











DR. WISEMAN'S

POPISH LITERARY BLUNDERS

EXPOSED.

BY

CHARLES HASTINGS COLLETTE.

“The gentleman's name was Mr. WORLDLY WISEMAN. He dwelt in the Town of Carnal Policy.”—*The Pilgrim's Progress*.

LIBRARY ST. MARY'S COLLEGE

LONDON :

ARTHUR HALL, VIRTUE & CO., 25, PATERNOSTER-ROW.

MDCCCLX.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

5720

P R E F A C E.

“ IN the person of his Eminence [Dr. Wiseman] is recognised, not only a Prince of the Church, but the illustrious head of the Hierarchy of England; the people of Ireland also recognise a champion of whom [Roman] Catholic Europe is proud.”

Such is the testimony of a leading London Romish newspaper, *The Weekly Register and Catholic Telegraph*, of the 28th of August, 1858.

There is no doubt that Dr. Wiseman has the reputation of being a learned man, and on a merely superficial examination of his controversial works, we cannot be surprised that he should pass as such; for he appears to possess an extensive knowledge of the writings of the early Christian divines, commonly called the “Fathers of the Church.” In the character of “Champion” of Romanism, he has undertaken to establish by the testimony of these Fathers, the antiquity and apostolicity of the peculiar “doctrines and practices” of his Church, against which we, the children of the Reformation, protest.

The *object*, then, of the following letters, addressed to Dr. Wiseman (reprinted from the *National Standard* and *Dublin Warder*), is to prove:

First: That whenever Dr. Wiseman seeks to esta-

blish his case as founded on the testimony of antiquity, these very Fathers are, with few and unimportant exceptions, misquoted or misrepresented.

And, secondly: That Dr. Wiseman, practically and personally, knows nothing of the writers he so confidently, and with such apparent erudition, cites: or, if we give him credit for a *knowledge* of the authors from whom he quotes, we have a very unpleasant inference forced upon us. It is, however, a matter of opinion with some persons, in what character they would prefer to appear before the public, under the circumstances in which Dr. Wiseman is now placed.

The *subject* derives importance, therefore, from the fact, that it exhibits the chief functionary of the Papal Church in this country, a **CARDINAL ARCHBISHOP**, in a very equivocal light.

As legitimately coming within the scope of the title I have adopted, I have added my "POPISH FRAUDS EXEMPLIFIED IN DR. WISEMAN'S LECTURE ON PURGATORY," the former edition being out of print. In this, the reader must be prepared to find a few repetitions, which, under the circumstances, could not be avoided.

I would wish it to be observed, that the examples adduced of Dr. Wiseman's "POPISH LITERARY BLUNDERS," are samples, merely, of similar misquotations and misrepresentations, plentifully dispersed throughout his controversial works.

C. H. COLLETTE.

Lincoln's Inn-fields, Dec. 1859.

CONTENTS.

LETTER

- I.—(1—4.)—Introductory.
- II.—(4—13)—*Tittman's* "Meletemata Sacra." *Dr. Turton's* reply. *Dr. Wiseman's* extraordinary blunderings, 5. *Origen's* "Saint Worship," four blunders, "the Lamentations," "the Lament," and "Commentary on the Book of Job," 6—12. Genuine sentiment of *Origen* on Saint Worship cited, 13.
- III.—(14—20)—"Annunciation of the Mother of God" attributed to *Athanasius*, to prove Worship of the Virgin Mary, spurious, 15. His genuine writings cited, 19.
- IV.—(21—30)—*Ambrose* on "Purgatory," "Com. on Epist. to Corinthians," spurious, 23. *Chrysostom* on "Transubstantiation," "In Proditione Judæ," and "De Pœnitentia," spurious, 23. *Basil* on "Purgatory," "Commentary on Isaiah," spurious, 23. *Augustine* on Matt. xii. 32, on "Purgatory," spurious, 24. *Methodius* on "Virgin Worship," spurious, 24. *Gregory Nazianzum*, "Christus Patiens," "Worship of the Virgin," spurious, 25. "Encomium S. Mariam," spurious, 26. "The Acts of St. Mary of Egypt," false date assigned, 27. *Augustine*, "Saint Worship," *De Curâ Gendâ*, doubtful, 29. *Ephram*, "The Praises of the Virgin Mary," spurious, 29.
- V.—(31—35)—Allegation that Peter was first Bishop of Rome, 31. *Cave*, 32. *Pearson*, 33. *Usher*, 33. *Young*, 34. *Blondel*, 34. All perverted.
- VI.—(36—46)—As to Peter's alleged visit to Rome, 36. *Bull-Barrow*—*Spanheim*—*Salmacius*, 37. *Scaliger*—*Cranmer*—*Flaccius Illyricus*—*Hiero. Zanchius*—*Ranke*, per contra, 38. Monuments no evidence, 39. *Irenæus* as to Peter being first

LETTER

- Bishop of Rome, misquoted, 39. And mistranslated, 42.—
Matt. xvi. 18. That Peter was *the* rock. Interpretation condemned by sixteen Fathers, 44. *Augustine's* testimony opposed to Dr. Wiseman's theory, 45. *Launoy's* evidence as to four interpretations of text, 46.
- VII.—(47—52)—*Cyril of Jerusalem* on "Transubstantiation" ingeniously perverted, 48. *Origen* on "Purgatory," strange use made of, 48. *Epiphanius*, 49. *Cyril of Jerusalem*, 51. On "Purgatory" misquoted.
- VIII.—(52—57)—*Ambrose* on "Purgatory" and "Prayers for the Dead," "De Obitu Theodosii" glaringly perverted, 52.
- IX.—(58—63)—*Cyprian* on "Saint Worship," Epistle lvii. mistranslated, 58. *Irenæus*, "Worship of the Virgin," strange perversion and blunder, 60—62.
- X.—(63—66)—*Augustine* (no reference) on "Purgatory," his sentiments examined.
- XI.—(67—74)—*Augustine* on "Psalm xxxiv.," on "Transubstantiation," passages explained and his true teaching and meaning proved.
- XII.—(74—91)—*Irenæus* on "the Rule of Faith." Rome's teaching, 76. "Tradition," *Dr. W.'s* theory, 77. His quotation examined and opposed, 79. What *Irenæus* meant by tradition, 88.
- XIII.—(91—108)—*Tertullian* on "the Rule of Faith," "on the prescription of Heresies," *Dr. W.'s* statement, 94. Misrepresentation exposed, 95. *Dr. W.'s* quotation and *Tertullian* placed side by side, 102. *Tertullian's* sentiment as to the sufficiency of Scripture, 107.
- XIV.—(108—135)—*Origen* on "the Rule of Faith." His true sentiments on the sufficiency of Scripture, 109. Dr. Wiseman's perversion exposed, 113 *et seq.* Apostolical tradition not rejected by us, 115. The rule followed by Reformers in this respect—*Bishops Patrick, Kaye, Faber, Rose, and Leslie*, 116. *Origen's* 7th Hom. on Levit., perversions of, exposed, 117 *et seq.* and 125 *et seq.* *Dr. W.'s* theory on tradition, 119. A citation from *Cyprian*, 123. His theory of tradition as explained by *Suicer* opposed to *Dr. W.'s*, 124, and opposed to Peter's primacy, 125. *Dr. W.'s* interpretation of John vi., 128, contradicted by *Origen* in the very passage cited, 130,

LETTER

who relies on the interpretation of the Church, 133. *Origen* held lightly by Romanists, 134. Opposed to transubstantiation. Prayers in a foreign tongue, 135. Image worship. The Romish interpretation of Matt. xvi. 18. The Immaculate Conception, and the Apocrypha, 135.

XV.—(136—138)—Concluding Letter. The principle on which *Dr. W.* has pretended to act, and his appeals to the Almighty.

POPISH FRAUDS EXEMPLIFIED BY DR. WISEMAN'S LECTURE ON
PURGATORY.

Introductory remarks, 142—146. Uncertainty of doctrine, 148. Definition of doctrine. Creed of Pope Pius IV. Council of Trent, 149—151. *Dr. Challoner*, 150. Real fire. Trent Catechism. *Bellarmino*, 152. *Bishop Quélen*. Duration of suffering. Ritual of Salisbury, 154. Treasures of the Church. *Leo XII.* on Indulgences, 155. Works of supererogation. *St. Thomas Aquinas*, 156. The Scapular, 156. "Satisfaction" done by deputy. The Trent Catechism. The Rhemish notes, 157. *Peter Dens*, 158. Indulgences a pious fraud, 160. Openly sold, 162.

Doctrine derived from Paganism, 163. *Gregory I.*, theory of, 163. The Gospel teaching, 165. *Veron's* three rules of "Catholic Faith" stated, 166-7. *Dr. W.'s* theological deductions of Purgatory from Prayers for the dead, 168. His theory as to prayers for the dead, 168—9. But early custom differed from the modern. *Jeremy Taylor* quoted, 170. *Usher* on the Liturgies, 171. Apostolic constitution. *Dr. W.'s* admission that the Apostles and *Virgin Mary* were prayed for. *Dr. W.'s* evasion, 172.

Scriptural evidence, 2 Macc. xii. 43—46, 173. Objected to, 176. Non canonical, 177. Matt. xii. 32. Venial and mortal sins, 179. Forgiveness of sins, 183. Rev. xxi. 27, 185. *Dr. W.'s* subterfuge alleging that other doctrines cannot be found by Scripture, as Infant Baptism, 187.

Testimony of Primitive Church, 187. Tradition, *Dr. W.'s* definition of, 187. And the *unwritten word*, 188.

An historical view of the rise and progress and final adoption of the doctrine of Purgatory, 192—214. Extracts from *Cyprian*,

- 196—208. *Tertullian*, 199, as to commemoration of the dead. *Irenæus* as to a future state, 203. *Erasmus* put in Expurgatory Index for his honest acknowledgment, 205. *Tertullian*. and *Maldonat* on "Abraham's bosom," 205. *Clement*, *Ignatius*, 206. *Justin Martyr*, 207, on an after state. *Augustine's* opinions, 210. *Hilary* on works done by proxy, 212. *Bishop Fisher's* testimony against Purgatory, 212. Not admitted by Greek Church, 213. *Alp. à Castro*, 213. Indulgences, 213. *Cajetan* against, 214. *Councils: of Florence*, 213, and *Ferrara*, 214.
- Dr. Wiseman's Testimony from the Fathers, *Tertullian*, 215. *Cyprian*, 221. *Origen*, 225. *Basil*, 233. *Ambrose*, 234. *Epiphanius*, 240. *Cyril of Jerusalem*, 242. *Jerome*, 252. *Augustine*, 255.
- The text 1 Cor. iii. 15, 258.
- Conclusion, 266.

 ERRATA.

- p. 41, note 1, line 1, "manifestam."
 67, note 2, line 10, for "ut" read "est;" line 12, "portamur."
 68, note 1, line 4, for "αὐτῶν" read "αὐτῶν."
 73, line 24, "fideles."
 90, line 2, for [], place (); note 1, line 12, "quibus."
 97, line 23, "*Scripturis*."
 102, line 22, "thou deniest," read "thou affirmest."
 110, note 1, line 7, "nos omnia."
 111, note 2, line 2, "rapacitatem;" note 3 for "et," read "ad."
 114, line 22, for "ete," read "et e."
 118, note 1, "divinam"—"homines edocent"—"excogitari"—"sed Dii"—"immortalis."
 124, line 15, "shall not depart."
 132, note 1, line 3, "occidit;" line 16, "perstringamus."
 160, note 2, line 2, "specialmente."
 209, note 1, lines 1 and 5, "pœnitentiæ," line 8, "delictis."

Quid Romæ faciam? mentiri nescio!—JUV. Sat. iii.

DR. WISEMAN'S
POPISH LITERARY BLUNDERS.

TO THE RIGHT REV. N. WISEMAN, D.D.

No. I.

RIGHT REV. SIR,—I have long desired an opportunity of bringing to your notice in some compact and convenient form, through some public channel, the various misquotations and misrepresentations of authors and facts which so plentifully pervade your works. In now doing so, you will perceive that I am not about to do the work of a “detective,” but of a *compiler* of “evidence,” dispersed over numerous works, which your hazardous and apparently reckless quotations and assertions have, from time to time, called into existence. The accusation, therefore, is nothing new; but as truths cannot be too often repeated, the present recapitulation may be of some

service, if not to yourself, at least to those who have not the opportunity of studying the controversy, and have not access to those works containing the exposures in question.

Before I enter on the immediate subject of these Letters, let me dedicate the first to a few remarks on yourself personally, as a slight apology for singling you out as the object of peculiar attention.

You, Rev. Sir, have been designated, and not inappropriately, "the Apostle in these parts of the Papistical Heresy." You have, either through personal merit (worldly or spiritual), or by agitation and intrigue, attained the highest ecclesiastical rank in this country that can be enjoyed by a Romish Priest. In you is revived the foreign title of Cardinal, extinct in this country, since the reign of the first Mary.¹ It is currently reported, that, like a former ambitious English Cardinal, in your spiritual pride, you aspire even to the Popedom, and that your ambition will only be satiated when you feel the weight of the triple Crown on your brow. You have even dared to set at defiance our laws, by assuming a territorial ecclesiastical rank. While you extend the begging palm, you do not hesitate to aim a death-blow at our constitution. You have credit for learning, power of argument, and certainly are looked upon as the great champion of the Papal cause in this country.

That such a man would either wilfully falsify, or even accidentally misrepresent a document, or fact, is a supposition which no Roman Catholic will for one

¹ I have been reminded that there has been one Cardinal since, viz. Cardinal Weld.

moment entertain, because you withhold from your people the means of enlightenment, by denying them the privilege of reading Protestant books. Notwithstanding all this, I boldly and unhesitatingly declare, that I know of no theologian in this country who has put forward more glaring perversions, and at the same time more subtle evasions, than yourself. You have presumed on your credit, overdrawn your account, and made bankrupt of your reputation, in the estimation of the learned.

Whether your perversions be the result of ignorance, carelessness, or dishonesty, I will not now stop to inquire. I have to deal with *facts* as I find them, and it is for the public to judge, whether a man of your reputation for learning among your co-religionists, of your dignity and station, is not personally responsible for erroneous statements and quotations, which are apt to mislead your confiding and uninitiated admirers. These blemishes are so much the more dangerous, as they appear in works of great talent, in other respects to be admired, as written in that elegant and polished style so peculiarly your gift; but, as our poet truly says,—

“ Since the more fair and crystal is the sky,
The uglier seem the clouds that in it fly.”

I have to deal with you only as a teacher and vindicator of “The principal doctrines and practices” of what you call the “Catholic Church.”

My observations will be principally directed to illustrations from your Lectures, published under the above title, and which have been largely circulated, the present edition being stereotyped.

If these Lectures have not entitled you to be called "learned," they have certainly earned for you the reputation of a subtle, crafty, and dangerous exponent and apologist of the "doctrines and practices" you have undertaken to vindicate. I shall not, however, confine my remarks to these, but, as time permits, wander over the broad field, laid out before me by your most prolific pen.

With these few preliminary observations, I shall proceed to my subject in subsequent letters.

I remain, Right Rev. Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

C. H. COLLETTE.

57, Lincoln's Inn Fields, London.

P.S.—Your reverence must not think me discourteous in not addressing you by your foreign ecclesiastical titles. Titles conferred by a foreign prince, are not legally recognised in this country; you will pardon me, therefore, for not publicly recognising them.

No. II.

RIGHT REV. SIR,—In examining the various exposures of your misquotations, perversions, and strange blunders, the first question that naturally suggests itself is—Have you personally inspected the books you, with such apparent research, summon in support of your particular views or arguments? I am willing, nay, I am constrained, to adopt the most charitable supposition, that, as a general rule, you have not your-

self examined the works from which you pretend to quote, otherwise I must accuse you of wilful and deliberate misquotation and perversion. If, however, you are contented to pass as a mere compiler, and admit that you have been blindly following preceding controversialists of supposed repute, and have implicitly relied on their veracity, then you must be content to renounce the title of "learned," by which you have tacitly permitted yourself to be addressed by your various admirers.

It is quite a matter of opinion with some persons, in what particular character they would prefer to appear before the public, when detected in the perpetration of some literary delinquency.

In the present Letter I will take two illustrations which have led me to believe that your quotations are taken "second-hand," and that you have not consulted the original works you pretend to quote. You have plumed yourself with borrowed feathers, but you have not had the sagacity to perceive that they are only painted, and fade when the bright sun of truth concentrates its rays upon them.

It must be a great humiliation to your pride to be reminded of your short-comings, but this is the penalty incurred by all those who place themselves in a false position.

I take the first example from an incident which occurred in your controversy with DR. TURTON, then Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge.

You published a series of Lectures on the Eucharist. Dr. Turton freely handled these, in a work entitled

“Roman Catholic Doctrine of the Eucharist, considered.” You were rash enough to hazard a reply, to which the Doctor rejoined.¹

You referred to Tittman's *Meletemata Sacra*, and quoted, with the usual additions, “Lips. 1816, p. 274.” Again, you desire your opponent, with some degree of confidence, “to consult all the best commentaries on the chapter (John vi.), Rosenmüller, Kuinoel, Tittman,” &c. &c. These references would lead one to believe that you yourself had an intimate acquaintance with the productions of the “learned Tittman,” and more particularly with the Leipsic edition of 1816 of Tittman's *Meletemata Sacra*.

The discussion was the interpretation of certain verses of the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel.

Dr. Turton having shown that the notion attributed to Tittman by you, in your fourth Lecture, involved something not very consistent with reason, he proceeded to prove that the notion was, in fact, altogether opposed to Tittman's recorded opinions. For that purpose, he quoted a passage from his *Meletemata Sacra*; but conceiving you to be (as you professed to be) perfectly familiar with that author, and naturally imagining that you were quite at home in this region of literature, he did not set out the full title of the work, which is as follows: “*Meletemata Sacra; sive Commentarius exegetico-critico-dogmaticus in Evangelium Iohannis*”—a title which declares, as distinctly as words can declare, that the work is a commentary on

¹ “Observations on the Rev. Dr. Wiseman's Reply to Dr. Turton's Roman Catholic Doctrine of the Eucharist, considered.” London: J. W. Parker, 1839.

the Gospel of St. John. Dr. Turton simply refers to the work as the commentary on St. John in the following terms:

“In the last place, I have carefully examined Tittman’s commentary on St. John at the place in question, to ascertain whether there was any pretence for attributing to him so absurd a sentiment as we have just been considering. No such pretence can be discovered.”

This drew from your pen one of those cutting rebukes in which you not unfrequently indulge when your veracity or accuracy is questioned. I will transcribe your ever memorable reply. You write:

“I quoted the *Meletemata Sacra*. I supposed the professor [Dr. Turton] was acquainted with the work; so like a good controversialist—*certainly not like a good scholar* [brave words these of yours, Sir]—he goes to *another work* of Tittman’s, and from that attempts to confute me. This is his commentary on St. John.”

This was a bold leap to take in the dark, and your intrepidity took the professor somewhat by surprise. The volume with which you pretended such familiar acquaintance, denominated *Meletemata Sacra*, is declared on the very title-page to be a commentary on St. John; at the top of every page, from the beginning of the book to the end, the particular chapter and verse under discussion are distinctly marked, so that the volume is indisputably nothing but a commentary on St. John; no other commentary on St. John by Tittman, than that called *Meletemata Sacra*, was ever heard of, except in your “Reply;” and, therefore, to quote Dr. Turton’s retort, notwithstanding the tone of confidence which you, Sir, thought proper to assume, and the accusation of a want of scholarship in a Pro-

fessor of Divinity in our University of Cambridge, the inference least injurious to your character is this—that you never, in the whole course of your life, had read, or even consulted, the volume called *Meletemata Sacra*.

But the case does not rest here. In your first Lecture, you referred to another volume by Tittman, with perfect accuracy—“*Opuscula Theologica*, Lips. 1803, p. 661.” Had you really consulted that volume, as your precise reference would indicate, that volume might have taught you that the *Meletemata Sacra* must be a commentary on St. John, and Dr. Turton points out that the first 170 pages of the volume, headed *Meletemata Sacra in Evangelium Ioannis*, contain the commentary on St. John, as far as the 42nd verse of the fourth chapter; which, with some additions, occupies the first 188 pages of the *Meletemata Sacra*, published in 1816:—a second and clear indication that you have here again quoted a work which you had never so much as seen, betraying, as you did, a most lamentable ignorance of its contents. And thus the tables were turned upon yourself.

The second example, I take from your Moorfields Lectures, entitled “Lectures on the Principal Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church;” the amended edition of 1851, Lecture XIII. vol. ii. p. 107. You are attempting to prove that the Romish doctrine of “Invocation of Saints” was taught by the Primitive Church. Among other writers, you press into your service Origen, who wrote in the third century. You state that:

“He (Origen) thus writes on the Lamentations: ‘I will fall down on my knees, and not presuming, on account of my crimes, to present my prayers to God, I will invoke all the saints to my assistance,’” &c.

And the reference you give in a foot-note is, “Lib. ii. de Job,” that is, the second book of the commentary on the book of Job, as being the place where we are to find the passage quoted by you.

Now, Rev. Sir, here we have, in the short space of a few lines, four distinct, gross, and unpardonable blunders, which display a lamentable ignorance of the subject you have undertaken to elucidate to your admiring auditory.

We are left in a state of uncertainty whether the passage you quote is taken from the treatise called “The Lamentations,” or from the “Commentaries on the Book of Job,” two distinct works. “The Lamentations” is a work universally admitted to be the genuine work of the writer whom you desire to press into your service; it is called “*Selecta in Threnos*,” and finds a place among the genuine works of Origen in the Benedictine edition, by De la Rue.¹ But the passage you quote is not from this work at all. The person from whom you borrowed wanted to palm off a spurious passage from a work bearing a somewhat similar title, containing an heretical modern Popish doctrine, on a respectable author of the third century. This is blunder No. I.

The “literary charlatans,” Messrs. Kirk and Ber-
rington, from whom you appear to transcribe, did

¹ Paris, 1733, tom. iii. p. 321,—the edition Dr. Wiseman himself purports to quote. See Lecture v. p. 142, vol. i.

know of the fraud. It originated with them; but they do not refer us to the "Commentary on the Book of Job,"¹ as you do. This additional complication was left for you to consummate. They quote two passages, from two different works; you transcribe one of them, but recklessly add the reference to the passage you do not quote. From the beginning of the "Commentary" to which you refer us, to the end, no such passage is to be found as that you quote. You might just as well refer us to the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel, to find your favourite passage quoted from 2 Maccabees, xii. 43, 46. And this is blunder No. II.

Blunder No. III. is to quote even this Commentary on Job as a genuine production of Origen. Pray, Rev. Sir, refer to some of your own writers—for instance, Bellarmine.² Sixtus Senensis in the *Bibliotheca Sancta*,³ or Possevin in *Apparatu*;⁴ and you will find it admitted that this work which you palm off with such confidence, is decidedly spurious. Erasmus, in his *Censura*,⁵ proved that it was written by some Arian, long after Origen's time, and calls the prologue to the treatise, "the production of a silly talkative man, neither learned nor modest." And your own Benedictine edition, the same you profess to have consulted, transfers it to an appendix, as the commentary of an anonymous writer on Job,⁶ and condemns it as spurious. And you have the assurance to quote the treatise as genuine!

¹ See "Faith of Catholics." London, 1830, p. 430.

² De Scriptor. Eccl. p. 62. Edit. Lovanii, 1678.

³ Pp. 281, 2, fol. Paris, 1610.

⁴ Tom. i. p. 526. Coloniae, 1608.

⁵ Edit. Basil, 1545; tom. i. p. 408.

⁶ Tom. ii. p. 894. Paris, 1733.

And, lastly, for blunder No. IV.: the passage you quote, as from the "Lamentations," or the "Commentary on the Book of Job" (you are not particular which), is from a work, the "Lament," or, the "Wailing of Origen." I have accounted for your culpable negligence in sending us to the "Commentary on Job." How you have fallen into the other blunder is patent. To one so totally ignorant of the subject as you have shown yourself to be, the "Lamentations" and "Lament" naturally appear to be one and the same work; it is just such a mistake as one would make who had not seen Tittman's work of *Meletemata Sacra*, and believed it to be a different work from the commentaries on St. John, of course reversing the order. The present case is the more unpardonable, for it is a part of your creed that you will never interpret Scripture, except according to the unanimous interpretation of those Fathers, of whose writings you appear to be hopelessly ignorant—a fact I shall presently bring out in bold and unmistakable relief. Your own Pope Gelasius, at a council held at Rome, considers this very work under the title of "Pœnitentia Origenis," as "written by heretics and schismatics," which "the Catholic and Apostolic Church by no means receives."¹ In the edition of 1545 of Origen's works, this universally condemned treatise is prefaced by Erasmus as "the fiction of some unlearned man, who attempted, under colour of this, to throw disgrace upon Origen."² And it is wholly excluded from the Paris Benedictine edition, 1733—the very edition from which you pre-

¹ Labb. et Coss. Concil. tom. iv. p. 1265. Paris, 1671.

² Basil. Edit. 1545. Tom. i. p. 498.

tend to take your quotations. These Roman Catholic editors do not admit the treatise even among the doubtful works of Origen. On the contrary, they give abundant reasons for excluding it, by inserting the observations of the learned critic, Huet, Romish Bishop of Avranches, who, after quoting the observations of Erasmus, and the condemnation of Gelasius, concludes with these remarkable words:

“It is wonderful, therefore, that, without any mark of their being forgeries, they should be sometimes cited by some theologians in evidence. Here we may smile at the supineness of a certain heterodox man of the present age, who thought the ‘Lament’ ascribed to Origen, to be something different from the ‘Book of Repentance.’”¹

Your supineness or heterodoxy led you, if I can give you credit for weighing the subject at all, to commit this very error.

In 1836 you fell into this blunder.² The Rev. Mr. Tyler, in 1847,³ exposed your blundering to the above effect; which blunders in 1851 you repeated by issuing a new edition.

I can only come to the conclusion, that these perversions are for the most part the result of ignorance, that you appear in borrowed plumes, and that you should renounce all pretensions to being considered a “learned” man, and should cease to aspire to be a teacher of subjects you have not studied, and content yourself by “editing” such silly fictions and romances as the “Fabiola; or, the Church of the Catacombs.”

The object of your quoting this spurious work, is to

¹ Tom. iv. part ii. p. 326.

² Lectures, vol. ii. p. 107.

³ “Primitive Christian Worship,” pp. 134 and 404.

convey to your hearers and readers that Origen held the modern Romish heresy of "Invocation of saints and angels." Had you been anxious to bear unbiased testimony as to the teaching of this same Father, whom you designate as "one of the most learned men in the early Christian ages," on the subject,¹ you would have had no difficulty. In his undoubtedly genuine work against Celsus, he is very clear and express, and there was no necessity to endeavour to press into your service an undoubtedly spurious work. He writes:

"All supplications and prayer and intercession and thanksgiving we must offer up to God who is above all, through the living Word and God who is a High-Priest superior to all Angels.—To invoke Angels, indeed, when men know so little about them, were itself irrational: but, even on the supposition that we were ever so well acquainted with such mysterious wonders, still this very supposed knowledge, while it was setting forth their nature and their respective offices, would forbid us presumptuously to pray to any other than the all-sufficient Deity through the Son of God our Saviour."²

I shall, in my next, proceed to expose another class of your perversions.

I remain, &c.

¹ Lecture v. vol. i. p. 142.

² Πᾶσαν μὲν γὰρ δέησιν καὶ προσευχὴν καὶ ἐντευξίαν καὶ εὐχαριστίαν ἀναπεμπτέον τῷ ἐπὶ πᾶσι Θεῷ, διὰ τοῦ ἐπὶ πάντων ἀγγέλων ἀρχιερέως, ἐμφύχου Λόγου καὶ Θεοῦ.—Ἀγγέλους γὰρ καλέσαι μὴ ἀναλαβόντας τὴν ὑπὲρ ἀνθρώπων περὶ αὐτῶν ἐπιστήμη, οὐκ εὐλογον' ἵνα δὲ καὶ καθ' ὑπόθεσιν ἢ περὶ αὐτῶν ἐπιστήμη, θαυμάσιός τις οὖσα καὶ ἀπόρρητος, καταληφθῆ' αὕτη ἢ ἐπιστήμη, παραστήσασα τὴν φύσιν αὐτῶν καὶ ἐφ' οἷς εἰσιν ἕκαστοι τεγαγμένοι, οὐκ ἔάσει ἄλλω θαρρῆν εὔχασθαι, ἢ τῷ πρὸς πάντα διαρκεῖ ἐπὶ πᾶσι Θεῷ, διὰ τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Υἱοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ. Orig. cont. Cels. lib. v. p. 233. Ed. Cantab. 1677.

No. III.

RIGHT REV. SIR,—Without recapitulating any of the facts brought forward in my last, it will be readily conceded as proved: 1. That you have betrayed a most culpable ignorance of, at least, the two subjects I have brought to your notice; and 2. That it behoves all those who desire to seek the truth, to exercise due caution, if they hope to find it in your controversial works. I have already said enough, I venture to assert, to throw discredit on every assertion and quotation you have made, or may hereafter venture upon; but it is really distressing to be obliged to carry into the regions of theological controversy, the axiom, used in some secular transactions, that we ought to believe our opponent a rogue until he proves himself to be an honest man.

Experience has taught those who are at all acquainted with the Romish controversy, to doubt every quotation or statement made by one of your co-religionists, until it has been subjected to a previous searching examination, by a competent and trustworthy person. A veteran theologian, the late George Stanley Faber, whose opinions must be respected, as having been given after long-trying experience, laid down the following rule:

“Whenever a Romish doctor makes a large or extraordinary, or startling assertion, there clearly can be no harm in a cautious suspension of belief, until either the inquirer himself or some competent and trustworthy friend, shall have had an opportunity of actual and personal verification of alleged authorities.”

I have ever acted on this rule.

But to continue my subject. Where shall I begin? I feel myself somewhat in the same embarrassing position you seemed to have been placed in, when you were compiling your lecture on "Purgatory." Your material from the writings of the Fathers, you alleged to be so plentiful, that "the only difficulty you experienced was to select such passages as may appear the clearest;" and so it is with the perversions and misquotations exhibited in your lectures. As I was last on your lecture on "Invocation of Saints," suppose we continue on that subject.

I find in your edition of 1836, vol. ii. p. 108, you most confidently appeal to the great Athanasius, in support of your modern Romish practice of "Invocation of Saints," and more particularly of the blessed Virgin Mary.

Now, Sir, I fearlessly challenge you to produce one single passage from the writings of this "renowned and undaunted defender of the Catholic [not Romish] faith"—"indicative of any worship of the Virgin Mary, or any belief in her power and intercession, and any invocation of her, even for her prayers." This illustrious Bishop of Alexandria died at the end of the fourth century. Your modern practice of invocation and intercession of saints did not then exist in the Christian Church.

You, however, were bold enough confidently to appeal to this Father as countenancing your modern innovation. The passage was thus given by you in Lecture XIII. vol. ii. p. 108:

"St. Athanasius, the most zealous and strenuous sup-

porter that the Church ever possessed of the Divinity of Jesus Christ, and consequently of his infinite superiority over all the Saints, thus enthusiastically addresses his ever blessed Mother: 'Hear now, O daughter of David; incline thine ears to our prayers; we raise our cry to thee. Remember us, O most holy Virgin, and for the feeble eulogiums we give thee, grant us great gifts from the treasures of thy graces, thou that art full of grace. Hail Mary, full of grace, the Lord is with thee. Queen and mother of God, intercede for us.' Mark well [you continue] these words; 'Grant us great gifts from the treasures of thy graces,' as if he hoped directly to receive them from her. Do Catholics [Romanists] use stronger words than these? or did Athanasius think or speak with us, or with Protestants?"

Leaving, for the moment, the question whether this passage indicates Popish or Protestant teaching, I assert that it has been established by your own writers beyond the possibility of a doubt, that Athanasius never wrote any such nonsense as you here have put into his mouth.

The passage is taken from a homily called "the Annunciation of the Mother of God." When you transcribed this passage, did you, or did you not, know that the whole homily had been unequivocally condemned as spurious by Cardinal Bellarmine,¹ and that he agrees with Du Pin in rejecting it? I believe you knew nothing about the subject, and so far I must give you credit for not being intentionally dishonest; but I cannot acquit you of the grossest negligence, and this is evidenced by the fact that the reference you yourself give clearly shows, that you never took the ordinary precaution of referring to the book to

¹ See his work, "De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis, p. 82. Edit. Lovanii, 1678, or the Cologne Edition, 1617, vol. vii. p. 50.

which you send us as your authority. Your reference is "Serm. in Annunt. t. [tom.] ii. p. 401," which indication refers to the Benedictine Edition of 1698. You blindly followed those literary impostors, Kirk and Berrington.¹

Had you but turned to the edition and volume indicated by your reference, you would have saved your reputation, for this once. You would have seen that the Editors "who published the Remains of St. Athanasius in 1698, class the works contained in this same second volume under two heads—the doubtful and the spurious; and the homily you quote you would have found ranked, without hesitation, *among the spurious*. In the middle of that volume, in close proximity to the passage in question, the Editors not only declare the work to be unquestionably a forgery, assigning the reasons for their decision, but they fortify their judgment by quoting, at length, the letter written by the celebrated Romish Annalist, Baronius, more than a century before (dated from Rome, Nov. 1592) to our countryman, Stapleton."² The Benedictine Editors begin their preface with these ominous words: "That this discourse is spurious, there is NO LEARNED MAN WHO DOES NOT ADJUDGE." And they add the testimony of Baronius, who said "that all persons of learning, WHO WERE DESIROUS OF THE TRUTH, would freely agree with him," that the homily was not the production of Athanasius. Alas! sir, for your reputation for "learning" and "truth." This same preface is also to be found set out in the later

¹ "Faith of Catholics," 1830, pp. 430, 431.

² See Tyler's "Primitive Christian Worship," 1847, p. 182.

Paduan Edition of 1777,¹ where this homily is also ranked, without any doubt, among the spurious works; and even in the earlier edition of Paris, 1662,² it is condemned as spurious. There was, therefore, not the slightest pretence or excuse for ascribing this homily to the respected writer whom you so much desire to press into your service.

It is true, that in your edition of 1851, you quietly withdraw the passage, but without one word of explanation to guard your readers from falling into the same error as *you* had done, or one expression of regret that the sacred cause of truth should have been injured by *your* negligence. No; such step would have been ruinous to your reputation; so you think it more prudent to keep your own counsel. This is not carrying out the command "to show yourself a worthy Minister of Christ in the word of truth,"³ with which you so ostentatiously commence your Lectures. And though you may boast that your Church is established with a "security against error" (p. 3.), you, Rev. Sir, have a most unfortunate mode of persuading us of the truth of the alleged fact.

As, however, you have so far taken a step in the right direction, by withdrawing the passage, pray take courage and complete the good work, by filling in the hiatus, with an admittedly genuine passage from one of the orations of Athanasius. It is as follows:

"We are truly worshippers of God, because we invoke no one of the creatures nor any mere man, but the Son who is by nature from God and true God; made

¹ Tom. ii. p. 332. ² p. 336, "Bibliotheca Patrum Concionatoria."
³ Lecture i. p. 1.

man indeed, yet not the less, therefore, the Lord himself, and God and Saviour. Who would not justly admire this being; or who would not collect, that he must needs be somewhat truly divine?"¹

It was scarcely worth while to risk your reputation, by going out of your way to select a passage from a notoriously spurious work, when you had genuine testimony at hand. While I admit the difficulty of your position, I cannot accept that as an excuse.

And here let me point out a fallacy in your introductory Lecture. You deny *Scripture* to be the only rule of faith; whereas you allege that *Tradition* is equally the rule of faith, and its addition to that rule "is not a corruption." "If *tradition* (you say) be equally a rule of faith, the Catholic [Romish] Church is not guilty of the alleged corruption of adding tradition." (p. 5.) This is a *non sequitur*. We admit tradition, where it confirms Scripture. The doctrine Athanasius taught on the subject under consideration was scriptural. The *tradition* handed down to us, by his writings, of the belief of the Church in his day, confirms the truth of Scripture; whereas you have perverted the doctrine as plainly taught by Scripture, and have attempted to confirm your error by corrupting the *tradition* as handed down by Athanasius.

It is this systematic corruption of tradition, exemplified in your writings, that I intend to expose.

¹ Ἀλλὰ ἀληθῶς θεοσεβεῖς, ὅτι μηδένα τῶν γενητῶν μὴ δὲ κοινὸν τινα ἄνθρωπον· ἀλλὰ τὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ φύσει καὶ ἀληθινὸν Θεὸν Υἱὸν τοῦτον δὲ γενόμενον ἄνθρωπον, οὐδὲν ἦττον Κύριον αὐτὸν καὶ Θεὸν καὶ Σωτῆρα, ἐπικαλούμεθα. Τοῦτο δὲ τίς οὐκ ἂν θαυμάσειεν· ἢ τίς οὐκ ἂν σύνθετο θεῖον ἀληθῶς εἶναι τὸ πρᾶγμα; Athan. contr. Arian. Orat. iv. Oper. tom. i. p. 275. Heidelb. apud Commel. 1600.

While, however, I admit that the doctrine conveyed by the passage quoted by you, is according to the *practical teaching* of your Church, I protest against your quoting it for the purpose for which you adduce it. Were I in controversy to accuse your Church of praying *to the Virgin* "to grant you great gifts from the treasures of her graces, as if you hoped directly to receive them from her," you would, as Dr. Milner had done,¹ protest that it was a libel and misrepresentation, an odious charge, a "calumny." In this very Lecture you protest that your Church is not responsible for abuses of the doctrine practised by individuals (p. 97); and yet, when you think to support your erroneous teaching by *tradition*, you do not hesitate to bring in evidence, under the sanction of respected names, that very form of doctrine which you would repudiate when alleged against you. In my recently delivered Lectures on "The Invocation of Saints,"² I have adduced from your "lecture" several specimens of the unfair use made of similar passages. As this little work greatly concerns yourself, I would respectfully bring it to your notice.

I remain, &c.

¹ Letter 33, "End of Controversy."

² Published by Wertheim and Mackintosh, price 1s.

No. IV.

RIGHT REV. SIR,—In the last edition of your Lectures, from which I have been quoting, you state in the preface, that it was undertaken under your own sanction, “as the only effectual means to prevent injury to yourself and to your cause;” and, indeed, you stated that you had “written a considerable portion of them over again.” All this indicates quiet study, calm judgment, and forethought; and you commended your book “to the favour and protection of the Almighty, begging his blessing upon both the writer and the reader;” and you court “a candid and unbiassed judgment of all who shall take it into their hands.” And you state to have derived a “consolation” at “witnessing the patient and edifying attention of a crowded audience.” Each succeeding edition seems to have been subjected to your mature deliberation and examination, and, therefore, am I the more surprised, that you should have allowed to pass palpable misrepresentations and erroneous quotations. But look at the method you adopt to mislead the members of your Church. You deny them the right of exercising any judgment or criticism at all on the subject of which you treat.

In your introductory Lecture (p. 17), you tell us that, “We may wander about the outskirts [of your Church], we may admire the goodness of its edifices and of its bulwarks, but we cannot be its denizens or children, if we enter not by that one gate—” CHRIST! the way, the truth, and the life? No, by no means; but of—“absolute unconditional submission

to the teaching of the Church." And you further tell us, that if we proceed to examine the grounds whereon the peculiar dogmas and practices of your Church are upheld, we shall find that "Catholics [Romanists] maintain them exclusively by the same principle of their being taught by an infallible authority vested in the Church." And so satisfied are you that the Church can teach nothing but what is infallibly true, that you do not hesitate to endorse that startling assertion of Ignatius Loyola, that we are to believe *white* to be *black* if your Church defines it to be so.¹

An "infallible authority," you assert, "exists, and always has existed, in your Church." This teaching can only be ascertained or communicated by or through the accredited ministers of your Church, delivered either in writing or by word of mouth. You come before us professedly as an exponent of her doctrines and practices, "clothed," as you pretended to be, "in a mail of proof." (p. 1.) As a natural consequence your flock gives an "absolute, unconditional submission to your teaching," and believes that it is being taught "by an infallible authority," as if "God's truth" were really "committed to your charge." (p. 1)

¹ "That we may in all things attain the truth (that we may not err in anything), we ought ever to hold it as a fixed principle, that what I see to be *white* I believe to be *black*, if the Hierarchical Church so define it to be." See Dr. Wiseman's edition of "Ignatius' Spiritual Exercises," London, 1847, p. 180. It is worthy of remark here that the printer was evidently puzzled, at the deliberate contradiction required of the senses, and Dr. Wiseman seems to have overlooked the mistake (if a mistake). The passage immediately preceding that above quoted stands thus: "Finally, that we may be altogether of the same mind and in conformity with the Church herself, if she shall have defined anything to be *black* which to our eyes appears to be *white*, one ought in like manner to pronounce it to be *white*;" which is evidently contradicted by the passage which follows it, the "Autograph," as above set forth.

Now, what security have your readers that they are not deceived? You invite implicit credence in the pastors of your Church, disarm suspicion, and then take advantage of your power by passing off spurious documents defending your modern and anti-scriptural doctrines, under the pretence of their being sanctioned by respected Fathers of the early Christian Church.

I have cited two such cases. We have numerous others dispersed throughout your Lectures. See with what confidence you quote Ambrose, the celebrated Bishop of Milan, in support of your doctrine of Purgatory, citing, as evidence,¹ a passage from a Commentary on Paul's 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, when these commentaries are rejected by all critics. Du Pin positively asserts, that they were not written by Ambrose. Bellarmine even condemns them, both in his critical and controversial works. He writes, "That the author of this commentary was not Ambrose, as the learned well know, neither was he one of the celebrated Fathers."²

In your Lecture XVI., on Transubstantiation (p. 229), you give two passages which you attribute to Chrysostom, but both are admitted to be spurious. You will find them declared so to be in the edition "Gr. et Lat. Studio D. Bernardi de Montfaucon," &c., Paris, 1837; that, "In Proditione Judæ," in tom. x. p. 877, and the other "De Pœnitentia," in tom. ix., are ranked among the spurious works.

To prove Purgatory to be advocated by Basil, you quote from the acknowledged spurious commentary on

¹ Lecture xi. vol. ii. p. 62.

² Bell. de Matrimonio, lib. i. c. 17, tom. ii. p. 1328.

Isaiah,¹ and it is yet to be proved that the writer of these was even, as you assert, “a contemporary author” with Basil. And in support of the same doctrine, you make Augustine quote Matt. xii. 32—in proof of the supposition, that some sins are forgiven in the next world, and therefore *you* (not Augustine) conclude this must be in Purgatory; whereas, not only is this theory contrary to the statement of your own doctrine (for, according to your statement, Purgatory is not a place where sins are forgiven, but “for the infliction of punishment for transgressions”—“where God has *forgiven* the sin;”²) but the passage attributed to Augustine is itself a modern addition.³

And now turn to your “Remarks on Mr. Palmer’s Letter.”⁴ Here you quote various spurious writings to prove that the blessed Virgin Mary was an object of invocation to the early Christians. You press into your service Methodius, the very learned Bishop of Olympus, or Patara, in Lycia, and afterwards of Tyre, in Palestine, who suffered martyrdom A.D. 303. You quote (p. 30) from a homily on which there is not the slightest question as to its being spurious. For, in the first place, the Benedictine Editor, in a note to Jerome’s works,⁵ says, once for all, that the “Symposium” is the only entire work of Methodius extant; and Baronius expressly says, “I do not hesitate to say

¹ Lecture xi. vol. ii. p. 60.

² Lecture xi. vol. ii. p. 42.

³ See Ludovicus Vives, in *Lib. De Civ. Dei*. lib. xxi. c. 24, p. 865, London, 1610.

⁴ London, 1841.

⁵ *Oper.* tom. ii. p. 910.

that no Greek or Latin writer has left a sermon delivered on the feast of the Purification (called sometimes 'Hypapantes,' sometimes 'Simeon and Anna') before the fifteenth year of Justinian (A.D. 542), and that Pope Gelasius paved the way for the institution of that feast, by putting an end to the festivities of the Lupercalia, which were also observed in February."¹ And the Benedictine monk, Lumper, in his "Critical Theological History,"² &c., unquestionably shows that the homily you quote is of a much later date than you give it, by attributing it to Methodius. In your same "Remarks on a Letter from the Rev. W. Palmer," in p. 28, you again boldly and confidently cite the illustrious, pious, and eloquent Bishop of Constantinople, Gregory of Nazianzum (A.D. 378), as having directly and unequivocally prayed to the Virgin Mary. The work you cite is the "Christus Patiens," or "Christ's Suffering"—found in the Appendix of the second volume, p. 1206, of the Benedictine (S. Maur) edition, Paris, 1840, of Gregory's works—a tragedy, the characters being Christ, his mother, Joseph, and others. In introducing the passage as from the pen of Gregory, which is too long to quote here (it partakes strongly of the mawkish sentimentality characteristic of your erratic, and not unfrequently erotic, prayers to the Virgin offered by celibate priests), you say, "After all, there is poetry in all sincere prayer; every office of [Roman] Catholic devotion, public or private, is essentially poetical; and

¹ Baronius, in Feb. 2, Paris, 1607, p. 57.

² Tom. xiii. p. 474. Aug. Vind. 1784.

if it was lawful for St. Gregory to address the blessed Virgin, as follows, under any circumstances, it cannot be idolatrous in us." And after giving the idolatrous prayer, you add: "Here is the blessed Virgin directly prayed to, considered a protector or defender against enemies. In short, in this one address St. Gregory sums up all that is contained in the passage considered by Mr. Palmer so objectionable in the mouths of modern Catholics." As to the prayer being "essentially poetic," I will not dispute with you, but that it is most decidedly "idolatrous" I maintain. But *if* Gregory never dictated such a prayer as you quote, and he most certainly did not, your argument founded on "if it was lawful" falls to the ground, but the consequent idolatry still remains. There is not the slightest doubt that Gregory of Nazianzum did not write this "dramatic composition," nor was it a production of his age; and for evidence I direct you to the very edition you are supposed to quote from (that you ever looked at any edition I cannot believe), of the Roman Catholic Benedictine Editor (Paris, 1840, second volume, in the Appendix); here you will find all the editor's arguments set out to prove the work to be spurious. It is marvellous, indeed, to find a man in the present day reckless enough to quote passages and books he never saw, and yet to stand forth as a "teacher in Israel!" You have been bold enough in the same "Remarks on Mr. Palmer's Letter" (p. 25), to press into your service Cyril, the eminent Bishop of Alexandria (A.D. 412-444), for the same object that you have quoted Methodius and Gregory, and you allege "that to the Virgin, in some

sort, the works of Christ are attributed" by this Father, this same Cyril, who, in his undoubtedly genuine works, showed the blessed Virgin to be weak, frail, and erring,¹ particularly when he referred to the words of Simeon (Luke ii. 35), saying, "By the 'sword' he meant the sharp attack of passion which distracted the female mind into reasonings which were out of place!" The homily quoted by you is the "Encomium S. Mariam," which Auberti, the editor (Paris, 1638), has placed in the fifth volume of Cyril's works, p. 379. This editor was the first who added the homily in question to Cyril's works, but he admits that he copied it out of a most faulty manuscript in the King's Library at Paris, and amended it as well as he could, by guesses. Had Cyril's works come under the critical examination of the Benedictine Editors, they would not have allowed this homily to pass as genuine.² And once again, in the same "Remarks," p. 26, you quote, for the same purpose, "the Acts of St. Mary of Egypt" as "a remarkable monument of most confident supplication made to the blessed Virgin [in the fourth century], and that, too, in the presence of, and suggested by, her image!" On the authority of the *Bollandists*, you assert the "Acts could not have been compiled later than A.D. 500." But the Bollandist editor³ built all his reasonings on

¹ See the 12th Book of his Commentary on St. John's Gospel, tom. iv. p. 1064 *et seq.* Edit. Paris (Lutet.), 1638.

² For a further critical notice on this subject, I beg to refer the learned (?) Doctor to Tyler's work, "The Worship of the Virgin Mary," London, 1851, pp. 360 and 408, and to which I am also indebted for previous observations on various citations.

³ That Dr. Wiseman never read the authority he quotes is evident, for he refers to the treatise as "The Life" or "Acts of Mary," as though it

assumed facts and dates, and which tumble down like a house built with cards under the critical pen of the Rev. J. E. Tyler.¹ But a man of your standing and pretensions to learning, instead of relying on the authority of a Jesuit writer of the seventeenth century, should have brought to bear your ingenuity and "inductive skill" to prove that the three manuscripts of this "Life of St. Mary of Egypt," in the Bodleian Library, and which are of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and bear the name of "Sophronius, Bishop of Jerusalem," as their author, are attributed to that writer. Sophronius lived at the close of the seventh century! But then you would have come in contact with a writer of a century earlier than John Bollandus—Lawrence Surius—also a compiler of "Acts of Saints," who had adopted a Latin translation of this work, wherein the authorship is attributed to the same Sophronius.² But as you cannot afford to give up "an authority" of so early a date when you would have us believe that the worship of the Virgin was practised, you are quite satisfied to stake your reputation on the writer you quote, and take no trouble to examine the *value* of the authority. Your object is gained if a series of early dates and names garnishes your books, they pass muster with the uninformed, and who would dare to doubt "CARDINAL WISEMAN'S" veracity!

were the joint work of many—the Bollandists; it is in reality, however, the production only of one, who speaks of himself in the first person singular. See *Acta Sanctorum*, tom. i., April 2, p. 68, Anop. 1675. See Tyler as above, p. 419. Many hands, it is true, were occupied in the entire work, but one only on this part.

¹ Worship of the Virgin Mary, as above, p. 410 *et seq.*

² Tom. ii. p. 186, Venice, 1581.

In your Lecture XIII. p. 113, in support of Saint Worship, you quote, as from Augustine, from a work "De Curâ Gerenda pro Mortuis," &c., which in the edition Bassani, 1797, tom. viii., is placed under the fifth class of sermons, as "Sermones Dubii."¹

Then, again, in this same Lecture on "Invocation of Saints."² How you labour to enlist in your service testimony from St. Ephrem, to whom you refer "as remarkable as being the oldest Father and writer of the Oriental Church." Would it have disarranged the force of your argument had you omitted the whole page of quotation from a work entitled "The Praises of the Virgin Mary?" What new evidence had you, Sir, when you so dogmatically set this sermon down as from the pen of Ephrem, the Syrian deacon, when Tiellmont describes the production as from some ignorant monk? Mr. Tyler shows that the whole work has not only been declared spurious by writers of your own Church, but, further, that the passages quoted by you are taken from a work which never was ascribed to Ephrem in any age, and which is not ascribed to him in any one manuscript or printed book, and which were never even bound up with Ephrem's works before the Roman edition of 1732.

¹ Augustine's testimony is so clear on the subject of Invocation of Saints, that I cannot refrain from quoting the following passage from his work on True Religion: "Let not our point of religion be the worship of dead men. For though they lived piously, still they are not to be so accounted of as requiring from us any such honours; but they rather wish us to worship Him, through whose illumination they rejoice that we should be partners of their merit. They are to be honoured, therefore, on account of imitation; not to be prayed to on account of religion."—(Honorandi sunt ergo propter imitationem, non adorandi propter religionem.) August. De Ver. Relig. c. lv. tom. i. p. 317. Edit. Colon. Agripp. 1616.

² Lecture xiii. p. 109.

If your object was to palm off such spurious trash as this, on your hearers for the genuine productions of a Syrian deacon of the fourth century, "as the *truths* committed to your charge,"¹ we can account for the anxiety exhibited in your introductory Lecture, demanding implicit, absolute, and unconditional submission to the teaching of your Church, with a bold assertion of your infallibility.

And so I might go on through a tedious list. But, mark here, again, your inconsistency. Ephrem is cited to prove the antiquity of your doctrine, and yet you are obliged to admit "that his expressions are so exceedingly strong, that some Catholics of the present day would feel a certain difficulty in using some of them in their prayers, *for fear of offending persons of another religion!*" What affectation! The idea of a Roman Catholic feeling any such difficulty for any such alleged reason! You, Sir, found no such difficulty when you published under your own name a translation of Liguori's "Glories of Mary," and wherein is repeatedly quoted that other work, Bonaventure's Psalter.

