

LECTURES
ON
PAPAL INDULGENCES
—
REV. R. MAGUIRE

110. d.
195.

PAPAL INDULGENCES:

Two Lectures,

DELIVERED ON

TUESDAY, SEPT. 21, AND FRIDAY, SEPT. 24, 1852,

BY THE

REV. ROBERT MAGUIRE, B.A.

Clerical Secretary of the "Islington Protestant Institute,"

IN

ST. PETER'S SCHOOL-ROOMS,

RIVER-LANE, ISLINGTON,

IN EXAMINATION OF A WORK ON "INDULGENCES," EDITED BY THE REV. FREDERICK OAKELEY, M.A., ROMAN CATHOLIC PRIEST IN ISLINGTON, AND RECOMMENDED BY HIM TO THE LECTURER, IN REPLY TO A PUBLISHED LETTER ON THE ABOVE SUBJECT.



LONDON:

J. H. JACKSON, 21, PATERNOSTER-ROW,
AND ISLINGTON-GREEN;

SEELEYS, FLEET-STREET.

1852.

110. d. 195.

LECTURE I.

MR. CHAIRMAN AND CHRISTIAN FRIENDS,

I appear before you this evening for a certain purpose, viz., to offer a reply to a book on the subject of "Indulgences," which has, within the past few days, been recommended to my attention by the Rev. Mr. Oakeley, a Roman Catholic Priest in this parish. In whatever remarks I may be led to make this evening, you must bear in mind, that I deal not in personalities; my object is not to assail a person, but to expose a fearful error. I deal with Mr. Oakeley this evening, not as a private individual, but rather, in his official character, as a public and acknowledged agent of the Church of Rome.

You have, doubtless, heard ere this of the letter which the Rev. Mr. Haslegrave and myself have addressed to the Rev. Mr. Oakeley, in reference to my recent Lectures in this place; * in reply, I received a letter, dated 6th September, to the substance of which the Chairman (Rev. Joseph Haslegrave) has just alluded. Mr. Oakeley states therein, that he is "not very much inclined to controversial writing," and recommends to me a book which has been translated and edited by him, and to which he has prefixed a short preface. This book is the production of a French Roman Catholic Bishop (Bp. Bouvier); it is "translated from the French, with a preface, by the Rev. Frederick Oakeley, M.A."

Mr. Oakeley concludes his letter by the following, viz., "I will not fail to read your book carefully, and if I feel that any part of it suggests the necessity of explanation, I will endeavour to find time for a private note; but if I cannot, I must protest against the silence of a particular writer, who happens to be challenged to a reply, indicating any want of theological means on the part of the [Roman] Catholic Church to vindicate her own doctrines."

* "Letter to Rev. F. Oakeley." J. H. Jackson, Islington-green.

In the preface, he, however, admits that the book does not anticipate the "ordinary Protestant cavils or allegations." If so, how can it be received as a *reply* to the letter which I lately forwarded to him? Why has it been recommended to my perusal, *in answer* to the published pamphlet on "Indulgences?" I have, accordingly, waited patiently for a full fortnight, expecting some public or private notice of the pamphlet; and seeing that time passed by without any such notice, Mr. Haslegrave and myself arranged these Lectures in reply to that only answer which Mr. Oakeley thought proper to give, viz., this book which he has edited, and to which he has written a preface.

In order that Mr. Oakeley should be fully informed as to our proceedings in this matter, I addressed to him, on last Saturday (18th September), the following note; viz.,

"12, Lonsdale-square, 18th September, 1852.

"REV. SIR,—I have to acknowledge the receipt of your favour of the 6th inst. I have purchased the book which you were good enough to recommend to my perusal, and I have read it throughout.

"You stated in your letter that you would carefully read the Pamphlet on 'Indulgences,' and that if you should consider it necessary, you would reply to it.

"I have since awaited your reply, but already a fortnight has almost elapsed without any further notice from you, either public or private.

"I must, therefore, *so far*, regard your note of the 6th inst., and the book therein recommended, as your *only reply* to the 'Letter' addressed to you on 'Indulgences.'

"I now, therefore, beg to inform you, that I intend (D.V.) to deliver a Lecture in reply to the book thus recommended by you, and I now beg to invite you to attend the meeting which will be held for that purpose on Tuesday evening next, 21st inst., at half-past seven o'clock, in St. Peter's school-room.

"I need hardly add that your letter of the 6th inst., and whatever may be written on this subject, must, to a certain degree, become public property.

"And I remain, yours truly,

"Rev. F. Oakeley."

"ROBERT MAGUIRE, Clerk."

Seeing, then, my beloved friends, that these letters have passed between us, and that we are now clearly entered on this controversy, it seems that Mr. Oakeley, as the exponent of Roman Catholic views, and of the Roman Catholic system in this parish, *must* come forward, else his cause must be acknowledged to be untenable and frail. I appear this evening with pleasure, to take in hand this book thus recommended to me by Mr. Oakeley, and to

examine what ideas he may entertain, and what sentiments he may hold, concerning this doctrine of "Indulgences." We shall consider the subject as given by Mr. Oakeley and by other Roman Catholic writers, and take our facts and illustrations from Roman Catholic Historians.

I must, at the outset, notice the very great ambiguity which, in Roman Catholic theology, manifestly besets this topic, even as to *the meaning and import* of the very term "Indulgence." For instance, we find Popes in many past ages, and even up to the present time, stating in their decrees, that they grant Indulgences "for the remission of *sins*." Cardinal Baronius, as I quoted on a former occasion, records Bulls of Popes on this subject, containing these identical words. We find, however, the Council of Trent, in a hasty moment, on the last day of their last Session, when the Council was on the point of dissolution,—then, and not till then,—defining this subject of "Indulgences" to be "the remission of *punishment due to sin*." This definition, however, has not removed the ambiguity of the term; for *since* the Council of Trent, we have Popes, again and again, publishing Bulls, announcing that an Indulgence means "the remission of *sin* itself." This point is somehow treated of in Mr. Oakeley's preface, and an explanation is attempted. He suggests one or two explanations of this difficulty. One would surely have imagined that in the Church of Rome, where everything is said to be so "certain," there would be but *one* meaning to a term like this. Not so, however, in this question; for Mr. Oakeley suggests, as a probable answer, that these Indulgences may "*tend* to the remission of sin." If so, why not thus stated in the Papal Bulls?—why perpetuate this ambiguity? Another explanation, however, is also suggested, and that by no means favourable to the Church of Rome, viz., (p. ix.) the author (Bishop Bouvier) "considers that Bulls which profess to remit *sin*, are commonly *spurious* or *apocryphal*!"

Let us examine this point. In A.D. 1095, Pope Urban II. published a Bull, announcing that an Indulgence,—that is, a "remission of sins," and not, mark you, of *the punishment due to sin*;—that a "remission of *sins*" would be granted to all those who would take up arms and fight in the Crusades! Pope Eugenius III. (as recorded by Cardinal Baronius, A.D. 1145) stated that those who had

incurred debts, if they took up arms in the Crusade, "need not pay the interest for the past." He confirms the decree, and renews the promise of his predecessor above-named, Urban II.

Again ; in Dupin's "Ecclesiastical History" (Dupin is a Roman Catholic historian), we find that at the Council of Lateran, A.D. 1215, Innocent III. not only granted to those who would fight in the Crusades "*a plenary indulgence of all their sins,*" but also promised them "*a more perfect degree of eternal happiness than to others,*" (Dupin, vol. ii. p. 453.)

We now come to later times ; and we find, in 1850, the present Pope, Pius IX., granted an Indulgence. For what, think ye, and to whom was it granted ?—To all those who should pray before the "Winking Picture," at Rimini ! I quote from "The Lamp," a Roman Catholic newspaper, Sept. 21st, 1850, the following Brief of Pope Pius IX., to the Bishop of Rimini :

"You may imagine, Venerable Brother, what a consolation to our heart was your letter of the 29th of this month, wherein you inform us that you, and the Clergy of the City of Rimini, long, with the utmost ardour, to give to the most Holy Virgin a public and striking mark of your eminent piety and gratitude ; that you have resolved to *adorn with a crown of gold that picture*, which under the title of the Mother of Mercy, and according to the report you gave us of it, having been rendered famous for two months past throughout all this country, by the *miraculous movement of its eyes*, is to the great advantage of the Faithful honoured and venerated with much piety and devotion * * *

"For these causes, by these presents, we grant and concede to you, Venerable Brother, with our entire good will, the permission to *offer in our name and with our authority, a crown of gold to that picture of the most Holy Virgin to-morrow, under the title of Mother of Mercy*, taking care to observe throughout what ought to be observed in such a ceremony * *

"Furthermore, by our apostolical authority, to all and every of the faithful of both sexes, who having confessed and communicated, shall devoutly visit the church where the holy picture is placed, and shall there pray from the heart for our intentions, and those of our Holy Mother the Church ; we grant, in the mercy of the Lord, a *Plenary Indulgence and the remission of all sins* applicable to the souls in Purgatory."

We now consult Mr. Oakeley regarding this Papal Decree ; and it becomes at once a grand uncertainty, a matter encompassed by difficulties ; for, according to this book, such Bulls are commonly "*spurious and apocryphal !*"

Let us now, however, come nearer home. We instance the primary cause of these Lectures—"the great Indulgence of Portiuncula," at St. John's Roman Catholic Chapel,

Islington. Here we find the Rev. Frederick Oakeley, "prostrate at the feet of his Holiness," humbly soliciting the Indulgence of Portiuncula. His request is granted.* Pius IX. promises an Indulgence to all those who shall pray in that chapel "for the exaltation of the Roman Catholic Church, and the extirpation of heresies" (and, I presume, with heresy, of *Heretics* also); to all such he grants "*a Plenary Indulgence, in the Lord, for all their sins!*" So that even this Bull of the *Portiuncula Indulgence*, notwithstanding all that has been said about it, becomes an utter uncertainty! Pius IX. proclaims to all those who will worship in yonder chapel, "*a Plenary Indulgence for all their sins;*" but Mr. Oakeley, the Priest of the chapel, considers "such Bulls to be commonly *spurious and apocryphal!*"

The author divides his book into four parts, and I shall take the liberty of making a fifth division. I. he treats of "Indulgences in General;" II. of "Indulgences in Particular;" III. of "Confraternities and Sodalities;" IV. of "The Jubilee;" and to these I add that which is distributed throughout the whole book, and which lays the axe to the root of this destructive error, V. "The utter *Uncertainty and Inefficiency of the System,*" Mr. Oakeley himself being judge.

First, then, as to the system of "Indulgences generally." The author gives a definition of an Indulgence, as we defined it on a former occasion, when we took these four objections to it—(I.) That there is no such thing as "punishment remaining due to sin" after the sin is forgiven, and by way of satisfaction to the justice of God. (II.) That there is no such place as "Purgatory," from which the soul can be released by Indulgences. (III.) That there is no such thing in existence, as the merits of Saints who have done *over and above* what it was their duty to do, and which can be applied to those who have done *less than* is their duty. And (IV.) even if there were such an accumulated treasure in existence, that such is not placed in the custody, or at the disposal of, the Pope of Rome;—these points remain unanswered!

In Article I., "of the punishment due to sin" (p. 3)

* See *Catholic Standard*, July 31st, 1852.

the Author says, "There are two kinds of actual sin (called also personal sins, in opposition to original sin), that is, *mortal* sin and *venial* sin." Of course, were I to go through all these principal and essential doctrines of Romanism, on the present occasion, the morning sun would have arisen before I should cease my task. I do not, then, intend now to enter into all these distinct doctrines, such as the difference between "mortal" and "venial" sins; I shall merely take a cursory glance at such as I proceed. I may just say, then, that this distinction between "mortal" and "venial" sin practically encourages immorality and vice in those who hold the doctrine; and this thought itself would be enough to condemn it in the mind of any true Christian, as it can be proved that such distinction is practically subversive of truth, morality, and even common-place honesty. In Dr. Doyle's (a Roman Catholic Bishop) "Catechism" (p. 63), we have the following question:—"When is a theft mortal sin?"—Now, suppose a child is asked this question? He naturally thinks with himself, "Then theft is not *always* a mortal sin!" and proceeds to examine *how much* he may steal from this or that person, and yet be guiltless of breaking God's command?—and this search he can prosecute, with great success, in Dens' "Theology," in the works of Liguori, and others. Of course, I have not time now to enter into all these; but the following is the answer to the question:

Ques. "When is a theft mortal sin?"

Ans. "When the thing stolen is of *considerable value*, or causeth a considerable hurt to our neighbour."

Thus a child or an adult person sees a piece of money on his master's desk; it is not of any considerable value, and to steal it would not make the owner a whit the poorer. The vicious propensity is satisfied, and yet, in Romish theology, no breach of God's commandments ensues!

In p. 46 of this same "Catechism,"—which, you should remember, is an accredited document in the Church of Rome,—in chapter VIII., this question is asked:

Ques. "By what kind of sins are the Commandments broken?"

Ans. "By mortal sins only; for venial sins are not, strictly speaking, contrary to the end of the Commandments, which is charity. Because a

venial sin—for example, a vain word, *the theft of a pin, or an apple, is not of weight enough* to break charity betwixt man and man, much less betwixt God and man.”

This is a question in theology (?) which Protestants, thank God, are never taught. We know from God’s word that “*all unrighteousness is sin!*” The Roman Catholic, however, is taught differently. He is instructed, in the first place, to understand, that *every* theft is not a breach of the commandment of God, which says, “Thou shalt not steal.” Think, my Brethren, “the theft of an apple,” for instance, not an infringement of the law of God! Think

“Of man’s first disobedience, and *the fruit*
Of that forbidden tree, whose *mortal* taste
Brought *Death* into the world, and *all our woe!*”

Surely this single fruit thus taken by our first parents was not in itself “of any considerable value.” Yet the act thus done contrary to the word and command of God, entailed on themselves and their posterity the dreary inheritance of woe and wretchedness, of pain and suffering, of sin and *death!*

The folly of such teaching in the Roman Catholic Church may further appear from the following illustration: Suppose a poor woman to have invested all that she hath in a fruit-stall, and that some twenty persons come and secretly remove each an apple; no *one* person of them has stolen “any considerable value;” “no considerable hurt” has been done by any *one* of them, and yet, in the aggregate, much harm has befallen her; still, according to the above, *no one sin, not one breach* of God’s commandment has been effected! This may be Romanism, and it *is*, but assuredly it is not Christianity!

The Holy Scriptures teach a holier practice and better *theology* than that which Rome teaches.

In Deuteronomy xxvii. 26 (I quote from the Douay version), we have these words, “Cursed be he that abideth not in the words of this law.”

We have likewise another passage, which says, “The soul that sinneth it shall die,” Ezek. xviii. 20. It does not say the soul that sinneth in this way or in that way, but “the soul that sinneth it shall die.” “Sinneth;” it is an abstract and universal expression, and admits of no

exception; every sin, both small and great, is included therein.

Having thus shown that this primary point is unfounded, what think ye, if the first step fails, what must the second and subsequent stages be?

The writer then proceeds, in the book which has been thus recommended to me: "The punishment due to mortal sins is eternal." I believe the punishment due to *any* sin is eternal, unless that sin be forgiven by the mercy and lovingkindness of God. He says this is a point "we must either admit, or wholly renounce the Roman Catholic faith." This may be true; I believe the punishment due to mortal sin is eternal, if not forgiven; but I again dispute the term "mortal," for I hold that *every* sin is mortal in its nature and mortal in its consequences, unless that fearful doom which is promised to sin be averted by the interposition of One "mighty to save." I find it registered in the records of inspiration—and who can dispute it?—that "the wages of sin is death." Any such distinction, then, must be unscriptural, and, as such, hateful to God.

I now quote from p. 4,—“God, in his infinite mercy, has furnished man with one means of *delivering himself* from the abyss of sin into which he may have fallen, but with one only,—*the Sacrament of Penance.*” My Brethren, is this true? I ask the veriest Romanist here, is it true? Can this consist in any way with St. Peter’s inspired teaching, where he proclaims Christ Jesus as the only Saviour? “This is the Stone which was set at nought of you builders, which is become the head of the corner. Neither is there salvation *in any other*, for there is *none other name* under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved,” Acts iv. 11, 12. Yes, my Roman Catholic brethren! there is one only and exclusive means of salvation, Christ, and Christ alone; and yet in this book it is said, that God “has provided only one means” of reconciliation with the sinner, and that *that* means is “the *Sacrament of Penance!*” I fear our examination this evening will be a very trying ordeal to those whose minds have been scripturally instructed. It has grieved myself while perusing these pages for your instruction, in order to expose its errors, and to show you “a more excellent way,”—to find that a man once, at least, professing the

truth should thus believe and sanction, nay, *publish* such unscriptural ideas!

