

meet at their church at a certain hour after dinner. Clothed in their habit, which covers their head, and permits only their eyes to be seen, they proceed to the place where the body is, and bear it to the church, singing psalms, and holding lighted torches in their hands. They subsequently take it to the grave. These duties they perform not only for departed members of their own fraternity, but for any person, Roman or foreign, for whom their services may be necessary. They have a cemetery near their church.

(To be continued.)

All letters and remittances are to be forwarded, free of postage, to the Editor, the Very Rev. Wm. P. McDonald, Hamilton.

THE CATHOLIC.

Hamilton, G. D.

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 23.

To the Editor of "The Catholic."

Presbytery, Perth,

Monday evening, Nov. 14, 1842.

VERY REV. SIR,

You will have the goodness to insert in the next number of the "Catholic" the following letter, directed to me when in Europe, by the talented and patriotic Archbishop of Tuam, the Most Rev. Dr. MacHale, on the subject of "Freemasonry;" and I most sincerely hope it may have the desired effect, and serve as a salutary admonition to those misguided Catholics who heretofore unblushingly contended that the Masonic Society was sanctioned by the hierarchy and priests of Ireland. It will, on the contrary, easily be seen from his letter that, ever since the condemnation of said society by the Court of Rome, the Catholic priesthood in Ireland, as elsewhere, exerted themselves most strenuously to put a stop not only to it but all other secret combinations, as dangerous to society in general, and subversive of all discipline in the Church of Christ.

I have the honor to be,

Very Rev. Sir,

Your humble and obed't servant,

J. H. McDONAGH, A.M.

(Copy.)

St. Jarlath's, Tuam.

Sept. 16. 1842.

REV. DEAR SIR,

Having been informed by you that there are in Canada some misguided Catholics, who, striving to justify the practice of Freemasonry, scruple not to assert that it was sanctioned by Priests and Bishops in Ireland. Allow me to tell you that this was never the case; and that those men are only aggravating their disobedience to the Church by the additional guilt of calumny. I have had extensive acquaintance, not only with the present race of Ecclesiastics, but also with some of those venerable men of more ancient standing, some of whom are now no more; and I can confidently state that, neither in this city nor in any other part of Ireland, was the bond of Masonry sanctioned by any portion of the Clergy. That Freemason Lodges were then more numerous

and frequent than now, may be true; but their existence, in contempt and defiance of the repeated annunciations of the clergy, cannot be brought as an argument of their sanctioning the system; more than the prevalence of other evils against which they do not cease to raise their voice could be adduced as a proof of similar connivance.

I am, Rev. Dear Sir,

Your very faithful servant,

† JOHN, ARCHBISHOP OF TUAM.

The Rev. J. H. McDonagh.

VERY REV. DEAR SIR,

I feel obliged to you for your congratulations on my return again to Canada, and allow me to return you my sincere acknowledgments. I would willingly do myself the pleasure of attending to your kind invitation to Hamilton; but immediately on my arrival I commenced the jubilee, and since then I have been very busy indeed. You must consider that I have not been idle, when upwards of eleven hundred of my flock have approached the holy table of communion since my arrival. Indeed, nothing can equal their zeal, their piety and devotion; and I really think that unfortunate Spirit had not, since the commencement of the jubilee, more ardent or more pious prayers offered to the throne of mercy for her reconciliation with the centre of unity, than from our good Catholics in Perth and the surrounding missions. You will, I am sure, be happy to learn the increase of temperance in this quarter. The society at present numbers almost eight hundred. I have got cards struck off for them, and intend as soon as possible to supply them with medals. In short, every thing regarding religion and morality is, thank God, on the increase.

I have the honor to remain

Yours, truly,

J. H. McDONAGH.

From the Durham Chronicle.

ALLEGED SUPPRESSION, BY CATHOLICS, OF THE SECOND COMMANDMENT. A Letter from the Rev. John Lingard, D.D., to Philip H. Howard, Esq. M.P.

At a late meeting, at Bath, of the London Hibernian Society, Mr. Tottenham renewed the charge against Catholics, of suppressing a commandment. The subjoined statement is addressed by the Rev. Dr. Lingard, to Philip H. Howard, Esq., to whom we are indebted for permission to publish his letter, which will be read with interest. We agree with Dr. Lingard that such objections as these of Mr. Tottenham have been so fully and so often exposed, that it is hardly worth while to notice them; but as the mis-statement is here concisely met and refuted, and the truth set forth clearly and in a narrow compass, we are persuaded it will be acceptable to most of our readers.

