

"CLERGY RESERVES."—At a dinner lately given at Perth to the Hon. M. Cameron, that gentleman made the following semi-official announcement of the intentions of the Ministry, of which he is a member:

"A Bill would be read the first day after the meeting of Parliament, for placing the Clergy Reserves in the general revenues of the Province. A measure would then be passed for rectifying an error in the Franchise Bill of last Session, and the House would be dissolved. In August, or September, there would be a General Election, when the people would be appealed to on the Ministerial measure for the 'Secularisation of the Reserves,' upon the success of which the present ministry had staked its political existence."

It will be left then for the people of Canada, at the next General Election, to decide upon this most important question. By that decision, either a great principle—viz., that it is the duty, as well as the right, of every government, to set apart, of its revenues, for the service of Almighty God—will be affirmed; or a great wrong done. The issue raised is not, whether the revenues so set apart by the law as it now stands, are distributed in the best manner possible; whether this denomination receives more, or that, less, than its due share of the proceeds; but whether any State endowment, to any denomination, shall be made for religious purposes. Coming before them in this latter shape, we know how Catholics should treat a proposition to secularise religious endowments; and whatever may be the fate of the Clergy Reserves, we trust that "secularisation," if come it must, will not be allowed to pass without the strenuous opposition of the Catholics of Canada.—God forbid that, for the sake of upholding any Ministry, they should be guilty of a dereliction of principle. God forbid that, at the next election, Catholics should be seen applying to Protestants a rule which they would not have applied to themselves.—Let not Catholics be the first to raise sacrilegious hands against religious endowments; they will yet need all their strength, all their energy and vigilance, to preserve their own from the insatiable maw of "brawling Pharisees," and infidel democrats.

#### "A PROTESTANT'S APPEAL TO THE DOUAY BIBLE."

There is nothing easier than so to misquote, an author—or by means of garbled extracts, and passages violently divorced from their context, so to misrepresent his meaning—as to make him preach any doctrine one likes. And if the author be tolerably voluminous, and if he who quotes, be but careful never to indicate where the passage quoted may be found, or to give any references, whereby it may be compared with the original, and verified, it is not easy to expose the disingenuous artifice. And thus it is with the work of Mr. Jenkins. It deals largely in quotations from the early Fathers, and modern Catholic controversialist writers; but rarely does it refer one to the place where the passage quoted occurs. In this we are more inclined to laud our author's prudence, than his candor; unless indeed, as we are sometimes led to suspect, his quotations have been taken up second, and third, hand, from the anti-Popery effusions of his predecessors; thus enabling Mr. Jenkins to acquire, at a very cheap rate, credit for the possession of an extensive and profound acquaintance with the tomes of a St. Augustine, a St. Chrysostom, or the learned Bellarmine—writers who are oftener quoted, than studied, by the occupiers of Protestant pulpits.

Of the manner in which these writers fare at the hands of our author, we will give a specimen; from which the reader may judge what reliance should be placed on Protestant quotations; and how far they give a fair and complete exposition of the quoted writer's meaning. If we give but one, it is because space, and not matter, is wanting.

Although, properly speaking, no article of the Catholic's Creed can be said to rest upon any text of Scripture—but solely on the testimony of the Church, the ground and pillar of truth, and who alone can certify as to the authoritative value, or meaning, of the Sacred Scriptures—still it is not uncommon for Catholic writers to show the harmony betwixt the teaching of the Church, and the writings which she authenticates. With this view, Dr. Milner, in his "End of Controversy," cites several passages of the New Testament, in which the existence of a Purgatory, or state after death in which the penalty of sin may be remitted, is clearly alluded to. Amongst other passages, Dr. Milner cites the well known one from St. Matthew, where our Lord speaks of the sin against the Holy Ghost, as of "a sin that shall not be forgiven, either in this world, or in the next."

—xii., 32.

Now, from this passage, as it stands, no one pretends that, according to the rules of logic, any conclusion can be drawn, that some sins—*quoad penam*—may be remitted in the world to come. It requires the addition of another term—viz., that our Lord never spoke one vain, or idle word; when the argument of the Catholic would stand as follows:—

Our Lord never spoke one vain, or idle word.

But it would have been a vain and idle thing for our Lord to have said that one particular sin would not be forgiven, either in this world, or in the next, if no sins could be remitted—at least *quoad penam*—in the next.

Therefore, logically concludes the Catholics—from the union of these two premises, though not from the first alone—that some sins—*quoad penam*—may be remitted in a future state of existence.

In this sense, Bellarmine, when treating of this passage from St. Matthew—*De Purgatorio*, l. 1, c. 4—admits:—

"Non sequi secundum regulas dialecticorum, id quod inferimus ex verbis Domini, sed tamen sequi secundum regulam prudentie, quia alioquin faceremus Dominum turpissime loquutum."