I remain, &c.

¹ Lecture i. p. 1.

No. V.

RIGHT REV. SIR,—I do not propose to follow any particular order in examining your misquotations and perversions, since it is not my intention to write a treatise, but shall take examples from different parts of your works, as convenience may suggest.

I beg now to refer you to the following passage in your Lecture on "The Supremacy."¹ You say:

"I presume it will not be necessary to enter into any argument to show that St. Peter was the first Bishop of Rome. The monuments which yet exist in every part of it, and the testimony of ecclesiastical writers from the oldest times, put the fact above all doubt; and it is only sufficient to say, that authors of the highest literary eminence, and remarkable for their opposition to the supremacy of the Roman See, such as Cave, Pearson, Usher, Young, and Blondel, have both acknowledged it and supported it. Among the moderns it may be sufficient to observe, that no ecclesiastical writer of any note pretends to deny this fact."

This is a fair specimen of your daring and sweeping statements.

Here are three dogmatic assertions:

I. That it is a "fact above all doubt," that Peter was the first Bishop of Rome.

II. That "authors of the highest literary eminence," remarkable for their opposition to the supremacy of the See of Rome (naming them), have acknowledged and supported the proposition.

III. "Among moderns, no ecclesiastical writer of any note pretends to deny this fact."

¹ Lecture viii. vol. i. p. 278.

I. In the sense in which you desire your words to be taken, I most emphatically deny that it is a fact above all doubt that Peter was first local Bishop of Rome, or that he exercised any dominant supremacy there. There is not the slightest reliable evidence to support the assertion. That Rome was called "Peter's Chair" I admit, and, in this general sense, Rome may have been called the See of Peter. But Carthage was also called "Peter's Chair;" Alexandria was called the "Chair" and "See of Peter;" even Canterbury was also called "Peter's Chair," though it is not pretended that Peter was ever at Carthage, Alexandria, or that he ever stepped into England. It may possibly be true that Peter went to Rome somewhere about A.D. 63, between the two visits of Paul to that city. The history of the Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistles of St. Paul, are wholly inconsistent with the idea suggested. Lardner, a writer of some note, lays it down as the most probable supposition, that Peter first visited Rome A.D. 63 or 64, and that he suffered martyrdom there with Paul, A.D. 64 or 65. But the idea of the twenty-five years', or any other reign as Bishop of Rome, is exploded.

II. Your appeal to the Protestant authors named, is on a par with your usual intrepidity, when a point is to be gained. CAVE gives testimony the very reverse of what you attribute to him. After alluding to the looser sense in which the title of Bishop may be applied to Peter, he says:

"The nature of the Apostolic office hardly allows that he should have been attached to the See of Rome as its

peculiar Bishop, and no record of primitive antiquity tells us that he was.”¹

If BISHOP PEARSON believed that St. Peter was Bishop of Rome, he considered Paul no less so. He uses the term in the general sense above referred to. His words are:

“Here, he (Epiphanius) plainly teaches that Paul, no less than Peter, was both apostle and bishop, and derives the succession of the Roman Bishops from Paul no less than Peter. It is true, therefore, that the ancient Greek Fathers considered *both* Peter and Paul to be Bishops of Rome.”²

His meaning is more evident in the following, from the same work, wherein, on the authority of Irenæus, he states that Peter and Paul founded that Church, and in the lifetime of the apostles, Linus was constituted Bishop:

“Cum Petrus et Paulus fundarent ecclesiam hoc est apostolis illis adhuc superstitibus, Linus Romæ episcopus constitutus est, ut docet Irenæus.”³

Do you propose to assert that Peter and Paul were joint possessors of the See of Rome, and that they both abdicated in favour of Linus?

With regard to USHER, I have carefully gone through all his writings, and the only passage I can find referring to the matter, is in his “Speech delivered in the Castle chamber at Dublin, in 1622, on the ‘Oath of Supremacy.’”⁴ He said that the grounds

¹ Romanæ vero Cathedræ tanquam peculiarem episcopum affixum esse, ægre patitur muneris apostolici ratio; nec alla nos docent primæ vetustatis monumenta. Hist. Lit. Sæc. Apost. p. 8, tom. ii. London, 1698; and Geneva, 1720, p. 5.

² Pearson. Opera Post., cap. vi. Dissert. i. p. 29. London, 1688.

³ Ibid. Diss. ii. c. v. sec. 2. p. 168

⁴ Edit. Cambridge, 1835, p. 649.

of the "claim of the Bishop of Rome" as the successor of St. Peter, "appear to be vain and frivolous." He supposes with an *if* it were true what Romanists allege, that Peter *was* Bishop of Rome after he was Bishop of Antioch, even then he adds, "Rome has little else to allege for this preferment, but only that Peter was crucified in it, which was a very slender reason to move the apostles so to respect it." In another place he distinctly makes Linus the *first* Bishop of Rome.

YOUNG, better known as "Patricius Junius," librarian to Charles I., only goes to the extent of admitting that the fact of the martyrdom of Peter and Paul, under Nero, was too well known to be brought into question; but the period he admitted to be doubtful.¹ But this is no nearer to your proposition than the other. He goes no further than to admit Peter's presence in Rome, which would give as good a title to Paul as having been Bishop of that See.

But your reference to BLONDEL is, indeed, somewhat surprising. Did you ever take the trouble to inquire what this "leader of the French Protestants of the seventeenth century" did say? I think not. You are really, Sir, a bold man to invite us to consult Blondel.

I will now transcribe, for your edification, what this Professor did say:

"The assignment of the Bishopric of Rome to St. Peter in particular, is contradicted by St. Irenæus, Eusebius, Epiphanius, and others, who commence their reckoning of the Bishops of Rome from the Apostles Peter and Paul, whom *they formally except from the cata-*

¹ This is found in a note to the Epistle of Clement, which he edited. "Petrum et Paulum Romæ sub Nerone martyrio vitam finiisse, notius est quam ut in dubium vocetur. De tempore autem opinio duplex est," &c.—*Clementis Epist. annot. in p. 8. Oxon. 1633.*

logue; showing that, properly speaking, neither Peter nor Paul were bishops of Rome; and that if the episcopal office is taken in a wider signification, they both of them equally exercised it there."¹

Unless you will admit the lawfulness of two Bishops occupying one See, I cannot possibly deduce from this admission, that Blondel "acknowledged and supported" your assertion.

Surely, Sir, the citations of these passages cannot render it "*unnecessary* to enter into an argument to show that St. Peter was the first Bishop of Rome." One would suppose the very reverse would have been the case, and that it was incumbent on you to prove the alleged fact, instead of taking it for granted.

In your introductory Lecture, you made the following promise:

"I will always make it a point, as much as possible, to give my statement in the words of some accredited defender and supporter of the Protestant cause." (p. 22.)

Is this the "method" which you proposed to follow, and which you call "*demonstrative*," rather than "controversial?" (p. 21.)

The third proposition I shall consider in my next; and in the mean time, I would claim your attention to Mr. Robins's learned work on this subject, entitled "The whole Evidence against the Claims of the Romish Church."

I remain, &c.

¹ "L'assignation de l'épiscopat de Rome à St. Pierre particulièrement est impugnée par St. Irénée, Eusèbe, Epiphane, &c., qui commencent à compter les évêques de Rome depuis les apôtres Pierre et Paul, qu'ils exceptent formellement de leur catalogue, montrant, que proprement parler, ni Pierre ni Paul n'ont été évêques de Rome, et qu'en prenant l'épiscopat en une signification plus large ils y ont tous deux également exercé l'épiscopat."—"De la Primauté," p. 588. A Genève, 1641.

No. VI.

RIGHT REV. SIR,—We were upon your Lecture on Supremacy. You *presumed* that it was not necessary to enter into any argument to show that St. Peter was the first Bishop of Rome. This was the first proposition disposed of in my last; the second, also disposed of, was the alleged acknowledgment and support given to this proposition by certain “Protestant authors of the highest literary eminence.” We now come to the third proposition: “Among the moderns, no ecclesiastical writer of any note pretends to deny this fact.”

You promised in your introductory Lecture (p. 21), that you would “not take any one single principle for granted which would possibly bear a dispute,” and with all the assumption of candour you could muster, you add, “that you would begin with the simplest elements, and that they should, as they go on, develop themselves by their own power,” and that it would be your “endeavour to conduct the inquiry precisely as one would do who has no prejudice on either side, but who, using such measure of sagacity or inductive skill in tracing out proof as he may possess, should proceed to search out what is right and true.” (p. 21.) And having thus thrown dust in the eyes of your readers, you forthwith jump to conclusions, and take for granted the very points most in dispute, and with that “inductive skill” so peculiarly your forte, you pervert Protestant authors to carry out your argument.

Not only is Peter's supposed personal reign as Bishop of Rome doubted, but his very presence in that city

has been called in question, by writers of very considerable note, whatever you may allege to the contrary.

The learned Dr. Bull, Bishop of St. David's (1705), said:

“Some very learned men have observed that the whole tradition of St. Peter's voyage to Rome was first derived from Papias—an author, indeed, very ancient, but also very credulous, and of a mean judgment.”¹

Our famous Dr. Barrow, in his treatise on the Pope's Supremacy,² gives very cogent reasons for asserting that Peter never was Bishop of Rome; and though he does not deny that it was possible Peter might have been at Rome, he says, “Many have argued him to have never been at Rome.” (p. 126.) Spanheim, Professor of Divinity at Heidelberg (1655), and at Leyden, and Rector of the University, in his treatise “*De fictâ Protectione Petri Apostoli in Urbem Romam*,” maintains that Peter never was in Rome. The illustrious scholar Salmasius, honorary Professor at Leyden (1631), asserts that there is no better evidence for Peter having gone to Rome, than for the preaching of James in Spain, or of Joseph of Arimathea in Britain, &c.; and that by calculation of dates, it is proved with the utmost certainty that the Apostle was never at Rome. His words are:

“*Qui Petrum Romæ fuisse potest credere, sane credat et Jacobum in Hispaniâ prædicasse evangelium, et Josephum Arimatheæ in Britannîâ. Nec verior est relatio quæ Andream dat Constantinopoli, sive antiquo Byzantio,*

¹ See his *Vindication of the Church of England*, p. 139. London, 1719.

² See *Edit.* London, 1840, p. 124 *et seq.*

quam ea quæ Romæ Petrum. Et temporum etiam ratione certo certius comprobari potest Petrum Romæ nunquam fuisse."—*Cl. Salmasii Apparatus ad Librorum de Primatu*, p. 15. Edit. Lugd. Batav., 1645.

Scaliger, one of the most learned men of his age (1609), says that no one moderately learned can believe Peter's journey to Rome, his session for twenty-five years, or his capital punishment there.¹

Archbishop Cranmer maintained "that it was not certain that Peter was ever in Rome."²

The very learned Flaccius Illyricus, the Professor of Hebrew and Divinity at Jena (1557), one of the authors of the Magdeburg Ecclesiastical History, in his "Catalogus Testium Veritatis," &c.,³ declares himself doubtful whether Peter ever was at Rome. Hieronymus Zanchius, one of the most learned and pious of the reformers, and Professor of Divinity, of Strasbourg (1553), has, in his work, "De Ecclesiâ," cap. 9, in the 9th vol. of his works (*s. l.* 1619), shown enough to make any candid person stand in doubt on the same subject. And, lastly, let me refer you to Leopold Ranke, of the University of Berlin. In his History of the Reformation in Germany, he exercised a wise caution, when he said, "Historical criticism has shown that it is a matter of doubt whether the Apostle (Peter) ever was at Rome at all."⁴

¹ Speaking of the manner of Peter's death, he says: "Sed neque Romæ potuit, quum Romæ nunquam fuerit." And again: "De ejus Romam adventu et supremo capitis supplicio ibidem, nemo qui paulo humanior fuerit, credere possit." (p. 7 of Scaliger's notes on the New Testament, Genevæ 1620: "Novum J. C. Testamentum, cum Notis J. Scaligeri in Locos aliquot difficiliores.") I may observe here that the above are given by M. Robins in his excellent work referred to in my last.

² See "Burnet's Reformation," pt. i. b. ii. p. 286, vol. i. London, 1830.

³ Vol. i. pp. 484-5, 2nd Edit.

⁴ B. ii. cap. 2, p. 472. London, 1845.

With these few references before us, which might be multiplied, I think it will be conceded, that it was necessary on your part to enter into some argument to show that St. Peter was the first Bishop of Rome.

I beg leave respectfully to deny your further assertion, "that the monuments which (you allege to) exist in every (or any) part of Rome, put this fact above all doubt." I presume that you do not desire to revive the famous Peter's chair controversy, on which Lady Morgan put you to the rout. The fact of the existence of a martyr's memorial, or even of a tomb in a particular city, does not prove, or even imply, that the martyr died in the place where it is erected. We have various tombs erected in different places in memory of the same person, even in places which they never visited. But, even supposing that it could be proved as an historical fact, that St. Peter did die at Rome, and was buried there, you surely would not intend to imply from this that therefore he was first Bishop of Rome?

You proceed, in the next passage, to perpetrate an equally gross piece of assumption and perversion. Having assumed Peter to have been Bishop of Rome, you proceed to say, "To Peter (as St. Irenæus observes) succeeded Linus, to Linus Anacletus; then, in the third place, Clement." This passage is placed within inverted commas as being a translation, and your reference is "Adv. Hær. lib. iii. c. 3." I beg to state that Irenæus "observes" no such thing. You, with your usual "sagacity and inductive skill," would have us believe that Irenæus declared, and took as a matter of course, that Peter was the first Bishop of Rome, and Linus succeeded him. He nowhere makes

or hints at such an assertion; but his evidence in the very place goes exactly to contradict the supposition. The Church of Rome, he tells us, was founded and organised, not by Peter alone, but by Peter and Paul together, and the two together delivered to Linus the episcopate for the purpose of administering their newly founded Church at Rome. Thus Linus, according to your own authority, stood as first Bishop of Rome; to whom Anacletus succeeded, and then Clement came, of course, as the third Bishop of Rome. There is not, therefore, the slightest pretence for the supposition that Peter was himself Bishop. The evidence is the other way.

The passage is as follows. I give it at length, as another of your perversions appears in it:

“The tradition of the Apostles, manifested throughout the whole world, may be seen in the Church by all who wish to hear the truth: and we can reckon up, both those who by the Apostles were appointed bishops in the churches, and the successors of those bishops down even to our own times.—But, since in such a volume as this it would occupy too much space to enumerate the successions of all the Churches, we shall confound all those persons who, from whatever bad motive, collect differently from what they ought to collect, by simply indicating that apostolic tradition and that declared faith of the greatest and most ancient and universally known Church, founded at Rome by the two most glorious Apostles Peter and Paul, which has come down even to us through the succession of her bishops. [For to this church, on account of the more potent principality, it is necessary that every church should resort; that is to say, those faithful individuals who are on every side of it: in which church, by those who are on every side of it, the tradition, which is from the Apostles, has always been preserved.] The blessed Apostles, then, founding and building up

that church, delivered to Linus the episcopate of administering it.—But to him succeeded Anacletus; and, after him, in the third place from the Apostles, Clement received the episcopate.—The successor of Clement was Euaristus; and, of Euaristus, Alexander. Next to him, the sixth from the Apostles, Sixtus was appointed; after him, Telesphorus: next, Hyginus: then, Pius: and, then, Anicetus. But, when Soter had succeeded Anicetus, Eleutherius now holds the episcopate, in the twelfth place from the Apostles.”¹

The “Apostolic Traditions” here referred to, I may mention, by the way, were the doctrines handed down from the Apostles by and in their writings, and had nothing to do with the primacy or supremacy of Peter or of his alleged reign at Rome as Bishop there, or elsewhere. It will require, on your part, a greater “measure of sagacity and inductive skill” to squeeze from this passage your proposition.

If you have any private source of information on

¹ “Traditionem itaque Apostolorum, in toto mundo manifestatum, adest perspicere omnibus, qui vera velint audire: et habemus annuere eos, qui ab Apostolis instituti sunt Episcopi in Ecclesiis, et successores eorum usque ad nos.—Sed quoniam valde longum est, in hoc tali volumine, omnium Ecclesiarum enumerare successiones; maximæ et antiquissimæ et omnibus cognitæ, a gloriosissimis duobus Apostolis Petro et Paulo Romæ fundatæ et constitutæ, Ecclesiæ, eam quam habet ab Apostolis traditionem et annunciatam hominibus fidem, per successiones Episcoporum pervenientem usque ad nos, indicantes, confundimus omnes eos, qui, quoquo modo, vel per sui placentium malam vel vanam gloriam, vel per cæcitatem et malam sententiam, præterquam oportet colligunt. Ad hanc enim Ecclesiam, propter potentiorem principalitatem, necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam; hoc est, eos qui sunt undique fideles: in qua semper, ab his qui sunt undique, conservata est ea quæ est ab Apostolis traditio. Fundantes, igitur, et instruantes, beati Apostoli, Ecclesiam, Lino Episcopatum administrandæ Ecclesiæ tradiderunt.—Succedit autem ei Anacletus: post eum, tertio loco ab Apostolis, Episcopatum sortitur Clemens.—Huic autem Clementi succedit Euaristus: et Euaristo Alexander. Ac deinceps, sextus ab Apostolis, constitutus est Sixtus: et ab hoc, Telesphorus: ac deinceps, Hyginus: post, Pius: post quem, Anicetus. Cum autem successisset Aniceto Soter: nunc duodecimo loco, Episcopatum, ab Apostolis, habet Eleutherius.”—Irenæ. adv. Hær. lib. iii. c. 3.

this subject it would be cruel to withhold it; but in the mean time permit me to submit to you the opinion of Valesius, the Romish Commentator on Eusebius, on this very subject and passage. He says:

“The Apostles had a rank peculiar to themselves, nor were they ever reckoned among the Bishops of the Churches.” (On Eusebius, iii. 14.) “It must not be forgotten that Eusebius never reckoned the Apostles among the Bishops of the Churches, as I have already remarked. Irenæus, as well as Eusebius, says, that Peter and Paul laid the first foundations of the Church which was in Rome, but these writers nowhere reckon them among the Bishops of that Church.”¹

Were it necessary to my argument, I could show that even this expression of “founding” a Church does not necessarily imply a personal presence of the founder.

In quoting the above passage, however, a little further on (pp. 281-2), you make a very characteristic use of your “inductive skill.” You translate—

“Ad hanc enim Ecclesiam, propter *potentio-rem principa-
litate*m, necesse est omnem convenire Ecclesiam; *hoc est, eos qui sunt undique fideles*: in qua semper, ab his qui sunt undique, conservata est ea quæ est ab Apostolis traditio”—

as follows:

“To this Church, *on account of its superior headship* [in Italics], every other must have recourse; that is, the faithful of all countries.”

This is a gross perversion, as well of the words as of the meaning of Irenæus. The proper translation appears above, p. 40, within brackets []. “On account of

¹ Ibid. iii. 21. Edit. Paris, 1659.

its superior headship" is not a correct reading of "*propter potentiorem principalitatem.*" The jurisdiction of the See of Rome was *confined* to a prescribed district, to the churches round about it, "*undique.*" It was the Metropolitan Mother Church, on account of its "more potent principality," of the district churches. Irenæus does not speak of a "superior headship." Each Metropolitan Church had, at this time, and for many years after (confirmed by the 6th Canon of the Council of Nice, A.D. 325), an independent jurisdiction; and to translate *undique fideles* "the faithful of all countries," is doing violence alike to the idiom of the language, as, also, to the well-established traditional custom and privilege of each Metropolitan Church.

This is so well known, that it would be superfluous for me here to dwell further on the subject.

I remain, &c.

P.S.—It may not be out of place if I here notice a statement in your same Lecture on "the Supremacy of the Pope." You, of course, dogmatically declare that CHRIST, in his words recorded by St. Matthew (xvi. 18), referred to *Peter* as the *rock*, on which His Church was to be built. And it is on this private interpretation that you principally assume the supremacy of Peter, and by *inference* that of the Popes of Rome over the whole Church of Christ, as his alleged successors. Your theory is, that our Lord addressed Peter as the rock, and without changing the *object* of His discourse, declared that His Church was to be built on Peter as that rock. You say:

"An attempt was made many years ago, and lately renewed, to prove that the rock upon which Christ

promised that he will build his Church, was not Peter but Himself. It is supposed that having addressed this disciple in the first part of his sentence, and said to him, 'Thou art Peter,' that is [as you say] a rock, our Saviour suddenly changed the *subject* [say rather *object*] of the discourse, and pointing to Himself, said, 'and upon *this* rock, I will build my Church.' This interpretation, you will perceive, my brethren, can boast more of its ingenuity than its plausibility; it seems rather calculated to betray the *shifts to which our opponents* feel themselves obliged to resort, in order to elude our arguments, than to make any effectual resistance to their force."¹

Many years ago, and lately renewed! How many years ago? A hundred or two? Perhaps only since the Reformation? Are you in earnest, are you attempting to impose on us, or are you really ignorant? Father Launoy, a celebrated Roman Catholic writer, was compelled to expose the wilful misrepresentation of Cardinal Bellarmine, on this very subject, when he alleged that all the Fathers agreed that Christ referred to *Peter* as the rock on which the Church was built. He cites sixteen Fathers and Doctors, ranging from and including Jerome (A.D. 415), Augustine (A.D. 420), Theodoret (A.D. 430), Bede (A.D. 720), Anselm (A.D. 1080), Pope Celestine (A.D. 1143), St. Thomas Aquinas (A.D. 1260), to Pope Pius II. (A.D. 1458), who, all before the Reformation, interpreting this same text, said that the Church was built on CHRIST *the Rock*;² and what is more remarkable, you condemn the very argument, or rather the reasoning, advanced by St. Augustine himself. This Father assumes the exact position you have suggested only to condemn as an interpretation "rather calculated to betray the

¹ Lecture viii. vol. i. p. 273.

² Launoy Opera, tom. v. p. ii. pt. 99. Epist. vii. lib. v. Gul. Voello, Col. Allob. 1731.

shifts" resorted to by an opponent. Was Augustine, then, an opponent of your doctrine and theory? Of course he was! He said, referring to these words of our Saviour:

"'And I say unto you, thou art Peter' (*Petrus*), because I am Petra, a rock, thou art Petrus, Peter: for *petra*, the rock, is not from *Petrus*, Peter, but *Petrus*, Peter, is from *Petra*, the rock: for Christ is not so-called from the Christian, but the Christian from Christ. 'And upon this rock I will build my Church:' not upon Peter whom thou art, but upon the rock, which thou hast confessed. 'I will build my Church;' that is to say, I will build thee, who, in this answer, art a figure of the Church."¹

And Jerome, in his Commentary on the 60th Psalm,² gives exactly the same reasoning and interpretation.

Here Augustine says Christ called Peter, *Petrus*, and then represents our Lord as changing the *object* of His discourse, and, pointing to Himself, calling Himself **THE ROCK**, and said that upon this rock (Christ) He would build His Church. But there is a still more remarkable passage in Augustine's thirteenth Sermon on the words of our Lord, where he says:

"Christ was the rock, Peter, figuratively, the Christian people. . . . Therefore, he said, 'Thou art Peter, and on this rock, which thou hast confessed, I will build my Church;' that is, I will build my Church on myself, the Son of the living God. I will build thee on Myself; not Myself on thee. For men willing to build upon men, said, I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, that is Peter. But others, who were unwilling to be

¹ "'Ego dico tibi, Tu es Petrus:' quia ego petra, tu Petrus; neque enim a Petro petra, sed a petra Petrus; quia non a Christiano Christus, sed a Christo Christianus. 'Et super hanc petram ædificabo Ecclesiam meam,' non supra Petrum, quod tu es; sed supra petram, quam confessus es. Ædificabo autem Ecclesiam meam; ædificabo te, qui in hac responsione figuram gestas Ecclesiæ."—Aug. Serm. cclxx. In die Pentecostes, tom. v. p. 1097. Paris, Benedictine Edit. 1680.

² Tom. vii. p. 178. Paris, 1602.

built on Peter, but would be built on the rock, said, but I am of Christ. But the Apostle Paul, when he knew that he was chosen, and Christ contemned, said, 'Is Christ divided? Was Paul crucified for you, or were ye baptised in the name of Paul?' Wherefore, as not in the name of Paul, so not in that of Peter, but in the name of Christ, that Peter may be built upon the rock, not the rock upon Peter."¹

But the fallacy is, that you should attempt to build a doctrine on a text, on the interpretation of which Fathers and Doctors disagree. The same Father Launoy cites eight Fathers who stated their opinion that the Church was built on all the Apostles equally, Christ being the chief corner-stone. Forty-four, who stated their opinion that it was the *faith* which Peter confessed, which was the rock on which Christ promised to build his Church, and seventeen who supposed that it was on Peter personally, as representing the Church. Here, then, we have it admitted, by a learned and candid Roman Catholic, that four widely distinct interpretations have been advanced by Fathers and Doctors on this same text. By your own Confession of Faith, you are precluded from advancing any interpretation of your own, unless you find the Fathers unanimously agreed on that interpretation. "Nor will I interpret them (the Scriptures) otherwise than according to the unanimous agreement of the Fathers," are the words of your own creed,² which you cannot evade.

¹ Aug. Serm. xiii. De verbis Domini, c. i. § i. tom. v. p. 415. Edit. *ut supra*.

² "Nec eam unquam nisi juxta unanimum consensum Patrum accipiam, et interpretabor."—Creed of Pope Pius IV., art. 3. Concil. Trid. apud Bullas, p. 311. Romæ, 1564, and Paris, 1848, p. 457.

No. VII.

RIGHT REV. SIR,—In examining the few preceding quotations, I have declined to express an opinion whether you have deliberately set them down with a full knowledge of their spurious and perverted nature. They are so glaringly outrageous, that I have been willing to concede to you the alternative that you personally knew nothing of the writers you summon, with such confidence and apparent erudition, to your aid. But I have to draw your attention to another class of quotations (to record them all severally would be to write a volume), where you appear to have been exercising “a measure of sagacity and inductive skill, in tracing out proofs,”¹ which betokens a certain degree of careful arrangement, adjustment, suppression, and management of quotations, and a predetermination on your part, to force out evidence where none existed, and to extract an admission of doctrines from writers of repute, who had no idea of them. That such a disingenuous (if not dishonest) course seemed to have been contemplated on your part from the first, appears from the fact, that even in your first Lecture you anticipated that, “perhaps by your preaching you would gain dishonour rather than credit”—for however conscientious you might be in delivering doctrines of the truth of which you alleged yourself to be firmly convinced, you “expected to be treated by many as merely a practised and cunning deceiver” (p. 2), and “thus prepared” and “forewarned,” and “having fully before you these

¹ Lecture i. p. 21.

consequences," you entered upon your course of Lectures.

Now, Sir, just look at the careful management of the following passage, as from Cyril's 4th Catechetical Discourse, quoted in your 16th Lecture,¹ in support of Transubstantiation :

"Wherefore, with all confidence, let us take the Body and Blood of Christ."

The words of Cyril are:

"Ὡστε, μετὰ πάσης πληροφορίας, ὡς σώματος και αἵματος μεταλαμβάνωμεν Χριστοῦ."² But which, when correctly translated, and by inserting in its proper place, the little, but all-important word ὡς, which you (wilfully, carelessly, or ignorantly, I will not pretend to decide) omit, Cyril's meaning becomes plain: "Therefore, full of certainty, let us partake, *as it were*, of the Body and Blood of Christ," not the literal flesh and blood, but the "types" (which words Cyril immediately after uses), represented by the bread and wine, "for in the *type* of bread His body is given to thee, and in the *type* of wine His blood is given."

Again; take your quotation from Origen, in your Lecture on Purgatory.³ You pretend to assert that the "fire" referred to in the text of 1 Cor. iii. 15, is the Popish Purgatory. You give a long passage from Origen's "Homily xvi. al. xii. in Jeremiah," as the dogmatic interpretation of this Father, as if enunciating the Romish teaching, and you say "nothing can be clearer regarding this doctrine," Purgatory (p. 59).

¹ Vol. ii. p. 225.

² Cyril. Hom. Myst. iv. § 3, p. 320. Ed. Paris, 1720.

³ Lecture xi. vol. ii. p. 59.

It is a well-known axiom, laid down even by Bel-larmine, that a text of doubtful interpretation cannot be quoted to support a doctrine.

In the passage cited by you as from Origen (if you will make a personal examination of it), you will find that he was not giving a dogmatic interpretation of the text in question, or enunciating what he considered the accepted doctrine of the Church, and that he expressly admits that this very passage in Scripture "was very difficult of explanation." Ὁ τόπος ἦν δυσδιήγητος σφόδρα,¹ which most important words are carefully dropped by you. Was this a wilful omission on your part? Again; had you studied the opinion of Origen at this time entertained, you would have found that he was broaching a new theory that had nothing whatever to do with Purgatory—that he was talking of the fire which should consume the world at the last day, and that the notions here enunciated were subsequently condemned by a General Council of the Church (the 5th Œcumenical Council),² and you should have known that Origen lived to express a totally different opinion on this very text, which we find in his work against Celsus, wherein he distinctly considers the text as referring to God's providential punishment of sin in this world.³

In the same Lecture on Purgatory (p. 62) you quote the following passage as from Epiphanius:

"There is nothing more opportune, nothing more to be admired, than the rite which directs the names of the

¹ Orig. Jerem. Hom. xvi. Oper. tom. i. p. 155. Ed. Huet. Rothomag. 1668.

² See Bals. apud Beveridg. Synod. tom. i. p. 150. Edit. Oxon. 1672.

³ Orig. cont. Celsus, lib. iv. p. 168. Ed. Cantab. 1677.

dead to be mentioned. They are aided by the prayer that is offered them, though it may not cancel all their faults. We mention both the just and sinners, in order that for the latter we may obtain mercy."

The reference given by you is, "Hær. lv. sive lxxv. t. i. p. 911." The edition is not given, but the page indicated agrees with the Cologne Edition, 1682.

I will add a literal translation of the passage, from the original Greek text, to which you refer, and I challenge criticism:

"But then, as to the reciting the names of the deceased, what can be more excellent than this practice? what more opportune and admirable? that they who are present should believe that the departed live, and are not annihilated, but exist *and live with the Lord*; and that the most venerable preaching might declare, that there is hope to those who pray for their brethren as if travelling in foreign lands."

Thus, then, in the very passage quoted by you as from this esteemed writer of the fourth century, we find the custom of reciting the names of the deceased in prayers; but Epiphanius expressly declared that those named were actually in a state of happiness, they "LIVE WITH THE LORD."¹ If there exist any passage fatal to Purgatory it is this; and yet you, Sir, have the temerity to quote Epiphanius as a witness in your favour, and accomplish the feat of priestly *legerdemain* by dropping the words which are clearly fatal to your case. And further, you *exclude* all that part of the passage which *includes* in the prayers offered up for

¹ Even in the marginal Latin translation in this edition is, "Sed existere et adhuc, atque apud Dominum vivere;" and in the Latin translation in the Paris edition, 1612, tom. iii. p. 762, "Et non sunt nulli, sed sunt et vivunt apud Dominum."

“the Patriarchs, Apostles, and Prophets,” whom your Church admits never went to Purgatory.

You have made a similar omission from the passage quoted as from Cyril of Jerusalem (p. 61). You quote him also as praying for the dead, and your reference is “Catech. Mystag., v. n. ix., x., p. 328.” You omit the words in “n. ix.,” though your reference would indicate that you commenced with this section, whereas you begin with “n. x.” The reason is too transparent, for in “n. ix.” we read, “We offer this sacrifice in memory of all who have fallen asleep before us; and, first, of Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, and Martyrs.” Your argument was, that “the doctrines of Prayers for the dead and Purgatory, go so intimately together that if you succeed in demonstrating the one the other necessarily follows.” (p. 54.) “Praying for the dead (you say) is essentially based on the belief in Purgatory;” and to make your evidence “demonstrate” what you want to prove, you omit such parts of the passages from which you quote as would, if given entire, cut to the very root of the whole system you are striving to prop up. This clever suppression and adjustment is more clearly illustrated in your citation from Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, which I will consider in my next. In the mean time it would be doing you justice to admit that you truly prophesied that “your preaching would gain dishonour rather than credit;” and I could not find more appropriate terms, than you yourself have furnished, to designate your proceedings as being the acts of a “practised and cunning deceiver” (p. 2); but, alas! in this case, the deceiver is himself the deceived. For the honour of human na-

ture, I am still willing to give you credit rather for even culpable negligence and ignorance, than deliberate fraud.

I remain, &c.

No. VIII.

RIGHT REV. SIR,—The following extract from your Lecture on Purgatory, gives rise to curious speculation, whether you have deliberately perverted your author, or have, in exercise of that blind obedience so characteristic in members of your Church, placed implicit credence in the Popish author from whom you borrowed your apparently learned store of knowledge.

The custom of praying for the dead, you tell us, “is essentially based on the belief in Purgatory, and the principles of both are consequently intimately connected together.”¹ And you declare that if you prove that the early Christians prayed for the dead, they must have believed that the object of their prayers was in Purgatory, in a place of torture, paying the debt due to God, for sins, which, though forgiven, are not atoned for; and this place is described by your Trent Catechism, as a place of *fiery torment*. Now let us turn to your passage, purported to be taken from Ambrose’s Funeral Oration on Theodosius.² The passage has reference to the custom of “praying for the dead,” and is an exemplification of the reckless manner of quoting from the Fathers. To carry out

¹ Lecture xi. p. 54.

² Lecture xi. p. 62.

your principle, Theodosius, the subject of this oration, was suffering in this fiery torment, paying the last farthing due to God's justice, for sins committed in the body. You quote him as follows:

“Lately we deplored together his death, and now, while Prince Honorius is present before our altars, we celebrate the fortieth day. Some observe the third and the thirtieth, others the seventh and fortieth.—Give, O Lord, rest to Thy servant Theodosius, that rest which Thou hast prepared for Thy saints. May his soul thither tend whence it came, where it cannot feel the sting of death; where it will learn that death is the termination, not of nature, but of sin. I loved him, therefore will I follow him to the land of the living; I will not leave him, till, by my prayers and lamentation, he shall be admitted to the holy mount of the Lord, to which his deserts call him.”

Your reference is “*De Obitu Theodosii*, tom. ii. pp. 1197-8, 1207-8.” This reference corresponds with the Benedictine Paris edition, 1686-90, from which edition I shall also quote.¹

In the above passage there is only one indication, that the quotation is not continuous. After the word “fortieth,” there is a —, but the fact is, the extract is a putting together of disjointed fragments, dispersed over ten or twelve pages, and which would lead an unsuspecting reader to believe that Ambrose was praying for a departed person, who was then suffering some punishment due to his sins, in Purgatory itself. By supplying the omitted passages, however, it will be seen at once, how very far was the doctrine of Purgatory from the mind of Ambrose when he delivered the oration in question.

¹ This subject is ably handled by the Rev. R. T. Pope, in his “*Roman Misquotations*,” p. 82. London, 1840.

In the very page referred to, "p. 1197," and immediately before that quoted by you, we read (sect. 2) that Theodosius "had been summoned to the Tabernacle of Christ," to "that Jerusalem which is above."¹

And after the word "fortieth" Ambrose refers us, for the solemnities to be observed, to the Sacred Scriptures; from which appeal you shrink with instinctive dread. By slurring over and mistranslating the passage, you are enabled to drop this troublesome reference.

The correct translation should be:

"And because some have been accustomed to observe the third and the thirteenth day, others the seventh and the fortieth, *let us consider what the lessons teach.*"

Reference is then made to Genesis l. 2, 3.; and Ambrose adds:

"The solemnity, therefore, is to be followed which the lessons prescribe."²

Thus it is manifest that Ambrose quotes as authoritative for the solemnities which were to be exercised not those prescribed by any particular Church, but the Scriptures; which plain appeal to the sacred volume you wholly suppress. Pray let me urge you to turn to your Bible, and study the passages indicated by Ambrose, and I challenge you, even with the aid of that "measure of sagacity and inductive skill" so

¹ "Et ille (Theodosius) quidem abiit accipere sibi regnum, quod non deposuit sed mutavit, in tabernacula Christi jure pietatis adscitus, in illam Hierusalem, ubi nunc positus dicit," &c. — Sect. ii. c. 1197. Bened. Edit. Paris, 1686-1690.

² "Et quia alii tertium diem et trigesimum, alii septimum et quadragesimum observare consueverunt, quid doceat lectio, consideremus," &c. — "Hæc ergo sequenda solemnitas, quam præscribit lectio," c. 1198.

particularly your forte, to extract from it either your Popish figment of Prayers for the dead, or Purgatory. Again, in section 32, is the following passage, omitted by you:

“Freed therefore from the doubtful contest, Theodosius *now enjoys perpetual light and tranquillity*; and according to those things which he hath done in this body, *rejoices in the fruits of Divine remuneration.*”¹

Passing over some of your free-and-easy translations, we come to section 39, where Ambrose says that “he (Theodosius) remains in light, and rejoices in the companies of the saints.”² That he “knows he reigns, since he is in the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ, and carefully beholds His Temple.”³ Again, in section 52, that “he had not put on the purple habit, but the robe of glory.” And concludes the oration thus: “Thou art altogether blessed which supportest a tenant of Paradise, and in the august receptacle of the interred body shalt hold an inhabitant of that city which is above.”⁴ We perceive, therefore, that Ambrose, while supplicating perfect rest for the departed Emperor, yet viewed him as in the actual enjoyment of felicity.

¹ “Absolutus igitur dubio certamine, fruitur nunc augustæ memoriæ Theodosius luce perpetuâ, tranquillitate diurnâ; et pro iis quæ in hoc gessit corpore, remunerationis divinæ fructibus gratulatur. Ergo quia dilexit augustæ memoriæ Theodosius dominum Deum suum, meruit sanctorum consortia.”

² “Manet ergo in lumine Theodosius, et sanctorum cætibus gloriatur.”—Sect. xxxix. c. 1208.

³ “Nunc se augustæ memoriæ Theodosius regnare cognoscit, quando in regno Domini Jesu Christi est, et considerat templum ejus.”—Sect. xl.

⁴ “. . . Non purpureum habitum, sed amictum induit gloriæ.”—Sect. lii. c. 1213. “Beata planè (Constantinopolis), quæ paradisi incolam suspis, et habitatorem supernæ illius civitatis augusto sepulti corporis tenebis hospitio.”—Sect. lvi. c. 1214.

I would ask any Roman Catholic whether he considers Ambrose honestly quoted by you? Will he pause to reflect whether the deception be intentional? Can he think otherwise, when you are supposed to be most learned and skilled in the controversy, when you pretend to vouch for your accuracy by giving a precise reference to a well-known edition? Will you, Sir, assert that Ambrose considered Theodosius suffering the pains of Purgatory when he was supplicating perfect rest for the Emperor? Will you presume to say that masses and prayers are now offered for the dead, "who have been summoned to the Jerusalem which is above," who are enjoying "perpetual light and endless tranquillity," "who reign in the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ in His Temple?" If it be so, it were well that this should be made known, that Roman Catholics may cease to grieve for those of their departed relatives, whose sins are supposed to be already forgiven. Let them keep their money for more pious uses. I would warn them, in the words of Tertullian:

"You wrong Christ when you do not hear with equanimity of those who are summoned hence by the Lord, as if they were to be pitied. 'I desire,' says St. Paul, 'now to depart and be with Christ.' (Phil. i. 23.) How greatly superior does he exhibit the hope of Christians! If, therefore, you impatiently grieve for others who had obtained their wish, you show yourselves unwilling to obtain it."¹

¹ "Et Christum lædimus, cum evocatos quosque ab illo, quasi miserandos non æquanimiter accipimus. Cupio, inquit Apostolus, recipi jam et esse cum Christo: quanto melius ostendit votum Christianorum. Ergo votum si alios consequutos impatienter dolemus, ipsi consequi nolumus."—De Patient. cap. 9. Rothom. 1662, tom. ii. p. 201.

What consolation can it be to a bereaved relative to be told that the sins of the dear departed who died in the faith, had been forgiven, but he was now expiating with severe and excruciating torture in the fires of Purgatory the debt due to those sins already forgiven? Well may we mourn for the departed in Christ, if such be our belief. But, Sir, we read in that blessed Book which has been bequeathed to us, that "He hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows" (Isaiah liii. 4); that He will give us rest (for there is a rest after this life to those who die in Christ). We have a glorious hope set before us: "We press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus" (Phil. iii. 14)—a joy which no Roman Catholic can experience; for he must anticipate not a joyful resurrection, but torments in Purgatory. Oh! Sir, if instead of teaching for doctrines the commandments of men, you would preach the "glad tidings of great joy," the forgiveness of sins through the blood of Christ, and that forgiveness is not followed by punishment, that a washing in the blood of the Lamb is not a Purgatory of torments: if you could but make your flock believe this, then would they no more grieve for the dead who die in the Lord—but rather rejoice, since Christ "hath by himself purged our sins" (Heb. i. 3), and "there is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus. (Rom. viii. 1.)

I remain, &c.

No. IX.

RIGHT REV. SIR,—Let me now take a specimen of your translation, so ably exposed by Mr. Tyler. To prove that your modern doctrine of Saint Worship was taught by the Fathers of the third century, you quote as from Cyprian's epistles the following:

“Let us be mindful of one another in our prayers; with one mind and with one heart, in this world and in the next. Let us always pray, with mutual charity, relieving our sufferings and afflictions. And may the charity of him, who, by the Divine favour, shall first depart hence, still persevere before the Lord; may his prayer for our brethren and sisters not cease.”

Having given the above as your rendering of the words of Cyprian, you add:

“Therefore, after our departure from this life, the same offices of charity are to continue, by our praying for those who remain on earth.”¹

Your reference is “Ep. lvii. p. 96.” [Benedictine edition.]

The original passage is as follows:

“Memores nostri invicem simus concordēs atque unanimes; utrobique pro nobis semper oremus, presuras et angustias mutua caritate relevemus, et si quis istinc nostrum prior divinæ dignationis celeritate præcesserit, perseveret, apud Dominum nostra dilectio; pro fratribus et sororibus nostris apud misericordiam Patris non cesset oratio. Opto te, frater carissime, semper bene valere.”

The literal translation of which is:

“Let us be mutually mindful of each other, with one

¹ Lecture xiii. p. 107.

mind and one heart. On both sides¹ let us pray for each other; let us, by mutual love, relieve each other's pressures and distresses; and if either of us from hence, by the speed of Divine favour, go on before the other, let our love persevere before the Lord; for our brothers and sisters with the Father's mercy, let not prayer cease. My desire, most dear brother, is that you may always prosper."

Whatever Cyprian intended here to teach, it is very evident it is not what you desire to convey, and therefore it was necessary to pervert the meaning by giving a false translation. 1. By introducing "in our prayers," which is not in the original, in the first sentence. 2. By rendering the adverb *utrobique*, IN THIS WORLD AND IN THE NEXT—a rendering foreign to the original. 3. By omitting the words "*pro nobis*," "for each other" after "*oremus*," "let us pray." 4. By changing the verb *relevemus*, "let us relieve," implying another branch of their mutual kindness, into the particle *relieving*, which may imply that the relief alluded to was also to be conveyed by and through the medium of their prayers. 5. By substituting "the charity of him" in the place of "*nostra dilectio*," "*our charity*." 6. By inserting the word *his*, which is not in the original, before *prayer*, where the grammar of the sentence requires *our*. Thus, you make Cyprian express a sentiment far removed from that which his words, in their plain and natural sense, conveyed.²

¹ Mutually—with reciprocal love, with mutual charity—as the Roman Catholic commentator, Regaltius, renders the word "*utrobique*" (Paris, Edit. 1666, p. 92), and not "in this world and the next," as you do, as it would seem, for a purpose.

² Tyler's "Primitive Christian Worship." London, 1847, pp. 167 and 406.

But even thus distorted, you cannot extract from the passage that Cyprian countenanced your doctrine of the Invocation of Saints. The question between us is not, whether the Saints in Heaven are engaged in offering up prayers for us on earth, but whether we may pray to them, invoking their intercession and aid, and that they *hear* our prayers; a sentiment invented since the days of Cyprian. One might almost express surprise that you should risk the reputation which, by some means or other, you have acquired. But had you written *truth*, and dealt honestly with authors, your case would not stand for one moment. A false system must be bolstered up by falsehoods; and the only chance you have of keeping it together is by denying your flock the privilege of reading Protestant works, which expose those falsehoods. By placing yourselves between them and Christ, they are led to believe all you choose to tell them as firmly as we believe our Bible.

Referring to the subject of translations, I may note here a little incident which exhibits a degree of carelessness on your part. Your "sagacity and inductive skill" betray you, at least, this time.

In this same Lecture, on Saint Worship (p. 107), you quote as from Irenæus:

"As Eve was seduced to fly from God, so was the Virgin Mary induced to obey Him, that she might become the advocate of her that had fallen.—Lib. v. c. xix."

You do not explain how Mary could become the advocate of Eve, Eve having departed this life many centuries before Mary was born. Even this is beside the question; viz. the lawfulness of praying *to* a Saint, which the passage does not countenance.

Irenæus, in the above passage, goes on to say: "And as the human race was *bound* to death by a Virgin, it might be *loosed* by a Virgin." "Et quemadmodum *astrictum* est morti genus humanum per Virginem, *solvatur* per Virginem." The grammar, as well as the antithetic turn of the sentence, requires *solvatur*—*loosed*; and Irenæus, in another place, uses the same expression in a similar manner.¹

In the *Dublin Review*, however (June, 1844), you make so bold as to pretend that the reading is *salvatur* not *solvatur*, and the passage you would render as follows:

"As the human race was *bound* by the Virgin, it might be *saved* by a Virgin."

And to this you add your own explanation. "That is, in common parlance, *the merits* of Mary were so great as to counterbalance the sin of Eve;" a monstrous anti-scriptural deduction from a perversion of the text of Irenæus; conveying an eminently Romish error, which, if we are to be guided by the sentiments expressed in other parts of his work, was most distant from his mind.

¹ "The following is the passage as it stands in Augustine, together with another passage from Irenæus, which Augustine quotes in *immediate* consecution, as illustrating the first on the principle of correlativeness of *binding and loosing*: a correlativeness totally lost, if the spurious self-condemnant reading *salvatur* be adopted. 'Quemadmodum astrictum est morti genus humanum per virginem, *solvitur* per virginem æqua lance disposita, virginalis inobedientia per virginalem obedientiam. Adhuc enim protoplasti peccato per correptionem primogeniti emendationem accipiente, serpentis prudentia devicta per simplicitatem columbæ, vinculis illis RESOLUTI sumus, per quæ *alligati* eramus morti.'" —Iren. adv. Hær. lib. iii. c. 22, p. 220. Edit. Benedict. and see Iren. apud August. Cont. Julian Pelagian, lib. i. c. 3, Oper. tom. vii. p. 326. Colon. Agrip. 1616, and Benedict. Edit. Paris, 1700, tom. x. p. 500. Quoted by Faber as in following note., p. 234.]

It is not my object now to vindicate the most natural reading of *solvatur*—this has been done elsewhere,¹—but to point out either your gross blundering or inconveniently short memory. In 1852, you sanctioned, under your own hand, a translation of Liguori's "Glories of Mary." You have put your signature to the following: "We approve of *this translation* of 'Glories of Mary,' and cordially recommend it to the faithful." In p. 82 of this edition, I find this identical passage quoted in the text, and the Latin added in a foot-note, where we read as follows: "Et quemadmodum astrictum est morti genus humanum per Virginem SOLVATUR per Virginem,—S. Iren. ad. Hæres, lib. v. c. 3," adopting the very reading you had previously insisted on with great pertinacity *as being false*. And what renders this more striking is the fact that in the preface to this very edition (p. 19) to which you give an unequivocal approval, we read, "I (the editor) have *carefully compared* and corrected all these quotations with the original, from which they are taken," thus vouching for the correctness of this particular reading. But you will perhaps seek to evade the difficulty by asserting that you only approved of the *translation*. Let us see whether you save your reputation here. The translation is:

"And as the human race was *bound* to death through a Virgin, it is *SAVED* through a Virgin."

So, Sir, you permit the reading to be correctly given "*solvatur*," but allow it to be falsely translated

¹ See Faber's Letters on Tractarian Secessions to Popery, London, 1846, p. 230, and the *Catholic Layman*, November, 1857, p. 129.

saved instead of *loosed*, to carry out your own Romish views.

With only these few illustrations of your strange proceedings before us, it is really difficult to find language which will sufficiently express the contempt and disgust which all true and honest men must feel. These instances, and "their name is Legion," are fair samples of the general tenor of your "Popish Literary Blunders."

I remain, &c.

No. X.

RIGHT REV. SIR,—Throughout your Lectures there is a desperate struggle to force antiquity to bear witness to your more modern Popish innovations. You have endeavoured to accomplish the hopeless task, by quoting from admittedly spurious works, and by garbling and perverting those that are genuine.

I may return to this branch of the subject at another time, but for the present I wish to draw your attention to examples of another class, where a passage may be correctly enough given, in its isolated state, as would seem to favour the doctrine you are labouring to uphold; but when fairly examined, either with the context or opinions elsewhere expressed by the same writer, the fallacy at once becomes apparent.

Take, for example, Augustine—a deservedly respected Father of the fifth century. You summoned him as witness, to prove the Romish doctrine of

Purgatory. The passage is by no means clear, and you give no reference. It is as follows:¹

“If they had built gold and silver and precious stones, they would be secure from both fires; not only from that in which the wicked shall be punished for ever; but likewise from that fire *which will purify those who shall be saved from fire*. But because it said *he shall be saved*, that fire is thought lightly of; though the suffering will be more grievous than anything men can undergo in this life.”

You have prudently withheld your reference; but if you turn to Augustine's work, entitled “Enchiridion de Fide, Spe, et Caritate,” in the Fourth Volume of the Paris Benedictine Edition, p. 222, or the Cologne (Agripp.) 1616 Edition, tom. iv. p. 250, you will find that Augustine clearly refers to trials and tribulations in this life, as the fire mentioned in the text of St. Paul, 1 Cor. iii. 15. And far from dogmatising on the subject, as you do, Augustine gives various *speculations* on the subject, and among others, refers to a purgatorial fire after this life, through which some believers are saved; but the whole is summed up as only a possibility,² clearly showing that Purgatory, in any phase, as a doctrine, did not then exist in the Church; and Bellarmine himself admits that Augus-

¹ Lecture xi. p. 63, vol. ii.

² “Tale aliquid etiam post hanc vitam fieri *incredibile* non est, et utrūm ita sit queri potest; et aut inveniri, aut latere, nonnullos fideles per ignem quemdam purgatorium, quanti magis minusve bona pereuntia dilexerunt, tantò tardius citiusque salvari; non tamen tales de quibus dictum est, quòd *regnum* Dei non possidebunt, nisi convenienter poenitentibus eadem crimina remittantur.”—Aug. Enchiridion de Fide, Spe, et Caritate, tom. iv. p. 222. Bened. Edit. Paris, and Colon. Agripp. 1616, tom. iv. p. 250.

tine, by the words "but he shall be saved so as by fire," understood "*the tribulations of this life.*"¹

But turn again to other parts of the writings of Augustine, and see how far they assist you. In the Popish Purgatory, it is asserted, that souls could be assisted by the suffrages, alms, good deeds, prayers, &c., of the living; while, on the contrary, Augustine said:

"There can be no help for mercy afforded by just men to the souls of the deceased, although the righteous would desire to have it so, because the sentence of God is immutable."²

And again:

"Such as a man is when he dieth, for such he is judged by God; neither can the sentence of God be changed, corrected, or diminished."³

And, again, in the same place, he says:

"Wherein every man's last days find him, therein the world's last day will hold him."⁴

"The Catholic faith (he said) resting on Divine authority, believes the first place, the kingdom of heaven, and the second, hell; a third place we are wholly ignorant of: YEA, WE SHALL FIND IN SCRIPTURES THAT IT IS NOT."⁵

¹ "Aliqui intelligunt tribulationes hujus vitæ.—Quocirca B. Augustinus et Gregorius, qui sunt auctores."—Bell. de Purg. lib. i. c. 5, p. 332. Prag. 1721.