In p. 5 he says, "All these points are so many articles of the Roman Catholic faith, articles which can never be called in question; and which, moreover, when they come into discussion, it must be remembered, are based upon unanswerable grounds." But now they *are* "come into discussion," and Mr. Oakeley may be here—he has a right to be here—and although he may not be amongst us this evening, yet I doubt not that some friend of his may bring him some note as to the manner in which his book is being handled. We may now, therefore, judge whether these are "unanswerable grounds" or not.

In p. 6, we come to Article II., "On the spiritual treasure of the church." This presents to me quite a new idea on this point. I am learning more of what Romanism really is from this book which has been recommended to me by Mr. Oakeley. He makes a marked distinction between "merits" and "satisfaction." He says, "Merits are proper to the person acquiring them, and are inalienable; they cannot be communicated to others." If so, what means the expression in "Butler's Catechism," which says, that Indulgences are drawn from "the merits of Christ, of the blessed Virgin Mary, and of all saints;" and that "merits *can* thus be given from the saints to others?"

The use of the word "satisfaction," however, as transferred from *saints* to *sinner*s, proves more clearly than ever that the Church of Rome practically destroys the only satisfaction of the Lord Jesus Christ, and places it in those human merits or satisfactions which they speak of as constituting "the treasury" of the Popes! The writer then speaks of the satisfaction of Christ being "infinite." They cannot deny this. They do, indeed, speak of the merits of Christ as infinite; but when we examine into the matter, we find that, practically, they depreciate these *infinite* merits of Christ, by pretending that they need *addition*. Surely that which has no end, cannot be added unto; and thus to add anything to Christ's merits is the same as to deny His *infinite* merit! He says (p. 6) "Many saints have made *more* satisfaction than their sins required. The blessed Virgin was never stained with sin." The writer has no reason whatever to assert that

the blessed Virgin Mary "was never stained with sin," because that is a point on which his Church has not yet decided, although they have had 1800 years of "thinking-time." The most fearful contentions have existed in the Church of Rome on this subject between the Dominicans and the Franciscans. Popes, in their infallibility, have withheld any decision on this disputed subject. One greater than these Popes has already spoken, and decisively too, on this point, and that too to *the Church of Rome*. St. Paul writes, in his Epistle to the Romans, that "ALL have sinned, and come short of the glory of God," Rom. iii. 23.

Again; the blessed Virgin Mary herself has said, "My spirit hath rejoiced in God *my Saviour*," Luke i. 47. A saviour is to save from *sin*; and one who had no sin could need no Saviour. God is sinless, and He therefore needed no Saviour. Christ is the sinless God, and He needed no Saviour; but was even thereby constituted *the Saviour* of sinners. All others "*have sinned, and come short of the glory of God*;" and "as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin, and so death passed upon *all men*, for that *all have sinned*," Rom. v. 12. Death is the curse of sin, and the sad inheritance of man. This was the inheritance of the blessed Virgin also, as of all others who have sinned. The statement, then, is *false*, that "the blessed Virgin Mary was never stained with sin." This book then proceeds: "The great number of confessors and martyrs, of spotless virgins, of mortified anchorites, who have passed their whole lives in prayer and fasting, in weeping and sorrow, in disciplines, and in macerations of the flesh, *have offered to God much more abundant satisfaction than they owed his Divine justice*. This also is a superabundance of satisfaction." I offer but one remark on this, and place it side by side with the Word of God. As Christ Jesus says to *his Apostles*—those very persons to whose over-merits, with others, Roman Catholics would now trust,—“When ye shall have done *all* these things which are commanded you, say, We are *unprofitable* servants; we have done *that* which was *our duty* to do,” Luke xvii. 10.

In page 7 it is stated, that "this is the treasure of the Church, or the fund from which the Church draws, when she grants Indulgences." I say if such a treasury

or coffer of accumulations be composed, as they say, of the merits of the saints, it must be a coffer both empty and void; because there exists no such thing as the merits of saints, or of any individual, except the merits of Christ, which are not in the Pope's custody, but are *free* and *full*, and in the possession of Christ alone, "He that openeth, and no *man* shutteth; and shutteth, and no *man* openeth." Rev. iii. 7.

The writer now speaks of this treasury, and asks the question "*Does it really exist?*" This is a fair question, and he proposes to answer it. "Luther," he says, "and the heretics, who have swarmed from his pretended Reformation, have *denied* that the superabundant satisfaction of Christ and the saints does still exist." Now it is false to say Luther denied the "satisfaction of *Christ*;" he never denied any such thing; and I challenge Mr. Oakeley to prove this. But Luther *did* deny "the superabundant satisfaction of *saints*." This was his principal weapon, drawn from the Gospel quiver, whereby he shook the Pope's dominion, when throughout the cities of Germany he preached the grand fundamental doctrine of "justification by faith alone, and not by the deeds of the law."

This "spiritual treasury," to which this book refers as containing the "merits of Christ and the saints," the writer asserts "has been confided to the administration of the Church;" this is an assertion, however, which must be *proved*. Englishmen will not take assertions without proof; and even though it should exist, yet it is not confided to the Church of Rome. But when I turn to this book to see *when* and *how* it was thus confided to the Church, what inspired epistle does he quote? Not one! Does he adduce any such commission of Christ? Not that either! He coolly tells us that, "We are assured *by Clement VI.* [A.D. 1342] that Christ confided the infinite treasure amassed by him to St. Peter and his successors!" He adds, "*The same Pope* tells us, that to this abundant treasure the merits of the blessed Virgin and of all the elect is joined." Is this Scriptural? Was the fourteenth century a fit time for a *Christian* doctrine to make its first appearance? How came it to lie dormant for 1,400 years? We need no better argument in disproof of these false

doctrines than the assurance of Mr. Oakeley and his author, that not Christ nor yet his Apostles, but rather a *Pope of the fourteenth century*, first broached these doctrines to which we object.

In page 8 he says, "This doctrine is *founded on*" [we may now be coming to the point!] "is founded on the tenth article of the Apostles' Creed—'the communion of saints.'" Now, you hear this expression continually read in our Liturgy. The meaning of the word "Saint" is a "holy man;" by this term the apostle designates the respective members of the Christian churches to which he wrote; for instance, Eph. i. 1, Phil. i. 1, &c., &c. Again; St. Paul writes to the Corinthians (1 Cor. xvi.) in reference to a "collection for the saints." What saints were these? It was not a collection for saints in heaven, but for persecuted and suffering saints on earth. The Churches were thus, and in other ways, to communicate the one with the other. Corinth was to contribute for Jerusalem, and Jerusalem for Colosse, and so forth; there was to be a communion, an intercourse, an intercommunication existing between the saints of the respective churches. This we acknowledge as a glorious article of our Apostolic Creed. "Communion" means "You speak with me, and I speak with you;" this is "communion." What communion, then, has the Roman Catholic with the saints above? He may say "I pray to them;" but though he speaks to *them*, yet have *they* ever spoken to *him*? If not, how can there be "communion?" "The communion of saints," here below, is only a type, a harbinger, an earnest of the communion we shall have in that glorious fellowship of the children of God above. There can, therefore, be no foundation for believing in any such "communion" as that for which the Church of Rome contends. In order to constitute such communion, *you* should not only receive of *their* merits, but *they* in turn should receive of *yours* also. This, however, cannot be; for they need not human merits; they, if in heaven, are there by grace, through the merits of Christ alone; and if Roman Catholics would but consult their own eternal interest, they would desire to reach heaven by no other merits, by no other means, than *that* appointed of God, and declared in His holy word.

The Author then leaps, in page 9, to the following con-

clusion :—“ It was with reason, *therefore*, that Leo X. condemned Luther’s proposition, which denied the existence of this treasure.” “ *Therefore*,” that is, *because* Clement VI., in the year 1342, *said* that it did exist, *therefore* Pope Leo X. acted towards Luther with reason and propriety! Is *this* a logical deduction? He then proceeds, p. 9: “ *If*” (they cannot argue this point without these “ *ifs*”) “ *If* our doctrine on this point is not *an absolute article of faith*, it so *approximates* to one, that it cannot be doubted without great temerity, and even error.” It is painful that, after eight pages of attempted proof, the conclusion should be, after all, “ *If* our doctrine,” &c. My Brethren, what certainty can any Roman Catholic possess regarding “ *Indulgences*,” involved, as the doctrine avowedly is, in doubt and uncertainty, as this accredited book attests? Why place us under ban and anathema for venturing to disown a doctrine as an article of faith, which, *at best*, and on their own evidence, *may only approximate* to one?

We next refer to Article III., “ On the power of granting *Indulgences*.” He says, “ No one can deny that the power of applying the satisfaction of Christ, by means of the sacraments, exists in the Catholic Church. But we must examine whether she can apply this satisfaction *independently* of the Sacrament of Penance, *by Indulgences*.” The assumed *practice* exists, but I think we may clearly see, from Mr. Oakeley’s book, that the *power* does not exist! The first authority quoted is Tertullian, and a most extraordinary evidence is this; he quotes Tertullian as “ *a heretic!*” He “ censured the facility with which canonical penances were lightened, and apostates, in the time of persecution, readmitted to the communion of the Church.” Again; “ The disciples of Valdo, called Vaudois, or the poor of Lyons, an ignorant sect of the twelfth century,” (I think there will be found a resemblance between these “ ignorant” people of the twelfth century and the *enlightened* ones of the nineteenth century!) “ looked upon *Indulgences* as an invention of the priests to deceive the people.” Well, besides these “ ignorant” people of the twelfth century, he adds, “ Wickliffe, the famous *heresiarch*, opposed *Indulgences* and the power of granting them.” So he did, because he knew the Bible; and for that glorious

testimony old Wickliffe's bones were not suffered to rest in peace; his grave was rifled, his dead body exhumed and burned, and being reduced to ashes, the dust of Wickliffe was scattered on the little river Swift; by that small rivulet 'twas carried to the Avon; thence onward to the Severn, and thence commingled with the waters of the mighty ocean:

" The Avon to the Severn runs,
The Severn to the sea;
Thus widely spread, as Wickliffe's dust,
Shall Wickliffe's teaching be."

Thus we see that, notwithstanding the power of the Popes in ancient days, there was not wanting a man of God to stand up and protest, even at the peril of his life, against Romish innovations. The author proceeds: "It is well known that Luther, being offended at the commission of preaching the Indulgence being granted by Leo X. to the Dominicans, in preference to the Augustinians, of which Order he was a member, attacked first the abuse of Indulgences, then Indulgences themselves, the power of the Pope and the Bishops, and many other articles." He thus pretends that Luther's motive was chagrin and disappointment at his Order losing the lucrative privilege of preaching Indulgences. But let us hear *the Roman Catholic Historian* of the Council of Trent, who gives a flat denial to Mr. Oakeley's book on this point. Pallavicini, in his "History of the Council of Trent," (and mark, he was not simply a Roman Catholic historian, but *the* Roman Catholic historian of Trent, an enemy as well to Luther as to the doctrines which Luther preached,) in Lib. I., cap. iii., sec. vi., speaking of this charge against Luther, calls it "*a calumny*," &c.

Pallavicini writes:

§ 6. "Est itidem *calumnia*, indulgentiarum promulgationem fuisse demandatam non Eremitanis S. Augustini, uti mos fuerat, sed Patribus Dominicanæ Familie, quo quid auctius exprimeretur."

§ 7. "Ac primo quidem *falsum* est, consuevisse hoc munus injungi

§ 6. "There is also *the calumny* that the preaching of Indulgences was granted, not to the Monks of St. Augustine, as the custom was, but to the Fathers of the Dominican order, that something more lucrative might be exacted."

§ 7. "And in the first place *it is false* that this office was usually

Eremitanis. cùm a Julio Minoribus impositum fuerit, ut supra declaratum est: similiter Minorum Moderatori unà cum Archiepiscopo Moguntino commiserat Leo in pluribus Germaniæ locis die ultima Martii anni 1516. Equites etiam Teutonici, paulo ante Patres prædicatores adhibuerant ad promulgandas quasdam similes Indulgentias."

conferred on the monks [of St. Augustine], inasmuch as it was conferred by [Pope] Julius on the Minors [*Dominicans*] as has been above declared: As also to the Moderator of the Minors, in conjunction with the Archbishop of Moguntium, Pope Leo, had granted the commission in many places of Germany. on the last day of March, 1516. Likewise the Teutonic Knights, a short time before, had admitted the Fathers [*the Dominicans*] as preachers, in order to promulgate certain similar Indulgences.

Thus, *by their own Historian*, this statement of Mr. Oakeley's book is proved, both as to its premises and its conclusion, to be "a calumny" and "a falsehood!" It is also worthy of remark, that this "calumny" against Luther was never broached *until after his death!* While he was a living man, none dared thus to attribute unworthy motives to that noble-minded servant of God.

Mr. Oakeley's book, *without any proof*, repeats the charge. His own acknowledged Historian, living nearer to Luther's times, chides him as "bearing false witness against his neighbour."

The Author then proceeds to certain alleged proofs "from Scripture," that the Church has received this power to grant Indulgences. He quotes the passage—"I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed also in heaven." I am very glad that he adds this likewise to the above, that "Christ makes the same promise to the Apostles *collectively*, saying, "whatsoever ye shall bind," &c. He then adds, "It is *therefore* in the power of the Church to open heaven, and to break the bonds which can detain souls from entering therein." Now if this doctrine can be so plainly proved from Scripture, I appeal to you, as honest men, whether he had any reason to say, in page 9, that "if it is not an *absolute article of faith*, it so *approximates* to one, &c.?"

My Brethren, either this doctrine is proved from the text, or it is not. If it is actually proved from it, why cast any shadow of doubt or uncertainty on a doctrine

thus proved? If it be *not* thus proved, then, why quote the passage at all?

It is one characteristic of the Church of Rome that she uses this text on almost every subject; no matter what is to be proved, her advocates adduce this passage of Scripture. Ask a Roman Catholic, "How do you prove the Supremacy of your Church?" he gives you this text. Ask one how he proves the Infallibility of *the Pope*? he refers you to "the keys!" Ask another how he proves the Infallibility of *Councils*? and he too instances "the keys!" Ask him whence he deduces the priestly power of Absolution? he again quotes "the keys." And now, when they would adduce Scripture proof for the doctrine of Indulgences, they again quote "I will give unto thee the keys," &c. Yet none of these dogmas can be proved by this passage of Scripture.

We must speak with deep respect regarding any portion of God's revealed word. But in this straining of the text to suit so many distinctive doctrines of the Church of Rome, they render it a kind of "patent" text, adapted, as they say, to prove many things, and yet failing to prove any peculiar doctrine of Rome; for these words of our blessed Lord, above quoted, refer not by any means to any such doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church. Besides, this is not a pertinent text by which to prove *Indulgences*. I enter not now on an exposition of the passage,—this on some other occasion; but I say that the doctrine of Indulgences cannot be proved from *this* text; because, whatever may be its import, it was a privilege granted to the Apostles *collectively*; and if from this text they prove that this privilege extended to the successors of St. Peter, it follows, as a matter of course, that it extends likewise to the successors of the other Apostles. But this they will not allow; it must only be the Pope of Rome,—the successor (as they say) of St. Peter,—who can perform that prerogative which (even upon their own showing) was given to all the Apostles alike. Again; Roman Catholics would argue from this same passage the power of *all* Priests to forgive sins judicially. To be therefore consistent with themselves in its application to our present subject, it should prove the power of *all* Priests to grant *Indulgences*. This latter, however, they

will not admit. This is in their system, exclusively *the Pope's* prerogative. Hence their inconsistency. From the same passage they would deduce in one case a *particular*, and in the other a *universal* prerogative.

Again ; this book quotes, as the second and last assumed proof from Scripture, the following passage : " To whom ye forgive anything, I forgive also : for if I forgave anything, to whom I forgave it, for your sakes forgave I it, in the person of Christ," 2 Cor. ii. 10.

