

# THE CATHOLIC.

QUOD SEMPER, QUOD UBIQUE, QUOD AB OMNIBUS CREDITUM EST.—WHAT ALWAYS, AND EVERY WHERE, AND BY ALL IS BELIEVED.

Very Rev. W. P. MacDonald, V. G., Editor.

OFFICE—CORNER OF KING & HUGHSON STREETS.

J. Robertson, Printer and Publisher.

VOLUME IV

HAMILTON, [GORE DISTRICT] FEBRUARY 7, 1844.

NUMBER 20.

From the Catholic Telegraph.

## The new Sacrifice of the Prophet Malachy examined by way of Question and Answer.

Ques. Of what sacrifice does Malachias speak in these words: "For from the rising of the sun to the going down, my name is great among the Gentiles: and in every place there is sacrifice, and there is offered to my name a clean oblation: for my name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of Hosts."

Ans. Of the christian sacrifice, or, in other words, the universal Eucharistic sacrifice.

Q. Might not the prophet speak of clean Jewish sacrifice.

A. No: for, the Jewish sacrifice was never offered up from "the rising to the setting, sun," "in every place," "among the Gentiles." That sacrifice was confined to a single people, to a single house; and it was, therefore, a single, insulated, and particular sacrifice. It could not be the great, the universal, sacrifice.

Q. What hinders us from believing that the Seer may not speak of the sacrifice of the cross? of Christ's death?

A. These reasons hinder us: the sacrifices of Calvary was but of a few hours duration, and not "from the rising to the setting of the sun;" it was confined to the hill of Calvary, but it was not offered up "everywhere," it was purely local; it was not offered "among the Gentiles," but it was offered in the Jewish nation alone.

Q. May not the sacred writer have spoken of the sacrifices of Prayer—of good works?

A. There would be no revelation, no prophecy, at all in the sacred text, if this were true; for the sacrifice of prayer is older than Adam. Angels offered that sacrifice before the apostacy of Angels and Adam. Good works were always done by Jews, and Gentiles; by Angels, and men; in the law of Eden, of the ante-diluvian, and post-diluvian world. Such, in any sense, could not be the new, universal, Gentile, and grand prophetic sacrifice.

Q. But do not Catholics hold that sacrifice of the Mass does not differ from the sacrifice of the cross, and how then can the former be universal, whilst they assert that the latter is particular?

A. The sacrifices of the Mass, and that of the cross, do not differ in substance, as to the adorable Victim offered, as to the efficacy, the price. But the sacrifice of the Mass differs from that of the cross, as to the manner of offering only. The Mass is universal, it is "every where," "among the Gentiles," "from the rising of the sun to the going down;" because, its manner being offered admits of this universality.

Q. Which was the manner of offering up the sacrifice of Calvary?

A. Christ himself was the visible Priest, the visible Victim, the only offerer; the blood was literally spilt, the body literally slain; the sacrifice continued a few hours; and it was confined to one spot.

Q. Which has been the manner of offering up the sacrifice of the Mass?

A. Christ himself is the invisible Priest, the invisible Victim; the only principal offerer; the blood is mystically spilt, the body is mystically slain; the sacrifice continues always; and it is universal. In all this there is not even a shadow of difference, if you will except the mere manner of offering. The manner is but a mere circumstance, it is for the substance we contend.

Q. How does Christ offer himself up invisibly, mystically, and universally.

A. He offers himself up, under the appearances of bread and wine; the body lying on the corporal, and the blood contained in the chalice, under the different, and separate, species of bread and wine, represent his blood as separated from the body on the cross; and the Mass is celebrated every where.

Q. What do you mean by the words invisible Priest, invisible Victim, and only principal offerer?

A. I mean that in the Mass there is the visible officiating Priest—the one who stands at the altar; besides, the same sacred person is the mere instrumental, delegated, inferior, offerer. Christ is not seen by the bodily eye, but he is seen by the eye of Faith, of the soul, and is, therefore, invisible.

Q. When was this universal sacrifice instituted?

A. At the Last Paschal Supper, and First Eucharistic Supper, when the blessed Redeemer took into his adorable hands the Melchisedechian type, bread and wine, and changed them into his own body, and blood, when He pronounced these words, "this is my body,"—"this is my blood."

Q. But how do we know that his body and blood were offered in sacrifice?

A. How could they be offered at all, if not in sacrifice?—Christ says of his body at the Eucharistic supper, "this is my body," "which is offered for you"—"which is broken for you"—"which is given for you." And he says of his blood—"this is my blood, of the New Testament, which shall be shed for many for the remission of sin." Now, what were offered, broken, given, shed for us, but Christ's body, and blood? The subsequents, and the antecedents, and the simple rules of grammar, necessarily call for a sacrificial offering at the Eucharistic supper.

