



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

it may appear trifling; but, for my part, I fancy it is quite appropriate, and capable of combining into regular system the elementary instructions hitherto given to his neophytes.

He submits to them the example of an earthly king, punishing offenders against his crown and person, and of their obtaining pardon, through the mediation and supplication of friends; and to imprint this illustration indelibly on their memories, that they may be able thereby to carry it in their minds throughout the whole of what he next proposes to teach them, he intimates to them the necessity of doing so by *κατα αυτον τροπον*, which is indicative of a repetition of the example proposed—"After the same manner that they supplicate the king to obtain pardon," &c.—*και ημεις υπερ των κεκοιμημενων αυτω τας δεησεις προσφεροντες, καν αμαρτωλοι ωσιν, ου στεφανων πλεκομεν, αλλα Χριστον εσφαγιασμενον υπερ των ημετερων αμαρτηατων προσφερομεν, εξιλιουμενοι υπερ αυτων και ημων τον φιλανθρωπον.*—"So do we offer up supplications to God for those that are dead, if they be sinners; we do not propose a crown, but we offer Christ slain for our sins, propitiating, both for them (*the dead*) and for us, Him who is so beneficent." This passage is of paramount importance; it is plain and simple in construction, and cannot be misunderstood; it is the climax of all St. Cyril has advanced respecting prayers, &c., for the relief of the dead; and if allowed to be the exponent of the doctrine of the Christian Church on this point, the controversy is at an end, and the distinction between prayers for the patriarchs, prophets, apostles, &c., and those for the other dead must be admitted. This you are aware of, and throughout paragraphs No. 1 and No. 2 of your reply to my letter referred to above, after a number of varied, desultory, but ineffectual attempts to ignore the plain, obvious meaning of this passage, you resign it as hopeless, and concede to me, on the authority of St. Cyril, this very distinction. An inextricable dilemma presents itself before you—you must either agree to the truth of St. Cyril's teaching, "If they (*the dead*) be sinners, we offer supplications for them; we offer Christ slain, to propitiate God for them, to make atonement for them, to obtain pardon for them, &c.; and the admission of this would be fatal to the Church of England doctrine in Article xxii. of her religion; or you must adopt the only alternative at your disposal, which, I think, still involves you in no trifling difficulty. This latter course you take, and, in pointed allusion to the doctrine enunciated in the foregoing passage of St. Cyril, you ask—"How, then, are we to account for the fact of St. Cyril being driven to justify prayers for those who died in their sins—*αμαρτωλοι*?" Now, if anything can be a proof, clear and inevitable, this query affords such proof—first, that I have not been guilty of "evident misconstruction" with regard to the passages of St. Cyril; second, that I was justified, on their authority, in making the distinction, as I have done, between "commemoration of patriarchs, &c., that God, through their prayers and intercessions, may receive our supplications," and prayers, &c., for the relief of the dead, "if they be sinners;" thirdly, that all you have attempted by way of argument to disprove this distinction is purely gratuitous, and utterly inconclusive—in fact, no argument at all.

These observations are supported by other arguments of yours, equally incontrovertible. In the reply you afford to the above query, you answer—"There is only one possible account of it; this corrupt practice had grown up of praying for such, and St. Cyril had the weakness to try and defend it," &c. Thus, you admit that St. Cyril inculcates prayers and sacrifices to obtain pardon for the dead, to free them from the punishment of sin; hence the purifying and cleansing of souls after death, and the consequent doctrine of purgatory—virtually, I allow; but the word *virtually*, in this case, is, I maintain, explained by *verily* and *indeed*; and these latter words are not to be taken in the sense in which you use them with respect to the *real presence* in the Eucharist—that is, to express a *real absence*; but in *reality* and in *truth*, without any doubt. These prayers, &c., you call "a corrupt practice," and that it had "grown up;" but you do not tell us where it had grown up; "and that St. Cyril had the weakness to try and defend it," &c. Now, as this corrupt practice of prayers and sacrifice for the relief of the dead is admitted by you to have prevailed in the time of St. Cyril—nay, more, that it "had grown up" before his time; for you do not charge St. Cyril with having originated it; and as this practice differs nothing from the doctrine of purgatory taught by the Catholic Church of the present day, and as you say "St. Cyril had the weakness to try and defend it," &c., I think, in justice to the cause of truth, you cannot refuse to afford the most ample and unequivocal proofs of these statements, instead of having them come begging, supported only by a *petitio principii*, the mere *dictum* by which you have asserted them. If St. Cyril had, as you assert, to try and defend a corrupt practice in opposition to the teaching of the Church, let us see this corrupt practice traced to its origin. When, and where, and how, I ask you, did it spring up? Who planted it? Who watered it and watched over its progress, until St. Cyril took it under his fostering care and ingrafted it upon his *Explanations of the Christian Liturgy*? What council, pope, bishop, or priest, if we except Aeries—an apostate priest in the beginning of the fourth century—ever denied the efficacy of prayers, &c., for the relief of the dead? And, as you so confidently assert, that, in the time of St. Cyril, this corrupt practice had neither the sanction of the Church, nor of the Liturgy—

