

declares marriage a holy state, and has raised it to the dignity of a sacrament. But she warns all those, who aspire to the priesthood, (which is a matter not of compulsion, but of free deliberate choice made at an age when one is capable of knowing one's self) that they must make up their minds to lead a single life, ere they are promoted to that dignity. If they cannot do this, they are free to marry; for it is better, says St. Paul, to marry than to burn. 1. Cor. vii. 9. Nay, in spite of all the reasons she has for enjoining celibacy to her clergy in general, she permits those of the Greek rite, who are in communion with her, to follow their own particular discipline in this respect, by marrying before they take orders, and living with their wives and families; but after ordination no one, even of these, is allowed to marry; or ever to become the husband of a second wife.

This is not then, as some are pleased to allege, that doctrine of devils, mentioned by the same great Apostle, forbidding to marry: no more than the doctrine of fasting and abstinence is that alluded to in the same text, commanding to abstain from certain meats, as unclean. 1. Tim. iv.—For if the forbidding to marry, in the sense I have mentioned, were the doctrine of devils, it is evident from the texts already cited, that St. Paul himself inculcated it, in what he says on marriage and virginity. The doctrine of devils, which he foresaw and alluded to, is acknowledged by all the learned in the Christian church to be the abominable doctrine of the Manicheans, who held two opposite supreme Beings; the one essentially good, and the author of all good; the other essentially bad, and the author of all that is evil.—They therefore forbade to marry, and enjoined abstinence from certain meats, as unclean; because they supposed such either of the creation or institution of their evil God.

The Catholic Church, on the contrary, declares marriage, as I have said, a holy state, and a sacrament; and enjoins fasting and abstinence only at certain times; and as an act of self denial, and a trial of our obedience: not as if what we abstain from were in any sense unclean.—The same trial of man's obedience was made by God himself in paradise: nor was it the apple which he eat that defiled him; but the transgression of his Maker's command. So it is the transgression of the command of the Church whom Jesus Christ has commanded us to hear and obey, (Matt. xviii. 17. and Luke x. 16.) that defiles; not the meat itself which we eat.

The practice of fasting and abstinence was always common in the Church of God under the old law, as well as under the new; and God has often shown how very acceptable it is to him. The great city of Niniveh, which, on account of the sins of its inhabitants he had threatened by his prophet Jonas to destroy in forty days, was spared by him, because its people proclaimed a most rigorous fast, to appease his wrath, and did penance for their sins in sackcloth and ashes. Jonas iii. v.—Our Saviour himself fasted forty days and

forty nights: (Matt. iv. 2.) and laid down besides rules for fasting, Matt. vi. 16.—He even told his apostles, when they could not on a certain occasion cast out the devil, that such could be cast out only by prayer and fasting. Matt. xvii. 20.

OF ANTICHRIST, AND THE IDOLATRY OF ROME.

Question 1.—Whether the Pope be Antichrist, and the Papists idolaters.

Bishop Montague is plain, as to the Antichrist mentioned in holy scripture: I profess, saith he, ingenuously, I am not of opinion, that the Bishop of Rome personally, is that Antichrist; nor yet that the bishops of Rome successively, are that Antichrist so spoken of.—Gag, p. 74, 75. And so also to the Informers: Who concluded it to be flat popery, not to believe or preach that the Pope is that Antichrist? Or to profess the contrary, that he is not that Antichrist? Who can find it to be the doctrine of the church of England? And what synod resolved it? Convocation assented to it? What parliament, law, proclamation, or edict, did ever command it to be professed, or have imposed penalty upon repugnants, or non-consentients unto it?—Ap. p. 143.

And as to any thing, Idolatry, or the common charge of Antichrist, Mr. Thorn-dike is positive against it: They, says he, that separate from the church of Rome, as idolaters, are thereby schismatics before God. Just Weights & Measures, c. 1. And again: Let not them who charge the Pope to be Antichrist, and the papists idolaters, lead the people by the nose, to believe that they can prove their supposition when they cannot.—Ch. 2.

And bishop Parker, speaking of this charge of Idolatry, is also very plain: So black a crime, says he, as this, that is no less than renouncing God, is not lightly to be charged upon any party of Christians, not only because of the foulness of the calumny, but the barbarous consequences that may follow upon it, to invite and warrant the rabble, whenever opportunity favors, to destroy the Roman Catholics and their images, as the Israelites were commanded to destroy the Canaanites and their idols. But before so bloody an indictment be preferred against the greatest part of Christendom, the nature of the thing ought to be well understood. The charge is too big for a scolding word. And how inconsistent soever idolatry may be with salvation, I fear so uncharitable a calumny [if it prove one] can be of no less damnable consequence. It is a piece of inhumanity that outdoes the savageness of the Cannibals themselves, and damns at once both body and soul. And yet after all, we have no other ground for the bold conceit, than the crude and rash assertions of some popular divines, who have no other measures of truth or zeal, but hatred to popery; and therefore never spare for hard words against that church, and run up all objections against it into nothing less than atheism and blasphemy, of which idolatry is the greatest instance.—Reas. far Abrog, the Test. pag. 27, 73.