Now, my Brethren, in this passage I find no proof of Indulgences, because St. Paul plainly tells the Corinthians, that what *he* has done, is only what *they themselves* have already done ; and, therefore, if an *Indulgence* is meant by the gift which St. Paul speaks of, it is evident, it must be in the power of *the laity* to grant Indulgences ! Again, we find that this instance differs essentially from the Indulgence system as practised by the Church of Rome ; we find here no " secret confession " to a priest,—no " Pontifical Bull " issued from Rome to warrant his re-admission into the Church ; we find there no " merits or satisfactions of the Saints " applied ; no visitation of any particular church prescribed ; no money to be paid by this erring Corinthian. We find other points of dissimilarity between the two cases ; the erring Corinthian had committed an open scandal against the Church, for which he was condemned to an open exclusion from the congregation ; and upon his sincere repentance, we find that the Corinthians re-admitted him to open communion with the Church. Now, are Indulgences, as taught in the Church of Rome, intended only for open scandal ? To such, and to such only, *this* case refers. Assuredly there must have been in the Corinthian Church many sinners (though not to a degree so flagrant), for whom no Indulgences were then proclaimed, as they now are, to *all* the members of the Church of Rome. In order to resemble the Indulgences of the Roman Catholic Church, the favour mentioned in the text adduced should have been offered, not to this particular offender only, but to *all* of the Corinthian Church who would accept of it. In this respect, therefore, I think, the parallel fails !

Again ; the erring Corinthian was condemned, in consequence of his sin, to open exclusion from the congregation.

I ask ; Are the partakers of Indulgences *ever thus* openly excluded from the Roman Catholic Church, at the time of receiving the Indulgence? Certainly not! They must actually be in communion with, rather than suffering exclusion from, the Church of Rome. Here, then, the parallel fails again! Moreover, by the application of an Indulgence, Roman Catholics do not obtain any *readmission* to the Church, as did the Corinthian, and, therefore, I maintain that every feature of similarity vanishes from our view. The cases are by no means parallel.

But the writer proceeds to say, that this doctrine "is still *more clearly* proved from *tradition*." But if he had "easily proved" it from Scripture, what need is there to prove it from tradition? However, he says, "A tradition which is clear, constant, and universal, which has come down to us without interruption from the times of the Apostles, may be justly considered as a sure method of arriving at any truth;" but, Brethren, before I admit the value of tradition, as applied to Indulgences, I must know that it *is* a tradition, clear, constant, and universal, and that it *has* come to us without interruption from the times of the Apostles. The Author pleads, that it was not necessary that this dogma should be *written*, and quotes, "And there are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that even the world itself could not contain the books that should be written," John xxi. 25.

But I ask, if it were not "necessary to be written" *then*, how comes it to pass, that this doctrine of Indulgences is "necessary to be written" *now*? If God in his wisdom and goodness has given us a certain book, containing all sufficient knowledge, ready to every man's hand, and accessible to all, why should any man say, "If there had been *more* written, *this* or *that* would have been found therein?" They appeal to a negative thing, which has no existence, and they merely say *if* (another "if!") "if a little more had but been written, this doctrine would surely have been in it!" This book proceeds: "How many were the truths revealed which have *never* been written!" But when he has already, as he pretends, proved that it *is* written, and *that* in two passages of Scripture, why should he now thus speak of this doctrine as

“having *never* been written?”—My Brethren, this is not satisfactory,—it is not consistent. Because, as he asserts, many truths were revealed, but not *written*; *therefore*, he says, “it has been always admitted that the Church has the power to grant *Indulgences!*” I leave it with any man of common-place sense, to discover the logical sequence of the above,—that “many things revealed were not written; *therefore!* it has always been admitted, that the Church has the power to grant *Indulgences!*!”

He then proceeds to speak to the historical point, p. 12, that “In the cruel persecutions suffered by Christians under the Pagan emperors, during the first three centuries, many apostatised, through fear and tortures,” &c.; when the Bishops saw them “sufficiently penitent,” they “lessened the penance imposed, and remitted a part of the punishment due to their sins.” This has nothing whatever to do with Indulgences. The punishment thus inflicted was by way of discipline, and had reference not to sins generally, but to the particular sin of open apostacy; and even this mode of re-admission, as it did occur, was strongly censured by contemporary Bishops, &c.

We now, however, come to examine into the “clear, constant, and universal tradition.” He refers to the Fathers; but in what age did the earliest of those referred to exist? The first he alludes to is Tertullian, who lived in the year 200; so that even this “clear, constant, and universal tradition” began just 200 years too late. Moreover, he speaks of Tertullian as *condemning* the practice, in his work “De Pudicitia.” He next quotes “St. Cyprian, who, in his Tenth Letter, *complains* of the abuse of this privilege;” but *he* lived A.D. 250. This is later still. So that the only Fathers he quotes in evidence of this “clear, constant, and universal tradition,” are two, *both* of whom *condemned* the practice, even when it resembled in no one particular the Indulgence system of the Roman Catholic Church; how much more, therefore, would they have condemned the fearful structure which the Church of Rome pretends to have reared on that foundation.*

* Mr. Oakeley’s book here quoting St. Cyprian, an orthodox father, remarks that, although he condemned the abuse, yet “he nowhere condemns the privilege.” Why does not our author adduce some *positive* evidence of the Fathers, some plain approbation of the practice? If, however, we consult St. Cyprian’s own writings, we find that he *does*

The Author, however, plainly abandons the above argument, by informing us that the present system of Indulgences is *not* the same as that to which he has alluded. He says (p. 13), "This method of obtaining Indulgences *ceased* with the persecutions." He then, in illustrating this "*clear, constant, universal, and uninterrupted* chain of tradition," leaps from A.D. 250 to the *ninth century*, when "a custom was established of substituting for canonical penances, and particularly fasts, which were frequently imposed, the recitation of psalms a certain number of

condemn this system, and that in the strongest terms—much stronger than any language adopted by me in these Lectures.

We quote some few passages from St. Cyprian's writings, "On the Lapsed." Speaking on this subject, he writes, "He who soothes the sinner by a flattering gentleness, supplies the seeds of future sinning, and does not stifle, but *feeds transgression*,—but he who with manly counsel, at once rebukes and instructs his brother, is leading him to salvation; 'As many as I love,' saith the Lord, 'I rebuke and chasten.' In the same way should God's priest, not misled by treacherous compliances, but use the remedies that will end in health. It is an ill-constructed physician that puts a sparing hand to the swollen edges of wounds, and collects the virus deep within the body by not expelling it. The wound must be opened and pierced, and the more powerful restoratives be applied of cutting away ulceration. He may call, and he may shriek, and complain of us, sick man, impatient through the pain; but he will be thankful afterwards, when he feels he is cured. There has, in fact, dearest brethren, a *new species of havoc* made its appearance, and as if the storm of *persecution* had not ravaged to the full, we find added to the load a *deceitful mischief* and *fair seeming pestilence*, under the title of mercy. Contrary to the vigour of the Gospel—contrary to the Law of our Lord—by the bold conduct of some *heedless* persons—terms of intercourse are opened, a *peace void and vain—perilous* to them who *grant*, and of *no use* to them who enjoy it. Repentance is driven forth from men's breasts, and the recollection put aside of their most heinous and extreme offence. The wounds of the dying are covered over, and a *fatal blow*, resting in the depth and secrecy of the vitals, has a veil of concealment drawn over its poignancy. * * * Why, when men ought to be weeping continually, and making entreaty to their Lord, do they interrupt the sorrowing of their repentance, and pretend to receive them into communion? Their mercies are like the mercies of *hail to the corn*, the *storm star* to the trees, a *wasting pestilence* to the flocks, and a *fierce tempest* to shipping. They rob them of the *comfort* of the eternal hope—they *overthrow the tree* from its roots—they help on a *deadly contagion* through *baneful words*, and *dash the vessel upon the rocks*, so that it gain not the harbour. Facility like this *does not give peace, but takes it away*; instead of conferring communion; it is an *impediment* to salvation."

"Let no man deceive—no man beguile himself. The Lord only can have mercy. *He alone* can grant a pardon for sins, which against himself have been committed, who bare our sins, who grieved for us, whom God delivered for our offences. Man cannot be greater than God. It is not for the servant to yield his grace and *indulgence*, when the offence is in main weight against the Lord; for then the lapsed will

times, alms, disciplines, and other pious practices, less rigorous than the Penance itself." Thus there arose, just 900 years too late, that practice in the Church of Rome which is so thoroughly inconsistent with the word of God, which makes the reading of the Scriptures to be a *penance*, the recitation of prayers a task! That which should be to the Christian his highest, holiest, happiest privilege,—the converse with his Father and his God, thus becomes a *weary work*; and prayer, instead of a privilege, becomes a *penance*!

This book now proceeds to speak of "Plenary Indulgences," and tells us (p. 14), that "Pope Urban II., when personally presiding at the Council of Clermont, in Auvergne, in 1095, granted the full and entire remission of the punishment due to the sins of all who, through motives of religion, and not of honour or interest, should enter on a crusade for the deliverance of the Holy Land, and who should die in religious sentiments." The Author adds, "This is *the first Plenary Indulgence* we read of in ecclesiastical history;" and yet this was after 1095 years had passed, without any such thing as a "Plenary Indulgence" having been known in Christendom! What a proof of antiquity is this from "clear, constant, universal, and uninterrupted tradition!" That the year 1095 should be the birth year of "Plenary Indulgences!" He then adds, "*Since* this period, many others have been granted; and *no doubt* can *now* be raised as to the practice of the Church, of granting Indulgences, both plenary and partial, nor of the value she attaches thereto." True! it may be doubtful or not so, it may be clear or the contrary, *since* A. D. 1095. But, according to Mr. Oakeley's own book, it is at least undisputed, that *before* that year *no such thing* was *ever* known in the Christian Church!

"*If*," he proceeds, "*if* any uncertainty regarding this point ever existed"—what! still uncertain, after fourteen be committing a fresh crime, by ignorance of that which is afore written, 'Cursed is the man that putteth his hope in man,' Jer. xvii. 5.

"Give audience rather, and yield submission to what we say? Why are your ears deaf, that they hear not the saving precepts which we apply? Why are your eyes blind, that they see not that path of repentance to which we point? Why is the mind stricken and estranged, that it understands not the lively remedies, which *from the Holy Scriptures* we both *learn* and *teach*?"—*Treatises of St. Cyprian*, vi. 11., &c., translated by Rev. J. H. Newman, D.D.

pages of *proof*?—"If any uncertainty regarding this point ever existed, it must attach to *the first ages*." Very good! It does "attach to the first ages!" It matters little to me what Indulgences may be in the nineteenth century, if, in the *first ages*, there was such "uncertainty" about it. But he proceeds (p. 14), "The Church has always opposed with vigour the least innovation in doctrine." He says, "If they had been 'innovations,' they would have been attacked;" but let us see, from their own historian, Cardinal Baronius, whether the "life" of the professing Church was such at that period, as would be likely to "repel" an innovation? He (Baronius) says that "the Church was then as the ship, in which were the disciples, tossed with the waves." Matters had come to such a pitch of iniquity, and vice, and sin, that, "as it seems, Christ evidently was in a deep sleep in the ship, when the winds blowing so strongly, the ship itself was covered with the waves."—"Baron. Annals," A.D. 912.) He speaks again of the eleventh century, and says that *the Papacy* was "a three-headed monster." Now, were I to say such a thing, I should be called a bigot! But Baronius was a *Cardinal*—a Roman Catholic Historian. The idea is taken from the Heathen poet Virgil, who makes Æneas, in his descent to "Hades," encounter Cerberus, a three-headed dog, to which he throws a cake saturated with a soporiferous mixture, which causes the monster to fall asleep; and Æneas and his companion pass in safety. Baronius says, "The Papacy in this age was like that three-headed monster." And the manner in which this monster was then quieted is thus recorded by Cardinal Baronius:—"A certain Priest, named Gratian, seeing this most wretched state of the Church, approached these men (the rival Popes), and prevailed upon them, *by money*, to depart from the holy see," &c.—*Baronius' Annals*, A.D. 1044.

It is not true, however, that none resisted these innovations; there have always existed witnessing servants of Christ to protest against error. These, at times, however, were forcibly removed out of the way; as, for instance, John Huss and Jerome of Prague, when in the fifteenth century they resisted the Council of Constance, in the withdrawal of the cup from the laity. These men counted

not their lives dear unto them. They protested, and *were slain* for the testimony of Jesus! Such, however was the age in which these innovations arose. It was not "in the *first ages*;" but in the ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries, of which era it may, notwithstanding, be said, that "when men slept, the enemy came and sowed *tares* in the field," Matt. xiii. 25.

"Moreover," says Mr. Oakeley's book, "the Church gifted with Infallibility, will never propose, nor permit to be proposed, any falsehood as an article of faith. *Since the eleventh century, at least*, the universal belief of the whole world, of pastors and people, has attributed to this Church the Divine power of which we here treat." Well! "*since the eleventh century!*" But what of the *first eleven centuries* which had then elapsed? The writer also refers to the Decree of the Council of Trent on Indulgences. We regard but with very slight importance the decree of Trent on this subject. It is a well-known fact, attested by Roman Catholic Historians, that after eighteen years of the successive sessions of this Council, yet it was not *until the last day of the last session* that a Decree was proposed, "*De Indulgentiis*," and passed, when there remained neither time nor space for bestowing on the subject the care and attention which it demanded. Dupin himself tells us, that it was on the last day of the eighteenth year of this session, that the Council of Trent came to a hurried conclusion on this point.

Our Author having thus endeavoured to establish his position on the hurried Decrees of the Council of Trent, says that "No [Roman] Catholic can for a moment hesitate after such a decision." "Our belief is required under pain of anathema." *This* perhaps may carry their point. It is this which prevents many a Roman Catholic from asking, in his own mind, Is this true? He fears to incur, even by a *doubt*, the anathema of Trent and of his Church. I saw a Roman Catholic yesterday, who knows Romanism so well as to induce him to leave that Church. He said that he was long afraid even to *think*, lest he should *doubt* as to any doctrine, and thus come under the anathema of Rome. So have they encircled themselves, as with "triple brass," to prevent even a doubt arising in any troubled but reflecting mind. The writer speaks (p. 18) of Tertullian, but he does not adduce any orthodox Father. He

says "Tertullian, when he was a Montanist, censured the facility with which canonical penances were lightened, and apostates, in the time of persecution, re-admitted to the Church." He (Tertullian) "censured St. Zephrinus, the Pope, for granting Indulgences to repentant *libellatici*, at the recommendation of martyrs." Why, then, appeal to the unanimous consent of the Fathers when some of them were heretics? Why make them part of the Rule of Faith? The Fathers have thus erred in many important particulars, and this Dr. Delahogue, Professor in Maynooth, attests. Do not, then, ask me to abandon my rule of faith, which is certain, inspired, and accessible to all, for "the Fathers," who are uncertain, uninspired, and inaccessible. He also says (p. 19), "All the Bulls of sovereign pontiffs, especially since Clement VI., (A.D. 1342,) mention the merits of Christ and his Saints as being applied by means of Indulgences; *therefore* an Indulgence is a liquidation of the debt to the Divine justice incurred by sin!" I reply, what matters it to me, or to any Christian, Bible-loving man, what any individual may have said in the year 1342, if I find the Apostles, and the Lord Jesus Christ Himself, telling me that there are no merits but those of Christ alone, and "*no other name* whereby I must be saved?"

Chapter IV. treats of the "Effects of Indulgences;" and here we have a pitched battle in the Church of Rome, even on Mr. Oakeley's own showing (p. 20). "Venial sin may be pardoned by an Indulgence, according to Peter of Pallu, and other Divines; but according to the general belief, which alone is true, it cannot;" so that we have one class of Roman Catholic divines, headed by a divine named Peter of Pallu, saying one thing, while the "general belief" says quite the contrary! The book, in the next page, states, "It is in this sense that those Bulls are explained which grant remission and pardon of *sin*, both as to the punishment and *the guilt*, if any such Bulls have ever existed. Their *existence* is maintained by *some*, and denied by *others*." Here is unity! the very *existence* of various Bulls *disputed*!

