

Testament to which we appeal in support of our propositions—that Christ did appoint a body of men as teachers, until the consummation of all things; and that He appointed no other means for transmitting or perpetuating, a knowledge of His doctrines to all generations; this answer is, we hope, explicit enough. In arguing with Non-Catholics or Protestants, we do not recognise the inspiration or the superhuman authority of the New Testament: if our opponents can prove that inspiration, and that superhuman authority—good—we will accept it, and not till then—begging them to remember that historical credibility is one thing, and inspiration another; one a fact in the natural, the other a fact in the supernatural, order, and that it is impossible to conclude from the first to the second.

Neither would it follow, as a logical consequence, that if the inspiration of the whole of the New Testament were established, there would be no need of any other infallible authority, any more than it would follow that, if the inspiration of any one book, out of the many which compose the New Testament, could be established, there would be no need of any other inspired, or infallible authority. It is one thing to admit that the New Testament is composed of inspired writings, and another thing to assert that in it are contained all the inspired writings—the whole of God's revelation to man. We cannot jump at conclusions quite so rapidly. For all we know, inspired books of the New Testament may have been lost, as have been many, and for aught we know the most important, of the inspired books of the Old: if the Church be fallible, she may, for aught we know, have erred in deciding upon the Canon of scripture, and have excluded therefrom real inspired scriptures, when it excluded the Gospel of St. Barnabas, and other ancient scriptures, whose canonicity was a matter of controversy in the early ages of the Church. Our opponent, ere he can conclude from the inspiration of the New Testament to the needlessness of any other infallible authority, must prove that—the New Testament contains all the inspired scriptures, and the whole of God's revelation to man.

To our cotemporary's second objection, based upon the uncertainty of all knowledge derived from uninspired history, we have a word or two to say. First, we would ask him—"Does he, or does he not, admit the 'historical credibility' of the biographical memoirs of Christ, vulgarly attributed to St. Matthew and the other Evangelists?" This is a point that must be settled, for of course even a Protestant must perceive that it would be the height of absurdity for him to assume the inspiration of scriptures whose historical credibility he hesitated to admit. We trust that we may receive to our question an answer as candid and explicit as that which we have given to the question of the *Montreal Witness*—"Whether we admitted the inspiration of the scriptures of the New Testament?"

But according to our Protestant opponent—"History is the most uncertain, and easily disputed of all uncertain sources"—from which certainty can never be evolved—Alas that it should be so! Sad indeed! for man has no other means of obtaining knowledge of past events, or indeed of any thing beyond the immediate range of his senses. All our knowledge, of what has been, of what is, is derived from history, and is based upon the assumed possibility of evolving certainty in the natural order from uninspired history; but if this be, as our Protestant cotemporary asserts, impossible, then must all knowledge, all Faith, be likewise impossible. Christianity is based upon history: Christ appealed to His miracles in proof of His divine mission, and it is in history alone that we have any proof of the performance of those miracles.—Even Protestants when contending for the inspiration of scripture, first assume its historical credibility: they argue from the historical credibility of the Gospel narratives, and the Gospel miracles, to the inspiration of the recording medium, and of the recorder; a rather illogical process, for it no more follows that the recorder of a miraculous event must be miraculously inspired, than it does that the driver of fat bullocks must himself be fat. But now our friends seem about to change their tactics, and heaping absurdity upon absurdity, seem about to argue—first from the inspiration to the credibility, and then from the credibility to the inspiration. Did the *Montreal Witness* ever hear of a vicious circle? and yet to this circle he must have recourse; for as certainty cannot be evolved from such an uncertain source as uninspired history, he must needs assume the inspiration of the New Testament scriptures before he can argue to the historical credibility of the Gospel narratives.

