

he means the Catholic Church, I consider it my duty to refute the errors into which he has fallen.

I should be grieved, dearest in Christ, were anyone to think I would have you follow me in a hostile spirit of bitter struggle, or a hateful feeling of triumphant victory. If you follow me in the unpleasant task which I have taken upon myself, I will ask you to do so in the spirit of truth, of faith, and of love, bearing in mind the exhortation of the Apostle St. John—"My little children, let us love, not in word or in tongue, but in deed and in truth" (1 John, iii., 18). And those of the Prince of the Apostles who exhorts us to be "ready always to satisfy everyone that asketh you a reason of that hope which is in you." (1 Peter iii., 15).

I have called it an unpleasant task, for it is always unpleasant to point out and correct errors, especially when they are—as we must charitably suppose these were—made in good faith. But when a clergyman assumes to teach the doctrines of a church whose faith he does not profess, it were surely unworthy his character as a scholar and a divine to take for the groundwork of his teaching from which to derive that Church's doctrine, the misstatements of an outsider—of an outsider known to be a bitter enemy of that Church; an enemy whose perversion of truth has gained him the disgust of the most eminent divines of his own Church, and the indignation of Catholics, whose faith and practices he has so notoriously and maliciously misinterpreted.

This is a strong thing to say, dearest in Christ, but you will soon agree with me that it is by no means stronger than it deserves. In his introduction to the addresses, the writer acknowledges his indebtedness, as I just now read to you, to Dr. Littledale's "Plain Reasons against Joining the Church of Rome." He says he is "indebted to him for much valuable information." It is quite right that he should acknowledge his indebtedness, though to anyone who has read—as I am sorry to say I have read—Dr. Littledale's "Plain Reasons," the acknowledgment was not at all necessary: the use he has made of Dr. Littledale is obvious at well nigh every page.

#### Utter Worthlessness of Dr. Littledale's Authority.

Let us, then, test the worth of Dr. Littledale's authority. I have mentioned his name, and naturally you would like to know who he is. I will tell you. He is an English Protestant vicar, with a strong mixture of ultra-Ritualism and a horror of true Catholicism and Low-Church Anglicanism. He is one who, in the same breath, denounces the leading "English and Scotch Reformers as a set of scoundrels" (I quote his very words), "a set of unredeemed villains," "men of utter scoundrelism;" while he pours out the coarsest vituperation against that old Faith, from which he has—indirectly, at least—received the right to celebrate daily with unleavened wafer and vestment, like a real Catholic priest—for every day he pretends, I believe, to celebrate.

A little more than a decade of years ago I remember that his work, "Plain Reasons," came out with a great flourish of trumpets. Several of whom it was my privilege and happiness to receive into the Holy Church, as soon as it was known to their friends, both clerical and lay—but especially clerical—that they had come to me for instructions, had at once Dr. Littledale's "Plain Reasons" thrust into their hands. So I became conversant with this strange manual.

It was published under the auspices of the Christian Knowledge Society, and it was entitled "Plain Reasons against Joining the Church of Rome." With considerable ingenuity it manages, in the brief space of two hundred pages, to bring together most of the hardest things that have ever been said against the doctrines of our Holy Church, and especially against her Popes. "The author," says Dr. Ryder, "has neglected no source of information, from the (badly read I would add) pages of the Fathers, to the fly-leaf of modern gossip. It is the work of one whose heart was in the work, and whose hand had not forgot its cunning." From its first appearance it was hailed as a very mine of wealth, a grand bulwark, a strong arsenal against the invasions of Rome amongst the ranks of the Anglicans, whose clergy and laity had been steadily going over to our Holy Church for many years before the publication of this manual.

Unlike the series of addresses on "The Hindrances to the Re-union of Christendom," Dr. Littledale's extraordinary assertions are seemingly substantiated by a formidable array of quotations in the shape of proofs from the fathers, Catholic theologians, ascetical, and other writers. Now, to make this crushing array still more crushing, he actually cited chapter and verse for nearly all proofs or quotations. For a short time all went well, until able men, like the present successor of Cardinal Newman in the Church of the Oratory at Birmingham, Dr. Ryder, showed more clearly than noon-day that the proofs given by Dr. Littledale were simply worthless because they had no foundation in fact. In his masterly reply to "Plain Reasons," which he published in the same shape and form, this learned oratorian literally pulverises the strong fabric which Dr. Littledale had reared on a lying foundation. So vigorously and thoroughly did another author, Mr Aubrey

Shiple, expose the untruthfulness and bitter unfairness of Dr Littledale in a pamphlet he wrote, called "Why Ritualists do not become Roman Catholics," that the English Church Union, though it was brought out under its auspices, felt it-elt bound, in sheer love of truth and justice, to withdraw it from circulation.