And afterwards, more particularly ex-

amining this charge as consisting of these three heads. 1. The worship of images; 2. Adoration of the Host; 3. Invocation of Saints; he has these words worthy to be considered:—But as to the first, the use of images in the worship of God, I cannot but admire at the confidence of these men, to make so bold a charge against them in general, when the images of the cherubim were commanded by God himself.—Exod. xxv. 22. They were the most solemn and sacred part of the Jewish religion; and therefore, though images, so far from Idolatry, that God made them the seat of his presence, and from between them delivered his oracles; so that something more is required to make idolatry, than the use of images. The instance is so plain and obvious to every reader, there being nothing more remarkable in all the Old Testament, than the honor done to the cherubim, that it is a much greater wonder to me, that those men who advance the objection of idolatry so groundlessly, can so slightly rid themselves of so pregnant a proof against it.—Ib. pag. 129, 130. And again:—Till therefore it be proved that they worship images of false Gods as the Supreme Deities, or that they worship the true God by corporal images and representations of his divine nature, there is no footing for idolatry in Christendom.—Ib. p. 133.

He goes on:—As for the adoration of the Host, when they can prove it is given to it either as a symbol of a false God or the picture of the true one, howsoever it may be faulty otherwise, it can be no idolatry. And as for the invocation of saints, unless they worship them as the supreme God, the charge of Idolatry is an idle word, and the adoration itself that is given to them as saints, is a direct protestation against idolatry, because it supposes a superior Deity, and that supposition cuts off the very being of Idolatry.—Ib. p. 133.

It will be needless to cite any other of our writers upon this subject, because these were eminent persons in our church: and though this great cry of antichristianism and idolatry, is so often repeated, even in the instances above mentioned, that I could not but here take notice of it again; yet surely, what is now said by these learned men, with that before noted to the same purpose in this essay, may by the help of our rules, fairly contribute to a friendly agreement also in this point.—Vide No. 344 of the Cath. Herald.

The Rev. Mr. Matthew at Limerick.—The Very Rev. Mr. Matthew arrived in this city on Friday evening by the Cork mail, en route to Lougrea, and put up at Moore's hotel. Immediately after his arrival became known, hundreds of persons visited him at the hotel, where he administered the pledge. One circumstance which came within public observation we may mention here, as illustrative of the effects of breaking the temperance pledge:—A man named John Moynahan, a tectotaller, who worked at the butter weigh-house, got drunk on Christmas eve, and next day became paralyzed, his left arm, side and thigh being perfectly inanimate; he was removed to Barrington's Hospital, and remained there under care of the surgeons

without improvement, until last evening, when his friends having heard of Father Matthew's arrival in town, went to the hospital and brought him out of his bed on a man's back to where the Rev. Mr. Matthew was staying; a crowd had collected before the door when the unhappy invalid was carried into his presence, and the Rev. Gentleman administered to him the pledge again in a kind and impressive manner, and the man instantly stood up, and was assisted by his friends to dress, and to the astonishment of all, walked up William street to his home, followed by a crowd of people.—Limerick Chronicle.

FREE WILL.—Tertullian, in his exhortation to chastity, observes: "It is not becoming true and enlightened faith to refer every thing to the will of God, and to flatter ourselves by saying that nothing takes place except by his ordinance, in such a manner as not to understand that something depends on ourselves. Otherwise every crime will be justified, by affirming that nothing is done by us unless by the will of God; and his principle will overthrow the whole teaching even of God himself, if he produces by his will things which he does not will, or if there be nothing which he does not will. When he forbids certain things, and threatens the perpetrators with eternal punishment, certainly he does not will the things which he forbids, and which are offensive to him: as on the other hand he commands and accepts the things which he wills, and he rewards them eternal happiness. Therefore when we have learned from his precepts, both what he wills, and what he wills not, it is for us of our own will to choose either, as it is written: 'Behold I have placed before thee good and evil: for thou hast tasted of the tree of knowledge.' And therefore we ought not to refer to the will of God what is left to our choice whom He wishes no evil, wishes to exercise their will. Therefore when we will evil in opposition to the will of God, who wills what is good, the will is our own."—De exhortatione castitatis, n. 2.

AN ALARMING DECISION.—An English paper says that a decision has just been given in the Court of Queen's Bench, Ireland, which will carry alarm into many a family. All marriages in Ireland, celebrated by Presbyterian ministers, where both parties are not Presbyterians, are declared invalid. The Presbyterians in Ulster amount to upwards of 600,000, and we understand, nothing was more common than the celebration of marriages between Presbyterians and the number of other communities, by Presbyterian ministers.

Government, it is currently reported, has resolved to establish a line of steam communication between the Pacific coast of South America and New Zealand and the Australian colonies. The authorities of Panama, we may add, have invited the English engineer to survey a line of railroad across the Isthmus and are most desirous that the line should be executed by an English company, to which they are prepared to grant extensive privileges.