

lie Chaplain, is to be found in the fact, that the former is disposed to entertain sentiments, too liberal for the majority of our enlightened advocates of "civil and religious liberty." It is because he would not allow himself to be a tool in the hands of Mr. Han-nibal Mulkins, and has, with a keen eye detected, and in a firm voice proclaimed, the abuses which the Protestant Chaplain is endeavoring to introduce, that Dr. Nelson has been so much misrepresented by the enemies of all justice to Catholics. But this will not discourage him: he knows that he has only done his duty—and we trust, that in so doing he will be properly supported by the Provincial government, against the attacks of his detractors.

"A PROTESTANT'S APPEAL TO THE DOUAY BIBLE."

It was observed by our old friend, Mr. Samuel Weller, as beautifully characteristic of the eloquence of Mr. Napkins, Mayor of Ipswich, "that one never could tell what he was driving at." The same remark would hold good, if applied to the greater part of those passages of Mr. Jenkins' lectures, in which the author intends to be unusually pathetic, and impressive—but with a difference. That which, in a Mayor, was an excellence, we are inclined to look upon as, in a Protestant divine, a blemish approaching to unsoundness. Nay, we would almost urge it as a reproach against the Rev. Mr. Jenkins, that it is often impossible to tell what on earth he is driving at; so sublimely mysterious, not to say utterly incomprehensible, does he occasionally become. We may sometimes guess at his meaning, but we can never feel certain that we have grasped it, or deterred it from out of the mass of words with which it pleases him to encumber it. Were we called upon to characterize his style, we should say that it was strongly marked with a tendency to, what our Yankee friends not inelegantly term, "high-faluting," or prose run mad.

More especially is this the case with the remaining lectures, on the dogmas of the Catholic Church, which we have now to notice; the first of which is headed—"The One Object of Religious Adoration;" and is, we suppose, intended to establish, that, betwixt Catholics and Protestants, there is some difference of opinion on this vital point. The writer may be quite correct; for though we know what, with all Catholics, is "The One Object of Religious Adoration," it would be rash, to say the least, for us to pretend to the same certainty as to the "One Object" of religious adoration amongst Protestants.—Some, we know, profess to worship a God in three distinct persons, and to render divine honor, or absolute worship, to the Second Person of that Trinity; whilst others amongst them recognise no such Object of Worship, as a Tri-une God, and look upon the homage, which their Trinitarian brethren pay to the Son of Mary, as rank idolatry. Leaving then Mr. Jenkins to settle this rather knotty question with his brethren, we will proceed to inform him what, amongst all Catholics, is the "One Sole Object of all Religious Adoration," and thus relieve him of certain fears which he professes to entertain, lest we should be found guilty of the sin of idolatry. "My desire is," says Mr. Jenkins, "that it may be found impossible to make good the charge"—p. 84. Make your mind easy, Mr. Jenkins, on this score; we will prove our innocence of idolatry out of your own mouth.—But, first, we will make our confession of Faith, as to our "One Object of Religious Adoration."

And that One, Sole Object of all our Religious Adoration, is the Most Adorable Trinity—Father, Son, and Holy Ghost—of Whom, and by Whom, and in Whom are all things, to Whom be glory for evermore—Amen. To this glorious Trinity—the One Object of all our religious adoration—do we give all honor, and all worship; Him do we praise; Him do we bless; Him do we adore, and glorify;—of Him do we ask all mercies, through Jesus Christ our Lord. "Quoniam Tu solus sanctus, Tu solus altissimus Jesu Christe, cum Sancto Spiritu, in gloria Dei Patris—Amen. For Thou only art Holy, Thou, only, O Jesus Christ, together with the Holy Ghost, art Most High in the Glory of God the Father—Amen."

In these words—taken from that Angelic Hymn, which, in the highest heavens, and before the everlasting Throne, Cherubim and Seraphim, Angels and Archangels, are for ever singing, whilst on earth, priest and people, catch up, and repeat the strain—is contained the Catholic's confession of Faith, as to the One, Sole, Object of all his religious adoration; and, in these words, will be found the refutation of the calumny, which, sometimes through ignorance, but we fear more often through malice, and at the instigation of the Devil who is the father of lies, Protestants bring against the Catholic Church, of sanctioning, and inculcating, idolatry. But as Mr. Jenkins still seems uneasy in his mind, we will endeavor to show him how groundless are his fears, and how impossible it is that Catholics can be obnoxious to such a charge; and as it is always convenient to attach right meanings to words, let us first define what idolatry is.

