

which it may yield to their platforms is as yet untold—nay, perhaps, it is infinite. Does not Paris alone, as M. Jules Simon informs us possess 34,000 actual burglars and would-be assassins? And of how great a crowd of less extreme unbelievers are these the saints? The supply is absolutely boundless. Who knows, then, what opportunities our lyceans are allowing to slip by. Some mute, inglorious Louise Michel, for instance, may lurk in the slums of an Australian city, only awaiting the call to lecturership. Ears that itch for the abuse of clericalism are needlessly pained, and those who can best and most appropriately satisfy all their longings are within reach. It should be the determination of every right-minded person, however little he should want, like Sairey Gamp, to want that little of the best. The mere namby-pamby of our colonial lecturers, caught up here and there from various stale and threadbare sources, and for the most part marred in the borrowing, is nothing to what the recidivists could give if they were only brought forward, and in pure disinterested friendship we recommend these more advanced members of their sect to our friends, the lyceans. Let them bridge over the seas between these colonies and New Caledonia. The work should be as congenial to them and as much in their interests as was to its constructors the building of that great bridge described by Milton when Satan had prepared the way for the smooth course of Freethought upon this earth.

A CONTROVERSY has taken place in the Melbourne *Argus* between the Anglican Bishop Moorehouse and Archdeacon Slattery, of Geelong. The matter in dispute was certain passages in one of St. Paul's Epistles, and the particular use of the Greek article was the especial point on which the argument seemed to turn. We have no intention of following the course of the learned discussion, which to be understood must be followed in its entire course, and is perhaps rather above the interest of the ordinary reader. We, however, find in the last letter which we have seen written by Dr. Moorehouse a sentence or two calling for comment. Dr. Moorehouse, then, says that it was 26 years ago that he adopted the views objected to by Archdeacon Slattery, and that he did so on reading certain notes on the Epistle to the Romans published by Dr. Vaughan—then Head-master of Harrow—who, being an excellent Greek scholar, had studied the subject for 18 years. From the time, therefore, that St. Paul wrote until twenty-six years ago, a chief argument in the Epistle to the Romans had been involved in a state of Cimmerian darkness—that is, at least, so far as the English-speaking or private-interpreting world had been concerned. The true meaning of the Apostle had been hid by an ignorance of the language in which he wrote, and passages on which doctrines had been built and sects founded had been completely misunderstood. Dr. Moorehouse disdains for his Church any pretensions to infallibility, but since the Scriptures also failed, how many of those needing a guide may have fallen, all unguided, into the ditch? The guide was there, indeed,—the “unaided Word”—but locked up out of reach, and powerless to instruct any of those wanting the key who applied to it for instruction. The fact is significant, and strongly tends to show the worth of that theory of private interpretation. Dr. Moorehouse promises, moreover, that if Archdeacon Slattery will give him “scriptural proofs” of the infallibility of the Pope he will turn Roman Catholic. But who shall judge as to the sufficiency of these proofs? Dr. Moorehouse will himself sit in judgment on the evidence to be produced, and, with a prejudiced mind and a decision arrived at in advance, will pronounce his sentence. What, indeed, can be proved by a book the true meaning of some of whose most important passages lies in abeyance for many centuries? And yet we can fancy that a man even exercising his right of private interpretation should easily find the infallibility of the Pope declared in Holy Writ. Can the rock, indeed, fall, whereon the Church, against which the powers of hell shall not prevail, is built? Or can he, commissioned by God to feed His sheep and lambs, give them poison instead of wholesome food? Had there been an infallible judge to pronounce the sentence that would bind him, then, Bishop Moorehouse would have made a rash promise, but since the interpretation is in his own hands, and the authority is one over which he exercises unrestricted control, his promise is a safe one. We see, however, the value of a vitally authoritative book, whose age is eighteen hundred years, while the true interpretation of any principal passage in it may date from to-day or yesterday, and whose plain words may be boldly challenged, since the right of explaining them in any convenient way has been seized upon. Dr. Moorehouse well repudiates infallible authority for his Church. She has taken as her guide a book—*ipso facto* stripped of its authority, and failure and division must necessarily be her principal notes.