Q. What type was fulfilled at the last supper?

A. The last supper itself was fulfilled. The Paschal Lamb was slain, and eaten before the institution of the Eucharistic supper. In the Paschal type there were flesh and blood, in the Paschal reality there are flesh and blood; the Paschal was eaten, and the Paschal Lamb of Calvary is eaten. Only take away the flesh and blood of Christ from the sacrifice, and sacrament, and you reduce them to the low, and beggarly, state of earthly elements, human manufacture, inanimate, inert, bread and wine—far beneath the Jewish type! Could no noble, and so lively a type, as was the Paschal Lamb, be the figure of the low, the degraded, ignominious, imaginary reality of bread and wine?

Q. Was there any other type fulfilled?

A. Yes the sacrifice of Melchisedech was literally verified. Melchisedech took bread, and wine; Christ took bread and wine; the former could offer nothing but bread and wine, as a type; but the latter offered his body and his blood under the appearances of bread and wine, that is, under the forms of the Melchisedechian types, to give us the reality, i. e. his body and blood.

Q. Can you point out the fulfillment of a third type?

A. Immediately. It is admitted by all that the Manna was a figure of the Eucharist. Now let us compare the type with the Protestant reality. Manna came from heaven, the Protestant reality comes from the oven; Angels were the bearers of the type; the cook, or the baker, is the bearer of the reality; the figure had many miraculous qualities, and varied tastes; the reality is just as

good as the baker can make it. God is said to give us such an absurd reality! Can God mock every rule of reasoning? Away with this heretical abortion! Look at the Catholic reality, and you have the noblest, and best, gift of God!

Q. But if the Mass be the same as the sacrifice of the cross, how does it come that the Sacrifices of Masses may be as many in number, as there are priests who daily offer them; whereas, the sacrifice of the cross was but numerically one? Are many the same as one?

A. The sacrifice of the mass is the same in substance as that of the cross. The Priests of the sacrifice may be many, or few, but the sacrifice of the Mass is not, therefore, many. This sacrifice is strictly, and numerically, one. It cannot be multiplied; for Jesus Christ the victim, and priest, cannot be multiplied. The Holy Ghost was neither divided, nor multiplied, on Pentecost Sunday, when he came under the forms of, at least, one hundred and twenty tongues of fire. The appearances of tongues, as well as, the appearances of bread and wine, may be numerically increased, but Christ, and the Holy Ghost, cannot be so increased. P. McL.

From the same.

## JOHN Q. ADAMS, vs. POPERY.

MR. EDITOR.—I thought you somewhat acquainted with party politics twenty years ago. You would easily have remembered, in that case, the mission to Panama.—It was John Quincy Adams who proposed as one of the objects for which that mission was instituted, a crusade diplomatique, (he was boasted of as a great diplomatist,) against the Catholic Religion. His notions or opinions publicly put forth, have never been retracted, nor has he perhaps, judging from the recent display, learned better diplomacy or better manners by longer experience.—There are one or two other incidents in his political life and personal history, which show, that however great, or wise, or philosophic, or learned, he does not love truth above all things, and cannot readily shake off the paltry prejudices of his Yankee education. One of these consists in some curious strictures on Popery in his "Lectures on Rhetoric," delivered while professor at Harvard College. But the other, older, is more serious. He published, when minister at the Court of Berlin, a literary work, entitled, I think, "Letters from Silesia," in which, among other curious assertions, if I am not mistaken, that in Silesia a profitable trade was driven in forgiving sins according to a certain Tariff, which allowed a man pardon for murdering his father on the payment of a small sum of money; and other sins of like enormity proportionably cheap. I wish, Mr. Editor, with your facilities for the investigation, you would look this work up, and hold the hoary calumniator to his responsibility to truth and justice before the world, ere he goes to his long account. It would be edifying to one who admires some points of his character, if he could be forced for very shame to publish a chapter of retractions, literary and political, which might stand him instead of bullying bravado at the "bar of Omnipotence." We have submitted to this aggressive warfare on our faith long enough. It is time now that we meet our calumniators foot to foot, and eye to eye; and your exposure of Adams was in the right spirit. I would be sorry if the groaning of his worshippers should turn you aside from the pursuit, or make you abate a jot of the just measure of severity which you meted to him. A YANKEE.