From this questionable existence of Bulls, I pass to page 28, and see how this system of Indulgences applies to the dead, or, as they term it, the "Souls in *Purgatory*." "We shall not," he here says, "discuss the dogmatical question of the existence of Purgatory, nor shall we enter the

lists with those modern heretics who deny it. This Catholic truth has been believed in all ages, by *Jews* as well as Christians, and in the traditions and customs of *most Pagan nations*." Most Pagan nations believe in it, *therefore* we should believe in it! But "most Pagan nations" believed in, and prayed to Jupiter and other supposed deities, and should *we* therefore also believe in false gods? The Author, however, "assuming this doctrine as an undoubted fact," purposes to inquire *how far* Indulgences apply to souls therein. "The present question is," he says, "can they be assisted by means of Indulgences?" He replies, "Many doctors of repute have denied this point;" that is, have denied the applicability of Indulgences to the dead. He remarks, however, "that such application of Indulgences to the Dead is not an innovation;" for "St. Thomas asserts, that it was the practice of the Church in the *thirteenth century*." Mark this! Brethren. It was a practice in the thirteenth century, *therefore* "it is not an innovation!" Again: "Examples are found in the ninth and twelfth centuries;" *therefore*, again, "it is not an innovation!!" * Now, my Brethren, such argumentation cannot be received, where there exists the slightest freedom of thought; no wonder, indeed, that Mr. Oakeley says, if he remains silent, he hopes "we shall not attribute it to any want of theological means on the part of the Church of Rome." But I say his silence in such a matter *will* give consent to the facts and arguments which were narrated in the published Letter which we sent to Mr. Oakeley!

He next comes to a very important query:—"But does God always accept the offered price, so that an Indulgence applied to the dead *releases* them from the *whole punishment* due to their transgressions, if *plenary*, or a corresponding portion, if *partial*?" Now this is an admission that God does not necessarily grant it, because the *Pope* grants it. "Upon this point," he says, "authors are at variance! By many the affirmative is maintained." "Many other authors of great weight," he admits, take the "contrary" view of the subject; so here are doctors ranged against doctors, and an unhappy disunion reigns in the camp of Rome on this really important point!

* Archbishop Whateley's admirable and standard work on "Logic," has been placed by the Church of Rome among the "Prohibited Books" in the "Index Expurgatorius"!!

He proceeds (p. 31): "Whatever may be the issue of this *speculative dispute*"—he designates this all-important question merely "a *speculative dispute*," and says: "Now, whether God will sanction what the Pope of Rome promises to give, or not, no one *can assure* himself of having delivered a soul from Purgatory by means of an Indulgence; and this for many reasons: 1. Because the first opinion is probable, yet uncertain. 2. Because even in this opinion there are many reasons for doubting whether the full effect of the Indulgence has been produced; it *may happen* that the *reason* of its being granted was *insufficient*—that the conditions have not been fulfilled—and that, by forgetfulness or neglect, some of the conditions have been omitted!"

What a wretched prop for an immortal soul to rely upon, in its entrance on the all-important realities beyond the grave! He adds: "Therefore those Indulgences cannot but be *suspected*, which promise a perfect deliverance of the soul from Purgatory." Any Bull or decree, then, from the Pope, which promises this, "cannot but be suspected!" Now, compare this with page 36, in which the following expression occurs: "Indulgences may be divided into *Plenary* and *Partial*. A Plenary Indulgence remits the whole of the temporal punishment due to sin; so that he who gains it perfectly, and receives its full application, is entirely cleansed and purified before God; and if he dies in this state, *his admission into heaven is instantaneous*." And yet he adds, that any Bull promising such privilege must be *doubted* and *suspected*! He says, at page 31, "But as it is *impossible* for man to know *to what extent* the real application of this kind of Indulgence obtains, the force of our observation is still the same. Hence, a soul for whom prayers have been offered, alms distributed to God's poor, the Lamb without spot offered in holy Mass, *Plenary Indulgences* gained, may *still stand in need* of our charitable assistance!" So that they promise what God does not sanction; they pretend to grant, give, and bestow, what, in reality, is neither granted, given, nor bestowed! In fact, it is an admission, that the Pope does bind and loose on *earth*, what is *neither bound nor loosed in Heaven*!

We now come to other important points. At page 47 we have Article IV., on "The manner of procuring and

accrediting Indulgences." The Author says, "Except in the case of indults, or particular rescripts granted to a Bishop, application must be made to Rome for all Plenary Indulgences, and also for all partial ones exceeding forty days. A petition to His Holiness is drawn up and sent to Rome, to some person who will be willing to present it to the prelate charged with this office, and to obtain the grant. If it be addressed to the Pope, and sent direct by post, it *may* possibly be answered; we, indeed, know cases of it; but *it is a liberty which no one ought to take!*"

Why should this be an improper liberty!—Did St. Peter or St. Paul ever thus express themselves towards those among whom they laboured? Is the Pope in this respect the successor of any of the Apostles?

He then proceeds to remind his readers (p. 48), that although "every grant of Indulgences is 'gratuitous,' yet the trouble, the care, and the labour of those who expedite it,—the expenses, the journeys to and fro of the agent employed, ought to be compensated: *this* cannot be expected to be done gratuitously. The expense of obtaining an Indulgence is now greater than in former times." This is unlike *the free gospel* of the Lord Jesus Christ. One would imagine that such a privilege would be "without money and without price."

This is the nature of a formal application, as given in Mr. Oakeley's book, page 49:

MODEL OF APPLICATION FOR INDULGENCES.

"Beatissime Pater,

"Rector Parochiæ vulgo dictæ N.N. ad pedes Sanctitatis vestræ devotissime procumbens, humiliter exponit parochianos suos erga Beatissimam Virginem Mariam jam pie esse affectos, et probabile sibi videri pietatem illorum magis ac magis augendam fore, si quædam Indulgentiæ ipsis præbarentur lucrandæ: quapropter a Beatitudine vestra suppliciter efflagitat facultatem ad tres annos duraturam benedicendi parvas cruces, numismata, coronas precatorias, in honorem dictæ Beatæ Mariæ Virginis peractas, cum applicatione Indulgentiarum Sanctæ Brigittæ nuncupatarum."

"Die mensis anni 184 ."

"Most blessed Father,

"The Rector of the Parish commonly called N.N., lying most devoutly prostrate at the feet of your Holiness, humbly declares that his parishioners are now piously affected towards the most Blessed Virgin Mary, and that it seems to him probable that their piety will increase more and more, if the acquisition of certain Indulgences be offered to them: wherefore he supplicantly solicits from your Holiness permission which shall continue for three years, to bless little crosses, medals, supplicatory beads, in honour of the Blessed Virgin Mary, together with the application of the Indulgences entitled those of St. Bridget.

"Day month year 184."

Such is the formal mode of application to the Pope for "permission to bless little crosses, medals, and beads!" At p. 56 he speaks of "Privileged Rosaries." "An Indulgenced Rosary, so long as it continues a rosary, retains its Indulgences; even when, by the substitution of a new cross, and new beads for those lost, the rosary has been *entirely renewed*; as it has not ceased to be a rosary, it has not ceased to be indulgenced. If, on the contrary, it be so broken as to consist merely of the pieces of a rosary, it loses its blessing and its Indulgences, and consequently if the beads, or a greater part of them, come unstrung at the same time, they are no longer to be considered blessed or indulgenced." This is the theology taught by the Roman Catholic agents in this parish; if the beads *gradually* disappear one by one, and be *gradually* replaced by other beads, the rosary continues the same, and with the same efficacy! I should like very much to enter into a disquisition with the editor of this book as to the "*personal identity*," if I may so speak, of these "Indulgenced Rosaries!" We might derive much help in discussing this topic, by reading a chapter of Dr. Brown's eloquent Lectures "On the Human Mind," where, in Lecture XII.; that learned metaphysician quotes some very curious extracts, which might tend to illustrate the above question. It is painful, however, to find a man, who once professed better things, thus descending to questions of such trivial importance.

At p. 66, Mr. Oakeley's book propounds the following extraordinary assertion: "In the mercy of God it frequently occurs that some privileged souls lead a life so regular, so pure, and so holy, that at the end of a few days they have nothing to accuse themselves of, or nothing which the Confessor can regard as sinful." This, Brethren, is altogether contrary to God's holy word and the recorded experience of holy men; even the holiest characters in God's word acknowledge themselves as sinners, and that, day by day, they need to confess to God fresh guilt, and to ask for fresh supplies of "grace and mercy to help them in time of need."

At the conclusion of this division of Mr. Oakeley's book, we are told that "*the time* for fulfilling the prescribed conditions, and for gaining Indulgences attached to a fixed

day, is, for Festivals and Sundays, from the hours of first vespers on the eve until twilight of the festival itself; for Ferias, from midnight to midnight, according to the civil computation."—"The hour of first vespers is that of which, in Catholic countries, it is customary to ring for them; but if the vespers be never said in a particular place, the inhabitants must be guided by the neighbouring churches, by the practice of the diocese, or of the cathedral of the diocese. Thus, in the town of Mans, the works of piety or prayers requisite for the granting of Plenary Indulgences attached to festivals may not be commenced *before three o'clock* in the afternoon of the eve, because that is the hour of the first vespers." We are taught in the Holy Scriptures to believe, that "*at all times*" and *in all seasons* we may come unto our prayer-hearing God, whose ears are ever open unto those who call upon Him.

At p. 76, you will find the last extract I shall read to you this evening; and I wish you to carry this with you till we meet again. "Many Popes have disavowed, condemned, and revoked Indulgences which have been attributed to, or *really granted* by their predecessors." Is *this* the certainty of Rome? Is it not possible, then, that even this "Indulgence of *Portiuncula*" granted by the present Pope to Mr. Oakeley, may be revoked or *condemned* by another Pope?

Allow me to ask you, in conclusion, to consider these points. Is that Christianity which dates not its distinctive doctrines beyond the 9th, 10th, 11th, and 13th centuries? Are these things written in God's Holy Word? I ask you, is there any mention there of pardon of sin, and forgiveness of iniquity, over and above or besides that which God, for Christ's sake, has promised to us? My dear Brethren! it is Christ that blotteth out our iniquities. For thus saith the Lord: "I, even I, am He that *blotteth out* thy transgressions for mine own sake, and *will not remember thy sins*," Isaiah xliii. 25. It is thus we are made to stand justified before God, by Faith alone, and are clothed in the garb of Christ's perfect righteousness.

My Roman Catholic Brethren! will ye lend your sanction to what we have this evening read from this book? The Rev. Mr. Oakeley has formally recommended this work to my perusal. To *your* attention I recommend the

Holy Bible, the Word of the Living God : "Search the Scriptures !"

And ye, my Protestant Brethren! be firm in "your most holy Faith." Read your Bible. Hold it fast. With many a hard-fought struggle it has been handed down to you. This will effectually arm you against Romanism, which would assail you by "the traditions of men and not after Christ," if perchance they may draw you away and pervert your minds from "the truth as it is in Jesus."

LECTURE II.

I have to make two preliminary remarks, my Brethren, before I resume the subject on which we have but lately entered; the first is to thank you for the deep attention manifested by you, when, upon last Tuesday evening, I had the pleasure of addressing you; and also to apologize for having asked you to assemble here again this evening. The only apology I can make is this, that if Mr. Oakeley had recommended to me *a short book*, I should have delivered *a short lecture*; but, inasmuch as he has recommended to me rather a long treatise, if I undertake a reply, I must do justice to my Author and to my subject. We are thus compelled again to occupy your attention this evening. The manifest interest, however, evinced upon the former evening, and the crowded audience which *now* surrounds me, serve as an encouragement to proceed with our examination of this book, which has been recommended to my perusal by Mr. Oakeley.

As a general abstract of our examination on last Tuesday evening, I may be allowed to remind you of the leading points which we then deduced from this book. (I.) I noticed their unavailing attempt to substantiate the doctrine and practice of Indulgences from Holy Scripture. (II.) The conscious inability of the writer thus from Scripture to sustain his cause; and hence his appeal to *tradition*. (III.) That, following the Author into this part of the subject, we find him acknowledging that, even with regard to *traditionary* evidence, there is great "uncertainty as regards *the first ages*;" and nothing appears definitely on this subject until the eleventh or thirteenth centuries! (IV.) The admission, as you may remember,

that this doctrine is not a "certain" article of faith, but that it may "*approximate* to one." (V.) The difficulty and expense of procuring Indulgences; whereby the system is proved to be inconsistent with the freedom and fulness of the everlasting Gospel of Jesus Christ. And (VI.) That Indulgences, even when obtained from one Pope, may yet be "*condemned and revoked*" by a subsequent Pontiff; thus involving the whole system in uncertainty!

Now, upon these points, I might have adduced the following argument, which I shall now propose for your consideration.

I find in the Creed of Pius IV.—the acknowledged creed of the Church of Rome—with regard to Indulgences, the following article :

<p>"Indulgentiarum etiam potestatem a Christo in ecclesia relictam fuisse, affirmo."</p>	<p>"I also affirm, that the power of Indulgences was left by Christ in the Church."</p>
--	---

Such is the statement regarding Indulgences in the Creed of Pope Pius IV., which Creed was first published on the 9th of December, A.D. 1564. This doctrine is inserted therein as *an institution* of Christ, and an *absolute* article of faith. Yet, when they come to the *proof* of this, there arises a gross uncertainty as to this doctrine "in the first ages,"—it is uncertain whether it *be* an article of faith! All that can be said on the subject is, that "it *approximates* to one." Is not this an inconsistency?—a contradiction between Mr. Oakeley's book and his acknowledged standard, the Creed of Pope Pius IV.?

Mark, likewise, Cardinal Bellarmine's evidence on this subject. You have a Cardinal, here in London, who says that it "was left by Christ." Yet another Cardinal (Bellarmine) thus writes regarding the evidence on this topic, "De Indul." lib. ii. c. xvii. 1.

<p>"Neque mirum videri debet, si auctores antiquiores non multos habemus, qui harum rerum mentionem faciunt, quoniam plurima sunt in Ecclesia, quæ solo usu, sine literis, conservantur."</p>	<p>"It is not to be wondered at, if we have not many <i>ancient authors</i> which make mention of <i>Indulgences</i>; inasmuch as many things are retained in the Church only by use and custom, <i>without writing</i>."</p>
---	---

Why, then, with such evidence against this doctrine—why does the Roman Catholic Church state that "the power of Indulgences was left by Christ in the Church?"

This summary of our former Lecture may tend to recall to your minds these various particulars, and enable you the better to understand what we now propose further to show you, in our examination of this book.

The first part of this subject is, as you may remember, "Indulgences in general." This we examined last evening, and I have just now given an abstract of our researches under the above six particulars. We shall now proceed to the second part, viz., "Indulgences in particular:" it commences at p. 79 of Mr. Oakeley's book. The first chapter speaks of "Privileged Altars," which are thus defined:—"A privileged altar is that to which a Plenary Indulgence is attached by the Pope, applicable to those souls for whom the holy sacrifice is offered thereon, either on any day, or on certain days only. This privilege may be attached to the *person* of the priest; in which case it is enjoyed wherever the priest celebrates."

You have heard of "Indulgenced Beads," and you shall this evening hear of "Indulgenced Scapulars," &c., &c.; but we *now* speak of an "Indulgenced Priest," who, wherever he goes, takes the Indulgence with him, and whatever may be the altar at which he serves, the privilege attaches thereto. But we must inquire into the *origin* of these "privileged altars." We have been searching into the depths of this subject on the former evening. We have searched the Scriptures, but we do not find Indulgences there; we have searched "the first ages," and even there we find them not! We must come to what are generally, and very properly, called the "*dark ages*," and there we find the earliest origin of this Roman Catholic doctrine. We must now ask, "When did Privileged Altars arise?" The reply of this Author is, (p. 80.) "Whether the Indulgence of privileged altars be an *ancient* custom is *disputed*." Here is another "dispute" in a church which professes to be so united, and to have no disagreement! "Supposing," he proceeds, "as *some* do, that the custom cannot be traced beyond Gregory XIII., yet examples may be cited of privileged altars so far back as the Pontificate of Paschal I., in 817." Some say it can, and others say it cannot be traced beyond Gregory XIII.; *i. e.*, beyond A. D. 1580. This is the Pope (Gregory XIII.) who caused a medal to be struck in honour of the Mas-

sacre of St. Bartholomew, to commemorate the destruction of the Huguenots; and this same Pope it was, who instituted these privileged altars! That sanguinary massacre, (A.D. 1572) and privileged altars date their origin from the same source! But, Brethren, whether it be Pope Gregory XIII. in the sixteenth century, or Paschal I. in the ninth age, is of very minor importance; if it is not sanctioned by the Bible, it matters not to me *when* or *where* these things may have begun. But, to give a plain illustration of these privileged altars, I hold in my hand a letter from one doubtless well known to this assembly,—I mean the Rev. Hobart Seymour, of Bath,—addressed to a friend of mine, a clergyman in Islington; viz.:

“I was at Vacallo, in Piedmont, last September; and finding at the *Sacra Monte* there an office for selling masses to release souls from Purgatory, I went boldly in, asked for a mass, paid about twenty pence, the price demanded, and have brought home a *receipt* for the money and the object. I was asked the name of the person who was to be released from Purgatory, and *I gave my own*, so that they have got *me* out! Can anything be more monstrous? There is a *privileged* chapel there, and one mass on a given day is sufficient.”!