Idolatry is the giving to any creature that which is due only to Creator, or God. To give however to creature, that which is due to creature, and is either, not due to God alone, or not fitting to be given to God at all, is certainly not idolatry, but rather a fulfilling of the law. Of this nature is the cultus, honor, or worship—the inadequacy of language as the representative of ideas compels us to use the word "worship"—which the Catholic Church renders to God's Saints, His creatures, and His noblest works, because the works of His divine grace. Not only is this honor, due to God's works—for God is to be honored in His works; but it is an honor which we could not, without being indeed guilty of idolatry, offer to God at all. For the honor, or worship offered to God's Saints is not absolute, but relative; but to offer relative honor, or worship to God would be to

deny Him as the Absolute; to set up other Gods, besides, and above, Him; and would be therefore the very sin of idolatry, of which our enemies accuse us. As then the cultus which Catholics pay to God's Saints is a worship, which, so far from being due to God alone, is not due to God at all, it manifests either a sad disregard of truth, or a strange contempt of logic, on the part of our Protestant friends when they tax us with idolatry.

We would remark here that we are not attempting to prove the lawfulness of giving even a relative worship to any creature. That it is lawful so to do we believe, solely because the Catholic Church teaches its lawfulness; any other authority, save the authority of the Church, we know not; we cannot therefore, as consistent Catholics, attempt to establish the truth of any Catholic doctrine, or the lawfulness of any practice, except by appealing to her authority, for, by so doing we should be admitting that there was some other authority besides her's—other reasons for believing, besides her teaching. It is in vain then for Mr. Jenkins to call upon us to prove this, or that doctrine, by, or from, the Scriptures.—We answer him in the words of St. Irenæus, lib. 3. c. 4. "What, if the Apostles had not left us any Scriptures, should we not be bound to follow that tradition which they delivered to those to whose care they committed the churches? *Nonne oportebat ordinem sequi traditionis quem tradiderunt eis, quibus committerant Ecclesias?*" Disclaiming therefore, any intention of attempting to prove the lawfulness of Saint worship, we will merely undertake to show that, whether right or wrong, it is not idolatrous—was practised by the early Christian Church—recommended by the Fathers of the first five centuries—and that therefore, modern Protestantism, which rejects it, is not the "Old Religion."

In the "Cultus Sanctorum" we distinguish two things. 1. The relative honor which we pay them, or *dulia*. 2. The Invocation of Saints. Our propositions are—that the first is not idolatrous,—that the second is not derogatory to Christ as sole mediator betwixt God and man—and that both were practised during the first centuries of the Christian era.

The worship, or honor which Catholics render to the Saints, is not idolatrous, because it is not absolute, but relative; and as we have shewn, relative worship is not due to the one supreme absolute God. Neither is it a worship, or honor, that by any conceivable excess can approach even the confines of the idolatrous, because it differs from that supreme and absolute worship which we owe to God alone, not in degree, but in kind. *Dulia* we render to the Saints; *latria* to God alone; but *latria* is not a multiple of *dulia*, but an absolute quantity, incapable of more or less. *Dulia*, as a relative worship or honor is susceptible of degrees, it may be either more or less, but it can never approach the former, for the multiple of *dulia* is not *latria*, but *hyper-dulia*. These may sound in Protestant ears, as vain and subtle distinctions; for Protestant ears are gross, and dull of hearing; but they are distinctions which were well known to the early Fathers of the Church, long ere it "may be said that corruption had commenced." We will cite St. Augustine.

"*Colimus ergo Martyres,*" says St. Augustine, in his work *contra Faustinum* lib. 20 c. 21—but not with Divine worship or *latria*, for he adds, "*At vero illo cultu qui græce latria dicitur, latine uno verbo dici non potest, cum sit quedam proprie divinitate debita servitus, nec colimus, nec colendum docemus nisi unum Deum.*" But with that worship which in Greek is called *latria*, but in Latin cannot be expressed by one word, as it is a service peculiar to the Divinity, we do not worship—(the Saints)—or teach that any save God alone should be worshipped." No doubt that St. Augustine was a Jesuit, and accustomed to hair splitting; but still from the above passage it is clear that the distinction betwixt *dulia* or the relative honor which Christians in the IV century rendered to the martyrs—and *latria*, or the absolute worship due to God alone—was well understood, and acted upon, although owing to its poverty, the Latin language was not able in any one word to express it: we contend therefore, that in the XIX. century we are perfectly justified in recognising that same distinction.

