

V. Spiritual Life

G. Protestantism

287.

Editorial, *The Catholic Telegraph and Advocate*, October 11, 1856

Obedience to Authority.

Obedience is a virtue very much in disrepute now-a-days. The doctrine of independence, having a just hold on the human mind, in so far as it implies freedom from illegitimate control, has been pushed to the absurd extreme of denying the legitimacy of *all* control. Protestantism began by refusing to acknowledge the authority of God, unless He revealed doctrines which were pleasing. And it is no wonder that in time, people learned to deny the authority of governments, and children to refuse submission to their parents. On Protestant principles, obedience to any authority would be an indefensible inconsistency. It would be to surrender the right of private judgment.

Hence the force of those appeals to prejudice by which Protestantism maintains, in a few countries, its tottering ascendancy. Protestants have a right to make such appeals--because no man is bound (in their system) to accept a creed which is contrary to his feelings and tastes.

If the belief in the justice of God, in future rewards and punishments, clashes with their ideas of propriety, they repudiate the belief.

If the humbling themselves in prayer before the Blessed Virgin Mary, the angel and saints of God,--the confession of their sins to a priest, the chastising their bodies by fasts and abstinence, are revolting to their sentiments of self-respect, they, at once, repel such humiliation, and pronounce it to be improper.

To be sure, this refusal to submit to any cross may, like a two-edged sword, be turned upon those who aspire to dictation among Protestants. But the leaders have not yet felt all its sharpness.

A great outcry was made by the infidels of the last century, against *blind obedience*, and the clamor is still renewed, from time to time, though with less vehemence, in our own age.

Now there are two species of blind obedience:

1. Where a person conforms his will to that of another, in all things, believing without inquiry, and executing without hesitation, all that the other dictates, the obedience is absolute and due to none but God.

2. Where a person, reserving to himself the judgment of moral principles and dogmas of faith, allows himself to be guided by another in actions that are indifferent or of doubtful morality, the obedience is imperfect, and such as is due from children to parents, from servants to masters, from citizens to law-givers, from Christians to

individual parish priests and bishops.

The first kind of obedience--submission to the *arbitrary* will of another--was never demanded by others than tyrants in politics, and unauthorized pretenders in religion. The Neros, the Caligulas, the Maximians, of old, exacted it under penalty of death. The established churches of Sweden, some German states, and England, the kirks, presbyteries, conferences, assemblies of other countries, or sects, have demanded it with threats of confiscation, disgrace, banishment, death, against those who might refuse it. But they did so, in the frenzy of power, unjustly possessed, and irresponsibly wielded.

The second kind of obedience is exacted by the fourth commandment of the Decalogue, and is quite conformable to good sense and justice. It is of course *blind*, in so far as the person obeying sees no reason for his obedience beyond the authority of the one commanding, but it is not foolish. The child may not see the reason why its parent directs it to such an occupation rather than to some other--but it trusts in the parent's judgment and disinterestedness, and submits wisely to their will. Obedience is the safest guide of life. Where one is sure he possesses the true faith, and that what is commanded is not wrong, he consults his own peace and security, by obeying. It is better to be under, than to wield, authority. The account we must render in the day of judgment, is in proportion to the gifts we have received. The great have nothing in this life, to compensate them for being set up, as a mark for the shafts of envy and malice--to pay them for the peace of mind they sacrifice, in the mighty anxieties of their necessarily agitated life. Blessed is he whose lot--thrice blessed he whose choice--it is to obey. With such, peace delights to dwell, for on them the Redeemer, by the mystery of His hidden life, has set the seal of His predilection.

288.

Editorial, *The Catholic Telegraph and Advocate*, November 21, 1857

[Division among Protestants.]

The Church of Christ is one. The figures under which she is represented in the New Testament, of a net cast into the sea, of a sheepfold with one shepherd, of a field in which tares and wheat grow till the harvest, of a holy city descending from heaven, of a house built upon a rock, of a pillar of truth, of spouse of Christ, all demonstrate that there can be no divisions among those who are truly Christ's followers. He prayed that His followers might be one; and those who are not one, are by that very fact excluded from the roll of His followers.

The Church was to apply to the individuals of all ages and nations, the benefits of His teachings, and the fruits of His passion. Hence she was to be a living body, animated by a divine soul, and therefore to be one.

No other church but the Catholic, has, or ever has had unity. Infallible authority, only, can unite the intellects[,] and supreme authority based upon a divine sanction, only[,] can unite the wills of men. The members of the sects may happen to agree, but that agreement is but a chance coincidence, and unworthy of the name of unity, because destitute of foundation, in authority.

A Methodist conference[,] recently assembled in Cincinnati, gave a new proof to the world of the (at best) human origin and character of that sect, by resolving on a total separation of the churches, north and south. Henceforward the Gospel which saves a northerner must be a northern Gospel, and a southerner must enter heaven through a portal south of the famous Mason's and Dixon's line. The preachers being equally formidable to each other, "agree to differ" in peace, at least until such time as circumstances shall have placed the power to compel submission in northern or southern hands.

Now the question ought to occur to a practical mind if the church is a mere human invention, subject to be divided by political parsons for political reasons[,] what is the use of it?--What is the utility of keeping up an organization, which neither instructs nor guides, nor *exists* independently of the political passions of the hour? If Christ founded a church, any human organization must be in opposition to it, and therefore pernicious. If He did not found a church, it must, at least, be useless.

Protestants are every day becoming more widely separated from each other, as they are daily losing more and more the dogma of Christianity. Can any one believe the Church of Christ to be among them? No, the prayer of Christ, "that all may be one" was not for them. They are not "gathering with Him" but "scattering" and though ignorance may palliate the guilt of the multitude, yet the banner of Christ's foes waves over their hosts, and the confusion of Christ's foes awaits them, in the end.

289.

Editorial, *The Catholic Telegraph and Advocate*, May 22, 1858

The Union of Error.

In an age professedly the farthest advanced in the scale of intelligence, it is not a little puzzling to account for the popularity which systems, false in principle, inadequate in means and impossible in practice, enjoy. It would appear as if the truth of all reasoning *a priori*, as philosophers say, is ignored by the present generation. There is no scheme, no matter how absurd may be its elementary principles[,] how totally irreconcilable with all notions of right and wrong, which elicits condemnation until it has acted itself out in *practical* development. This apparent inability to pronounce in its plan, aim and constitution, *prior to actual test*, the truth or falsehood of any measure, indicates the very low state of purely intellectual studies at the present day. It reminds

us of the stupid schoolboy who could not comprehend the truth of the axiom, "if two things be equal to a third, they are equal to one another," until three straws of *exactly* equal length, put side by side, convinced him.

