

Yet this was precisely what was attempted to be done; and for resisting this usurpation and contending strongly until death for the liberty of the Church, Gregory has sustained so much obloquy!—Could he have done otherwise without betraying his duty, and, to use his own strong language, “by satisfying the caprice of princies, being hurled with them into the abyss?” So far was this pretended right of investiture carried, that the German emperors even asserted it in regard to the Roman Pontiff himself, thereby seeking to crush the liberty of the Church in its head—in the only one able effectually to resist the ever encroaching usurpation! The emperors had more than once attempted to elect and depose Popes at will; but they always met with powerful resistance from the Church, and never succeeded in causing more than temporary confusion. Sometimes called to the “eternal city,” as its natural protectors, to quell popular insurrections, or to assert the liberty of the Church, they often went beyond the mere office of protection, and sought to rule in spiritual as well as in temporal matters. In one of his trips to Rome (after the middle of the tenth century.) Otho the Great emperor of Germany, with the aid of the anti-pope, styled Leo VIII, whom he had set up himself, had a decree or canon passed, by which the emperor’s right to interpose in the election of the Pope was recognized; and tho’ the provisions of this law were annulled by Henry II, in the beginning of the following century, they were renewed again by Conrad II, and became the cause of incalculable evils to the Church. In consequence of this law there were three claimants to the papal chair at one time, and Henry III, the father of Henry IV, paid a visit to Rome, and succeeded in suppressing the schism, without, however, giving up the pretended privilege from which this and other evils had sprung.

It required such a man as Gregory VII to wrest from the hands of the German emperors what they would not willingly resign! And how wisely and how effectually he did it, Mr. Voight informs us, and we shall have occasion to show more at length hereafter. Those writers who would fain persuade their readers that the controversy about investitures was one of mere form, show only their profound ignorance of history. It was a vital question—a question of liberty or slavery for the Church. And as long as kings and princes exercised this pretended right, can we wonder at the dreadful evils which St. Peter Damian so pathetically laments?—Can we be astonished that this good man should weep, like another Jeremiah, over the calamities of God’s people, and the desecration of his holy places—that, reposing near the sanctuary which he loved, he shed tears over its desolation and abandonment, while the courts of princes were thronged with a worldly minded clergy? Can we wonder that when he had exhausted all the resources of prose, he resorted to poetry and wept in numbers over the evils of his day? And that finally disgusted with a world which he did not love, and which he despaired to be able to reform, he fled to solitude, and devoted himself entirely to prayer?

[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, APRIL 5, 1843.

ON POPISH IDOLATRY,—CONTINUED FROM OUR LAST.

But are not Catholics downright idolaters; who transgress the first (according to Protestants the second) of God’s commandments? “Thou shalt not have strange Gods before me. Thou shalt not make to thyself the likeness of any thing that is in Heaven above, or in the Earth beneath: nor of those things that are in the waters under the Earth: Thou shalt not adore nor serve them, &c.” Exod. 20. &c.

Of this one commandment Protestants make two; though surely to make the likeness of any thing, and adore or serve it as God, is having strange Gods before the only true God. This indeed were worshipping idols; and all who do so, must be accounted idolaters. But do Catholics adore and serve such? The Devil is the father of lies; and those under his deceiving and malignant influence, are inspired by him to break God’s express commandment, which forbids to bear false witness against our neighbour. Catholics, for keeping with respect holy images, are accused by Protestants of idolatry. Are then no such images ever to be kept? or, if kept, are they not to be kept respectfully for the sake of the originals? Protestants make and keep images, and even cram their temples; Saint Paul’s Church, for instance, and Westminster Abbey, with the statues, busts and representations of their fellow mortals, in no sense remarkable for their Christian perfection; while they exclude those of Jesus Christ and his Saints! They would feel indignant should any one offer insult or disrespect to these images of their favourite worthies: to burn any of them in effigy would be considered a heinous offence offered to the original; and nothing less than treason, if offered to the Sovereign. They make and keep with affectionate regard the pictures and likenesses of their relations, friends and esteemed acquaintance; the Orange gang, the Zealots and Sicarii of the Protestant establishment, are seen yearly in Dublin, to deck out in gay attire, and worship their Dutch Moloch on College Green. And yet these are they who accuse Catholics of Idolatry, for adoring Jesus Christ in his image; and showing their love and reverential regard for his glorious Saints, by keeping with respect their representations. But Catholics are seen kneeling to them. Not to them, for our catechisms teach, and christian common sense informs us, that no such things, formed by the hand of Man, can either see, or hear, or help us. Would it be fair in us, if we saw a protestant kneeling at his communion table, over which is often seen painted the Royal Arms, to say that he is wor-

shipping the Lion and the Unicorn?—Who never once kneels, there is always some object before him: And Catholics kneeling to pray choose rather to have set before them sacred objects than profane. And if any marks of respect is paid by them before such representations, they are invariably referred to the immortal originals: to those, who look down upon us from their heavenly thrones; and, as the Saviour assures us, rejoice at the conversion of the sinner.