This distinction betwixt *latria* and *dulia*, or the absolute worship due to God alone, and the relative honor which we pay to His works, has been constantly asserted by the Church at all periods of her existence; and more particularly in the case of the Collyridians, whom she justly condemned for their idolatrous practices. This sect, composed principally of women, adored the Virgin as a Goddess, with absolute worship, offering to her in sacrifice small cakes ("Collyridæ" whence their name)—and arrogating to themselves the title of the priestesses of the Goddess Mary, to whom they transferred that worship which is due to God alone. "It would seem," says Neander—"that this was a transfer of the oblations at the Lord's Supper to the worship of Mary"—and therefore idolatry, because the offering of sacrifice to creature; a worship, which is due to God alone, and that peculiar worship with which since the days of Abel, who offered to the Lord "of the firstlings of his flock, and of their fat" it has pleased Him that He should be worshipped by the children of men. No wonder that the Church denounced the idolatrous worship of the Collyridians, and that the Fathers most zealous for the true honor of Mary were loudest in their reprobation of such an insult to the Divine Majesty of her Son. They condemned it, not as an exaggerated form of the same worship which they together with the universal Church, had ever rendered to the Mother of God: but as an entirely and essentially different worship. Protestants do not so readily perceive this difference, because having no real sacrifice to offer—having in fact totally lost the idea of

sacrifice as the one, peculiar, worship due to God alone—they withhold from God His due, and are therefore obliged, in order to avoid giving the Saints as much as they do to God, to abstain from honoring them at all. It is because of this inability to understand the nature of the worship which the Church renders to God that Mr. Jenkins asks the silly question "whether it were possible for those Collyridians to exceed the Saints Bonaventura and Liguori in the homage which they paid to the Virgin Mary"—not perceiving that, inasmuch as the homage of the Collyridians consisted in the sacrifices they offered to the Virgin, it cannot be properly said to have exceeded, but transcended, the relative homage paid to her by Catholics at the present day, who would shrink with horror and disgust from the proposition to offer sacrifice to any creature. And in fact we find that the idolatry of the Collyridians did not proceed from, or grow out of, any excess in, or exaggeration of, the legitimate worship which a St. Ambrose, a St. Jerome, and a St. Epiphanius offered to the Mother of God—a worship which, as taught and practised in the Church is an impregnable barrier against all idolatry—but was a thing of foreign growth entirely—a remnant of the old pagan practices in honor of Ceres, which they brought with them from their native Thrace to Arabia; ingrafted upon, and modified by, the pre-existing oriental idolatries of which we read in Jeremiah, 44, 19—and 7, 18—where the women are represented as kneading dough, to make cakes to the queen of heaven—"Melekith hashamayim"—probably the Phœnician Ashtoreth.

That the highest worship which Catholics of the present day render to the Saints, is relative, not absolute—*dulia*, and not *latria*—and therefore not idolatry, whatever else it may be,* is unconsciously admitted by Mr. Jenkins himself, and fully established by the quotations which he gives from the writings of Catholic authors. Having cited some of the titles which, in the Litany of Loretto, are applied to the Blessed Virgin, Mr. Jenkins asks—"Do they not savour too much of divinity to be applied to any creature?" and adds—innocently enough, and evidently quite unconscious that he is himself triumphantly refuting the charge of idolatry which he is all along endeavoring to make good against the Catholic Church—"more than which I am not aware that any Catholic ever contended the Virgin to be." Perfectly true, Mr. Jenkins; and therefore the worship—*hyper-dulia*—which Catholics render to the Blessed Virgin, cannot be more than relative, and therefore cannot be idolatry—which is giving to the creature that which is due to God alone—unless a relative worship is due to the Absolute. By admitting the Blessed Virgin to be creature, we admit her to be at an infinite distance from Creator—we assert her being to be contingent, and not absolute; and, no matter what titles may be applied to her, so long as we apply them, not to the absolute, but to the contingent, we apply them solely in a relative sense, and can no more be guilty of idolatry, by so doing, than is the British Parliament when, in an address to Queen Victoria, it approaches her as "Her Most Gracious Majesty." But God alone is "Most Gracious;" for the prophet Joel says,—"The Lord our God is *gratiosus*"—i. e., 13 v.; therefore, according to Mr. Jenkins' logic, because ascribing to a creature "Divine names and titles"—p. 92—the British Parliament is idolatrous. "Oh, no," he will answer. "In applying the terms 'Most Gracious' to the Queen, Parliament intends to apply them in a very different sense from that in which any one of its members would apply them to God; and this is so well understood that there is no danger of our lapsing into idolatry, because our Supreme Courts of Legislature, the mouth-piece of the whole Empire, give to an earthly Sovereign, but only in a relative, or restricted, sense, titles of honor, which, if taken in their absolute sense, belong to God, and to Him alone." Rightly reasoned, Mr. Jenkins; we acquit the British Empire of idolatry; and trust that you will be equally just towards us, poor Papists, who ascribe to the Blessed Virgin, the titles which grate so harshly on your Protestant ears, in a relative, and not in an absolute, sense. So long as Catholics see in the Blessed Virgin, Mother of God, only creature,—though the purest, the most exalted, and most highly privileged, of all God's creatures—there is no danger that the worship which they offer to her, shall ever tend towards the idolatrous. Nay, if rightly understood, it is the best preservative against idolatry; but this Mr. Jenkins can not understand, for, as we shall see before we have done with him, he does not rightly understand the doctrine of the Incarnation; a right understanding of which is absolutely necessary to any one who pretends to criticise the teaching of the Church, and the devotion of her children towards the Mother of God.