It would seem to be a truth beyond the possibility of a doubt in pure reasoning, that, "societies, holding different opinions on *one* point, cannot *unite* in sentiment on that *same* point, and yet retain their individual views;" yet we have in our midst an association, called the Young Men's Christian Union, which attempts to *falsify* that truth in practice. This association, according to its programme, is composed of young men of *all* religious denominations; and its aim is the dissemination of Gospel *truth*: and all this is to be effected without any sacrifice of individual religious opinion on the part of the members! That is, they profess to mould into one organic system elements mutually repulsive; to give unity of purpose to views radically opposed; and to bring into harmonious association for the attainment of one specific end, men whose thoughts, habits, professions and practice widely differ in reference to this *same* end. These young men have, no doubt, good intentions; try, according to their own way, to effect what, to them, appears both laudable and practicable; and the public favor and encouragement they received, do insinuate that the means they employ are as efficacious as their end is admissible. But with all respect for their benevolent course, and at the risk of offending their self-complacency, truth compels us to say, that the union they propose is as feasible as that of fire and water; and the result they labor to produce is as practicable as to pry up the great leviathan from her cradle with a pipe stem!

Let us see. The object of the Young Men's Christian Union is conjoint exertion in the dissemination of Gospel *truth*. Now, the first thing that an association, purporting to labor for one end, should do, is to define that end and agree as to the means best calculated to secure it. Gospel truth, then, it is their avowed object to disseminate; but have they decided upon what is *specifically* Gospel truth? The Bible, interpreted by private judgment, is the great means by which this Gospel truth is to be propagated. But *is* the Bible, so interpreted, a safe guide? These are questions which, at the outset, should have engaged the attention of the Young Men's Christian Union; and which should have been satisfactorily answered before their association could be intelligently formed. Now, have they agreed as to what is Gospel truth? Have they drawn up any symbol of belief and subscribed to it? And if they have, why do they not publish it in their programme? Is truth so vague as not to be formalized? Is it so timid as to dread investigation in its *clear* and *definite* expression? The fact that the Young Men's Christian Union is composed of individuals holding *all* shades of religious opinion and widely differing about what is Gospel truth, shows plainly that they have not *united* in sentiment as to what this religious truth which they are about teach *is*. Now, in the name of common sense, how can they, *by joint effort*, impart to others that upon which they are themselves divided? If it be said that they differ only in *trivial* points

respecting religion, we ask, why, then make these trivial differences the grounds of *separation*? Why not, in the name of Charity, give up all this splitting into sects, this mutual anathematizing which the conduct of one sect towards another exhibits, and, thus, *practice* union, before *professing* it?

If the points of religious difference which keep the sects asunder be *essential*, how, consistently with their honest convictions, can they compromise? Can any young man, without forfeiting his independence of character and in carrying the guilt of mental cowardice and inconsistency, be induced to regard as *trifling*, that which every reason convinces him is all-important and necessary? Certainly not. The truth then is:--the Young Men's Christian Union, if they unite at all, agree in asserting that trifles divide the several Christian denominations. If this be so, their first and principle mission should be to reconcile these same sects, bring them into harmonious unity, destroy the distinction of Methodist, Baptist, &c., construct one grand society, and then, having unity of purpose, complete agreement and no dissensions in its members, the association may, consistently at least, assert that their aim is the dissemination of *one* Gospel truth. But until this is first effected, unity with them is a misnomer, and the propagation of harmonious Gospel truth as possible in the nature of things as to attempt depriving water of the tendency to seek its level. They have no principles which in any variety of combination can produce the result they are aiming to reach; for mutually conflicting opinions can never produce an uniform judgment. They can unite, indeed; but only as error unites with error:--the result being of necessity antagonistic truth! All such societies as the Young Men's Christian Union, remind us of the syncretism of the old pantheon of pagan Rome--a system which excluded no deity from its mythology, no matter how repugnant in character and idea; but paid to all the homage of equal adoration!

290.

Editorial, *The Catholic Telegraph and Advocate*, April 17, 1858 (1)

The Soul's Unrest.

The destiny of man is unalterable peace. Every thought of his mind, every throb of his heart, every appetite of his nature and act of his life, betray the strivings of his restless spirit in its flight towards the realms of repose. The speculations of science increase its longings; the purest of earth's affections lose their interest and disappoint; pleasures tire by enjoyment; and human glory, which a whole lifetime has been wasted to secure, is but the pinnacle upon which, like the "bird of passage," it rests for a moment, soon again to soar away in its long and weary flight towards the climes to which instinct leads it. And where is that spot of peace? Where is the terminus of that path which enters the gloomy portals of the grave, and, stretching away over the

solitudes of the eternal future, reaches at last the city of rest? This is the question that has engaged the attention of the whole human race from the beginning, and filled with anxiety the last moments of every departed member of the human family. This is the question which, even today, can rouse the millionaire from his dreams of gold, drive the sensualist from the haunts of pleasure, and fill with trembling the man of scoffing tongue and unbelieving heart.

The present "revivals" in the Protestant and unbelieving world are not, as some erroneously imagine, mere freaks of fancy, periodical excitements, the result of no serious motive. Unless men are mad and play the buffoon and neglect their business for nothing, some very candid and sober-minded persons attend these gatherings; and why? It is because they feel the want of something which dollars and cents cannot procure; it is because they are conscious of a void which materialism cannot fill; it is, to seek the solution of doubts regarding God, the soul, and eternity, which in the solitude of thoughtful moments harass and perplex them. Yes; these revivals are, for many, the troubled heavings of a spirit not at rest, the outward expression of hopes deferred and expectations unfulfilled, the strong and earnest cry for mercy and pardon gushing up from the depths of the sin-stricken soul.

But, do revival excitements calm the mind, allay its fears, dispel its doubts, and give to the trembling conscience the assurance of forgiveness? No, indeed. They give to the inquiring infidel no satisfactory evidence of revealed religion; they promise pardon to all who heave a sigh, sing a hymn, or shout a prayer; and when some outward sign or proof of this promised pardon is solicited, they refer the poor and anxious sinner to the vague and doubting sentiments of his own heart. Thus, Protestant revivals effect no permanent conversion, in fact, nor true change of heart, at all. Their sole aim is to excite emotion and enkindle feeling, without informing the mind or convincing the intellect: but mere sentiment undirected by reason--mere emotion not guided by intelligence--mere feeling not the result of conviction--is as hollow, inconstant, and unenduring as the foam that is tossed on the bosom of the ocean.

