

most evident beyond the possibility of any just or reasonable contradiction, I was horrified at the disingenuity of Protestant writers, such as Dr. Hook of Leeds, who, whilst they accuse others of fallacy, imposture, and impudence, dare to advance so great and demonstrable a falsehood in matter of fact, that nothing but gross ignorance can excuse; so they expose themselves to the greatest censure of rashness and indiscretion, as uncharitable and unjust to those whom they call their enemies, as also unsafe and abusing the credulity of their friends.

The four first general councils, sir, were held between the years 315 and 357, and which first four general councils Protestants appear to venerate and to subscribe to their decrees, but, I am concerned to state, it is but in appearance. In those times the church believed firmly in the real presence, and the eating with the mouth, (these are the words of an eminent Catholic divine) the body of Christ in the sacrament, as Zuinglius, the founder of the Sacramentarians, acknowledges as follows: 'From the time of St. Augustin the opinion of a corporeal flesh had already got the upper hand, (Lib. de Vera et Falsa reliq. cap. de Eucharist); and in this quality he (St. Chrysostom in 1 Cor. Hom. 24) adored the Eucharist with outward gestures and adoration as the true and proper body of Christ. The church, then, sir, believed the body of Christ to be in the sacrament. (St. Cyril, Alex. Ep. and Cæsar Pat) The church, then, believed, I repeat, that communion under both kinds were not necessary; and that the whole body and all the blood were taken and received under either species; and for this reason, in domestic communions, in the communion of children, of sick persons, of those at sea, and at the hour of death, it was distributed under one species only. In these times the church believed the Eucharist to be a true, full, and entire sacrament. (St. Cyprian ad Cæcil. ep. 63). Not only eucharistical, but propitiatory (Euseb. et Vita Const. l. 4), and offered it as well for the living (St. Chrysostom in Cor. Hom. 41) as for the dead.

The primitive church held that the mingling of water with wine in the sacrifice of the Eucharist was a thing necessary and of Divine and of apostolical tradition. (See St. Cyp. Cæcil. ep. 63.) She, besides baptism and the Eucharist, held Confirmation. (St. August. Cont. Petit. lib. iii. cap. 4), Marriage (St. Aug. de Nupt. et Conc. c. 17), Penance (St. Ambrose de Pœnit. c. 7), Auricular Confession (St. Leo, 1 Epist.,) Orders (St. Aug. Cont. Parm. l. ii. c. 13), and Extreme Unction, for true and proper sacraments, which the church in communion with the see of Rome acknowledges. The primitive church used in the ceremonies of Baptism (St. Cyprian, epist. 70) oil (Conc. Carth. iii. c. 3.) salt, wax lights, (St. Greg. Nas. de Babi). exorcisms (St. Aug. ep. 101.) and the sign of the cross (St. Aug. Contra. Jul. lib. vi. cap. 8.) Now none of these things were used without reason and judgment. The primitive church made use of holy water, sanctified it by using certain words and ceremonies on it, and used it for baptisms (St.

Basil de S. Spirit, c. 17) and against enchantments (St. Epip. Hær. 30), exorcisms (Theod. Hist. Eccles. l. v. c. 3), and against all evil spirits.

I beg further to remark in regard to holy water, that St. Alexander (the Seventh Pope from St. Peter) commanded that holy water should be kept in the churches and in the houses of individuals, in order to put to flight evil spirits; but do not let my readers for a moment suppose that, from this ordinance of that holy Pontiff, that he was the first who instituted it.—Such was not the fact. This institution came direct from the Apostles themselves. This ordinance regarded merely the use of holy water, which ought to be held in great veneration by the faithful; therefore this holy Pontiff exhorts every one to keep it in their bed-chambers, and to sprinkle their rooms with it in case they might be troubled by evil spirits. This Pope also commanded that the bread used in the Eucharist should have no leaven, as being most pure and conformable to the institution of Jesus Christ, and likewise as an apostolical tradition, the mixing of a little water with the wine in the chalice, to represent the union of God with His church. All these are traditions which come direct from the Apostles. The Rev. Mr. Jones wishes to be informed when my next letter, (it being the third of the series) to the Rev. Wm. Palmer, of Oxford, on Confession and Satisfaction will be published, and, in reply, I beg to inform him that it will be before the public early next month, on my return to England. VERAX,

A CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

*Naturam expellas Furca, tamen usque recurret.*

To the Correspondent of the Canada Inquirer, signed a Protestant, will have us Catholics to be downright idolaters, whether we will or not. It is in vain for us to declare in all our books, preachings, councils and catechisms, that we adore but one God in three persons, the Father, Son and Holy Ghost; that we pay to him alone that sovereign worship, which it were a heinous crime to pay to the most holy and exalted of the creatures. But because we at the same time pay an inferior homage to his confirmed friends and favorites, the blessed in heaven, we are all, yes, the whole Catholic world, which,—according to a late census taken by Protestant missionaries, to whose testimony we refer in another part of our paper, comprises, even according to their partial account, above three hundred and ninety millions—we are all poor benighted idolaters! And may we not justly call any one capable of believing this, and of thinking himself and his local, or national groups, the only truly enlightened christians in the world;—(for he should recollect that there are existing other casts of Protestants not quite so illiberal as he seems to be;—and as we know not to what denomination of such he belongs, he is still to us quite a nondescript; may we not justly, as we said, call such a one a real simple downright noodle? "But we apply to a creature the sacred epithets and attributes of the