All knowledge, we repeat, is based upon the possibility of evolving certainty from uninspired history—a certainty, it is true, limited to the natural order. Deny this, and all knowledge, all Faith, are impossible. Faith requires first—the certain knowledge that God has made a revelation to man; but that He has done so we have no proof save from history; and if from history we can never evolve certainty, never shall we be able to arrive at the certain assurance that God has made a revelation to man at all. The language of our opponent is only another proof, if proof were needed, that, with Protestants, Faith is impossible. Does our cotemporary object to this language as harsh? "Tell us then" would we say to him—"from what source do you derive your knowledge that God has ever revealed Himself to His creatures at all?—and till you possess that certain knowledge you cannot have Faith. Is it not from history that you pretend to derive that knowledge? From history, of which you cannot logically predicate inspiration, for that would suppose some other source whence you obtained your knowledge of inspiration?—from history, from which you assert that certainty never can be evolved? You can have therefore no certainty that God has ever revealed Himself, either to Moses on Mount Sinai—or through Christ in the New Testament; you can therefore have no Faith. For if you pretend to

Faith, from whence comes it? on what knowledge or certainty is it based? You reject the testimony of history as the most uncertain of all sources of knowledge—how know you then that there ever was such a person on earth as Jesus Christ—that He healed the sick, cleansed lepers, raised the dead, was crucified, rose again from the grave, and ascended into Heaven? You cannot be sure that these things ever occurred, you can therefore have no Faith.—Again, you reject history as a sure basis of knowledge; how know you, that there ever was such a city as Jerusalem, or another called Rome, and another called Babylon? how know you that there ever was such a man as Julius Cæsar, or as Pontius Pilate?—or such a man as Napoleon Bonaparte?—or that there is such a man as an Emperor of the French? or that the Duke of Wellington died last year—and was buried in St. Paul's? You know none of these things—all knowledge, and all Faith are, to you, who deny the possibility of evolving certainty from history, equally impossible. For all you know, the story of L'Empereur Napoleon may be a myth, and the narrative of Jesus Christ and His twelve disciples a monkish legend, merely a mediæval corruption of some more ancient allegory of the Sun and the twelve signs of the Zodiac.

Upon one other portion only of our cotemporary's rejoinder would we make a few remarks. He says—"All that is Scriptural in these propositions" (what in the name of wonder does he mean by scriptural? all our propositions were written, and therefore, scriptural) "may most easily and naturally, be understood of the Scriptures penned by Christ's inspired Apostles, which together with his own teaching, recorded by inspired Evangelists, and the Old Testament, also the fruit of inspiration, constitute an infallible and unchangeable body of Divine truth, the faithful reading or preaching of which is to be attended through all ages with the presence and power of Christ through His Holy Spirit. There is, therefore, no shadow of proof in the texts advanced of any infallibility in the Church."

Now the question is not whether they may, but whether they must, be so "understood." Our friend cannot conclude from may be to is; he must show that the commission of Christ to His Apostles must be understood in his sense and in no other. This will be a difficult task for him; and Lo! we throw upon his shoulders a still heavier burden. We defy him to prove that he has in his possession the writings of any one of the Apostles to whom Christ gave commission to teach. As to his boast that when he does "produce a positive and contrary thesis" (it will be a long time first we fear, but when he does we will reproduce it) "he will attempt at least to sustain it out of the Bible—an attempt which it appears to him we can scarcely be said to have made;" we have only to remark, 1st—that until he shall have proved the inspiration of the Bible, and its superhuman authority, his texts therefrom will have no more weight with us, than quotations taken from Tacitus or Ammianus Marcellinus; 2nd—that we learnt, long ago, from Tertullian, never to chop Scripture with heretics.

And now with one word of exhortation, and application, would we, in the most approved orthodox style, conclude. We exhort our cotemporary, to retract as soon as may be, his Protest against history, and to recognise that from uninspired history, certainty of facts, in the natural order—mark, we say not, in the supernatural,—may be obtained. Failing in this, he will be driven from one absurdity to another. He will be forced to deny the possibility of all "objective certainty," and to ignore all "objective existence." For him there will be no more "things," but only "things." For him Being will no longer Be, and existence will cease to exist. God and man, earth and heaven, time and eternity, will melt away, and the *Montreal Witness* itself, with all its types "shall dissolve.