Two remarkable results reveal the character of what are called religious revivals--a decay of religious feeling, accompanied by a growing unbelief, and the birth of new systems, intended to correct and improve Christianity as identified with Protestantism. Nothing brings religion into such contempt with men of intellect as the frenzied exuberance of animal feeling which characterized the old revivals, and which have not entirely disappeared from the new ones: we read now in the papers of fits and trances and convulsions as *evidences* of true conversion and Ghostly inspiration, just as in the palmy days of the old camp-meetings. And any man of sound thinking and logical turn of mind, who believes in the existence of any *true* form of revealed religion at all, if he examine, must soon be convinced that it is not to be found in the self-contradicting systems of the sects; and, if prejudice prevent him from noticing the claims of the

Catholic Church, he accordingly proceeds to make a creed of his own. The revivals are properly called "great awakenings;" for they do awaken the religious sensibilities of man's nature, and rouse the faculties of the soul, to a consciousness of its religious wants. But to *awaken* is not to *satisfy*; to *terrify* is not to *soothe*; to *start* doubts is not to *solve* them. Two classes of persons are injured by revival excitements: they whose common sense and sober judgment are shocked by ludicrous puerilities lose their former religion; and they whose mental darkness and harassing doubts have received neither the light nor relief they had expected go back again to their own unaided reason for direction, and plunge anew into the ocean of bewildering speculation. Poor souls! are they doomed always to seek and never to find? Is there no star to guild their course, no beacon-light to warn away from the frowning rocks and deceitful shallows? God has put His sun in the firmament of the physical world to give it light and shed on mortal eye the thousand beauties of its golden ray. Is there no sun in the lofty realms of ideal truth, no light for the mental eye, whose destiny is to gaze on the splendors of the Godhead, and whose immortal home is in the bosom of Light Inaccessible? Yes; there is a star; and it guides aright when darkness hides it not and mists do not obscure its brightness; and it leads securely through the shades of night to the portals of the morning's sun. That star is *reason*; away with the mists of passion, prejudice, and prepossession; and with pure intention, strong desire, and earnest longing, follow its direction; and soon the morning sun of revealed truth will show its dawns, and flood ere long with glorious light the doubtings of the soul. Yes; inquiring reader, be not content with vain promises, vague systems, and sentiments more vague still. Confront with argument and reason the creeds that challenge your assent; accept the *ipse dixit* of no sect; ask proof, and not assertion; and always remember that not all who say "peace, peace," can give it--not all who cry "Lord, Lord," can enter the Kingdom of Heaven.

291.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, Aug. 28, 1875 (2)

[Private Judgment]

The principle of private judgment has almost come to its last development in this Protestant world. Three hundred years ago it was as easy to see as now, what it means. If my judgment determines the truth then there is [no] standard of truth but me. There is no divine teaching, no supernatural authority, no God, no unseen world, no retribution for wickedness and [no] justice. So the unfathomed cravings of the human soul must find satisfaction in time and on earth, or nowhere. This is Absolutionism and Communism both. What I crave I must have, and truth, justice, sin, are but inventions of the crafty, which I will trample, if need be, to attain what I desire. This is the law of

292- Preaching No Hell

brute force, which, at the same [time is] the law of the Paris Commune and the German court.

292.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, May 9, 1878

[Preaching No Hell]

Scribner's *Magazine* for May is kind enough to say something of "the more dignified discussions of the question of everlasting punishment." The gist of the elegant and condescending article is that the belief in such punishment is "dying out of American and English pulpits." For instance, there are Canon Ferran and Rev. Dr. Whiton, who have been making a profound impression by new and better interpretations of scripture that do away entirely with the notion that man is free to choose his own eternity. Now suppose that Canon Ferran and Dr. Whiton were to "interpret scripture" so as to prove that a fallen tree is not a fallen tree, that a dead man is not a dead man, would that make any difference with the fallen tree or the dead man? In like manner, if these same worshipful gentlemen "interpret scripture" in suchwise as to prove it an idle fiction, and Christianity a myth, the Word Made Flesh no messenger from God, the martyrs all what the pagans called them, a pack of fools, will their sapient interpretations and the profound impression they create make any difference as to the truth of matters? We think not. If a man drops into hell, he will fall none the lighter for having tried to persuade himself that no such place existed. All his pride will not strip man of his nobility. He must choose between heaven and hell, he must reach a point of existence where change ceases, and eternal rest, or eternal unrest, begins.

293.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, January 24, 1878 (2)

[Belief in Hell]

"If you want to uproot society, take away the belief in the eternal reprobation of the impenitent sinner." That is true. And there is worse in it than the uprooting of society. For taking away the belief in hell will not remove *the fact that there is a hell*. The more the belief is taken away, the more astonishment, when the curtain that hides eternity is drawn by death, and heaven is seen shining above and hell darkening below. "Now, O you nine-tenths of the Protestant Ministers of the United States," the soul going forth from the body might say, "You got me into this trouble, by your teaching. Get me out of it."

294.

Editorial, *The Catholic Telegraph and Advocate*, June 8, 1861

An Anti-Catholic Terror.