² "Nullum auxilium misericordiæ potest præberi a justis defunctorum animabus etiamsi justis præbere velint, quia est immutabilis divina sententia."—Quæst. Evan. i. 2, c. 38.

³ "Qualis quisque moritur talis a Deo judicatur, nec potest mutari, corrigi, vel minui divina sententia."—Ep. 80, ad Hesych.

⁴ "In quo enim quemque invenerit suos novissimus dies."—Ibid. Edit. Basil. 1529, al. 199, sec. 2, Edit. Bened.

⁵ "Tertium penitus ignoramus, immò nec esse in Scripturis Sanctis invenimus."—Ang. Hypog. 1, 5, tom. vii. Basil, 1529.

And yet you, Rev. Sir, assert that Augustine's reason for quoting St. Paul's words *is here precisely the same as you, and every [Roman] Catholic now use.*"¹

But, supposing in the citation given by you, Augustine did refer to a *literal fire*, yet even then you cannot extract from this writer the modern doctrine of Purgatory. According to your theory, Purgatory is a *present fire*, to which the departed in faith go immediately after death, and eventually emerge from thence to happiness when sufficiently punished for sins already forgiven: whereas, when Augustine referred to a fire, it was plainly to a future punishment, to a fire which should consume all things at the end of the world, at the *future* judgment, and not to any then present Purgatory.²

I challenge you, Sir, to produce any one passage, from all the voluminous writings of Augustine, which will indicate that he held the Romish doctrine of Purgatory, and its appendages. Your present attempt is a miserable failure.

I shall, in my next, expose a similar violation of Augustine's sentiments on the subject of the Eucharist.

I remain, &c.

¹ Lect. xi. p. 63, vol. ii.

² "*Vespera autem illa finis est seculi; et caminus ille, veniens dies judicii; divisit, inter media illa quæ divisa erant, etiam caminus,*" &c. —Aug. Enarr. in Psalm ciii. Conc. 3, Oper vol. viii. p. 430. Edit. Col. Agrip. 1616. Mr. Faber in his "Difficulties of Romanism," book ii. chap. v., third edition, has done full justice to this part of the argument.

No. XI.

RIGHT REV. SIR,—In your Lecture on Transubstantiation (Lecture XVI.), you state that “the authorities (to prove the Romish teaching) of the 5th century are absolutely overpowering;” but you content yourself by citing Augustine of the Western Church, and Isaac of the Eastern Church, in proof of your extensive assertion. I will take the two passages from Augustine, which you introduce as follows:

“‘When, committing to us His Body, He said, *This is my body*, Christ was held in His own hands. He bore that body in His hands.’ ‘How was He borne in His hands?’ he asks in the next sermon, in the same Psalm; ‘because when He gave His own body and blood, He took into His hands what the faithful knew; and He bore Himself in a certain manner, when He said, *This is my body.*’”¹

The reference given is “in Psalm xiv. (xxxiv.) t. iv. p. 335.”²

¹ Lecture xvi. p. 230.

² These passages are found in Augustine’s commentary on Psalm 34, alias 33 [not xxiv]. The context is necessary to understand the passages. I beg therefore in this note to supply the omission:

“‘*Et ferebatur in manibus suis.*’ Hoc verò fratres quomodo posset fieri in homine, quis intelligat? Quis enim portatur in manibus suis? Manibus aliorum potest portari homo, manibus suis nemo portatur. Quomodo intelligatur in ipso David secundum litteram non invenimus, in Christo autem invenimus. Ferebatur enim Christus in manibus suis, quando commendans ipsum corpus suum, ait, Hoc est corpus meum. Ferebat enim illud corpus in manibus suis. Ipsa ut humilitas Domini Jesu Christi, ipsa multum commendatur hominibus. Ad ipsam nos portatur, Fratres, ut vivamus, id est humilitatem ejus imitemur, et percutiamus Goliath, et tenentes Christum vincamus superbiam.”—August. Enanatio in Psalm xxxiii [34]. Sermo I.

“Quia cum commendaret ipsum corpus suum et sanguinem suum,

Now, what you wanted to persuade your hearers to believe by citing these two passages, was, that Augustine so firmly believed in the doctrine of Transubstantiation, that he actually taught the palpable absurdity that Christ held Himself whole and entire in His own hand, while sitting at the same table with the disciples, and with His own hand gave Himself to the disciples to be eaten *literally* in flesh and blood, and that He survived this ordeal to be afterwards crucified! If you do not mean this, the object for which the passages are quoted entirely fails. Christ did not hold Himself in His own hands, there was no Transubstantiation of the elements. All that we have to inquire, therefore, is, what Augustine meant by these passages.¹

acceptit in manus suas quod norunt fideles; et ipse se portabat, *quodammodo* cum dicebat, 'hoc est corpus meum.'—Ibid. Sermo II.

The passages are to be found also in the Edit. Bassani, 1802, tom. v. col. 282, sec. 10, B., and col. 285, sec. 2, B.

¹ Augustine is expounding the 33rd (34th) Psalm, and quotes 1 Samuel xxi. 13 (either from some ante-hieronymian version, or translates from the Septuagint, the transcribers of which seem to have mistaken *ἀντὼν* for *ἀντοῖν*), and he writes erroneously "et ferebatur in manibus suis," *he carried himself in his own hands*: he says, these words could not be understood of David, nor of any other man, literally for "quomodo fieri potest?" *how could this be?* and, therefore, he expounds them as meant of Christ prophetically, applying it to his holding the elements in his hand at the last supper. This is the testimony which all Popish controversialists ostentatiously bring forward as a witness which alone must stop the mouth of any Protestant; which, therefore, above all others, they dictate to their novices, and furnish them with it as armour of proof against all opponents; especially since this testimony *seems* founded on Scripture. We have seen, however, that its foundation is *not Scripture*, but that it rests solely on a mistranslation; and that neither in the authorised English version, nor in the Hebrew original, which is alone acknowledged by Protestants, nor yet in the *vulgate Latin, which is alone recognised by Papists*, is the passage found so written; but only that David conducted himself as a madman in the hands of the servants of Achish, King of Gath. But even taking the passage as it stands, what does St. Augustine mean by "*quomodo?*" does he not mean that it is impossible for *any man* to be carried in his own hands in a literal sense? That this is his meaning, I think, can-

I shall prove, what you pretend to be ignorant of, viz. that Augustine did not mean to convey any such absurdity as you desire to attribute to him.

Augustine lays down a rule by which we are to interpret certain passages of Scripture; he says:

“If a saying be preceptive, either forbidding a wicked action, or commanding what is good, it is not figurative: but if it commands any wickedness, or forbids what is good, it is *figurative*; for instance, the expression ‘except ye eat the flesh,’ &c., ‘ye have no life in you,’ seems to command a heinous or wicked thing. Therefore it is a figure enjoining us to communicate in the Passion of the Lord, and profitably to meditate upon it, because His flesh was wounded and crucified for our sakes.”¹

Here, then, we have the key to the words, “Take, eat, this is my Body,” as quite a parallel passage to that cited by Augustine. It is a *figure*, enjoining us to communicate on the Passion of the Lord, and profitably to meditate upon it. That Augustine did not believe that Christ handed over His own Body to the disciples is evident, for he says:

not be denied; therefore, it was, in his opinion, impossible that Christ, *as man*, could *literally* carry himself in his own hands. If, however, Christ, by his divine power, could carry himself in his own hands corporeally and properly, then could David, or *any man*, by the same divine power being exercised on his behalf; so that the expression might be used of David, and, therefore, in either supposition, if the words be taken literally, St. Augustine is made to contradict himself. That St. Augustine’s reference, however, to the act of our Lord in the last supper was figurative, is clear from the passages cited in the text.—Ingram’s “Transubstantiation Refuted,” p. 140-2. London, 1840.

¹ “Si præceptiva locutio est, aut flagitium aut facinus vetans, aut utilitatem aut beneficentiam jubens, non est figurata. Si autem flagitium aut facinus videtur jubere, aut utilitatem aut beneficentiam vetare, figurata est. Nisi manducaveritis, inquit, carnem Filii hominis, et sanguinem ejus biberitis, non habebitis vitam in vobis; facinus aut flagitium videtur jubere. Figura ergo est, præcipiens passioni Domini esse communicandum, et suaviter atque utiliter recondendum in memoria, quia pro nobis caro ejus crucifixa et vulnerata sit.”—Augustin. de Doct. Christ. lib. iii. cap. 16, tom. iii. col 52. Edit. Paris, 1685.

“Christ admitted Judas to that banquet, in which He commanded and delivered unto His disciples the *figure* of His body and blood.”¹

And again:

“The Lord did not hesitate to say, ‘This is my Body;’ when He gave the *sign* of His body.”

“You are not about to eat this body which you see, nor shed, nor drink that blood which they shall shed, who shall crucify me. I have recommended you a certain Sacrament, which if *spiritually* understood shall quicken you; though it must be celebrated visibly, it must be understood invisibly.”²

Augustine further explains what he means by eating Christ’s flesh and drinking His blood. In his 25th treatise upon the 6th cap. of St. John’s Gospel, he writes:

“Jesus answered and said to them, This is the work of God, that ye *believe* in him whom he hath sent. To do this is to eat the meat which perishes not, but endures unto eternal life. Why do you prepare your teeth and your stomach? Believe only, and you will have eaten.”³

And so, again, in the following treatise on the same chapter he says:

¹ “In quo corporis et sanguinis sui *figuram* discipulis commendavit et tradidit.”—Tom. iv. in Psalm iii. p. 9. Edit. Paris, 1685.

² “Non enim Dominus dubitavit dicere, Hoc est corpus meum, cum signum daret corporis sui.”—Contra Adimantum, c. 12.

“Non hoc corpus, quod videtis, manducaturi estis; nec bibituri illum sanguinem, quem fusuri sunt, qui me crucifigent. Sacramentum aliquod vobis commendavi: spiritualiter intellectum vivificabit vos. Etsi necesse est illud visibiliter celebrari oportet tamen invisibiliter intelligi.”—August. Enarr. in Psalm xcvi. Edit. as above; and see Oper. tom. viii. p. 397. Col. Agrip. 1616.

³ “Respondit Jesus et dixit iis, Hoc est opus Dei, ut credatis in eum quem misit ille. Hoc est manducare cibum non qui perit, sed qui permanet in vitam æternam. Ut quid paras dentes et ventrem? Crede et manducasti.”—In Johannis Evang. c. 6, Tract. 25, tom. iii. p. 490. Edit. Paris, 1685.

“ This, therefore, is to eat that food and to drink that cup, viz. to abide in Christ, and to have Christ abiding in you. And for this reason, he who does not abide in Christ, and in whom Christ does not abide, beyond all doubt does not *spiritually* eat his flesh, or drink his blood, although he carnally and visibly presses with his teeth the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ.”¹

And so again:

“ When the Lord was about to give the Holy Spirit, he said that he was the bread which descends from heaven, exhorting us to believe in him. *And to believe in him, is to eat the living bread.*”²

Clearly indicating, therefore, that the eating the body and drinking the blood of Christ were acts of faith, and are only spiritually received by *believers* in Christ. To *believe* in him is to eat his flesh and drink his blood.

In his Sermon 60, on the “ Word of God,” he reasons on the personal absence of the carnal body as distinguished from his spiritual body.

“ He is indeed, always with us by his Divinity; but unless he were *bodily absent from us*, we should always see his body in a carnal manner.”

“ *Semper quidem Divinitate nobiscum est, sed nisi corporaliter abiret a nobis, semper ejus corpus carnaliter videremus.*”

And in the 11th chapter of the 22nd book against Faustus, he says:

¹ “ Hoc est ergo manducare illam escam, et illum bibere potum, in Christo manere, et illum manentem in se habere. Ac per hoc, qui non manet in Christo, et in quo non manet Christus, procul dubio nec manducat spiritualiter carnem ejus, nec bibit ejus sanguinem, licet carnaliter et visibiliter premat dentibus sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Christi.”—In *Evang. Job. Tract. 26*, tom. iii. p. 501. Edit. Paris, 1685.

² “ Daturus ergo Dominus Spiritum Sanctum, dixit se panem qui de cœlo descendit, hortans, ut credamus in eum. Credere enim in eum, hoc est manducare panem vivum.”—In *Joh. Evang. c. 6, Tract. 26*, p. 494. Edit. as above.

“Christ, according to his corporeal presence, cannot be at the same time in the sun, and in the moon, and on the cross.”

“Secundum præsentiam corporalem simul et in sole, et in luna, et in cruce esse non potest.”

A sentiment Augustine could not have uttered had he believed in the modern Popish doctrine of Transubstantiation.

Augustine gives a reason for calling the elements the Body and Blood of Christ:

“If the Sacraments had not a certain resemblance of those things of which they are Sacraments, they would not be sacraments at all; but from this resemblance they take commonly the name of the things themselves.”¹

And he carries out the same idea in another way:

“All things intended to signify, seem, in a manner, to sustain the persons of those things which they signify; as the Apostle says, ‘The Rock was Christ,’ because that rock of which this is spoken signified Christ.”²

And so in his Commentary on John, Tract xlv., he said:³

“See how the signs are varied, faith remaining the same. There (*i.e.* in the wilderness) the *Rock* was Christ; to us that which is placed on God’s altar is Christ.”

¹ “Si sacramenta quandam similitudinem earum rerum non haberent quarum sacramenta sunt, omnino sacramenta non essent. Ex hac autem similitudine plerumque etiam ipsarum rerum nomina accipiunt.”—Epist. xxiii. ad Boniface. Edit. Paris, 1685, and see Edit. Basiliæ, 1569, tom. ii. col. 93.

² “Quodammodo omnia significantia videntur earum rerum quas significant sustinere personas, sicut dictum est ab apostolo, Petra erat Christus, quoniam Petra illa de qua hoc dictum est significabat utique Christum.”—De Civit. Dei, lib. xviii. cap. 48. Edit. as above, and see Basil Edit. 1569, tom. v. col. 1120.

³ “Quid enim illi bibebant? Bibebant enim de spiritali sequente petra; petra autem erat Christus. Videte ergo, fide manente, signa variata. Ibi petra Christus, nobis Christus quod in altar Dei ponitur.”—And see Basil Edit. 1569, tom. ix. col. 333.

Thus, as the "Rock was Christ" *figuratively*, so the *Bread* that laid on the altar was Christ also; of course, *figuratively*.

Now we can return to the words of Augustine in the passages cited:

"For Christ was carried in his own hands, when, commending his own Body, He said, 'This is my body:' for that body He carried in His own hands. This is the humility of Our Lord Jesus Christ, this is much commended unto men. According to this, He exhorted us, brethren, to live; that is, that we should imitate His humility, that we should slay Goliath, and, holding Christ, should conquer pride."

St. Augustine could have no more meant that we should literally slay Goliath, than that Christ held Himself in His own hands. That he did not dream of Transubstantiation is clear; for he says a little before (§. 6):

"In His own body and blood He willed our health to be. But whereby commended He His body and blood? By His own humility; for, unless He were humble, neither could He be eaten nor that drunk."

The second passage is:

"Accepit in manus quod nôrunt fidelis, et ipse portabat *quodammodo*, cum diceret, Hoc est corpus meum." (In Psa. xxxiii.)

Which I translate as follows:

"Christ took in His hands what the faithful understand, *and in a manner* carried Himself when He said, 'This is my Body.'"

And he uses the same idea in another place:

"*Secundum quendam modum* sacramentum corporis Christi, corpus Christi est; sacramentum sanguinis

Christi, sanguis Christi est."—(Aug. Epist. xxiii. ad Boniface, tom. ii. col. 93. Basilæ, 1569.)

That is:

"*After a certain manner* the sacrament of the Body of Christ is the body of Christ, and the sacrament of the Blood of Christ is the blood of Christ."

Now, can there be any mistake as to the real meaning of Augustine? What did the faithful understand that Christ held in His hand but the signs or figure of the Body and Blood of Christ, represented by the elements of bread and wine, which elements commonly took the names of the things themselves? These elements used in the celebration of the sacraments, are, *after a certain manner*, the body and blood of Christ. And, therefore, when Christ said, "This is my Body," He, *in a manner*, or *after a certain manner*, carried Himself in His hands. Will any reasonable man, with these passages before him, say that your references are to be read in that literal, gross, unreasonable manner in which you would desire them to be understood? So pray, Sir, dismiss Augustine from the list of your "overpowering" witnesses.

I remain, &c.

No. XII.

RIGHT REV. SIR,—In my previous letters I occupied myself by exposing generally what I have designated your "Popish Literary Blunders." I now proceed to examine the citations from the "Fathers" of the Church, adduced in your Lecture "On the

Principal Doctrines and Practices of the [Roman] Catholic Church," entitled "Rule of Faith."

You come before us ostensibly, as an honest controversialist, with an affectation of profound learning, precision, and frankness. "I will not," you assert in your introductory Lecture,¹ "take any one single principle for granted which will possibly bear a dispute." "The investigation," you say, "will merely consist in the statement of a few historical facts; and I shall be careful to support it by what must be considered incontestable authority; indeed, to base it on such admitted grounds as, I trust, will leave no room for cavil or rejection."² And you "commend" your "little book to the favour and protection of the Almighty, begging His blessing upon both writer and reader."³

The first Father cited by you⁴ is Irenæus, who, though born a Greek, was Bishop of Lyons, and suffered martyrdom very early in the third century. He is summoned by you to prove that the "Rule of Faith" of your modern Church is the same as that held by the Church of the days of Irenæus. I propose to test the value of this appeal.

We must first ascertain what is the teaching of your Church on this head. You, Sir, I have observed, throughout your Lectures, are particularly shy of definitions. You never tell us, in the words of your Church, what is her true doctrine. You state your

¹ p. 21. Edit. 1851.

² p. 120, Lecture v., "The Catholic Rule of Faith."

³ Ibid. p. viii.

⁴ Lecture v., on "The Catholic Rule of Faith," p. 130.

case in your own way with great tact and ingenuity, and on that statement you base your arguments, supported by citations, as from Fathers of the Church, but quoted in a manner which, to the uninformed, gives a semblance of truth to all you utter. These citations are made with an intrepidity truly astonishing.

Before I give your explanation, let me record your Church's definition. We find it set out sufficiently precise in your creed. In this you are required to declare:

"I most firmly admit and embrace apostolical and ecclesiastical traditions, and all other constitutions and observances of the same [*i.e.* Roman] Church.

"I also admit the Sacred Scriptures, according to the sense which the Holy Mother Church has held, and does hold, to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Holy Scriptures; nor will I ever take or interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers."¹

Here, then, we have a double rule. 1. Apostolical and ecclesiastical traditions, and all (!) other constitutions and observances of the Church.

2. The Sacred Scriptures interpreted only according to the sense of the Church; but such interpretation is not to be otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.

¹ I here adopt Mr. Butler's translation (a Romanist) given in his "Book of the Roman Catholic Church," London, 1825; but, to be more in order, I add the original text:

2. "Apostolicas et ecclesiasticas traditiones, reliquasque ejusdem ecclesiæ observationes et constitutiones firmissime admitto, et amplector.

3. "Item sacram Scripturam juxta eum sensum, quem tenuit et tenet sancta mater ecclesia, cujus est judicare de vero sensu et interpretatione sacrarum Scripturarum, admitto; nec eam unquam, nisi juxta unanimam consensum Patrum accipiam, et iterpretabor." — Concil. Trid. apud Bullas, p. 311. Romæ, 1564.

Now, Rev. Sir, I boldly and unhesitatingly challenge you to produce even one single early Christian writer, of the first five centuries, who advocated such a rule. You have not produced one.

Your explanations are as follow: You admit the Scriptures as the revealed Word of God.¹ This is what you call the written Word (p. 60). To this you add the unwritten Word. "Whatever is believed," [you say] "by the [Roman] Catholic, although not positively expressed in the written Word of God, is believed, because the principle adopted by him is there expressly revealed." This unwritten Word, you assert, is a "body of doctrines which, in consequence of express declarations in the written Word, we believe not to have been committed, in the first instance, to writing [*i.e.* not in the Scriptures], but delivered by Christ to his Apostles, and by the Apostles to their successors." (p. 60.) You further assert, that "Tradition, or the doctrines delivered down, and the unwritten Word of God, are one and the same thing." (p. 61.) But these traditions are now *fixed*, and to this admission I now hold you. You inform us that it is not to be understood

"By the term unwritten word, that these articles of faith or traditions are nowhere recorded. Because, on the contrary, suppose a difficulty to arise regarding any doctrine, so that men should differ, and not know what precisely to believe, and that the Church thought it prudent or necessary to define what is to be held, the method pursued would be to examine most accurately the writings of the Fathers of the Church, to ascertain what, in different countries and in different ages, was by

¹ Lecture iii. p. 58.

them held; and then, collecting the suffrages of all the world (!) and of all times (!!)—not, indeed, to create new articles of faith, but to define what has always been the faith of the Catholic Church. It is conducted in every instance as a matter of historical inquiry, and all human prudence is used to arrive at a judicious decision.”¹

This process would, no doubt, be very edifying; but who is to undertake and be responsible for the investigation? The Church is appointed to interpret the Scriptures (a task, by the way, she has never performed in a practical manner, by committing the interpretation to writing), but who has been appointed to “collect—from the Fathers—the suffrages of all the world and of all times,” to define what are, and what are not, “articles of faith?” “Human prudence” has been at fault in the threshold, even in directing us to the genuine works of the Fathers! If we are to take your Lectures as samples of the result of your “historical inquiry,” I cannot admit that you have “arrived at a judicious decision.” Take, for example, the blunders exposed in my last series of letters. Your wresting antiquity to support so-called tradition (your modern innovations), only proves the fallacy of your system. Your “rule of faith” is, indeed, complicated and uncertain; and one which, I quite admit, requires a considerable “measure of sagacity and inductive skill, in order to trace out proofs” to support. You cling, nevertheless, to Tradition, and whatever doctrine you advance, which you cannot find sanctioned by Scripture, you assert was taught by one or other of the Fathers as an Apostolic Tradition.

¹ Lecture iii. p. 61.

Your admission that you do profess articles as of faith which are not found in the Written Word, is clear. You say:

“ I have more than once commented on the incorrectness of that method of arguing, which demands that we prove every one of our doctrines individually from the Scriptures. I occupied myself, during the first course of my lectures, in demonstrating the [Roman] Catholic principles of faith, that the Church of Christ was constituted by Him the depositary of His truths, and that, although many were recorded in His Holy Word, still many were committed to traditional keeping, and that Christ Himself hath faithfully promised to teach His Church, and has thus secured her from error.”¹

You further assert that it is clear that the Apostles did not consider the Scriptures as the sole foundation on which they built the Church.² They employed, in fact, two “ codes,” the written and the unwritten:

“ Must we not conclude [you say] that an authority to teach was communicated to them [the Apostles], and by them to their successors, together with an unwritten code; so that what was afterwards written by them was but a fixing and recording of part of that which was already in possession of the Church ?”³

You even argue that the Scriptures are practically unnecessary as a rule of faith, and in order to “ confirm” what you have said, you cite Irenæus, as your first authority, whose words, you say, are:

“ There were many Churches which believed all the doctrines of the Apostles, without having had the Word of God presented to them in any written form, which they could understand.”⁴

¹ Lecture xi. vol. ii. p. 53.

³ Ibid. p. 128.

² Lecture v. p. 130.

⁴ Ibid. p. 131.

The "many Churches" is your invention. Irenæus speaks of barbarians or foreigners of many nations. The passage as from Irenæus you introduce as follows:

"Speaking of the necessity, or non-necessity, of the Bible as a rule of faith, he thus expresses himself: 'And had these Apostles left us nothing in writing, must we not, in that case, have followed the rule of doctrine which they delivered to those to whom they entrusted their Churches? To this rule many barbarians submit, who, deprived of the aid of letters, have the words of salvation written on their hearts, and carefully guard the doctrines which had been delivered.'—(Adv. Hæres. lib. iii. c. iv. p. 205.)"

A more correct translation is as follows:

"Even *if* the Apostles had not left us the Scriptures, ought we not to follow the order of that tradition which they delivered to the same persons to whom they committed the Churches? But many nations of barbarians [*i.e.* foreigners] who believed in Christ, assent to this regulation, having salvation written, not on paper and with ink, but in their hearts, by the Spirit, diligently keeping the old tradition, believing in one God, the Maker of Heaven and Earth, and of all things that are therein, through Jesus Christ the Son of God. He, on account of His most eminent love towards the work of His own hands, vouchsafed to be born of a Virgin, uniting in himself man to God, suffered under Pontius Pilate," &c.¹

These were the apostolic traditions referred to, the

¹ "Quid autem, si neque Apostoli quidem Scripturas reliquissent nobis, nonne oportebat ordinem sequi traditionis, quam tradiderunt iis quibus committebant ecclesias? [In the Basil edit. of 1526, there is no note of interrogation, but a comma.] Cui ordinationi assentiunt multæ gentes barbarorum, eorum qui in Christum credunt, sine caractere et atramento scriptam habentes per Spiritum in cordibus suis salutem et [vel] veterem traditionem diligenter custodientes, in unum Deum credentes, fabricatorem cœli et terræ," &c.—Irenæus adv. Hær. lib. iii. cap. iv. p. 172, fol. Edit. Basil, 1570, and p. 145, Edit. Basil, 1526.

truths which Valentinian denied, but which these barbarians believed. Irenæus continues:

“ Barbarians without letters and ignorant of our speech, but most wise on account of their faith, and as regards thought and practice, and manner of life. If every one should make known to them, in their own language, these inventions of the heretics, they would stop their ears and flee far away, not enduring even to hear such blasphemous talk. Thus, by the old tradition of the Apostles, they would not receive into the conception of their minds anything so monstrous.”

The first part of this passage (mutilated) is quoted by you for a double purpose: First, in order to prove that “according to this venerable authority” the primitive Churches recognised as authoritative “unwritten tradition” as well as the “written Word,” that oral instruction was sufficient, and that, in point of obligation (the unwritten Word being sufficient), the written Word need not be enunciated by the priesthood to the laity; and secondly, under cover of this admission of Irenæus (a recognition of an “unwritten code” which, according to your system, contained other doctrines besides those recorded in the “written code”), these Churches recognising “tradition,” admitted more than was contained in the “written word,” as articles of faith.

If this is not what you intend to convey, I see no point in your citation. The passage, however, with the context, proves exactly the reverse of all this. Doubtless, as Irenæus remarks, *if* it had so happened, that the Apostles had left no written Scriptures, we should then have been necessitated, like believers in the patriarchal ages, to follow the order of tradition.

The Lord, in His great mercy, would have provided some safe counsel other than the degenerate priesthood of a grossly corrupted Church, through which that tradition should be handed to us. But, through the good Providence of God, the Apostles have left us the Scriptures. Therefore, by entrusting us with them, they have practically demonstrated the insufficiency and insecurity of tradition; for had oral tradition been sufficient, the written word would have been superfluous, which you will not admit. I will venture to assert, that you picked up the passage you quote second-hand, and that you never took the trouble of examining the context, otherwise you would not have so grossly blundered by quoting Irenæus to support your theory.

I may here observe that the word *παράδοσις*—*traditio*—rendered “tradition,” when used by Irenæus, and other early Christian writers, as referring to apostolical tradition, meant the truths handed down in the written Word.¹

Irenæus was combating the Valentinians, a sect who could scarcely be admitted to be Christians, because they denied that the God of the Jews was the same as the God of the Christians. He pressed them with proofs from the Gospel first preached by the Apostles, and then by Divine direction committed to writing; that the God of the Old Testament was the God of the New. To this they replied by vilifying Scriptures, asserting that the truth could not be discovered from

¹ For a clear demonstration of this see Pope’s “Roman Misquotations,” p. 253 *et seq.*, London, 1840; and my “Milner Refuted,” part i. p. 53 *et seq.*

them without tradition (just the argument you have been labouring upon); a heresy combated by Irenæus in this very book you have the hardihood to quote against us. Very well, rejoins Irenæus, let us appeal to tradition; but what tradition shall it be? Not, surely, the tradition of Valentine, who came to Rome so late as under Hyginus, the eighth Bishop of that see; but the tradition of the Apostles, handed down in the Church by a continued succession of bishops in all parts of the world. Even if the Apostles had left no Scripture (he urged), we should have had this tradition to guard us from your errors. That it would have been effectual is evident from the example of those ignorant barbarians (foreigners), who have been converted to the Christian faith by the preaching of the Gospel, and who, if they were to understand your blasphemies, would stop their ears and flee from thee.¹

By stopping short in your quotation, and using the expression, "rule of doctrine," you would have us believe that an oral tradition was recommended, whereas Irenæus was, on the contrary, insisting that nothing should be received that was not found in the written tradition of the Apostles. He was not, in your sense of the expression, "speaking of the necessity or non-necessity of the Bible as a rule of faith," but was insisting on the sufficiency and fulness of Scripture.

What this tradition of faith was he clearly sets out in his "first book against heresies,"² as follows:

¹ Jarvis's reply to "Milner's End of Controversy," p. 82. New York, 1847.

² Cap. x. (edit. as above), and p. 50. Edit. Benedict. Paris, 1710.

“1. For the Church, although she is extended throughout the universe, even to the ends of the earth, received the faith from the Apostles and their disciples, which faith is in one God, the Father Almighty, who made heaven, and earth, and the sea, and all things which are in them; and in one Jesus Christ, the Son of God, who was incarnate for our salvation; and in the Holy Spirit, who predicted the dispensations of God by the prophets, and the advent, and the generation from the Virgin, and the passion, and the resurrection from the dead, and the ascent in the flesh into heaven of Jesus Christ our beloved Lord, and His coming from heaven in the glory of the Father, to resume all things, and to raise the flesh of all mankind; so that, according to the good pleasure of the invisible Father, every knee, of things in heaven, and things on earth, and things under the earth, should bow to Jesus Christ our Lord, and God, and Saviour, and King, and every tongue should confess Him, and that He should judge all things in righteousness, and that He should consign to eternal fire the spiritual things of iniquity, and angels that have transgressed and apostatised, and the impious and unjust, and the blasphemers among men; and granting, on the other hand, life and immortality and eternal glory to the just and righteous, and to those who keep His commandments and persevere in His love, some from the beginning, others after repentance.

“2. And the Church, albeit she is scattered throughout the whole world, having received this preaching and this faith, diligently keeps it as if she inhabited one house; and in like manner she believes in these things, as having one soul and one heart, and she uniformly teaches them and hands them down as having one mouth. For although there are various languages in the world, yet the strength of tradition is one and the same. And neither do the Churches that are founded in Germany believe or hand down otherwise; nor do the Churches which are in Spain, or in Gaul, or in the East, or in Egypt, or in Lybia, or those which are established in the middle of the world. But as the sun, the creation of God, is one and the same in the whole world, so also the light, which is the preaching of truth, everywhere shines and enlightens all men,

who will come to the knowledge of the truth. And neither will he who is strong in speech enlarge it (for no one is above his master), nor will he who is weak in speech diminish it. For this faith being one, neither has he who can say much respecting it amplified it, nor has he who can say little curtailed it."¹

But the more we examine the writings of Irenæus, the more we are surprised that you should direct our attention to his testimony on the subject under consideration. His very words refute your whole argument. Disputing against those very heretics who, like yourself, deny the perfection and sufficiency of the Scriptures as a rule of faith, and who maintained that the truth could not be discovered from them by those who were ignorant of tradition, he says:

“We ought to leave such things as these to God, who also made us; most rightly knowing that the Scriptures indeed are perfect, as having been dictated by the Word of God and his Spirit.”²

“For [said he again] we have become acquainted with the dispensation of our salvation through no other men than those through whom the Gospel has come to us; which they then indeed preached, but afterwards, by the will of God, delivered to us in the Scriptures to be the foundation and pillar of our faith.”³

Clearly pointing out the Scriptures alone wherein

¹ At this period the expressions “Communion of Saints,” and “One baptism for the remission of sins,” formed no part of the creed of the Church; they were afterwards added.

² “Cedere autem hæc talia debemus Deo, qui et nos fecit, rectissime scientes, quia Scripturæ quidem perfectæ sunt, quippe a Verbo Dei et Spiritu ejus dictæ.”—Cont. Hær. lib. ii. c. 47; Edit. Grabe, 1853, cap. 25, and p. 117. Edit. Basil, 1526.

³ “Non enim per alios dispositionem salutis nostræ cognovimus, quam per eos per quos Evangelium pervenit ad nos; quod quidem tunc præconiauerunt, postea vero per Dei voluntatem in Scripturis nobis traderunt, fundamentum et columnam fidei nostræ futurum.”—Lib. iii. c. 1, in Init. p. 139. Edit. Basil, 1526.

we are to learn the economy of our salvation. And here the very expression, even in the Latin translation, is used which carries out my assertion, that Irenæus meant the tradition committed to writing (in *Scripturis nobis tradiderunt*) by the Apostles.

We have next a remarkable passage which completely nullifies your further theory that the Apostles "fixed," in writing, "a part" only of what they taught. Irenæus, referring (as it would seem, in anticipation) to your objection, added immediately after the last extract:

"Matthew, among the Hebrews, published the Scriptures of the Gospel in their own language, while Peter and Paul were preaching the Gospel in Rome, and laying the foundation of that Church. After their departure, Mark, the disciple and interpreter of Peter, delivered to us in writing (*per scripta nobis tradidit*) what Peter had preached. Luke, also the follower of Paul, deposited in a book the Gospel preached by him. Afterwards John, likewise the disciple of the Lord, who also leant upon his bosom, set forth the Gospel while he dwelt at Ephesus."

Is it not evident to the most superficial observer, that, if Irenæus had held your theory, he would have referred to it in this place? Whereas, on the contrary, he plainly tells us that what one Apostle omitted to record, another committed to writing, and for this reason, he, like Tertullian, "adored the fulness of the Scriptures," and, therefore, he earnestly exhorted us to

"Read more diligently the Gospel given unto us by the Apostles, and read more diligently the Prophets, and

you shall find the general mode of action, and the whole teaching, and the whole passion of our Lord."¹

But there is yet another truly remarkable passage in this same work, to which you refer us, exhibiting, as it does, a striking resemblance between the respective positions taken by the heretics, against whom Irenæus was contending, and that occupied by yourself, in your Lectures now under review, in common with modern Romish controversialists in general:

"When they (the heretics) are confuted out of the Scriptures, they turn round and accuse the Scriptures themselves, as if they were not accurate, nor of authority, and because they are ambiguous, and because the truth cannot be discovered by those who are ignorant of tradition, for that the truth was not delivered in writing, but orally."²

Does not the cap fit exactly?

You again, a little further on (p. 140), refer us to the same Father, as teaching that the Bible was a book which was not to be received and explained, except on the authority of the Church. On this point you say Irenæus speaks:

¹ "Legite diligentius id quod ab Apostolis est evangelium nobis datum, et legite diligentius Prophetas, et inveniatis universam actionem, et omnem doctrinam, et omnem passionem Domini nostri prædictam in ipsis."—Lib. iv. c. 34, ed. Grabe, 1853, and cap. 66, Edit. Basil, 1526, p. 275. The meaning obviously is, that in the Gospel the general tenor of our Lord's actions and the whole of his doctrines were exhibited; whilst the prophets predicted all the circumstances connected with his passion.

² "Cum enim ex Scripturis arguuntur, in accusationem convertuntur ipsarum Scripturarum, quasi non recte habeant, neque sint ex auctoritate, et quia varie sint dictæ et quia non possit ex his inveniri veritas ab his qui nesciant Traditionem. Non enim per literas traditam illam, sed per vivam vocem."—Cont. Hær. lib. iii. c. 2, in Init. p. 140. Edit. Basil, 1526.

“To him that believeth that there is one God, and holds to the head, which is Christ, to this man all this will be plain, if he read diligently the Scripture with the aid of those who are the priests in the Church, and in whose hands, as we have shown, rests the doctrine of the Apostles.”¹

Admitting, for a moment, that your translation is correct, I deny that your interpretation is borne out by the passage cited; you add:

“That is to say, the Scripture may be read, and will be simple and easy to him who reads it, with the assistance of those to whom the Apostles delivered the unwritten code, as the key to its true explanation.”

Here you commit the gross blunder of making the “doctrine of the Apostles” spoken of by Irenæus, “the unwritten code, as the key to the true explanation of the Scripture;” a gross perversion of the whole drift, sentiment, and teaching of Irenæus. The doctrine referred to was exclusively contained in the Written Word, as defined by him in the third book of the same Treatise; and I challenge you to show that Irenæus was pointing to any alleged unwritten code as a key to Scripture. But is there anything unnatural in the fact of Irenæus advising the aid of the priests in the Church in reading the Scriptures? Do not Protestant laymen of the present day admit the same practice, by listening on each Sabbath to the explanation of the Word by their ministers? But though we do admit the teaching of the ministers of God’s Word, we do not believe that an “unwritten code” is entrusted to them for the purpose of elucidating the

¹ Cont. Hær. lib. iv. c. 52, p. 355.

Scriptures. We would gladly hear your ministration, if you could show us that you taught nothing but the "doctrine of the Apostles." No, no, Sir, your gloss upon Irenæus is very ingenious, and may appear satisfactory to those unacquainted with the author; but those who have studied the context can at once detect the cunning displayed in the application of your "sagacity and inductive skill."

The translation of the passage is as follows; after quoting the text, Ephesians iv. 16, Irenæus says:

"Thenceforth also every word will be plain to him, if he will diligently, also, read the Scriptures, which (Scriptures) are (deposited) with those who are elders in the Church, with whom, as we have shown, is the Apostolic doctrine."

"Apud eos" means, I conceive, in whose possession the Scriptures were, and not as you would make it, "with the aid of the priests;" and if I am correct in this, your theory is again overturned. But the idea of an unwritten code being in the hands of the priests to explain the Written Word, is quite nullified by the passage which immediately follows, which you, of course, never saw—or, if you did, you expected that your readers would not trouble themselves to examine. Had this alleged unwritten code existed in the days of Irenæus, as in your modern Church, surely he would have spoken of three Testaments, the Old, the New, and the unwritten code, whereas he mentions but two; for he says immediately following the passage you pretend to quote:

"For all the Apostles, indeed, have told us that two Testaments were in the hands of two people [*i.e.* the Jews and Christians]; and that it was one and the same

God who disposed both Testaments for the good of men [according to which purpose the Testaments were given] who began to believe in God, we have shown from the very teaching from the Apostles in our third book. And because the former Testament was not idly given (nor the result in vain), but as to those, indeed, to whom it was given for the service of God, concurring to their good, for God does not need the service of men, showing, moreover, a type of heavenly things, because man could not as yet, by his own power of vision, see the things of God, and prefiguring the images of these things which are in the Church, that the faith which we now hold may be made firm, and containing a prophecy of future things, that man might learn that God is prescient of all things."¹

I have, Sir, at great sacrifice of space and patience, transcribed to the end of the chapter, from the foot of your alleged quotation, that you should not have an excuse to urge; and now, giving you credit for being an honest man, I ask you, how you dare tell your readers or hearers that Irenæus was inculcating that the Scriptures would be easy to him who reads with

¹ "Hic primo erit tenens caput, ex quo totum corpus compactum et connexum per omnem juncturam subministrationis in mensura uniuscunq̄ue partis incrementum corporis facit, in ædificationem sui in charitate. Post deinde et omnis sermo ei constabit, si et scripturam diligenter legerit *apud eos* qui in ecclesia sunt presbyteri, apud quos est Apostolica doctrina, quemadmodum demonstravimus. Apostoli enim omnes duo quidem testamenta in duobus populis fuisse docuerunt, unum autem et eundem esse Deum qui disposuerit utraque ad utilitatem hominum, secundum quod testamenta dabantur, qui incipiebant credere Deo, ex ipsa demonstravimus Apostolorum doctrina, in tertio libro. Et quoniam non ociose, nec frustra obvenit, datum est prius testamentum; sed illos quidem quitas dabatur in servitutem Dei concurrens ad utilitatem eorum, non enim indiget Deus ab hominibus servitutem: tyrum autem cœlestium ostendens, quoniam nondum poterat homo per proprium visum videre, quæ sunt Dei: et imagines eorum quæ sunt in ecclesia prefigurans, ut firma ea quæ secundum nos est fiat fides: et prophetiam futurorum continens, ut disceret homo præscium esse omnium Deum."—*Adv. Hær. lib. iv. c. 51.* The edition I have consulted is the Basil Edit. 1526, p. 266.

the aid of the priest, to whom the Apostles had delivered the unwritten Word as a Key to their true explanation? A more monstrous, barefaced, wanton assumption on your part, I have never seen equalled in the annals of literature, except by similar perversions found in other parts of your Lectures.

Reverend Sir, this groping in the dark among the Fathers is hazardous work. They (the "Fathers") are, as it were, edged tools, which, when unskilfully used, by a certain class of persons, become dangerous. This is a trite adage, but peculiarly applicable to yourself. An affectation of learning is sure to come to ridicule, but when it is accompanied by protestations of honesty of purpose, like the ass in the lion's skin, the bearer excites our pity and contempt.

I remain, &c.

No. XIII.

RIGHT REV. SIR,—The next authority in order of date which you summon, with equal confidence, is Tertullian; and you direct our attention to his work "On Prescription against Heretics." I have Semler's edition of this work before me, which I have carefully read. It would have been as well had you taken the same precaution before you transferred Tertullian's name to your pages. Pray, Sir, do so now, and as you proceed, just cast your eye over the second chapter. The following passage from that chapter somewhat amused me:

“In pugna pugilum et gladiatorum, plerumque non quia fortis est, vincit quis, aut quia non potest vinci: sed quoniam ille, qui victus est, nullis viribus fuit; adeo idem ille victor bene valenti postea comparatus, etiam superatus recedit. Non aliter hæreses; de quorundam infirmitatibus habent, quod valent, nihil valentes si in bene valentem fidem incurrant.”

Pardon me if I add a translation; it is for our less learned readers:

“In a contest of boxers and gladiators, a man for the most part conquereth, not because he is strong, or cannot be conquered, but because he who is conquered was a man of no strength; and so this very conqueror, being afterwards matched against a right lusty man, is also conquered and retreateth. In like manner heresies derive what strength they have from the weakness of certain men; having no strength if they encounter a faith of right good strength.”

I find myself “matched against a right lusty man” (after the flesh). If I conquer, it is not because I am strong, but because you are weak. You derive what strength you have from the weakness of “certain men,” who place implicit confidence in your impeccability, if not infallibility; but you have no strength, if encountered by “a faith of right good strength”—that faith “once delivered to the saints.” Arming myself, therefore, with “the shield of faith and the sword of the Spirit, which is the word of God,”¹ I go forth boldly to “fight the good fight” against this “right lusty man,” the chosen champion of the Papacy in this country.

I have shown how grossly Irenæus has been misrepresented, notwithstanding the application of your

¹ Eph. vi. 17.

wonted "sagacity and inductive skill." You consider the "words of Tertullian are still clearer" than those of Irenæus; but in order to enable you to mould your authority to your own views, you deem it necessary "first to premise a few words regarding the nature of his work" (*De Prescriptionibus Hæreticorum*), "which gives us [as you assert] the earliest account of the method pursued, in matters of faith and discipline, in the Western Church;" the treatise, by the way, having nothing to do with discipline. You further say that Tertullian "has written a very instructive work, when considered at the present time, entitled 'On the Prescription of Heretics,' that is, on the method whereby those are to be judged and convicted, who depart from the Universal Church."¹ But instead of giving your readers the true nature of the work in question, you follow the footsteps of Dr. Milner, and controversialists of his class, and, instead of examining the treatise itself, most violently pervert the whole drift of the argument and meaning of Tertullian. I cannot do better than repeat here the observation I applied to Dr. Milner's citations from the same author, quoted for a similar purpose. After reading your explanations and comparing them with the original, I am utterly at a loss in what terms to describe your procedure. The only supposition which I can make, consistent with your good faith, is this,—that you found certain passages in some Romish selection of Tertullian's sayings (probably in Dr. Milner's work itself), and, wholly ignorant of their connexion and

¹ Lecture v. p. 141.

import, as they stand in the original, you draw your conclusions to suit your arguments. To me it appears incredible that any intelligent man, moderately skilled in the Latin language, with a copy of Tertullian before him (that you are an accomplished scholar renders the position more embarrassing for yourself), should, with honesty of intention, have so misrepresented the drift of that Father's reasoning as you have taken the liberty of doing. Your theory may be thus shortly stated—the Traditions of your Church are to be held in equal reverence with the Scriptures; the latter are insufficient as a Rule of Faith. You do not pretend that all your doctrines individually can be proved from Scripture; although many are there recorded, still many were committed to traditional keeping;¹ what is wanting in the one is made up by the other. "The Church" alone has authority to interpret the Scriptures; but how that interpretation is to be ascertained you do not inform us. At all events, you would deny me and all Protestants (heretics according to your creed) the right of arguing on the Scriptures, or indeed reading them, except through your spectacles.

Thoroughly imbued with these ideas, you state your views of the "peculiar nature" of the work you pretend to quote, which you give as follows:

"The whole drift of his (Tertullian's) argument is to show that they [the heretics] have no right whatever to appeal to Scripture, because this has no authority as an inspired book, save that which it receives from the sanction of an infallible Church; and that consequently they are to be checked in this first step, and not allowed to

¹ Lecture xi. p. 53, vol. ii.

proceed any further in the argument. They have no claim to the Word; it is not theirs; they have no right to appeal to its authority, if they reject that of the Church, on which alone it can be proved; and if they admit the authority of the Church, they must believe whatever else she teaches. Go, he (Tertullian) tells them, and consult the Apostolic Churches at Corinth, or Ephesus, or, if you are in the West, Rome is very near, 'an authority to which we can readily appeal,' and receive from them the knowledge of what you are to believe."

It is impossible, in a letter, sufficiently to expose or to give an adequate notion of the extent to which misrepresentation has been carried in these few lines of yours. The whole scope of Tertullian's argument is most grossly perverted.

It is not true that Tertullian denied to the heretics the right of appeal to the Scriptures, because these had no authority as inspired save that which they received from an infallible Church. Tertullian placed the Scriptures above the Church; the doctrine of the Church was to be tested by the Scriptures. If the doctrine of a Church was not conformable to the Scriptures it was not Apostolic; and he nowhere makes the authority of the Scriptures as an inspired book, depend on the sanction of any assumed infallible Church. Nor does he anywhere say, in the treatise in question or elsewhere, that if the heretics admit the authority of the Church, they must believe whatever else she teaches. All this is of your invention. It is true he bids the heretics consult the Apostolic Churches, but it was to show that they all taught the same Apostolic faith which was preached by the Apostles, and afterwards committed by them to writing in their

Epistles; and it is equally true that he considered those Churches which might be afterwards established, which, though not founded by an Apostle, received the same doctrine, were to be equally accounted Apostolic—a heresy according to your narrow-minded prejudices. Tertullian was refuting or opposing certain heretics, the Gnostics, who held a compound of Oriental and Grecian philosophy, with a certain admixture of adulterated Christianity. (See cap. 45.) They rejected a portion of the Scriptures (cap. 17); and that portion which they did receive they mutilated and expounded variously and arbitrarily, and moulded to suit their own views. They appealed to their pretended secret traditions in opposition to the Traditions of the Apostolic Churches; which, in that age, were in agreement with the Scriptures on the points at issue. This I observed in the case of the citation from Irenæus. In fact, Tertullian made use of similar arguments as did Irenæus, when contending with his adversaries. In arguing, then, with such opponents, Tertullian, as might be expected, considered and treated their appeal to Scripture as simulated and nugatory. The question, therefore, arises, what were the Scriptures to which they appealed as the Inspired Word, and to which Tertullian objected? On the answer to this question rests the whole force of the argument, and the case you attempt to make out against us Protestants. Do we appeal to false, corrupted, mutilated, or imperfect writings; or fix on them arbitrary and forced interpretations; or, like these same heretics, pretend to have a secret tradition of our own in opposition to the Apostolic Churches? Did not these heretics

rather resemble your own sect, by appealing to their traditions, by which they corrupted the simplicity of the Christian faith? Did they not allege that the whole truth had not been revealed to the Apostles, or had not been communicated to Christians in general?¹

And do not the more learned of your divines rely on the doctrine of development to support your modern system of theology?

But, what were the questions in dispute? The Pope's supremacy, Invocation of Saints, Purgatory, Image Worship, Transubstantiation, or any other additions to the Apostolic Creed of the Churches? To set this matter at rest, we find Tertullian, in the 13th chapter, introducing, as a kind of test, a short summary of Christian doctrine, a *Regula Fidei*, or rule of faith, which was almost identical with the Apostles' creed. It was these fundamental articles he proposed as a test of orthodoxy. To have made out your case you should have shown that we objected to, or rejected, any one of these points. The heretics in Tertullian's day did not admit all these fundamental points, though they quoted what they called Scripture. To this he ironically exclaims (*Sed ipsi de Scripturas agunt et suadent!*), they argue and persuade out of Scriptures, knowing that the orthodox appealed to Scripture alone as their standard. Tertullian saw through their craft. How did he reply? Did he say, as you would have it, that, on questions of faith, the Scriptures are not sufficient?

¹ "Solent dicere (hæretici): non omnia Apostolos scisse; eadem agitanti dementia, qua rursus convertunt; omnia quidem Apostolos scisse, sed non omnia omnibus tradidisse. In utroque Christum reprehensioni injicientes, qui aut minus instructos, aut parum simplices Apostolos miserit."—Cap. xxii. p. 25. vol. ii. Edit. Semler. Halæ, Magd. 1770.

By no means. "*Aliunde scilicet suadere non possent de rebus fidei, nisi ex literis fidei?*"¹

Why! could they possibly speak of the things of faith, except from the records of the faith? an appeal which Tertullian readily admitted, but one from which you instinctively shrink. "By the very impudence of this appeal," he goes on to say, "they advance their cause, they exhaust the patience of the strong, they impose on the weak, they raise doubts in the minds of the wavering."²

He does not refuse an appeal to Scripture to settle the controversy, but denies their right to argue on their alleged scriptural grounds. Before the questions could be satisfactorily decided, the genuineness of their Scriptures, to which appeal was made, should be first ascertained.³

Tertullian very properly asks them, "to whom do the Scriptures belong? who has the legal possession of them? could it be said that the heretics who thus distorted and mutilated them had a legal possession?"⁴

It is not true, therefore, that the drift of Tertullian's argument is to show that these heretics had no right to appeal to Scripture, because the Scripture has no

¹ Semler in his edition Halæ, Magd. 1770, tom. ii. p. 19, does not give a note of interrogation, but the edition you quoted from does.

² "Scripturas obtendunt, et hac sua audacia statim quosdam movent. In ipso vero congressu firmos quidem fatigant, infirmos capiunt, medios cap scrupulo dimittunt."—(Ib. cap. xv. id. vol. ii. p. 20.

³ "Hunc igitur potissimum gradum obstruimus, non admittendos [or, according to Semler, admittendi] eos ad illam de Scripturis disputationem; si hæ sunt illæ vires eorum, uti eas habere possint. Dispici debet cui competat possessio Scripturarum."—Ibid. id.

⁴ "Ita hæresis non recipit quasdam Scripturas, et si quas recipit, adjectionibus et detractionibus ad dispositionem instituti sui intervertit. Et si recipit, non recipit integras."—Ibid. cap. xvii. id. p. 21, vol. ii.

authority as an inspired book, save that which it receives from the sanction of an infallible Church; and it was not on this ground that the heretics were checked, and not allowed to proceed in their argument. And the rest of your sentence is equally objectionable. Tertullian, I repeat, nowhere says that the Church alone proves the Scriptures; nor does he say that if the heretics admit the authority of the Church, they must believe whatsoever she teaches.

In the 21st chapter, to which you refer, Tertullian lays down a principle on which he shapes his Rule. If Christ, he says, sent the Apostles to preach, no others ought to be received, save those Christ appointed. Nothing more was revealed than what He revealed to the Apostles, and to ascertain what Christ ruled and they preached, must be proved in no other way than by those same Churches which the Apostles founded, by preaching to them *viva voce*, and afterwards by Epistles. All doctrines, therefore, agreeing with these Apostolic Churches must be true, as containing what they received from the Apostles, and the Apostles from Christ; all other doctrines must be adjudged false, which are contrary to the truth of the Churches, of the Apostles, and of Christ. "It remaineth, therefore (he adds), that we show whether this our doctrine, the rule of which we have above declared, be derived from the traditions of the Apostles, and from this very fact, whether the other doctrines come of falsehood. We have communion with the Apostolic Churches, because we have no doctrine different from them. This is evidence of truth." This "Tradition of the Apostles," be it remembered, embraced in the *Regula*

Fidei, he had before set out as being wholly included in and proved by Scripture. How different, then, is all this to your explanation, and the thrusting in of the authority of "the Church."