"DEAR SIR,—Mr. Tottenham's objection has been so often and so fully exposed, that it is hardly worth while to notice it. As the scripture is silent with respect to the manner in which the seventeen first verses of the twentieth chapter of Exodus were divided, so as to form the ten words or commandments, every Christian church is at liberty to adopt that manner of division which seems to it the most probable. Formerly, St. Augustine and many others condensed the three first prohibitions, regarding the worship of God, into one commandment; dividing

the two prohibitions of concupiscence into two commandments; and thus made up the number of ten. On the other hand, Origen and St. Jerome divided the three first prohibitions into two commandments, joining the two last into one; and thus, though by a different arrangement, also made up the number of ten. At the time of the Reformation, the division approved by St. Augustine was generally followed on the continent; and Luther, finding it adopted by the Catholics of Germany, followed it also, as appears from his 'Catechism for parsons, schoolmasters, masters of families, young persons and children at school;' in which the first commandment forbids the worship of false gods, the second the taking of God's name in vain. (See Luther's German Bible App. p. 23, Luneburgh, 1640.) In England, the other manner of division, approved by St. Jerome, was followed; and the English Catholics adopted it also in their communion service and catechism, and so it remains to the present day. But if the English Catholics followed that mode of division formerly, how comes it that they follow another now? Because, during two centuries of persecution, their clergy being educated abroad, brought with them to their own country that form to which they had been accustomed; but neither they nor Luther ever supposed that by such a division they were encouraging idolatry, as has been discovered by bigoted polemics of later days. Mr. Tottenham's first assertion, that what he calls the second commandment is always omitted in Roman Catholic churches on the continent, is most certainly untrue; his second, that they know not which is their ninth or tenth commandment, because these are placed in different positions in Exodus and Deuteronomy, is sheer nonsense. The Catholics abroad follow the order in Deuteronomy; the Protestants, in England, that in Exodus. Is not the first as good as the last? Both books are part of the inspired writings. When he says that the creatures of the Romish system are reduced to such shifts that even in their catechisms, such as that of the Council of Trent, they are compelled to put the ninth and tenth commandment separate. He appears to have forgotten that there are no questions asked in the catechism of the Council of Trent. That catechism indeed explains both commandments in the same chapter; but remarks that though both treat of concupiscence, yet they should be considered as distinct commandments; because they forbid two different kinds of concupiscence, the object of one of which is the acquisition of property, of the other the gratification of lust.

"I have the honor to be, dear sir,

Most truly yours.

J. LINGARD."

REASONS why the Catholic Church, under the promised direction of the Holy Ghost, has settled down the Ten Commandments in their present order, as all in her is rational order, and harmony.

Because in them there are two distinct sets of duties, commanded to be performed; our duties towards God, and our duties towards man. Without this distinction, why should there be mentioned two tables of the law, when one table could contain the whole?

1. As the first commandment on the first table enjoins our supreme homage to God alone, the author of our being: so the first commandment on the second table enjoins our subordinate homage to our parents, the carnal authors of our being.

2 Because it is impossible in common

sense, to make, as Protestants do, two distinct commandments of the first, in order as they intended to represent Catholics as idolaters, for making and respectfully keeping holy images (that which God himself ordered to be done). For it is the same sin to make and adore idols, as to have, what, in their first commandment, God forbids; that is, *strange gods before him*. So that in the division of the commandments, their second would be but a repetition, in more explicit terms, of the first.

3. Again, as they have made two of one commandment, not to exceed the acknowledged number ten; they were forced in the end to make but one of two. Yet these two, of which they make but one, namely: *thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's wife; thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's goods, &c.* forbids sins as distinct in thought as the two following forbid sins equally distinct in deed: *thou shalt not commit adultery; thou shalt not steal*. For to covet a neighbour's wife is to commit adultery in thought; since our Saviour has said: *he who looketh upon a woman to lust after her, hath committed adultery with her in his heart*. And again, he who covets his neighbour's goods is guilty of stealing in thought: for without coveting a neighbour's goods, there would be no theft. Therefore, if these two commandments, prohibiting distinct sins in thought, may be joined into one; why may not the two commandments prohibiting the same distinct sins in deed be joined into one; and then, instead of ten, Protestants would, according to their first division, have twelve commandments.

We discover at the same time a mystical harmony in the Catholic adopted division of the ten commandments, which is this, that as there is one God in three persons; so on one table of the law there are three commandments, regarding our duties to God; while on the second table of the law there are seven commandments. The number seven, as remarked by St. Augustine and other eminent writers in the Church, being in Scripture the one most frequently used in whatever regards the Deity's manifestations to man. Thus the measure of our time is regulated by seven, as the seven days of the week; the seven weeks to be observed (Lev. 23, 15); the seven year and the Jubilee week, of seven times seven years; the term revealed to Daniel, which was to elapse from his time till the coming of the Saviour; the seven pillars of wisdom's house (the church), Prov. 9, or the seven sacraments; the seven aspersions (Lev. 8, 11); the seven sprinklings of the door of the Tabernacle with the blood of the victim (Numb. 19); all figurative of the seven ways in the seven sacraments of applying to our souls the purifying effect of the blood of our Divine Victim. The seven washings of Naaman in the waters of the Jordan (4 Kings, 5, 14); the seven branches of the golden candlestick (Exod. 25, 31); the seven lambs offered up in sacrifice (Numb. 23, 14); the seven jubilee trumpets (Josh. 6, 45), &c.; all alluding to the purifying and enlightening effects of the Saviour's dispensation. Besides, in the mystical history of the