The unwillingness of Protestants generally to investigate the claims of the Catholic Church is apparent to the most casual observer. Whoever does not know it from his own personal experience, might easily discover it from the fact that Catholic works, nay, even reports of religious discussions between Catholics and Protestants, are never found in Protestant bookstores. Non-Catholics do not need them. Why? We believe that the great terror of the anti-Catholic world is a secret fear that the Old Church--after all the clamor and excitement of Reformation, progress, liberty of thought, and of political institutions--*is right*. This of course the Protestant descendants of Protestants find it hard to admit. Can Luther, Calvin, John Knox, Cranmer, have been imposters? Was Fox the martyrologist a deliberate liar? Are the stories of popish cruelties, superstitions, idolatries, including the horrors of the inquisition, pure inventions? Were the generations of anti-Catholics from Luther down, in France, Holland, Switzerland, England, only victims of a great delusion? *Is* the hated, reviled, persecuted, slandered Roman Catholic Church, with all its austere doctrines of fasting, penance, confession, indeed the spotless Spouse of Christ, the dispenser of the Bread of Life, the only gate of heaven? It is hard to think so. Yet she is the Old Church, out of whose bosom the whole circle of sects were one day cast. They have divided and subdivided, and changed doctrine and discipline from generation to generation, while she holds the same language, and puts forward the same claims as in the ages past. Investigation of those claims might produce conviction of their justice; and this possibility is a terror to many. To the ambitious it seems the death knell of cherished hopes and labored schemes: to the sensual it speaks of austerity and self-control: to the proud of the humiliating confession of sin: to all of an imaginary sacrifice of individuality, a being swallowed up and delivered over to oblivion by an all-absorbing corporation the more terrible because vague and unknown. Yet why should this fear be such a terror? If the Church is true, it were best to know it. If she alone has the means of salvation, it were best to seek them in her. It is wise to go through fire even, to be saved. Besides, the Church is not so unamiable as this prejudice represents her. She asks of no man any sacrifice of rational liberty, or honest pleasure. She imposes no restraint not sanctioned by the law of nature. Her fasts scarcely interfere with bodily comfort; and even the sham of confession, is a relief to the torture of remorse. Dismiss the terror. Enter on the investigation.

295.

Editorials, *The Catholic Columbian*, July 3, 1875 (1)

Forms of Infidelity

Faith was logically struck down by the Lutheran revolution against the teaching authority of the Church. But the principle of belief in revolution was put forward by the sects and upheld for a century or so by the fallacy of private interpretation of the Scriptures. Now, however, this principle is almost universally rejected and most of the so-called religious sects of America are only forms of infidelity.

A few old fashioned Episcopalians, Presbyterians and German Lutherans still hold, with more or less tenacity, the belief that Jesus Christ has something to do with our salvation. But the great mass of the sects think no more of looking to Him for what they are to believe than to Plato and Socrates. The Unitarians, Congregationalists, Methodists, Baptists, Universalists and a hundred others make up their *creed* first and then prove it from the Bible afterwards. Then, after they have proved it, they will admit that perhaps it is not true, and go on to attend to earthly matters.

They secure their salvation first by a single bound and then attend to politics and social life the rest of the time. Thus the Methodists have a *bee*, and settle the calling and election of a whole neighborhood by a single camp-meeting, and that gives all the brethren time to attend to politics and outdo the rascalities of Romanism. Being secure themselves by a saving faith, they can employ their whole time in cursing the Pope and fixing up elections.

A man must be blinder than an owl at noonday not to see that the "Reformation" of the sixteenth century was a movement *away* from eternal things and in the direction of the temporal. The faith of centuries had laid up treasures in the hands of God and the poor, and the Reformation stole them from God and the poor.

Vows of poverty, chastity and obedience had consecrated souls to the following of Christ, and the Reformation flung the obligations to the winds and told the monks and nuns not to mind Christ any more, but to catch pleasure where they might. From St. James down to the apostasy the idea of Christianity had been to keep one's self in the hermitage, or cloister, or religious habit, unspotted from the world. But Luther talked his religion in the beer shop and rushed into marriage and politics and war. Ever since, the profession of undefiled religion [in] the vocation of the priest, the monk and the nun has been the subject of vituperation for the followers of the Reformed religion, because Protestantism turned the hearts of men earthward and made the pursuit of eternal things secondary, even in the minds of devout believers in its tenets. Since then the Evangelical precept has been revised and has read, "Seek first political distinction, your countrymen's applause, wealth, pleasure, or anything else earthly, and trust to your

superior excellence over Catholics for obtaining the kingdom of God."

They discussed the influence of "Romanism" on civil governments in the University of Athens, Ohio, the other day, as a part of the Commencement exercises. Both champions were Protestants, and the champion of the Church was pronounced defeated by somebody who telegraphed the result to the only morning daily of Columbus. St. Paul had a discussion of the same kind in the old Athens and was voted a bore by the greater part of the audience.

Some alarming statistics about the "Growth of Romanism in America" are beginning to be circulated in the anti-Catholic papers once more. Well, is not this the freest, most enlightened and best governed country on earth? Is it not a wonder that the tribe of Jacques does not reflect on this singular coincidence of liberty, enlightenment and growth of Romanism?

We would like to know from the *Sunday News*, who are the "Fathers of our Republic" who thought over the dangers likely to be experienced from "Roman Catholicism." Charles Carroll, of Carrollton, was not one. Bishop Carroll, of Baltimore, employed by the Republic on a mission to Canada, was not one. Jefferson was not. Even Adams had more dread of Citizen Genet than he had of the Pope.

296.

Editorial, *The Catholic Telegraph and Advocate*, March 12, 1853

Father Rosecrans apparently thought this 65-page "pamphlet" was written by Charles P. McIlvaine, Episcopal Bishop of Ohio, who had been president and professor at Kenyon College during Rosecrans' days there. The position taken agrees with that of the bishop. But today the pamphlet is ascribed to Episcopal clergyman Dudley Atkins Tyng, who was rector of a Cincinnati church in 1853.

Vital Truth and Deadly Error.

Is the title of an anonymous pamphlet, addressed to Episcopalians, being a castigation of the High Church party.

The style is unmistakable. No one could sit four years, as we did, under the author's pulpit, and not recognise him in his writings.

He proves, to our satisfaction, that "Romanism" is logically deducible from the doctrine of *inherent righteousness*, though we believed that, long ago. Truth has a necessary and eternal connection with truth.

This author, like many others under the influence of early education, has taken

for granted, as a first principle, that the Catholic Church has erred, and hence, that whatever leads to her must be wrong.

Hence, he exhibits the spectacle of a strong mind struggling to make contradictions appear consistent. In confounding the inconsistencies of his High Church brethren he is clear and irresistible, but in refuting the principle from which he says their errors spring, he is weak and puerile.

This principle, he says, is that of *inherent* as opposed to *imputed* righteousness. The doctrine of inherent righteousness he confutes with two arguments; one, that it *does not give ease to the conscience*, which in a person who knows the uneasiness of Holy Paul, as to his acceptance with God, is puerile, the other that it is Pelagian. He thinks Hooker's is a satisfactory refutation of the distinction of righteousness being in us, and not of us. Hooker says, "if it is in us it is of us," a miserable sophism. If it is in us it is of us, by the grace of God we concede, and that is the doctrine of the Church against Pelagius; it is of us from our own natural strength, we deny, and Hooker's whole "answer" falls to the ground.