"And like an insubstantial pageant faded,  
Leave not a rack behind."  
No God, no devil, no man, no nothing—merely Ultra-Protestantism, and the denial of everything.

A writer in the *Montreal Witness* challenged us, a few weeks ago, to make good from the writings "of any Protestant author," our assertion, that the tendency of Protestantism was to ignore the supernatural in religion. We replied by quoting, from the authoritative writings of the Anglican sect, and from the printed sermons of the father of Methodism, passages which fully substantiated all that we had advanced respecting the tendencies of Protestantism; to this testimony we can add that of one of the most celebrated Protestant divines, and perhaps the most eloquent and influential Protestant divine, in the United States—the Reverend Theodore Parker. The Reverend gentleman has published two sermons lately delivered by him at Boston; from these sermons we copy the following passages:—

"I do not believe that there ever was a miracle, or ever will be; everywhere I find law, the constant mode of operation of the infinite God. I do not believe in the miraculous inspiration of the Old Testament, or the New Testament.

"I do not believe the miraculous origin of the Hebrew Church, or of the Buddhist Church, or of the Christian Church; nor the miraculous character of Jesus. I feel not at all bound to believe what the Church says is true"—the Rev. gentleman is beyond all question a sound Protestant—"nor what any writer in the Old or New Testament declares true; and I am ready to believe that Jesus taught, as I think, eternal torment, the existence of a devil, and that he himself would ere long come back in the clouds of heaven; I do not accept these things on his authority; I try all things by the human faculties."

Here then is the testimony of a Protestant minister—of one who protests against all authority, and who asserts his right to "prove all things" in the

\* He cannot prove it from history, for that is "the most uncertain and easily disputed of all uncertain sources."—*Montreal Witness*.

most orthodox Non-Catholic style—a Protestant indeed of Protestants—who makes the most sensible Protestant, or Non-Catholic, Confession of Faith we ever met with. "I do not believe," "Non Credo"—"in miracles, or miraculous origin," or in anything supernatural. We have been called upon to produce "any Protestant author": we have produced the Anglican Homilies, Mr. Wesley, and the Reverend Theodore Parker, the minister of a large and highly intellectual Protestant Church in Boston; surely here is enough of Non-Catholic testimony to the truth of our assertion, that the tendency of Protestantism, or Non-Catholicity, is to eliminate the supernatural. We hope that after reading the above, our cotemporary will retract his charge against us of having said what is "simply untrue."

"BROWNSON'S QUARTERLY REVIEW."

We have before us the January number of this valuable periodical; it contains articles upon the following subjects:—

- I. The Worship of Mary.
- II. The Two Orders. Spiritual and Temporal.
- III. Father Gury's Moral Theology.
- IV. Protestantism not a Religion.
- V. Catholics of England and Ireland.
- VI. Literary Notices and Criticisms.

To the pious Catholic who cherishes in his heart a warm and tender devotion to the Immaculate Virgin Mother of God, the first article of this number will prove especially interesting. The object of the *Reviewer* is "to consider the worship of Mary in its foundation, the principles, or reasons, on which it rests, and to defend the strong expressions used by Catholic writers, when speaking of her in connection with our salvation." Not for the special benefit of Protestants does he write—"for they are not in a proper state of mind or heart to appreciate" what he has to offer—but "solely for the sake of those Catholics who are liable to be more or less affected by the objections, cavils, and sneers of the heretical and unbelieving world in the midst of which they are obliged to live."

The *Reviewer* distinguishes between the honor which we offer to Mary, in common with all the other saints, and the honor which we offer to her, as Mother of God, and on account of her peculiar relation to the great Mystery of the Incarnation. He distinguishes also in the "cultus sanctorum," or worship paid to the saints, two things—the honor or "cultus" proper that we pay to them, and their intercession which we invoke.