and as the different phases of the Church, whether bleeding under the sword of the persecutor, or embroiled by the turbulent and poisoning influence of heretical factions, or spreading far and wide the enlivening rays of the Gospel, are faithfully recorded on the page of history, from that time forward—you cannot fail to inform us, at what subsequent period this corrupt practice became a *dogma* of Catholic faith; this, surely, is not too much to require from you. You have before you the ecclesiastical records of every age of Christianity, the decrees of councils, the volumes of the Fathers—deduce from any of them, if you can, clear, decisive evidence on the different points I have here enumerated; or, in default of such evidence, all you have stated with respect to St. Cyril must pass for empty sound, mere assertion, a figment worthy of no credit. If, as you say, the Church gave no sanction to these prayers for the dead, how could St. Cyril charge those, who denied their utility, with having contradicted the Church? This disposes of another of your conclusive arguments. Lastly, I require of you to show that the word *αμαρτωλοι* means hardened sinners only; or, as I understand you, those who die in mortal sin; and that St. Cyril uses it in this sense.

When you satisfy me with information on all these points, I will then show you that the liturgies agree with St. Cyril in the distinction for which I contend. I will show you that in the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom, *Goar's Rituaie Græcorum*, page 63, is stated a doctrine in substance thus—"By the intercession of the most holy, immaculate, blessed above all, our glorious Lady, Mother of God, and our Virgin Mary, &c., and of all the saints, may Christ, our true God, have mercy on us." And, again—"We offer thee this rational service, for the sake of the prophets, apostles, martyrs, and particularly the most holy, pure, blessed above all, our glorious Queen and Mother of God, ever Virgin. Perfect us, O God, by the prayers of St. John the Baptist, the saint whose memory we celebrate, and of all the saints." And, in page 78, I will show you a paragraph for the relief of the dead, to this effect—"We entreat thee for the repose and pardon of the soul of thy servant, in a place of rest from which grief and lamentation are far removed." Thus do St. Cyril and the Liturgy of St. Chrysostom afford corroborating evidence; and, on the authority of the former, until you shall prove that he teaches a corrupt practice, I am justified in rendering *αναπαυσις*, by repose, relief, rest, from *pain, trouble, torment*, &c.; and, further, that the whole of your long paragraph No. 5 of reply is utterly inconclusive and nugatory. The substance of that paragraph amounts simply, to this—"Those who have no 'rest' are in hell, and those who have 'not' are in heaven, from the time of their death," and because, these two conditions are, as you have stated; and because, in Apocal. xiv. 11, 13, "there is not one word to prove the *pain* and *torment* of purgatory," you would thence reason your readers into the belief that there is no such place as purgatory!! I think, as a lover of truth, I have stated my views of these points honestly and openly, and with the same unbiassed feelings, I shall return again to a consideration of the remainder of your statements. I am, Sir, yours with respect.

EDMOND POWER.

Mullinavat, May 30, 1855.

We are happy to hear from Mr. Power again, after so long a silence.

We shall first notice briefly what is not in Mr. Power's letter.

In his last letter (No. for March, 1855), Mr. Power asserted that prayers for the dead may be offered for other purposes besides getting souls out of purgatory. We agreed to this, and we asked Mr. Power if he could produce, out of the ancient liturgies, a single prayer which cannot be for anything else but for getting a soul out of purgatory. Mr. Power says nothing about this. It is clear from his letter that he has searched the ancient liturgies, and it is also clear that he has not found in them any prayer for getting a soul out of purgatory. This is an important point to have settled.

Mr. Power affirmed in that letter that there was a distinction in the ancient liturgies—*commemoration* being made for the saints, and prayers and intercessions for the other dead.

We proved, from the ancient liturgies themselves, that there is no such distinction in them; Mr. Power does not now produce any such distinction in the liturgies (which he has been studying); but he says he was justified by St. Cyril in saying that there is such a distinction in those liturgies. To this we answer that, since there is no such distinction in the liturgies, neither St. Cyril nor any one else can justify Mr. Power in saying that there is one.

Mr. Power in that letter quoted two passages from St. Cyril—the first, about "commemoration," the second, about sacrifice for the dead. We said that, in the first, Mr. Power argued on an evident misconstruction. Mr. Power does not attempt to justify his construction of that passage, but he says he did not misconstrue the second passage (which we never charged him with), and that, therefore, we have no right to charge him with misconstruction of St. Cyril. We think there is danger that our readers may get tired of such arguments.