Now, my Brethren, this is a practical illustration of this chapter of Mr. Oakeley's book on “Privileged Altars.” This is the practical working of the system. I ask; is it not a delusion to all that trust in it? and yet this principle is avowedly inculcated in the book which comes to me with the solemn recommendation of the chief Roman Catholic Priest in this parish. Mr. Oakeley himself ought to be here; he was invited to attend on the former evening. On him lies all the responsibility of this extraordinary teaching. To such Roman Catholics as are here present, I sincerely say, that I seek not in anywise to offend you; God forbid I should put a stumbling-block in the way of your reception of what I believe to be Gospel truth! This book, without any solicitation on my part, has been recommended to me by your chief pastor in this parish, and I must take it in hand, and deal with it honestly, and as it ought to be dealt with.

I proceed now to page 86, where you will find the following question proposed, “Is it necessary to say at a privileged altar the masses for which *fees* have been given on this condition? And if the priest has engaged to say more masses than he is able, how must he act?”

We may put this question in another form—"If a merchant has received payment for a certain number of articles, *how many* of them is he under an obligation to send home? And if he has taken money for more than he can *possibly* send, what is he to do?"

The *Answer* is given in p. 86. "It cannot be doubted but that those masses for which fees have been paid, *ought* to be said at a Privileged Altar, otherwise the persons paying the fees would be *deceived*. Care ought to be taken not to accumulate masses to such a degree as to be unable to say them according to the intentions of those who require them; but *if* it happens, *culpably* or not, that a priest has *engaged* to say *more Masses* than he *possibly* can say or obtain to be said at the privileged altar, the *only resource* is to procure their celebration at another privileged altar, or to write to *Rome* and *obtain the personal privilege for as many masses as are in arrears!*"

I now speak under correction. But I am led to understand, I have indeed read, that there is actually in existence in Rome, an office—where Priests under such circumstances can compound for any number of masses in arrears, by paying a certain sum to procure an indemnity for such as they cannot say. This seems also clear from the words of this Author, "The only resource is *to write to Rome* to obtain a *personal privilege for as many masses as are in arrears.*"

¶We shall now leave the "Privileged Altars," and come to the Chapter on "Indulged Beads." Of these there are two kinds—"one in honour of our Blessed Saviour, and the other in honour of *the Blessed Virgin.*" Many privileges are attached to prayers repeated on the former of these beads, that in honour of our Blessed Saviour; however, I shall only mention one, and that is "the crown of the five wounds of our Saviour." There is, I fear, much of superstition, even in these matters, which refer specially to Christ, as they are practised in the Church of Rome. Now in the Holy Scriptures we have all needful information given, and examples presented to our notice—all showing *how* the Lord Jesus Christ is to be worshipped. We must not, therefore, invent anything of our own mere imagination: whatever is written is sure. We are therein simply commanded, "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy

God, and Him *only* shalt thou serve," Matt. iv. 10. We know nothing of worshipping the "five wounds," the "sacred heart, &c." I worship Christ as a person, as "the effulgence of God's glory, and the express image of His person." But in Roman Catholic refinements of theology, we have "the order to be observed in honouring the sacred wounds;" namely, "we must adore first that of the *left foot*, then that of the *right*; next, that of the *left hand*, then that of the *right*; and finally, that of the *side*." Now, my Brethren, I do believe that we go far away from the simplicity of the gospel of Christ, if we allow ourselves to enter into such matters as these. We have Christ set before us as a person, having done a certain work, which is sufficient for the salvation of man. Let us adore HIM! Let us worship HIM! It is those who "worship Him in spirit and in truth," that He delights to hear,—these He delights to answer!

Next let us notice the "crowns" or "*chapelets*" in honour of the Blessed Virgin. These are three in number; namely, "the rosary, the ordinary chaplet, and the crown of the seven dolours." Let us now inquire into the *origin* of these various observances? Did Christ, or His Apostles, or any of the early Christians pray on them? No, no, far later than these! Mr. Oakeley's book states, at page 126, that "St. Dominic, who died 1221, instituted the practice of reciting fifteen decades of 'Aves,' each preceded by a 'Pater Noster' in honour of the principal mysteries of Jesus Christ, and of the Blessed Virgin; and this is what is termed the *Rosary*." So that no one knew of the Rosary till the time of St. Dominic, which Dominic was also the founder of "*the Inquisition*."

There is, again, another "*chapelet*," called the "*Bridgetine Beads*," page 129. These "were granted by Pope Alexander VI. to the Priests of the Order of our Saviour, commonly called the Order of St. Bridget, and there is attached to each of these an Indulgence of 500 days."

We now come to the subject of "Crosses and Medals." "This good and pious custom the Pontiffs have encouraged by attaching divers Indulgences to these pious objects, when sanctified by apostolical benediction. These Indulgences are the same as those attached to indulgenced beads." I have with me some of these crosses and

medals, which I have procured from converts from Romanism in Ireland, by whom they had once been looked upon as charms to drive away evil both from body and soul. Upon the medal there appears inscribed, the "image and superscription" of *Mary!*—the figure of a woman standing *on the serpent's head*, with rays of light issuing from her hands, and around it this prayer, in French :*

"O Marie! conçue sans peche, priez pour nous, qui avons recours à vous!"	"O Mary! conceived without sin, pray for us, who flee to thee for succour!"
--	---

In page 134, we are informed that "the Indulgence cannot be attached to crosses of paper, or of card, wood, iron, lead, glass, or other fragile substances; these objects should be of gold, silver, brass, or other metal, and should bear no other effigy than that of Jesus Christ, or of some canonized saint." In the same paragraph, he gives us another piece of information from Rome: "An answer from Rome decides that Indulgences may be attached to *ivory images!*" Again: "Any person who has in his room, or other decent part of the house, a crucifix, cross, or image, blessed by the Pope, or a priest who has the power to do so, and shall perform before it the works of piety enumerated above, with reference to indulgenced beads, may gain the Indulgences there mentioned!" All these conditions must be complied with, "otherwise no Indulgence will be granted, but only a pious work will have been performed." We are next told, "Beads of crystal or glass may be blessed with the application of Indulgences, if they be *solid* and *compact*; but iron is forbidden, as also tin, lead, and all other fragile substances. According to a decree of Alexander VII., February 6th, 1657, and to a declaration of the Congregation of Indulgences, November 26th, 1714, crosses, medals, and beads which have been Indulgenced cannot be used by other persons, on any pretext whatever; and can be used by those only for whom they were blessed, or to whom they

* This, I need hardly say, encourages the worship of a creature, and that, after an unscriptural, yea, *anti-scriptural* form of prayer; places the Virgin in the position of Christ, who *alone* can "bruise the serpent's head;" and strongly reminds one of the scene in Ephesus, as recorded in Acts xix. 24, &c.

were first given.”—“The Indulgences cannot be gained, if the object to which they are attached are lost.” Again : “If a person lends his Indulgenced Beads to another, merely to afford him the opportunity of performing this devotion, he who borrows it certainly does not gain any Indulgence ; but nowhere is it found that the beads cease to be indulgenced to the owner. *But if* he lends them in order to communicate the Indulgence to the other person, or that he may gain the Indulgence, *the beads cease to be indulgenced, both to the lender and to the borrower.* The Holy See has expressed itself formally on this point !”

Really, it is a pity the “Holy See” has nothing better to do than to decide on such very *unimportant* matters ! Such *important* decisions, however, would be very likely to engender a spirit of selfishness in matters of religion ! What would you think, my friends, if “an answer from Rome” should decide that should a man with a lighted candle chance to meet another man whose lamp had been extinguished, and should he attempt to communicate *the light* of his candle to the man in darkness, that such attempt would in fact extinguish his own light ? Yet such, in principle, is the theology of Rome as recorded in Mr. Oakeley’s book ! I remember having read somewhere among the *heathen* Classics, that “He that communicates of his light to another, diminishes not aught of his own thereby.” And, again : “He that points out the way to the wanderer, loses nothing himself by the act.” The above extract from this Roman Catholic work surely contrasts but badly with these sentiments of one who was yet without the light of Christian truth !

We remark, again, another important consideration, page 136 : “It is necessary to have the beads in the hand when they are said, and to touch each one at the time of the corresponding prayer ; no Indulgence would be gained by merely having it about one, without touching it !”

Another question is now asked (p. 137), which will puzzle many of us : “In what do Bridgetine Beads differ from beads simply Indulgenced ?” The answer, however, is that the Bridgetine Beads “have an Indulgence to each bead ;” with the ordinary ones it is not so.

With regard to the form in which they are blessed, we are told, in page 140, that “no special form is prescribed ;

a simple form, *without any words*, will suffice." How they can be blessed without any words, either vocally or mentally expressed, we are not told ; but we are informed that the Pope "does not bless the many objects presented to him in any other manner." But though no words are needed, and the Pope in general uses none, yet "a lighted wax taper and holy water should be used!"

The writer now proceeds to the worship of "the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary;" and we are informed that "it is no longer a question among [Roman] Catholics whether it is lawful to honour and adore the Sacred Hearts of Jesus and Mary." As to the form and the words used in the prayer to "the Sacred Heart of Mary," we may be allowed to read the following passage (p. 145), which presents a fearful instance of material worship: "Heart of Mary, be our comfort in our necessities, our support in temptation, our refuge in persecution, our assistance in danger, and above all, at the hour of death, when all hell let loose against us shall seek to ruin our souls—at that awful moment, on which depends our eternal doom; O most compassionate Virgin, prove to us the tenderness of thy maternal heart; manifest thy power with Jesus, by opening to us a refuge in the source of mercy itself, in order that we may visit him in the kingdom of the blessed for ever and ever. Amen!" This object of supplication—this "refuge in persecution"—this "assistance in danger," were all alike unknown to the Apostles, and unheard of in the Christian Church for many, many centuries; and if unknown to them, be it also unknown to you! The apostle St. Paul, for instance, in all his trials, afflictions, and persecutions, never sought *her* protection, compassion, or pity; but he knew himself to be "strong in *the Lord*, and in the power of *His* might." And is not God still the same?—"His hand is not shortened that it cannot save; neither His ear heavy that it cannot hear," Isa. lix. 1. He is "the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever," Heb. xiii. 8.

We are next instructed as to the "Indulgences which have been granted to the Litanies of Jesus and the Blessed Virgin." Sixtus V. "granted an Indulgence of three hundred days to all who would recite the Litany of the Holy Name, and two hundred days to those who would recite the Litany of Loretto," (*i.e.*, of the Blessed Virgin

Mary.) A subsequent Pope (Pius VII.) increased the two hundred days for the Litany of Loretto to three hundred days,—thus making this Indulgence equal to that granted for the Litany of *Jesus!* Nay, more—he afterwards added a *Plenary Indulgence* to all who would recite daily *the Litany of Mary*; but left the Indulgence for the Litany of *Jesus* without any augmentation! Thus actually offering an inducement “to worship and serve the creature more than the Creator!” Against such an unholy service, St. Paul specially warns the Church of Rome in his Epistle to the Romans, i. 25. Brethren, beware!

It is ordinary in the Church of Rome sometimes for three persons to associate themselves together, in order to recite a rosary or litany with these indulgenced beads. Now hear the theology of Rome, as taught in this book, on this subject. It is very unlike the promise of Christ, that “where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them,” Matt. xviii. 20. We are told, however, by this book (p. 151), that “if *one* of the three fails, we very much doubt whether the others can gain the Indulgence”—that is, two may pray with all their heart, fervently and devoutly; but if “one should fail,” there is no Indulgence vouchsafed to any,—not even to those who have prayed fervently! So says the Church of Rome; but Christ says, and with unmistakeable emphasis declares, that “if *two* of you shall agree on earth as touching anything that they shall ask, it shall be done for them,” Matt. xviii. 19.

The Author then proceeds to suggest some ejaculations, to which, in themselves, and disconnected from their erroneous associations amongst Romanists, I do not at all object. They are these: “My God, my sovereign good, would that I had always loved thee! My God, I detest the time in which I loved thee not!” &c. Yet even in these otherwise unobjectionable phrases, we find many unknown and extraordinary names introduced; as an example, we observe, in p. 155, “Would that I had for Thee a love similar to that of St. Mary Magdalene, St. Catherine, and St. Teresa; or such as that of St. Austin, St. Dominic, St. Francis Xavier, St. Philip Neri, St. Aloysius Gonzaga.” With these names we have nothing whatever to do. It is, indeed, rather questionable as to

whether many of these were, in religious profession, in life and character, at all worthy *models* for our imitation.

On page 158 we are presented with a most shocking decree of Pope Pius VII. (1807), who "granted an Indulgence of three hundred days to all who should make the following invocations devoutly :"

"Jesus, Mary, and Joseph! I offer you my heart and soul.

Jesus, Mary, and Joseph! assist me in my last agony.

Jesus, Mary, and Joseph! May I breathe forth my soul in peace with you."

My Brethren, is this Christianity? I ask, is this *Christianity*? Would Christ thus condescend to "give His glory unto another?" Will He give His praise to creatures of his hand? Would Christ, my beloved Brethren, who is "God over all, blessed for evermore," sanction this union with two of his creatures who cannot hear or answer? Roman Catholics say that they do not pray to them, but to Christ; but here is a prayer addressed to *the three together*, and to *each of the three alike!* If this be not giving worship to Mary and Joseph, such as is given to Christ, and which ought to be given to HIM ALONE, why then it must be that words have no meaning! The same adoration, the same words, the same supplication, are offered to all three alike, with the same breath, in the same posture, and at the same time! I repeat, is this *Christianity*? I remember during the very first week which I spent in Islington, I incidentally found lying on the ground, in one of our courts, the paper which I now hold in my hand. It is headed, "Remembrance of the Mission given by the Redemptorist Fathers," contains a prayer to the Virgin, has *no prayer to God*, and concludes with the following, which greatly resembles the above :

"Blessed be Jesus, Mary, and Joseph!

Jesus, Mary, and Joseph! I give you my heart, my life, and soul.

Jesus, Mary, and Joseph! assist me always, and in my last agony.

Jesus, Mary, and Joseph! receive my last breath!—Amen."

Now, my Brethren, I ask you, has this a particle of that Christianity which Paul preached when he spake of Christ as the "One *only* Mediator;" or which Peter preached when he declared, that "there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must

be saved," but the name of Christ? In what estimation these prayers to "Jesus, Mary, and Joseph," are held by Romanists, may appear from the grant of "Indulgences" to those who thus invoke the creature with the Creator. This book informs us that a grant was made by Pope John XII. of "forty days' Indulgence to those who "reverently *kiss the cross*;" and that "Clement IV. granted a year for this last action."

"By a rescript of Jan. 10th, 1815, Pius VII. granted in perpetuity, one hundred days' Indulgence to those who should say the following prayer, in honour of the Blessed Virgin Mary and her holy mother, St. Anne;" and "a Plenary Indulgence on the 26th of July, to all who shall have recited it at least ten times a month:"—"Hail, full of grace! the Lord is with thee; may thy grace be with me; blessed art thou among women, *and blessed be holy Anna, thy mother, from whom thou didst proceed without stain or sin,*" &c. To this *unscriptural prayer* there is granted, by a Papal decree, a Plenary Indulgence to all those who use it. You see how *many* names they introduce between God and the sinner; and all this through wilful ignorance of this grand and *truly Catholic* truth, "There is one God, and *one Mediator* between God and man,—the man CHRIST JESUS."

Again; there is an Indulgence, granted by this same Pope Pius VII., of two hundred days, to be gained once a day, "by those who, with a contrite heart, should recite devoutly the following hymn, prayer, and versicle, in honour of *St. Michael*, to obtain his protection in the warfare of life, and at the hour of death!"

"Thee, of thy Father effluence bright,
And power supreme, our hearts' delight,—
Thee, with the angels, let us greet,
Meek listeners, Jesus, at thy feet.