Creator; such as seat of wisdom, cause of our joy, health of the weak, refuge of sinners, comfort of the afflicted, help of christians, queen of angels, queen of all saints," &c. But was she not the seat of wisdom, of that God incarnate, who sat upon her knee? was she not chosen by God to be the cause of our joy, as Eve had been the cause of our woe? Health of the weak, without whom our race must all have perished? Refuge of sinners, in whose charitable intercession for us with God, we confide more than in that of our fellow mortals? comfort of the afflicted—help of Christians? yes, while we have so powerful, so prevailing an advocate with her divine Son in our behalf: Queen of angels, Queen of saints; and is she not the mother of him who is God? Who of all creatures can claim so near a kindred with him who is the King of heaven? The antipathy which most Protestants shew to his most blest of creatures, reminds us of God's mystical address to the devil in paradise after the fall of man. I will, said he, put enmity between thee and the woman; and between thy seed and her seed.—Gen. iii. 15. Surely they, who refuse due honors to the mother, though a creature, honor not the Son, who though man, yet is God. An archangel from the throne of God saluted her, as no mortal was ever before or since saluted by celestial messenger. Hail Mary, said he to her, full of grace; the Lord is with thee; blessed art thou among women! Her cousin, St. Elizabeth, inspired by the Holy Ghost, pronounces her like the archangel, blessed among women, and blessed the fruit of her womb. And whence she exclaims, is this to me, that the mother of my Lord should come to me, &c. She herself, also, inspired by the same Holy Ghost, in her gratitude breathing, and humble Canticle, declares: from henceforth shall all generations call me blessed. And in the only church of all generations we do daily call her blessed in the very words of the archangel, which Protestants hate to repeat, and abhor them as those of a Catholic prayer.—"We apply to her, only a creature, the sacred epithets and attributes of the Creator." Does not our Protestant, in addressing our governor, call him his Excellency? Now, who is excellent in the supreme sense, but God? To Sovereigns is given the title of your Majesty; to some in high stations that of Most High and Mighty, Serene Highness, Royal Highness, Right Worshipful, your Worship, your Honor, your Grace, your Reverence, your Lordship, &c. Now, are not all these titles in the supreme sense, the sacred epithets and attributes of God? And yet our Protestant, unless he be a Quaker, will have no scruple in bestowing them in a limited sense, on his fellow mortals, as indicative of their rank and station in society. And will he not own that the saints in heaven, deserve still higher titles, concerning each of whom the filial Deity himself thus declares: To him that shall overcome, I will give to sit with me on my throne; as I also have overcome, and am set down with my Father on his throne.—Revelations iii. 21.

As to the story of the Skeleton Revived, or any other wonderful Legend, such every Catholic is free to believe, or disbelieve, according to the degree of human evidence afforded him on the subject; yet, even that of the Skeleton is not a miracle surpassing the power of God to perform; no more than that was, of raising to life the dead man cast into Elisha's grave, the moment the corpse had touched the bones of the Prophet.—2 Kings, chap. xiii. We have no saints named Anselm or Errie Suzon, in the Catholic calendar; so we make them over, and part of their testimony too, to our anonymous Protestant. All such stories, true or false, form no part whatever of the Catholic doctrine.

But, Matt. xii, 47, did not the Saviour slight his mother, when, in reply to those who told him, "Behold thy mother and thy brethren stand without seeking thee, [he said,] who is my mother, and who are my brethren? And stretching forth his hands towards his disciples, he said, behold my mother and my brethren; for whosoever shall do the will of my Father who is in heaven, he is my brother, and sister and mother." The holy fathers of the church saw nothing in this speech derogatory to the honor of his blessed mother. The venerable Bede, in particular, a surer interpreter of the scripture than our Protestant one, observes on this text, that the Saviour only gave it thereby to be understood that it was not temporal kindred that endeared any one to him so much, as the doing the will of his Father who is in heaven. She was certainly dear to him from the closest ties of kindred; but still more dear to him was her perfect conformity with the will of his heavenly Father. Did our Protestant know, that in citing against us the 2d chapter of Colossians, verse 18th, that St. Paul in that Epistle was guarding his people against the superstitious worship of angels, and some Neophytes, speculating on platonic whims and reveries? And in the citation from 1 Tim. iv, 1, that the same apostle, according to all the learned, was alluding to the hideous sect of the Manicheans? The compliment thus paid to our church by applying to her this text, in no sense suits her, who raises marriage even to the dignity of a sacrament; and forbids none to marry who choose, and abstains not from meats, like the Manicheans as evil in themselves, and the production of an evil god.—But our Protestant is not up to this much of church history, where the Saviour says "there is more joy before the angels in heaven for one sinner who is converted, (or who repenteth,) than for the ninety and nine just."—Luko xv, 7. Our opponent ignorantly says, this is spoken only of the angels, not of the saints; whereas, did he know the scripture, he should have remembered that the Saviour also said, that the saints in heaven shall be like the angels of God.—Matt. w. xxii, 30. The story of the red and white Ladder, we make him quite a present of, together with all the other absurd tales and false applications of scripture with which he fills some three columns of the Canada Inquirer.