It is a pity that a gifted mind should take as irrefragable certain promises from the world, should blind itself with a sectarian local erudition, and then should exert all its strength in the support of error.

297.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, April 18, 1878 (2)

[Episcopalian Evidences of Christianity]

The late Bishop McIlvaine* of the Episcopal Church, in Ohio, concocted a book called "Evidences of Christianity," in which he used the fulfillment of prophecy, the spread of Christianity, the miracles of the Lord, and other arguments, which prove the truth of a Divine Authority amongst men, with some ability. He forgot, however, to show any connection between the truth of a system depending on infallible authority, and one confessedly fallible, and having for its final court the English Government, or private opinion. That was the reason why the students at Kenyon College, where the book was in the course, failed to see it.

* Charles Petit McIlvaine. The book was *The Evidences of Christianity in their External Division*, published in 1832.

298.

Editorial, *The Catholic Telegraph and Advocate*, January 1, 1859

Protestant Service in Rome.

The *Commercial* of one day last week published from the *Episcopal Recorder*, a glowing account of Protestant service, having been held, in Rome by an American Protestant bishop, namely, Dr. McIllvaine of Ohio. It seems the Bishop McIllvaine now on a tour for his health, in Europe, found himself in Rome on a Sunday; and instead of doing what most men of taste would have done--going to Mass at St. Peter's--he gathered together "about six persons" in somebody's private parlor, and read the prayer-book and preached to them. Whereat the writer of the letter from Rome (who, by the way, seems to imitate Bishop McIllvaine's style very happily) begins to wonder, to feel thrilled, and to become ecstatic.

Now what there is sublime in this fact of the Calvinist Episcopalian we are at a loss to see. Whether we consider what was done, where it was done, or who did it, the whole affair seems quite true and common-place.

There was preaching in Rome by an American Calvinist. The letter-writer lets drop a hint that "they feared the Argus eyes of the police;" as though the meeting were in a dreadful secrecy and at fearful risk--and then getting into a glow in describing the scene, he does not omit the "two policemen pacing up and down in front of the dwelling," according to custom in Rome, when assemblages are held in unwonted places.

Certainly a parson preaching in Rome is no novelty. Protestant service was held for years at the residence of Lewis Cass, jr., on the *Piazza del Popolo*; also at the residence of the Prussian Ambassador; also, at the house of the English Consul; also in a public hall just outside the *Porta del Popolo*; and, in fact, whenever a parson, and five or six Englishmen, could be found who did not go to Mass they had full leave from "the Argus eyed police" to do what they pleased in their own rooms.

The wonder of Dr. McIllvaine's performance must have been therefore in what was done, or in him who did it. He did three things--read the prayer-book; preached a sermon; and gave "Protestant Episcopal Communion." Ages ago, the Pope of Rome sent out St. Austin to convert England from paganism; and, fruit of the influence of Rome, a flourishing Christianity, and its attendant blessings, of order and civil liberty, subsisted then for many centuries. Then wicked men arose, and renouncing their allegiance to God's Church, made up dogmas for themselves, and manufactured ceremonies and prayers, by patch-work and travesty, of the Roman Missal and Breviary, to suit their incongruous faith. The faith lost its hold on the minds of the people; and just as their religion is in its death-throe--a pleasure seeking preacher, happens to read an English travesty of Roman prayers, in a private parlor, and we are expected to find sublimity in

the operation!

He preached--Calvinism, of course--the doctrine of shams--of sham Sacraments, sham presence of Christ in the Eucharist, sham justification, by imputation to us of what never becomes ours, sham morality in actions that must follow God's Church and immutable decrees, sham prayer, for what God had decided upon by absolute, and conditional will, before ever we existed. There is nothing sublime in that.

He gave some bread and wine to six or seven persons--a sham sacrament. Is that anything wonderful?

It may be wonderful, in the view of the letter-writer, that *Bishop McIlvaine of Ohio*, should have done this: and we suspect that the real cause of enthusiasm on a subject so little calculated to awaken interest was of a personal nature.

The only thing sublime about the affair, apparent to us, is the imprudence of the letter-writer in thrusting it on the public as something wonderful and new.

299.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, February 13, 1875 (5)

Gallileo

Gallileo is a Protestant hero because he is represented to have been imprisoned for saying that the world moves. Now, he was not imprisoned for saying that the world revolves--for that had been taught more than a hundred years before him, by a Catholic priest, who was never molested for teaching it.

But Gallileo made a theological question of it; and, encountering theological opposition, he became heated to utter sentiments which his adversaries laid hold of, as contrary to faith. He was brought before the Tribunal of the Inquisition, and there the irritable old gentleman came out with sentiments which offended the sense of faith of judges so much that they sent him to prison until he should retract. He did retract, and was released. The story that, after signing the paper, he kicked the ground and exclaimed passionately, "For all that, it moves!" is not improbable, but if true, is no great credit to him. It was the same as to say in signing this paper, "I have been a cowardly liar."

The citation of this fact as an argument against Papal Infallibility is so strangely illogical that one seems, in it, to touch with his finger an instance of wisdom becoming folly when it loses its hold, even for a moment, on the Teacher of all Truth.

300.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, Oct. 3, 1878 (1)

[Methodists and the War for American Independence]

The *Waterloo Times* says very justly that the Methodists are the last sect that ought to say anything about what they did in the war of 1776. John Wesley their patron saint was the most bitter and virulent Tory of the period, lying as seeklessly against Washington, Jefferson, Hancock, and the doctrine of government being for the good of the people as the modern Methodist editor lies about the Jesuits.

301.

Editorial, *The Catholic Telegraph and Advocate*, May 31, 1856

The Puritans and the Indians.

The *Commercial* of Wednesday morning "will not defend the Puritans," but attacks the Catholics. We hope he may increase its circulation in Kentucky by this course.

The editor of the *Commercial* has discovered that his views of history differ from ours. We cannot deny it. Any history which represents the conduct of the Spaniards as more censurable than that of the Puritans, is most certainly different from ours. We have nothing to say in defense of the treatment the poor Indians received at the hands of the worldly Spaniards. We sympathise most cordially with the Catholic Bishop Las Casas, who, unterrified by their rank and influence, denounced them before the Spanish Court.

Yet even those hordes of Spanish adventurers, the scum of society, "the cankers of a calm world," restless, unscrupulous, regardless of their religion as they were, treated their Indians more kindly than did the Puritans those of North America.