"Around thee close, in serried band,
A thousand thousand chieftains stand;
But he that waves the Saviour's sign,
Is Michael, CHAMPION OF THE LINE!"

This is the hymn for the recitation of which two hundred days' Indulgence, once a day, is given! Again; this same Pope Pius VII. granted a year's Indulgence "to all the faithful" who shall recite the following prayers in honour of St. Joseph, "foster-father of our Lord Jesus

Christ, and most chaste spouse of the Blessed Virgin Mary :”

“ Ye who would live and die secure,
In merit strong, of mercy sure ;
Choose Joseph for your heavenly friend,
To guide your steps, and bless your end.
He was sweet Mary’s consort dear,
And Jesus’ sire when exiled here ;
Just, true, of purity untold,
Say, shall *he* ask, and God withhold ?

“ Ye who would live and die secure,
In merit strong, of mercy sure ;
Choose Joseph for your heavenly friend,
To guide your steps, and bless your end.”

Is this Christianity ? It may be Popery, and it is ; but it is not Christianity to invoke such names, and to repose in such, our trust and confidence in the article of death ! The Holy Scriptures point out to us a “ a more excellent way ”—Christ, who is “ the way, the truth, and the life ;” and “ no man can come unto the Father but by him.”

Again ; they introduce the names of St. Peter and St. Paul in a manner which those holy Apostles would not sanction. Pius VI. granted one hundred days’ Indulgence (Jan. 19th, 1782), to all who recite the following hymn in honour of St. Peter :

“ Would’st thou an *intercessor* find,
A patron to thy Saviour’s mind ?
Then know He grants to thy desire,
The Prince of the Apostolic choir.

“ Oh, *Holy Prince* ! to whom were given
The keys that ope the gates of Heaven
O may thy love to us reveal
The glory which those gates conceal ?

“ As thou by sweet angelic hands
Wert loosen’d from thy prison bands ;
So may *thy hands* our *souls* release
From *chains* that mar our wish’d-for peace ?
O Holy Prince, &c.

“ Rock of th’ Eternal Church secure,
Ground of the Truth, and pillar sure ;
Grant us true constancy to find
Where sin corrupts, or errors blind ?
O Holy Prince, &c.

“ The malice of the fiendish foe,
Do thou, *blest Advocate*, lay low ;
His arts divert, his ire assuage,
Lest on our souls he wreak his rage ?
O Holy Prince, &c.

“ And when he casts his fiercest dart,
 In Death's drear hour *do thou impart*
Strength for the fight, that, cheer'd by thee,
 Our strife be lost in victory ?

O Holy Prince, &c.”

Ah! my Brethren, Roman Catholics thus invoke St. Peter to cleanse them from their sins, and to loose the bands of their iniquities; they thus, on their knees, in prostrate worship, ask of him, what Christ *alone* can give. Were St. Peter now to speak with the living voice to those who thus address him, he would doubtless correct them, as he once corrected the prostrate Cornelius, saying, “ Stand up; I myself also am a man,” Acts x. 26. He would say as Paul and Barnabas said, when they saw the people coming out to burn incense and offer sacrifices to them: “ Sirs, why do ye these things? We also are men of like passions with you, and preach unto you, that ye should turn from these vanities unto the living God,” Acts xiv. 15.

Again; we find here Pope Pius VII. granting an Indulgence of one hundred days, each day, to those who recite the following hymn in honour of St. Paul:

“ When loads of grief thy heart oppress,
 To *Paul* thy suppliant vows address;
 He showers profusely from above
 Sure pledges of *Christ's* saving love.
 O blessed Victim, dear to Heaven,
 Teacher to longing Gentiles given;
 O *Paul*, loved friend, avenger strong;
Guide us our *thorn-set* path along!
 Thou lovedst us erst; then leave us not,
 Be not thy ancient gifts forgot.
Our parch'd and languid souls once more,
To hope of heavenly grace restore? ”

Here we find many prayers, my Brethren,—many “ Indulgenced ” hymns,—many “ Indulgenced ” prayers,—to Mary, Joseph, Anna, Peter, Paul, Michael, and many other Saints, some of them unknown; and yet I know not of one single Indulgence being granted for the *reading* of a single portion of the inspired writings of St. Peter or St. Paul, or any other Apostle. If there were, they would soon sing and pray differently. They would soon learn from Paul, that there is but “ *one Mediator!* ” This quotation I must again and again repeat; and, as I meet the Infidel, the Atheist, the Polytheist, with the text,

“ There is *one* God,”—so I meet the Romanist with this, —“ there is *one* Mediator between God and man!” We have again given, by the same Pope, “ one year’s Indulgence, applicable to the Souls in Purgatory, *to all Priests,*” each time they say the following prayer in honour of St. Joseph :

“ I beseech thee, by this double and most sweet pledge, Jesus and Mary, to preserve me from all uncleanness, and with a mind pure from stain, a clean heart, and a chaste body, to *make* me in all holiness, now and for ever, the devout servant of Jesus and Mary. Amen.”

Here is a prayer offered by Roman Catholics, and especially by *the Priests*, to a creature, to make them what God alone can make them ; here is a Papal authority sanctioning this creature worship by granting so many years’ Indulgence to all those who say this prayer ! What must the condition of the *taught* be, when *the teachers* themselves are thus instructed ?

We now come to Part III., which treats of “ Confraternities and Sodalties.” These are companies—public associations of Romanists, who are leagued together under certain rules ; one special rule directs that each member should become entitled to the merit of each and all of the good works of the whole association ! We must, however, inquire into *the origin* of these things. I see nothing of it in the Scriptures ; but that they were all one body, when in an upper room they assembled together in the name of Christ Jesus only, and there worshipped God in simplicity, sincerity, and truth. Mr. Oakeley’s book, however, (p. 190) states very clearly the earliest beginning of these Roman Catholic associations ; and they possess an undoubted antiquity. “ The origin of Confraternities,” he writes, “ generally understood, may be traced to *Numa Pompilius*, who is said to have established associations for the trades, and *required each to sacrifice to the tutelar deity he had assigned him !*” You remember your Roman history ? Many hundreds of years before Christ came down from heaven lived Numa Pompilius, the second king of Rome—a *pagan* king, a *heathen* monarch, and yet the first founder of *Roman Catholic Confraternities !* This king, over whose head, at his inauguration, the name of *Jupiter* was invoked !*—that king, who feigned nightly

* See Hist. T. Livii, lib. i. ch. xviii.

interviews with the goddess Egeria, in order to obtain additional sanction for his *heathen* ceremonies ;—he, according to Mr. Oakeley, was the originator of *Roman Catholic* Confraternities !

Many a hard day's work I had at the Roman History, and yet I never learned this fact till now ; and is it possible that we of Islington are now invited to attach ourselves to such "Sodalities" and Confraternities, which date their origin from a heathen king in ancient days, and many a long century before Christ came "to seek and to save that which was lost ?" Shall we be followers rather of this heathen monarch than of Christ ? I am filled with amazement that a Roman Catholic Bishop of France, and a Roman Catholic Priest in Islington, should thus honestly avow their Pagan origin, at least in this particular.* And I thank them for the admission.

Again ; the Tutelary Deities of the Pagans have given place to the Tutelar Saints of Rome ; and what is the difference ? The one is merely baptized into the name of the other. "In the history of the first ages," says Mr. Oakeley's book, "we find no mention of the establishment of special Confraternities as at present." So that in the "first ages," the Church had nothing to do with *Paganism*. It did not take up this pagan custom till long, long after the time of Christ and his Apostles, as we find in page 191 : "The first we discover is that of Confalon, which was established at Rome, under *Clement IV.*, in 1267." So long after Christ as the thirteenth century ! Is it not a glorious thing, my Brethren, that notwithstanding all the old errors of Rome—all the growth of tares amidst God's wheat, which He planted with His own right hand, and watered with the dew of His heavenly grace,—that yet the professing Church continued for 1267 years before this pagan custom was engrafted upon her system ? You ask me, "Where was your church before Luther ?" and I in return ask you, "Where were Indulgences before the dark ages ?" Our doctrines, and the creed of our church, were, both before and after Luther, just as they are now—registered in the blessed book of God. Buried, indeed, these doctrines may have been amid the accumulated traditions of men ; but they were

* See p. 27, where we quoted also the Pagan origin of Purgatory.

"buried alive," again to shine upon the earth, and to refresh the weary soul. But the doctrine of Indulgences, Purgatory, and such like, were registered in the archives of *Paganism*, as this book declares; and not until a later age—not until the year 1267—did the Church of Rome espouse this old Pagan institution of Numa Pompilius.

"The Roman Pontiffs," we are told, at page 191, "thinking it their duty to encourage these pious associations, granted them special favours, privileges, and particularly Indulgences." You see, therefore, it is the Popes who have introduced and sanctioned this species of credulity; and Mr. Oakeley, once a Protestant clergyman, now inculcates Indulgences with all their absurdities, with all their uncertainties, and with all their Pagan Institutions!

Well! wherever there are these confraternities, there must be chaplains to them; and we are told (p. 200) that there were "*many long and grievous disputes*" between the chaplains of these confraternities and the parish priests! This Church which boasts of its perfect unity is disunited again! These chaplains began to encroach, perhaps, on the functions, &c., of the parish priests; but it was finally determined "that the chaplains of confraternities, and the directors of congregations, can perform in their chapels or oratories, no one of the functions which are considered *parochial*." This advantage and privilege however was granted to the chaplains, "they may *bless candles*, on the Purification, for the brotherhood, and the sisterhood"! The parish priests, therefore, you observe, made this agreement: "Don't you interfere with us, and you may *bless candles* for your confraternities and guilds!"

We come now to the "Confraternity of the Rosary." The Rosary, or "Beads," is one of the most ordinary forms of devotion in the Church of Rome. We are told, (p. 202), that "the practice of reciting the Rosary in honour of the Blessed Virgin Mary, may be traced back as far as *St. Dominic*;" so, that which is the daily work of every Roman Catholic (*i.e.*, the repetition of fifty-one "Hail Mary's"), no one knew anything of till *St. Dominic* arose, and with "*the Inquisition*" introduced "*the Rosary*" likewise! We are told that in A.D. 1571, Pope Pius V. (this was the individual who excommunicated Queen Elizabeth,

and absolved all her subjects from their oath of allegiance to that heretic Queen!) “to perpetuate the remembrance of a victory over the Turks in the Gulf of Lepanto, by Don Juan of Austria, instituted a solemn festival in honour of the Blessed Virgin Mary, under the title of ‘Our Lady of Victory,’ and inserted in her Litany the words ‘Help of Christians, pray for us.’” I do not exactly see the connection between this and the Rosary; but it shows to you, Roman Catholics, that the expression you daily use, “Help of Christians, pray for us!” was never used till A.D. 1571. There are now *two* “Rosaries,” as they are called; one is “the Living Rosary,” the other is generally called “the Ordinary Rosary,” of which we have just been speaking. The “Living Rosary” has only lately been established (1826); and they give us but very little information about it in this book of Mr. Oakeley’s. He merely remarks, that “those who wish to join it, will find all that is necessary explained in a little book called the “Manual of the Living Rosary.” Well! I happen to have this “Manual of the Living Rosary,” and in it I find that the difference between the “Living Rosary” and the “Ordinary Rosary” is this,—“the Ordinary Rosary was instituted by St. Dominic, the holy Founder of the order of preachers,”—we may add also, the *holy* Founder of “the Holy Inquisition!”* “The authors of his life inform us, that it was revealed to the saint, as a most

* In the “Glories of Mary,” by St. Alphonsus Liguori, lately published, and which claims in the title-page to be “the first complete translation” (Dolman, 1852), the following miracle of the Rosary is narrated, p. 273:—“Father Eusebius Neirembergh relates, that there lived in Arragona a girl, named Alexandra, who being noble and very beautiful, was greatly loved; and on her account two young men, through jealousy, one day fought and killed each other. Their enraged relatives in return killed the poor young girl, cut off her head, and threw her into a well. A few days after, *St. Dominic* was passing through that place, and, inspired by the Lord, approached the well, and said, ‘Alexandra, come forth!’ and immediately *the head* of the deceased came forth, placed itself on the edge of the well, and prayed St. Dominic to hear *its* confession. The saint heard its confession, and also gave *it* communion, in presence of a great concourse of persons, who had assembled to witness the miracle. Then St. Dominic ordered her to speak, and tell why she had received that grace. Alexandra answered, that when she was beheaded, she was in a state of mortal sin; but that the most Holy Mary, *on account of the Rosary*, which she was in the habit of reciting, had preserved her in life. *Two days* the head retained its life *upon the edge of the well*, in the presence of all, and then the soul went to Purgatory”!!

efficacious means of counteracting the abuses of the *Albigenses*, and other heretics of the time." Aye! but not the only means employed! Could we now ask those suffering *Albigenses*—who then "counted not their lives dear unto them;" could we but inquire of them—how came their dry bones to lie thus bleached at the base of yonder Cottian Alps?—could we, I say, but ask them—oh! what a page of history would they unfold of persecutions dire, of Rome's destructive tyranny, of *Dominic's* dark and cruel deeds; not with rosaries and beads, not with prayers and supplications, but with fire and faggot, with subtlety and the sword, he sought their lives, and compassed their destruction! Thus were they chased from hill to dale, from valley to valley, taking refuge in "caves and dens of the earth," not, surely, to escape St. *Dominic's rosaries*, but rather to avoid St. *Dominic's sword!*

The inducement to unite with this confraternity of the "Living Rosary," is thus related in "the Manual," to which we are referred in this book:—"In the first place, as the portion of the Rosary, which each person has to recite, according to the rules of the '*Living Rosary*,' is so very small, there is thereby an inducement for a greater number to unite in it. Many allege that the Ordinary Rosary is too long, and that their occupations allow them not time enough to say it. But when it is *divided* according to the plan of the '*Living Rosary*,' amongst a circle of fifteen associates, each of whom has to recite *only one decade*, this excuse is at once removed." In this, then, the brevity is put forward as the great advantage and inducement; and the fact that others will share the *task* with you, and each one *say* his own part, ensures a large accession to their association.*

* The real result, and most likely the real intention, of this devotion of the "Living Rosary," is, that instead of each person saying for himself *fifty* Hail Mary's and *five* Paters per day, as in the "Ordinary Rosary," fifteen persons between them recite *one hundred and fifty* Hail Mary's, and fifteen Paters each day. Thus, at the conclusion of the year, instead of 18,250 Hail Mary's, as in the "Ordinary Rosary;" by this "Living Rosary" the almost incredible number of *fifty-four thousand seven hundred and fifty* Hail Mary's have been recited! Thereby, indeed, the worship of the *Blessed Virgin* is immensely increased. But what additional merit, or merit at all, can thereby accumulate, or even exist, in favour of the respective members, I know not; but this much I know, that "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and HIM ONLY shalt thou serve."

Another inducement is specified, in page 15, of "the Manual,"—one of consolation and encouragement,—viz. : "How consoling and encouraging must it not be to the members to be able to *assure* themselves, that though they are required by the rules of the devotion to recite *only one decade*, they have *the full merit* of the *entire* Rosary recited by the circle to which they belong." Merit in *this* there can be none. How can God, in anywise, even acknowledge such worship as that here described? It is nothing but a daily task, and that a *task divided!*

But to return to our Author. Article III. treats of the important confraternity of the "*Scapular*," which is, I think, the most widely spread of all. I have myself a large number of these Scapulars, both large and small. The origin of this confraternity is attributed (p. 210) to one "St. Simon Stock," who was "a native of England, and a religious, of the Order of the Carmelites." It appears that "in a vision (I quote from Mr. Oakeley's book) the Blessed Virgin Mary appeared to him, and gave him a Scapular, which remained in his hands as a proof of the vision,"—at least, so says Mr. Oakeley's book. But in this "united" Church even this vision has not been *undisputed*; for we are told,—and mark this!—(p. 210), that "the learned Dr. Launoy *attacked the truth of this vision!*" but our Author, nevertheless, proceeds to say, "the institution of the confraternity undoubtedly appears to be as ancient as the time of St. Simon Stock (A.D. 1225.) *This at least is certain*, that its *existence* cannot be doubted, nor its actual authenticity, nor the Indulgences which it enjoys."