Catholics honor, or worship, the saints as God's greatest and noblest works, for God must be honored in all His works. In the clouds, and in the mountains, in the dark forests, and the wide spreading prairies, in the giant oak, and in the humblest flower of the field, we should recognise, and honor the works of God. But far transcending the works of nature are the works of grace. The Saint is the work of God's grace; it is to God, and to God alone, that the Saint owes all that he has—all that he is. In honoring the Saints therefore, we honor God's highest and noblest works, the works of His grace; we therefore honor God in His highest and noblest works. In withholding that honor, or worship, from the Saints, we refuse to honor God's works, and thereby do most foul dishonor to Him whose works they are. God will be honored, in His Saints—yea, He Himself honors them by crowning them with a crown of never fading glory. So far therefore from the worship that Catholics pay to the Saints being an idolatrous worship, or having the slightest tendency to approximate to an idolatrous form of worship, it is, in the language of the *Reviewer*, "one of the most effectual preservatives against idolatry, because even in the creature it keeps the mind and heart fixed on the Creator."

Why does the worship, or honor, that Catholics pay to the Saints appear to Protestants idolatrous? It is because they have no clear idea of what constitutes idolatry; it is, because Protestants pay to God too little, and not because Catholics pay to the Saints too much. Idolatry is to give to creature what is due only to Creator; but to the Creator we could not give the worship, or honor, we give to the Saints. In the worship we give to the latter we worship God, in His works—in the worship we give to Creator we worship God in Himself. These two worships differ from one another, not in degree, but in kind: one is not a multiple of the other, and therefore—raise the worship that Catholics pay to Saints to its highest power, exaggerate the warmth of their expressions, and the fervor of their devotional ardor, as you will—never can it even approximate to that entirely different kind of worship that Catholics pay to the Creator; never therefore can it approximate to an idolatrous worship.

But in Mary we worship or honor, something more than we honor in any of the other Saints. In her we honor the Mother of God: in the worship we pay to Mary we express our Faith in the mystery of the Incarnation. This mystery Protestants do not believe in their hearts, though they may profess it with their lips. To them the Incarnation is a mere abstraction: it is not to them, as it is to Catholics, a living, and ever-present reality. In the opinion that Protestants hold of Mary, we see the truth of what has often been asserted—that the tendency of all Protestantism is to ignore, or to eliminate, the supernatural. They refuse to look upon the Blessed Virgin as an extraordinary woman; to them she is quite an ordinary person—of less account in the great work of Man's Redemption than the veriest driveller of a fanatic who, in virtue of a black coat, a white choker, and a large stock of impertinence, sticks himself up as a minister of the gospel. In Mary, Protestants do not recognise the Mother of God—they therefore cannot recognise God in her Son, for we cannot think lightly of Mary without lightly esteem-

ing the Son of Mary; nor, on the other hand, can we honor Him—who, when He took upon Him to deliver man, did not abhor the Virgin's womb—without at the same time, and by the same act honoring Him, who is God above all, blessed for ever and ever.

In Mary we honor one who—strange as it may sound to Protestant ears—co-operated with God in the work of Redemption. In her womb the Word became flesh, but not without her free consent—that consent which Mary was free to give, and free to withhold, was necessary ere God could become Incarnate in her womb; for a moment then, the Salvation of the world, the Redemption of mankind, depended upon the will of Mary: not until she had given that consent—not until she had uttered those words, which at morn, and noon, and again at still eventide, the solemn peal of the Angelus bell recalls to the heart of the Catholic—"Ecce ancilla Domini, fiat mihi secundum verbum tuum"—not until Mary had pronounced her ever-memorable, ever-blessed "fiat," could the mystery of the Incarnation be accomplished, and the great work of man's Redemption be commenced. Yes, for a moment the salvation of the world depended upon the free will of a Jewish maiden; and shall it be said that in that maiden, at whose "Fiat," God became Incarnate, we are to behold only an ordinary woman?

But Mary is also our Mother:—  
"She is our mother, and, say the least as truly our mother as was Eve herself. Eutychianism is a heresy. The human nature, hypostatistically united to the Divine, remains for ever distinct from the Divine nature, and therefore our Lord remains for ever God and man in one Divine person. By assuming our nature, the Son of God has made himself our brother. We become, through the nature so assumed, of the same nature with God. Hence he is not ashamed to call us brethren. Now of this human nature in Christ, by which we become united to God by nature, Mary is the mother, and as the human as well as the Divine nature is one, she is truly our mother, in so far as we through that nature become united to him. She is not our natural mother in the sense of mother of our personality, but of our nature in God, and in so far as we were raised to brotherhood with Christ her Son, and are made through him one with God.