But are our protestant adversaries, not aware (they who pretend to read the Bible, and ground all their peculiar doctrines upon it,) that, though God forbade the likeness “of any thing in the heavens above, or on the earth beneath, or in the waters under the earth,” to be made and worshipped as Gods; he nevertheless commanded likenesses to be made in gold of the Cherubims; and these to be placed in his Tabernacle over the mercy seat? Were not these the likeness of something in the Heavens above? And the twelve oxen placed under the sea, or great Laver in the Temple, 3. Kings 7. 41. And the Brazen Serpent, a Miracle-working image; the Hieroglyph of the Saviour crucified, as he himself declared it. Numb. 21.—John, ch. 3. Were not all these likenesses of the earth beneath? Therefore sacred images and representations may be made and retained, as edifying and instructive, in the Church of God, without the least danger to the faithful of thereby incurring the guilt of idolatry. Nay, God, when he pleases, in spite of protestant prohibition, may by such even work miracles; as he did by the Brazen Serpent exalted in the wilderness; as he did by the Mantle of Elias; by the handkerchiefs and aprons that had touched the Body of Saint Paul, which cured all diseases and cast out Devils,—Acts, 19. 12; and by the very shadow of Saint Peter, which cured the sick, on which it fell, as he passed along the streets of Jerusalem. Acts 5. 15.—Is there any text in Scripture that proves that Catholics are idolaters for believing that God can still work such, or even greater wonders, whenever, and with whatever instruments he chooses? He who believes, says the Saviour, “the work that I do, he shall do also: and greater than these shall he do because I go to the Father.” John 14. 12.

In the Toronto Church paper of the 24th ult., we find an article entitled *Heavenly origin of the worship of the Blessed Virgin*, by a Rev’d J. J. Blunt, B. D.

The Man has picked up the whimsical and absurd argument of Doctor Middleton; that, because the pagan Romans had certain rites in their worship resembling those in the Christian Church, therefore the Christian Church must have borrowed them from the pagans; that because the pagans revered Cybele, a fictitious deity, as the Mother of their God; therefore the Christians, or such “ill-judging persons as Gregory Thaumaturgus, came to an accommodation with them,” to reverence the Blessed Virgin as the Mother of God!!! O, the pride and profanity of Ignorance. And this Blunt worthy

holds himself better judging than the illustrious and sainted Thaumaturgus, one of the brightest ornaments of the primitive Church. Because there were Beggars too among the pagans, there must be Beggars also in Italy. Are there also no Beggars in England? Yes, and beggared too by a legally plundering Church; are there no Beggars in protestant States? Yes, and while the real poor are not there allowed to beg; but are shut out from the public charity; and immured in worse prisons than common jails; their idling self-proclaimed Evangelists and their female partners, are allowed to practice begging all over the country in the most importunate and unlimited sense.—Witness the following specimen of protestant beggary, taken from that elegant compound of cant and fanaticism, the so called *Christian Guardian*, of the 29th ultimo.

HAVE THE CHILDREN MISSIONARY BOXES?—We put this question to Ministers, Teachers, and Parents, and think it too interesting and important to meet with neglect. A few days ago, on entering a parlour in this City, we saw an object we had not seen there before—a small, neat, and firmly-made chest, having a lock upon it, and on taking it up found a plate on the lid with the names of two children engraved upon it, with other words conveying to our mind the welcome intelligence that it was a “Missionary Box.” We remarked, “It is made very strong;” and received for answer, “Yes, I intend it to be of use when I am gone: an answer worthy of the holiness and benevolence of a widowed mother—a member of our Church, who furnishes an example of devotedness to Christ we have never seen equalled. We have since read part of the report of a Juvenile Missionary Society at Lowell, Massachusetts, which raised last year more than \$46. We cannot forget the Report of our own Missionary Society, and that the Missionary Boxes named in it do not, by much, bring the smallest of the contributions. Why should we not have such a Box in every Methodist School and Family?—What if every one of our Branch Societies had only one Box:—if well handled about, they would bring hundreds of dollars in the year. Mr. Wesley’s penny-a-week plan was ridiculed at first. It turns out to be mighty. The success of many Missionary Boxes, we are sure, would surprise persons who may now smile at our suggestion. Smile; but immediately procure a Missionary Box.

To the Editor of the Catholic.

St. CATHARINES, 26th MARCH, 1843.

VERY REV. SIR,—Knowing the great pleasure it has always afforded you in eulogizing the far famed and distinguished qualities of the patriotic and loyal Irish, I beg with sincere gratification to inform you, of the very becoming and peaceable manner with which they have conducted themselves on the Anniversary of their patron Saint, here. I regret, however, to add, that there were persons to be found so base, and malicious, as to circulate reports,—that a number of the Irish employed on the public works, were to march in countless numbers here, and consume the Episcopal Church, in return for that diabolical act of depravity which was committed on the Catholic Cureh in August last together with other acts of unequalled atrocity; you must