

## THE HERITAGE.

## HERITAGE.

The rich man's son inherits lands,  
And piles of bricks, and gold,  
And he inherits soft, white hands,  
And tender flesh that fears the cold,  
Nor dares to wear a garment old ;  
A heritage, it seems to me,  
One would not care to hold in fee.

The rich man's son inherits cares ;  
The bank may break, the factory burn,  
Some breath may burst his bubble shares,  
And soft white hands, would hardly earn  
A living that would suit his turn :  
A heritage, it seems to me,  
One would not care to hold in fee.

What does the poor man's son inherit ?  
Sweat muscles and a sinewy heart,  
A hardy frame, a hardier spirit ;  
King of two hands, he does his part  
In every useful toil and art ;  
A heritage, it seems to me,  
A King might wish to hold in fee.

What does the poor man's son inherit ?  
Wishes o'erjoyed with humble things,  
A rank adjudged by toil-worn merit,  
Content that from employment springs,  
A heart that in his labor sings ;  
A heritage, it seems to me,  
A King might wish to hold in fee.

What does the poor man's son inherit ?  
A patience learned by being poor ;  
Courage, if sorrow come, to bear it,  
A fellow-feeling that is sure  
To make the out-cast bless his door ;  
A heritage, it seems to me,  
A King might wish to hold in fee.

O, rich man's son there is a toil  
That with all others level stands ;  
Large charity doth never soil,  
But only whitens, soft, white hands,  
This is the best crop from my lands.  
A heritage, it seems to me,  
Worth being rich to hold in fee.

O, poor man's son, scorn not thy state,  
There is worse weariness than thine,  
In merely being rich and great ;  
Work only makes the soul to shine,  
And makes rest fragrant and benign ;  
A heritage, it seems to me,  
Worth being poor to hold in fee.

Both heirs to some six feet of sod,  
Are equal to the earth at last ;  
Both children of the same dear God ;  
Prove title to your heirship vast  
By record of a well-filled past,  
A heritage, it seems to me,  
Well worth a life to hold in fee.

From the Catholic Herald.

## THE TERM CATHOLIC.

It has pleased your talented correspondent "Neophilus" to refer to our humble self, in a cause, which it is our highest glory to advocate : the Church—the universal—the Catholic Church : and although we do not, in the smallest degree, merit his compliment, we will cheerfully make the reference that he seems to desire.

It needs no display of learning ; nor, indeed, array of extracts, to prove what all admit ; and what if they did not, we would not condescend to ask, our right to the name of CATHOLIC—our baptismal name—unto which we have been baptized in the baptism of blood ? The name of the Holy Catholic Church—in which martyrs have died ; whose glories have been the theme of men and angels ; that baptismal name, by which the saints of all ages have distinguished their Holy Mother from the sour schismatics of their time. That church of which Tertullian, as early as the 2d century, wrote :—  
"We fill your cities, your islands, your castles, your towers, your camps,—we are

in your palace, your senate, your forum : THE TEMPLES ALONE ARE YOURS."—*Apol. adv. Gent. c. xxxvii.* Two more centuries had not rolled by, until even of these, it was said : "We fill your temples ;" for the heathen had cast their idols "to the moles and to the bats," and their temples were turned from the worship of idols to that of the one living and only true God ; and, to this day, the Pantheon at Rome, dedicated to the worship of all the Gods, and all the other monuments of ancient heathen splendour, still resound with the praises of Jehovah.

St. Cyril of Jerusalem, fifteen hundred years ago, said—"If you should ever arrive as a stranger in any city, do not ask merely where is the church ? the heretics dare to give themselves this name ; but ask where is the CATHOLIC Church, for that is its particular name,—that is the essential title of this Holy Mother of all the faithful—of this glorious spouse of our Lord Jesus Christ, the only Son of God."—*Catech. xviii.* That which St. Cyril advised, in the fourth century, may be tested in the nineteenth. Go to any place in Christendom, and ask for the Catholic Church ; I care not if you ask the direction from prince or beggar, learned or unlearned ; your cicerone will pass by Episcopal, Presbyterian, Methodist, Quaker, and the whole host of meeting-houses, and point you to that church, of which St. Augustine, speaking of the ties that should make us cling to her, said :—"Her authority [is] first established by miracles, cherished by hope, extended by charity, strengthened by the lapse of years ; the succession of pastors from the chair of PETER, to whom the Lord committed the care of feeding His flock, down to the present Bishop—(the present Bishop in that see is Gregory XVI.) lastly—the name itself of CATHOLIC." He adds : "These, so many and so great ties, bind the believing man to the Catholic Church,"—*Contra Ep. d'un. Tom. II. p. 120.*

Five years ago, when searching for this Catholic faith, it was our lot to travel considerably through the United States : [thousands of miles and fifteen hundred years removed from Saint Cyril's and Saint Augustine's native land and age ;] and it was our invariable practice, on entering city, town, or village, to ask whoever we might chance to meet, where is the Catholic Church ?—and in no instance were we ever directed to any church, but the one of which we speak. Its name—Catholic—is indelibly impressed upon the minds of all, who have heard of the Christian religion ; even the slave, the most ignorant person, "the way-faring man, though a fool"—all, all, have that name indelibly impressed upon their minds, and apply it, when asked, to that same church with respect to which St. Irenæus said—"For this Church of Rome, on account of its superior headship, every other must have recourse."—*Adv. Her. l. III. c. 3.*

We also gather the perpetual application of this term Catholic from the incidental mention of it by the writers of every age. The church of Smyrna (1st

century) writing on the death of St. Polycarp, says : "He made mention of the whole Catholic Church." St. Clement, (also of the 1st century) uses the same distinguishing name : St. Clement of Alexandria (2d century) says—"The ancient and Catholic Church, alone is one in essence, in opinion, in origin, and in excellence, one in faith."