Mr. Jenkins furnishes us also with the best of antidotes to the venom which he squirts against the Catholic Church. By citing the writings of her divines, he has so satisfactorily shown, that she most expressly forbids the sin of idolatry, that we shall merely quote some of these passages, and then proceed to establish our second proposition—"That the Invocation of Saints, as taught by the Catholic Church is not derogatory to Christ as sole Mediator betwixt God and man."

"I take up Dr. Butler's Catechism," says Mr. Jenkins—"recommended by the four Roman Catholic Archbishops of Ireland, and find the following:—'What is commanded by the first commandment? Answer—To adore one God, and to adore but Him alone.' I read again:—'What else is forbidden by the first commandment? Answer—To give to any creature the honor due to God alone.' In another catechism, I find this abhorrence of idolatry expressed yet more forcibly; and though the copy of the work,

* We would venture to suggest to Mr. Jenkins, in his next edition, the propriety of calling it flat burglary; there would be novelty in this, if no other merit, and the name would be quite as appropriate.

now in my hand, does not appear to be sanctioned by ecclesiastical authority, I willingly quote from it, forasmuch as it is published in this city by a Roman Catholic bookseller, and, as I suppose, freely circulated, and used by the members of that communion. I believe it indeed to be a reprint of an ecclesiastically authorised catechism, bearing the same title, and published, and circulated, in Ireland. On page thirty-seven, I read—"Do you then worship the angels and saints as God, or give them the honor that belongs to God alone? Answer—No; God forbid: for this would be high treason against His divine majesty."—p. 89.

Now, really, if having read all this, Mr. Jenkins be not satisfied that the Catholic Church prohibits, in the most positive terms, the giving to any creature, that which is due only to God—he must be the most unconscionable of mortals, and it would be in vain for us to attempt to argue the matter with him.—We shall therefore content ourselves with giving him the opinions of some of his brother Protestants upon this very point, trusting that they may have some weight with him—and first of Liebnitz, who, convinced, from the perusal of ecclesiastical history, of the antiquity of the practice of Saint worship in the Catholic Church, cautions his co-religionists against the danger of attributing universal idolatry to the Anti-Nicene Christians.

"It is to be dreaded," says Liebnitz, "lest they who are of this opinion" (that the cultus sanctorum is idolatrous) "open the way for the overflow of all Christianity—*viam aperiant ad omnem rem Christianam convellendam*."—For he argues, if from such an early period, such a horrid error as idolatry could have universally obtained in the Church—how much is the position of the Arians and other contemporary heretics who impugned the doctrine of the Trinity as an idolatrous corruption, strengthened?—how extraordinary must it appear that, whilst Judaism and Mahomedanism, have remained so many centuries free from idolatry, the Church of Christ alone hardly preserved the Faith pure for one, or at the most, two?—and how ominous under these circumstances, the counsel of Gamaliel, to the Sanhedrim, Acts, c. 5, v. 38, to judge of Christianity by its success, or failure?

We might quote also the opinion of Grotius, and other eminent Protestant authorities, to the same effect; but we fear that we should only be wasting time and paper, and our reader's patience, to no purpose. We will defer until next week, the further examination of Mr. Jenkins' charges against the Catholic Church.