In the territories settled by Catholic immigration, the Indians survive and form an integral part of the free population. In North America they are exterminated.

We need not quote "a stale joke" to prove the avarice and injustice of the Puritans. It is written on the history of the colonies in characters of blood--blood of Catholic priests, harmless Quakers, and slaughtered Indians. Let any one who wishes to know the character of Puritanism read what a Protestant preacher, Coit, says of it in a book published about ten years ago by the Harpers. Did the Puritans ever convert an Indian to Christianity? Did they ever establish a mission among the Indians? Did they ever have a single Las Casas to spend his life following the tribes from camp to camp, sharing their toil, and gently winning them to Christ by continual persuasion and holy example?--Never. They sent traders to trade with them, armed men to shoot them and their Catholic priests, troops to chase them forever westward, but never a man to teach

them the arts of peace and the way of salvation.

Next week we intend to give a view of the Papal grant of lands in the new world, taken from a writer of the sixteenth century, which will no doubt be pleasing and instructive to many others besides the encyclopædic editor of the *Daily Commercial*.

H. Religious Toleration

302.

Editorial, *The Catholic Telegraph and Advocate*, February 19, 1853

Toleration.

No candid, well-meaning man can fail to see justice and common sense in the doctrine of the Catholic Church with regard to toleration, provided he understand it. The clamors against it originate either in malice, or prejudice, or ignorance. We therefore, at the risk of repeating what has been said a thousand times before, propose to explain it.

Toleration means the suffering, or permitting others to hold without molestation their own religious opinions. Now molestation is of two kinds, bodily and mentally. We molest a man *mentally* for an opinion which he holds, when we prove his opinion to be false, unfounded, and absurd. We molest him bodily or materially, by fines, imprisonments, exiles, tortures, death.

As to the first sort of molestation, the Catholic Church can never refrain from giving it to her adversaries. Since she has the command to preach the Gospel to every creature, she cannot leave any false opinion undisturbed. She must preach truth every where--and the preaching of truth is the confounding of error. She knows that she is infallible; whence all who deny her doctrines are in error. Nor can error be indifferent to her. The charity of Christ urges her. She cannot be silent while the nations redeemed by the blood of Jesus Christ are perishing. She must cry aloud, or be recreant to her mission of charity among men. Neither can she love to see her children linking hands and hearts with those out of her pale "forgetting their religious differences," in the pursuit of some great, absorbing, temporal object. For, besides that the Church loves not to see the faithful *absorbed* in any temporal pursuit, she cannot but look with loathing on friendships so hollow and false--in which Catholics make a tacit bargain with men whom they call friends, not to warn them of their eternal interest--but to permit them to dream on--and for fear of offending them and of interrupting a maudlin harmony--allow them to go to the judgment, having no part in the redemption of Jesus Christ. Towards those without her pale she would have exercised a true charity--a charity that seeks their *good*, and not their applause.

Surely no reasonable and candid man can find fault with the Catholic Church for

molesting in this manner, those who hold what she teaches to be false opinions.

Anti-Catholics are perpetually molesting us in this way--preaching against opinions which they say we hold. We do not blame them for trying to confute our real doctrines. If they would confine themselves to these, leaving slander and misrepresentation alone, they would soon finish the discussion. Neither can they blame us when we confute their errors.

As to corporal molestation for religious opinions--a subject fiercely agitated, as a sort of *dust--excited* whenever our professed enemies want to enact penal laws, or fasten a despotic school system upon us--several observations are to be made:

1. The Church has never taught, dogmatically, any doctrine on this point. Gregory XVI. proscribed the theoretical tolerance, of which we have spoken above. But no pope or council ever defined anything with regard to material tolerance. The doctrine of St. Thomas of Aquin, however, has always been received by theologians--that corporal force can never be used as a means of propagating the faith.

2. A religious opinion is a persuasion of mind; but a persuasion is necessarily internal to the mind, whereas corporal punishment can only be inflicted for crimes for which there is jurisdiction in *foro externo*; and since the *forum externum*, not having cognisance of the acts of the mind, has over them no jurisdiction, it follows that no corporal molestation can be given to a man for his religious opinion, in so far as it is an opinion.

3. When a religious opinion is expressed,--it is no longer a mere opinion--it is an external act, falling under the jurisdiction of ordinary criminal courts. Thus when I express my opinion that Mr. B. is guilty of a certain crime, Mr. B. can sue me for slander--and make me prove the *truth* of my opinion or abide the penalty of law.

Is the *expression*, then, of a religious opinion to be hindered or punished by corporal force? We distinguish. The false opinion is either merely false, having none, or only a remote bearing on the temporal interests of society, of which civil government has the care, or, it is not only false, but directly and immediately contrary to those interests. In the former case civil government is bound to leave to God the punishment of the sin against truth. In the latter it may use corporal punishment against the opinionist--not as a religious sectarian, but as an enemy of society--in self-defense. Of course the responsibility of using force will always rest on the ruler. The principle on which he rests is a principle, not of positive revelation--the Church having defined nothing--but of the natural law; that is, that "society has the right to use the means essential to its own preservation." Whether the suppression of any doctrine in a particular case is, or is not, a means essential to the preservation of a specific society is for the ruler of that society to judge. Thus the Duke of Tuscany, in judging the silencing of the Madiai to be necessary to the conservation of society in his dominions, formed a judgment for which he alone is responsible before God. If the necessity was real the

303 - Two Types of Religious Toleration

Duke has done right; if not real, wrong. But the Church had nothing to do with his judgment. The political and social necessities of the Dukedom of Tuscany are no part of revelation, directly or indirectly--and the Church is only the guardian and interpreter of revelation.

Certainly the Church enabled the Duke to judge with infallible certainty that the opinions propagated by the Madiai were erroneous--but he could not punish them as merely erroneous but as subversive of society--and the Church did not assist him any farther than to judge of their falsity.

With these views of toleration we think no cool, honest mind can be displeased. Men of sense cannot be angry.

1st. As to the fact that charity will not permit us to withhold from our Anti-Catholic neighbors, truths on which, in our belief, depend their eternal salvation.

2. That physical force never can be used as a means of propagating religion.

3d. That no man is to be molested corporally merely for *holding* a false opinion.

4th. That no man can be molested for *expressing* an opinion, *merely* false.

5th. That the natural law gives government the right to suppress the preaching of certain opinions--as directly hostile to the existence of society.