But what answer did Tertullian's adversaries give. Forsooth, that the Apostles did not know all things, or did not reveal all that they knew? This objection he answers, and calls upon his opponents to show the origin of their Churches, the succession of their Bishops, such as the Church of Smyrna, which reckoned from Polycarp, and Rome from Clement, their first Bishops, both founded by Apostles, and so all the other Apostolic Churches, and even later established Churches, though they could boast of no one of the Apostles or apostolic men as founders, nevertheless, by agreeing in the same faith, are, by reason of the consanguinity of doctrine, accounted not the less apostolical.¹

The heretics, on the contrary, on account of the diversity of religion (scilicet ob diversitatem sacramenti), were by no means apostolical. To learn, therefore, what is of apostolical doctrine, Tertullian sends the heretics to those churches in which the Apostles presided, and in which their own authentic writings were read (apud quas authenticæ literæ eorum recitantur); actually appealing here to the Written Word. If then, he says, you are in Achaia, appeal to Corinth; in Macedonia, Philippi; in Asia, Ephesus.

¹ "Ad hanc itaque formam provocabuntur ab illis ecclesiis, quæ licet nullam ex Apostolis vel Apostolicis autorem suum proferant, ut multo posteriores, quæ denique quotidie instituuntur; tamen in eadem fide conspirantes, non minus apostolicæ deputantur pro consanguinitate doctrinæ."—Ibid. cap. xxxii. id. pp. 40, 41, vol. ii.

But if you are near to Italy, you have Rome, where he (Tertullian) also had an authority close at hand.¹

A bold man, you are, indeed, Sir, to refer us to this passage, for it really limits Rome's authority to those in and near to Italy! The "ready appeal" on which you seem to lay so much stress, was simply on account of the near proximity to the see, not on account of any supposed divine right. Tertullian thus further reasons:—"If his adversaries were heretics, they were not Christians, because they followed not Christ, and not being Christians, they had no right to Christian writings, and, therefore, they had no right to appeal to the Scriptures." (cap. 37.)

Thus, then, *toto cælo, tota via aberras*. You lamentably pervert Tertullian. If you had read the treatise, you could not honestly have deduced such a theory as you desire to propagate and uphold; if you have not read the treatise in question, then you show yourself to be a mere transcriber, a blind follower of some dishonest controversialist, who calculated on escaping detection, because he was addressing those who he supposed had not the time or opportunity for examining the original. In either case we cannot acquit you of guilt, for you profess an intimate knowledge of all you propose to teach, with the addition of an affectation of honesty and integrity of purpose.

¹ "Age jam, qui voles curiositatem melius exercere, in negotio salutis tuæ, percurre ecclesias Apostolicas, apud quas ipsæ adhuc cathedræ Apostolorum suis locis præsentantur [president Rigalt]. Apud quas authenticæ literæ eorum recitantur, sonantes vocem, repræsentantes faciem. Proxima est tibi Achaia? habes Corinthum. Si non longe es a Macedonia, habes Philippos. Si potes in Asiam tendere, habes Ephesum. Si autem Italiæ adjiceris [adjaces, Rigalt et Paris], habes Romanam; unde nobis quoque autoritas præsto est statuta."—Ibid. c. xxxvi. id. pp. 45, 46.

You quote one passage in order to exemplify the doctrine you have laid down. This passage you place in inverted commas, as being a verbatim translation of one continuous passage. I propose to place the literal translation and your rendering and significant curtailment, in contrast. The translation I have adopted is that from the Library of the Fathers, by the Rev. C. Dodgson:

TERTULLIAN, c. xvi.—“This heresy doth not receive certain of the Scriptures, and whatever it doth receive, by adding to them and diminishing from them, it turneth about according to the plan of its proper purpose; and if it receiveth, it doth not in fact receive them, and if to a certain extent, it furnisheth them entire, nevertheless, by desiring different expositions, it perverteth them. An adulteration by the sense imposed is as much opposed to the truth as a corruption by the pen. Their various presumptions must needs be loth to recognise those things whereby they are refuted. They rely on what they have falsely trumped up or have derived from some ambiguity. What wilt thou gain, O man, most practised in these Scriptures, when if thou deniest anything, it is denied, and, on the other hand, if thou deniest anything, it is affirmed? And then indeed wilt lose nothing but thy breath in the dispute, gain nothing but vexation from their blasphemy.”

DR. WISEMAN.—“What will you gain by recurring to the Scriptures, when one denies what the other asserts?”

TERTULLIAN, c. xvii.—“But he, if any such there be, for whose sake thou enterest into a discussion of the Scriptures that thou mayst strengthen him when wavering, will he incline the more to the truth or to heresies? Being moved by the very fact that he seeth that thou hast advanced not a whit, being on an equal footing in denying and affirming on a different side, yet questionless, in a like position, he will depart, rendered more uncertain by the contest, not knowing which to judge the heresy. It is their part, too, surely to retort these things upon us. For they also, who, in like manner,

affirm that the truth is with them, must needs say that the corruptions of the Scriptures, and the falsities in the expositions of them, have been rather introduced by us."

c. xix.—"To the Scriptures, therefore, we must not appeal, nor must we try the issue on points on which the victory either is none or doubtful; for though the debate on the Scriptures should not so turn out as to place each party on an equal footing, the order of things would require that this question should be first proposed, which is now the only one to be discussed, 'To whom belongeth the very faith; where are the Scriptures; by whom, and through whom, and when, and to whom, was the rule delivered whereby men became Christians?' For wherever both the true Christian rule and faith shall be shown to be, there will be the true Scriptures, and the true expositions, and all the TRUE Christian traditions."

DR. WISEMAN.—"Learn rather who it is that possesses the faith of Christ; to whom the Scriptures belong; from whom, by whom, and when that faith was delivered by which we are made Christians. For where shall be found the true faith, there will be genuine Scriptures, and the true interpretations of them, *and there all the Christian traditions.*" [The italics are Dr. Wiseman's.]

Let me here pause for a moment, to examine your "sagacity and inductive skill." In a discussion where one denies what the other asserts, you make Tertullian repudiate the Scriptures altogether as an authority, and send them to the Church for a decision. You deduce from this that *your* Church only has a right to explain the Scriptures. By omitting all the context, and perverting the little of the text you do quote, you make out your case. But look at the context. These heretics, as I before stated, perverted and mutilated the Scriptures; and therefore it was, that argument should not be held with them on the Scriptures. They denied the Rule of Faith. What rule?—the Apostles' Creed—a rule admitted by your Church and

ours to the letter. The parallel, therefore, you seek to establish, falls to the ground, as against us Protestants. But you try to admit other doctrines, independent of the Scriptures; and you want Tertullian to assist you in sanctioning your traditions; "*all Christian Traditions,*" as you have it. Whereas Tertullian only sanctioned *True Christian Traditions*. These true Christian Traditions were none other than the Rule of Faith contained in the Apostles' Creed, which he maintains is contained and proved by these Scriptures, and which you would make subservient to, if not altogether set aside for, the "authority of the Church."

Your manipulation of the passage is very ingenious, and as you pervert it, it may be "precisely the very rule which the doctrine of the [Roman] Catholic Church professes at the present day." It becomes necessary, therefore, to pervert Tertullian to support your false rule.

I will go on with your quotation in contrast with Tertullian's words, merely to show your ingenuity:

TERTULLIAN, c. xx.—"Christ Jesus our Lord did himself, while he lived in the world, declare what He was, what He had been, of what will of His Father He was the minister, what He determined should be done by man, either openly to the people, or privately to His disciples, out of whom He had chosen to be attached to His person twelve principal ones, the destined teachers of the nations."

DR. WISEMAN.—"Christ chose his Apostles, whom He sent to preach to all nations."

TERTULLIAN continued. — "Therefore one of them being struck off, He, when departing to the Father, after his resurrection, commanded the other eleven to go and teach all nations, who were to be baptised 'into the name of the Father, and into the Son, and into the Holy

Ghost.' Immediately, therefore, the Apostles (whom the title intended to denote 'sent') having chosen by lot a twelfth, Matthias, into the room of Judas—first having through Judea borne witness to the faith in Jesus Christ, and established Churches, next went forth into the world, and preached the same doctrine of the same faith to the nations, and forthwith founded Churches in every city, from whence the other Churches thenceforward borrowed the tradition of the faith and the seed of doctrine, and are daily borrowing them, that they may become Churches. And for this cause they are themselves accounted Apostolical, as being the offspring of Apostolical Churches."

DR. WISEMAN.—"They delivered his doctrines and founded Churches, from which Churches others drew the seeds of the same doctrine, as new ones daily continue to do. Thus these, as the offspring of the Apostolic Churches, are themselves deemed Apostolical."

TERTULLIAN continued.—"Wherefore these Churches, so many and so great, are but that one primitive Church from the Apostles, whence they all sprang. Thus all are primitive and all Apostolical, while all are one. The communication of peace, the title of brotherhood, and the token of hospitality, prove this unity, which rights no other principle directeth than the unity of tradition of the same mystery."

c. xxi.—"On this principle, therefore, we shape our rule—that if the Lord Jesus Christ sent the Apostles to preach, no others ought to be received as preachers than those whom Christ appointed: for 'No man knoweth the Father save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son hath revealed Him?' Neither doth the Son seem to have revealed Him to any other than to the Apostles, whom He sent to preach, to wit, that which He revealed unto them. Now, what they did preach—that is, what Christ did reveal unto them, I will here also rule, must be proved in no other way than by those same Churches which the Apostles themselves founded; themselves, I say, by preaching to them as well *viva voce* (as men say), as afterwards by Epistles. If these things be so, it becometh forthwith manifest that all doctrine which agreeth

with these Apostolic Churches, the wombs and originals of the faith must be accounted true, as, without doubt, containing that which the Churches have received from the Apostles, the Apostles from Christ, Christ from God; and that all other doctrine must be judged at once to be false, which savoureth things contrary to the truth of the Churches, and of the Apostles, and of Christ and of God. It remaineth, therefore, that we show whether this our doctrine, the rule of which we have above declared, be derived from the tradition of the Apostles; and from this very fact, whether the other doctrines come from falsehood. We have communion with the Apostolic Churches, because we have no doctrine differing from them. This is evidence of truth."

DR. WISEMAN.—"Now to know what the Apostles taught—that is, what Christ revealed to them, recourse must be had to the Churches which they founded, and which they instructed by word of mouth, and by their Epistles. For it is plain that all doctrine which is conformable to the faith of these mother Churches is true; being that which they received from the Apostles, the Apostles from Christ, Christ from God; and that all other opinions must be novel and false."¹

This, you say, is precisely the rule which your Church proposes at the present day, and comprises every one of the principles which you allege you had been striving, for several evenings, to explain! It may be very plausible, but it amounts to mere assertion, the *rule* here insisted upon, did not embrace one single Tridentine addition. But the *rule* you are striving to explain and establish includes "The Supremacy of the Pope," the authority of "the Church," "the Sacrament of Penance," "Satisfaction and Purgatory," "Indulgences," "Invocation of Saints: their relics and images," "Transubstantiation"—the titles of

¹ Lecture v. pp. 141-2.

your several lectures. Neither the Apostles nor the Apostolic Churches, taught any of these either by word or epistle, and therefore, according to the rule you appeal to, "they must *not* be accounted true;" they came under Tertullian's denomination of "all other doctrines which must be judged at once to be false, as savouring of things contrary to the truth of the Churches, and of the Apostles, and of Christ, and of God."

You know full well, Rev. Sir, that the points on which we are disputing, and which you undertake to uphold and prove as being apostolic, were not those which Tertullian was contending for against his adversaries. He was maintaining just those points we both readily admit as having been preached by the Apostles, and afterwards committed to writing by them—a position, however, you are obliged to abandon. Since you teach other doctrines not included in Scripture, you are compelled to maintain that it is not necessary that you should prove every one of your doctrines individually from Scripture.¹ While other writers of your communion, more learned and more candid than yourself, relinquish antiquity, and rely on the theory of "development;" *you* do not hesitate to quote garbled, forged, or spurious documents, in order to induce your hearers to believe that these modern developments are "apostolic traditions!"

You appeal to Tertullian as an authority, and yet you take your stand upon the fact that it is not necessary to prove all your doctrines from Scripture. The Scriptures not containing all that is necessary to be believed, they must be, as regards these additional doc-

¹ Lecture xii. p. 53, vol. ii.

trines, imperfect. But what does Tertullian say? "I adore the fulness of the Scriptures;" and he challenged the heretic Hermogenes to produce the Written Word; and if he was unable to produce the Written Word in support of his doctrines, he told him, as I would now tell you, to dread the scriptural woe which is destined for those who either add to or detract from it.¹

I remain, &c.

No. XIV.

RIGHT REV. SIR,—You next summon ORIGEN in support of your theory, and quote him as advocating your modern Tridentine teaching, with as much assurance as you have quoted Irenæus and Tertullian.

By far the greater portion of the writings of Origen have come to us through the medium of a Latin "rendering" of Ruffinus, a writer of the fifth century; who has evidently taken considerable liberties with his author, and it has generally been considered a loose paraphrase rather than a translation; at least this is the opinion of your ecclesiastical historian Du Pin, who said:

"We have almost no Homilies in Greek: his [Origen's] works on Scripture, consisting of commentaries and scholia, are, with the exception of a few fragments, lost, and those in Latin have been translated with so much liberty by Ruffinus and others, that it is very difficult to know what is Origen's and what the translator's."²

¹ "Adoro scripturæ plenitudinem—Scriptum esse doceat Hermogenis officina. Si non est scriptum, timeat væ illud adjicientibus aut detrahentibus destinatum."—Tertul. adv. Hermog. cap. xxii. vol. ii. p. 111. Edit. Semler. Halæ, Magd. 1770.

² Du Pin Bibliothèque, tom. i. p. 124. Paris, 1683.

This is not a very encouraging beginning. But we must deal with the materials we have got, such as they are. Before we proceed to your citations, we may profitably employ a few moments in ascertaining Origen's sentiments with regard to the Sacred Scriptures as a "Rule of Faith," and in what estimation he held Tradition when placed in comparison with the Written Word. And here it is essential to bear in mind your estimation of the sufficiency, or rather insufficiency, of the Scriptures, as a Rule of Faith, which I have gathered from your Lectures in my former letters.

Origen was a pupil of Clement, Bishop of Alexandria; a worthy master. Origen had no doubt had the precept of his master instilled into him. Clement wrote:

"They who are ready to labour for what is most excellent, will not desist in their search after truth till they obtain demonstration from the Scriptures."¹

It is most evident to my mind that Origen not only did not place tradition on a level with Scripture, but on questions of doctrine he looked to the Scriptures alone. He considered them so perfect as to be sufficient for every part of Christian instruction. Who can read the following passage and believe that Origen considered the Old and New Testament insufficient as a Rule of Faith, or that a third unwritten Word or Tradition was necessary to supply what had not been revealed to us in the two Testaments?

"In the two Testaments every word that appertaineth

¹ Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. vii. p. 889. Edit. Potter.

unto God may be sought and discussed, and out of them all knowledge of things may be derived. But, if anything remains which Divine Scripture does not determine, no other third Scripture ought to be received to authorise knowledge. . . . But let us commit to the fire what remains ; that is, let us reserve it for God. For God has not willed that we should know all things in this present life."¹

And I will refer you to another passage :

"We know Jesus Christ is God, and we seek to expound the words which are spoken, according to the dignity of the person. Wherefore, it is necessary for us to call the Scriptures into testimony ; for our meanings and interpretations, without these witnesses, have no credit."²

Bellarmino has endeavoured to explain away this and other similar passages, referred to in the note below,² as involving questions on which tradition does not treat, but such a position will not hold good for one moment. You have taken the more prudent course of hiding them from view altogether. Had you taken his line of argument, I would have at once confronted you with the three following passages from the same Father :

¹ "In hoc biduo Testamenta posse intelligi, in quibus liceat omne verbum quod ad Deum pertinet requiri et discuti ; atque ex ipsis omnem rerum scientiam capi. Si quid autem superfuerit, quod non Divina Scriptura decernat, nullam aliam tertiam Scripturam debere ad auctoritatem scientiæ suscipi. . . . Sed igni tradamus quod superest, id est, Deo reservemus. Neque enim in præsentī vita Deus scire nos omnia voluit."—Origen Homil. v. in Levit. tom. ii. p. 212. Edit. Benedict. Paris, 1759.

² "Jesum Christum scimus Deum ; quærimus verba quæ dicta sunt juxta personæ exponere dignitatem. Quapropter necesse nobis est Scripturas sanctas in testimonium vocare ; sensus quippe nostri, et enarrationes, sine his testibus, non habent fidem."—Tractatus 5. Matt. Vide etiam Hom. 25 in Matt. Hom. 7 in Ezek. et Hom. 4 in Jer.

“As all gold, whatever it be, that is without the temple, is not holy, so every sense, which is without the Divine Scripture, however admirable it may appear to some, is not holy, because it is foreign to the Scripture.”¹

“Consider how imminent their danger is, who neglect to study the Scriptures, in which alone a knowledge of their condition can be ascertained.”²

And lastly:

“No man ought, for the confirmation of doctrines, to use books which are not canonised Scriptures.”³

The citation of the above passages is necessary, in order to appreciate the value of those you have brought under notice. There are sins of omission as well as commission. Had you inserted the above well-known quotations, your hearers and readers would have been able—at least they would have had the opportunity of weighing the testimony of this ancient writer, and have at once perceived that, according to Origen, on questions of doctrine, Scripture alone was to be our guide, and from Scripture apostolic doctrine was to be learnt. What the Apostles handed down through the Church, was nothing more than what they conveyed to us in their writings. You, however, as I shall presently show, by a skilful change of words, by substi-

¹ “Sicut omne aurum quodcumque fuerit extra templum non est sanctificatum, sic omnis sensus qui fuerit extra divinam Scripturam, quamvis admirabilis videatur quibusdam, non est sanctus quia continetur a sensu Scripturæ.”—In Matt. Hom. 25.

² “Et ideo vigilans sensus, et mens intenta requiritur; quæ probare noverit vel ovis in propatulo simplicitatem, vel lupi latentem rupacitatem. Vide quam proximi periculis fiant hi, qui exerceri in divinis literis negligunt, in quibus solis hujusmodi examinationis agnoscenda discretio est.”—Orig. c. xvi. in Rom. lib. x.

³ “Nemo uti debet, et confirmationem dogmatum, libris qui sunt extra canonisatas Scripturas.”—Tract. 26, in Matt.

tuting "apostolic men" for "the Apostles" themselves, and by the introduction of a passage including the words "apostolic traditions," shift the ground entirely, and would have us suppose that Origen believed that, independent of the Scriptures, there was a code of doctrine continued in the Church, and that Origen adhered to them, the "apostolic men," as to God, and that he drew "intelligence from the Scriptures, according to the sense that had been delivered by them, the apostolic men !"

The adjustment and arrangement is more ingenious than creditable. There can be no doubt of Origen's teaching. When, therefore, we find the same writer, talking of apostolic tradition as conveying a rule of doctrines, to be observed, to be consistent with himself he could not intend to convey your theory that besides the Sacred Scriptures there was an unwritten code equally binding on us, co-ordinate with the Scriptures, to be received with "like feeling of piety and reverence." *Pari pietatis affectu et reverentia*, as your Trent Council has it. Origen, then, when speaking of apostolic traditions, to be consistent with himself, must have referred to the doctrines contained in the apostolic writings, as being the apostolic traditions which had been handed down by succeeding Churches. I have already fully proved, in my previous examination of your quotations from Irenæus and Tertullian, that such was the express teaching of these Fathers. You do not show that Origen taught otherwise.

Your citations are as follows, in immediate sequence:¹

¹ Lecture v. pp. 142-3.

“ 1. As there are many who think they believe what Christ taught, and some of these differ from others, it becomes necessary that all should profess that doctrine which came down from the Apostles, and now continues *in the Church*. That alone is truth which in nothing differs from ecclesiastical and apostolical tradition.”¹

“ Again” (immediately following):

“ 2. Let him look to it who, arrogantly puffed up, contemns the apostolic words. To me it is good to adhere to apostolic men, as to God, and his Christ, and to draw intelligence from the Scriptures, *according to the sense that has been delivered by them*. If we follow the mere letter of the Scriptures, and take the interpretation of the law, as the Jews commonly explain it, I shall blush to confess that the Lord should have given such laws.—But if the Law of God be understood as the Church teaches, then truly does it transcend all human laws, and is worthy of him that gave it.—Hom. vii. in Levit. t. ii. pp. 224-226.”

“ And in another place:”

“ 3. As often as heretics produce the canonical Scriptures, in which every Christian agrees, and believes, they seem to say, Lo! with us is the word of truth. But to them (the heretics) we cannot give credit, nor depart from the first and ecclesiastical tradition: we can believe only *as the succeeding Churches of God have delivered to us*.—Tract. xxix. in Mat. t. iii. p. 864.”

By the first and third of these passages you propose to hold up the Traditions of the Church, as of authority. There can be no possible objection to this, if those traditions be proved to be truly apostolical. Such of those apostolical traditions as are retained in your Church we unfeignedly accept, but we do not place the Church above the Scriptures; but learn what the Apostles

¹ “Præf. lib. i. Periarchon, t. i. p. 47. Edit. PP. S. Mauri. Paris, 1733.”

taught, and what the Church should now teach as apostolical traditions wholly and solely from the Scriptures.

To be in order, and clear the ground as we proceed, I will supply the text. The first passage is taken from the first book "De Principiis" according to Ruffinis' interpretation:

"Quoniam ergo multi ex his qui Christo credere se profitentur, non solum in parvis et minimis discordant, verum etiam in magnis et maximis . . . propter hoc necessarium videtur prius de his singulis certam lineam manifestamque regulam ponere . . . servetur vero ecclesiastica prædicatio per successionis ordinem ab apostolis tradita, et usque ad præsens in ecclesiis permanens; illa sola credenda est veritas, quæ in nullo ab ecclesiastica et apostolica discordat traditione."¹

Passing over the second passage for separate comment; the third passage is as follows:

"Quoties autem canonicas proferunt Scripturas, in quibus omnis Christianus consentit et credit, videntur dicere: Ecce in domibus verbum est veritatis. Sed nos illis credere non debemus, nec exire a prima et ecclesiastica traditione, nec aliter credere nisi quemadmodum per successionem ecclesiæ Dei tradiderunt nobis."²

Origen flourished about A.D. 230, sufficiently ancient to commend him to our respect and attention, though we cannot admit him, or any other of the early Christian Fathers of the Church, to be infallible. They not only were liable to error, and did err, but what we have of their writings you know to have been garbled and falsified.

¹ Tom. i. p. 47. Edit. Bened. Paris, 1733.

² Origenis in S. Matth. Commentar. Series. Tract. 29, Opp. tom. iii. p. 864. Ed. Bened.

But, Sir, let me ask whether we reject ecclesiastical and apostolical Traditions as handed to us by those Fathers? "The present question is," said Stillingfleet, "how far Tradition is to be allowed in giving the sense of the Scriptures between us? Vincentius saith, we ought to follow it when there is antiquity, universality, and consent. This we are willing to be tried by."¹ "We ought," said Cranmer, "interpret the Scriptures in conformity with the sense of the ancients."² And as Bishop Patrick said:

"We reverently receive the unanimous Tradition or doctrine of the Church in all ages, which determines the meaning of the Holy Scriptures, and makes it more clear and unquestionable in any point of faith wherein we can find it hath declared its sense. For we look upon this Tradition as nothing else but the Scripture unfolded: not a new thing, which is not in the Scripture; but the Scripture explained, and made more evident."³

"Nothing was more remote," wrote Bishop Kaye, "from their (the Reformers') intention than indiscriminately to condemn all tradition."⁴

"If," said Faber, "we reject Scripture, we reject the very basis of theological belief: if we reject antiquity, we reject all historical evidence to soundness of interpretation."⁵ But "the principle on which we separated from the Roman Church was, not that we had discovered any new views of Scripture doctrines, but that we desired to return to the primitive confes-

¹ The Council of Trent examined and disproved by Catholic Tradition. Part i. p. 23. London, 1688.

² See Collier's *Ecl. Hist.* vol. ii. p. 56. London, 1714.

³ Patrick's "Discourse about Tradition," p. 11. London, 1685.

⁴ Bp. Kaye's *Tertullian*, p. 302. Cambr. 1829.

⁵ Faber's "Prim. Doctrine of Election," p. 13. London, 1836.

sion, the views held by the Apostles and the early Fathers of the Church.”¹

In citing, then, such passages as above from Origen against us, you merely echo the sentiments of some of our own learned divines. You should have shown by the ecclesiastical or apostolical Tradition handed down to us through Origen, that we have rejected the principle by which we profess to be tried. Leslie truly remarked, “They who refuse to be tried by this rule . . . are justly to be suspected; nay, it is evident that they are broaching some novel doctrines which cannot stand this test.”² What we have to complain of is this, that you abandon that apostolic Tradition handed down by the ancient or primitive Christian Churches, and endeavour to introduce your innovations under cover of *tradition*, and with this object in view you *falsify* the primitive Christian writers, the only legitimate source through which the pure and unadulterated tradition should flow or can be ascertained. A very good example of this discreditable process is to be found in the second passage above cited by you as from Origen’s 7th Homily on Leviticus, and which should be exposed; and to this task I shall now proceed.

Of the three passages cited by you as from the works of Origen, the second claims the most particular attention. The whole extract suggests subjects for

¹ Rose’s State of the Protestant Religion in Germany, p. 21. Cambridge, 1824; and Appendix, pp. 78-81. London, 1828. I am indebted for these passages to the learned work “Roman Forgeries and Falsifications,” exposed by the Rev. R. Gibbins. London, 1849.

² Leslie’s Works, vol. i. pp. 71-2. Oxford, 1832.

most severe animadversion. I will take the first portion of the extract, which you give as follows:

“Let him look to it, who, arrogantly puffed up, contemns the Apostolic words. To me it is good to adhere to Apostolic men, as to God, and his Christ, and to draw intelligence from the sense that has been delivered by them.”—(Lecture v. p. 143).

You desire to make Origen adhere to Apostolic men, as to God, and his Christ, and to draw intelligence from the Scriptures, according to the sense that has been delivered by them, *i.e.* the “Apostolic men.” Your object is apparent. You claim for yourselves (the priests) personal Apostolic succession, you set up yourselves as Apostolic men, and you would have us to adhere to the priests as to God, and have us to draw intelligence from the Scriptures according to the sense that has been delivered by them. But, alas! Sir, for your “sagacity and inductive skill.” Had you taken the ordinary precaution of referring to the original text instead of following some dishonest controversialist, you could have scarcely perpetrated so impious a blunder. You refer us to the Paris edition of 1733, and in page 224 of the second volume we are to find the passage in question. Your fatal precision stands you to little service except conferring on you the equivocal and ephemeral honour of appearing learned to the unlearned. For your information I will transcribe the passage you indicate, and for our unlearned readers I will add a translation:

“Si quis vero arrogantia tumidus Apostolica dicta contemnit aut spernit, ipse viderit. Mihi autem, sicut Deo et Domino Jesu Christo, ita et Apostolis ejus adhærere

bonum est, et ex divinis Scripturis secundum ipsorum traditionem intelligentiam capere."

Literal translation :

" But if any one, puffed up with arrogance, undervalues or scorns Apostolic words, he shall look to it. But to me it is good to adhere, as to God and our Lord Jesus Christ, so also to his Apostles, and to draw intelligence from the Scriptures, according to the sense that has been delivered by them."

Your perversion :

" Let him look to it who, arrogantly puffed up, contemns the Apostolic words. To me it is good to adhere to Apostolic men, as to God, and his Christ, and to draw intelligence from the Scriptures, according to the sense that has been delivered by them."

This is a bold perversion, nor does it appear altogether unintentional, since the sentiment desired to be conveyed is in accordance with the teaching of the Catechism of the Council of Trent, wherein (treating of "Orders" of the Romish priesthood) we are informed :

" For since bishops and priests are, as it were, certain interpreters of God, and intermediate messengers, who in his name teach men the divine law and the precepts of life, and represent on earth God himself, it is manifest that their function is of that nature that none greater can be imagined. Wherefore, they are deservedly called not only angels, but Gods also, because they hold among us the power and authority of the immortal God."¹

¹ " Nam cum Episcopi et sacerdotes, tanquam Dei interpretes, et internuntii quidam sint, qui ejus nomine divine legem, et vitæ præcepta homines docent, et ipsius Dei personam in terris gerunt, perspicuum est, eam esse illorum functionem, qua nulla major ex cogitari possit. Quare, merito non solum angeli, sed Dei etiam, quod Dei immortales vim, et numen apud nos teneant, appellantur."—Cat. Concil. Trid. pars ii. cap. vii. sec. ii. p. 327. Edit. Paris, 1848.

And so you would have Origen direct us to Apostolic men as to God, and draw intelligence from the Scriptures, according to the sense that has been delivered by them; and these Apostolic men are none other (as you allege in the passage next after the above) than those in communion with the Church of Rome. Considering that you profess to take nothing for granted, but proceed on demonstrative evidence, this is a bold leap to a conclusion.

But the extent of your perversion does not terminate here. The theory you have undertaken to prove is that—

“An authority to teach was communicated to the Apostles, and by them to their successors [the Apostolic men, the priests of Rome] together with an unwritten code, so that what was afterwards written by them [the Apostles], was but a fixing and recording of part of that which was already in possession of the Church.” “We discover in the New Testament [you say] no hint or intimation whatever, that the Christian code was to be committed to writing.”¹

You maintain that an unwritten code was entrusted to the Church to explain the written code. (p. 140.) Hence the further necessity of this perversion of Origen. Your argument, founded on this passage, is, that the Scriptures are to be understood according to the sense delivered by the priest, to whom is entrusted this unwritten code to interpret them, whereas I have asserted that the tradition referred to by Origen was the Apostolic tradition, handed down by the Church from the Apostles, which the latter fixed and com-

¹ Lecture v. p. 128.

mitted to writing. The very passage in question defeats your own theory, and establishes my position; indeed, I could hardly have selected a more appropriate example. The question is raised in the very place cited, where is to be found the sense of Scripture delivered by the Apostles? You maintain, in the Traditions of the Church; I maintain, according to the very testimony adduced by you, in the writings of the Apostles. The "context proves to demonstration that Origen refers to the Apostles themselves; and, secondly, to the exposition of passages of the Old Testament delivered by the Apostles in the New."¹

Origen is showing that in many instances if we take the letter of the Scriptures, we shall do violence to them, and that therefore it is necessary to explain some passages after a spiritual manner. He is commenting on the interpretation of passages in the Old, which are explained in the New Testament, and this the context will clearly show, which is as follows:

"But now let us also see some of those things which are written concerning clean and unclean, whether concerning meats or animals; and, as in the explanation of the cup [please to bear this in mind, *the cup*], so also concerning meats which are spoken of by way of shadow, let us ascend to those which spiritually are true meats. But, to investigate these subjects, we stand in need of the testimonies of Divine Scripture, lest any one should think (for men love to whet their tongues as a sword), lest any one, I say, should think that I do violence to the Divine Scriptures, and in a forced manner apply to men those things which are written in the law concerning

¹ My attention was first drawn to this view of the passage by Mr. Pope, in his "Roman Misquotations," London, 1840, cap. i. sec. ii., whose exposition I will now follow, having carefully and personally tested its accuracy.

animals, quadrupeds, or even birds, or clean or unclean fishes, and fain that those things were spoken of for men. For, perhaps, some of the hearers may say, why dost thou violence to Scripture? Animals are spoken of—let animals be understood. Lest, therefore, any one should believe that these things are perverted by a human understanding, the Apostolic authority on these subjects is to be called forth. Hear, first of all, therefore, after what manner Paul speaks of these things. ‘For all,’ he says, ‘passed through the sea, and were all baptised unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea, and did all eat the same spiritual meat, and did all drink the same spiritual drink, for they drank of that spiritual rock that followed them, but that rock was Christ.’ (1 Cor. x. 2 *et seq.*) Paul says these things, an Hebrew of the Hebrews, according to the law a Pharisee, and instructed at the feet of Gamaliel; who, truly, never would dare to name spiritual meat and spiritual drink, unless he had learned by the knowledge of the truest doctrine delivered to himself, that such was the meaning of the lawgivers. From whence he adds this also, as if confident and certain respecting the import of clean and unclean, that they are to be observed, not according to the letter, but spiritually; and says, ‘Let no man, therefore, judge you in meat or in drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new moon, or Sabbath days, which are a shadow of things to come.’ (Col. ii. 16.) Thou seest, therefore, in what manner Paul, who had learned those things better than they who now boast that they are teachers, says that all those things which Moses speaks concerning meats or drinks, are a shadow of things to come. And, therefore, as we have said, we ought to ascend from this shadow to truth. The discourse is to Christians and from Christians, to whom the authority of Apostolic words ought to be dear.”

In immediate connexion with the preceding extract, stands the first part of your quotation:

“But if any one, puffed up with arrogance, undervalues or scorns Apostolic words, he shall look to it. But to me

it is good to adhere, as to God and our Lord Jesus Christ, so also to His Apostles, and to draw intelligence from the Scriptures, according to the sense that has been delivered by them."

Origen immediately continues:

"But, however, if the will of God be so, and tranquillity shall exist (for we know not what a day about to come will bring forth), a convenient time will, perhaps, occur, when we may also show from the Old Testament, according to the view of the Apostles, that not only the import of clean and unclean meats, but also the signification of animals, or birds, or fishes, concerning which it is written in the law, is to be referred to men. But since, at present, time does not allow us a more extensive explanation, let us be content with the two lights of the Apostles, Peter and Paul, as witnesses. And, indeed, we have already brought forward Paul's opinion. But, when the Apostle Peter was in Joppe, and desired to pray," &c.

Origen proceeds to comment upon the tenth chapter of the Acts, particularly upon the vision of the sheet, and adds:

"Does not the Apostle Peter seem to thee manifestly to have transferred all these four-footed beasts, and creeping things, and fowls, to man, and to have understood those things which had been shown to him in the sheet let down from heaven as men?"

Having now transcribed the passage you purport to quote with its context, we at once perceive that the propositions I have laid down are fully borne out, viz.:

1. That Origen is speaking of the Apostles personally, and not of Apostolic men.
2. That he does not refer to a traditive interpretation of Scripture confided to Apostolic men, apart from the Scriptures themselves, but that he is main-

taining the significations of passages of the Old Testament furnished by the Apostles in the New.

The former position is demonstrated by the citation of the apostles Paul and Peter, and a recommendation to us to be content with these two lights as witnesses, without any reference to "Apostolic men." The latter position is established by the fact, that in interpreting the passages of the Old Testament, he actually appeals to specified texts in the New.¹ Origen, therefore, does not leave us in doubt, where "the sense" of Scripture "is delivered."

Your perversion, as I said before, is very ingenious, for under cover of this passage you would have us to suppose that Origen held the theory that we are to draw intelligence from the Scriptures according to the sense that is delivered by those priests who are in communion with the Church of Rome [for so you go on to argue], who alone you pretend have that magic charm, "Apostolic succession." You arrive at the latter conclusion on the alleged authority of Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage, by the citation of a well-known passage from his book on the "Unity of the Church," which no more applies to the Church of Rome exclusively than it does to any other Apostolic Church.² But, strange enough, Cyprian gives us very important information on this very subject, and carries out the same principle I have been contending for; when

¹ See Pope's "Roman Misquotations," as above.

² The examination of this passage belongs more properly to the question of "supremacy," but in the mean time I would direct your attention to Mr. Robin's learned and practical work, "The whole Evidence against the Claims of the Roman Church." Edit. London, 1855, cap. xi. p. 111 *et seq.*

speaking of Tradition, with reference to matters of doctrine, he refers to the Written Word. The learned Suicer has made this clear.

“The word *traditio*,” he remarks, “is employed by Cyprian in this very sense. One or two instances taken from his works will suffice. When Stephen had observed, ‘Let no new practice be introduced except that which has been handed down,’ Cyprian (Ep. lxxiv. ad. Pompejum)¹ thus writes: ‘From whence is that tradition? Whether has it come down from the authority of the Lord and the Gospels, or from the commands and letters of the Apostles?’ For that those things which are written, are to be done, God testifies, and sets before Joshua, saying: ‘The book of this law shall depart out of thy mouth; but thou shalt meditate therein day and night, that thou mayest observe to do all things which are written therein.’ (Josh. chap. i. 8.) Presently Cyprian remarks: ‘If, therefore, it is either commanded in the Gospels, or contained in the Epistles or Acts—that those abandoning heresy, should not be baptised, but that hands should merely be laid on them in order to penitential discipline, let this divine and holy Tradition be observed.’ Thus in the same Epistle: ‘If truth shall in any respect be uncertain and fail, let us return to the fountain head which is from the Lord, to the Gospels (*ad Originem Dominicam et Evangelicam*) and to Apostolical tradition.’ And a few lines after, he calls it the sacrament of divine Tradition.” On these passages Suicer remarks: “Accordinging, therefore, to Cyprian, Tradition is twofold;

¹ Cyprian. Epist. xxiv. Oper. vol. ii. p. 211. Oxon. 1682.

that of the Lord, and that of the Apostles—of these, the former is transmitted in the Gospels; the latter is revealed in the Epistles.”¹

But while you were referring your hearers to this work of Cyprian, you might have warned them that it was his opinion that the rest of the Apostles were the same as Peter was, and that they shared equally with him in honour and power,² and you should have also warned them against the corruptions and forgeries introduced into the Paris and Benedictine editions of Cyprian’s work, giving a primacy to Peter.

To return to your citation as from Origen. In the latter part of the quotation is yet another serious and unpardonable blunder, which exhibits you in that most equivocal light in which I have so often exposed you to the public. You either are the most bold, shameless, and determined perverter of the most patent facts, trading on the ignorance and credulity of your hearers, taking advantage of your responsible and exalted position in your Church, or, with an affectation of learning, you dabble in subjects in which you otherwise prove yourself to be lamentably uninformed. “*Utrum horum mavis accipe.*” This further perversion I will now proceed to consider.

I now proceed to the second part of the quotation under examination. Without any indication of a break in the subject, you immediately continue as follows:³

¹ See the whole subject fully examined in Pope’s “Roman Misquotations,” p. 256 *et seq.*

² “Hoc erant utique cæteri apostoli quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio præditi et honoris et potestatis.”—De Unit. Eccles. p. 107, Oxon. 1682, and p. 172, cap. ii. Edit. Paris, 1836.

³ Lecture v. vol. i. p. 143. (See above, pp. 113 and 122.)

“If we follow the mere letter of the Scriptures, and take the interpretation of the law, as the Jews commonly explain it, I shall blush to confess that the Lord should have given such laws.—But if the law of God be understood as the Church teaches, then truly does it transcend all human laws, and is worthy of him that gave it!”

I have stated that between this passage and that which went before you put no indication that the quotation is otherwise than continuous; but you put a break after the word “laws.” Your foot-note reference is to “tom. ii. pp. 224-226,” intimating that your few lines are taken from the two pages of Origen’s works, and that the part omitted comes in after the word “laws,” whereas the following words only are here omitted, instead of two folio pages:

“For the laws of men, for instance, those of the Romans, or Athenians, or Lacedemonians, will appear more elegant and reasonable.”

While the omission of two pages occurs immediately after the passage (as you render it; see pp. 113 and 122 above):

“To me it is good to adhere to Apostolic men, as to God and his Christ, and to draw intelligence from the Scriptures according to the sense that has been delivered by them.”

In order fully to appreciate your strange proceeding, it is necessary to comprehend the full scope of the three quotations as from Origen, “a man [you tell us] of philosophic mind, one of the most learned men in the early ages of Christianity, and fully able to detect any flaw of reasoning, had it existed, in the train of argument advanced in demonstration of Christianity.” You make Origen declare it to be necessary to profess

the doctrine which came down from the Apostles and now continues in the Church; that that alone is truth which does not differ from Ecclesiastical and Apostolical tradition; that Origen adhered to Apostolic men as to God, and drew intelligence from the Scriptures according to the sense that has been delivered by them; that we are not to follow the mere letter of the Scriptures and take the interpretation as the Jews commonly explain it, but as understood by the Church; that we are to give no credit to heretics, nor depart from the first ecclesiastical tradition, but must only believe as the succeeding Churches of God have believed.

Such is the summary of your argument from Origen, whom you cite as authoritative on the subject. I propose to test you by the rule and authority you have thus dogmatically laid down for our guide.

We are, says Origen, to draw intelligence from Scripture according to the sense that has been delivered by the Apostles—we are not to take the letter of Scripture, nor the interpretation as the Jews commonly explain it, but as understood by the Church.

Now, Sir, I will put your honesty to the test. Did you ever read the passage which comes between the first and second part of your quotation, where I have placed a — but you make a continuous quotation! If you have, your daring is truly astonishing, if you have not, then let me give you a little information on the subject, with this piece of advice: Do not quote from the works of “one of the most learned men of the early ages of Christianity” without reading them for yourself, for your co-religionists are not to be trusted when they enter on that dangerous ground.

Throughout your Lectures the greatest amount of labour and ingenuity is bestowed by you upon the interpretation of the 6th chapter of St. John's Gospel, from verse 47. In Lecture XIV. p. 157, you thus comment on this part of the chapter :

“The Jews believed our Saviour's words in the literal sense even as we [Romanists] do ; now the main point is, were they right in doing so, or were they wrong? If they were right in taking our Saviour's words literally, we [Romanists] also are right ; if they were wrong in taking them literally, then we [Romanists] also are wrong. The entire question now hinges on the point,—the ascertaining, if possible, whether the Jews were right or whether they were wrong in taking Christ's words in their literal sense.”

Then you argue the question, exercising your own private judgment to a most heretical extent, and thus conclude (p. 162):

“The difficulty raised is, ‘how can this man give us his flesh to eat?’ If the words were meant figuratively, Jesus, according to His usual custom, will meet the objection by stating that He wished to be so understood. Instead of this, He stands to His words—hence we must conclude that this passage belongs to the second class where the Jews were right in taking the different expressions to the letter ; and consequently we [Romanists] too are right in so receiving them.”

The words “unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood, you shall have no life in you,” you declare “are to be taken in the strictest and most literal sense.” (p. 164.) A more appropriate opportunity, you think, did not occur to our Saviour during all his entire ministry to propound the doctrine of the “real presence”¹ than this, and you declare that

¹ Lectures on the Real Presence, London, 1851, p. 42.

you have spoken of this doctrine as “synonymous with Transubstantiation; for as by the real presence you say you have understood a corporal presence, to the exclusion of all other substances, it is evident that the one is, in truth, equivalent to the other, and for this reason you have contended for the literal meaning of our Saviour’s words.”¹ A spiritual interpretation you call “a new, unheard-of trope.”²

This is plain, unequivocal language, and you challenge investigation by boastfully saying, “I do not wish to conceal anything, or shrink from any argument or objection that may be made.”³

Now, Sir, one unaccustomed to controversy with Romanists would scarcely credit the fact that the very authority you quote, in the very passage to which you refer us as evidencing “precisely the very rule which the doctrine of your Church proposes at the present day,”⁴ gives a direct contradiction to all your arguments and assertions!

You are labouring, as I showed, to prove, by the authority of Origen, that the interpretation of Scripture was vested in the Church, and that “his train of argument advanced in demonstration” the teaching of the Church. I will now supply the omitted passage, and show how far you follow your own rule; and the reason for thus tampering with the text will, at the same time, become apparent.

I have shown (in my last) that Origen explained cer-

¹ Lectures on the Real Presence, p. 304. London, 1851.

² Ibid. p. 292.

³ Lecture xiv. p. 168, vol. ii.

⁴ Ibid. v. p. 142.

tain texts of the Old Testament by the New, concerning "clean and unclean, whether concerning meats or animals; and as in the explanation of the cup, so also concerning meats which are spoken of by way of shadow." To investigate these subjects, he directs us to the testimony of the "Divine Scripture;" the written testimonies of Peter and Paul were to be followed, and we are "to draw intelligence from the Scriptures according to the sense that has been delivered by them." But lest a literal interpretation of certain texts of Scripture should prove a stumbling-block, Origen proceeds to show that these texts must be understood in a spiritual manner. He quotes those referring to "quadrupeds, and creeping things and birds," and "clean and unclean things," and first our Saviour's words, in Matt. xiii. 47, wherein he says our Lord plainly taught that "those fishes which are said to be taken in nets, are either good or bad men. Those, therefore, are they who, according to Moses, are called either clean or unclean fishes."

Origen then proceeds to give the interpretation to certain passages in Scripture, which he argues must be interpreted spiritually; and we must here admire your boldness in directing our attention to the page where the passage, I shall next quote, is found:

"These matters, then, having been established by Apostolic and Evangelic authority, let us see (continues Origen) in what manner each man can be shown to be either clean or unclean.

"Every man has some food in himself, which he supplies to the individual who comes nearest to him. For, when we approach each other, it is impossible but that, either from an answer, or a question, or from some ges-

ture, we mutually receive or impart some relish. And if the man from whom we derive a relish be clean and of a good mind, we receive clean food. But if the individual with whom we are brought into contact be unclean, we receive from him, agreeably to what has been already said, unclean food. And on this account I am of opinion the Apostle Paul says of such persons, as of unclean animals: 'With such an one no not to eat.' (1 Cor. v. 11.) But that my meaning may be more intelligible, let us take an example from greater things, that we may thence gradually descend, until we come to inferior things. Our Lord and Saviour says: '*Except ye shall eat my flesh and drink my blood, ye shall not have life in yourselves. My flesh is truly meat, and my blood is truly drink.*' (John vi. 54-56.) Because Jesus, therefore, is altogether and wholly clean, his entire flesh is meat, and his entire blood is drink, because his every work is holy, and his every speech is true. On that account, therefore, both His flesh is true meat, and His blood is true drink. For, by *the flesh and blood of His own word*, as with clean food and drink, He gives drink to, and recruits all the race of men. In the second place, after His flesh, Peter and Paul and all the Apostles are clean food. In the third place, their disciples; and thus each, according to the extent of his deserts and the purity of his perceptions, is made clean food to his neighbour. He who cannot endure to hear these things, may, perhaps, turn aside, and avert his ears, after the example of those who said, 'How will He give us His flesh to eat? Who can hear Him? And they departed from Him.' (John vi. 53, 61, 67.) But you, if you are the sons of the Church, if you are imbued with evangelical mysteries, if the Word, made flesh, dwells in you, acknowledge, because they are of the Lord, the things which we say, lest, perhaps, he who knows them not, should not be known of Him. Acknowledge, because they are figures, the things which are written in the Inspired Volume; and, therefore, as spiritual, not as carnal persons, examine and understand what is said. For if as carnal persons you understand them, they injure and do not nourish you. For there is in the Gospels, also, a letter which kills: a

killing letter is not found in the Old Testament alone. There is also in the New Testament a letter which kills him who does not understand spiritually the things which are spoken. For if according to the letter thou followest the very thing which is said, 'Except ye eat my flesh and drink my blood' (John vi. 54), this letter kills."

Then, after referring to other texts, such as Luke xxii. 36, and 1 Cor. ii. 11, which Origen says must also be explained in a spiritual manner, he proceeds immediately to the second part of your quotation, introduced, as I observed before, without any mark indicating the omission of all the above matter:

"But if we cleave to the letter, and understand the things written in the law, according to the meaning the Jews attach to it, or according to the vulgar acceptance, I blush to speak and confess that God should have given such laws. In the law of man, for instance, those of the Romans or Athenians, or Lacedemonians, will appear more elegant and reasonable. But, if the law of God be understood as the Church teaches, then plainly does it transcend all human law, and will be believed to be truly the law of God."¹

Thus, then, according to Origen, this very text,

¹ It would be too tedious to insert here the entire passage from the original, I therefore transcribe only the last part:

"Est et in novo testamento litera, quæ occidit eum, qui non spiritualiter quæ dicuntur adverterit. Si enim secundum literam sequaris hoc ipsum quod dictum est: '*Nisi manducaveritis carnem meam, et biberitis sanguinem meum*' (Joan. vi. 54), occidit hæc litera. Vis tibi et aliam de Evangelio proferam, literam quæ occidit?—Si vero adsideamus literæ et secundum hoc, vel quod Judæis, vel id quod vulgo videtur accipiamus quæ in lege scripta sunt, erubescere dicere, et confiteri, quia tales leges dederit Deus. Videbuntur enim magis elegantes, et rationabiles hominum leges, verbi gratia, vel Romanorum, vel Atheniensium, vel Lacedæmoniorum. Si vero secundum hanc intelligentiam, quam docet ecclesia, accipiat Dei lex, tunc plane omnes humanas supereminet leges, et vere Dei lex esse crederetur. Itaque his ita præmissis, spirituali (ut commonuimus) intelligentia de mundis et immundis animalibus aliqua perstringamus."—Orig. Hom. vii. in Levit. tom. ii. p. 226, Edit. Bened. Paris, 1733.

John vi. 54, which you say must be understood in a literal sense, according to the "meaning the Jews attached to it," must be understood spiritually; and he actually appeals to the authority of the Church in his day as explaining the passage spiritually in opposition to the Jewish interpretation which you contend to be correct, but which your authority, Origen, "would blush to speak and confess."

Origen, you will observe, urges on his hearers this spiritual interpretation, expressly on the ground of their being "sons of the Church:"

"If you are sons of the Church, if you are imbued with evangelical mysteries, if the Word made flesh dwells in you—acknowledge, because they are figures," &c.

I now call upon you, Rev. Sir, for an explanation of this daring outrage on all rules of honourable citation. You have a perfect right to hold your own private opinions, and interpret Scriptures "according to the meaning the Jews attach to it," if you prefer it. But I maintain that it is a palpable fraud "as a [professed] son of the Church," to appeal to Origen as an authority as teaching precisely the same rule "which the doctrine of your Church proposes at the present day," while you omit from the middle of the very passage (without even the conventional indication), his own words, which, as I repeat, give the very lie to all you say. Every honest man will, if you refuse explanation, treat you either as a literary impostor or a wicked deceiver, according to the temper of his mind. You are announced to deliver a Lecture at the Greenwich Literary Institution, on the 9th proximo, on an interesting subject, "Difficulties of Literary Forge-

ries.”¹ You, Sir, are, of the present day, the most systematic adopter, if not perpetrator, of literary forgeries (whether knowingly or ignorantly the public will judge). I doubt much whether this notorious position will entitle you to come before the public as a lecturer on “literary forgeries.” The greatest difficulty in my mind is, how you can dare to appear before the public on such a question, when your own honesty and integrity, on the very subjects, are called in question. You remind one forcibly of the old trick of the pickpocket, who, to escape detection, joins in the general cry, “Stop thief!” and thus hopes to draw off attention from himself.

So much, then, for your citations from Origen. But how is it, Rev. Sir, that you think so highly of Origen, when Ribera, the wily Jesuit, said that “he was full of errors which the Church has always detested?”² Is it because he spoke of the bread at the Eucharist as the “typical and symbolical body” of our Lord, and the bread and cup as images, and that “by these symbols He (Christ) commended His memory to His disciples?”³ Is it because in his book against Celsus⁴ he says that we are to pray to “God alone and to the only begotten Word of God,” and that invocation of angels is irrational? and in book vii. he teaches that we should each offer our prayers in the vulgar tongue, for “He that is Lord of every language hears the prayers which are put up to him in every

¹ See the *Tablet*, 15th of January, 1859, p. 37, col. 3.

² “Originem plenum fuisse erroribus, quos ecclesia semper detestata est.”—Ribera in Malach. in præm.

³ Origen comment. in Matt. tom. iii. pp. 498, 500, Bened. Edit. Paris, 1733.