Now, in order to give you a little insight into this matter, I shall refer you to "the Book of the Scapular," a "Manual" widely circulated amongst Roman Catholics. In Chapter I., we are informed as to the actual *institution* of the order of the Scapular; namely,—

"The ancient and most famous Order of the Blessed Virgin was begun and founded on the mountain of *Carmel*, about *nine hundred and thirty years* before the coming of Jesus Christ, for which cause the professors of the order are commonly called *Carmelites*, taking their denomination (as it hath happened to other orders) from the place where their institutes were first founded. The *institutor* of it was the *great Prophet Elias*, who three times made fire to come down from heaven to punish the idolaters."

There exists, then, a wonderful discrepancy between these two books as to *the origin* of the "Order of the Scapular." Mr. Oakeley's book dates the origin of the Order 1225 years *after* Christ. But this "Manual" of the Order, specially "*printed for the Confraternity*," so widely and authoritatively circulated throughout the Church of Rome, dates its origin 930 years *before* Christ!

But "the Book of the Scapular," which, mark ye! is much more generally read and circulated amongst Roman Catholics, at least in Ireland, than is even *their own Douay Bible*, thus proceeds :

"This holy prophet, praying on Mount Carmel (as it is related in 3 Kings xviii.), saw a little cloud rise from the sea, *which he knew, from a prophetic notion, to signify the glorious Virgin Mary!*"

This may, my friends, to you appear to be absurd ; but such is *verily believed* by many thousands of Roman Catholics, and often within *my own* experience have I met with those who firmly believed it, and much trouble have I had on many occasions to disabuse their minds of such an idea. But again :

"These disciples and successors of Elias are named, in the Holy Scriptures, Sons of the Prophets ; and they so much multiplied in a short time, that their glorious founder, before his translation (*it is thought*), had the consolation to see *convents* erected in Bethel, Jericho, Gilgal, and Samaria. * * Elias being taken away in a whirlwind, Elisens succeeded him, not only in the spirit of prophecy and miracles, but also in the government of the Prophetical Order. * * After the death of Elisens, *Jonas the prophet* is affirmed *by many* to have had the general government of the Order!"

Thus the Carmelite succession continued, at least as this "Manual of the Scapular" informs us (p. 17), until

"A little after the birth of our Saviour, St. Elizabeth, fearing the tyranny of Herod, who had slain many thousands of infants, fled with her son, St. John Baptist, into the desert, where *he joined himself to the successors of Elias*, and embraced the Institute ; from whom, they being more fully instructed of the dignity and excellence of the Blessed Virgin, they *much augmented their love and devotion to her*, and were the first of all mortals that built a chapel, or temple, *in her honour, whilst she was yet alive*, about the year of our Lord 38 ; and that on Mount Carmel, near the place where their father St. Elias had seen the little cloud mount up out of the sea, by which she was represented ; and in this chapel they daily met, and there offered up their sacrifices, prayers, and petitions, to the Divine Majesty, in honour and under the invocation of the Blessed Virgin, their mother, *singing continually her praises, and wholly addicting themselves to her devotion!*"

Not one word of all this can be established from Holy Scripture. These are really "*vain inventions.*" This

"Manual of the Scapular," from which I quote, further informs us, regarding the scene at Pentecost (Acts ii.), page 19,—

"There were dwelling at Jerusalem, Jews and religious men of every nation under heaven. The occasion of their being in Jerusalem was, that *they had there two convents*; the one on the part of Mount Zion, which was called Millo; the other was in the Golden Port, which is the place where Joachim and Anne, father and mother of the Blessed Virgin, first met, and consented to their future marriage."

My Brethren, well may we remind you of the warning of the Apostle Paul, "Beware lest any man spoil you through philosophy and vain deceit, *after the traditions of men*, after the rudiments of the world, and *not after Christ*," Col. ii. 8.

This Manual likewise enumerates the four privileges which are attached to the Order of the Scapular, viz. :

The first privilege is,

"That those *who wear* the Scapular are partakers of the prayers, discipline, alms, watchings, fasts, masses, canonical hours, mortifications, austerities, and good works, which are done in the holy order of Carmelites."

The second privilege is this :

"He that dieth *invested* with this habit *shall not suffer eternal fire*! which is as much as to say, that the Scapular is a great help in order to obtain eternal felicity."

The third privilege is,

"That which we call 'Bulla Sabbatina;' and it consists in this, that the blessed Virgin doth assist her devout brethren, after their decease, in freeing them speedily from the horrible pains of Purgatory, especially on the first Sunday [query, Saturday], after their death.* *The truth* of this promise cannot now *reasonably* be called in doubt, seeing it hath oftentimes been approved of by the Popes!"

As to *the truth* of this, we shall just now examine the evidence adduced in Mr. Oakeley's Book. Meanwhile,

The fourth privilege of the Scapular

"Consists in the great multitude and variety of Indulgences with which the order has been enriched by the Popes of Rome."

These Indulgences are too numerous to admit of enumeration just now.

* The "Manual of the Scapular" informs us, at page 47, that "the Scapular must be made of cloth, serge, or other stuff, or embroidered with gold or silver, it must be of a *brown or tawny colour*. *The reason* of this is, because it is worn in honour of the most Blessed Virgin, of whom it is attested that she never wore silk, but woollen, and that of the native colour!"

So much for our researches into the "Manual of the Scapular," and our digression from Mr. Oakeley's Book. It was quite necessary that we should know these details regarding the "Order;" and what we have just now learned may help us the better to understand what follows on this subject in the book which we are reviewing this evening.

And now, to return. Our Author proceeds, at page 214, to state the three conditions on which may be obtained the benefit of the Indulgences attached to these Scapulars. They are as follows, viz. : "(I.) That the Scapular be received from a priest who has proper authority. (II.) That it be worn habitually. (III.) That the person's name be inscribed in the register of the confraternity." And he adds, that "If any one of these conditions be neglected, the person could *not be at all certain* of gaining the Indulgences." What uncertainty is here!

Well, then Mr. Oakeley's book proceeds thus:— "Having frequently heard that the Scapulars should be entirely of woollen cloth, we (*i. e.*, the Author of Mr. Oakeley's book) mentioned the subject to the General of the Order of the Carmelites at Rome, who said that *the strings might be of tape!*"—"A prelate gave him the same answer;" and "therefore," he says, "there can be no difficulty on this point!" What weighty cares *do* beset these men in Rome!—What learned decisions they *do* sometimes arrive at!—What noble and dignified occupation for a prelate!—Assuredly St. Paul, amidst all his cares, when there devolved on him "the care of all the Churches," never mentions or decides on such puerilities as these! And yet such matters Mr. Oakeley not only sanctions, but even *publishes*, and formally *recommends* to my perusal!

Having received the Scapular in a duly formal manner, and worn it constantly, the writer states, that "*Nothing more is requisite; neither prayers, abstinences, nor extraordinary fasts. The seven Paternosters and Ave Marias given in the little books, are not at all necessary.*" Thus, this privilege of the Scapular exempts from every Penance and every good work! No wonder, then, that so many should trust to its efficacy. But what hope, or trust, or confidence, *can* it impart to any poor sinner? Let us examine the foundation on which it rests!

For this purpose we enter on a consideration of the great privilege of the "*Bulla Sabbatina*," of which we have already heard somewhat from "The Manual of the Scapular." We find this described in page 216:—"This Bull, given at Avignon, by John XXII., in 1316," commences with the words, *Sacratissimo uti culmine*." Now this is the Bull which promises to this confraternity that, upon the first Saturday after the death of any member, the Virgin Mary will descend into Purgatory, and take him out of it! This is here registered in Mr. Oakeley's own book. But the "authenticity" of this Bull, we are informed (p. 216), "has been attacked by critics." "Authentic" means "relating matters of fact as they occurred, and entitled, therefore, to full credit!" Well! the "authenticity" of this Bull is disputed by critics! Those who have examined into it, dispute the reality of the facts alleged therein! The reasons whereon its authenticity has been assailed are four; they are recorded in this same page, and I now put them before you as honest Englishmen, and ask your candid verdict as to the weight of these objections.

It is objected (I.), "that it is not found in the collections of the Bulls and Constitutions of John XXII." This is surely a very important objection! (II.) "It does not resemble them in style," which is another very reasonable objection. (III.) "That the writers of the time do not mention it," which is a still better reason; and (IV.), that "It contains incredibilities, such as the absolute promise of salvation and certain deliverance from Purgatory on the first Saturday after death of those who have worn the Scapular." Now, Brethren, you would like to know the *answers* to all these objections? Doubtless you would! But then they are not given! Instead of such, we have the *mere statement* that "*the Carmelites*, on the contrary, have always maintained that this Bull is authentic; and their reasons are far from being insignificant." But this is no answer to the above objections. I put it to you as an honest jury, whether such objections ought not to be answered—whether, instead of a mere assertion, *reasons* should not rather be given? We are, however, informed (p. 216), that "*Clement X.*, in a Brief of May 8th, 1673, and *Benedict XIV.*, in his work

on the 'Canonization of Saints,' mention this Bull as *almost* positively authentic!" *Two Popes*, Clement X. and Benedict XIV., "mention this Bull as *ALMOST positively AUTHENTIC!*" These two infallibles examine *this document*, and in their infallibility come to the conclusion that it is "*almost* positively authentic." On such a foundation is this superstructure erected!

The "two privileges" are, "(I.) That every brother who shall die with this Scapular on, will be preserved from hell; and, (II.) That if the brothers who die, wearing the Scapular, go to Purgatory, the Blessed Virgin Mary, as their tender mother, will deliver them *on the first Saturday after their death*. John XXII. avers that the Blessed Virgin Mary appeared to him, and announced this double privilege." This latter fact is stated twice in one page! (216.) I think, however, we must still leave the matter in its obscurity; for the investigation of *two infallible Popes* has not been able to bring it nearer than "*almost* positively authentic." The requisite "conditions" are, to wear the Scapular regularly, the preservation of chastity, to recite daily the canonical office of the Blessed Virgin Mary, and, if unable to read, to observe the fasts prescribed by the Church. Thus he that cannot read, must *fast!*

The next Confraternity which I shall notice is that of "Our Lady Auxiliatrix, of Munich." Among the other advantages of this Confraternity which are stated, we are told that "in it are celebrated yearly more than 40,000 Masses, and an *infinite* number of Rosaries. The whole is for the profit of *all* the members, *living and dead*." "If, *through forgetfulness*, they have omitted to say" the needful prayer on the proper days, "they may say it on any other day, or have a *mass* said during the year *for all the prayers they have omitted!*" Thus it appears that one mass at the end of the year will wipe off all former omissions. There is also a Confraternity of "Our Lady Auxiliatrix of Namur." "Sixty days' Indulgence" are granted to the members of this Confraternity "every time they assist at mass or other offices in the chapel of the Confraternity, or at the public or private meetings of this said Confraternity, in whatever place they may be held." The same Indulgence is granted "whenever they teach the ignorant

the commandments of God." This, however, is an Indulgence which they might almost have omitted, for they *very seldom* teach the commandments, as God wrote them. I have here five or six catechisms, in no one of which can I find the commandments as God himself has given them. It is just the same on the Continent. Our Second Commandment is from most catechisms altogether omitted.*

We must now proceed to Part IV., which treats of Jubilees, — festivals so called after the ancient Jewish jubilees, every fiftieth year, when the corn-fields, and vineyards, and oliveyards, were permitted to rest; all debts were remitted; all slaves were liberated; the land was not cultivated, and what it produced spontaneously belonged to the poor. "In imitation of this ancient jubilee," we are told (p. 260), "the Church opens her treasures at certain periods, and solemnly grants to her children many great favours and graces." But I cannot understand how the Papal jubilee can be considered, in any respect, an imitation of the Jewish. "We are told (p. 260) that the jubilee of the new law is a Plenary Indulgence attached to the performance of certain works of piety prescribed." There are two kinds of jubilee,—the "ordinary" and the "extraordinary." But we must inquire here, as on other subjects in this book, what is the *origin* of these jubilees? In reply, we are informed (p. 261),

"When this jubilee commenced *we are at a loss to ascertain*. Towards the close of 1299, *it was reported* that in Rome all who should visit the churches of St. Peter and St. Paul would gain a great Indulgence. . . . The conflux of pilgrims was so great, that during the whole of the year there were, on an average, 200,000 strangers in Rome; nevertheless, there never was any want of provisions, which was looked upon as a miracle."

* A few evenings ago, and since the delivery of the above Lecture, at a meeting for inquiring Roman Catholics (I hold such every week), the above topic occurred in the course of conversation. An Irish Romanist who was present stated that he had learned *all* the Commandments. I asked him *how* and *where* he had so learned them? He replied, that he had learned them from a Roman Catholic Catechism, published in *England*; and remarked, that the Commandments are not so taught by the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland! Another member of our meeting at once very sharply observed, that this is an act of *injustice* to the *Irish* people, to teach *them less* than they teach the English Romanists; and a feeling prevailed throughout the whole meeting, that what is taught to *English* Romanists *ought* to be taught to *Irish* Romanists also. This was advocated in a *truly national spirit*, and may, I trust, be productive of much good.

This must have brought great gain both to the Church and people. It was not for nothing that they held their jubilees. At the beginning they were held every 100 years, then every fifty years, next every thirty-three years, and now they (the ordinary jubilees) are held every twenty-five years.

The next matter of importance to which I refer is, that "Nicholas V. published, in 1449, the Jubilee for the following year, and on Christmas Eve he opened the *holy door** with great solemnity." How it is opened, we are informed, in page 263, viz. :

"On Christmas Eve, before the first vespers, the Pope proceeds in procession, with great splendour, to the *Holy Door*, under the vestibule of St. Peter's, and ascends his throne. The hymn ended, he receives from the Grand Penitentiary a *silver hammer*, gilt; approaches the wall which closes the door, and strikes it three times, each stroke being harder than the preceding, and at each he sings a versicle, to which the chanters answer; he then reascends the throne, and gives the signal for throwing down the wall, which is previously prepared."

Now it is of importance to ascertain when and whence did this ceremony originate? Mr. Oakeley's Book informs us (p. 264) that "*the origin* of this magnificent ceremony is involved in *uncertainty*!" Well now this book makes "confusion worse confounded." It renders uncertainty still more uncertain. It proceeds: "*Some* affirm that it is of very early date; but *the opinion* is that it was instituted by *Alexander VI.*, at the opening of the jubilee, in 1500." Such is the received opinion on this subject, according to our Author. Yet I cannot at all imagine how Pope Alexander VI. could possibly originate any *holy* thing! It will be worth our while to inquire *how* this man became Pope at all? and while in the Papal chair, how he conducted himself,—and again, how he *died*? However, let us see!

We refer to "Dupin's Ecclesiastical History," Vol. 3, p. 44 :

"His (*i. e.* Sixtus IV.) successor was Innocent VIII., who died 25th July, 1492. *Theodoric Borgia*, nephew to Callistus III., procured his own election in the room of Innocent VIII. by his *canvassing*, his *money*, and the *promises* he made to the Cardinals to give them *benefices and lands*, and took upon him the name of *Alexander VI.*

* "The Holy Gate is one of the portals of St. Peter's Church, which is never opened except during jubilee years; at other times it is walled up."—Note, p. 263.

He *disgraced* his dignity by his *ambition*, his *avarice*, his *cruelties*, and his *debaucheries*, and died on the 18th of August, in the year 1503, *having taken by a mistake that poison which he had prepared for poisoning the Cardinals whom he had invited!*

To this evidence of a Roman Catholic Historian, I add also the further testimony of another standard Historian in the Church of Rome, regarding this Pope Alexander VI., who first instituted "the *Holy Door*." Platina, in his "Lives of the Popes," thus writes respecting this Pope, p. 360 :

"Hæc animi ornamenta magnis obiverat vitiis, *perfidia* plusquam Punica, *ævitia* immani, *avaritia* immensa ac *rapacitate*, inexhausta parandi filio imperii, *per fas et nefas*, libidine. Si quando negotiis non premeretur, omni se jucunditatis generi sine discrimine dedit. Mulieribus maxime addictus, ex quibus quatuor filios et duas filias tulit. * * *

"Roma gentium profugium et asylum omnibusque sæculis populorum omnium tutissima arx, jam carnificina facta erat, quæ quidem omnia, suorum causa, quibus omnia indulserat, permittebat!"

