

ing influence of the spirit of error, holding forth her counsel and injunctions, as inspired, to man, her natural head, superior, and director. Thus, the one, that should be guided, presumes in turn to guide; and the fickle female fancy is seen to lead round in all its wild vagaries and fondly formed conceits, as if spell-bound, the manly intellect.

The law laid down for woman—Gen. 3, 16—is thus inculcated by the great Apostle, Saint Paul: *Let women keep silence in the Churches: for it is not permitted to them to speak; but to be subject; as also the law saith. But, if they would learn any thing, let them ask their husbands at home: for it is a shame for a woman to speak in the Church.* 1, Corinth. 14, 31. And again: *Let the woman learn in silence, with all subjection: but I suffer not a woman to teach; nor to use authority over the man; but to be in silence. For Adam was first formed; then Eve. And Adam was not seduced; but the woman, being seduced, was in the transgression, &c.* 1 Tim. 0, 11.

What, then, would this Apostle have said, had he witnessed, as in our days, female doctors and expounders of the Divine Law to man; not expounding in the sense of the Church; though even this was the presumption blamed and forbidden by the Apostle; but every one holding forth her own doctrinal notions, and interpreting the word of God according to her supposed inspired conjectures. Is not this still Eve in Paradise, tempted first herself, & still tempting her husband? What would he have said, had woman assumed in his time, as in our parliamentary sect, the right to rule the Church of Christ as its spiritual head; and to dictate, like old Queen Bess, its Faith and discipline; under pain of death to a terror-struck, trembling and passive people and Clergy? And, were he alive, in what terms would he reprobate in a pretended Christian Church, the law enjoining all to consider as the head of that Church, the man, woman or child, male or female, who happens to be born the successive legitimate sovereign of the Land? Did Christ ever commission Cæsar, not Peter, to feed his flock?

Our American Watchman, in his article titled—*Worshipping the Blessed Virgin*—cites a certain Dr. Scott, whom he styles for his purpose, an *eminently pious and learned Minister of the Church of England*; as a commentator on the text; or rather on the Protestant's false version of the text, John 2, 4. Did Dr. Scott, in commenting on that text, look at the original? Not, surely; otherwise he would, if he understood the Greek; or even the oldest Latin translation; which, for all his eminent learning, is still a question, have discovered no more than these simple words: *Ti emoi kai soi gunai?* or *Quid mihi et tibi, mulier?*—the plain and simple meaning of which, though unknown, or wilfully concealed, by our noodle's learned commentator, is just what is expressed, neither more nor less, in the universally approved of Catholic translation: *What is it to me and thee, woman?* a very natural observation; as the want of wine for the occasion certainly concerned neither: whereas, the Protestant translation turns this simple observation

into these words, which have quite a different meaning: *What have I to do with thee, woman?* Thus, in order to detract from the dignity of the thrice blessed Mother of God; they, whose Father's head she was destined to crush; Gen. 3, make the Saviour hold to her a discourse, equally revolting to common sense; and unworthy of his filial, and her maternal character.

ON PENANCE AND INDULGENCE.

THE doctrine of indulgence, which Luther made the first pretence for differing with the Church of Rome, I shall next touch upon, as it is the immediate and necessary consequence of confession. It simply affirms that there is granted to the Church by her divine founder, a power to loose the sinner from the debt of temporal punishment, which he is supposed to owe to divine justice for sins, the eternal punishment of which is supposed remitted him on account of his real repentance for them: which loosing power, as well as that of binding, or subjecting to penance, or to temporal punishment, the Catholic thinks conferred by Jesus Christ on the pastors of the Church, in these his words: *What soever you loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven; and whatsoever you bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven.*