⁴ Orig. Cont. Cels. lib. v. p. 233. Ed. Cantab. 1677.

language," and because in the same work he directs all Christians to eschew images in all religious worship, and that "we ought to die rather than contaminate our faith to God with such impieties?" and because even the relative worship your Trent Council enjoins, Origen designates as "sottish stupidity, from which the very lowest and least informed of Christians are exempt?"¹ Is it because in his commentary on the 16th chap. of St. Matt. he declared his opinion that Peter was not the sole rock, but that the other Apostles were equally so, and that the keys were given in common to all?² Is it because in his Homily on Leviticus he condemned, by anticipation, your doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary by saying "Solus Christus sine macula est," &c. Only Christ is without spot, who did no sin? Is it because he, according to the testimony of Eusebius,³ rejected all the Apocrypha from the canon of Scripture?

To conclude, the only time I find you agreeing with Origen is in your Eleventh Lecture, vol. ii. p. 60, where you fancy this Father favours your doctrine of Purgatory by giving a seemingly Popish interpretation of the text (1 Cor. iii. 11-15); and here, again, you blunder most grievously, for Origen was condemned by a General Council of the Church as broaching, on this very occasion, an impious and heretical doctrine,⁴ which you characteristically adopt.

I remain, &c.

¹ Cont. Cels. lib. vi. p. 284. Edit. Cantab. 1677.

² Comment. in Matt. tom. i. p. 336. Huet. Rothomag. 1688.

³ Euseb. lib. vi. cap. xvi. xxv. p. 289. Cantab. 1700.

⁴ Bals. apud Beverdg. Synod. vol. i. p. 150. Oxon. 1672. Conc. Constantinop. A.D. 553.

No. XV.

RIGHT REV. SIR,—With this I propose to conclude the present series of Letters. If I have been led to use language which might be objected to, I much regret it. When, however, the nature of the perversions which I have undertaken to expose be considered, no honest man could restrain the expression of an indignant protest. I heartily wish it could have been otherwise.

I have confined myself principally to your “Lectures on the [Roman] Catholic Church.” The examples adduced of your “Popish literary blunders” may be considered samples merely of the various groups under which they may be classified. At some future time I hope to renew the subject; but, before I conclude, while the nature and extent of these perversions and misrepresentations are fresh in the memory, let me make a few observations. You profess that it is the Word of God alone that you have endeavoured to declare.¹ You exclaim, “What shall I have gained, if I shall be proved to have sought to enmesh you in the toils of captious reasoning and wily sophistry, and not rather to have been desirous of captivating your souls to the truth as it is in Jesus Christ?” (p. 241.) What indeed have you gained! But, Sir, let me here further record your fearful imprecation. You declare that you are writing and speaking “under the awful conviction that the arm of God was stretched over your head, and challenged by every word you uttered

¹ Lecture xvi. p. 243.

to strike and crush you as a lying prophet, and a deceiver in His name!!"¹ And you "commend your book to the favour and protection of the ALMIGHTY, begging His blessing upon both the writer and reader." These, Rev. Sir, are awful words. Taking your position on the very lowest ground—namely, that you are blindly relying on the veracity of others—is this the language to be held before a mixed audience, when you had not taken even the commonest precaution of referring to the works you so confidently quote, to satisfy yourself of the TRUTH of your statements before you so recklessly and thoughtlessly imprecated the Divine wrath on your head?

You declare yourself "fully satisfied,"—"not merely that no doctrine, but that not a single argument, had been advanced by you, of which you had not the most entire conviction." (p. 242.) What means, may I ask, have you taken to arrive at that "most entire conviction?" Does it not convey to our minds that you had *personally* made a most careful and minute examination of facts and documents, before you committed yourself to them? Does the result of the present examination convince us that you are really sincere in your assertions? Let me beg and entreat you to ponder well what I have written; and if you really desire us to give you credit for candour, honesty, and integrity of purpose, vindicate the position you have assumed, or frankly admit that you have yourself been deceived. Such an alternative as this last may be a bitter pill; but, oh! how true, indeed, are your own words, "What will you have gained if it should be

¹ Lecture xvi. vol. ii. p. 242.

proved that you have caught one of your readers in the toils of captious reasoning and wily sophistry;” and “what satisfaction can it afford you if you felt a suspicion that you had been misleading your hearers.”¹ The arm of GOD is, indeed, stretched over your head, to challenge every word you have uttered. That it may not crush you—that it may not fall on the head of “a lying prophet, and a deceiver in His name,” is my earnest prayer.

I remain, Right Rev. Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

C. H. COLLETTE.

¹ Lecture xvi. p. 241.

POPISH FRAUDS

EXEMPLIFIED BY

DR. WISEMAN'S LECTURE

ON

PURGATORY.

“ . . . Pontifici — strepitu testimoniorum antiquitatis simplicium oculos perstringere volunt, Purgatorium esse antiquam Patrum traditionem.”—*Chemnitz, Examen Conc. Trid.* pars iii. p. 153. Ed. 1606.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

PHYSICS DEPARTMENT

PHYSICS 309

LECTURE NOTES

BY

ROBERT A. FERMI

1952

CHICAGO, ILL.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

POPISH FRAUDS EXEMPLIFIED BY DR. WISEMAN'S LECTURES! This, it may be said, is a bold title for a Protestant layman to assume for a short pamphlet. It is admitted. "But, CARDINAL WISEMAN is a learned man, a scholar, well read and versed in controversies?" This, too, is admitted. He has been called "THE APOSTLE in these parts of the Papistical Heresy." Whether he be an apostle for GOOD or an apostle for EVIL is a question that now divides Christendom. We know that it seemeth good in the sight of God to have hidden the truths of His Gospel from the wise and prudent, and revealed them unto babes. (Luke x. 21.) "But fraud is insinuated against the head of the Romish Church in this country?" The title of this work is, "POPISH FRAUDS." Dr. Wiseman is not an originator of the deceptions complained of, he is but an imitator and copyist of more eminent men who have preceded him;

Möhler's "Symbolick," and Messrs. Kirk and Berington's "Faith of Catholics," have, according to his own admission, furnished him with his materials. If, however, he takes upon himself to adopt them, he must be content to be responsible for them.

"But *fraud* is a strong term; were the charge even true, charity might suggest a more mild or courteous expression?" To this it is answered, that were the Lectures under review the production of a layman, and not of an authorised teacher, it might be so. The detected *frauds* are errors, not of judgment, but of intention; precise references are given, scrutiny is invited, and assertions are put forward with dogmatic effrontery. The arguments and assertions are but repetitions of oft-exposed fallacies. The example given by Dr. Wiseman would justify far stronger terms. In the Review of PASCAL THE YOUNGER'S admirable production, "CASES OF CONSCIENCE," publicly attributed to Dr. Wiseman, and not denied by him, in the fifth article of the October number of the "DUBLIN REVIEW," 1851 (p. 140), Dr. Wiseman (if not without provocation, certainly without the slightest justification) accuses "Pascal the Younger" of writing "LIES, PALPABLE AND ENORMOUS LIES!" The occasion, perhaps, demanded strong language, a bold front, and an uncompromising negative; for "He happened to *know* that even excellent Catholics had been distressed by

it"—(the CASES)—and he almost despaired "of recovering the ground to which its influence had probably extended." (p. 131.) And so Dr. Wiseman did not hesitate to use expressions which, however justifiable, are here discarded in favour of the milder, but not less significant, term of *fraud*. Let the reader suspend his judgment until he has considered the justification for it. The following pages are submitted to the candid and impartial perusal of Protestants, Tractarians, or Romanists. Their verdict is patiently awaited.

Some short time since the writer was favoured with a letter from Dr. Wiseman, wherein the Doctor expressed his regret that the writer should allow his mind to be so completely and grievously warped on Catholic topics, and should consider it his duty, as he supposed the writer did, to keep up before the public an irritating and useless controversy. The Doctor suggested that were he to step out of his way to attack week by week members of the legal profession, or rather the profession itself, and for that purpose, uninitiated in its intricacies, endeavour, by means of law-books and legal instruments, quoted in scraps, to show they are all but a body of harpies preying on public credulity and the vices of mankind for the purposes of profit, he thinks he could make out a good, popular, and plausible case, at the expense of many dozen of

blunders which a professional and practised eye would at once detect, but which in his conceit he should not be convinced of; the old wise saw, *Ne sutor, &c.*, would be lost upon him. This the Doctor conceived to be a parallel case with that of a Layman meddling with matters out of his vocation. And the writer was politely told to attend to what concerned his own profession, and not meddle with a subject of which he could know nothing, and into the intricacies of which he could not be initiated.¹

The writer, in reply, would remind Dr. Wiseman that the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ was not written for the Roman Catholic priest alone, but equally for all; that as long as a Roman priest, or other minister of the Gospel, keeps within the revealed Word of God, so long will he find the laity leave the work of the evangelist in his hands; for we say with St. Jerome, the Church is not to go out of her limits of the Holy Scriptures, for from thence the timber and material must be taken with which the house of Wisdom is to be built.² But when the Doctor attempts to bring in another gospel, making void the Word of God by his tradition, then should every true-hearted and spirited Layman come forward to vindi-

¹ "Romanism in England Exposed." Hall and Co., Paternoster-row. Second edit. p. 235.

² Hier. in Mich. p. 445, tom. vi. Veron. 1736.

cate "the faith once delivered to the saints," and, to use the expression so happily selected by Dr. Wiseman, "expose this body of harpies preying on public credulity and the vices of mankind for the purposes of profit." Nor, other advantages apart, would it be easy to find any one more capable, than a lawyer, of analysing the subject in question, and freeing the "pure and unadulterated Word" from the "intricacies" with which it has been surrounded by the Romish priesthood. His mind is accustomed to examine subjects on *evidence*—and not on *ipse dixits*, mere hardy assertions—a faculty fatal to the Romish system. The writer cannot read St. Peter's Epistle without applying the Apostle's admonition to himself, "Be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you with meekness and fear;" or the not less impressive direction of the great Apostle Paul, to "prove all things, and hold fast that which is good."

In these eventful times, it is surely unnecessary for a layman to make an apology for coming forward in support of the working and faithful clergy of the Church of England, and assisting them to repel the insidious attacks, whether of Tractarians from within, or Romanists from without.

Of the various Lectures delivered by Dr. Wiseman, that on PURGATORY is selected as the subject of this

Essay, as being the most subtly worked up, as well as the most specious.

The writer wishes it to be understood that he lays no claim either to originality of matter or elegance of composition. His aim has been to put together acknowledged truths in as simple a form as possible. Nor is the following intended as a vindication of Protestant *truth*, but simply as an exposure of Popish *fraud*. The opinions and writings of what are called the FATHERS of the Church are cited, not as *authorities*, but as admissions elicited on cross-examination of an opponent's own witness, and, as such, legitimate evidence against himself.

The writer has derived considerable assistance from Faber's "Difficulties of Romanism," "Pope's Roman Misquotations," and a small, but interesting French work, printed in 1669, under the title of "A History of Ancient Ceremonies."

C. H. C.

POPIISH FRAUDS

EXEMPLIFIED BY

DR. WISEMAN'S LECTURE

ON

PURGATORY.

DR. WISEMAN, now a CARDINAL of the Roman Church, undertook to vindicate the Romish doctrine of Purgatory in a Lecture delivered some time since at Moorfields Chapel, now called the pro-cathedral, and which, with the series, has been published, re-published, and now stereotyped for the benefit of all who desired to be satisfied of the antiquity and reasonableness of this Romish doctrine. I say, simply, antiquity and reasonableness, for Dr. Wiseman does not aspire to claim for it scriptural support, or even apostolicity. The present theme is undertaken to expose the fallacies and sophisms advanced in support of the Lecture under the title of "Purgatory," which stands No. XI. in the second volume of the stereotyped

edition 1851 of his Lectures, "On the Principal Doctrines and Practices of the [Roman] Catholic Church."

There is, perhaps, no doctrine of the Church of Rome on which greater uncertainty exists than the doctrine of Purgatory. Uncertainty and mystery are prolific sources of superstition. When the mind is kept in dread of some impending calamity it is prostrated. Make a person believe that you have it in your power to avert such evil, or alleviate the afflictions which it may entail, and he is in your power. Such is the relative position of the priest and the Roman Catholic laic in reference to the dogma of Purgatory.

When a teacher undertakes to defend a doctrine, or rescue it from misrepresentation, it is usual to commence with a precise explanation or definition of the subject under examination; and so, one would reasonably expect to find in a Lecture undertaken to defend the "doctrine and practice" of a Church, a clear definition of *the* "doctrine and practice" to be vindicated. It is not so, however, in the Lecture now to be brought under review. It did not suit Dr. Wiseman's purpose to be too precise in his definitions, for he would find himself in the awkward dilemma, that the true doctrine and practice of his Church rightly defined, would not square with the scriptural and patristic evidence he relies on as sanctioning what he undertakes to vindicate.

It is a remarkable fact, however, that even the Roman Church, which declares itself infallible, has not put forward a clear and defined exposition or explanation of her belief on the doctrine under consideration.

As if conscious of her fraud, the Roman Church has given no authoritative declaration defining the particulars of this dogma, but leaves the matter in vague uncertainty; requiring the pastors to teach concerning it, what "the Church has ever taught from the beginning."

We have to gather the Church's teaching in scraps. By the creed of Pope Pius IV., first published in November, 1564, the Romanist repeats:

"I steadfastly hold that there exists a Purgatory, and that the souls there detained are assisted by the suffrages of the faithful."

He is directed here to believe in "*a Purgatory*:" this is nothing definite. In December, 1563, the Council of Trent decreed:

"Whereas the Catholic Church, instructed by the Holy Ghost, has from the *sacred writings and the ancient traditions of the Fathers*, taught in sacred council, and very recently in this Œcumenical Synod, that there is a *Purgatory*, and that the souls there detained are relieved by the suffrages of the faithful, but chiefly by the acceptable sacrifice of the altar."¹

We advance another step; we are here told that the prayers and suffrages of the faithful in the sacrifice of the altar—namely, the mass—are efficacious to those supposed to be in this imaginary, at least unknown, abode, PURGATORY, and that this doctrine is taught by Scripture and Tradition, and supported by the writings of the Fathers.

The then recent canon referred to, was passed at the

¹ Session 25. Decret. de Purg. Labbé Concl. tom. xiv. p. 894. Paris, 1672.

sixth session of the same Council of Trent in January, 1547. By the thirtieth canon on Justification, it is decreed:

“If any one shall affirm that, after the grace of justification received, unto every penitent sinner the guilt is so remitted, and the penalty of eternal punishment so blotted out, that there remains not any *penalty* of temporal *punishments* to be discharged either in this world or in the next in *Purgatory*, before the entrance to the kingdom of Heaven can be laid open, let him be anathema.”

And in the twenty-second session (chap. ii.) it is declared that the Romish sacrifice of the Mass is not only “propitiatory,” but what the minister offers on the altar is the “one and the same victim which was offered on the cross;” whereby they tell us that this modern sacrifice, this crucifying our Saviour anew, “agreeable to the traditions of the Apostles,” “is rightly offered—not only for the sins, punishments, satisfactions, and other necessities of the faithful who are alive, but also for those who are departed in Christ, and who are not as yet fully purified and purged.”

Dr. Challoner describes Purgatory as:

“A middle *state* of souls which depart this life in God’s grace, yet not without some lesser stains of guilt of punishment which retards them from entering heaven.”

And the Christians who go to Purgatory are stated to be:

“1st, such as die guilty of lesser sins, which we commonly call *venial*; as many Christians do, who, either by sudden death or otherwise, are taken out of this life before they have repented of these ordinary failings: 2nd, such as having been formerly guilty of greater sins,

have not made full satisfaction for them to the divine justice."¹

We have advanced a step further, for we are now informed by what beings this Purgatory is tenanted: namely, by the "justified," "those who are departed in Christ;" "the faithful," those who are guilty of venial sins only, before they have made sufficient satisfaction or atoned for their sins in this life.

Our next consideration is, what is the nature or the locality of this third abode. In the Bible we read only of two places, Heaven and Hell. The holy and infallible Council did not deem it prudent to disclose for vulgar ears these or any further particulars whatever; probably it knew nothing about them, and therefore prudently retained a mysterious silence on this part of the subject. The Synod, nevertheless,

"Enjoined on bishops that they diligently strive that the *sound* doctrine touching Purgatory, delivered by the holy Fathers and sacred councils, be believed, held, and taught, and everywhere proclaimed, by the faithful of Christ; but that the more difficult and subtle questions, and those which tend not to edification, and from which for the most part there is no increase of piety, should be excluded from popular discourses before the uneducated multitude. In like manner, such things *as are uncertain*, or which labour under an appearance of error, are not to be made public and discussed."

But the holy Synod, having an eye to the commercial value of the doctrine, warns the clergy that:

¹ "The Grounds of the Catholic Doctrine," &c. By the Ven. and Right Rev. Rich. Challoner, D.D., Vic. Ap. 15th Edition. London, 1843, pp. 39, 40.

It should be observed that while Dr. Challoner describes Purgatory as a *middle state of souls*, other Romish divines describe it as a *place*, and *bodies* are not unfrequently represented as suffering corporeally.

“The suffrages of the faithful—to wit, sacrifices of masses, prayers, *almsgiving*, &c., which are wont to be performed by the faithful for the other faithful departed—be piously rendered; and whatsoever things are due on their behalf from the *endowments of testators*, or in any other way” (and here is the whole *morale* of the question), “these are to be discharged in a proper manner.”

The difficult and subtle questions suggested are, the nature of the sufferings undergone by the inhabitants of Purgatory, the duration of such sufferings, and the supposed locality of this imaginary place, or state.

We obtain a little further information on one of these questions from the Catechism of the Council of Trent. This Catechism Dr. Doyle asserted on oath to be the most approved and authentic summary of the creed, faith, and morals of the Roman Church:¹

“Besides this (namely, hell) there is a *purgatorial fire*, where the souls of the pious are for a certain time expiated by suffering, by which an entrance may be gained to the eternal abodes into which nothing unclean can enter.”²

By this we learn that in this place the souls of the faithful are *tormented* (*cruciatæ* is the word employed) for a time, by a literal fire.

This is all we can gather from documents of authority on the subject under consideration. But we can gain a little more information from other sources. Cardinal Bellarmine, the most distinguished champion of the Romish Church, in his work entitled “De

¹ Phelan, Digest: Lords: March 21, 1825, part i. p. 176.

² “Præterea est purgatorius ignis, quo piorum animæ ad definitum tempus cruciatæ expiantur, ut eis in æternam patriam ingressus patere possit, in quam nihil coinquinatum ingreditur.”—Catech. Concil. Trid. pars i. v. Purg. ignis, p. 61. Paris, 1848.

Gemitu Columbæ" (book ii. c. 9), gives a very minute account (asserted to be by special revelation) of the dreadful tortures suffered by the inmates of Purgatory. "The torments which I there witnessed" (says an apparition from Purgatory) "are so dreadful, that to attempt to describe them would be utterly in vain." In a small work (a sample merely of many others that might be quoted to the same effect) purporting to be "published with the approbation of Monsig. de Quélen, Bishop of Evreux," we read:

"There is then a Purgatory; that is to say, a place in which souls are purified—a place in which they suffer torments immense in their duration, innumerable in their multitude, excessive in their rigour, incomprehensible in their nature."¹

And though Dr. Wiseman has most scrupulously abstained from giving any description or definition of Purgatory, or even any explanation of the precise teaching of his Church on this dogma, in his Lecture now under review, we nevertheless gather a little more information from his writings in another place. In discoursing on the wondrous virtues of a saint of his Church, St. Pacificus of San Severino, Dr. Wiseman describes one of the occupations of this individual,

"Whose heart," he tells us, "burned with the desire of freeing the souls that are affected in Purgatory, *from the most cruel and bitter torments*; as cheerfully taking

¹ "Il y a donc un purgatoire; c'est-à-dire, un lieu dans lequel les âmes sont purifiées, un lieu dans lequel elles souffrent des peines immenses dans leur étendue, innombrables dans leur multitude, excessives dans leur rigueur, incompréhensibles dans leur nature."—*Les Ames du Purgatoire*, p. 6. Paris, Simon, Rue d'Enfer. [A rather appropriate locality!] 1843.

upon himself to satisfy, both by prayer and mortification, some portion of the punishment which the souls of the members of the suffering Church are doomed to endure."¹

The Bull of Leo XII., after quoted, seems to refer to Purgatory as being a literal fire.

Thus, then, it is plain that the modern Church of Rome consigns all those who die in the faith, the justified, who have not made satisfaction in this world by acts of penance, &c., to *purgatorial fires and torments*, though the voice from heaven declared in trumpet tones, "*Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth: Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may rest from their labours.*" (Rev. xiv. 13.)

Another subtle question is the duration of the sufferings of the just. Here various opinions are suggested, but according to the compilers of the "Hours of the Blessed Virgin according to the Ritual of the Church of Salisbury," many thousand years of suffering are contemplated. In this we are told, that:

"Whosoever in a state of grace shall say seven prayers before the crucifix, and seven Paternosters, and seven Ave Marias, shall attain fifty-six thousand years' pardon; fourteen thousand granted by St. Gregory, fourteen thousand by Nicholas I., and twenty-eight thousand by Sixtus IV."²

Souls are liberated from Purgatory by the act of the Pope, and, when duly delegated, by bishops and priests. This is effected by the application to the suffering souls of a portion of the "treasures of the

¹ "Lives of St. Alphonsus," &c. Edited by Dr. Wiseman, p. 202. Dolman, 1847.

² See further extracts from this, with the references, in Tyler's "Primitive Christian Worship," part ii. chap. i. London, 1847.

Church,"¹ which sacred treasure consists "of the superabundant merits, sufferings, and virtues, of Christ our Lord, and of his Virgin Mother, and of all the saints."

"We have resolved," says Pope Leo XII., "*by virtue of the authority given to us from heaven, fully to unlock that sacred treasure composed of the merits, sufferings, and virtues, of Christ our Lord and of His Virgin Mother, and of all the saints, which the author of human salvation has entrusted to our dispensation.*—To you, therefore, venerable brethren, Patriarchs, Primate, Archbishops, Bishops, it belongs to explain with perspicuity the power of Indulgences; what is their efficacy in the remission, not only of the canonical penance, but also of the temporal punishment due to the divine justice for past sin; and what succour is afforded, *out of this heavenly treasure, from the merits of Christ and his saints, to such as have departed real penitents in God's love, yet before they had duly satisfied, by fruits worthy of penance for sins of commission and omission, and are now purifying in the fire of Purgatory, that an entrance may be opened for them into their eternal country, where nothing defiled is admitted.*"²

On these imaginary treasures they pretend to draw from time to time, and apply them to the necessities of the less fortunate brethren "purifying in the fire of Purgatory, that an entrance may be opened to them" to heaven. This presupposes the truth of the doctrine of supererogation; *i.e.* that we can do more good works than are necessary for our salvation, and that these superabundant good works are treasured up and reserved by the Church, to be applied to make up the deficiency of others.

¹ Bell. de Indulg. sec. iii. p. 657, tom. iii. Prag. 1721.

² Bull of Pope Leo XII., Laity's Directory. Keating and Brown, London, 1825.

The seraphic doctor and canonised saint, St. Thomas Aquinas, says:

“There actually exists an *immense* treasure of merit, composed of the pious deeds and virtuous actions which the saints have performed, beyond what is necessary for their own salvation; which are, therefore, applicable to the benefit of others. The guardian and dispenser of this precious treasure is the Roman Pontiff; and, of consequence, he is empowered to assign, to such as he thinks proper, a portion of this *inexhaustible* source of *merit* suitable to their respective guilt, and sufficient to deliver them from the punishment due to their crimes.”¹

And to the like effect we read, in an *interesting little work*, the “History of the Four Scapulars,”²

“It is one of the benefits to which all Catholics are admitted by the communion of saints, that they have a share in the good works that are performed by all its members. This is a doctrine which even the most learned Protestants admit. [?] . . . Indeed, it would be difficult for any candid person to entertain any doubt of this consoling doctrine after reading the declaration of St. Paul. (Col. i. 24.) . . . Well, then, the Scapular admits its members to a participation in the good works of one of the holiest orders in the Church, the order of the great St. Theresa. What treasures of grace are every day and every hour heaped up by the religious men and women of that order!—what an accumulation of merits has it acquired during the seven centuries of its existence! Those who are received into the Confraternity of the Scapular have a share in these riches. The priest, when he admits you into it, says, ‘By the power given to me, I admit thee into the participation of all the prayers,

¹ I am indebted for this passage to the excellent little work, “Protestant Lectures on the Errors and Abuses of Romanism.” Pigott, London, 1851, p. 42.

² Sold by Burns, Portman-street, London, 1850, p. 18. The authority of this work, and its recognition by Dr. Wiseman, is fully set out in the author’s work, “Romanism in England Exposed.” Hall and Virtue. Second Edition, 1851, p. 18.

disciplines, suffrages, alms, fasts, vigils, masses, canonical hours, and all the good works that, by the mercy of Jesus Christ, the religious of Mount Carmel shall perform, whether by day or by night.' ”

All this is confirmatory of the teaching of the Church of Rome as defined by the Catechism of the Council of Trent, where we find it laid down under the chapter on Penance and Satisfaction, founded on the text, Gal. vi. 2, under the title, “ *One person can make satisfaction to God for another.* ”

“ Herein, indeed, must we magnify, with the greatest praises and thanksgivings, the great goodness and mercy of God, who has granted this indulgence to human weakness, namely, that one person should be able to make satisfaction for another; which, indeed, is, in a pre-eminent sense, a property of this part of penance. . . Those who are endowed with divine grace can, in the name of another, fully pay to God what is owed to God (by the other). ”¹

In the annotations to the early Rhemish Testament (A.D. 1582) we find the following:

“ Luke xi. 35.—The works which we do more than precept, be called works of supererogation; and whereby (that is from what was above said) it is also evident against the Protestants that there be such works.” “ This place [2 Cor. viii. 14] proveth plainly, that the fastings and satisfactory deeds of one man, be available to others. Yea, and that holy saints or other virtuous persons, may in measure and proportion of other men's necessities and

¹ Catech. Concil. Trid. i. pars ii. De Pœnitentiæ Sacramento, No. cix. and cx. p. 312. Paris, 1848, and p. 109. Edit. Mechlin. 1831.

“ cix. *Satisfacere potest unus pro alio.* In eo vero summa Dei bonitas et clementia maximis laudibus et gratiarum actionibus prædicanda est, qui humanæ imbecillitati hoc condonavit, ut unus posset pro altero satisfacere; quod quidem hujus partis pœnitentiæ maxime proprium est.

“ cx. . . . Ita qui divina gratia præditi sunt, alterius nomine possunt quod Deo debetur persolvere; quare fit ut quodam pacto (Gal. vi. 2) alter alterius onera portare videatur.”

deservings allot unto them, as well the supererogation of their spiritual works, as those that abound in worldly goods may give alms of their superfluities to them which are in necessity."

"We infer [from 2 Cor. ii. 10] most assuredly, that the satisfactory and penal works of holy saints suffered in this life, be communicable and applicable to the use of other faithful men, and to be dispensed according to every man's necessity and deserving, by them whom Christ hath constituted over his family, and hath made the dispensers of his treasures."

To carry out this view of her teaching, the Church of Rome should be prepared to state what amount of penance and satisfaction in this life would entitle one, not only to escape Purgatory, but to enable his less fortunate fellow-creature to take to his own account some of these surplus merits. This attempt to cheat the devil by deputy is curiously illustrated by the illustrious Maynooth theologian, Peter Dens. He says:

"It is imposed, with good effect as a sacramental penance, that the penitent shall see to have works of satisfaction performed for him by others, yet these works performed by others are not part of the sacrament; but the act of the penitent himself attending to it, that these should be performed *for him* is part of the sacrament."¹

This is strange theology indeed!

And here let us observe how strangely contradictory is all this to the doctrine which Dr. Wiseman has found it necessary and convenient to assert, and which he lays down, in the Lecture on Purgatory under consideration, to be the true and accepted teaching of his Church. He says:

¹ Dens, Theolog. tom. vi. p. 242. Dublin, 1832.

“In fact, no fasting, no prayers, no alms-deeds, no work that we can conceive to be done by man, however protracted, however rigorous they may be, can, according to the Catholic doctrine, have the most infinitesimal weight for obtaining the remission of sin, or of the eternal punishment allotted to it.”¹

We are quite ready to admit the truth of this proposition, but we deny that it is the universally accepted doctrine of his Church; I have shown that it is not. Nor is Dr. Wiseman consistent in his own teaching on this subject; for we have seen, that one of his imaginary saints most cheerfully took upon himself to satisfy, both by prayer and mortification, *some* portion of the sufferings which the souls of the members of the suffering Church are doomed to undergo (in Purgatory).

The locality of Purgatory is quite uncertain. This question, also, has been a source of speculative argument among the curious.

Having now given Rome's own definition of her teaching, we can afford to smile at Dr. Wiseman's affected indignation, when he says:

“What, then, in God's name, is there in this doctrine, viewed simply in itself, that can make it so popular a theme of declamation against [Roman] Catholics? The *anti-scriptural* doctrine of Purgatory, as it is termed, is, more frequently than almost any other of our less important dogmas, the theme of obloquy and misrepresentation. It seems to be fancied, in some way or other, that it is

¹ Lecture viii. p. 41, vol. ii. London, 1836. We may gather from the context that Dr. Wiseman means that the acts of penance cannot help another mortal *except* through the merits of Jesus Christ, but that through these merits they can. I challenge Dr. Wiseman, or any other Romanist, to produce either scriptural or patristic sanction for even this species of modified Romanism.

an instrument either for benefiting the clergy, or for enabling them to work on the fears of the people; that the terror of Purgatory is somehow a means of strengthening the arm of the Church over its subjects; but in what way, it is impossible for any Catholic, who knows our practice and belief, possibly to conceive."¹

One would have thought Dr. Wiseman to have been joking, but for his taking God's name—though I fear—in vain. Cannot Dr. Wiseman bring his mind for a moment to speculate on what was one of the principal causes which led to the Reformation? Was it not the indiscriminate sale of Indulgences, whereby the Pope and his pedlars, with these ecclesiastical wares, bartered with the people, pretending to free them from the punishments due to their sins, in this life and the life to come—in Purgatory; ay, from the sins themselves even? Did not the Pope's emissaries go forth under pretence of the power of the Keys to sell for a small price, or while over their cups in a tavern, the power to redeem the souls of dead men out of Purgatory?² These Indulgences are a *pious fraud* and a cheat, and, as we shall after show, were believed by Bishop Fisher to have been introduced into his Church after men had been awhile scared with the torments of Purgatory;³ and the Jesuit Gregory of Valentia tells us of those who thought:

“That an ecclesiastical Indulgence of itself could re-

¹ Lecture xi. vol. ii. p. 53.

² “Aveva concitato in molti luoghi indignatione, e scandalo assai, e specalmente nella Germania, dove a molti da' ministri era veduta vendere per poco prezzo, o giocarsi sulle taverne la facolta di liberare l'anime de morti dal purgatorio.”—Guicciard. *Histor. libro decimoterozo*, p. 935. Venezia, 1738.

³ *Roffens, Lutheri Confut. art. xviii. p. 200. Colon. 1559.*

mit no punishment, either in the judgment of the Church, or in the judgment of God; but that it was a kind of *pious fraud*, whereby the Church, by promising such remission, may allure men to the devout performance of good works which were required in the form of the Indulgence, that in proportion to his devotion, and the value of those works, satisfaction be made to God, and not by any virtue in the Indulgence itself."¹

To much the same purpose speaks another "school-doctor:"

"The devising of Indulgences is a pious fraud and a harmless deceit, that by a devout kind of error the people may be drawn to godliness"²—

and it also might be added, a strong inducement to make money gifts for, so-called, pious uses.

Though Indulgences are not so openly sold at the present day, yet we know their value when death-bed gifts are concerned, and masses purchased for the repose of souls supposed to be in Purgatory. Will Dr. Wiseman dare deny that even at the present day masses are not paid for for such a purpose?³ Will

¹ "Una est, quam refert Albertus in quarta distinctione vigesima, articulo decimo septimo, et D. Thom. hic in supplemento, tertiæ partis, quæstione vigesima quinta, articulo secundo, quorundam qui dixerunt indulgentiam ecclesiasticam nullam pœnam remittere per se, nec in foro Ecclesiæ, neque in foro Dei; sed esse piam quandam *fraudem*, quâ Ecclesia per illam remissionis pollicitationem homines allicitat ad exequendum devote ea opera pia, quæ in indulgentiæ forma exiguntur, ut pro ratione ejus devotionis, et valore eorum operum, Deo satisfiat, non autem per vim ipsius indulgentiæ."—Gregorii de Valentia, e Societate Jesu, Comment. Theol. tom. iv. disp. vii. quæst. xx. de Indulgentiis, punct. i. col. 1784, A. Lutet. Paris, 1609.

² "Num tibi leves . . . causæ videntur, quibus ab hac nova Indulgentiarum assertione patres ante Albertum et Thomam discesserunt, asserentes nihil esse nisi piam fraudem ac dolum non malum, quo plebs officioso," &c.—Wessel. Farrag. Rer. Theolog. Basil, 1522. Epist. contra Tac. Hock. de Indulgent. cap. i. fol. 106.

³ The following announcement is taken from the Romish papers, the *Weekly Register* of September 24, and the *Tablet* of October 1, 1859:

"THE FEMALE ORPHANAGE AT NORWOOD.—The Rev. Mother Su-

he deny that Indulgences are not, even in the present day, bartered for subscriptions to build and endow chapels, schools, &c. &c.? and that the very documents which advertise these cheats actually state, that the Indulgences thus purchased are applicable to the souls in Purgatory of the nominees of the subscribers? The circumstances are of such every-day occurrence at home, and more particularly abroad, that I need only now remind Dr. Wiseman that in Italy it is a common saying of the people that Purgatory is the Priests' Kitchen!

perior of the Convent of Our Lady of the Orphans, at Norwood, gratefully acknowledges the receipt of 20*l.* 9*s.* towards the extension of the Orphanage, collected by Richard Golding, jun., Esq., assisted by Miss Golding and Mr. James Dooley. By this collection Mr. R. Golding has become a life-subscriber to the institution, and the leaves of his collecting-book, containing the names of those who have contributed, will form pages from 26 to 38, vol. A. of the 'Register of Founders,' and will be deposited in the chapel of the convent, where the Holy Sacrifice is offered daily. The Rev. Mother also gratefully acknowledges the sum of 2*l.* 4*s.* 6*d.* collected by Miss Kilkelly. The names of the contributors will form pages 39 and 40, vol. A. of the 'Register of Founders.' The Superioress solicits the return of the collecting-books still out. Those who have been unable, this year, to reach the sum required to constitute a life-subscriber (20*l.*), will be invited to continue their collection next May. The Rev. Mother also proposes to present each perpetual and life-subscriber (as a memento of their charity) with a copy, in fac-simile, of the Rescript of his Holiness Pius IX., containing the writing and signature of the Holy Father, and granting Plenary Indulgences to the benefactors of the Orphans of Our Blessed Lady."

In the same *Weekly Register*, September 17 (p. 2, col. 2), we read of a Father Thomas Longman, among others, selling masses to contributors to his church-building fund. He says:

"The reverend bishop, the Right Rev. Dr. Ullathorne, has granted the following special privilege to all contributors, that for *fifty years* a monthly mass shall be offered up in the church for the good estate of the souls of all contributors whether living or dead, or for the soul of your father or mother, or any person to whom you may wish to apply the benefit of it. The names of all donors of five shillings or more, will be inserted in the *Register*, and kept in the Sacristy. If the benefit of the masses is to be devoted to any person already dead, their name should be sent with the offering."

Such advertisements are now of almost daily occurrence.

The fact is, Dr. Wiseman has exactly "hit it;" we do not simply *fancy*, but we *know*, that Purgatory is an instrument, and a very powerful one, too, for benefiting the priests, by enabling them to work on the fears of the people. This is the only true part of his Lecture. Dissipate the fears of Purgatory, do away with Purgatory, and the priests' authority and occupation would be gone: like Demetrius of old, they would exclaim, that their "craft was in danger to be set at nought." (Acts xix. 27.)

We have now before us all that the Church of Rome teaches on the "Doctrine of Purgatory." Those who are acquainted with heathen mythology will readily perceive that modern Purgatory is a borrowed idea from the Pagan philosopher, Plato.¹ His speculations, and the legends related in the sixth book of Virgil's "*Æneid*," have furnished the substance and materials; though, in fact, the idea is of a still more ancient date.

Pope Gregory I. speaks of souls being punished in Purgatory; some by fire, some by water, others suspended, &c.² This he borrowed from Virgil, who stated:

"That the souls suffer torments due to former crimes: some remain suspended in the air, agitated by the winds; others expiate their faults, plunged in an immense gulf

¹ Plato, in *Gorgiâ*, in *Phædone*, in *Phædro*, in *Timæo*.

² Greg. lib. iv. Dial. c. 40-55, cols. 444-464, tom. ii. Paris, 1705. It is much doubted whether these dialogues are the true production of this pope. If this conjecture be true, the date of the introduction of this speculation must have been still later than the seventh century, and this is the first public declaration of the doctrine. But see Clarke's "*Succession of Sacred Literature*" (vol. ii. p. 360, London, 1830), who considers these dialogues the genuine productions of Gregory.

or devoured in flames; until at last purified they can raise themselves to heaven."

And Otho Frisingensis, in the year 1146, an old historian, and a Roman Catholic Bishop, who was contemporary with Saint Bernard, informs us, in his Chronicon:

"The doctrine of Purgatory was first built upon the credit of those fabulous dialogues attributed to Pope Gregory I., about the year 600."¹

Augustine, a celebrated Father of the Church, much esteemed by Romanists, who wrote about A.D. 430, when the question of a temporary penal state after this life was agitated, admitted that the doctrine

"Was borrowed from the Platonists, who held that all punishments were inflicted by divine or human laws, whether in this life or in the other; and that there is, therefore, no obligation upon us to receive it into Christianity."²

And notwithstanding this declaration made by a canonised saint, Bellarmine, echoing the decree of the Council of Trent, boldly declares that those who do not believe and accept the doctrine as part of the Christian faith, are sure to go to hell.³

By the Gospel dispensation we know nothing of these fables; but we are taught, "that if the earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, we have a building of God, an house not made with hands, eternal IN THE HEAVENS."⁴ We hear the voice from

¹ Jeremy Taylor, vol. x. pp. 150 *et seq.* Heber's Edit. London, 1839. Elliott's "Delineations of Popery." London, 1851, 3rd Edit. p. 247.

² De Civ. Dei, lib. xxi. c. 13. Bened. Edit. Paris, 1685.

³ Bell. lib. i. de Purg. c. 11, pp. 1839 and 1843. Ingolst. 1590.

⁴ 2 Cor. v. 1.

that heaven, saying, "Blessed are the dead which die in the Lord from henceforth: Yea saith the Spirit, that they may *rest* from their labours; and their works do follow them,"¹ for "there is now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus."² "The blood of Jesus Christ, the Son of God, cleanseth us from all sin."³ And the first martyr who sealed his faith with his blood, anticipating an immediate reward and happy resurrection, prayed, "Lord Jesus receive my spirit."

It is sufficient for us to observe here, that from the first chapter of Genesis to the last of Revelation we do not find one single word which may lead us to suppose that there is an intermediate state, or place for souls of the faithful, where they are tormented for a season; and from which they are relieved and assisted by applying to them the suffrages and prayers of the faithful, or by the "sacrifice of the altar," and much less by any supposed "treasure of the Church," consisting of imaginary superabundant merits of departed saints.

In order to appreciate Dr. Wiseman's line of argument, the reader should have laid before him a few rules insisted upon by some Roman Catholics, who desire to "draw a distinct line between the doctrines of their Church and the opinions advanced by [Roman] Catholic theologians, on [alleged] erroneous tenets ascribed to them by writers of other persuasions." And for this purpose, I will quote the rules laid down in a well authenticated book, from the Translator's Preface of which, the above extract is taken. I refer to Veron's "RULE OF CATHOLIC FAITH."⁴ This work, among

¹ Rev. xiv. 13.

² Rom. viii. 1.

³ 1 John i. 7.

⁴ "The Rule of Catholic Faith, or the Principles and Doctrines of

a few others, was stated by the Romish priest, Dr. Murray, in his examination on oath, before a Committee of the House of Commons, to contain "the most authentic exposition of the faith of the [Roman] Catholic Church."¹

The translator, in his preface, says that "the authority of the following treatise of Veron is well known, and universally acknowledged." And Veron himself says, in p. 28:

"I will take care to support every application of the Rule of Faith, and every decision to which it may lead me, by the authority of the most approved Catholic theologians."

In examining, then, Dr. Wiseman's arguments, the reader will test them by the following rules laid down by Veron:

I. "That, and that only, is an article of Catholic faith, which has been revealed in the Word of God, *and* proposed, by the Catholic Church, to all her children, as necessary to be believed with divine faith." (cap. I. § 1, p. 1.)

This important proposition is put again, in § 2, p. 3, as follows:

"For any doctrine to be an article of Catholic faith, two things are conjointly necessary: *first*, that the doctrine be revealed by Almighty God, by the mouth of his prophets or Apostles, or contained in the inspired writings that form the canon of Scripture; and, *secondly*, that it be proposed to the belief of the faithful of the Church.

the Catholic Church, discriminated from the Opinions of the Schools, and from Popular Errors and Mis-statements." Translated by Father Waterworth. Birmingham, 1833.

¹ "A Digest of Evidence taken before a Select Committee of the two Houses of Parliament," &c. By Phelan and O'Sullivan. Commons' Report, March 22, 1825. Report, p. 224.

A doctrine invested with these two conditions must be believed with divine, and Catholic faith. But it no longer belongs to this heavenly deposit, *if either* of these conditions fail; namely, if it have not been revealed, or not been propounded by the Church."

II. "No doctrine is an article of Catholic faith which is grounded on texts of Scripture, which have been interpreted in various senses by the holy Fathers, or are still differently explained by our best and most learned theologians." (cap. I. § 3, 3, p. 8.)

III. "We do not admit as an article of faith, any consequences, however certain, or however logically deduced from premises, one of which is of faith, and the other clear by mere light of reason." (Ibid. 4, p. 8.)

This proposition is again stated in other words:

"It must, then, be laid down as a certain and undeniable position, that theological conclusions are not articles of Catholic faith."

If these three propositions be strictly followed, it will be seen that the whole of Dr. Wiseman's supposed proofs in support of the doctrine of Purgatory fail him. His are only "opinions of the schools," and *not* the "doctrines and principles of the Catholic Church," which he undertakes to vindicate.

While some zealous Romanists occupy a high ground by asserting that the doctrine of Purgatory can be fully established by scriptural texts, or, to use the expression of Dr. Milner, "is demonstratively evinced from both the Old and the New Testament,"¹ Dr. Wiseman takes the more safe and consistent course of frankly admitting that the doctrine is laid down, "*indirectly at least, in the Word of God.*"² Coming in

¹ Milner's End of Religious Controversy, Letter xliii. p. 411. Derby Edit. 1851.

² Lecture xi. vol. ii. p. 53. Romanism is full of contradictions; the

contact at the outset with the first rule above laid down from Veron's work.

Having selected his own field for argument and proof, I certainly was not prepared to find, so far as the modern doctrine of Purgatory is concerned, the fight fairly given up on the field of Scripture; for not one passage from that source, nor, indeed, from the writings of the Fathers, as we shall presently see, can Dr. Wiseman produce to establish his position.

How does he propose, in the outset, to get over the obvious difficulty? He is obliged to avail himself of a subterfuge; which, as will be seen, comes under the third rule as a "theological deduction," is condemned by Veron:

"To examine fully the proofs of this doctrine" [Purgatory], he says, "it is necessary to connect it with another [Roman] Catholic practice, that of *praying for the dead*; for this practice, as we shall see, is essentially based on the belief in Purgatory; and the principles of both are consequently intimately connected together. I have no hesitation," he adds, "in saying that the two doctrines go so completely together, that if we succeed in demonstrating the one, the other necessarily follows. For if we prove that it has always been the belief in the Church of Christ, that they who are departed may be benefited by our prayers, and brought to the sight of God, while at the same time it was the *universal belief*

Catechism of the Council of Trent boldly appeals to Scripture in support of this doctrine. Cat. Concil. Trid. p. 61, Paris, 1848. Pt. i. De Purg. Ignis, § v. And though the Council of Trent prefaces her canon on the subject of Purgatory (Sess. xxv.) with the usual declaration that the doctrine defined is in accordance with the teaching of Holy Scripture and the Primitive Church, she, nevertheless, when enjoining bishops, &c., to teach the doctrine, command them to do so, not according to Scripture, but according to the precept of fathers and councils, and thus tacitly pass over the Scripture, and teach for doctrines the commandments of men. (*Ante*, p. 151.)

that they who had incurred eternal punishment could not be released from it, assuredly we have the same system as ours—that there was a middle state wherein the face of God was not enjoyed, and yet eternal punishment was not suffered.”¹

Here I would beg to remind the Doctor that what he has to prove, is not only, as he here asserts, whether the oldest Christian writers believed that those who departed in Christ were in a middle state, where they could be assisted by the prayers of the faithful; but whether the oldest Christian writers believed that the departed in Christ, the justified, the faithful, were in a place of torment, paying the last farthing, as Bellarmine expresses himself, to satisfy God's justice:² this chastisement being inflicted on the sinner after the remission of his sins.³ And, further, Dr. Wiseman has to prove the antiquity of the belief that these suffering souls can be relieved by penitential works, fasting, almsdeeds, the sacrifice of the mass, indulgences, &c. &c.

We shall see how far he succeeds in proving his assertion that these *oldest writers* speak of prayers for the dead as essentially based on the belief in Purgatory, or “that they assure us that by such prayers we are able to release them from a state of suffering.”⁴

It is asserted, and we freely admit, that the Christians of the third century did begin to *pray for the dead*. To what end did they pray for the departed, argues Dr. Wiseman, but with the supposition that the object of prayer was not immediately after death ad-

¹ Lecture xi. p. 54.

² Bell. Disput. tom. i. pp. 1807-8. Ingolst. 1590.

³ See Lecture xi. vol. ii. p. 47, &c.

⁴ *Ib.* p. 54.

mitted to the sight of God, but "enduring that punishment which God awards after the forgiveness of sins;" and the prayer is raised, he asserts, that the departed may be released from that distressing situation. From this he has no hesitation in drawing the "theological deduction, or conclusion," that the two doctrines, "Purgatory" and "Prayers for the Dead," go so completely together, that if he succeed in demonstrating the one, the other necessarily follows. This proposition I most emphatically deny, and shall sustain my denial by presently tracing out this custom of praying for the dead from its origin and earliest introduction into the Church, and the subsequent development of the doctrine. But while admitting that the early Christians did, in a manner, pray for the dead, it was for a very different purpose from that in use in the modern Romish Church; such as it was, Tertullian admitted¹ that the custom was not enforced by Scripture; vindicating it on the authority of tradition *alone*, while Dr. Wiseman's whole argument rests on the assumed fact that this custom *is* sanctioned by Scripture.

Praying for the dead was the first innovation on primitive Christianity; but to argue from hence that Purgatory was at this time an accepted doctrine of the Christian Church, is a manifest perversion of the truth. The learned Jeremy Taylor, on this subject, observed:

"How vainly the Church of Rome, from prayer for the dead, infers the belief of Purgatory, every man may satisfy himself by seeing the writings of the Fathers, where they cannot meet with one collect or clause for

¹ "De Corona Militis," p. 289. Edit. Roth. 1662.

praying for the delivery of souls out of that imaginary place. Which thing is so certain, that in the very Roman Offices, we mean the vigils said for the dead, which are psalms and lessons taken from the Scripture, speaking of the miseries of the world, repentance, and reconciliation with God, the bliss after this life of them that die in Christ; and the resurrection of the dead; and in the anthems, versicles, and responses, there are prayers made recommending to God the soul of the newly defunct, praying 'he may be freed from hell and eternal death,' that 'in the day of judgment he be not judged and condemned according to his sins, but that he may appear among the elect in the glory of the resurrection;' but not one word of Purgatory or its pains."¹

And Usher, in his celebrated "Answer to a Challenge made by a Jesuit," in the chapter "Prayer for the Dead," quotes largely from the Liturgies of Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Cyril of Alexandria, Chrysostom, and others, which fully establish the fact that the oblations or sacrifices were offered FOR the Apostles, Virgin Mary, Martyrs, Saints, &c., wholly irrespective of either the modern additions or innovations of supplication for their intercession, or of the belief that such oblations would be beneficial to the departed, suffering in a supposed fiery or any other species of Purgatory. It is a well established belief among Romanists that none of these went to Purgatory. This alone is sufficient *evidence* that the custom and intent of the early Christians, in praying for the dead, were wholly different from the *modern* Popish doctrine, which I admit, with Dr. Wiseman, is quite inseparable from the modern doctrine of Purgatory.

One example out of the many will suffice. In the

¹ Jeremy Taylor's Works, edited by Heber. London, 1822, vol. x. p. 149. "Dissuasive," &c. chap. i. sect. iv.

Liturgy attributed to the Apostles, under the title of the "Apostolic Constitutions," is the following prayer:

"We offer unto Thee for all the saints which have pleased Thee from the beginning of the world, patriarchs, prophets, just men, apostles, martyrs, confessors, bishops, priests, deacons," &c.¹

Dr. Wiseman admits this to be the fact, but avoids the difficulty, and endeavours to explain it away by saying:

"There is no doubt that in the ancient Liturgies, the saints (Apostles and Virgin Mary) are mentioned in the same prayer as the other departed faithful; from the simple circumstance, that they were so united *before the public suffrage of the Church proclaimed them to belong to a happier order.*"²

When did the Church proclaim the Apostles to belong to a happier order? Who gave the power for a miserable sinful mortal, the Pope, assisted by his fallible minions, Cardinals and Bishops, to make such a proclamation? The first act of canonisation took place at the Council of Rome, A.D. 993, under Pope John XV.³ Thus, for nearly a thousand years, the suffrages of the Church had not been proclaimed, and during all this time poor deluded Christians had been incessantly praying for the Apostles and the Virgin Mary with the other faithful departed; under the belief that they

¹ Ἐπι προσφερόμέν σοι καὶ ὑπὲρ πάντων τῶν ἀπ' αἰῶνος εὐαρησ-
τησάντων σοι ἁγίων, πατριαρχῶν, προφητῶν, δικαίων, ἀποστόλων,
μαρτύρων, ὁμολογητῶν, ἐπισκόπων, πρεσβυτέρων, διακόνων, &c.
—Constitut. Apostolic. lib. viii. cap. 12.

² Lecture xi. vol. ii. p. 67.

³ When Uldaric, Bishop of Augsburg, was canonised: the bull is extant. Labb. et Coss. Concil. tom. ix. p. 741. Paris, 1671.

were frying in Purgatory, suffering the torments of the damned, paying the last farthing due to the justice of God for the sins they had committed in this life!

To make the modern custom square with antiquity, Dr. Wiseman reminds us of the saying of Augustine, "that he does injury to a martyr who prays *for* a martyr;"¹ and from this would deduce that one intention was inferred from the petitions for one class of saints, and another for others. No such distinctions, however, can be traced in the *early* Liturgies; all were classed under one form of prayer. The distinction here pointed out is of a more modern date than the days of Augustine, to which modern Romanism has superadded her innovations.

Praying for the dead, nevertheless, we are assured, can be proved from, and is sanctioned by, Scripture. Dr. Wiseman begins *with the Word of God*, and cites two texts, one as from the Old Testament, 2 Maccabees xii. 43-46, and one from the New Testament, Matt. xii. 32. First we are told:

"Now Judas, the valiant commander, made a collection, and sent twelve thousand drachmas of silver to Jerusalem for sacrifice, to be offered for the sins of the dead, thinking well and religiously concerning the resurrection. For if he had not hoped that they that were slain should rise again, it would have seemed superfluous and vain to pray for the dead. It is, therefore, a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from their sins.—[And, secondly, that] our blessed Saviour distinguishes two kinds of sins, and calls one a sin against the Holy Ghost, saying, 'Whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of Man, it shall be forgiven him, but he that shall speak against the Holy

¹ Lecture xi. vol. ii. p. 67.

Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, either in this world or in the next.' ”

Here, in the outset, is a most unfortunate selection and combination of texts. The point to be proved is obvious; by the first text Dr. Wiseman proposes to establish the fact that the Jews considered prayers for the dead a wholesome thought; and argues that:

“ If there be nothing in the New Law to reprobate this belief, we have a right to consider it a true belief in the present time, and we must expect it to be still continued; for if prayers would benefit the dead of old, and sacrifices too, they must continue to benefit them as much now.”

From the second, he argues that the New Law establishes a distinction between venial and mortal sins, for—

“ Here (he says) is a species of sin, the aggravated nature of which is expressed by its not being forgiven in the next world. Should we not then conclude, that some other sins be forgiven there? Why give this peculiar characteristic to one, if no sin is ever pardoned in the next world? Assuredly we have a right to conclude that there is some remission of sin there; and yet it cannot be either in heaven, or in the place of eternal punishment. We must, therefore, admit some other state in which this may be.”¹

From this strange combination of texts and the “theological deduction,” condemned by the third proposition of Veron, we can come to this only conclusion, that Dr. Wiseman means to assert that the sacrifices named in the first text were offered for the dead in Purgatory, then in *a state of suffering*, undergoing a purgation from their venial sins, but *departed, nevertheless, in God's grace*; which sins, according to the

¹ Lecture xi. vol. ii. pp. 56, 57.

promise deduced from the text in Matt. xii. 32, would be forgiven in *the next world*. This is one of the frauds we have to complain of. Without here stopping to discuss whether the latter text does sanction the Romish doctrine of *venial and mortal* sins, it is very evident that the two texts together in no way prove the doctrine of Purgatory; for the dead referred to in Maccabees must, according to the Papal doctrine, be in hell; they died in mortal sin. Under the coats of the slain "they found some of the donaries of the idols of Jamnia, which the law forbiddeth to the Jews" (verse 40); and the text itself goes on to tell us that these idols were forbidden by the law to the Jews, "so that all plainly saw, that for *this cause* they were slain." And in the note to this text in the Douay Bible, approved by Dr. Wiseman, dated Birmingham, 1847, and published by Richardson of Derby, we are referred to Deut. vii. 25, where the law is recorded condemning these idols as "an abomination to the Lord." They died, therefore, in idolatry. If the prayers and sacrifices were offered for their slain, they were offered for those who were *known to have died in idolatry, therefore in mortal sin*, and could not be classed among those who are contemplated in the text from St. Matthew, or in the modern Roman Purgatory, according to Dr. Wiseman's own interpretation.

The next objection I make to the citation of the first text is, that the books of Maccabees were written before the coming of Christ, whereas, according to the admission of Romanists, Purgatory did not then exist.

But Dr. Wiseman proposed to begin *with the word of God*, and quotes the text from Maccabees *as such*.

The books in question were not added to the canon of Scripture of the Roman Church until April, 1546, at the fourth Session of the Council of Trent. Dr. Wiseman, in a most modest manner, says, "Many will say that the Second Book of Maccabees is not part of the Scripture, that it is not included in its canon." Had he desired to teach the truth, he would have told us that many *had* said that the books of Maccabees are *not* part of the Scripture, and are *not* included in its canon, and he would have told us who had said so: but it was not convenient. He might have told us that Bellarmine himself acknowledged that the Jews did not receive these as canonical;¹ that neither Christ nor his Apostles ever quoted, or referred to the books which we term apocryphal, though the whole of the other books comprehended in "the law of Moses, and the Prophets, and the Psalms,"² were acknowledged by them. Now, as to the historical evidence to which we are so boldly referred, the tradition of the Church most unequivocally rejects them. That they are referred to and quoted, I freely admit, but they are not quoted as part of the canon of Scripture; they appear to be universally omitted from the canon by all orthodox Christians.

They were rejected in the first age (to A.D. 100), as we have seen, by the Jews, and never quoted by the Apostles.

In the second age, A.D. 100 to 200, by Melito, Bishop of Sardis.³

¹ Bell. de Verb. Dei, lib. i. c. 10, sec. i. p. 18, tom. i. Prag. 1721.

² Luke xxiv. 44.

³ Euseb. Eccl. Hist. lib. iv. c. 26, p. 161. Cantab. 1700; and Bell. de Verb. Dei, lib. i. c. 20, sect. xv. p. 38, tom. i. Prag. 1721.

In the third age, A.D. 200 to 300, by Origen.¹

In the fourth age, A.D. 300 to 400, by the canonised saints, St. Hilary,² St. Cyril of Jerusalem,³ and St. Athanasius,⁴ Eusebius, Bishop of Cæsarea,⁵ Ruffinus, or, as some say, Cyprian,⁶ St. Jerome,⁷ St. Gregory of Nazianzen,⁸ and the bishops assembled at the Council of Laodicea, confirmed by the sixth general council.⁹

In the fifth age (A.D. 400 to 500), by St. Epiphanius,¹⁰ and St. Augustine.¹¹

In the sixth age (A.D. 500 to 600), by the African Bishop Junilius,¹² and Isidore.¹³

And in the seventh age (A.D. 600 to 700), by no less a personage than Pope GREGORY THE GREAT himself.¹⁴

Even the Vatican edition of Pope Gregory's works testifies that he rejected the Apocrypha.¹⁵

¹ Euseb. lib. vi. cap. 16-25, p. 286, *ut supra*.

² See Bell. de Verb. Dei, lib. ii. cap. i. sect. xv. p. 38, tom. i.

³ Cyril. Catech. iv. sec. xx. Oxon. 1703.

⁴ Athan. in Synops. Paris, 1627.

⁵ Euseb. Chron. lib. ii.; ex Hier. Versione Canus. lib. ii. c. xi. p. 59. Colon. 1605.

⁶ Bell. de Verb. Dei, lib. i. c. xx. tom. i. p. 38. Prag. 1721.

⁷ In præf. lib. Solom. tom. i. Paris, 1693-1706; Bell. *ut supra*, sect. xx. p. 20.

⁸ Greg. Naz. Cur. Iamb. ad Seleucum Iamb. iii. p. 194, tom. ii. Paris, 1630.

⁹ Bin. Concil. can. lx. p. 304, tom. i. Paris, 1636.

¹⁰ Epiph. li. de Mens. et Ponder. vol. ii. p. 161. Colon. 1682.

¹¹ Aug. de Mirab. Sacræ Script. i. ii. c. xxxiv. p. 26, tom. iii. pt. i. 1686; De Civ. Dei, p. 519, tom. vii. Paris, 1685, &c.

¹² Jun. de Part. Divinæ Legis, lib. i. cap. iii. p. 80, tom. xii. Bibl. Patr. Venet. 1765.

¹³ Isid. Prænot. Elucid. de Script. et Scripturis Sac. c. vi. et vii. Edit. prima. [See Cousin's Canon of Scripture, p. 141.]

¹⁴ Greg. Mor. lib. xiv. 39th chap. of Job. Bened. Edit. 1705.

¹⁵ "De qua non inordinate agimus si ex libris licet non canonicis, sed tamen ad ædificationem ecclesiæ editis testimonium proferamus."—Edit. Rom. 1608, Typograph. Vatican. tom. ii. p. 899.

It is true that the books in question are said to have been enumerated as canonical by the Council of Carthage A.D. 397, in the forty-seventh canon; but with reference to the two books of Maccabees these are inserted only in the Latin copy of this council, and do not stand in the Greek copies or manuscripts. Baronius and Binius both declare that this forty-seventh canon was not confirmed at this council;¹ and Bellarmine himself admits that "this provincial council ought not to bind the Bishop of Rome nor the bishop of other provinces."² The reason for his making this statement was because this council denied the Pope's Supremacy. And, indeed, these apocryphal books were always separated from the canon of Scripture, even in the Roman Catholic Vulgate edition of the Bible until the Council of Trent. What can we say, then, of the gratuitous assertion of Dr. Wiseman, in reference to the second book of Maccabees, when he states that "it is quoted by the Fathers, and enumerated in its canons by councils which have drawn up catalogues of its books."³

I contend that it is a fraud—a palpable fraud, on the part of Romanists, to quote the book of Maccabees as part of the "WORD OF GOD."

We now proceed to consider the second text, taken by itself:

"Whosoever shall speak a word against the Son of

¹ Baron. Ann. 397, n. 56, p. 249. Lucæ, 1740. Bin. Concil. Carth. III. p. 722. Paris, 1636.

² Bell. de Rom. Pont. lib. ii. cap. xxxi. sec. xviii. p. 387, tom. i. Prag. 1721.

³ Lecture xi. p. 55.

Man, it shall be forgiven him, but he that shall speak against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, either in this world or in the next." (Matt. xii. 32.)

As this text cannot refer to the practice of "praying for the dead," it must be quoted in proof of the existence of a Purgatory. How is this made to appear when there is not the most distant reference to such a place? We have seen that those who die in *venial* sins go to Purgatory. It is necessary, therefore, to show that the Bible recognises the distinction of *venial* and *mortal* sins. Dr. Wiseman observes on this text, that,

"Our blessed Saviour distinguishes two kinds of sins, and calls one a sin against the Holy Ghost—here is a species of sin, the aggravated nature of which is expressed by its not being forgiven in the next world. Should we not thence conclude, that some other sins may be forgiven there? Why give this peculiar characteristic to one, if no sin is ever pardoned in the next world? Assuredly, we have a right to conclude that there is some remission of sin there; and yet it cannot be either in Heaven, or in the place of eternal punishment. We must, therefore, admit some other state in which this may be."

He actually requires us by this illogical "theological deduction" to believe, that this other place is Purgatory, a literal fiery Purgatory, where souls are purified to enable them to enter into that heavenly Jerusalem *where nothing defiled shall enter*. Bellarmine¹ follows up the same line of argument, but in summing up he is compelled to admit that the inference does not follow from the premises; and, there-

¹ "Non sequi secundum regulas dialecticorum."—De Purg. lib. i. cap. iv. tom. ii. p. 393, B. Colonæ, 1628.

fore, as has been justly observed,¹ any reasoning upon the passage for this purpose is altogether illogical.

We tell Dr. Wiseman that, if the Bible be true, there is no want of such a third place to purify the souls of the just. FOR THE BLOOD OF JESUS CHRIST CLEANSETH FROM ALL SINS; Come unto me, saith the Lord, all ye that labour and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest; Though your sins are as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow. Those who have washed their robes in the blood of the Lamb need no fiery Purgatory. It is true that nothing that defileth shall enter the kingdom of Heaven, neither whatsoever worketh abomination, or maketh a lie, but they which are written in the Lamb's Book of Life. Are not these the justified who die in the grace of God, and in the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, relying on the gracious promises of His gospel, putting off the corruptible to put on the incorruptible, the mortal to put on immortality; and being purified by the blood of the Lamb, they believe that when absent from the flesh they will be present with the Lord?

But the text in question cannot be tortured to sanction the modern Popish dogma of *venial* and *mortal* sins. Though we are not prepared to deny that to us men some sins do appear more heinous than others, GOD, who alone can see and appreciate our motives and actions, is the sole judge, and not man. He has told us that every sin is a transgression against His law, and, therefore, as such *deserves* eternal punish-

¹ Hall's "Doctrines of Purgatory and Practice of Praying for the Dead Examined," p. 49. London, 1843.

ment. We dare not account it a venial offence to offend the Great God of the universe, "all unrighteousness with him is sin;" and "whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all."¹ It is a blasphemous imposition on the part of the Romish priesthood when they assume the power of drawing a line of distinction between venial and mortal sins; when they gravely tell us that it is a mortal sin, "if one should steal any small thing out of the district of Rome, for example the holy cross, or the hair of the blessed Virgin,"² while at other times they will allow theft, perjury, and other crimes, when it is for a good cause, the good of the Church being paramount.³

In the next place, Dr. Wiseman would endeavour to infer from this text, that there are some sins which are forgiven in the "world to come," but since the sins of those who are in hell are never forgiven, and as Purgatory is asserted to be a place for those who die in venial sins, therefore, by the "world to come," we must mean Purgatory. This cannot be the meaning of the words in St. Matthew's Gospel, "Whosoever

¹ James ii. 10.

² "Quæritur hic, an sit mortale furari parum reliquæ sacræ? Nulli dubium, quin in districtu Romano sit mortale, cum Clemens VIII. et Paulus V. excommunicationem indixerint contra eos, qui in vitis rectoribus ecclesiarum, furantur reliquias etiam minimas: secus probabiliter ait Croix, l. 3, p. l. n. 1603, &c., si quis furetur extra districtum aliquid minimum, ipsam reliquiam non deformans, neque minuens illius æstimationem; nisi sit aliqua reliqua insignis, aut rara, ut puta sanctæ Crucis, capillorum B. Maria Virg." &c.—Liguori's Moral Theology, tom. iii. lib. iv. c. i. p. 256, n. 532. Edit. Mechlin, 1845.

³ See Dr. Blakeney's epitome of Liguori's Moral Theology. London, 1849. British Reformation Society. London.

speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, *neither in this world, nor the world to come,*"¹ The words are explained in the parallel text in Mark (iii. 29), where we read, "He that shall blaspheme against the Holy Ghost, hath *never* forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation." And St. Luke (xii. 10) says, "Unto him that blasphemeth against the Holy Ghost it *shall not* be forgiven him."

By reference to these parallel texts we at once perceive the meaning of our Saviour's words recorded by St. Matthew and repeated by Dr. Wiseman, namely, that he who shall sin against the Holy Ghost it shall *never be forgiven* him. It will require a little more logic than that displayed by Dr. Wiseman to induce us to believe that this text can prove the Roman Purgatory.

Many of the early Fathers have freely commented on this text (Matt. xii. 32). Their silence on the point in question (that is, deducing from it a proof of Purgatory) will prove to demonstration that they were entirely ignorant of the Romish interpretation of the passage;² and among others I would more particularly

¹ "By the world to come, is understood the world succeeding this, and so it answereth to the world present, as Mark x. 30, 'They shall at this present receive a hundredfold, and in the world to come life everlasting.' Wherefore, Purgatory being imagined to be now present, it cannot be taken to belong to the world to come (Ephes. i. 12); so also must we understand that place, that Christ is exalted above every name, 'that is named in the world, or the world to come;' that is, in the world which shall be after this, I think that they will not by the world to come in this place infer Purgatory; nor yet, where the Apostle saith, 'The powers of the world to come' (Heb. vi. 5)."—Willet's Synopsis Papismi. Revised edit. London, 1852, vol. iv. p. 62.

² See Archbishop Sharp, vol. ii. serm. viii. Edit. 1754; Lightfoot, vol. ii. p. 1095. Edit. 1684.

refer to Chrysostom,¹ Hilary,² Ambrose,³ Jerome,⁴ and Augustine, in several places.⁵ It is scarcely worth wearying the reader with their expositions; I merely mention their names to challenge Dr. Wiseman to meet me on the field he has himself selected—the early Christian Church.

Dr. Wiseman tells us in many places, “that it is God’s ordinance that when God has forgiven sin, and so justified the sinner as to place him once more in a state of grace, he still reserves the infliction of some degree of punishment for his transgression.” Observe, that it is here asserted that the sin is already forgiven, and that Purgatory is for punishing *transgression*, therefore, according to his own reasoning, this “world to come” cannot be Purgatory, for the sins are already forgiven before they go to the Roman Purgatory. And since Purgatory is for the *punishment* for sin, “purgatorius ignis in quo animæ piorum cruciantur,” a purgatorial fire in which the souls of the faithful are tortured or punished—the paying the last farthing—is it not a contradiction, a mockery, to call this a “FORGIVENESS OF SIN?”

The “forgiveness of sins” is a distinct article in the

¹ Chrys. Hom. xli. in Matt. xii. 32, tom. i. p. 475. Paris, 1636.

² Hilar. Pictar. Comment. in Matt. xii. 31, col. 671. Paris, 1693.

³ Amb. de Bono Mortis. cap. ii. sect. v. tom. i. col. 391, D. Paris, 1686.

⁴ Jerom. Comment. in Matt. xii. 32, lib. ii. tom. iv. pt. i. col. 49, 50. Paris, 1706.

⁵ Aug. Ser. 71, de Matt. xii. 32, cap. viii. sect. xiii. tom. v. col. 390, F. Paris, 1665; Aug. ad Bonif. Epist. 185, cap. xi. sect. xlviii. tom. ii. col. 662, C. Paris, 1688; ad Julian. Pelag. lib. vi. cap. v. tom. vii. col. 1119, D. Basil, 1569.

⁶ Lecture xi. p. 42, vol. ii.

Christian's creed, admitted by all Protestants. We sincerely believe that God, in His great mercy, does pardon the truly contrite and penitent believer; that if we seek that forgiveness, humbly bewailing our past sins, and bring forth fruits meet for repentance, God will "cast all our sins into the depths of the sea," not imputing our trespasses unto us. We know that through Christ is preached unto us the forgiveness of sins;¹ that repentance and remission of sins are preached in His name;² "In whom we have redemption through His blood, the forgiveness of sins."³ We know, also, that Christ our Lord "is the propitiation for our sins,"⁴ and that "His blood cleanseth from all sins." There is no room for a *Purgatory* other than this. The question between us and the Roman Catholics is, whether that person whose sins are already forgiven, and who is reconciled to God by true repentance, and whose name is "written in the Lamb's Book of Life," must nevertheless endure the pains and torments of *Purgatory*, a satisfaction to the divine justice for the temporal punishment of those sins which are forgiven. Impossible! God, we read, is faithful and just to *forgive* us our sins. Punishment is not a forgiveness; a purgation in the "blood of the Lamb" is not a bodily torture. For He hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows,⁵ and He will give "us rest;" for there is a *rest*, and there is no condemnation to them that die in the Lord Jesus. We have a glorious hope before us: "We press toward the mark for the prize

¹ Acts xiii. 38.² Luke xxiv. 47.³ Eph. i. 7.⁴ 1 John ii. 2.⁵ Isaiah liii. 4.

of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus;"¹ a joy which no Roman Catholic can experience, for he must anticipate, not a joyful resurrection but torments in Purgatory.

There is one other text referred to; not, indeed, as any direct proof of the existence of a Purgatory, or sanctioning prayers for the dead. Dr. Wiseman reminds us, that "there shall in no wise enter it (heaven) anything that defileth;" and as we all die in sin, he argues from this that the soul must be purified. The soul is not purified in heaven, therefore there must be a Purgatory. But had Dr. Wiseman quoted the whole text, he would have found its true meaning, and a refutation of the position assumed. The verse runs thus: "And there shall in no wise enter into it any thing that defileth, neither whatsoever worketh abomination, or maketh a lie; but they which are *written in the Lamb's Book of Life.*" From the context it is evident that St. John here intends to point out, that *that which defileth* must refer to those whose names are not "*written in the Lamb's Book of Life,*"—the wicked man dying without repentance. Is Dr. Wiseman prepared to assert that those who die truly penitent are not all "*written in the Lamb's Book of Life?*" The distinction made in the text is that which defileth *cannot* enter into heaven, but those whose names *are* written in the Lamb's Book of Life *do*. "That which defileth" must mean the impenitent, and those do *not* go to heaven. How can this prove a Purgatory? The Roman purgation is for those who die in the Lord, and

¹ Phil. iii. 14.

are sure of their salvation eventually, and therefore must be those who are already written in the Lamb's Book of Life. Dr. Wiseman's argument, therefore, amounts to a "theological deduction," that as "impenitent persons cannot go to heaven, and the souls of the penitent cannot go to heaven until they are cleansed, therefore there must be a Purgatory to cleanse them."¹

We Protestants admit that nothing unclean can enter into the kingdom of heaven, and we also admit that even the most perfect die in sin; but we also believe in the forgiveness of sin—that the Lord is merciful and gracious, and will forgive us our sins, through the merits of Jesus Christ. We believe that His precious blood can cleanse us from all sin. Who shall lay anything to the charge of God's elect? The Pope of Rome! Who art thou that judgest another? It is GOD that justifieth: who is he that condemneth?²

Although Dr. Wiseman admits that all these texts are obscure, he still considers "that enough has been said to guide us to some striking probabilities, and that we have the germs of a doctrine which only requires to be unfolded."³ We shall see how he accomplishes this feat of development. For a further elucidation he directs us to the teaching of *the Church, especially in ancient times*, and here we will follow him.

But, first, let me remark, that having fairly given up the Scriptures, and while admitting that Purgatory cannot be proved thereby, Dr. Wiseman shields himself under the assertion that we of the Church of England admit infant baptism. Our Articles prescribe it,

¹ See Bennett's "Confutation of Popery." London, 1714, p. 268.

² Romans viii. 33.

³ Lecture xi. vol. ii. p. 58.

though we have, as he asserts, no proof or warranty from Scripture; we, therefore, rely on tradition and the practice of the early Church. On the same principle do Roman Catholics believe in Purgatory, a sort of *tu quoque* argument. This is by no means a parallel case, for, *first*, by a reference to the Index or "Table of Reference" to the Douay Bible, "For the Baptism of Infants," we are directed, as *scriptural proofs*, to the following texts: "Luke xviii. 16, compared with John iii. 5;" and, *secondly*, Bellarmine considers that the command to baptise infants is sufficiently clearly gathered from the Scriptures.¹ This subterfuge will, therefore, not avail him.

We now pass on to the testimony of the Primitive Church.

The Church of Rome claims for herself a two-fold rule of faith—SCRIPTURE and TRADITION. The *written Word of God*, THE BIBLE, every Roman Catholic is bound "to receive," but with the following qualifications: viz. first, according only to that sense which his Church does hold, and always has held, to whom (the Church) it belongs to decide upon the true sense and interpretation of them; and, secondly, he shall not interpret the Scriptures otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers; while, on the other hand, he is bound "most firmly to receive and embrace" the *traditions* of his Church. These traditions are, in fact, the unwritten word, which Dr. Wiseman states to be:

"A body of doctrine which, in consequence of the

¹ "Colligitur satis aperte ex Scripturis," &c.—Bell. de Sac. Bapt. lib. i. c. 9.

express declaration in the written Word, they believe not to have been committed to writing, but delivered by Christ to His Apostles, and by His Apostles to their successors.¹

He further assures us that—

“It is not implied by the term ‘unwritten word,’ that these articles of faith or traditions are nowhere recorded. Because, on the contrary, suppose a difficulty to arise regarding any doctrine—that men were to differ, and not know what precisely they should believe—and that the Church thought it prudent and necessary to examine into this point, and define what was to be held—the method pursued would be to *examine most accurately the writings of the oldest Fathers of the Church*, to ascertain what, in different countries and different ages, was by them held; and then collecting the suffrages of all the world and of all times—not, indeed, to create new articles of faith, but to define that such and such has always been the faith of the Catholic Church. It is conducted” (adds Dr. Wiseman, and to this particular attention must be given)—“it is conducted in every instance as a matter of *historical inquiry, and all human prudence* is used to arrive at a judicious decision.”

What a vast amount of ingenuity, research, and exercise of private judgment must the members of the Church of Rome bring to bear before they can with certainty “most firmly admit and embrace” any *point* of doctrine not contained in the written Word as an article of faith! We Protestants have, thank God, “a more sure word, whereunto we do well to take heed as unto a light that shineth in a dark place.” We believe that the HOLY SCRIPTURES contain all things necessary to salvation; so that whatever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be

¹ Lecture iii. vol. i. p. 61. London, 1836.

required of any man that it should be believed as *an article of faith*, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.

It is in reference to this declaration of our Church that I have often proposed to Romanists a simple question without obtaining a satisfactory reply. The Bible alone, they say, is not a sufficient rule of faith, that is, it does not contain all the articles of the Christian faith necessary *for our salvation* to be believed. I have often requested to be informed what point of faith the Apostles believed and taught as necessary to our salvation which is not read in the Scriptures, or may be proved thereby, but is enjoined by tradition? It was not until I read Dr. Wiseman's "Lecture on Purgatory" that I met with a reply. He writes:

"I have more than once commented on the incorrectness of that method of arguing, which demands that we prove every one of our doctrines individually from the Scriptures. I occupied myself during the first course of lectures, in demonstrating the Catholic principle of faith, that the Church of Christ was constituted by Him the depository of His truths, and that, although many were recorded in His Holy Word, still many were committed to traditional keeping, and that Christ Himself taught in His Church, and secured her from error. It is on this authority that the Catholic grounds his belief in the doctrine of Purgatory; yet, not that but its principle is laid down, indirectly at least, in the Word of God."¹

Thus, then, it is freely admitted that the doctrine in question is not revealed in the WRITTEN WORD OF GOD, and the Church of Rome is indebted to TRADITION to establish its apostolicity, thus opposing the rule laid down by Veron in his "Rule of Catholic

¹ Lecture xi. vol. ii. p. 53.

Faith;"¹ and further, to ascertain the truth of this assertion, we must pursue the method laid down by Dr. Wiseman, namely, *examine most accurately the writings of the oldest Fathers of the Church*. The subject resolves itself into a *matter of historical inquiry*. This bold appeal to historical evidence is precisely the line of argument I wish to follow; and the *inquiry* will result in demonstrating that neither Scripture nor apostolic tradition supports the modern Popish dogma of Purgatory.

In conducting our inquiry, I propose to confine my more critical remarks to the *writings of the oldest Christian Fathers*, namely, those who flourished within the first three centuries of the Christian era; any later evidence which is not supported by an antecedently recorded historical testimony cannot prove that the doctrine was held from the beginning, though I shall not omit to notice the irrelevancy of the other authorities quoted.

Dr. Wiseman considers nothing can be more simple than to establish the belief of the universal Church on this point; namely, belief in the modern doctrine of Purgatory. "The only difficulty" (he finds) "is to select such passages as may appear the clearest;" and for this purpose he draws our attention to three isolated passages from three different writers during the first three hundred years of the Church. We may feel assured that Dr. Wiseman has chosen *the clearest* and most to the purpose. He can afford to pass over two hundred years without producing a single witness,

¹ See *ante*, p. 166.

though there are several during this interval, as we shall presently see, who bore testimony to the truth!

Dr. Wiseman begins with what he calls, first, *the very oldest Father of the Latin Church*, Tertullian, who wrote at the latter end of the second century. The work quoted was written when Tertullian was a declared heretic, and not a member of the Catholic Church; and what he wrote on the subject, he admitted to have learnt from a notorious impostor, MONTANUS, who pretended to be the "Holy Ghost."

Secondly, he quotes from a letter of St. Cyprian, who wrote about the middle of the third century, a passage which has been most satisfactorily proved to be a forgery; and,

Thirdly, from Origen, who wrote about the same period; his doctrine was condemned by a general Council of the Church as heretical.

The first two passages refer to a traditional custom of praying for the dead, and making *offerings* or *oblations* on the anniversaries of their death, celebrating their *birthday to heaven*; and the third is an original and whimsical interpretation of the text, 1 Cor. iii. 15, put forward with uncertainty, and which interpretation is not admitted by the Roman Church at this day.

There is not the slightest doubt but that the Purgatory of the Romish Church is founded on Paganism. The early Christian custom of offering oblations for the dead, on the anniversary day of the death of saints and martyrs, gave occasion for its gradual reception and revival among some Christians; for from hence proceeded the custom of reciting prayers for the dead,

which gave rise to the speculation of an intermediate place between heaven and hell where the departed spirits were supposed to rest, waiting for the day of judgment. Origen first broached the doctrine of a limited punishment in hell, and that *all* eventually emerged from this fiery ordeal, and were afterwards admitted into a state of happiness. But as there was no warranty from Scripture for supposing that hell was only to exist for a time, the doctrine was condemned by a General Council; but, nevertheless, the belief of a limited punishment, founded on an erroneous interpretation of the text, 1 Cor. iii. 15, gained ground, and eventually gave place to the modern doctrine of Purgatory.

It is well known that when our Lord ascended to His throne above, the Apostles and their immediate successors suffered cruel persecutions. The history of the early Christian Church records the severe persecutions suffered by the converts from Judaism and Paganism, which were carried on through all the Roman provinces. The martyrs died in support of their faith, and sealed it with their blood. Torments of the most exquisite nature were invented, and none were considered too horrible to be inflicted on those soldiers of Christ.¹ The vengeance of their persecutors was not satisfied with the death of the victims, but their malice extended to their dead bodies, and even to their very bones; for they used to burn the latter, and scatter the ashes to the winds. This was done in the vain hope of depriving Christians of a *future*

¹ Iren. lib. iii. c. 4.

resurrection; the mainspring of their constancy, and solace in their sufferings.¹

The early Greeks, we are told, celebrated the memory of their heroes, and those illustrious persons who died in defence of their country, on the anniversaries of their deaths; and these celebrations and solemnities were performed about their tombs. This was done both in regard and honour of the deceased, and also to animate and encourage each other to follow the example of the illustrious dead.

Thus the early Christians, lately converted, bringing with them their customs and prejudices, imitated, in this respect, their Pagan ancestors, and in like manner celebrated the anniversaries of the death of those who had suffered for the Gospel. They also hoped, thereby, to confirm others in the faith, and excite them to patience and fortitude, and strengthen them to meet their fate with resolution and resignation. The great object of the survivors was, in the first place, to give their martyrs burial; and where they could not recover the *entire* body, to collect such fragments as could be found, which, as relics of the departed, they honourably buried: without, however, pompous ceremony—without requiems or dirges—the persecutions of the times would not admit of such solemnities. There is in the Epistle from the Church of Smyrna to the neighbouring churches,² announcing the martyrdom of Polycarp, an interesting passage which may be appropriately quoted here. The epistle describes the

¹ Epist. Martyrum Galliæ, apud Euseb. lib. v.

² Euseb. Hist. iv. cap. xv. p. 163. Paris, 1628.

circumstances attending his martyrdom. He was burnt to death; after this some Christians collected his remains, and the epistle proceeds:

“But the envious adversary of the just observed the honour put upon the greatness of his testimony and his blameless life from the first, and knowing that he was now crowned with immortality and the prize of undoubted victory, resisted, though many of us desired to take his body, and have fellowship with his holy flesh. Some then suggested to Nicetes, the father of Herod, and brother of Alce, to entreat the governor not to give up his body.

Lest,’ said he, ‘leaving the Crucified One, they should begin to worship this man.’ And this they said at the suggestion and importunity of the Jews, who also watched us when we would take the body from the fire. This they did, not knowing that we can never either leave Christ, who suffered for the salvation of all who will be saved in all the world, or worship any other. For Him, being the Son of God, we worship; but the martyrs, as disciples and imitators of our Lord, we worthily love, because of their pre-eminent good-will towards their own King and Teacher, with whom may we become partakers and fellow-disciples. The centurion, seeing the determination of the Jews, placed him in the midst, and burnt him, as their manner is. And thus we, collecting his bones, more valuable than precious stones, and more esteemed than gold, deposited them where it was meet. There, as we are able, collecting ourselves together in rejoicing and gladness, the Lord will grant to us, to observe the birthday of his martyrdom, for the remembrance of those who have before undergone the conflict, and to exercise and prepare those who are to follow.”

The celebration of an *anniversary commemoration* of the trials and constancy of martyrs, on the day on which they *suffered death*, was then introduced. The anniversary days of the martyrs’ death were called the *days of their nativity*, as upon that day they were *born* to a new life, or, as it is sometimes called, *their transla-*

tion. These anniversary commemorations were still continued to be held at the places of burial; and, therefore, the assemblies were ordinarily held at the cemeteries, and subsequently in churches; they became more frequent as the long list of martyrs daily increased, and we gather from the early writers how these meetings were conducted. Public or congregational prayer was celebrated, with an exposition of the Scriptures. The names of those who had that day suffered for the truth were rehearsed. They dwelt on the several trials and sufferings sustained by the departed; their courage was extolled, their tombs decorated with trophies or garlands of flowers, as emblems of victory; then *thanksgivings were offered to God for giving their martyrs victory over sin and death*; Chrysostom describes their enthusiasm as rising sometimes almost to madness.¹ The ceremony was concluded by the celebration of the Eucharist, and *almsgiving to the poor*.

These alms were afterwards called *oblations*. The gifts were mere *doles*, not in money, but in corn, grain, grapes, bread, wine, &c.; and not, as in modern days, offered for the souls of the deceased supposed to be in Purgatory.²

There can be no question, then, as to the intention of these assemblies and solemnities. It was, in the first place, to show to the people that such as were dead in Christ were still alive, both in God and in the memory of the Church; and, in the next place, to animate and

¹ Chrys. Oper. tom. ii. p. 339. Paris, 1718.

² See Scultet. Med. Theol. Patrum, Amb. 1603, p. 307, on the Canons of the Councils of Carthage and Vaison.

encourage the survivors who were still suffering persecutions, to the like trials, sufferings, and constancy. They worshipped Christ, and served no other; Him they adored as the Son of God, but cherished the martyr as the disciples and followers of the Lord. *They solemnised the day of their nativity, which was that of their death*; in remembrance of such as had conflicted for the truth, and in order to incite others to follow the example thus set before them. They hoped to be made capable of the like graces, and at last copartners and fellow-sharers *in the same glory*.¹

We might quote largely from the writings of the early Christian fathers in illustration of these interesting customs of primitive Christianity; I shall, however, limit myself to the three writers of the first three centuries appealed to by Dr. Wiseman in support of his position—Origen, Cyprian, and Tertullian.

There is a very remarkable passage in one of the books attributed to Origen:

“Let us observe, O friends, what a change has taken place in men. For the ancients (Greeks) celebrated the natal day, loving one life, and not hoping another after this. But now we do not celebrate the *natal day*, because it is a beginning of gifts and temptations; but we celebrate *the day of death*, inasmuch as it is a laying aside of all griefs, and an escape from all temptations. We celebrate the day of death because those die not who seem to die. Wherefore, we both observe the memorials of the saints, and devoutly keep the *remembrance* of our parents and friends which die in the faith; *as well rejoicing for their refreshing* [which cannot be in Purgatory] as re-

¹ See *ante*, Epist. Smyrn. p. 194.

questing also for ourselves a goodly communion in the faith. Thus, therefore, we do not celebrate the day of birth; because they which *die* shall live for ever, and we celebrate it, calling together the religious persons with the priests, the faithful with the clergy; inviting, moreover, the needy and the poor, feeding the orphans and widows, that our festivity may be for a MEMORIAL OF REST to the souls departed ('ut fiat festivitas nostra in memoriam requiei defunctis animabus, quorum memoriam celebramus'), *whose memory we celebrate*, and to us may become a sweet savour in the sight of the eternal God."¹

That these commemorations and oblations were offered for, or in memory of, martyrs, then actually enjoying *eternal happiness*, is evident from the writings of CYPRIAN, who professed himself to be a pupil of Tertullian, and a great admirer of his writings.²

The following passages from Cyprian are highly interesting and pertinent to the subject. In his thirtieth epistle he writes:

"His grandmother, Celerina, was long since crowned with martyrdom. His paternal uncle also, and his maternal uncle, Laurentius and Egnatius, themselves once militant in secular camps, but true and spiritual soldiers of God, whilst they overthrew the devil by the advance of Christ, merited palms of the Lord and crowns by illustrious suffering. We always offer sacrifices for them, as you remember, as often as we celebrate the passions and days of the martyrs by an anniversary commemoration."³

Again St. Cyprian, in his twelfth epistle, speaking of those who, though not having undergone martyr-

¹ Orig. Oper. studio Erasmi, Basil. 1536, tom. i. p. 500, ex off. Froben.
a Pseud. Origen in Job, lib. iii. tom. ii. p. 902. Paris, 1733.

² See Jerome, tom. iv. part ii. p. 115, Edit. 1684.

³ "Sacrificia pro eis semper, ut meministis, offerimus quoties martyrum passiones et dies anniversaria commemoratione celebramus."
—Epist. xxxix. Oxon. 1682, p. 77, Ed. Pamel. num. 34.

dom, had “witnessed a good confession” in chains and imprisonment, says:

“Finally, also, take note of the days on which they depart from life, that we may be able to celebrate their commemorations among the anniversaries of the martyrs; although Tertullus, our most faithful and most devoted brother, according to the usual anxiety and care which he shows to the brethren in every kindness and labour of love (who neither in that respect is deficient in attention to their bodily wants), has written, and does write, and signify to me the days on which, in prison, *our happy brethren by the issue of a glorious death, pass to immortality; and oblations and sacrifices are here celebrated by us on account of their commemorations, which we shall speedily hold in company with you, the Lord being our protector.*”¹

It is allowed, also, that martyrs on death passed *into glory, not purgatory*. Cyprian, after having in preceding lines described the manner in which the year was passed by the confessors and saints shut up in prison, observes:

“Sufficiently blessed are those of you, who, journeying by these footsteps of glory, have already departed from life; and *the path of virtue and faith having been completed, have arrived at the presence of the Lord, the Lord himself rejoicing.*”²—“Torments which do not readily dismiss to a crown; but torture, until they overthrow; unless that some one, rescued by the Divine Majesty, should expire amidst the very torments, *having obtained*

¹ “Ac significet mihi dies quibus in carcere beati fratres nostri ad immortalitatem gloriosæ mortis exitu transeunt; et celebrantur hic à nobis oblationes et sacrificia ob commemoraciones eorum, quæ cito vobiscum Domino protegente celebrabimus.”—Epist. xii. Oxon. p. 28, ed. Pam. num. 37.

² “Beati satis qui ex vobis per hæc gloriarum vestigia comœantes jam de seculo recesserunt, confectoque itinere virtutis et fidei ad complexum et osculum Domini, Domino ipso gaudente venerunt.”—Epist. xxxvii. p. 73, ed. Pam. num. 16.

glory, not by the termination of punishment, but by the quickness of dying."¹

Again, in his seventy-sixth epistle, addressed to Christians imprisoned in the mines for the cause of truth:

"Joyful you daily expect the salutary day of your departure, and about forthwith to retire from life, you hasten to the gifts and the divine habitations of the martyrs; *expecting to see, after these darkneses of earth, the most resplendent light, and to receive a glory greater than all sufferings and conflicts,* agreeable to the declaration of the Apostle, 'The sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed to us.'"²

And in Epistle 31:

"For what more glorious or happy event could, from the Divine Majesty, fall to the lot of any man than, amidst the very executioners, undauntedly to confess the Lord God?—than, whilst the diversified and exquisite torments were putting forth all their severity, the body having even been wrested to dislocation, and tortured and mangled, to confess Christ the Son of God, although with a departing, yet a free spirit?—than, *the world having been abandoned, to have sought heaven?—than, men having been left to stand among angels?—than, all secular hindrances having been burst asunder, now to be placed liberated in the presence of God?—than to hold fast, WITHOUT ANY DELAY, a heavenly kingdom?*"³

And again from TERTULLIAN:

¹ "Adeptus gloriam non termino supplicii, sed velocitate moriendi."—Epist. xi. p. 23, Ed. Pam. num. 8.

² "Post has mundi tenebras visuri candidissimam lucem, et accepturi majorem passionibus omnibus et conflictationibus claritatem, Apostolo testante et dicente, Non sunt," &c.—Epist. lxxvi. Oxon. 1682, p. 233, Ed. Pam. num. 77.

³ "Quam relicto mundo cælum petiisse? quam desertis hominibus inter Angelos stare? quam impedimentis omnibus sæcularibus ruptis in conspectu Dei jam se liberum sistere? quam cæleste regnum sine ulla cunctatione retinere?"—Epist. xxxi. p. 62, Ed. Pam. num. 26.

“ We make oblations for the dead *for their birthdays to heaven on the anniversary days.*”¹

To the like effect we might quote from other writers; it will, however, be sufficient to add here, that Cassander, a Romanist himself, admitted that these prayers were to show the love and affection, and the hope of a resurrection, of those who offered them up. In a word, they gave thanks for the glorious victory of the martyrs.²

This primitive custom did not remain long in its original simplicity; *time* began to work changes, the large influx of Jews and Pagans who renounced their faith to embrace Christianity brought with them their prejudices, and retained many of the rites and ceremonies to which they had been accustomed. The following age, therefore (A.D. 200), was most fruitful in these innovations and ceremonies.

How applicable are the words of Tertullian, who wrote about this time, in his “ Apology for Christians !” (cap. 6):

“ Tell me, where is your religion? Where is that reverence which is due from you to your Fathers, whom ye are become so exceedingly unlike, in your habit, in your course of life, in your manners, in your opinions, and, in short, in your language? Ye are always applauding antiquity, and yet *daily engross novelties*; thus whilst ye, as much as possible ye can, deviate from the laudable institutions of your ancestors, ye plainly discover, that of the things by them established, ye retain only that which is of no value, forasmuch as ye reject that which is.”

¹ “ Oblationes pro defunctis, pro natalitiis, annua die facimus.” —De Cor. Milit. p. 289. Rothomagi, 1662.

For the above selection I am indebted to Pope’s “ Roman Misquotations.” London, 1840, p. 197 *et seq.*

² Cassander, Consultat. Artic. 24. De Artic. Religionis, p. 234. Lugd. 1608.

To confine ourselves, however, to the subject proposed, and fully to understand the development of the present dogma of Purgatory, it is necessary to trace out each custom bearing upon it, to its particular source. As the anniversary meetings were derived from the ancient Greeks, so the *offering of oblations* above alluded to was derived from the Jews. It was customary with them whenever they made their solemn appearances before God, always to take with them some presents especially of the first-fruits of the earth, in token of homage and acknowledgment; the ancient Christians, of whom a great part were descended from the Jews, followed that example, insomuch, that at the public assemblies every one brought with him a certain quantity of bread and wine, corn, grain, or grapes, which were sanctified or consecrated to God by prayer. A part of this bread and wine was apportioned for the communion of the Holy Supper, and the rest was eaten in common (for the *agapes*, or love-feasts, were continued after the days of the Apostles), and the surplus was distributed among the poor. These gifts, thus presented by the people, were, as before explained, called *offerings*, and it was from this that the *Eucharist* was sometimes called an *oblation*, and afterwards a *sacrifice*; not *expiatory* but *gratulatory* only. The Fathers of that age say, that "they offered to God the first-fruits of his creatures," which words cannot be understood to mean the body of Jesus Christ, though it has served as a pretence afterwards for changing the *Supper* into a so-called *real sacrifice*. Thus it was that the offerings presented at the assemblies held on the days solemnised for the martyrs,

were called *oblations* or *sacrifices offered in memory of the saints*, the circumstance of the day occasioning that title; for nothing passed on that action relating to the saints other than *simple commemoration*; and those *offerings* were not the Body and Blood of Christ, but *bread and wine* only, or the first-fruits themselves, employed for the several purposes mentioned.

It is further remarkable, that to induce every one to contribute something, the names of those who offered, and the nature and extent of the offering itself, were with a loud voice proclaimed in the church.¹

In course of time, we find, that on the death of *any* distinguished personage, the year having fully expired, they commemorated in the assembly the *name* of the defunct on that day, declaring how happy he was having *died in the faith*; and all those that were present, besought God that he would grant them the like exit; which done, the *parents or friends* of the deceased, that they might render *his memory honourable*, presented the church and the poor present with their offerings. Many stipulated that *their* names also through such *acts of charity* might continue in favour of the church; and not unfrequently for such purposes bequeathed to the church testamentary legacies, to be yearly paid upon the anniversary day of their decease, and upon this the custom of *anniversaries* was grounded.

We have thus seen that these “offerings for the dead” were only *memorials* of the *devotions, trials, &c.* of the deceased, and not *expiatory sacrifices*. In corroboration of this latter position, we find that women,

¹ Hieron. in Ierem. lib. ii. c. xi. and in Ezech. c. xviii.

who were never in those days permitted to sacrifice, still offered in memory of their deceased husbands;¹ besides many of the living presented such offerings upon their own *actual birthdays*, this being an *act of recognition* only, and a piece of homage paid to God, who gave them life on that day. We see now to what this ancient custom has been *perverted*, for from hence proceeded the custom of "praying for the dead," which, as we shall presently see, Tertullian confesses, even as practised in his days, to be founded on *custom and not Scripture*, ranking it among many other observances, which are at this day disallowed by the Church of Rome.²

But we should carefully remark in what sense the early Christians "prayed for the dead," for they never believed that they were shut up in a place of torment, for the expurgation or washing away the sins done in the body; and, in fact, the doctrine of Purgatory was as yet unknown. It was the belief of some that souls of martyrs and saints were *immediately after death* translated to heaven. By others, that the souls of the just remained in a state of non-existence, as it were, awaiting the last day of judgment; which belief paved the way for the doctrine of Purgatory.³

Irenæus believed that the souls of the just were not admitted into the presence of the "Beatific Vision" until after the day of judgment, and that the souls of

¹ Tert. de Monag. c. x. p. 955. Rothom. 1662.

² Tertul. de Corona Militis, p. 289. Rothom. 1662.

³ See A History of Ancient Ceremonies, London, 1669, translated from the French, to which highly interesting work I am considerably indebted for the above; and see Bingham's Antiquities, vol. vii. b. xx. cap. vii. sect. x. b. xxiii. cap. iii. sect. xvi. Edit. 1840.

those go into unseen places assigned to them by God, and there remain *till the resurrection*, afterwards receiving again their bodies and rising perfectly, that is bodily, even as the Lord also rose again, so will they come again into the presence of God.¹

The questions that suggest themselves are: Where is that place? Is it a place of torment? Is it a place of repentance? And did they believe that souls in that intermediate state could be assisted by the suffrages of the faithful? Irenæus explains the former passage as follows:

“The preachers, who are the disciples of the Apostles, affirm, that those who are translated from hence are transported unto Paradise, that being prepared for just men, and such as have the spirit, the place whither St. Paul’s was caught up, where he heard things unutterable; and that they should continue there till the consummation and end of the world seeing incorruption.”²

And thus Erasmus, in his animadversions upon that

¹ “Cum enim Dominus in medio umbræ mortis abierit, ubi animæ mortuorum erant; post deinde corporaliter resurrexit, et post resurrectionem assumptus est: manifestum est, quia et discipulorum ejus, propter quos et hæc operatus est Dominus, animæ abibunt in INVISIBILEM LOCUM definitum eis a Deo, et ibi usque ad Resurrectionem commorabuntur sustinentes Resurrectionem; post, recipientes corpora et perfectè resurgentes, hoc est corporaliter, quemadmodum et Dominus resurrexit, sic venient ad conspectum Dei.”—Iren. adv. Hær. lib. v. c. xxvi. p. 356. Gallasii, Edit. Genève, 1570; and cap. xxxi. § 2, Ed. 1853.

Irenæus here propounds an undoubted scriptural doctrine; but not a syllable does he say of the disembodied spirits being in any Purgatory during the intermediate state, or (what was the earliest form of the superstition) of their finally passing the fire which at the Day of Judgment will burn up our present earth in order that by suffering they may make atonement for their sins.—Faber’s Difficulties of Romanism, p. 333, book ii. chap. v. Edit. 1852.

² Iren. lib. v. c. vii.

Father, observes, and with good reason (*de purgatorio nulla mentio*), that there is no mention made by him of Purgatory; justly acknowledging that that pious author spoke as one wholly unacquainted with any such fable; and for this reason it was ordered, by the *Expurgatory Index* both of Spain and of the Low Countries, that that note of Erasmus should be quite obliterated.¹

Tertullian tells us his belief that—

“That place (of departed souls) is the bosom of Abraham, not in heaven, yet higher than hell, a refreshing to the souls of the just *until* the consummation of all things at the resurrection, &c.”²

But Romanists do not admit Tertullian's speculation relative to the term “Abraham's bosom,” for Maldonate, a Jesuit, on the text Luke xvi. 23, says: “I very much suspect that by the bosom of Abraham the highest heaven is intended;”³ and the Testament now in use with Romanists has this note: “*Abraham's bosom*: The place of REST where the souls of the saints resided *till Christ had opened heaven by His death!*”

That this place was believed to be a place of torment there is no evidence whatever, for similar passages to the following from Cyprian are frequently met with in the writings of the *ante-Nicene* Fathers, who

¹ Index Expurg. Belgic. p. 72, and Index Expurg. Hispan. p. 136.

² “Eam regionem sinum Abrahæ dico, et non cælestem, sublimiorem tamen inferis: interim, refrigerium animabus justorum, donec consummatio rerum resurrectionem omnium,” &c.—Lib. iv. cont. Marcion. cap. xxxiv.

³ “Valde suspicor per sinum Abrahæ summum cælum designari.”—Mald. in eum locum, p. 298. Edit. Mogunt. 1596.

say that, "The righteous are called to their refreshing, the unrighteous are called to punishment."¹

That it was not considered a place of repentance, or that the souls after death could be assisted by the prayers of the faithful on earth, is evident; for Clement, Bishop of Rome (A.D. 66), who wrote copiously on Death and the Resurrection, gave it as his opinion that—

"When once we shall have departed this life there is no room for us in another either to confess or repent; our condition hereafter being as fixed and immovable as that of an ill-formed vessel of clay, when once, with all its imperfections, it shall have been irrevocably hardened by the process of baking."²

And again, Ignatius (A.D. 70), a reputed saint of the Church, in a work attributed to him, said:

"When our existenee shall have been brought to an end, two states only are set before us, a state of death and a state of life. For as every allegorical coin bears impressed upon it the stamp of God or the stamp of the world, so after his decease shall every one depart to his own appropriate habitation."³

¹ "Ad refrigerium justii vocantur, ad supplicium rapiuntur injusti." —Serm. de Mortalit. Edit. Oxon. 1682.

² 'Ὡς οὖν ἐσμὲν ἐπὶ γῆς, μετανοήσωμεν. Πηλὸς γάρ ἐσμεν εἰς τὴν χεῖρα τοῦ τεχνίτου. Ὁν τρόπον γὰρ ὁ κεραμεὺς, ἐὰν ποιῇ σκευὸς, καὶ ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτοῦ διαστραφῇ ἢ συντριβῇ, πάλιν αὐτὸ ἀναπλάσσει· ἐὰν δὲ προφθάσῃ εἰς τὴν κάμινον τοῦ πυρὸς αὐτὸ βαλεῖν, οὐκέτι βοηθήσει αὐτῷ· οὕτως καὶ ἡμεῖς, ἕως ἐσμὲν ἐν τούτῳ τῷ κόσμῳ ἐν τῇ σάρκι ἃ ἐπράξαμεν πονηρὰ μετανοήσωμεν ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας, ἵνα σωθῶμεν ὑπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου, ἕως ἔχομεν καιρὸν μετανοίας. Μετὰ γὰρ τὸ ἐξελθεῖν ἡμᾶς ἐκ τοῦ κόσμου, οὐκέτι δυνάμεθα ἐκεῖ ἐξομολογήσασθαι ἢ μετανοεῖν ἔτι.—Clem. Epist. ad Cor. ii. § 8. In Patres Apost. Ed. Jacobs. Oxon. 1838.

³ 'Ἐπεὶ οὖν τέλος τὰ πράγματα ἔχει, ἐπικείται τὰ δύο ὁμοῦ, ὁ τε

All this looks very like Purgatory?

On the other hand, some of these early Christians held with Paul, that to be absent from the body was to be present with the Lord. Justin Martyr (A.D. 150) said: "When God shall raise all from the dead, He will place the holy in eternal happiness, but will consign the unholy to the punishment of eternal fire."¹ He makes no mention of Purgatory.

In another place, in a work published with his writings, but supposed to be of a later date, and therefore a better witness against the Church of Rome, we read:

"In this life, while the body and the soul are united, all things are common to the just and to the unjust. But, immediately after the departure of the soul from the body, the just are separated from the unjust; each being conducted by angels to their fitting places. The souls of the just pass forthwith into Paradise, where they become the associates of the angels and the archangels, and where they are privileged to enjoy the beatific vision of Christ the Saviour; but the souls of the unjust pass into certain regions of Hades, which have been appointed for them.

θάνατος, καὶ ἡ ζωὴ· καὶ ἕκαστος εἰς τὸν ἴδιον τόπον μέλλει χωρεῖν. Ὡσπερ γάρ ἐστιν νομίσματα δύο, τὸ μὲν Θεοῦ, τὸ δὲ κόσμου· καὶ ἕκαστον αὐτῶν ἴδιον χαρακτῆρα ἐπικείμενον ἔχει, οἱ ἄπιστοι τοῦ κόσμου τούτου, οἱ δὲ πιστοὶ ἐν ἀγάπῃ χαρακτῆρα Θεοῦ Πατρὸς διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ· δι' οὗ εἰ μὴ αὐθαιρέτως ἔχομεν τὸ ἐπιθανεῖν εἰς τὸ αὐτοῦ πάθος, τὸ ζῆν αὐτοῦ οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν ἡμῖν.—Ignat. Epist. ad Magnes. § 5. Edit. *ut supra*, Clem. Epist. and Edit. Oxon. 4to, 1709.