The real point raised in this present letter of Mr. Power is this—he produced a passage from St. Cyril, ar-

guing in favour of prayers for the dead who were "sinners"—*αμαρτωλοι*. We admit this passage is now in St. Cyril's works. Mr. Power says, that in this passage he "allowed to be the exponent of the doctrine of the Christian Church on this point, the controversy is at an end."

We admit this is, but we deny the fact; we affirm that this passage is not an exponent or example of the doctrine of the Christian Church, and we prove it thus—In the liturgy of the Church in St. Cyril's time, there was not anything to justify prayers for the dead who were "sinners"—*αμαρτωλοι*. If there be, Mr. Power would have produced it, but there is not. The liturgies only authorize commemoration for those "who had gone to rest, in hope of the resurrection of eternal life"—not for "sinners"—*αμαρτωλοι*. Therefore, when St. Cyril argues for praying for the dead who are sinners, *αμαρτωλοι*, he is only arguing for an opinion of his own, not for the doctrine of the Christian Church.

Mr. Power argues from this passage of St. Cyril as if the production of a single passage from one Father was enough to prove a doctrine or practice to be right. But Mr. Power must know that such an argument may be produced to prove anything, however erroneous. The Fathers were men subject to error like ourselves. Does Mr. Power admit or deny this?

How are we to account for St. Cyril defending a use of the liturgy, which was opposed to the liturgy itself? We can only account for it thus—a practice had probably grown up of praying for "sinners."—*αμαρτωλοι*—in the public service of the Church, although that service itself did not warrant such a practice. Some justified the practice, others condemned it. If St. Cyril argued in favour of that practice, instead of saying boldly that it was an abuse of the liturgy, he was guilty of a great weakness, unworthy of a Christian bishop.

But Mr. Power calls on us to tell the name of the man who first introduced that abuse, and the precise time when he introduced it, all which we promise to tell Mr. Power, if he will first tell us the name of the man who sowed the tares in the field, and on what night he did it.—See the Parable of the Tares, Matt. xiii. 24-30. When we see the tares, we are sure that somebody sowed them, even though we do not know the name of the man.

Mr. Power also says—"lastly, I require of you to show that the word *αμαρτωλοι* means hardened sinners only; or, as I understand you, those who die in mortal sin; and that St. Cyril takes it in this sense."

We subjoin a note* of forty one places in the New Testament in which the word *αμαρτωλοι* is used for sinners; and in every place, the word seems to us to be intended to express those who are in mortal sin. Will Mr. Power show us in which place it means those who are under venial sin? or can he show us that the word ever was used in that sense?

FARMING OPERATIONS FOR JUNE.

(From the Irish Farmer's Gazette).

TURNIP CULTIVATION should be preceded with briskly; and, in order to prevent undue evaporation in dry weather, keep the harrow, and rollers going close after the plough. Let the Swedes be got in with as little delay as possible, to be followed by the hybrids, then the Aberdeens, and, last of all, the soft white turnips. The land under the soiling crops of vetches, rye, or rape, should be prepared and sown, as fast as cleared, with suitable varieties of turnips.

Carrots and Parsnips should be singled out to intervals of about 8 to 9 inches, and kept well hoed, and grubbed between, during the summer.

Cabbages.—Continue planting in well-tilled and highly-manured land. Cabbages planted during this month, or early in July, will produce much valuable food for sheep and cattle, during the winter and early spring months.

Beans and Peas should be kept hoed, and the earth slightly ridged up, when cultivated in drills; when sown broadcast, careful hand-weeding can only be resorted to.

Potatoes will require much attention in weeding, and, if in drills, drawing up a little earth to the stems as they advance, taking care not to bury the leaves. Those in beds should have a little fine, fresh earth cast over them from the furrows, just as they are coming to the surface, but before the leaves are developed.

Buckwheat may be sown as soon as all danger of frost is over. It is useful for ploughing in as a green manure, for a soiling crop, or for seed.

Hemp, when sown in rows, should be singled out to 10 or 12 inches apart, as soon as fit, and subsequently kept clean by the hand and horse hoe. If sown broadcast, hoe and single out to 12 inches apart, and keep it clean by the hoe till grown so much as to smother all weeds.

Fallows should be well harrowed during the month, grubbed if required, and ploughed up again.

* Matt. ix. 10, 11, 13; xi. 19; xxvi. 45. Mark ii. 16, 17; viii. 38; xiv. 41. Luke v. 8; vi. 32, 34; vii. 37, 39; xiii. 2; xv. 1, 2, 7, 10; xviii. 13; xix. 7; xxiv. 7. John ix. 16, 24, 25, 31. Rom. iii. 7; v. 8, 19; vii. 13. Gal. ii. 15, 17. 1 Tim. i. 9, 15. Hebrews vii. 26; xii. 3. James iv. 8; v. 20. 1 Peter iv. 18. Jude 15.