"She is our spiritual mother, for it is only through her flesh assumed by the Son of God that we were redeemed and begotten to the new spiritual life. We cannot too often repeat, that it is the Word made flesh, or God in the flesh, that redeems and saves or beaifies us. It is always through the incarnate Son that we have access to the Father, or that even the saints in heaven become one with God, and behold him in the beatific vision as he is. The life we as Christians live here is the life that proceeds from God in his humanity, and the life we hope to live hereafter proceeds from him in the same sense. To suppose the saint here or hereafter separated from the flesh which God assumed in the womb of the Virgin, would be to suppose his annihilation as a saint, as much as to suppose our separation from God as Creator would be to suppose the annihilation of our natural existence. Here is the mystery of godliness which was manifested in the flesh. Then, unless we can make it true that Mary is not the mother of our Lord in his human nature, we cannot make it untrue that she is our spiritual mother. So long as spiritual life is dependent on God in his human nature, so long is Mary truly the mother of spiritual life, and so long as she is the mother of that life, so long is she our spiritual mother, and to be honored as such, and honored even more than our natural mother, for the spiritual life is infinitely more than the natural life. Mary is also our spiritual mother, inasmuch as it has been through her intercession that we have been regenerated, and hope to obtain the gift of perseverance."

Shall we not then love our Mother? Shall we not, confiding in a mother's love, call upon her—"Mater purissima—ora pro nobis?"

We have not room this week to notice particularly the other articles enumerated in the title page before us. We will endeavor to lay before our readers some extracts in our ensuing numbers.

"Paul Peppergrass," the author of *Shandy McGuire*, has completed his pleasant tale of the *Spawwife, or the Queen's Secrets*, being a romance founded upon the cruelties perpetrated upon the Catholics of England during the reign of Queen Elizabeth. We have already noticed the previous numbers of this work as they appeared, and have only to add that the interest excited in the first parts is not allowed to flag in the last. The "Spawwife" is for sale at Mr. Sadlier's, Notre Dame street, Montreal.

*The Lives of the Fathers of the Eastern Deserts.*  
By the Rev. Dr. Chaloner. D. & J. Sadliers, Boston and Montreal.

In as much as this book sings the praises of abstinence, chastity, purity of heart, and Christian asceticism, it is likely to prove a book of offence, and a scandal, to the Protestant world, whose God—the belly—and whose cardinal virtues—the lusts of the flesh—it treats with marked disrespect. But to the Catholic, who believes that a Christian life is a life of self-denial, and mortification, a continual struggle with the world, the flesh, and the devil, it will prove a useful and instructive monitor—useful, in that it exhorts to the practice of the same virtues, as those by which the "Fathers of the Desert"—the holy eremites of old—gained their crowns; instructive, in that it shows these virtues are to be imitated—by patience in suffering, great humility, and the fear of the Lord.

We have to return thanks to the publisher for the *Maple Leaf*, for January, 1853—a work which we heartily commend for the good taste which presides over its selections, and the elegance of its appearance. For sale by R. W. Lay, Great St. James street, Montreal.

A charitable Soiree in aid of the funds of the Society of St. Vincent de Paul, took place in Toronto on the 29th ult., in the St. Lawrence Hall; and never, we believe, did that magnificent saloon contain a more respectable assemblage, among whom we noticed many of our Protestant fellow citizens of the highest standing in society, and whose courteous demeanor marked their good sense and polished manners. The decorations of the Hall were grand and tasteful; the speeches eloquent and appropriate, and the refreshments—furnished by the Catholic ladies of the city—luxuriant and abundant. The chair was occupied by W. J. MacDonnell, Esq., President of the Society.—*Abridged from the Mirror.*