¹ Ὁ Θεὸς, ὅταν πάντας ἀναστήσῃ, καὶ τοὺς μὲν ἐν αἰωνίῳ καὶ ἀλύτῳ βασιλείᾳ ἀφθάρτους καὶ ἀθανάτους καὶ ἀλύπους καταστήσῃ, τοὺς δὲ εἰς κόλασιν αἰώνιον πυρὸς παραπέμψῃ.—Just. Dial. cum Tryph. Oper. p. 270, Edit. Heidelb. apud Commel. 1593; and cap. 117, tom. ii. 388, Ed. Jenæ, 1843.

Here each, in the places respectively suitable to their characters, remain under sure guardianship until the day of resurrection and final retribution.”¹

Cyprian, however, gives us still more precise information as to the belief in his day:

“When once we have departed hence, there is *no longer any place for repentance, no longer any effectiveness of satisfaction*. Here, life is either lost or held: here, we may provide for our eternal salvation by the worship of God and the fruitfulness of faith. Let not any one, then, be retarded, either by sins or by length of years, from attaining to salvation. To a person, while he remains in this world, repentance is never too late. Those who seek after and understand the truth may always have an easy access to the indulgence of God. Even to the very end of your life, pray for your sins; and, by confession and faith, implore the one only true Deity. To him who confesses, pardon is freely granted: to him who believes, a salutary indulgence is granted from the divine pity;

¹ Οὐχ ἦν ἔχουσιν αἱ ψυχαὶ ἐνταῦθα μετὰ τοῦ σώματος καταστάσιν, ταύτην ἔχουσι καὶ μετὰ τὴν ἐντεῦθεν ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος ἔξοδον. Ἐνταῦθα μὲν γὰρ τὰ τῆς ἐνώσεως πάντα κοινὰ ὑπάρχει δικαίων τε καὶ ἀδίκων, καὶ οὐδεμία ἐστὶν ἐν αὐτοῖς διαφορὰ κατὰ τοῦτο· οἷον τὸ γενέσθαι καὶ τὸ ἀποθνήσκειν, καὶ τὸ ὑγιαίνειν καὶ τὸ νοσεῖν, καὶ τὸ πλουτεῖν καὶ τὸ πένεσθαι, καὶ τὰ ἄλλα τὰ τούτοις ὅμοια. Μετὰ δὲ τὴν ἐκ τοῦ σώματος ἔξοδον, εὐθὺς γίνεται τῶν δικαίων τε καὶ ἀδίκων ἡ διαστολή. Ἄγονται γὰρ ὑπὸ τῶν ἀγγέλων εἰς ἀξίους αὐτῶν τόπους· αἱ μὲν τῶν δικαίων ψυχαὶ, εἰς τὸν παράδεισον, ἔνθα συντυχία τε καὶ θεὰ ἀγγέλων τε καὶ ἀρχαγγέλων, κατ’ ὀπτασίαν δὲ καὶ τοῦ Σωτῆρος Χριστοῦ, κατὰ τὸ εἰρημένον, Ἐκδημοῦντες ἐκ τοῦ σώματος, καὶ ἐνδημοῦντες πρὸς τὸν Κύριον· αἱ δὲ τῶν ἀδίκων ψυχαὶ, εἰς τοὺς ἐν τῷ ἄδῃ τόπους.—Καὶ εἰσιν ἐν τοῖς ἀξίοις αὐτῶν τόποις φυλαττομεναι ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας τῆς ἀναστάσεως καὶ ἀνταποδόσεως.—Quæst. et Respons. ad Orthod. lxxv. in Oper. Justin, p. 339, Edit. ut supra, and pp. 105, 106, tom. iii. pt. ii. Ed. Jenæ, 1843.

and, *even in the very article of death he passes to immortality.*"¹

Dr. Wiseman's assertion that the doctrine of Purgatory is reasonably deduced from the early customs of praying for the departed, remains wholly unsupported, and is untrue.

This divided opinion, and uncertainty on the subject of the nature of the existence of the soul immediately after death, gave rise to many speculations; and Origen, as already observed, was the first of all the Fathers who suggested the probability of a purging, or purgation of souls by fire. Dr. Wiseman, having quoted Origen as one of his witnesses, we shall presently give the reference itself a more particular consideration.

This idea, first promulgated by Origen, was taken up by others who came after him; and Lactantius, Ambrose, Augustin, Jerome, and others, put forward their speculations, but they still to a certain extent admitted the supposition put forward by Origen.

Augustine, however (A.D. 400), extended his specu-

¹ "Quando istine excessum fuerit, nullus jam pœnitentiæ locus est, nullus satisfactionis effectus. Hic, vita aut amittitur, aut tenetur: hic, salutis æternæ cultu Dei, et fructu fidei providetur. Nec quisquam aut peccatis, retardetur, aut annis, quominus veniat ad consequendam salutem. In isto adhuc mundo manenti, pœnitentia nulla sera est. Patet ad indulgentiam Dei aditus: et, quærentibus atque intelligentibus veritatem, facilis accessus est. Tu, sub ipso licet exitu et vitæ temporalis occasu, pro delictis roges: et Deum, qui unus et verus est, confessione et fide agnitionis ejus implores. Venia contenti datur: et credenti indulgentia salutaris de divina pietate conceditur: et *ad immortalitatem, sub ipsa morte, transitur.*"—Cyprian. ad Demetrianum, Oper. vol. i. cap. v. p. 196. See also Cyprian. Epist. xii. Oper. vol. ii. pp. 27, 28. Edit. Oxon. 1682, and Edit. Paris, 1726. And see a striking passage in his work, "De Mortalitate," p. 163, cap. iv. Oxon. 1682.

lative meditations on the subject. He at one time said, that our souls must under some "circumstances remain in the fire of Purgatory just so long a time as it may require to burn away our smaller sins, like wood, hay, and stubble."¹ This sounds very much like genuine Popery; but, not to mention that doubts have been raised whether this sermon was written by Augustine, the doctrine here enunciated is very different from the Popish Purgatory, for Augustine's fire was not then kindled—his, like Origen's fire, was deferred to the day of judgment. But even this was not an accepted doctrine of the Church in his day. He resolves the whole question into a *may be*; it was in his mind problematical only, and was not, therefore, dogmatically laid down by the Church:

"It is not incredible," he said, "that some such thing may take place even after this life, and we may inquire whether it is so, and it may either be found, or be had from us; namely, that certain of the faithful, passing through a certain purgatorial fire, are sooner or later saved in proportion as they have more or less loved perishing things."²

And, as we have seen, he admits that the doctrine was borrowed from the Platonists, and that Christians were not obliged to accept it. But an acknowledgment made in another part of his works, the genuineness of which I have not heard disputed, leads us to

¹ Aug. Serm. civ. in Append. tom. v. col. 183, Ed. Bened. assigned to Cæsarius of Arles.

² "Tale aliquid etiam post hanc vitam fieri incredibile non est, et utrùm ita sit quæri potest, et aut inveniri aut latere; nonnullos fideles per ignem quandam purgatorium, quanto majus minusve bona pereuntia dilexerunt, tanto tardius citiusve salvari."—Aug. in Enchir. ad Laur. chap. lxxix. tom. vi. p. 222. Bened. Edit. Paris, 1685.

believe that the former quotations are additions of a later date. In a later and more mature work he writes, in more decisive terms: "The souls of the righteous being separated from the body, *are at rest.*"¹ "There is no middle or third place, but he must needs be with the devil, that is not with Christ;" and again, "The third place besides heaven and hell we are utterly ignorant of; nay, we find not in Scripture that there is any."² And, "After this life, there remains no compunction or satisfaction."³

Purgatorial fires are also mentioned in other writings of the early Fathers, but in quite another sense, namely, the *tribulations in this life*; thus in the fifty-fifth Epistle of Cyprian,⁴ which we shall presently more fully notice, and in other writers.

That one mortal can assist another in working out his salvation is so contrary to all Scripture and reason, that were all the Fathers to testify their belief in such a monstrous and unnatural doctrine, it could have no possible weight in deciding the matter; but happily not one can be found, who, in the most distant manner, insinuates that such a belief ever existed in the primi-

¹ "In requie enim sunt animæ piorum a corpore separatae."—Aug. de Civit Dei, lib. xiii. cap. viii. tom. vii. col. 330. Paris, 1685.

² "Non est ulli ullus medius locus, ut possit esse nisi cum diabolo, qui non est cum Christo." "Tertium locum penitus ignoramus, imo esse in Scripturis sanctis invenimus."—De Peccat. Remiss. et Merit. lib. i. c. 28, Patr. Caill. tom. cxl. p. 316, sect. lv., Paris, 1842; and tom. vii. col. 680, Basil, 1569.

³ "Postea, cum hoc sæculo transierimus, nulla compunctis vel satisficio remanebit."—August. Hom. v. in 1 Tim. iv. col. 420, tom x. D. Basil, 1569.

⁴ Vol. ii. pp. 109, 110, Edit. Oxon. 1682. "Aliud est ad veniam stare," &c.

tive Church; on the contrary, such of them as have mentioned this subject, are most positive in denouncing so gross an idea; one illustration alone, of the many that might be adduced, will suffice. Hilary said, "No one can be aided by the good works or merits of others, because each must buy oil for his own lamp."¹

That the doctrine of Purgatory was not admitted by the early Church is thus frankly acknowledged by the Roman Catholic Bishop Fisher:

"There is," he says, "no mention at all, or very rarely, of Purgatory in the ancient Fathers. The Latins did not at once, but by degrees, admit this doctrine; and the Greeks believe it not at this day. And Purgatory being so long unknown, it is no wonder that in the first times of the Church there was no use of indulgences, for they had their beginning after men had been awhile scared with the torments of Purgatory."²

This reference to the present belief of the Greek Church is to my mind a very cogent argument that the custom of praying for the dead, as practised in the early Church, was totally different from the modern Popish practice, for it is now inseparable from the modern doctrine of Purgatory.³

Before, what is called, the great Western schism took place, the Churches of the East and West professed one and the same creed and symbol of faith; they were one in point of doctrine; corruptions of time affected

¹ "Alienis scilicet operibus ac meritis neminem adjuvandum, quia unicuique lampadi suæ emere oleum sit necesse."—In Matth. cap. xxvii, p. 591. Paris, 1652. See Birkbeck's Protestant Evidence, London, for a succession of witnesses on this subject.

² Roffens. Lutheri Confut. art. xviii. p. 200. Colon. 1559, and Polydore Virgil. Invent. Rerum. lib. viii. cap. i., Basil, 1544.

³ See Stillingleet's Grounds of Protest. Religion, fol., London, 1665, part iii. cap. iv. p. 593.

each; the Greeks, equally with the Latins, in course of time, prayed for the dead in the sense before explained. When the schism, or separation, took place, the Greeks did not know of the doctrine of Purgatory; and though they still retain the ancient practice of praying for the dead, they do not *now* believe in Purgatory. The Latins, or Western Church, on the contrary, became by degrees more corrupt; and as, "by degrees," the doctrine became developed, and men's minds became "scared with the torments of Purgatory," the priests began to find it profitable to themselves in many ways. It was, therefore, thought proper to stamp it with the infallible seal of the Church, which was first effected at the Council of Florence, A.D. 1439.¹

The testimony of Bishop Fisher is thus corroborated by Alphonsus à Castro, who says: "There is almost no mention of it (Purgatory) in any of the ancient writers."² The *almost* is, in fact, *never*. He adds, "especially among the Greek writers. In consequence of which, even to this day, Purgatory is not believed by the Greeks." And on the subject of the Popish figment of INDULGENCES,³ the offshoot of Purga-

¹ Synod. Florent. apud Labb. et Coss. Concil. tom. xiii. p. 515. Paris, 1671.

² "De purgatorio fere nulla in antiquis scriptoribus mentio—potissimum apud Græcos scriptores. Qua de causa, usque hodiernum diem, purgatorium non est a Græcis creditum."—Alphons. do Castro contra Hæres. lib. viii. p. 578. Paris, 1571; and see Taylor's *Dissuasive from Popery*, vol. xi. part ii. book ii. § ii. pp. 59, 60. London, 1822.

³ It must be borne in mind that Indulgences are said to affect the living as well as the dead; *e. g.* the following I take from the *Catholic Vindicator* of December 6, 1851: "Blessed be the holy and Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary! One hundred days' Indulgence for the above ejaculation, *not applicable to the dead.*—Pius VI."

tory, the same Alphonsus says, "that they were received very late in the Church."¹ And Cardinal Cajetan said: "There is no authority of Scripture, nor of any Fathers, Greek or Latin, that bring them to our knowledge."²

The proposition of a Purgatory, and an intermediate state of suffering, was *first* submitted for discussion at the Second Session of the Council of Ferrara, 15th March, 1438.

Having thus briefly taken a review of the origin and progress of the custom of praying for the dead, and from it the subsequent establishment of the doctrine of Purgatory, we can at once proceed to consider the quotations adduced by Dr. Wiseman from the writings of the early Christians, in support of this modern Popish dogma.

It will be remembered that Dr. Wiseman, on this subject, invites us "to examine most accurately the writings of the oldest Fathers of the Church," in order to ascertain what doctrine the Church did hold in various ages. And with regard to the doctrine in question, it will also be recollected, he says, that "nothing can be more simple than to establish the belief of the Universal Church on this point;" the only difficulty he has to contend with is, to "select such passages as may appear to be clearest."

¹ "Earum usus in Ecclesia videtur sero receptus."—Alphons. de Castra contra Hæres. lib. viii. p. 578. Paris, 1571.

² "De ortu indulgentiarum, si certitudo haberi posset, veritati indagandæ opem ferret: verùm quia nulla sacræ Scripturæ, nulla priscorum doctorum Græcorum aut Latinorum autoritas scripta hunc ad nostrum deduxit notitiam."—Thom. de Vio Cajetan. Opusc. Tract. xv. De Indulg. cap. i. p. 129. August. Taurin. 1582, and Venet. 1531, tom. i. fol. 46.

With this object in view, he selects, as I have already noticed, one isolated passage from each of three writers of the first three centuries—Tertullian, Cyprian, and Origen.

TERTULLIAN.

Tertullian, he informs us, advises a widow “to pray for the soul of her departed husband, entreating repose to him, and participation in the first resurrection, and making oblations on the anniversary day of his death, which if she neglect, it may be truly said that she has divorced her husband. De Monogamia, c. 10.” The passage itself is “Pro anima ejus orat; et refrigerium interim adpostulat ei, et in prima resurrectione consortium; et offert annuis diebus dormitionis ejus:”¹ which is more correctly translated, “Let her pray for his soul; and let her, meanwhile, beg for him refreshment and a participation in the first resurrection; and let her offer on the anniversaries of his dormition.” Dr. Wiseman has substituted the word “repose” for “refreshment,” and has foisted in the word “oblations,” which does not stand in the original; and translates “dormitionis ejus” *his death*, instead of *his dormition*, or *having fallen asleep*. This latter phrase will be again referred to when we come to examine the reference from Cyprian.²

These, however, are minor points. Dr. Wiseman proposes to explain to us the belief of the *Universal*

¹ Halæ, Magd. 1770, vol iii. p. 155 and p. 682, A. Paris, 1634.

² See Hall's *Doctrine of Purgatory*, &c. p. 283 *et seq.*, London, 1843, where this and similar passages are considered and fully proved to be inapplicable to the doctrine of Purgatory.

Church, and for this purpose actually gives us a passage from a work written by a person who lived about the latter end of the second century, and who at the time was actually out of the pale of the Church. Tertullian wrote this particular work *against* the Church.¹ This is the *only* passage quoted, though there are others from Tertullian more, much more, to the point, and which are continually quoted by Romanists to prove that the doctrine of Purgatory was admitted by the Christians of that time. It will not be an uninteresting inquiry to trace the reason of this apparent omission on the part of Dr. Wiseman; it is not accident. Bellarmine quotes one passage from Tertullian to the following effect: "Why should you not think that the soul is both punished and cherished in Hades in the mean time, while it is expecting either judgment, through a certain practising or whitening of it?"² Now, one would have supposed that this was sufficiently explicit for Dr. Wiseman, but he knew that this was dangerous ground; for, though this work also was written when Tertullian was a heretic, Dr. Wiseman was likewise aware that Tertullian expressly says that he derived this doctrine from the wretched impostor Montanus, who pretended to be the "Holy Ghost," and deceived many, and among others Tertullian himself, who was on this account also declared to be a heretic:³ "for the Paraclete (meaning Montanus) most frequently set forth this doctrine." This passage, therefore, would not serve his purpose. The other

¹ Præfatiuncula Pamelii Archidiaconi. Rothom. 1662, p. 936.

² Bell. de Purg. lib. i. cap. vii. and x. from Tert. de Anima, cap. lviii.

³ See Edit. Rigalt. p. 306, Paris, 1675. Tert. de Anima, cap. lviii.

passage more frequently quoted is taken from "De Corona Militis," a work which Tertullian also wrote after he espoused Montanism. The passage is, "*Oblationes pro defunctis, pro natalitiis, annua die facimus*"—"We make oblations for the dead, for their birthday to heaven, on the anniversary day."¹ This, in "The Faith of Catholics," is rendered, "We make oblations for the dead on the anniversary day," as the correct translation; and to carry out the deception, the editors actually add what they pretend to be the passage from the original, as the words of Tertullian, "*Oblationes pro defunctis annua die facimus.*"² The significant words, "*pro natalitiis,*" are omitted. That "*pro natalitiis*" is properly rendered *birthdays to heaven*, is borne out by the corroborative testimony of two Roman Catholic commentators. De la Cerda, the Jesuit, on this passage says: "By *natalitia* Tertullian means the days on which saints, dead to the world, are born to heaven."³ And another Roman Catholic, Le Prieur, says: "By *natalitia* Tertullian means the solemnities accustomed to be held in honour of martyrs, on the day on which, being dead to the world, they were born to heaven. From whence we make oblations on the annual day—that is, yearly."⁴

The omission of the word *natalitia* (if intentional) is

¹ Edit. Roth. 1662, p. 289, and cap. iii. p. 102, A. Paris, 1664.

² "Faith of Catholics," Ed. 1813, p. 354, and Edit. 1830, p. 356.

³ "Tertullianus intelligit per *natalitia* dies, quibus sancti, mundo mortui, nascuntur cælo."—De la Cerda è Soc. Jesu; *in loc.* Tert. Op. Paris, 1624, p. 657.

⁴ Prior. *in loc.* Tert. Oper. Rig. et Prior. annotat. adject. Lutet. 1664, p. 102. Pope's Roman Misquotations. London, 1840, p. 65; and see Cyprian's Epist. xxxix. p. 77, Epist. xii. pp. 27, 28. Oxon. 1682.

most obvious; for its appearance in the proper place clears the passage of all difficulties.

We have seen what these *oblations* on the anniversary days mean; we may be, therefore, spared any further explanations here.

We, nevertheless, have in this passage the tempting word "oblations," and though Dr. Wiseman introduces it in another passage, where it should not be, he lets this passage pass where it does occur. There must be some reason for this, which must account for the *difficulty he had in selecting such passages as may appear the clearest*.

There is no difficulty, however, in accounting for his passing over this passage unnoticed. It will be remembered that Dr. Wiseman admitted that the doctrine of Purgatory could not be directly adduced from Scripture; but he tacked it on to the other doctrine of "praying for the dead;" this he maintained was taught and sanctioned by Scripture. Now, had Dr. Wiseman quoted the passage in question, he would have at once destroyed his argument; for in the same paragraph Tertullian admitted that the custom was not enforced by Scripture, which he vindicated without any support from writing, but "by the authority of tradition *alone*, and from thence by the protection of custom." He expressly classes the custom among many others which were merely traditional customs, or discipline, not matters of faith, but ceremonial usages, and for the most part entirely repudiated by the Roman Church at the present day. After naming all these several observances, Tertullian uses these words: "If for these and other like *regulations* you

demand the law of the Scriptures, none can be found; tradition will be held up before you, as originating, usage as conforming, and faith as practising them."¹ He nowhere states the custom to be an "Apostolic tradition;" this also is an invention of the compilers of the "Faith of Catholics."

Now, it must be observed that Roman Catholics have always quoted this last passage in proof of the antiquity of Roman "masses." Modern Roman oblations for the dead, and masses for the dead, are almost inseparable; I ask Dr. Wiseman, or any other Romanist, lay or clerical, whether they are ready to stand by the testimony of Tertullian, namely, that there is *no* warranty in Scripture for their doctrines of Purgatory and Masses, and Prayers for the dead? I do not think they will dare to make so wide an admission; and if not, they must entirely renounce the testimony of Tertullian.

It may not be amiss to notice that when Tertullian is talking of a matter of *faith*, as necessary to be believed, he uses a very different strain; here he makes a direct appeal to SCRIPTURE, and rejects all other authority. He "adores the fulness of Scripture." "Whether all things were made of any subject-matter, I have as yet read nowhere. Let those of Hermogenes' shop show that it has been written; if it be not written, let them fear that woe which is appointed for to such as add or take away."²

¹ "Haram et aliarum ejusmodi disciplinarum si legem expostules Scripturarum, nullam invenies; traditio tibi prætendetur auctrix, consuetudo confirmatrix, et fides observatrix," p. 289. Edit. Roth. 1662, and "De Corona Militis," cap. iii. p. 121, D. Paris, 1634.

² "Adoro Scripturæ plenitudinem."—Tert. adv. Hermog. cap. xxii.

We can now appreciate the value of the omission of this and the former quotation by Dr. Wiseman from his list of witnesses.

There are many passages in this tract, "De Anima," which are altogether subversive of the doctrine of Purgatory. According to the Romish creed, martyrs, and certain others, go directly to heaven; but Tertullian asserts that no soul whatever, not even that of Christ himself, has avoided, or can avoid, the intermediate state of which he is speaking.¹ And although it will not be affirmed that Tertullian is always uniform and consistent in his opinions and views respecting the state of the soul after death, it is very clear from these passages that his idea of an intermediate state was perfectly distinct from that of the Romish Church. "We observe," he affirms, "that all souls remain in the intermediate state until 'the day of the Lord,' the general resurrection of the dead; that the only suffering to which the soul is subject in its separate state arises from the awful forebodings of its future destiny; and that the torment or refreshment experienced by each soul is everlasting: all which is directly at variance with the opinions of Papists respecting Purgatory. The testimony of Tertullian, therefore, is vainly alleged in favour of the ideal fire of the Romish creed."

Édit. Roth. 1662, p. 417. "An autem de aliqua subjacenti materia facta sint omnia, nusquam adhuc legi. Scriptum esse doceat Hermogenis officina. Si non est scriptum, timeat vae illud adjicientibus aut detrahentibus destinatum."—Ibid., and Halæ, 1770, vol. ii. p. 111.

¹ Tertull. de Anima, c. lv. p. 304 A. Paris, 1664; and see De Præscript Hæres. cap. xxxii.

² Hall's Doctrine and Practice of Praying for the Dead Examined, pp. 104-107, 108, 109. London, 1834

Dr. Wiseman speaks of "Prayers for the dead," and "Purgatory" as being *strict correlatives*, but his authority, Tertullian, clearly illustrates that the early Christians who adopted the former practice prayed for the dead on a totally different principle from that adopted by the modern Church of Rome. This is clearly illustrated by Mr. Faber in his invaluable work, "Difficulties of Romanism,"¹ which the reader will consult with profit.

CYPRIAN.

The second passage is from Cyprian:

"Our predecessors prudently advised that no brother, departing this life, should nominate any churchman his executor; and should he do it, that no oblation should be made for him, nor sacrifice offered for his repose, of which we have had a late example when no oblation was made, nor prayers in His name, offered in the Church. Ep. lxvi. p. 114."²

In this extract from St. Cyprian one expression calls for particular attention. The words "*for his repose*," as used by Dr. Wiseman, would lead the reader to imply that the sacrifice spoken of was offered with a view of obtaining *rest* for the departed soul. This interpretation of the clause is not justified by the original "*pro dormitione ejus*." Mr. Pope, in his work "Roman

¹ London, 1853, pp. 135-6, b. i. c. v.

² "A tutor' on the death of the parent, had the care of the child and his property until, if a boy, he had arrived at the age of fourteen; if a girl of the age of twelve. Afterwards, whoever held the office, was called a 'curator.' A 'tutor' could be legally nominated by will, but not a 'curator.' It required the confirmation of a civil magistrate before he could perform the duties. At the same time the civil magistrate generally confirmed the appointment."—The Rev. E. J. Shepherd's Second Letter to Dr. Maitland on the Genuineness of the Letters of Cyprian, p. 17. Longman, 1853.

Misquotations," fully expounds the value and meaning of this word *dormitio* ; with reference to the expression, though not in itself classical, he adduces many parallel passages where it occurs, incontestably proving that the passage in question ought to be rendered "*for his decease*," or "*for his having fallen asleep*" in Christ. Mr. Pope in particular quotes two passages from the Vulgate, 1 Thess. iv. 14, and Matt. xxvii. 52. In both of these texts the same word is used, and in the Roman Catholic translation now in use, the word is rendered "sleep," and in no way indicates a "repose from torment." If we read, therefore, "nor sacrifice offered for his having fallen asleep" (in death), the true and literal meaning of the passage will speak most strongly against Papal Purgatory. Further, the quotations both from Tertullian and Cyprian are totally irrelevant to the subject in dispute. The usages to which they refer are *prayers and oblations for the dead*. We have seen, particularly from these two very authors quoted by Dr. Wiseman, that these prayers were offered, according to Tertullian, for those he considered in Abraham's bosom, free from torment or pain, and, according to Cyprian, for those actually in heaven; and had Dr. Wiseman fairly quoted *all* on the subject, and not a few extracts, we should not have taken for granted, as he would wish us to do, that the individuals in whose honour the assemblies took place were detained in Purgatory. The quotations, therefore, are wholly inadequate to prove that the dogma of a Papal Purgatory was an object of credence in, or even contemplated by, the early Church.

I have treated this passage as genuine, but it has been

clearly shown by a late writer, the Rev. E. J. Shepherd, that the passage is not a genuine production of the writer to whom it is assigned. Without going into Mr. Shepherd's arguments, showing that the Cyprianic epistles are all productions of a later date—and I cannot but admit the force of his arguments—it is quite sufficient for our present purpose if I here refer the reader to his Second Letter to Dr. Maitland.¹

Cyprian was bishop of Carthage, in Africa, A.D. 248 (according to Dupin). Mr. Shepherd shows that the prohibition named in the passage in question was not enacted until many years after, and the concurrent history of the times, gathered even from the writings of Cyprian himself, shows that it was not contrary to the discipline of the Church for a cleric at that time to hold such and similar secular employments pointed out.

It is very evident, therefore, that this passage was never written by Cyprian; and even if it were, it does not prove a *Purgatory*, and we have only to bring forward the other passages already quoted, and which Dr. Wiseman has most studiously avoided, to show clearly that the doctrine was quite unknown to Cyprian.

There is another well-known passage from Cyprian that is most confidently quoted as a proof that he and modern Romanists hold the same belief with respect

¹ See the Rev. Mr. Shepherd's Second Letter to Dr. Maitland on the genuineness of the writings attributed to Cyprian, pp. 24-28, Longman, 1853; as also his work, *The History of the Church of Rome, &c.*, Longman, 1851. There appears great reluctance on the part of some Protestant clergymen to admit Mr. Shepherd's works; and yet no person has been able to refute his arguments.

to Purgatory. The inquiry why this apparently much more tempting and explicit reference is omitted, to give place to the more equivocal passage above set out, may cast some further light upon the subject; and further explain *the difficulty Dr. Wiseman experienced in selecting such passages as might appear the clearest.*

The passage is as follows:

“It is one thing to stand a petitioner for pardon, another, to come to glory; it is one thing, to be thrown into prison and not to come out from it until the last farthing be paid, another, immediately to receive the reward of faith and virtue; it is one thing, to be cleansed from sins through the suffering of long pain, and to be long purged in fire (*et purgare diu igne*¹), another, to have purged all sin through suffering; finally, it is one thing, to depend in the Day of Judgment upon the sentence of the Lord, another to be crowned by the Lord immediately.”²

This passage is familiar to almost every Roman Catholic; it has been sent to me as positive proof that Cyprian held the Roman doctrine of Purgatory; it is quoted by Bellarmine, Kirk, and Berington, in the “Faith of Catholics,” Challoner, &c. It has no reference whatever to Purgatory. Cyprian treats of the trials and tribulations in this life, and to such he exclusively refers, and this is frankly admitted by a

¹ “It may be here remarked that instead of *diu igne* many manuscripts read ‘divine;’ whence Bishop Pearson, the learned editor of the Oxford edition of Cyprian, 1682, has a very probable conjecture, that the true reading is, with the insertion of a single letter, *diutine*. If this be correct, we not only get rid of the notion of fire altogether, but keep up a unity in Cyprian’s discourse, which is otherwise unnecessarily and arbitrarily broken by speaking of the dead.”—See “Elliott’s Delinuations of Roman Catholicism,” note, p. 270, 3rd edit. London, 1851.

² Ep. lv. ad Antonian, part ii. p. 109. Oxon. 1682.

Roman Catholic commentator on the works of Cyprian, Rigaltius.¹

If every Roman Catholic could afford to be as honest as Rigaltius we should have little need of controversial writings.

I would now ask any honest man, be he Protestant or Romanist, whether Dr. Wiseman be justified in quoting Cyprian as a witness in his favour, from one equivocal passage, while he hides from view the real sentiments of this bishop, clearly enunciated in his other epistles. Can he plead ignorance of the other passages? No Romanist, perhaps, has read more on the subject than he. Dr. Wiseman does not plead ignorance; if he do, it is rank imposition on his part to come forward as a teacher.²

ORIGEN.

The next passage is from Origen. This Dr. Wiseman quotes in a free-and-easy style, abridged to suit his fancy, as follows:

“When we depart this life, if we take with us virtues or vices, shall we receive reward for our virtues, and those trespasses be forgiven to us which we knowingly committed; or shall we be punished for our faults, and not receive the reward of our virtues?”

This query, he says, is thus answered:

“Neither is true; because we shall suffer for our sins, and receive the rewards of our good actions. For if on the foundation of Christ you shall have built, not only

¹ Rigalt. in Cyprian. Epist. lii. p. 68. Paris, 1648; and see the passage from Rigaltius fully set out in the Oxford edition of Cyprian, p. 109, vol. ii. 1682.

² See passage quoted, *ante*, p. 208.

gold and silver and precious stones, but also wood, and hay, and stubble, what do you expect when the soul shall be separated from the body? Would you enter into heaven with your wood, and hay, and stubble, to defile the kingdom of God: or, on account of those encumbrances, remain without, and receive no reward for your gold and silver and precious stones? Neither is this just. It remains, then, that you be committed to the fire, which shall consume the light materials; for our God, to those who can comprehend heavenly things, is called *a consuming fire*. But this fire consumes not the creature, but what the creature has himself built—wood, and hay, and stubble.† It is manifest that, in the first place, the fire destroys the wood of our transgressions, and then returns to us the reward of our good works.—Homil. xvi. al. xii. in Jerem. tom. iii. pp. 231, 232.” [Paris, 1740.]

This passage is quoted to prove the modern doctrine of Purgatory.

There are three deceptions here practised.

I. It will be seen that the doctrine enunciated by Origen, whatever that may be, is founded on the text, 1 Cor. iii. 11-15. Now, Origen expressly admits, in this very place, that this passage “was very difficult of explanation.”¹ And these words appear in the very edition quoted by Dr. Wiseman himself, at the part marked †, but studiously omitted by him! Can we consider this suppression otherwise than a gross and intentional fraud, for the reference given by Dr. Wiseman is correct? Had he inserted the omitted passage, the reader would have at once perceived that Origen was not recording what could have been considered the then accepted doctrine of his Church, but a mere

¹ Ὁ τόπος ἦν δυσδιήγητος σφόδρα. Orig. in Jerem. Hom. xvi. Oper. vol. i. p. 155, Ed. Huet. Rothomag. 1688; and Edit. Paris, 1740, tom. iii. p. 232.

theory or speculation of his own, founded on a private interpretation of a text, which he admitted at the time to be difficult of explanation. It is admitted by Romanists that texts of doubtful interpretation cannot be cited to support a doctrine, and, as we shall see, the text has been variously interpreted by the Fathers, and therefore, according to the second rule above cited of Veron, cannot be admitted. If Dr. Wiseman had been an honest controversialist, one who indeed sought to open the eyes and ears of his confiding auditory, he would have told them that this very text has been a source of great speculation among the Fathers, who have given various interpretations of it, and *not one of them* agreeing with the modern Romish interpretation. He would have told them that a greater man than himself, Cardinal Bellarmine, who so strongly advocated the doctrine of Purgatory, admitted that there are five great difficulties in the passage: "1. What is understood by the builders. 2. What is understood by gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, and stubble. 3. What is understood by the day of the Lord. 4. What is understood by the fire, of which it is said that in the day of the Lord it shall prove every one's work; and 5. What is understood by the fire, of which it is said, He shall be saved, yet so as by fire," &c.¹ He would have told them that on all these various points the most orthodox Fathers are diametrically opposed to each other; and their various and conflicting opinions are set out by Bellarmine himself. If Dr. Wiseman, I repeat, had been an honest controversialist, he would have told his hearers that this same Origen, in another

¹ De Purg. tom. ii. c. iv. lib. i. p. 332. Prag. 1721.

place, and in his last, best, and crowning work, that against Celsus,¹ most distinctly considers the text, as referring to God's providential punishment of sin in *this* world: arguing, with some acuteness, that we cannot legitimately deem the fire mentioned by the Apostle to be a *literal* or *material* fire, unless, what is a plain absurdity, we also deem the objects consumed by it to be *literal* or *material* wood, and hay, and stubble.²

But Dr. Wiseman cannot afford to give up the text, for, with Bellarmine, he must admit that, while it is one of the most obscure, it is one of the most useful passages in Holy Writ.³ But these two worthies should bear in mind that excellent saying of Jerome: "Parables and enigmas of ambiguous meaning are altogether insufficient to settle the authority of doctrines."⁴

Dr. Wiseman will have Origen to contradict himself, and yet would produce him as a witness of the truth,

¹ See Faber's "Difficulties of Romanism," book i. c. v. p. 142, Edit. 1852.

² Καταβαίνει γὰρ ὁ Θεὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἰδίου μεγέθους καὶ ὕψους, ὅτε τὰ τῶν ἀνθρώπων καὶ μάλιστα τῶν φαύλων οἰκονομεῖ.—Ἐπὶ οὖν λέγεται πῦρ εἶναι καταναλίσκον, ζητοῦμεν· τίνα πρέπει ὑπὸ Θεοῦ καταναλίσκεσθαι; Καὶ φάμεν, ὅτι τὴν κακίαν, καὶ τὰ ὑπ' αὐτῆς πραττόμενα, καὶ τροπικῶς λεγόμενα ξύλα εἶναι καὶ χόρτον καὶ καλάμην, καταναλίσκει ὁ Θεὸς ὡς τῦρ. Ἐποικοδομεῖν γοῦν ὁ φαῦλος λέγεται τῷ προὑποβλημένῳ λογικῷ θεμελιῶ ξύλα καὶ χόρτον καὶ καλάμην. Εἰ μὲν οὖν ἔχει δεῖξαι ἄλλως νενοῆσθαι ταῦτα τῷ ἀναγράφαντι, καὶ σωματικῶς δύναται τις παραστήσαι ἐποικοδομοῦντα τὸν φαῦλον ξύλα ἢ χόρτον ἢ καλάμην· δηλον, ὅτι καὶ τὸ πῦρ ὑλικὸν καὶ αἰσθητὸν νοηθήσεται.—Orig. cont. Cels. lib. iv. p. 168. Ed. Cantab. 1677.

³ "Unum ex difficilissimis et utilissimis totius Scripturæ."—Bel. de Purg. lib. i. cap. v. tom. ii. Prag. 1721.

⁴ "Nunquam parabolæ et dubia ænigmatum intelligentia potest ad auctoritatem dogmatum proficere."—Hieron. in Matt. xiii. 33, lib. ii. tom. iv. col. 57. Paris, 1706.

quoting him in support of his own prejudices, when the opinion is given by Origen with diffidence and admitted uncertainty; while Dr. Wiseman has found it convenient to overlook Origen's opinion subsequently expressed with certainty on the same text, which interpretation would overthrow the hypothesis that he believed that the text in question referred to a literal, Popish, purgatorial fire.

II. Secondly, we complain that Dr. Wiseman should attempt to pass off this quotation as proof that Origen held the modern Romish doctrine of Purgatory. Dr. Wiseman does not hesitate to add these words immediately after the passage:

“Therefore, according to this most learned Father (two hundred years after Christ), *when the soul is separated* from the body, if there be smaller transgressions, it is condemned to fire, which purges away those lighter materials, and thus prepares the soul for entering into heaven.”¹

He would have it appear that this fire spoken of by Origen is the same as the modern Popish Purgatory, to which the departed go *immediately* after death, “when the soul is separated from the body.” To induce us to believe that Origen so thought, he translates the passage as given above:

“When we depart this life, if we take with us virtues or vices, shall we receive reward for our virtues, and those trespasses be forgiven to us which we knowingly committed; or shall we be punished for our faults, and not receive the reward of our virtues?”

¹ Lecture xi. vol. ii. p. 60.

Thus making it appear that the fiery punishment immediately follows death, whereas Origen's words are:

“ It must now be considered, *what awaits us hereafter : whether, if we depart this life, having sins, but having likewise virtues, we shall be saved indeed on account of our virtues, and shall be absolved of our sins knowingly committed ; or whether we shall be punished on account of our sins, and shall receive no reward on account of our virtues.*”¹

The fact being that Origen did not refer to an *immediate* purgatorial fire; but to the fire which should consume the world at the last day. Of this Dr. Wiseman must have been aware, for it is universally so admitted; but it was not convenient for his position to make a candid acknowledgment; and yet Dr. Wiseman has the boldness to quote this passage in proof that Origen here taught the modern doctrine of Purgatory.

III. But, lastly, the most palpable fraud is, that Origen should be quoted at all *to establish the belief of the Universal Church on this point* (namely, Purgatory). Dr. Wiseman knew, or ought to have known, that Origen, in the very work quoted, wished to establish a new theory of his own, namely, that *the punishment of hell was only temporary, and that all,*

¹ Τὶ ἡμᾶς περιμένει, κατανοητέον· ἄρα, εἰ ἐξέλθωμεν τὸν βίον, ἔχοντες ἁμαρτήματα, ἔχοντες δὲ καὶ ἀνδραγαθήματα, σωθησόμεθα μὲν διὰ τὰ ἀνδραγαθήματα, ἀπολυσόμεθα δὲ περὶ τῶν ἐν γνώσει ἡμαρτημένων· ἢ κολασθησόμεθα μὲν διὰ τὰ ἁμαρτήματα, οὐδαμῶν δὲ μισθὸν ληψόμεθα τῶν ἀνδραγαθημάτων· ἀλλ' οὐδὲ τὸ ἕτερον.
—Orig. cont. Cels. lib. iv. p. 168. Ed. Cantab. 1677.

the devil himself included, would be finally restored to eternal happiness. He also taught, that all except Christ would have to undergo this fiery ordeal. This, among other speculations, was condemned as *impious and heretical* by the fifth Œcumenical Council of the Church, namely, that of Constantinople, A.D. 553.¹

But it is really surprising to witness the boldness of a man in Dr. Wiseman's position, as the representative of the Romish Church in this country, putting forward the teaching of Origen on this subject as the orthodox doctrine of the Universal Church. Independent of this condemnation by a general Council of the Church, we have the much esteemed Father Augustine repudiating the doctrine enunciated by Origen in the following words:

“What Catholic Christian,” he said, “learned or unlearned, does not vehemently abhor that Purgatory of sins which Origen speaks of—namely, the doctrine that those who have finished this life in scandalous crimes, and sacrileges, and impieties, the greatest possible—nay, that the devil himself and his angels shall, after a very long time indeed, be purged and liberated, and restored to the kingdom of God and to light. . . . Concerning which vain impiety, I have disputed diligently in the books on the City of God, against the philosophers from whom Origen learned those notions.”²

And before Augustine, Epiphanius did not hesitate

¹ Ἡ πέμπτη σύνοδος γέγονεν ἐπὶ Ἰουστινιανοῦ βασιλέως τοῦ πρώτου, ἑκατὸν ἐξήκοντα πέντε ἀγίων πατέρων συνελθόντων ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει· ἥτις ἐπεκύρωσε τὰ δογματισθέντα ὑπὸ τῆς ἁγίας τετάρτης συνόδου, καὶ τοὺς κατ' αὐτῆς βλασφημοῦντας ἀνεθεμάτισεν, ἧγουν Ὀριγένην καὶ τὰ αὐτοῦ ἀσεβῆ δόγματα καὶ συγγράμματα.—Bals. apud Beveridge. Synod. vol. i. p. 150. Oxon. 1672.

² Aug. lib. de Hæres. c. xliii. tom. viii. p. 10. Edit. Benedic Paris.

to call Origen "the Father of Arius," and the root of other heresies, adding:

"And this, too, which he maintains, I know not whether to grieve or laugh at; for this excellent teacher, Origen, dares to teach that the devil will again be what he was once, and will return to the same dignity, and will ascend the kingdom of heaven. O shocking! Who can be so senseless and so foolish as to believe that John the Baptist, and Peter, and John the Apostle, and Isaiah, and Jeremiah, and the rest of the prophets, shall be co-heirs with the devil in the kingdom of God?"¹

Origen's *hell*, and his whimsical speculations, paved the way for the readmission of the Pagan and Platonist doctrine of a temporary punishment; and, assisted by the custom of praying for the dead, subsequently introduced, finally, in course of time, led to the belief in modern Purgatory. Dr. Wiseman is driven to the necessity of quoting a passage wholly irrelevant to the subject at issue, and which was condemned as heretical by canonised saints, and by a General and Œcumenical, and according to his own theory, an infallible Council, to substantiate the assertion that the modern Popish dogma of Purgatory was *the belief of the Universal Church*.

Such, then, is the testimony adduced from the writers of the first three centuries: one an acknowledged heretic; another evidently perverted, but who nevertheless has left abundant testimony that he was a stranger to the doctrine in question; the third enunciated a new theory, which was condemned by a general Council of the Church!

If no trace of a belief in Purgatory can be found

¹ Epiph. Oper. vol. ii. p. 314. Paris, 1622.

to exist in the writings of the Fathers of the first three centuries, what historical testimony of a subsequent date can be produced to negative the positive testimony I have already brought forward in the earlier part of this treatise? I shall, nevertheless, briefly advert to the other witnesses adduced, to show how hard Dr. Wiseman is driven for his *selection of passages that may appear the clearest*. These so-called witnesses refer principally to the custom of making offerings and prayers for the dead, and three are introduced as giving the modern Romish interpretation to the text 1 Cor. iii. 15.

It must be admitted, that in the fourth century, great innovations were made in the form and practice of public worship. Prayers and oblations for the dead became more frequent; and this custom, grounded on no warranty of Scripture, but on tradition alone, was the innovation on primitive Christianity.

The very first author in the fourth century, quoted, is BASIL THE GREAT, whom Dr. Wiseman represents as giving a somewhat Romish interpretation to the contested text 1 Cor. iii. 15, in his commentary on Isaiah ix. He quotes from the Benedictine edition. In the Preface of this very edition these commentaries attributed to Basil are unequivocally and unreservedly condemned as spurious; and this Dr. Wiseman must have well known when he quoted as from Basil's works, for he says, "St. Basil or a *contemporary author*." Dr. Wiseman is the first who ever asserted that the writer of those commentaries on Isaiah was a *contemporary* of Basil; it is a pure invention of his own.

But if Basil is to be cited as an authority on this subject, let us have the full benefit of his evidence, and we shall find that the Roman doctrine of Purgatory was wholly unknown to him.¹

In his comment on Psalm xv. 1, he says, “It is fitting that he who liveth in the flesh, should be as a sojourner; but that, departing out of this life, *he should be at rest* in his own abode.”²

In another place he observes that, “This present life is a state of penitence, the next of retribution; here we must labour, *there we receive our wages*; this is a life of patience, that of consolation.”³

And again: “Everlasting rest is apportioned to those who strive lawfully in this life; not given in payment as for a debt of works, but awarded by the grace of a bountiful God to them that trust in Him.”⁴

AMBROSE, who was Bishop of Milan about A.D. 370, is also quoted as giving a seemingly Popish interpretation to the same text; but Bellarmine is constrained to admit, under the “third difficulty” arising on the interpretation of this text, that Ambrose held heretical opinions on this subject:

¹ Hall's Doctrine of Purgatory, &c., pp. 125, 126. London, 1843.

² Ζωντᾶ μὲν ἐν τῇ σαρκὶ παροικόν εἶναι προσηκεῖ, μεταβαίνοντα δὲ ἀπο τῆς ζωῆς ταύτης τοῖς οἰκειοῖς τοποῖς ἐναναπαυεσθαι.—Basil. in Psalm. xv. 1, tom. i. p. 250, A. Paris, 1718.

³ Οὗτος ὁ αἰὼν τῆς μετάνοιας, ἐκεῖνος τῆς ἀναποδοσεως· οὗτος τῆς ἐργασίας, ἐκεῖνος τῆς μισθαποδοσίας· οὗτος τῆς ὑπομονῆς, ἐκεῖνος τῆς παρακλησεως.—Basil. Præm. in Regulas fusius disputatas, tom. ii. p. 403, A. Paris, 1718.

⁴ Προκειται γὰρ ἀναπαυσις αἰωνία τοῖς νομιμῶς τὸν ἐνταυθα διαθῆσασι βιον· οὐ κατὰ τὸ φεῖλημα τῶν ἐργῶν ἀποδοδομένη, ἀλλὰ κατὰ χάριν τοῦ μεγαλοδώρον Θεοῦ τοῖς εἰς αὐτὸν ἠλπικοσι παρεχομένη.—Basil. in Psalm. cxiv. tom. i. p. 310, D. Paris, 1718.

“It remains, therefore,” he says, “that we should say that the Apostle here speaks of the fire of the severe and just judgment of God, *which is not a purging or punishing fire*, but one that probes and examines. Thus AMBROSE explains it in *Psalm 118*.”¹

The other passage from Ambrose has reference to the custom of “praying for the dead,” and is a fair sample of the passages that are quoted on this subject, and fully illustrates the manner in which such passages are treated when handled by Roman controversialists. On the funeral oration of Theodosius; Ambrose, Dr. Wiseman tells us, thus speaks:

“Lately we deplore together his death, and now, while Prince Honorius is present before our altars, we celebrate the fortieth day. Some observe the third and the thirtieth, others the seventh and the fortieth.—Give, O Lord, rest to Thy servant Theodosius, that rest which Thou hast prepared for Thy saints. May his soul thither tend whence it came, where it cannot feel the sting of death; where it will learn that death is the termination, not of nature, but of sin. I loved him, therefore will I follow him to the land of the living; I will not leave him, till, by my prayers and lamentation, he shall be admitted to the holy mount of the Lord, to which his deserts call him.”

It will be observed that in this passage there is but one indication, that the quotation is not continuous, after the word “fortieth” there is a —; but the fact is, the extract is a putting together of disjointed fragments, which would lead a confiding and unsuspecting reader to believe that Ambrose was praying for a de-

¹ “Supersit igitur, ut dicamus hic apostolum loqui de igne severi et justi judicii Dei, qui non est ignis purgans, vel affligens sed probans et examinans. Ita exponit Ambros. in Psalmo cxviii.”—De Purg. p. 332. Edit. Prag. 1721.

parted spirit, who was, in fact, undergoing some punishment due to his sins, if not in Purgatory itself. By supplying the omitted passages, however, it will be seen at once how very far was the doctrine of Purgatory from the mind of Ambrose when he wrote the oration in question.

In section 2 of this same oration, Ambrose says that Theodosius "had been summoned to the *Tabernacle of Christ, to that Jerusalem which is above.*"¹ Then follows the extract quoted by Dr. Wiseman:

"Lately we deplore together his death, and now, while Prince Honorius is present before our altars, we celebrate the fortieth day."

Almost in immediate connexion is found the second part of the quotation; Dr. Wiseman gives it:

"Some observe the third and the thirtieth, others the seventh and the fortieth."

This, however, is not the correct translation, which is as follows: "And because some have been accustomed to observe the third and the thirtieth day, others the seventh and fortieth, *let us consider what the lessons teach.*"² Reference is then made to Genesis, 1, 2, 3, and Ambrose adds, "The solemnity, therefore, is to be followed *which the lessons prescribe.*" Thus it is manifest that Ambrose quotes as authoritative for the

¹ "Et ille (Theodosius) quidem abiit accipere sibi regnum, quod non deposuit sed mutavit, in tabernacula Christi jure pietatis adscitus, in illam Hierusalem supernam, ubi nunc positus dicit," &c.—Sect. ii. c. 1197. Bened. Edit. Paris, 1686-1690. *The very reference given by Dr. Wiseman, and the very edition quoted by him.*

² "Et quia alii tertium diem et trigesimum, alii septimum et quadragesimum observare consueverunt, quid doceat lectio, consideremus," &c. "Hæc ergo sequenda solemnitas, quam præscribit lectio."—C. 1198.

solemnities which were to be exercised, not that prescribed by any particular Church, but the *authority of Scriptures*, which plain appeal to the Sacred Volume is wholly suppressed by Dr. Wiseman. In section 32 is the following passage: "Freed, therefore, from the doubtful contest, Theodosius *now enjoys perpetual light and endless tranquillity*; and according to those things which he hath done in this body, *rejoices in the fruits of divine remuneration.*"¹

The next part of the quotation, as given by Dr. Wiseman, occurs in section 36: "Give, O Lord, rest to Thy servant Theodosius, that rest which Thou hast prepared for Thy saints." The original is, "Give *perfect rest*," &c. "Da requiem perfectam." As quoted by Dr. Wiseman, the clause implies, without the context, the judgment of Ambrose, at the time the prayer was made, that Theodosius did not enjoy *even partial rest*; whereas, on the contrary, the supplication, "Give *perfect rest* to Thy servant," is quite consistent with the opinion that the departed emperor was regarded as in possession of rest, and that its increase and consummation were the objects implored.

In section 39, Ambrose says, that he (Theodosius) "remains in light, and rejoices in the companies of the saints."² That he "knows he reigns, since *he is in the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ*, and carefully

¹ "Absolutus igitur dubio certamine, fruitur nunc augustæ memoriæ Theodosius luce perpetuâ, tranquillitate diuturnâ; et pro iis quæ in hoc gessit corpore, remunerationis divinæ fructibus gratulatur. Ergò quia dilexit augustæ memoriæ Theodosius dominum Deum suum, meruit sanctorum consortia."

² "Manet ergo in lumine Theodosius, et sanctorum cætibus gloriatur," &c.—Sect. xxxix. c. 1208.

beholds His Temple.”¹ Again, in section 52, that “he had not put on the purple habit, but the robe of glory.” And concludes the oration thus: “Thou art altogether blessed which supportest *a tenant of Paradise*, and in the august receptacle of the interred body shalt hold *an inhabitant of that city which is above*.”² We perceive, therefore, that Ambrose, while supplicating *perfect* rest for the departed emperor, yet viewed him as in the actual enjoyment of felicity.³

I would ask any Roman Catholic whether he consider Ambrose honestly quoted by Dr. Wiseman? Will he pause to reflect whether the deception be intentional? Can he think otherwise, when Dr. Wiseman is admitted to be most learned and skilled in the controversy; and pretends to vouch for his accuracy by giving a precise reference to a well-known edition? Will Dr. Wiseman presume to assert that Ambrose considered Theodosius suffering the pains of Purgatory when he was supplicating *perfect* rest for the emperor? Will he presume to say that masses and prayers are now offered up for the dead “who have been summoned to the Jerusalem which is above;” who are enjoying “perpetual light and endless tranquillity;” who “reign in the kingdom of the Lord Jesus Christ—in His Temple?” Throughout the works

¹ “Nunc se augustæ memoriæ Theodosius regnare cognoscit, quando in regno Domini Jesu Christi est, et considerat templum ejus.”—Sect. xl.