Origen, of the 3rd century, Lactantius, 4th century, St. Augustine, of the 5th century, &c. &c., all make use of it as the common designation of the Church ; and if any especial reason called for a more positive term, they failed not to explain, by the use of the word *Roman*, that it was to Rome as the stalk, all the branches were united ; and that they thus proved their right and title to membership of the Catholic Church. But, on the other hand, whenever men departed from unity, what claim did they set up to being *the*, or a *part* of the Catholic Church ? None whatever. They despised the very name : laughed at it, and instead thereof, substituted—what ? *their own* ! Hence we have Arians, Donatists, Armenians, Eunomians, Eutychians, &c. &c.—then, Waldensians, Wickliffites, Lutherans, Calvinists, Brownists, Wesleyans, &c. &c. ; not one of whom heretofore have cared one straw about designating themselves by the ancient name of Catholic. That is an invention of the "Puseyites," (a new name, recently derived from one Pusey, an English schismatic,) who, having put pictures, and candles, and crucifixes to their meeting-houses, and dressed themselves in long-tailed black coats, imagine they have regained their right to the venerable title of the Holy Catholic Church.

So regardless have they been of this title, that in all their Synods, 'Conventions,' 'Conferences,' 'General Assemblies,' 'General Conventions,' 'Yearly Meetings,' &c., and in all their deeds and other legal instruments, they call themselves by their newly invented names : 'Presbyterian,' 'Protestant Episcopal,' 'Protestant Methodist,' 'Wesleyan Methodist,' 'Baptist,' &c. Now we should like to be informed by what right they usurp our well-known, ancient title. In law, an "alias" is a criminal offence ; a man who files a deed under a fictitious name is liable to forfeit his property ; a person to whom an estate is left, cannot inherit under a false name ; and in business transactions you would not trust, nor even speak to the man, who should come to you, with an assumed name. Why should these sectarians be exceptions to the general rule ? Shall they be allowed to forge and cheat, when common rogues are thrust into prison ? But perhaps we are only fighting the air. They do not wish the name. It is only a few of them who have run mad about pictures and crosses, that wish it. "The term Catholic, then, has been (most graciously!) conceded to us ;" and "we have never been without it to the present day."

We do remember once having had our nervous sensibilities terribly shocked, by a Presbyterian, who called himself a Catholic. Upon asking him authority for the assumption, the plea was discovered to

have been based on the ground of his church being a branch of the Church. Let us examine this plea. If by the term *branch*, he means no more, than that some Presbyterians, and some Protestant Episcopalians, and Methodists, will be saved ; the Roman Catholic will admit the same, and more—the possibility of the salvation of some of the Hindus, Indians, &c. Not, however, because they are Presbyterian, Protestant Episcopal, Hindoo, and Indian ; but because they have lived righteously according to their knowledge ; as the Apostle says : "When the Gentiles, who have not the law, do by nature those things that are of the law ; these having not the law, are a law to themselves ; who show the works of the law written in their hearts, their conscience bearing witness to them, and their thoughts between themselves accusing, or else defending one another ; in the day when God shall judge the secrets of man by Jesus Christ, according to my Gospel."—Rom. ii. 14—16. But if it be meant, that, as Presbyterians, Protestant Episcopalians, &c., they are *branches*, it is very natural to look for the trunk of the tree to which they are attached ; and if that cannot be found, is it not reasonable to conclude, that if they ever had a common trunk, they have been cut off therefrom, and being cut off, that they must be, at best, but *dead branches*. Let us, then, search for the connection. What, in the first place, shall we consider the trunk of the tree ? The Roman Catholic ? No ; that is corrupt, idolatrous, and utterly out of the question. Shall we suppose the Methodist ? Open the page of history, and you will not discover so much as the name, previous to the year 1729 ; when two men, Morgan and Wesley, manufactured that artificial out of an English stick. Shall we suppose the Presbyterian ? Again consult the historic page, and the utmost limit of their antiquity reaches no further back than the year 1500 ; about the time that Martin Luther and John Calvin connected a *something*, which, after various mutations, during a lapse of years, came to be known by that name. Shall we suppose the Church of England ? History ever true, informs us that that was by *law and bayonet* established about the year 1600. The oldest that we can find, of any note, is the Greek branch, which extends as far back as the sixth century ; when, alas ! it became *sickly*, and the Irishman was reluctantly forced to apply the pruning knife. From that day it died. But is there no possibility of grafting them altogether, and thus out of many branches, make a whole tree ? No ; they will not stick together. There is no union in them. Their only union is, unless against admitting Rome to be the trunk. Well, then, there is no trunk to the tree ; consequently the branches must be all *dead* ; for it is, and ever must be, an anomaly in nature, for branches dis severed from the trunk, to live. And equally so is it, for the branches to say, we are the *whole tree*. The name Catholic then does not belong to them, either separately or unitedly ; they are each *sui generis*, and have no characteristic ; that is, Catho-