"These intellectual accomplishments he marred by great vices,—by *perfidy* worse than Carthaginian, by *savage cruelty*, by *exorbitant avarice* and greediness, by an unbounded desire of obtaining, by right and by *wrong*, the empire for *his son!* If at any time he was not engaged in business, he abandoned himself to every kind of pleasure without distinction. * * He begat four sons and two daughters. * * *

"Rome, the refuge and asylum of nations, the most secure protection for every people in every age, had now become a *slaughter-house*; all which things he permitted on account of his own family, to whom he allowed every indulgence."!!

These two Roman Catholic Historians amply testify to the manner of this man's life and conduct while in the "Papal Chair," his attainment of, and departure from "Infallibility!" The "Vicar of Christ" was then a disgrace to Christendom! and yet this is the man who, according to Mr. Oakeley, *instituted* the ceremony of "the *Holy Door!*" any comment would be needlessly superfluous!

"The closing of the Jubilee," we are told (p. 264), "is performed with equal solemnity on the same day of the following year;" and after singing, &c., the Pope "blesses the stones and mortar to be used in walling it up," and the masons proceed to build it up again.

Much gain has accrued from the grant of Indulgences and Jubilees; we read (p. 266) that, "after the Jubilee at Rome in 1450, Nicholas V. granted, in the following year, to the Poles, at the request of Cardinal Sbignée, Bishop of Cracow,

the Jubilee Indulgence ; and dispensed with the journey to Rome, on the condition that they should give, by way of alms, *half the expense* they would have incurred by the journey to and from Rome, to defray the costs of the war against the Turks " !

We now come to the " Extraordinary Jubilee." " Leo X. granted an Indulgence of this kind in 1518, to those who would enter the league against the Turks."—" Paul III. published a similar one at Rome, July 25th, 1546, to implore *Divine mercy* during the weight of evils with which the Church was burdened by heresy, and to obtain a successful issue for *the war* he thought himself obliged to make *against the Protestants, whose stubbornness* would yield to no merely *persuasive* courses ; " *therefore*, he sets out for battle against Protestants, and prays to God to sanction his project ! What mockery ! The Protestants would not "yield" to their "merely persuasive courses." All honour to those Protestants for their fidelity and fortitude ! May it now, and ever be their privilege to be "stubborn" against error ! "Contend earnestly for the Faith, which was once delivered unto the Saints." Jude 3.

In page 273, the subject of "Confession" is introduced :—" But he who in his Confession should have omitted a mortal sin through inculpable forgetfulness, is not obliged to make a second confession ; for the first having been sacramental, he has *complied with the Pope's intention*, and effected his reconciliation *with God.*" He may indeed have complied with "the Pope's intention ;" but the real vital question is, has he fulfilled God's requirements ?

In page 284, we are informed that "*Almsgiving*, as well as fasting, is ordered in extraordinary Jubilees, as a *condition* of the Indulgence ; hence it is *necessary* to perform this work of mercy, or obtain its commutation. This condition, according to the opinion of most divines, applies to *the poor*. Monks, nuns, married women, children, in a word *all*, without exception, are subject to this condition. If they possess nothing, they ought to ask for what is necessary ; religious from their superiors, wives from their husbands, children from their parents ; if the poor cannot obtain the requisite means they must procure a commutation." Thus you see all these religious benefits must be *paid for* ! The poorest must pay, else a *necessary, essential condition* is lacking, which negatives the whole !

“Confessors,” we are told, “can absolve from all censures incurred, and from all sins committed, before or after the publication of the Jubilee, even with the *prospect* of the Jubilee, and *with the hope of being more easily pardoned*, provided the penitent be sincerely contrite.” To forgive even those sins committed in prospect of the Jubilee!—Is not this to encourage immorality? sins are committed in prospect of a jubilee, and that pardon may be obtained on easier terms! Is *this* Christianity?

We shall now proceed to the fifth head, which in fact closes the controversy! It matters not what Indulgences in general or in particular may be—we come now to deal with the gross *uncertainty* and acknowledged *inefficiency* of Indulgences according to Mr. Oakeley’s own book.

First, as to the effect of Indulgences, we refer to Mr. Oakeley’s own Preface (p. xiv.); and although, “humbly prostrate,” he solicited the Pope to grant “the Indulgence of the *Portiuncula* ;” and although it was formally granted, and thereby an unusual excitement prevailed in Romish circles, and priests and laymen hastened from all parts of London to obtain that Indulgence,* yet, in his own preface, Mr. Oakeley states, that “the conditions of giving an Indulgence are of such a nature that it is *impossible to know*, except by a *direct revelation*, that they have answered their end!” “Who can know,” he adds, “whether he has been truly contrite, or have performed his acts of devotion in the best manner? The probability is that *few* indeed perform them so as to gain *the whole* of the Indulgence;” “although they may be gained *partially* by something *less* than such due fulfilment.” Here he frankly acknowledges, in this book, in his own preface, what he does not even hint at, in his efforts to obtain and dispense the Indulgences of *Portiuncula*, namely, that it is “*impossible*, except by *direct revelation*,” to know whether they have obtained that which the Pope has promised! What, then, is the meaning of *the Pope’s own words*, when he states most solemnly that he has “graciously granted in the Lord a plenary Indulgence, &c.?” The usual forms of granting Indulgences are *expressly* worded, definite promises are made; and yet, Mr. Oakeley says, that nothing but a “direct revelation” will tell

* See *Tablet*, August 7th, 1852.

us whether these Indulgences have been really obtained according to the Pope's promise! In page 21 he likewise states, "A Plenary Indulgence *if* gained, and applied to its full extent, would remit the whole of the punishment due to the sins committed up to the time of its being gained; so that if a person were to die immediately after having gained a Plenary Indulgence, he would immediately enter Heaven: *but*,"—this one word "*but*" spoils it all; in this little word lies the sting!—"but it is *impossible* to know when an Indulgence is so perfectly gained; and it is *still more difficult*,"—*i. e.*, *more difficult than an impossibility!*—"to ascertain the exact value of a partial Indulgence; because, its effect depends on the nature of the debt contracted towards Divine justice—on the dispositions of the person—and on the degree of fervour and piety with which the conditions are fulfilled; hence, as all these may vary to infinitude, *nothing can be positively asserted.*"

Again: "In granting an Indulgence for a certain number of days, weeks, or years, the Pope does not grant a proportionate abridgment of the pains of Purgatory; but he merely remits that portion of the punishment due to sin which would have been remitted by the faithful accomplishment of the canonical penance during that length of time." (p. 22.) "But what the measure of this punishment is we know not." "*Perhaps* Indulgences of many years' length, and *Plenary* Indulgences *reiterated* and *multiplied again and again*, would be *insufficient* to release us from the punishment due to our sins!" Why this word "*perhaps?*" Why not *this* word stated *expressly* in the Papal Bulls? Why such *absolute* Decrees? Tetzl surely knew nothing of this word "*perhaps*," when throughout Western Europe he preached Indulgences, and *sold* them at an enormous profit! He used no qualifying "*perhaps*" when he publicly proclaimed that "the soul would at once fly up into heaven, the moment the money was cast into the chest." (See Dupin, vol. iii., p. 154.) Again; there was no such uncertainty even hinted at by Pope Innocent III., when he *promised* to those who should fight in the crusades not only "a Plenary Indulgence," but also "a more perfect degree of eternal happiness than to others!" (See Dupin, vol. ii.,

p. 453.) Here, indeed, Mr. Oakley mentions the uncertainty,—“*perhaps Plenary Indulgences reiterated and multiplied again and again;*” and what could be more?—would still be “insufficient!” Thus he casts a shroud of darkness, and leaves not a single hope as to their efficacy. Christianity differs from this; it affords a “Hope,”—a sure Hope;—“which hope we have *as an anchor* of the soul, both sure and stedfast, and which has entered into that within the veil.” This is Christ, on whom all our hopes are fixed. He is the “Rock of Ages,” and if our feet are stayed on Him, we shall be “stedfast, unmoveable;” we are secure from every attack of the great enemy of souls, and are safe in Christ’s own care; for “they that trust in the Lord,” saith the Psalmist, “shall be as Mount Zion, which cannot be removed, but abideth for ever. As the mountains are round about Jerusalem, so the Lord is round about His people from henceforth even for ever,” *Psa. cxxv. 1, 2.*

“Frequently,” Mr. Oakeley says, “we do not gain Indulgences, either partial or plenary, to the whole of their extent, sometimes because the reason of their being granted is insufficient in the sight of God; and sometimes because we have not the requisite disposition.” Again; he says (p. 26), “It happens very frequently that a Plenary Indulgence is reduced to a partial one, either because the reason for granting it was insufficient, *et elavis errat*, to use the theological term” [*i.e.*, “*and the key errs,*”] “or, because the conditions have not been fully complied with, or both, or for some *unknown* reason.”

All this doubt and uncertainty as to the *real* application of Indulgences must leave an unsatisfactory impression on our minds. Mr. Oakeley, in his Preface (p. xiii), speaking of the objection urged regarding “the disproportion between the gain, and the terms of an Indulgence,” thus expresses himself: “Till they” [*i.e.*, Protestant objectors,] “know all the *difficulty*, and consequently all the *merit*, of a good sacramental confession, certainly they are no fair judges of the question.” Aye! “all the difficulty of a good confession!” We may have a slight idea of “the difficulty” in this respect by consulting the directions given to Roman Catholic Priests in the “Roman Ritual,”

as to *how* they are to conduct the examination of the penitents, especially females, p. 52, "De Pœnitentia:"

"Audiant patienter confitentem, et adjuvet quotiescumque opus fuerit; nec unquam reprehendat nisi finita confessione; nec facile interpellat, nisi opus fuerit aliquid melius intelligere: sed fiduciam ei præbeat et humaniter suggerat, ut omnia peccata sua rite et integre confiteatur, remota stulta illa quorundam verecundia, qua præpediti, suadente diabolo, peccata sua confiteri non audent!"

"Let him (i.e. the Confessor) patiently hear the penitent, and assist him (or her) as often as may be necessary; and let him never reprove until the confession is ended; nor let him interrupt, unless it be necessary to understand anything the better: but let him impart confidence to him (or her), and make kind suggestions, so that he (or she) may duly and entirely confess his (or her) sins, *that stupid modesty of some persons being removed*, by which, being impeded, at the suggestion of the devil, they dare not confess their sins!"

Again; the "Roman Ritual,"—which is, in fact, the Roman Catholic Priest's "Hand-book,"—p. 53, "De Pœnitentia," further directs:

"Cæterum de peccatis contra sextum præceptum, non raro necesse erit penitentes, præsertim muliebris sexus, examinare, nunquam aliter præ pudore hujusmodi peccata confessuras. In hoc autem examine Confessarius castè et cautè admodum procedat; sensim a cogitationibus simplicibus ad morosas, a morosis ad desideria, a desideris ad actus minus criminosos ascendendo; et si illos fateantur, ad magis criminosos"!!

"Moreover, concerning sins against the *Sixth Commandment* (i.e., our Seventh), it will not rarely be necessary to *examine* penitents, especially those of the *female sex*, who otherwise will never, through shame, confess sins of this kind. But in this examination, the Confessor should proceed *chastely and very cautiously* (cunningly), by *ascending imperceptibly from simple thoughts to evil ones*,—from evil thoughts to desires, from desires to *acts less criminal*,—and if they confess these, then to *acts more criminal*!!

Such is "the difficulty of a good confession." Surely God never designed such a system. Yet *the half* is not here told! This, and more than this, we find in the Priest's own "Ritual;" and this without even disclosing the dregs of Dens and Liguori, &c., &c., on the Confessional!

Dr. Delahogue, Professor of Theology in Maynooth, writes regarding penitents thus: ("De Pœnitentia, p. 164.)

"Pudor ille vincendus,—et sacrilega foret confessio, quæ ex tam vano motivo decurtaretur!"

"That *modesty* must be overcome,—and the confession which would be cut short by so vain a motive, would be *sacrilege*!"

I must almost apologise to you, Brethren, for thus bringing before you this accredited teaching of the Church of Rome. Her impurities, however, must not be allowed to purchase her indemnity, nor procure a way for her escape. If the Pope and the Cardinal mean to make us Romanists, it is only just and right that we should know what Romanism is. It requires but to be thoroughly known, in order to be avoided. I ask but that Popery should be unfolded to view in her true colours—that an intelligent knowledge of this controversy be imparted to our people; and then let Old England, as a nation, send this Diplomatic message to the Pope of Rome :

“Tell him this tale; and from the mouth of England
Add this much more,—that no Italian priest
Shall tithe or toll in our dominions.”

But bear with me for five minutes more, while I show you the uncertainty of these Indulgences with regard to the *dead*, which is still greater than their uncertainty with regard to the living. In this book we find, as I told you on a previous occasion, that great uncertainties exist as to the effect and value of Indulgences to the *dying* and the *dead*. At p. 90 the clergy are instructed to be “assiduous in explaining to the faithful the doctrine of the Church on the temporal punishment due to sin; on the obligation of satisfying God’s justice by fasting, alms-deeds, prayers, and other good works; on the *danger* of a *tenterarious* reliance on the efficacy of the sacrament of Penance, and of a Plenary Indulgence *at the hour of death*; for it is *uncertain*, at our departure hence, of whatever kind our death be, whether we *shall* receive a Plenary Indulgence at that awful moment, and whether, although the external rite be applied, we shall reap the fruit thereof, *or even a part*”!

Yet, in p. 92, we find an extract from the “Ritual,” in which the Priest is directed to comfort the dying man, and to give him hope of eternal life!—

“Tunc piis ipsam verbis consoletur, in *spem* erigens fore ut, ex divinæ munificentiae largitate, eam penarum remissionem et vitam consecuturus æternam.”

“Then with pious words let him (the Priest) console the (dying) man, building him up in hope that from the bounty of Divine mercy, he may obtain remission of his punishment, and eternal life.”

And then he is directed to state to the man, viz. :

<p>“Indulgentiam plenariam et remissionem omnium peccatorum tibi concedo.”</p>	<p>“I grant to you a <i>Plenary</i> Indulgence and remission of all your sins.”</p>
--	---

Yet, notwithstanding all this, Mr. Oakeley states that “it is *uncertain* at our departure, *whether we shall receive a Plenary Indulgence* at that awful moment, and whether, although the external rite be applied, we shall reap the fruit thereof, or *even a part*” ! And as with *the dying*, so with *the dead*. Notwithstanding all the promises of Popes—all the absolute grants of Indulgences for “the souls in Purgatory;” yet hear Mr. Oakeley in his Preface (p. xvii.):—“All, therefore, that we can know for certain is, that to perform faithfully the conditions proposed, in order to gain a Plenary Indulgence for the dead, is a work highly meritorious and acceptable to God; but to *what extent*, or *even WHETHER AT ALL*, benefit thence accrues to the particular soul in view, *God has not declared!*” What uncertainty, both *in life*, *at death*, and *after death!*

This must conclude my review of Mr. Oakeley’s book. My task is done. And, let me ask you; upon whose side are truth and reason? We have made every proposal in our power to induce Mr. Oakeley to come forward and vindicate his own book, or in any way to reply to my assertions with regard to the origin, the progress, the practice, the uncertainty, and the inefficiency of these Indulgences. I ask you, especially, my Roman Catholic Brethren, to come at once to that which is certain,—the infallible, inspired Word of God; and there you will find but One ransom for sin, and that is CHRIST! There you will find that there is but One sacrifice for sin, and that is CHRIST! There you will find Jesus is the beginning and the end, “the first and the last,” able and willing to supply the need of those who come unto God by Him. He bled and died for us. See Him in the garden of Gethsemane,—in His “agony and bloody sweat,”—see His “cross and passion.” And why all this? For your sins and for my sins! How enormous, then, must be the sin of man! What an aggregate of guilt was this, which brought the Saviour from above!—which caused Him thus to bleed and die for us! ’Tis thus, and thus alone, we can view our sins in their real enormity.

If a fellow sinner can pardon our sins, then must those sins be small indeed. If an Indulgence can cancel either penalty or guilt, it, in fact, hides from view the gross enormity of our sins! But the Son of God,—Himself the sinless Jehovah,—thus atoning for our sins, because no other ransom could be found, or, though found, could possibly satisfy God's offended justice,—this, this, my Brethren, must humble self and exalt the Saviour; and this much we know of His ability and willingness to save, that “He is able to save *to the uttermost* them that come unto God by Him, seeing HE *ever liveth* to make intercession for them,” Heb. vii. 25.

LONDON:

J. H. JACKSON, ISLINGTON-GREEN.