² “. . . Non purpureum habitum, sed amictum induit gloriæ.”—Sect. lii. c. 1213. “Beata planè (Constantinopolis), quæ paradisi incolam suscipis, et habitatorem supernæ illius civitatis augusto sepultû corporis tenebis hospitio.”—Sect. lvi. c. 1214.

³ The reader is referred to Pope’s “Roman Misquotations,” where this subject is further discussed, cap. ii. sect. v. p. 82 *et seq.* I have followed to a considerable extent Mr. Pope’s words.

of Ambrose, we find him holding out to Christians an immediate *rest* after death, and that the soul is set free, and translated to its *repose* and will be with Christ;¹ that by means of death, “we pass from corruption to incorruption; from mortality to immortality; from trouble to *repose*;”² and that it is a refuge from all troubles and sorrows, a sure haven of security, and harbour of rest.³ If it be so, it were well that this should be made known, that Roman Catholics may cease to grieve for their departed relatives, on the supposition that they are being tortured in Purgatory; and keep their money for more pious uses. I would warn them in the words of Tertullian, that “you wrong Christ when you do not hear with equanimity of those who are summoned hence by the Lord, as if they were to be pitied. *I desire*, says St. Paul, *now to depart and to be with Christ*;⁴ how greatly superior does he exhibit the hope of the Christian, [than do your accredited teachers in these latter days]. If, therefore, you impatiently grieve for others who had obtained their wish, you show yourselves unwilling to obtain it.”⁵ I would warn them in the still more impressive language of the great Apostle, “But I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, con-

¹ Ambros. de Bono Mortis, tom. i. lib. i. cap. iii. col. 392, F. Paris, 1686.

² Ibid. cap. iv. § 15.

³ Ambros. de Fide Resurrectionis, tom. ii. lib. ii. § xxii. p. 1140. Paris, 1690.

⁴ Phil. i. 23.

⁵ “Et Christum lædimus, cum evocatos quosque ab illo, quasi miserandos non æquanimiter accipimus. Cupio, inquit Apostolus, recipi jam, et esse cum Christo, quanto melius ostendit votum Christianorum? Ergo votum si alios consecutos impatienter dolemus, ipsi consequi nolumus.”—De Patientia, cap. ix. Rothom. 1662, tom. ii. p. 201.

cerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope. For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with Him.—Wherefore, comfort one another with these words.”—[1 Thess. iv. 13-18.]

Grieve not for the dead who die in the Lord—rather rejoice,—but grieve for those who have not known Him. “Tribulation and anguish cometh upon every soul of man that doeth evil; but *glory, honour,* and PEACE, to every man that worketh good.”¹ Christ “hath by himself purged our sins,”² and “there is therefore now no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus.”^{3 4}

EPIPHANIUS, who flourished about the latter end of the fourth century, is thus quoted:

“There is nothing more opportune, nothing more to be admired, than the rite which directs the names of the dead to be mentioned. They are aided by the prayer that is offered for them; though it may not cancel all their faults.—We mention both the just and sinners, in order that for the latter we may obtain mercy.”

The reference given is, “Hær. lv. sive lxxv. t. i. p. 911.” The edition is not given, but the page indicated agrees with the Cologne Edition, 1682.

¹ Rom. ii. 9, 10.

² Heb. i. 3.

³ Rom. viii. 1.

⁴ There is a striking passage from Cyprian which might be here quoted with effect. He writes: “I would earnestly aver, and publicly declare, that our brethren who are delivered from this world by the summons of the Lord, ought not to be bewailed, inasmuch as we know that they are not lost to us, but sent before us; that though receding from us, they precede us, as those who go on a journey or a voyage are wont to do; that they should be regretted, not mourned; nor should black garments be assumed here, since they have already put on white robes there.”—Cypr. de Mortalitate, p. 163, cap. iv. Oxon. 1682.

I cannot discover this passage; but in my search I have come upon the following striking resemblance, which is probably *the* passage desired to be quoted, but which, when examined, will prove to be very different in effect and meaning. In the same lxxv. Hæres. in this very edition, Epiphanius says:

“But then as to the reciting the names of the deceased, what can be more excellent than this practice? what more opportune and admirable? that they who are present should believe that the departed live, and are not annihilated, but exist and *live with the Lord*; and that the most venerable preaching might declare, that there is hope to those who pray for their brethren as if travelling in foreign lands.”¹

Thus, then, in the very same passage quoted by Dr. Wiseman as from Epiphanius, we find the custom of naming or reciting the deceased in their prayers; but he expressly declared that those named were actually

¹ Ἐπειτα δὲ περὶ τοῦ ὀνομάτα λέγειν τῶν τελευτησάντων, τι ἂν εἴη τούτου προυργαίτερον; τί τούτου καιριώτερον καὶ θαυμασιώτερον; πιστεύειν μὲν τοὺς παρόντας, ὅτι οἱ ἀπελθόντες ζῶσι, καὶ ἐν ἀνυπαρξίᾳ οὐκ εἰσὶν, ἀλλὰ εἰσὶ καὶ ζῶσι παρα τῷ δεσπότη; Καὶ ὅπως ἂν τὸ σεμνότατον κήρυγμα διηγῆσαιτο, ὡς ἔλπις ἔστιν ὑπὲρ ἀδεγφῶν εὐχομένοις ὡς ἐν ἀποδημίᾳ, τυγχανόντων; Ὁφελεῖ δε καὶ ἡ ὑπὲρ αὐτῶν γινομένη εὐχὴ, εἰ καὶ τὰ ὅλα τῶν αἰτιμάτων μὴ ἀποκόπτοι· ἀλλ’ οὖν γε διὰ το πολλάκις ἐν κόσμῳ ἡμᾶς ὄντας σφάλλασθαι ἀκουσίως τε καὶ ἔκουσίως, ἵνα τὸ ἐντελέσερον σημάνθῃ· Καὶ γὰρ δικαίων ποιούμεθα τὴν μνήμην, καὶ ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτωλῶν ὑπὲρ μὲν ἁμαρτωλῶν, ὑπὲρ ἐλέους Θεὸν δεόμενοι, ὑπὲρ δὲ δικαίων καὶ πατερῶν καὶ πατριαρχῶν, Ἡροθητῶν, καὶ Ἀποστολῶν, καὶ Εὐαγγελιστῶν, καὶ Μαρτύρων, καὶ Ὁμολογητῶν, Ἐπισκόπων τε καὶ Ἀναχωρητῶν, καὶ πάντος τοῦ ταγμάτος, ἵνα τὸν Κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ἀφορίσωμεν ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν ἀνθρώπων τάξεως, διὰ τῆς πρὸς αὐτὸν τιμῆς, καὶ σέβας αὐτῷ ἀποδώμεν, ἐν ἐννοία ὄντες, ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἐξισουμένος ὁ Κύριος τινὶ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἀν τε μυρία, καὶ ἐπέκεινα ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ ὑπαρχῇ ἕκαστος ἀνθρώπων. — Epiphanius, lib. iii. pt. i. Hæres. lxxv. sec. vii. tom. i. p. 911. Edit. Colon. 1682.

in a state of happiness, they “LIVE WITH THE LORD.” And the *hope* that is held out is *to those who pray for their brethren*, not to those who are dead.¹ If there exist any passage fatal to the doctrine of Purgatory it is this, and yet Dr. Wiseman has the temerity to quote Epiphanius as a witness in his favour, and accomplishes the feat of priestly LEGERDEMAIN by dropping the words which are clearly fatal to his case! Epiphanius is contending against Aerius. His first point is the mention of the names of the departed; of which he approves, as expressing a full conviction that they are not annihilated, but exist and live with the Lord. He proceeds to mention that prayers for the dead should be viewed as prayers for brethren who are on a journey; and he *thinks* them profitable, though they may not remove every fault, nor does he speak dogmatically. He then gives his approbation to the naming of both good and bad; imploring God’s mercy for sinners, but what he asks for the just is difficult to comprehend, for he loses himself in a multitude of words. He, nevertheless, includes in these the patriarchs, apostles, prophets, and martyrs! Where is the Roman Purgatory in all this? What proof is there that Epiphanius held any such doctrine? None at all.

CYRIL OF JERUSALEM, a contemporary with Ambrose, is thus garbled by Dr. Wiseman:

“Then we pray for the Holy Fathers and the Bishops that are dead, and in short for all those who are departed

¹ The marginal Latin translation in this edition is, “Sed existere et adhuc, atque apud Dominum vivere;” and in the Latin translation in the Paris Edition, 1612, tom. iii. p. 762, “Et non sunt nulli, sed sunt et vivunt apud Dominum.”

this life in our communion, believing that the souls of those for whom prayers are offered receive very great relief while this holy and tremendous victim lies upon the altar."

The reference given is "Cyril, Catech. Mystag. v. n. ix. x. p. 328," without naming the edition; the page, however, corresponds with the Paris edition, 1720, Catech. xxiii. § ix.

It has been freely admitted that about this time, namely, the latter end of the fourth century, the custom of praying for the dead was introduced into the Church, but it was only just then being adopted; it was not universally practised, and this we gather from Cyril himself, in the very passage quoted by Dr. Wiseman, had he given Cyril's own words. The reference is to sections ix. *and* x., whereas Dr. Wiseman has taken a little bit only from the end of the first section, and substituted a word which does not appear in the original.

First, Dr. Wiseman omits Cyril's opening words:

"ix. We offer this sacrifice in memory of all who have fallen asleep before us; and first of Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, and Martyrs, that God, by their prayers and intercession, may receive our supplication."

These opening words are evaded by Dr. Wiseman, for this simple reason, namely, that the sacrifice is offered up in memory of *Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs, &c.*, whom, as we have already stated, the Church of Rome does not believe are or ever were in Purgatory, and persons in Purgatory do not offer intercessions for us, they require rather to be assisted by the prayers of the living, and therefore does Dr. Wise-

man see fit to thrust this part of the passage out of sight. Dr. Elliott, in his "Delineations of Popery,"¹ adds to the above remarks:

"The words '*by their prayers and intercessions*' are doubtless an interpolation, inasmuch as the ancient Liturgies prayed *for* their holy men; and Chrysostom expressly says, that prayers were offered for martyrs.² Archbishop Usher complains of a like insertion in the Latin translation of Chrysostom's Greek Liturgy, in order to make it appear that the Primitive Church did not offer up their prayers *for* saints and martyrs. That she did, however, is abundantly evident from the writings of the Fathers; whence it appears that in the above passage, fairly and fully cited, Purgatory was never contemplated."

Archbishop Usher³ shows a similar falsification of the old Roman Liturgy of the days of Innocent III., and especially that for St. Leo, which is found in the older copies of the Gregorian Sacramentary: "Grant unto us, O Lord, that this oblation may profit the soul of Thy servant Leo;"⁴ for which the later books have foisted in this prayer, "Grant unto us, O Lord, *that by the intercession* of Thy servant Leo this oblation may profit us."⁵

Secondly, the passage is not fairly translated. Dr. Wiseman slips in the word "victim;" there is no such word in the Greek text. Cyril says only the "*sacrifice*," which is by no means so significant an expression

¹ London, 1851, p. 277, col. 1.

² Hom. xxi. in Acts, ix. Liturg. Chrysost. Oper. tom. xii. p. 1011. Paris, 1838, and tom. iii. p. 204, A. Paris, 1636.

³ Vol. iii. p. 214, Edit. Dublin, 1847, title "Prayers for the Dead."

⁴ "Annue nobis, Domine, ut animæ famuli tui Leonis hæc prosit oblatio."—Gregor. Oper. tom. v. col. 135. Paris, 1605.

⁵ "Annue nobis, Domine, ut intercessione famuli tui Leonis hæc nobis prosit oblatio."—Liturg. Pamelii, tom. ii. p. 314. Col. Agrip. 1571.

as *victim*. The latter may mean the offering up of a living thing or being: the modern Roman sacrifice is pretended to be the actual offering up on the altar the self-same Christ who suffered on the Cross—soul and divinity, body, blood, bones, and nerves;¹ whereas the Christian sacrifice conveyed no such meaning or intention. Cyril then proceeds with the passage quoted by Dr. Wiseman:

“Then also (we offer this sacrifice to Thee) on behalf of the holy Fathers and Bishops who have fallen asleep before us, and in a word of *all those who have among us previously fallen asleep*; believing that to the souls for whom the supplication is offered up, there will be the greatest benefit of the holy and most tremendous sacrifice lying before us.”

Here let me observe that, in using the word “tremendous sacrifice,” Cyril had no idea of the other Popish Doctrine of Transubstantiation; Cyril speaks of it in other places as a *figure* and *type* of THE ONE ONLY SACRIFICE.²

The passage, however, intimates a belief that the souls of the departed would in some way or other be benefited by prayer, and by what was deemed the sacrifice of the altar. But it neither specifies *what* benefit, nor says anything of a *victim* lying on the altar. The doctor is *coaxing* the passage. It establishes nothing more than that the custom of praying for the dead, and a notion that *some* benefit to be derived to

¹ “Jam vero hoc loco a pastoribus explicandum est, non solum *verum* Christi corpus, et quidquid ad veram corporis rationem pertinet, velut ossa et nervos, sed etiam totum Christum in hoc sacramento contineri.” —Cat. Concil. Trid. part ii. cap. iv. § xxxi. p. 235. Paris, 1848.

² See Faber's “Difficulties of Romanism,” 3rd Edit. Bosworth, London, 1853, pp. 248, 315.

them from the sacrifice of the altar, were *then* creeping into the Church.

This leads us to the *third* objection. The passage itself is quoted in proof: first, that Cyril believed that the persons for whom these prayers were offered up were in Purgatory; secondly, that Cyril was only repeating the then universally admitted doctrine of the Church.

The first proposition is untenable: and as to the second, had Dr. Wiseman condescended to give the passage entire, this proposition would also fall to the ground; for, in the very next sentence indicated by Dr. Wiseman's reference, num. x., Cyril himself fully confesses that **MANY** even then denied that the souls of the departed, whether they quitted this world with sin or without, could be at all benefited by the prayer offered on their behalf, or even by this sacrifice!¹

The earliest prayers for the dead we find recorded by Tertullian, which were prayers for a partaking of

¹ The entire passage is as follows :

Εἶτα μνημονεύομεν καὶ τῶν προκεκοιμημένων πρώτον πατριαρχῶν, προφήτων, ἀποστόλων, μαρτύρων ὅπως ὁ Θεὸς ταῖς εὐχαῖς αὐτῶν καὶ πρεσβείαις προσδέξῃται ἡμῶν τὴν δέησιν. Εἶτα καὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν προκεκοιμημένων ἁγίων πατέρων καὶ ἐπισκόπων καὶ πάντων ἀπλῶς τῶν ἐν ἡμῖν προκεκοιμημένων, μεγίστην ὄνησιν πιστεύοντες ἕσσεσθαι ταῖς ψυχαῖς, ὑπὲρ ὧν ἡ δέησις ἀναφέρεται τῆς ἁγίας καὶ φρικωδεστάτης προκειμένης θυσίας. Καὶ βούλομαι ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ ὑποδείγματος πείσαι· οἶδα γὰρ ΠΟΛΛΟΥΣ τοῦτο λέγοντας, Τί ὠφελεῖται ψυχὴ, μετὰ ἁμαρτημάτων ἀπαλασσομένη τοῦδε τοῦ κόσμου, ἢ οὐ μεθ' ἁμαρτημάτων, εἰ ἐπὶ τῆς προσευχῆς μνημονεύετε; Ἄρα γὰρ, εἴ τις βασιλεὺς προσκεκρουκός αὐτῷ, ἐξορίστους ποιήσῃεν· εἶτα οἱ τούτοις διαφέροντες, στέφανον πλέξαντες ὑπὲρ τῶν ἐν τιμωρίαις, αὐτῷ τοῦτον προσευγκεῖεν· οὐκ ἂν αὐτοῖς ἄνεσιν δῶν τῶν κολάσεων; Cyril. Hieros. Catech. xxiii. Myst. v. §§ ix. x. p. 328. Edit. Paris, 1720, and p. 241, Edit. Paris, 1631.

the first resurrection: a notion plainly built upon the text, Rev. xx. 5, "But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished. This is the first resurrection." This notion he admitted to have borrowed from the heretic Montanus.¹ Justin Martyr,² who professes to give a minute account of the mode of celebrating the Eucharist in his time, about A.D. 150, is totally silent both on the subject of prayers for the dead and Purgatory. The wily doctor suppresses the acknowledgment of Cyril that MANY, even in the fourth century, objected to prayers for the dead, though it occurs *in the very next sentence* quoted by him. "I wish," says Cyril, "to persuade you through an *illustration case*; for I know that MANY say this, 'What is a soul profited by your mentioning it in your prayer; whether it left this world with its sins, or not with its sins?'" Then comes the *case*, which is no proof whatever of the doctrine. "If a king should banish those who had offended him, and if their relatives should weave a crown for those under punishment and present it to him: would he not grant to them a remission (*ἀφεσις*) of their punishments?" The objection could never have been made by *many*, if it were well known that the doctrine and practice had been in the whole Church, or the universally accepted doctrine of the Church, from the very beginning. A *few* sceptical inquirers might have put such a question, but *many* persons could not. The very suppression by

¹ Tert. de Anim. Oper. p. 689, Edit. Rhenani, 1550; and vol. iv. cap. lviii. p. 335, Ed. Hal. Magd. 1770. "Hoc etiam Paracletus (Montanus) frequentissimè commendavit."—Ibid.

² Justin. Apolog. i. Oper. p. 73. Heidelb. apud Commel. 1593.

Dr. Wiseman shows that he felt its force. Why did he not honestly produce it?¹

I will dare venture to assert, that not one in a thousand of the readers of Dr. Wiseman's Lectures would have the slightest suspicion that he was being misled by this garbling of the Fathers, and would remain perfectly satisfied with the explanation given in the Lecture.

Roman Catholic writers, who undertake to defend their modern notions, and endeavour to make them square with the teaching of the early Christian Church, cannot afford to be honest. Dr. Newman has long since given up the idea, and has been driven to adopt what he calls a principle of "Development" to carry him through his difficulties.

Dr. Newman had certain scruples of conscience; he could not bring himself boldly to proclaim what he knew to be an untruth; he could not declare that such

¹ In the edition quoted by Dr. Wiseman the passage is thus Latinised in the margin:

"ix. Postea recordamur eorum quoque qui obdormierunt: primum patriarcharum, prophetarum, apostolorum, martyrum; ut Deus eorum precibus et legationibus orationem nostram suscipiat. Deinde et pro defunctis sanctis patribus et episcopis et omnibus generatim qui inter nos vita functi sunt [oramus]; maximum hoc credentes adjumentum illis animabus fore, pro quibus oratio defertur, dum sancta et per quam tremenda coram jacet victima. [So translated.]

"x. Hujus rei fidem vobis ab exemplo facere volo. Novi enim multos ita dicere: Quid juvat animam ex hoc mundo in peccatis, seu sine peccatis decedentem, si ejus in oratione mentio fiat? An verò, si rex quispiam viros à quibus offensus fuerit relegarit in exsilium; posteaque illi ad quos adtinent, coronam plectentes eam Regi pro suis pœna ab ipso afflictis obtulerint: nonne ipsi suppliciorum relaxationem gratificaturus sit? Ad eundem modum et nos pro defunctis, etiamsi peccatores sint, preces Deo offerentes, non coronam plectimus: sed Christum mactatum pro peccatis nostris offeremus, clementem Deum cum pro illis tum pro nobis demereri et propitiare satagentes." — Cat. Mystag. v. §§ ix. x. p. 328. Paris, 1720.

and such doctrines were laid down in the Fathers, and that the modern Trentisms are mere echoes of their declared opinions; he was not, at least if we are bound to believe him in this respect, born and bred a Romanist. The fraud, though even for the good of the Church, was too apparent to him on the face of it. He could not discover the truth of the assertions made by the Council of Trent, by Bellarmine, Milner, Berington, Wiseman, &c.; therefore, to make his declaration of faith consistent, he pretends that the doctrines lay hidden in the Church, but were not known, at least publicly; but, like reason or science, became *developed* by time. Dr. Newman's principle cuts at the very root of the Tridentine declaration of faith, which not only states that "Semper hæc fides in Ecclesia Dei fuit"—that this faith was always held in the Church of God—but that each particular doctrine is revealed to us in the Holy Scriptures, and have always been set forth and maintained by the ecclesiastical writers of the Church.¹ Dr. Newman's declaration has given dire offence to many of the Roman divines; his book is not admitted by the Church, though he himself is; he is necessary for their position, though a heretic; he is worth having at any price. Dr. Newman and Dr. Wiseman are opposed on first principles; therefore unity of doctrine and belief does not exist in the Roman Church.

But to return to Cyril. In the very same volume he explains himself on this subject in a manner that leaves

¹ See Concil. Trid. sess. xiii. c. 5; sess. xiv. c. 5-7; sess. xxiii. c. 1-3; sess. v. &c.

no doubt that he did not believe in Purgatory, for he writes:

“He who believes in the Son is not judged, but is translated from death to life. How great is the mercy of God! The just, indeed, were tried through many years; but that which they obtained by the diligence of a long life, Jesus *freely confers upon us in one hour*. For if you believe that the Lord is the Christ, and that God has raised Him from the dead, you shall be saved and transferred to Paradise by Him who therein introduced the thief.”¹

We see here that Cyril believed that our Lord confers His mercy and grace freely *upon us in an hour*, and declares that the believer is translated from *death to life*, and instances the fate of the thief on the cross; and yet with this passage before him, Dr. Wiseman asks, “Will you say that God forgives all sin at the moment of death? Where is the warrant for such an assertion?”² Cyril is attempted to be introduced as a proof in favour of one peculiar dogma, namely, praying for the dead, and is quoted as an authority. Dr. Wiseman cannot with consistency refuse to admit Cyril’s evidence on another subject, though contradicting his own opinions, unless he would depreciate

¹ Ὁ πιστεύων εἰς τὸν Υἱὸν οὐ κρίνεται, ἀλλὰ καταβέβηκεν ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου εἰς τὴν ζωὴν. Ὁ μεγάλῃς Θεοῦ φιλανθρωπίας· οἱ δίκαιοι μὲν γὰρ ἐν πολλοῖς ἔτεσιν εὐηρέστησαν· ὅπερ δὲ ἐκεῖνοι δι’ ἐρευνησεως πολλῶν ἐτῶν κατορθώσαντες ἐκτίσαντο, τοῦτο νῦν Ἰησοῦς διὰ μιᾶς ὥρας χαρίζεται. Ἐὰν γὰρ πιστεύσῃς, ὅτι Κύριος Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς, καὶ ὅτι ὁ Θεὸς ἤγειρεν αὐτὸν ἐκ νεκρῶν, σωθήσῃ καὶ μετατεθήσῃ εἰς Παράδεισον, ὑπὸ τοῦ τῆν ληστήν εἰς Παράδεισον εἰσαγαγόντος.—Cyril. Catech. v. sect. x. De Fide, pp. 76, 77. Paris, 1720.

² Lecture xi. vol. ii. p. 577.

altogether the value of the adverse testimony, as being the production of a young man;¹ he nevertheless does receive it when it apparently speaks in his favour.

Romanism is full of inconsistencies! Again, with the assumed attribute of infallibility, it is strange that the Roman Church has never authoritatively declared which are the genuine productions of the Fathers, that we may know with certainty what is the faith of the Church (see *ante*, p. 188), and *precisely to know what we should believe*. Except according to the unanimous consent of these same doubtful, uncertain, and contradictory writings, no portion of Scripture must be interpreted, and yet the Roman Church has put forward no canon of the Fathers! Dr. Wiseman quotes Cyril's Catechism as genuine, and from it wishes to prove the antiquity of a particular doctrine. Is he aware that great doubts have been raised as to the genuineness of the production? That it is believed that a certain John of Jerusalem, who lived about A.D. 767, a great advocate for the use of images, is the true author? The following passage bespeaks the eighth century rather than the times of Cyril, when he is made to say, approvingly, "that the wood of the cross increased and multiplied to such an extent that the earth was full of it."²

¹ Jerome said, referring to Cyril's work in question, "Extant ejus Κατηχῆσεις, quas in adolescentia composuit."—Hieron. Catal. Scrip. Eccles. cap. cxii. tom. i. p. 380. Paris, 1602.

² Τοῦ ξύλου τοῦ σταυροῦ πᾶσα λοιπὸν ἡ οἰκουμένη κατὰ μέρος ἐπληρώθη.—Cyril. Catech. iv. p. 56. Paris, 1720.

I have extended my notice on the extract from Cyril, as it will render an examination of two other passages of a similar nature unnecessary.

JEROME of the fifth century is quoted in reference to the *fire* alluded to in 1 Cor. iii. 15; but in his second book against Jovinian, he expressly refers to this *fire* as being the *temptations in this life* whereby a man is tried, and brought to the knowledge of his own weakness and sinfulness, as a preparation for the more perfect and excellent work of the spirit by which the trials and suffering of life will be assisted and lightened. And here I may observe that Dr. Wiseman expressly refers to this text, declaring that "several Fathers apply this text to the doctrine of Purgatory."¹ I most distinctly deny that Dr. Wiseman has produced any one authority to prove his gratuitous assertion; Origen, Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine are the only four authors he quotes, and not one of them has he shown as applying the text to prove, or even to refer to the Roman doctrine of Purgatory. And with this palpably erroneous assertion he takes upon himself to call the Rev. Hartwell Horne to account for saying, what is the truth, that the modern Popish doctrine of the fire of Purgatory is based on this text, which text has nothing to do with punishment hereafter, but only refers to the tribulations endured on earth.² Mr. Horne could have reminded Dr. Wiseman, of what he, in fact, well knew, but which was not convenient to be recorded in his Lectures, that even Cardinal Bellar-

¹ Lecture xi. p. 64, vol. ii.

² Reference given is "Horne, vol. ii. p. 473, seventh edition."

mine himself is compelled to acknowledge, that the two canonised saints, Augustine and Gregory, the latter a Pope, "and others," declare among other opinions, that the fire spoken of by St. Paul might be understood to be the *tribulations in this life*. Bellarmine even goes so far as to say that the "day" spoken of when the works shall be revealed by *fire* "by all the ancients seems to be understood *the day of the last judgment*."¹

Bellarmino and his servile imitators boldly quote Ambrose, Hilary, Origen, Basil, Lactantius, and Jerome, as holding the doctrine of Purgatory, because they speak of a *fire* of tribulation. Their own Sixtus Senensis² admits that all these writers allude to the fire which they supposed would consume all things at the end of the world, or day of judgment; nevertheless, Bellarmine and others cite *all*, and Dr. Wiseman *some*, of them as referring to the *fire of Purgatory*, which (according to modern Popery) has been in existence since the death of our Lord Christ!

I would ask any candid and thinking Romanist what faith can be placed in Dr. Wiseman's assertions?³

Jerome comes too late to be quoted as an authority

¹ "Omnes tamen veteres videntur accepisse per illam diem, diem ultimi judicii, ut Theodoretus," &c. &c., tom. ii. c. 4. De Purg. tom. ii. lib. v. p. 332. Prag. 1721.

² Sixt. Senens. in Biblioth. Sancta. Paris, 1610, lib. v. annot. 171.

³ The passage selected by Dr. Wiseman is from Jerome's exposition of chap. lxvi. of Isaiah. To such of my readers who are admirers of Jerome, the following scriptural exposition may be interesting, but I regret to say that I cannot add instructive:

"Porro qui volunt supplicia aliquando finiri, et licet post multa tempora, tamen terminum habere tormenta, his utuntur testimoniis. 'Cum intraverit plenitudo gentium, tunc omnis Israel salvus fiet. Et iterum, Concluserit Deus omnia sub peccato ut omnibus misereatur,' &c. &c.

to establish a doctrine, otherwise many passages might be quoted from his writings similar to those given from Ambrose's works,¹ but we can afford to content ourselves with the following observation.

Dr. Wiseman has chosen his own ground by asserting that the doctrines of prayers for the dead and Purgatory are inseparable, that one necessarily follows the other, and the essence of the Roman doctrine is that *souls*, or *bodies*, in Purgatory (they are not determined which, or if both go there) are assisted by the prayers and suffrages of the faithful in this world. Jerome, on the contrary, taught exactly the reverse, for, following Diodorus Tarensis, who taught "the dead have no hope of any succour from man;"² he said:

"While we are in this present world we may be able to help one another, either by our prayers, or by our counsels; but when we shall come before the judgment-seat of Christ, neither Job, nor Daniel, nor Noah, can entreat for any one, but every one must bear his own burden."³

And on the first chapter of Joel, he says:

"That which shall happen unto all at the day of judgment, is accomplished in every one at the day of his death."⁴

¹ See particularly in his Epistle xxii. ad Paulam, tom. iv. pars ii. col. 56. Paris, 1706.

² Οἱ νεκροὶ ἐλπίζουσιν οὐκέτι βοήθειαν ἀνθρωπίνην οὐδεμίαν. Diodor. Caten. Græc. in Psalm. lxxxvii. 5. MS. in publica Oxoniensis Academiæ Bibliotheca. Quoted by Usher.

³ "Obscure licet docemur, per hanc sententiam, novum dogma quod latitat: dum in præsentī seculo sumus, sive orationibus sive consiliis invicem posse nos coadjuvari; cum autem ante tribunal Christi venerimus, non Job, non Daniel, nec Noe rogare posse pro quoquam, sed unumquemque portare onus suum."—Hieronym. lib. iii. Commentar. in Galat. cap. vi. tom. iv. col. 311. Paris, 1706.

⁴ "Quid enim in die iudicii futurum est omnibus, hoc in singulis dies mortis impletur."—In Joel. cap. 2, edit. as above; and tom. vi. p. 49, Frankfort Edit., 1684.

Sentiments wholly repugnant to the doctrine of Purgatory.

Dr. Wiseman's last witness is ST. AUGUSTINE, also of the fifth century. After the extracts already given, I might be spared further remark upon the sentiments of this writer; but as he is expressly quoted I shall give the references a passing notice.

There are two passages adduced, the first having reference to the text Matt. xii. 32, and the second to the disputed text of 1 Cor. iii. 15.

The first is quoted from Augustine's work, "City of God," lib. xxi. cap. 24. This passage is also quoted by Bellarmine in proof of Purgatory.¹ I have already fully proved that the text in question from St. Matthew does not in any way prove the doctrine of Purgatory (see *ante*, p. 178); and with regard to the passage itself, stated to have been written by Augustine, Ludovicus Vives, a Roman Catholic commentator on this particular work, acknowledges that "in the ancient copies (or manuscripts), which are found at Bruges and Cologne, those ten or twelve lines which follow are not to be found,—those things which follow are not extant in them, neither in the copies printed at Friburg."² Nor is the passage found in the Paris manuscript 1531.³

As to the second reference, Bellarmine, as we have seen, admits the text from 1 Cor. iii. to be a *vexata questio* among the Fathers. He gives Augustine's in-

¹ Bell. de Purg. tom. ii. p. 330. Prag. 1721.

² Lud. Vives, in lib. De Civ. Dei, lib. xxi. c. 24, p. 865. London, 1610.

³ See Dailé "On the right use of the Fathers," cap. iv. p. 41. London, 1841.

terpretation of the *fire*. “But he shall be saved yet so as by fire,” as meaning the “*tribulations of this life*.”¹

Augustine has written at considerable length on this text, and instead of giving a scrap, as Dr. Wiseman has done, I will transcribe the whole context, and see what Augustine does really say. I quote from the work, “*Enchiridion de Fide*,” &c., attributed to Augustine:

“For the fire of which the Apostle speaks, must be understood to be such a fire as both could pass through, that is to say, as well he who builds upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, as he who builds upon it wood, hay, stubble. For when he had said this, he added, ‘And the fire shall try every man’s work, of what sort it is; if any man’s work abide, which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man’s work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire.’ The fire, therefore, shall prove the work not of one of them only, but of both of them. The trial of tribulation is a sort of fire, respecting which it is clearly written in another passage, ‘The furnace proves the potter’s vessel, and the trial of tribulation just men.’ That fire effects in this life what the Apostle affirms, if it occurs to two believers, to the one, namely, who thinks of the things of God, how he may please God, that is to say, who builds upon Christ the foundation, gold, silver, precious stones; and to the other, who thinks of worldly things, how he may please his wife, that is to say, who builds upon the same foundation, wood, hay, stubble. For the work of the former is not burned, because he did not love those things by whose loss he might be tormented; but the work of the latter is burnt, because these things which are loved in their possession, are not destroyed without grief. But forasmuch as when the alternative was presented to him, he preferred being

¹ “*Aliqui intelligunt tribulationes hujus vitæ.—Quocirca B. Augustinus et Gregorius, qui sunt auctores.*”—Bell. de Purg. lib. i. c. 5, p. 332. Prag. 1721.

without them to being without Christ, and did not through the fear of losing them desert Christ, although he grieved for their loss; *he is saved*, indeed, *yet so as by fire*: because the grief for the things which he loved consumes him; but it does not overthrow him, he being supported by the stability and incorruptibility of the foundation. *But that some such thing may take place after this life is not incredible, and whether it is so may be inquired into; and it may either be discovered or lie concealed, namely, that some believers are saved through a Purgatorial fire, sooner or later, in proportion as they have more or less loved perishable goods, not those persons, however, of whom it is said, 'They shall not possess the kingdom of God,' unless, indeed, their crimes are remitted to them in consequence of their seasonable repentance.'*¹

¹ "Ignis enim, de quo eo loco est locutus Apostolus, talis debet esse intelligi, ut ambo per eum transeant, id est, et qui ædificat super hoc fundamentum aurum, argentum, lapides pretiosos; et qui ædificat ligna, fœnum, et stipulam. Cùm enim hoc dixisset, adjunxit, *Uniuscujusque opus quale sit, ignis probabit. Si cujus opus permanserit, quod super-ædificavit, mercedem accipiet. Si cujus opus autem exustum fuerit, damnum patietur: ipse autem salvus erit, sic tamen quasi per ignem.* Non ergo unius eorum, sed utriusque opus ignis probabit. Et quidem ignis tentatio tribulationis, de quo apertè alio loco scriptum est, 'Vasa figuli probat fornax, et homines justos tentatio tribulationis.' Iste ignis in hâc interim vitâ facit quod Apostolus dixit, si accidat duobus fidelibus, uni scilicet cogitantî, quæ Dei sunt, quomodo placeat Deo, hoc est, ædificanti super Christum fundamentum aurum, argentum, lapides pretiosos; alteri autem cogitanti ea quæ sunt mundi, quomodo placeat uxori, id est, ædificanti super idem fundamentum ligna, fœnum, stipulam. Illius autem opus non exurit, quia non ea dilexit quorum amissione crucietur; exurit autem hujus, quoniam sine dolore non pereunt, quæ cum amore possessa sunt. Sed quoniam alterutrâ conditione propositâ, eis potiùs carere mallet quàm Christo, nec timore amittendi talia deserit Christum, quamvis doleat cùm amittit; *salvus est, quidem, sic tamen, quasi per ignem*: quia urit eum rerum dolor, quas dilexerat, amissarum; sed non subvertit neque consumit fundamenti stabilitate atque incorruptone munitum. Tale aliquid etiam post hanc vitam fieri *incredibile* non est, et utiùm ita sit quæri potest; et aut inveniri, aut latere, nonnullos fideles per ignem quemdam purgatorium, quanti magis minusve bona pereuntia dilexerunt, tantò tardius citiusque salvari; non tamen tales de quibus dictum est, quòd regnum Dei non possidebunt, nisi convenienter pœnitentibus eadem crimina remittantur."—Aug. Enchiridion de Fide, Spe, et Caritate, tom. iv. p. 222. Bened. Edit. Paris, 1685, and Colon. Agripp. 1616, tom. iv. p. 250.

I ask any reasonable man whether, from the above extract, he can gather the acknowledgment, even in the fifth century, of the existence of the Romish doctrine of Purgatory; and, indeed, were Augustine's definition to agree point by point with the modern interpretation, Roman Catholics would be none the nearer in establishing their position, for Augustine expresses himself in a doubting manner. He there proposes a doctrine as not being *incredible*, or whether it be so might *be inquired into*; and he admits that the language, or opinion of St. Paul, is very difficult to understand.¹ "A subject upon which the erudition of himself or others might be exercised, but which was in no wise sanctioned by canonical authority."² But this is undeniable evidence that in Augustine's time Purgatory was not a matter of *faith*, and what is stated by him is only a matter of opinion.

It may not be out of place here to make a few observations on the text itself, and show its irrelevancy to the doctrine it is quoted to establish.

It will be perceived that five out of the eight Fathers cited by Dr. Wiseman refer to the text, 1 Cor. iii. 15, a text which bears an admittedly different interpretation, and all these writers, it is pretended, quote the text as referring *exclusively* to the Popish doctrine

¹ "Illa sententia Pauli Apostoli ad intelligendum difficilis."—August. de Octo Dulcit. Quæst. sect. vi. tom. vi. col. 124, C. Paris, 1605.

² "Cum iis quæ scribimus, ita nostra vel aliarum, exerceatur et erudiatum infirmitas, ut tamen in eis nulla velut canonica constituatur auctoritas."—Aug. de Octo Dulcitiis Quæst. Q. iii. sect. iii. tom. vi. col. 131, E. Paris, 1685.

of Purgatory. Such a notion is a pure invention—a fiction.

I will not presume to put forward an interpretation of this text as to the Apostle's meaning, in the face of so many conflicting opinions. The Church of Rome has never taken upon herself to favour her children with an infallible interpretation, declaring the sense of the Church, nor has she published *the unanimous consent* of the Fathers. I may, nevertheless, be permitted to show that there is no reasonable ground for believing that this text has any reference whatever to Purgatory.

St. Paul is speaking figuratively, and his words cannot be taken in a literal sense. He calls the ministers of Christ *labourers*, the hearers *God's husbandry*, afterwards *God's building*. He changes the figure, and compares himself to a *wise master-builder*, who had laid his *foundation* JESUS CHRIST. Others who should succeed him in his office of preaching and ministration would build on this foundation, *but* (he says), *let every man take heed what he buildeth thereon*. For there is but one only Foundation, which is neither Paul, Apollos, nor Peter, but Christ.

The Apostle then suggests that whatever may be built on the foundation, *gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, or stubble, every man's work shall be made manifest. For the day shall declare it*. It is evident that all this language is figurative; and if so, why should not the remainder of the passage be also figurative, for it continues to tell us that *every man's work shall be revealed by fire*, and this *fire shall try every*

man's work of what sort it is? The *fire* being plainly also a figurative expression, referring to the previous figures used, metals and combustibles.

On a careful perusal of the entire chapter, it is most evident that this metaphorical, probatory fire has reference to the trial and manifestation of the doctrine of *false teachers*, and not to a literal penal fire for the general purgation of the souls of men; and there is no warrant whatever for the assertion that "the day" named by St. Paul when our works are to be declared has any reference to the time when the souls of men are supposed to be suffering in Purgatory: on the contrary, it is much more probable that the day of judgment is here meant; and indeed, if by "*the day*" is meant Purgatory, we may object to its being a Romish Purgatory, as by the Popish doctrine, men's *works* are not then either *made manifest* or *declared*.

But the language used by St. Paul, whether it be figurative or not, will not bear the interpretation Romanists seek to establish. According to modern notions, apostles, martyrs, saints, &c., do not undergo the trial, whereas the Apostle says, that the fire shall try *every man's work*. Again, the fire of Purgatory is for *punishing* men's souls, the *sin* has been ascertained and forgiven, and it is now paying by sufferings the debt due to God's justice, the *paying* of the last farthing; whereas the process spoken of in the text is a *probing, sifting, trying*, of every man's work to test what sort it is. Purgatory is for *purifying*, Paul only speaks of *trying*.

As this fire is to try every man's works, it must be to try *all* works, while modern Purgatory is only for the purging of *venial* sins. Pope Gregory, at the latter

end of the sixth century, thought that the fire spoken of was only to consume the lightest and most trivial and minute faults. If any one examine the pages of Liguori's Moral Theology, he will readily see that the accepted modern Roman definition of venial sins, cannot come under Gregory's definition of "*peccata minuta atque levissima.*"¹

Again, in the fourteenth verse, we are told that *if any man's works abide, he shall receive a reward*, which suggests the probability that some will *not* receive a reward, while all those who go to Purgatory *do* ultimately receive that reward.

And, lastly, *if a man's works be burnt, he shall suffer loss, but he himself shall be saved.* No person who goes to Purgatory *suffers loss*, nor are his works burnt. But how is he saved?—*by fire?* No such thing. The Apostle, carrying on the metaphor, says,

¹ Pope Gregory, if the work bearing his name be in fact genuine, was the first writer whose works have come down to us who advocated what very much approaches modern Purgatory. He quotes 1 Cor. iii. 15 in support of his views. I subjoin an extract in order to show how far even Pope Gregory was from leading us to believe that Dr. Wiseman's Purgatory was held even at that comparatively late period; and we may ask how this modern Cardinal can presume to speak dogmatically, when a Pope and canonised saint spoke with caution and hesitation?

"Nam, cum Paulus dicat Christum esse fundamentum, atque subjungat, 'Si quis superædificat, super hoc fundamentum, aurum, argentum, lapides pretiosos, ligna, fœnum, stipulam, uniuscujusque opus quale sit, ignis probabit; si cujus opus arserit, detrimentum patietur: ipse autem salvus erit, sed tamen quasi per ignem:' quamvis hoc de igne tribulationis, in hac nobis vita adhibito, possit intelligi; tamen, si quis hoc de igne futuræ purgationis accipiat, pensandum sollicitè est, quia illum per ignem dixit posse salvari, non qui, super hoc fundamentum, ferrum, æs, vel plumbum, ædificat, hoc est, peccata majora, et idcirco duriora, atque tunc jam insolubilia; sed ligna, fœnum, stipulam, id est, *peccata minuta atque levissima*, quæ ignis facile consumat. Hoc tamen sciendum est; quia illic saltem de minimis nihil quisque purgationis obtinebit, nisi bonis hoc actibus, in hac adhuc vita positus, ut illic obtineat, promereatur."—Gregor. Magn. Dialog. lib. iv. c. 39, tom. ii. p. 442. Paris, 1705.

ὡς διὰ πυρός, so as by fire, plainly a figurative expression denoting "with great difficulty," so often met with in classic writers.¹ The figure is not unfrequently used in other parts of the Scriptures; as in Amos iv. 11, when he reprov'd the Israelites for their idolatry and wickedness: "I have overthrown some of you, as God overthrew Sodom and Gomorrah, and ye were also as a firebrand plucked out of the burning"—that is, they were in the greatest danger of being overthrown, but were saved as a firebrand plucked out of the fire; and to the like effect in Zech. iii. 2, Jude 23, and Psalm lxvi. 12.

Faber, a priest of Rome, on this text observes, that "this authority is certainly very obscure; and various explanations are offered, not only from different Fathers and Doctors, but even from the same Doctor. Augustine interprets this place in various ways."² Is an admittedly doubtful and obscure text to be quoted to establish a point of doctrine? and is a writer who gives various and conflicting interpretations of the same text, to be cited as an authority for our guidance?

But to return to the opinions of Augustine.

In the Popish Purgatory, it is asserted that souls can be assisted by the suffrages, alms, good deeds, prayers, &c., of the living; while, on the contrary, Augustine said, "There can be no help for mercy afforded by just men to the souls of the deceased, although the righteous would desire to have it so,

¹ See various passages collected in Elliott's *Delineations of Popery*, p. 254, 3rd Edit. London, 1851.

² "Hæc auctoritas est certe valde obscura, et variæ explicationes offeruntur, non solum a diversis Patribus et Doctoribus, sed ad eodem Doctore. Augustinus hunc locum variis modis interpretatur."—Faber, lib. ii. p. 444. Paris, 1720.

because the sentence of God is immutable."¹ And again: "Such as a man is when he dieth, for such he is judged of God; neither can the sentence of God be changed, corrected, or diminished."² And again, in the same place, he says: "Wherein every man's last day finds him, therein the world's last day will hold him."³ And in another place: "Know ye this, that when the soul is separated from the body, it is either immediately placed in paradise for its good works, or cast headlong into the depths of hell for its sins."⁴

"The Catholic faith," he said, "resting on divine authority, believes the first place, the kingdom of heaven, and the second, hell; a third place we are wholly ignorant of: YEA, WE SHALL FIND IN SCRIPTURES THAT IT IS NOT."⁵ And yet Dr. Wiseman asserts that Augustine's reason in quoting St. Paul's words *is here precisely the same as he, Dr. Wiseman, has used, and every [Roman] Catholic now uses.*"⁶

Bold assertions may with some persons pass as a substitute for *truth* and *proof*. With credulous and over-confiding Romanists this may be the case; but,

¹ "Nullum auxilium misericordiæ potest præberi a justis defunctorum animabus etiamsi justii præbere velint, quia est immutabilis divina sententia."—Quæst. Evan. i. 2, c. 38.

² "Qualis quisque moritur talis a Deo judicatur, nec potest mutari, corrigi, vel minui divina sententia."—Ep. lxxx. ad Hesych.

³ "In quo enim quemque invenerit suus novissimus dies, in hoc eum comprehendet mundi novissimus dies."—Ibid. Edit. Basil. 1569, al. 199, § ii. Edit. Bened.

⁴ "Scitote vero quod, cum anima a corpore evellitur, statim aut in paradiso pro meritis bonis collocatur, aut certe pro peccatis in inferni tartara præcipitatur."—Aug. de Vanit. Seculi, cap. i. tom. ix. col. 947. Basil. 1569.

⁵ "Tertium penitus ignoramus, immò nec esse in Scripturis Sanctis invenimus."—Aug. Hypog. contra Pelag. lib. v. tom. vii. col. 1405. Basil. 1569.

⁶ Lecture xi. p. 63, vol. ii.

taking things on trust does not accord with the temperament and education of Protestants, nor do we find it agree with the admonition of St. Paul, who invited his readers to "prove all things."

It has been a well-established fact that there is much put forward under the name of Augustine which is of comparatively modern date, and these bear their own refutation, as they make Augustine contradict himself several times; but even Augustine amended does not go far enough to prove that the modern doctrine of Purgatory was held in his day, for, in addition to the doubtful manner in which he speaks of the matter, he plainly refers to a future punishment, to the fire which should consume all things at the end of the world at the *future* day of judgment, and not to any present *Purgatory*.¹

But of what value, in the estimation of Roman Catholics themselves, can be the testimony of Augustine in favour of any Popish doctrine when we find it openly acknowledged, in the preface to the Index of Prohibited Books, reprinted at Geneva, that "great care had been taken [in the Venice edition of this Father] to remove all those things which might either infect the minds of the faithful with heresies, or cause them to wander from the Catholic faith?"²

¹ "Vespera autem illa *finis est seculi*; et caminus ille, veniens dies judicii: divisit, inter media illa quæ divisa erant, etiam caminus," &c. —Aug. Enarr. in Psalm. ciii. conc. 3, Oper. vol. viii. p. 430. Edit. Col. Agrip. 1616. Mr. Faber, in his "Difficulties of Romanism," book ii. chap. v. third edition, has done full justice to this part of the argument.

² "Curavimus removeri illa omnia quæ fidelium mentes hæreticâ pravitate possint inficere, aut a Catholica et orthodoxa fide deviare."—

It is not only the application of the pruning-knife of which we have to complain, but the grafting of strange and unnatural branches to the original stock, so that where we expect to find grapes, we find wild grapes.

Dr. Wiseman cannot plead ignorance of these frauds; "The Sacred Congregation of the Index" is a regularly constituted body, and forms an essential portion of the Roman Church; it has its Prefect and associated Cardinals, its secretary and consultors, and Dr. Wiseman is the authorised consultor in England. The plea of ignorance of the several matters I have endeavoured to expose, will scarcely be admitted by any one. To account, then, for these strange perversions, we are reduced to one only alternative. . . .

I have now reduced Dr. Wiseman's arguments and sophistries to plain matters of fact. All his scriptural and patristic quotations have been passed under review; and I sum up with the following "conclusion," with confidence leaving my case to the good judgment of the reader:

Præfat. Ind. Lib. Prohibit. ad Lectorem. Genevæ, impress. an. 1629. "In hunc modum est repurgatis, ut in libri inscriptione testantur qui editioni præfuerunt."—Ibid. p. 6.

In the "Bibliothèque Curieuse" of Clement there is a long and precise account of the edition here alluded to, printed at Venice in 1570, tom. ii. pp. 265-268.

CONCLUSION.

I have now laid before the reader :

I. The teaching of the Church of Rome, on the doctrine of Purgatory, derived from authentic and unexceptionable sources.

II. The acknowledgment on the part of Dr. Wiseman, of his inability to prove the truth of such doctrine, from THE WORD of GOD.

III. The abortive endeavour to link this Popish figment with another unscriptural custom of *praying for the dead*, in order to claim for it the sanction both of Scripture and the authority of the early Christian Church.

IV. That to establish the custom of *praying for the dead*, Dr. Wiseman is compelled to appeal to writings (the Books of Maccabees), which the most learned divines of antiquity have declared to be apocryphal; and from these writings to select a text, which appears to recommend a custom which is repudiated by his Church. And the very first ecclesiastical writer he names, specially declares that this particular custom is founded entirely on tradition, and grounded on no warranty of Scripture; this alleged Jewish custom being nowhere approved of or referred to, in any part of the canonical Scriptures.

V. That the other text from Matt. xii. 32, cited, contradicts the position assumed by the former text, and is quite irrelevant to the subject.

VI. That in order to show how wholly different was the early Christian custom of praying for the dead, both in purpose and effect, from the modern custom under the same name, I have traced the origin and progress of the custom, and examined the same with testimony *omitted* to be noticed by Dr. Wiseman, as also with the very passages cited by him.

VII. I have shown that not one word of evidence has been adduced from any of the writers, acknowledged as orthodox, by the Roman Catholic Church, of the three first centuries. Two of these authorities cited are repudiated by that Church. The other authors are either misquoted, or misrepresented, or the passages quoted are irrelevant to the subject at issue.

VIII. That Dr. Wiseman has not adduced one single Father or ecclesiastical writer who defines, upholds, or in any way advocates, the notion of a Roman Catholic Purgatory.

Inasmuch as the Council of Trent professes and decrees that the Roman Church, "instructed by the Holy Ghost, has, from the *sacred writings and the ancient traditions of the Fathers*, taught that there is a Purgatory, and that the souls there detained are relieved by the suffrages of the faithful;" and Dr. Wiseman, as a faithful son of the Church, has sworn "undoubtedly to receive and profess all things delivered, defined, and declared," by this Synod, and with God's help to retain and confess the same entire, and to take care that they be held, and taught, and preached, by those under his charge; we must regard the Lecture under review as a vindication of this solemnly pledged oath. Dr.

Wiseman, further, *commends his book to the favour and protection of the ALMIGHTY, begging his blessing upon both writer and reader!* (*preface, p. ix.*) I ask the candid and thinking reader to examine the evidence on which Dr. Wiseman rests such vindication; and judge for himself, whether any case has been made out either from the sacred writings or the ancient traditions of the Fathers, in support of the assertion "that there is a Purgatory, and that the souls there detained are relieved by the suffrages of the faithful," or that he has established that *the belief of the Universal Church on this point* coincides with the modern teaching of his Church. And though it may be a part of his bounden duty "ever to hold it as a fixed principle that what he sees *white* to believe to be *black* if his Church so define it to be,"¹ he cannot expect reasonable and thinking Christians of the nineteenth century, who have no worldly preferment or profit to attain by the confession, to admit as true what are patent, palpable Popish frauds, though such frauds are endorsed by the vivifying genius of a DR. WISEMAN, or any other prelate of his Church.

Reader, I ask, Are not these **POPISH FRAUDS FULLY EXEMPLIFIED BY DR. WISEMAN'S LECTURE?**

¹ "Spiritual Exercise of St. Ignatius," edited, with a Preface, by Dr. Wiseman. London, Dolman, 1847, p. 180.