This power seems requisite for the proper and beneficial administration of confession. In the ancient Church, public and notorious sinners were accustomed publicly to acknowledge their guilt; and were therefore subjected to public penances. In private confession, private penances were always enjoined. These are some mortifying, but salutary injunctions, to be complied with, intended as a temporal satisfaction for one's guilt: a memento to the sinner of his promise of amendment; and particularly as a means of withdrawing him from his evil habits; and of preventing a relapse into his former sins. Thus, to the avaricious and covetous, the giving of alms on certain occasions, is properly enjoined; to the epicure, the glutton, and drunkard, abstinence and fasting; to the negligent and lukewarm Christian, certain prayers, or pious exercises, &c. When one has given sufficient proofs of a thorough conversion, these penances may be lessened, or wholly dispensed with. Now this is in one sense an indulgence.

Certain penances are enjoined at times to all the faithful, as all are more or less sinners: such as fasting and abstinence during Lent. One's state of health or circumstances, may require an indulgence. Then the penance is commuted into some other good work, to be performed. In the same manner general, as well as particular penances, are commuted, on condition that the faithful concur with their means, or personal endeavours, in some great, pious, and meritorious undertaking. The building of St. Peter's Church at Rome, was accounted such; as the building of the Temple of Jerusalem had been by Solomon, Esdras, and the Jews. It was thought redounding to the honour of the Messias, whose religion had triumphed over all other religions, to make his temple, which was considered as the centre of Christianity, the greatest in the

universe. The expulsion of the Turks out of Europe, where they threatened to plant, sword in hand, the impure sect of Mahomet, on the ruins of Christianity, as they had done in the East; was also accounted a pious and meritorious undertaking. But in such commutations of penances, or indulgences, private as well as public; particular as well as general; it is not denied but that abuses may have existed, and partially may exist. The unprincipled, needy, and greedy, contrary to the true spirit of the religion they profess, will turn every thing to their own account; and make, without remorse, the most sacred and best intended institutions subservient to their own avaricious and selfish views. A Judas, a thief from the beginning, was found even in the company of Jesus Christ, and the apostles, but that blessed company was not to be slighted or shunned on his account.

Some of our Protestant countrymen are so very ignorant as to the nature of an indulgence, that they suppose it a leave even to commit sin. Such an iniquitous idea never once entered into the head of any Catholic in the universe. This is one of the many cruel misrepresentations of their doctrine, which Roman Catholics so loudly and justly complain of.

SELECTED.

One might naturally presume that Christianity is well guarded and watched over in these Provinces, when at one extremity of them we have the *Christian Guardian*; and at another, the *Christian Sentinel*; though not wearing the same livery, nor belonging to the same Governments, either temporal or spiritual. In the middle, too, between them, we have here a turn-coat Watchman, belonging to neither, or to either; just as it may suit his purpose; which is—to catch the passing penny. He wears his uniform inside out, when claiming kindred with the *Sentinel*: but his usual garb, and even his name, bespeaks him of the *Guardian's family*. Though we have not nearly hit the exact nature of this *outlandish nondescript*. He exacts a remnant of—which shall we say—of the *Cromwellian*, or the *Covenanting brood*. But of this we have certain proof, that he is any man's man, who pays him best. Is he a Church of England man?—yes, and no. Is he a Methodist?—yes, and no. Is he a Calvinist?—yea, and nay. Is he a British subject?—nay, but yes. Is he an American?—well, I guess I am. Who hath sent thee here to watch over our spiritual weal? Truly, I sent myself: and I know you can well reward me for my good will and trouble. Your guides are all blind, but I can see; and will direct you better than any, or all of them. Was ever impudence surpassing this? Why didst thou not stick to thy trade, man? Because it would not stick to me: besides, the constant trouble of it.

And this is the worthy, who comes to filch the penny from the ignorant, well-meaning, British simpleton.

As he has thought fit to introduce to the public, amidst all the mass of his mystical ravings, the remorseless calumnies of the notorious apostate, Blanco White, against the Church of all nations and ages; of which he owns himself to have been so long, like the first reformers, an unbelieving; worth-