The last point will be the only one, we presume, with which even bigots will quarrel. But their quarrel will be not with the Catholic Church, but with the natural law--with common sense. Let them and common sense "fight it out."

303.

Editorial, *The Catholic Columbian*, Oct. 23, 1875 (2)

[Two Types of Religious Toleration]

There are two kinds of religious toleration: one that comes from indifference as to what religion teaches, and the other from intelligent charity, which regrets to see neighbors believe a lie, but does not presume to dispute every man's right to his own soul.

The first was the toleration of pagan Rome, and is that of dechristianized followers of the "Reformation." Pagan Rome not only tolerated but fostered every error. Each conquered nation had its gods brought to the capitol; and their worship was permitted to the captives, because the emperor held the office of High Priest, and so willed it. Only when Christianity came in and taught that man has a destiny and duties over which the emperor does not preside, toleration ceased. So in modern times, all error is allowed. It is only where belief is reality, that the world takes the alarm. Its principle of toleration reduces down to this: "No matter what a man believes, so long as he does not believe in Christianity." He may call himself Christian; he may quote the Bible and preach something he calls the doctrine of Christ; but if he shows that he does

304 - Does the Catholic Church Countenance Riots?

not believe any doctrines but those of his own making, and is ready to modify them when his interest dictates, his Christian professions need not prejudice his influence. But beware of those who say that Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is rightful master of mind and heart, teacher to whom all who would be saved must submit. They are believers in "a higher law" than an act of Congress and their loyalty cannot be trusted. Christian toleration, on the other hand, demands no surrender of honest convictions. The Catholic does not say, "Perhaps, after all, non-Catholics may be right and therefore I will not molest them;" but, "I know that all who do not submit to the teaching of the Church are in error, and am sorry there are so many, but God is their master and judge, and the matter belongs to Him. As for me, I have enough to do to work out my own salvation, and in doing that I may aid, by prayer and good example, in the conversion of others. At any rate it is not for me to domineer where God is master."

This was the toleration of the Catholic colonists of Maryland, who were the first to introduce into the modern world the policy of forbidding civil governments to meddle with affairs of conscience. And the other was the toleration of the Protestants, who took advantage of the franchise granted them in Maryland, as soon as they gained the majority, to proscribe all Catholics.

304.

Letter, *Ohio State Journal*, July 18, 1871

Does the Catholic Church Countenance Riots?

To the *Ohio State Journal*:

The attempt of certain persons to make the Catholic Church responsible for the late New York riot is unfair and unjust. Those who were fired upon by the police and military were on the spot in defiance of a strict command of their Archbishop, given in all the churches of the city the Sunday previous. The feud between the Orange and Ribbon factions, both made up of a fraction of the lower orders of the Irish people, is now centuries old. Religion was made the pretext, but both parties practically renounced religion in their strife. The New York riot was simply a continuation of that strife. To make the Catholic Church responsible for what it forbids, abhors, and condemns, is unfair and unjust.

Rev. D. H. Moore, in Wesley chapel last evening, according to the reports in to-day's *Journal*, was guilty of this unfairness:

"A child," said he, 'always tells the secret of the family,' and in this riotous, untutored, ungoverned portion of the Catholic Church we see the tumultuous upheaving, the gathering power that shall shake, unless it is broken, this country from center to circumference. The principle of toleration is a fundamental principle of this country; destroy it, and all is lost. The tendency of the whole Catholic Church, in its

teachings, is toward intolerance."

The injustice of this consists in assuming that "the untutored, ungoverned portion of the Catholic church" are following her teachings and fulfilling her spirit; that the "untutored" are the best taught, and the "ungoverned" the best directed. The fact is those men, when they disobeyed the command given them from the altar, ceased to be children of the Church; and the secret they revealed was the old, old story of human wrath, known since the time of Cain.

To connect acts like this with the doctrine of infallibility is simply absurd. Is not the Rev. Mr. Moore convinced that he is right in his religious convictions, and that Catholics are wrong? To say no were to call him a hypocrite. Yet because he considers himself undoubtedly or infallibly right, does he think himself bound to coerce others? But if he can tolerate, why cannot Catholics? Toleration, to be wholesome, need not be founded on a conviction that there is *no* religious truth— but rather on the belief that God alone is master and judge of men. This was what actuated the Catholics of Maryland, who were the first to legalize religious toleration in America. This is the principle on which the Catholics of this country who are true to their faith propose to live in peace with their non-Catholic countrymen. They do not think of saying, "We may be wrong in our belief; therefore let our neighbor alone;" but, "We know our faith is true, therefore we know that we are bound to love our neighbors, no matter of what creed or color, as we love ourselves, and reverence in them the right we claim for ourselves, of having God alone for master and judge."

We Catholics, Mr. Editor, desire to be citizens of a free republic. We want nothing for ourselves but what we will do our best to maintain for others. It would be a pleasure to us to see JESUS CHRIST CRUCIFIED honored and loved by all our countrymen, but no pleasure to see any one calling himself a Catholic for fashion's sake or on compulsion. The clergy have no temporal or political design. Their expectations are on the period that shall follow the judgment, whence they can suffer patiently, though with regret, the obloquy and unjust hate excited against them by misrepresentations of such scandals as the New York riot.

S. H. ROSECRANS,
Bishop of Columbus

Columbus, July 18, 1871

305.

Letter, *Ohio State Journal*, July 22, 1871

The Basis of Religious Toleration

To the Ohio State Journal:

In his eagerness to fix the responsibility of the New York riots on the Catholic

Church, the Rev. David H. Moore, Pastor of Wesley Chapel, lays down, in his letter published in the Ohio State Journal July 20th, the following principle:

Without the admitted possibility that one may be mistaken in his convictions, and that possibly the contradictory view may be correct, toleration in religion is impossible.

Let us put this into Saxon and illustrate it. The English of it is: If I do not doubt what I believe, I cannot help but persecute all who do not believe as I do.

The illustration is: Mr. Moore firmly believes that he is right in being a Methodist, and I am wrong in being a Catholic. But were it not for a lurking suspicion in his mind that he "may be mistaken after all," and my "view may possibly be correct," he would consider it his duty to "go for me" and "put a head on me." Surely the venerable clergyman does not mean precisely this! Yet he says what is equivalent to it.