Dr Littledale, "the mendacious writer" as he had been justly called, has seen his plain reasons torn to shreds by writers both Anglican and Catholic. In his admirable reply to the Anglican Bishop of Ballarat and Canon Potter, the illustrious Archbishop of Melbourne, brings forth a host of Protestant witnesses in condemnation of Dr Littledale's rash statements as to Catholic teaching.

Like the Archbishop, I intend to produce the testimony, not of Catholic authors, but of Anglicans of the highest standing—and you may remark this is what I have done during the whole course of the lectures which I have been giving for the last nine or ten weeks.

Of course I cannot give you Protestant testimony before Protestantism existed, because, as we know, for a thousand years and more, there were only Catholic writers throughout the civilised, Christianised world, but I have given many a strong proof of Catholic teaching and Catholic practice among our Protestant friends in Great Britain and Ireland since the so-called Reformation.

Now Dr Lee, an eminent clergyman of the Anglican Church, well-known for his historical writings, gave himself the painful task of examining Dr Littledale's "Plain Reasons." He took the trouble to tabulate the errors he detected in "Plain Reasons," even after it was more than once revised and corrected, and these are the facts that he discovered. He found the following mistakes or misstatements, whatever you like to call them:—On stern, stubborn, historical facts, he found no fewer than fifty-one errors; on facts touching on dogma, he found forty-three; of wrong quotations from writers on history and canon law, there were twenty-nine; mutilated historical and theological quotations, thirty; quotations from Fathers, upon which Dr Littledale had put a meaning totally different from the meaning of the Fathers, twenty-four; passages wherein he confuses the opinion of some Catholics with the defined doctrine of the Church, seventeen; passages where he assumes as dogmas the current opinions of the theologians, seven; making a total, under all heads, of two-hundred-and-one palpable errors or misstatements. Having drawn his hearers' attention to these obvious errors, Dr Lee says—listen to the words of this eminent clergyman of the Church of England—"had we a body of clergymen with a sound theological education, such a publication must have been met with only a chilling welcome from those who were duped, and then," he says, "with a howl of execration as it deserves, I will not directly say more than, having carefully examined it in conjunction with others, the first edition with the last, we have found it to be manifestly unfair and altogether untrustworthy. I would," he concludes, "that we could regard its author as unintentionally misled and mistaken."

At the close of 1881, when other editions had come out, Mr. Shitley Brabazon, another Anglican, gave public expression to his opinion of the "Plain Reasons." "A book which has been corrected," he says, "in nearly a hundred acts of misstatements, should have been first submitted to some competent author before being put into print. It shakes our confidence in the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge (under auspices, I am told, Dr Littledale's "Plain Reasons" had been printed), and it is not creditable that no expression of regret was made by its Committee for the circulation of errors and fictions. Dishonesty in controversy, particularly in religious controversy, even when resulting from the want of necessary inquiry beforehand, is greatly to be deprecated." I should think it is.

The learned rector of Torrington, in England, Dr. Mossman, writes thus:—"The book appears to me to be written in a most reprehensible spirit, unless exposed and refuted, it is calculated to do grievous harm to the blessed and holy cause of Christian re-union. The book cannot, of course, mislead anyone who is really acquainted with ecclesiastical history and dogmatic theology; but how very few of its readers will know, that it is very little more than a rude congeries of false and erroneous statements taken at second hand which have been exposed and refuted again and again."

Another clergyman of the Church of England, Rev. W. Hankey, says:—"I should be much obliged if you will allow me, as an Anglican who prefers Dr. Littledale's past to his present views, to express the shame and indignation with which I have from the first regarded the publication of "Plain Reasons." Since the issue of translations into French and Italian, the claim of the work to be defensive, not aggressive, can no longer be contended, and considering what manner of men are the vast majority of the Church's enemies in France and Italy, I protest in the name of religion, in the name of Christianity, against any such attempt to weaken the hands of the Church." He considered it was weakening the hands of the Anglican Church.