We have received, too late for insertion this week, the Prospectus of a new political paper, the *Montreal Freeman*. This document promises well; and we have no doubt, that the journal whose advent it heralds, will be well supported by the Irish in Canada, who, from want of unity of action, have not hitherto been able to exercise that influence in the management of public affairs, to which they are, by their numbers, wealth, and intelligence, amply entitled.—It is time, that in the political world, the Irish should make themselves heard, and felt; this, we believe, is the intention of the proprietors of the *Montreal Freeman*. More power to it.

CONVERSION.—On the 13th inst., Mary Jane Benson, wife of J. P. Malone, was received into the Catholic Church, by the Rev. L. A. Bourget, Curé of St. Anne de la Pointe.

PRACTICAL PIETY. By St. Francis de Sales.

We have received from the publishers, Messrs. D. & J. Sadler & Co., a copy of this most excellent work lately published by them. It is a re-print from the English edition, and will, we are sure, have an extensive sale. The French work of which this is a translation, has been long known to the faithful of France as one of the most beautiful and characteristic of all the works bequeathed to posterity by the great bishop of Geneva. It contains useful and truly practical advice on all the various duties of social and religious life, and breathes, in every line, the unctuous sweetness for which the illustrious author stands pre-eminent even amongst spiritual writers.—It is a work calculated at once to direct us in all the difficulties of Christian life, and to console us under its complicated trials and sufferings. We welcome it as an invaluable addition to the Catholic literature of our mother-tongue, and hope it will be duly appreciated by those for whom it is intended.

REMITTANCES RECEIVED.

Quebec, M. Enright, £10; Cobourg, F. Assikineck, 12s. 6d.; P. Lynch, 12s. 6d.; St. Andrews, Rev. G. A. Hay, £3 2s. 6d.; Port Hope, J. Guerin, 6s. 3d.; Huntingdon, J. Corrigan, 6s. 3d.; Godmanchester, P. Brady, 7s. 6d.; Rivière des Prairies, Rev. J. E. Le Blond, 12s. 6d.; St. Raphael, Very Rev. J. McDonald, 10s.; St. Johns, A. Bourgeois, £1 5s.; Pembroke, D. O'Meara, 12s. 6d.; St. Regis, Rev. Mr. Marcoux, 12s. 6d.; St. Hyacinthe, Rev. Mr. Allaire, 12s. 6d.; Right Rev. Dr. Pinco, 12s. 6d.; St. Denis, Rev. Mr. Demers, 12s. 6d.; Carillon, A. E. Montmarquet, 12s. 6d.; St. Andrews, T. Fitzgerard, 12s. 6d.; Industry, Rev. Mr. Manseau, 12s. 6d.; Moore, J. Baby, 12s. 6d.; Clark, W. McBride, 6s. 3d.; Kingston, Richard Thompson, 10s.; Russelltown, E. McGill, 10s.; Bourbonnais, J. Mullin, 15s.; Isle Perrot, Rev. Mr. Aubry, 6s. 3d.; Chatham, A. B. McIntosh, 15s.; St. Athanasie, D. Tassé, 12s. 6d.; Danville, S. Codely, 12s. 6d.; Tyendinago, J. Gargan, 6s. 3d.; St. Marthe, Rev. Mr. Martineau, £1 5s.; Russelltown, D. Camphion, £1 15s. Miramichi, Hon. J. Davidson, 12s. 6d.; Memramcook, Rev. Mr. La France, 12s. 6d.; Cornwall, A. Stuart McDonald, £5; Rev. J. Eneas McDonald, 12s. 6d.; Waterville, T. McGovern, 12s. 6d.; Hatley, T. Daley, 12s. 6d.; St. Sylvester, B. Maguire, 12s. 6d.; Norwood, J. Foley, £1 5s.; Pakenham, D. McGillis, Esq., 6s. 3d.; St. Ann de la Pointe, Rev. L. A. Bourget, £1 10s.; Granby, P. Mahendy, 12s. 6d.; Richmond, P. Kelly, £1 5s.; St. Flavie, Rev. Mr. Duguay, 10s.; St. Augustin, Rev. Mr. Champagne, 12s. 6d.; Cavan, J. Knowlson, Esq., 18s. 9d.; Frasersfield, Mrs. McCann, 15s.; Norton Creek, A. McCallum, 12s. 6d.; Georgetown College, D. C. 12s. 6d.; College of the Holy Cross, Mass., 12s. 6d.