It seems to me such teaching is far more dangerous to society than any claim of infallibility. Give people to understand that doubt of their own convictions is the only reason for letting dissenters live, and you will speedily fill society with strife. For whatever the necessity of keeping up a discussion can lead a man to subtilize, the practical common sense of the masses can never be muddled into acceptance of the distinction between "being convinced," and being "undoubtedly convinced."

The true ground of wholesome toleration is not the doubt of your own faith--for if you doubt your own faith what are you good for in life?--but respect for the souls of others, that is Divine charity.

Hence the value of the Rev. Mr. Moore's capital point appears. That point is, in his own words:

"That intolerant spirit existed in every Roman Catholic church in the city; for the Archbishop felt it was necessary to have his letter of warning and prohibition read in each of them; thus recognizing the fact that there were those in every Roman Catholic Church in New York who would be disposed to take part in such a riotous assault. This I count very remarkable, *if the evident tendency of the teachings of that Church is toward toleration!*"

The Spirit of Anger was certainly known to be spread extensively before the riots in New York. The Orangemen, whose object is not to build up anything, but to put down Catholics and shed their blood--as the first article of their oath binds them to do--were determined to appear publicly to insult the Catholics--and the Ribbonmen, excommunicated Catholics--were determined to fight them according to their challenge.

The Archbishop of New York knew the existence of this wrath, and warned all who would listen to him not to give place to it. Mr. Moore's argument supposes this wrath to have been kindled by the Church's teaching, most absurdly.

In the Methodist Churches there are frequent sermons against intemperance. Does that prove that in every Methodist Church there are those who would be disposed

306 - The Soul of Religious Tolerance

to swill drink? or have I a right to think this remarkable *if the evident tendency of the teachings of the Methodist Church is toward temperance?*

I cannot go into a discussion of the municipal government of Rome under the Popes. That government, like all local governments, not military, was in the main regulated according to the temper of the population and the necessity of public order, but the infallibility of the Pope had nothing to do with it.

S. H. Rosecrans,
Bishop of Columbus

July 21st, 1871.

306.

Sermon, *Ohio State Journal*, July 24, 1871

The Soul of Religious Tolerance

(synopsis)

Bishop S. H. Rosecrans preached a sermon at 10 o'clock yesterday before Cathedral Chapel congregation, at Naughton Hall. The subject of his discourse was in relation to the New York riot, and the much discussed idea of the intolerance of the Catholic Church. The Right Reverend's allusion to the riots was quite brief, and its substance was that the Catholic Church should in no way be held responsible for the misdeeds of those who are merely reputed to be Catholics. His remarks concerning the tolerance or intolerance of different religious denominations were materially those set forth in his discussion through the Journal with Rev. D. H. Moore, of Wesley Chapel. He disputed the argument advanced that the soul of religious tolerance was the admission that, though believing you are right in your views, there yet exists a possibility that you may be entirely wrong. Catholicism firmly believes it is right, and thus believing spurns to acknowledge the possibility of being wrong; yet Catholicism is tolerant toward other churches in that it believes them to be sincere in their worshiping of the Divine Being, by whom they are governed and directed.

307.

Editorials, *The Catholic Telegraph and Advocate*, July 2 and 30, 1853

[Shepherd of the Valley.]

We have seen for some time, an extract from the *Shepherd of the Valley*, going the rounds of the secular press. The sentiment of the extract is bad, and difficult to be explained, except by attributing it to the ignorance under which the writer labored of Catholic subjects. Dr. Brownson suffers enough, without being subjected to odium, by friends, who misunderstand him.

Of course, the sectarians have tried to make out the sentiments of the lay editor of "*the Shepherd of the Valley*" to be those of the Archbishop of St. Louis; but the Archbishop himself has publicly repudiated them, we understand. Controversial books, although they may seem to converts to contain an immensity of information, are nevertheless, not sufficient to enable one to write accurately on all subjects.

"A Few Plain Words."

Under this heading the "Shepherd of the Valley," of July 16, complains that we did him an injustice, when we said, a few weeks ago, of certain extracts from that paper, seized upon by secular and sectarian journals to the injury of the Church: "The Archbishop of St. Louis has, we understand, publicly repudiated" the sentiments therein contained. We did "understand" so; but if we were misinformed, we give the "Shepherd" the benefit of a correction.

Still, though the Archbishop of St. Louis have not publicly repudiated the sentiment, that "when Catholics shall have acquired a numerical majority in this country, Religious Liberty is at an end," we do not believe that he has endorsed it. Certainly, his general approval of the publication does not make him responsible for it, any more than it does for the Protestant letters that appeared not long since in the columns of the Shepherd; and it is not to be supposed, that any one whose ideas are formed from the teachings of theologians and from accurate knowledge of ecclesiastical history--who, therefore, knows that civil or political liberty has never been denied to any religious opinion, by the Church, unless that opinion tended to subvert the existing civil or political order--would wish to be its approver.

He who has observed the conduct of the Church towards pagans and Jews, and towards all quiet and orderly heretical bodies, cannot "believe" what, with the enemies of Catholicity, the editor of the *Shepherd of the Valley* professes to believe. We have no wish to excite any controversy with the "Shepherd of the Valley." We are perfectly willing to leave him, as he says we ought, "for correction and reproof, in the hands" of whomsoever he may fall. We wrote not for him but for our own readers. We spoke not "indefinitely," but very definitely of the extracts from the *Shepherd of the Valley*, about which our local papers were teeming with abuse of us.

We considered the sentiment of these extracts bad: and we said so. We considered that sentiment as emanating from a mind not deeply versed in Catholic Theology, literature and accurate history: and we said so. But not for the Shepherd of the Valley, its editor goes on the even tenor of his way: let us go ours. If he escapes the reproof of his ecclesiastical superiors, so much the better for him. We do not reprove him--we only cut ourselves loose from the paternity of his sentiments.

For the rest, we have the kindest feelings towards the "Shepherd of the Valley." We honor his sincerity even while we deprecate his bitterness, and we esteem his zeal

307 - Shepherd of the Valley

while we cannot always respect his discretion.

In justice to the Senior Editor of this paper, who is now absent from the City, we will state that he neither wrote nor suggested the paragraph which has occasioned this difficulty.--The pressure of the times, and the unwarranted importance attached by the secular papers to the "*Shepherd's*" sentiment, rendered it necessary to say *something*; otherwise, we would have remained silent, not to offend a Catholic cotemporary.

The Shepherd of the Valley *was founded by the Archbishop of St. Louis in 1850 but by 1853 was edited by a layman. It ceased publication in 1854.*