The eighth centenary of a great Pope and a great POPE ST. saint occurred this year on May 25th, and was duly GREGORY VII. celebrated on June 1st by the Church. Pope St. Gregory VII. died at Salerno on May 25, 1085—for it is to him that we allude. There has been, perhaps no other

character on the page of history to which so much injustice has been done as to that of St. Gregory, and his whole career has been the subject of fierce and continual misrepresentation. The contempt and hatred of the Protestant world has been poured out on Hildebrand, as he is commonly called, and the resistance shown to him during his life by the evil powers and people whom he condemned and against whom he struggled was renewed towards his memory in after ages when the lasting effects of his warfare, seen in the condition of the Church, had again become detestable to those who had rebelled.—St. Gregory was a martyr in his life and death, and like many of the saints his triumph on earth only became apparent when he himself had gone to join the Church triumphant in Heaven. “In his life time” says Montalembert, “Gregory knew little success, except of a purely spiritual kind; and this he bought at the cost of trials and disappointments the hardest and most bitter, and which were constantly repeated till the end of his days. He foresaw this and accepted it before hand. ‘If I had been willing,’ he often said, ‘to let the princes and great ones of the world reign by the guidance of their passions; if I had been silent when I saw them trample under foot God's justice, if at the peril of their souls and of mine, I had concealed their crimes; if I had not righteousness and the honour of the holy Church at heart ah! . . . I might better have counted on submission, wealth, repose, and homage more surely than could any of my predecessors. But knowing that a bishop is never more a bishop than when he is persecuted for right's sake, I resolved to brave the hatred of the wicked by obeying God rather than provoke his anger by guilty complaisance towards them. As to their threats and their cruelty, I pay no regard to them, being always ready to die rather than consent to partake of their iniquity and betray the good cause.”—But even the Protestant world itself has attained of late years to a more just appreciation of the character of St. Gregory if as yet they have not arrived at the full understanding of his work. The *Saturday Review* for example at the conclusion of an article on this centenary and which is on the whole fair and moderate if in some instances rather over-drawn and incorrect, speaks as follows: “Hildebrand has paid the accustomed penalty of greatness. An extravagant homage has been followed by a far more extravagant defamation. From the Reformation onwards it became the fashion among Protestants to load his memory with every term of obloquy and reproach, in which the compilers of the English *Homilies* set a somewhat conspicuous example, while even Roman Catholic, seemed half-ashamed to speak of him; he was represented as a cruel and narrow-minded bigot, the typical ‘Giant Pope,’ of the Pilgrim's Progress, whose teeth had not yet been drawn. A juster estimate has succeeded, and sceptical or Protestant writers in Germany and France are the first to make reparation for a very great literary wrong. Guizot hailed him as the champion and pioneer of modern civilisation. Sir James Stephen, who loved him little, could not refrain from testifying that his despotism, with whatever inconsistency, sought to guide mankind by moral impulses to a more than human sanctity, while the feudal despotism with which he waged war sought, with a stern consistency, to degrade them into beasts of prey, or beasts of burden. It was the conflict,” he adds, ‘of mental with physical power, of literature with ignorance, of religion with debauchery, and Hildebrand, who is celebrated as the reformer of the impure and profane abuses of the age, is yet more justly entitled to the praise of having, left the impress of his own gigantic character on the history of all the ages which have succeeded him.’ Milner, who had less than no sympathy with ecclesiastical pretensions of any kind, names him ‘the Caesar of spiritual conquest,’ before whose eyes floated in outline the beautiful vision of St. Augustine's ‘City of God,’ which he aspired, however imperfectly, to make a reality on earth.—It is but a shallow libel on his memory to call him the founder of Ultramontanism. . . . But Hildebrand who expired at Salerno in exile, on May 25, 1085, may fully be styled the Founder of the Medieval Papacy, and it must be allowed on all hands that the architect of so stately an edifice has well earned the honours of his eighth centenary.”—Coming from the sources whence it proceeds this is high testimony, and it is to be desired that on every point on which the Protestant world has been wont to calumniate the Church, a study of the truth, may be followed by a similar reparation.—Research coupled with honesty is all that is necessary to produce such an effect.—But let us acknowledge this tribute to justice as another victory won by Pope St. Gregory VII.

THE efforts that the people of the West Coast, Nelson, THE EAST AND Canterbury are making, and the determined WEST COAST front shown by them in this matter of the railway, RAILWAY do honour to their resolution, and their knowledge that those who desire others to help them must first help themselves. We say the people advisedly and not the men, for it was remarked by one or more of the speakers at the great meeting the other day in Christchurch that the enthusiasm shown by the women in this cause was one of its most hopeful features. And it may be granted that the rights of woman fully extend to the promo-