

flower, and his remains were borne to their resting place, in the ground of the brethren. One day the aged monk was observed standing over the grave of the departed. Tears flowed down his wrinkled cheeks, and his breast heaved with the intensity of his emotion; for a moment, nature triumphed over duty. The inscription upon the grave told him that it was the grave of his only son. He had not seen him since he left him a boy, to the care of his guardians, in the world."

The following incident we should rather expect to meet in the history of the Caliph Haroun Al Raschid: A traveller, making his way through the mountains, missed his way; he wandered about some time after sunset, in danger of being dashed to pieces among the rocks, or of sinking in the morasses that surrounded him. About eight o'clock he heard the tolling of a large bell, and, with some difficulty, made his way to the spot from which the sound proceeded. It was a large monastery. He sought shelter for the night, and was admitted. One kind attendant took care of his jaded steed, another conducted him to the apartment where he got refreshment, and where a plain but neat bed received his weary limbs. But, from his entrance to his departure in the morning, strange to say, no sound of human voice broke upon his ear. His noiseless attendants came and went, like so many beings of another world, ready to anticipate his slightest wish; but, as it was the hour of silence, even for those who waited upon the strangers, not a word was spoken when he went, or when he came."

Concluded in our next.

CELIBACY OF THE CATHOLIC CLERGY.

Having had occasion, a few days since, to visit a friend who resides in Stillwater, a small village on the banks of the Hudson, I engaged in due time a seat in the Albany and White Hall stage coach. The goodly vehicle being crowded with passengers within, and heavily laden with baggage without, plodded on at an unusually slow goit. We had not proceeded far, when two of the passengers, one a Methodist Minister, the other a Catholic gentleman, commenced a conversation which was in substance as follows. The rev. gentleman having adjusted his spectacles, and shrugged his shoulders twice or thrice, thus opened the dialogue:—

Sir—you made some observations since we left Albany which lead me to think that you are a Catholic. You are quite correct in your conjecture—I do belong to, and firmly believe in the divine origin of the Catholic religion. I thought as much—but surely a gentleman as well informed as you are, cannot sanction or approve of that absurd and unscriptural law of your church, which forbids her clergy to marry, and dooms them to pass their lives

in a state of celibacy. So far am I from regarding as absurd or anti-scriptural, the celibacy of our clergy, that I look upon it as a holy institution, highly honourable to our religion, and eminently conducive to the spiritual welfare and consolation of the respective flocks over which they are placed, as 'the dispensers of the mysteries of God.' In proof of this we need not refer to past ages or other lands. The history of our own country in the year '32, will amply sustain me in what I have said. Sir, let me, even at the risk of being thought impolite, interrupt you for a moment, and ask you a question. Is there not one man, at least, whose name your church honours, and whose memory it venerates, whom you must acknowledge to have been unnatural and inhuman? A man of whom it is said, 'that he never looked a woman in the face.' Can you after this say that this woman-hater could be a Christian, much less a Saint? I have read with much attention the life of that illustrious servant of God, and hold in the highest admiration, the exalted virtues that adorn his character. Let me now, in turn, ask you, by what right you can say, or what proof you can adduce to show, that he was a hater of women? Is it, because unlike your great apostle, Martin Luther, he strictly observed to the hour of his death, the vow of chastity he freely made, when ordained a priest? Is it because he stood to imitate the virtues of his Divine Lord, than whom greater was not born of woman, and follow an example confirmed by the life of the Redeemer himself? Is it because he aspired to be one of those who make themselves Eunuchs for the Kingdom of Heaven's sake? Is it because he sought to be enrolled among those thousands, whose high privilege it is, to follow the Lamb and sing that canticle which no others can learn? Or because, Apostle-like, he renounced all things to follow Christ?

Well, admitting all this, you cannot deny but that your church prohibits and dishonours matrimony. Here again you are in error. Our church prohibits no one from marrying. She only requires those who have freely taken a vow of chastity to keep it, having learned from St Paul the heinousness of violating it, and of casting off like those to whom the Apostle refers, 'their first faith in Christ.' So far from prohibiting or degrading, our church peculiarly honors matrimony. She requires of the parties entering into it, the same pious dispositions she does of those who approach the table of the Lord. What you have now stated, I cannot contradict, but one thing I will say, which you cannot oppose. It is, that St Dominick was the founder of the Inquisition, and must, therefore, be ever regarded as cruel and inhuman. Here again you are grossly mistaken, in as much as St Dominick died on the 4th of October, in the year 1060, and the Inquisition was not established for many years after. Let me further add that it was founded for a purpose of which you, as a Christian, cannot disapprove. It was established to oppose the principles, and check the progress of