The meaning which we put upon our Lord's words—says Bellarmine—does not flow from the rules of

dialectics, but of prudence; for, otherwise, we should impute to our Lord vain and idle words, in saying that this particular sin would not be remitted, if no sin whatever could be remitted, in the life to come. Thus we see that, although admitting that the Catholic's interpretation of this disputed passage, does not flow from the strict rules of dialectics, Bellarmine stoutly contends for that interpretation, as the necessary consequence of recognising in our Lord a wise and prudent teacher, Who never spoke, one vain, or idle word. Now, let us see how Mr. Jenkins, with true Protestant honesty, treats Bellarmine.

He represents him as abandoning the argument in favor of Purgatory, drawn from our Lord's words, altogether, as perfectly untenable:—

"Cardinal Bellarmine was candid enough to allow that the inference does not follow from the premises, and therefore that any reasoning upon the passage for this purpose, is altogether illogical."—p. 373.

And then he quotes—"Non sequi secundum regulas dialecticorum"—taking care however not to add the conclusion of the sentence—"sed tamen sequi secundum regulam prudentie." And this is the way in which Catholic writers are almost invariably served when they have the misfortune to fall into the hands of Protestant commentators! Upon the same principle, the Psalmist may be cited as authority that—"There is no God."

We have been thus particular in pointing out Mr. Jenkins' dishonesty, or ignorance, we know not which, in this instance, as a proof how little reliance can be placed upon his veracity in other instances, when he quotes from other Catholic controversial writings; which like Bellarmine's, are not within the reach of the great mass of his readers; and who are therefore too apt to place implicit confidence in the integrity of the quoter. Of such confidence, Mr. Jenkins is, as we have shown, altogether unworthy.—Either he is grossly ignorant of the works of the writers whom he quotes; or if acquainted with them, he wilfully misrepresents their meaning. In either case he is utterly unworthy of credit. We will now proceed to notice his arguments against the Catholic doctrine of Purgatory, based upon certain passages from the writings of the early Fathers, in which our author pretends to find, that doctrine disavowed, or, at all events, such discrepancies with other passages in which the doctrine is apparently asserted, that they "at once convict the Fathers of the Church, of inconsistency with each other and themselves, and therefore of being unworthy witnesses in support of Roman Catholic pretensions."—p. 398.

The manner in which our author accomplishes his purpose is very simple; and will be easily understood by the following explanation. The Fathers, when treating of the condition of the souls of the departed, speak, sometimes of their future, sometimes of their final, state. When speaking of the latter, or final state, the state in which all shall be after the last judgment, they clearly recognise only two states, and deny any third, or intermediate state, betwixt heaven and hell. But, although the final, must of course be a future, it does not follow that a future, is always the final, state of the departed; and hence, when the Fathers are speaking only of a future, as distinguished from the final, they clearly recognise a third, or intermediate state, in which the souls of the departed, though sure of their ultimate salvation, suffer severely for a season; and in which they may be assisted by the prayers of the living, by their good works and alms deeds, and above all by the Holy and Tremendous Sacrifice of the Mass. Now by simply applying what St. Augustine, or any one of the other Fathers, says of the final state in particular, to a future state in general—as if the two terms were synonymous—it is very easy to find in his writings a denial of a third or intermediate state; and to convict the Father, thus barbarously treated, of gross inconsistency with himself and his contemporaries, when he and they speak of a future state, not final, and intermediate betwixt heaven and hell.—We will give an instance of our meaning.

In the 21st book of the City of God, c. 25, St. Augustine thus speaks of the final state of the departed: of course, as final, he recognises only two states, heaven and hell:—

"Si in regni Dei possessione nunquam erunt, eterno supplicio tenebuntur; quoniam non est locus medius, ubi non sit in supplicio, qui illo non fuerit constitutus in regno."

And so in many other passages; always when speaking of the final state of the departed, St. Augustine denies any third, or intermediate state, betwixt heaven and hell; as does the Catholic Church at the present day. But though the final is future, it does not follow that a future is always the final; and thus in other passages, without rendering himself obnoxious to the charge of inconsistency—which in his ignorance Mr. Jenkins brings against him—St. Augustine, when speaking of a future, though not necessarily of the final, state of the departed, uses very different language:—

As, for instance, when commenting on the words of the thirty seventh psalm, second verse:—

"Rebuke me not O Lord in Thy indignation, nor chastise me in Thy wrath."

Here St. Augustine recognises very distinctly a future state, which is not however necessarily final, for he says:—

"Futurum est enim ut quidam in ira Dei emendantur, et in indignatione arguantur. Et forte non omnes qui arguantur, emendantur; sed tamen futuri sunt in emendatione quidam salvi. Futurum est quidem, quia emendatio nominata est; sic tamen quasi per ignem. Futuri autem quidam qui arguentur, et non emendantur."—*Enarrat. in Psalm. 37.*

As the whole passage is conclusive as to the belief of St. Augustine in the doctrine of a Purgatory, we will continue the quotation.

"May I not be amongst those to whom it shall be said—'Depart into everlasting fire which is prepared for the Devil and his angels; neither do Thou chas-

tise me in Thy wrath.' But so purge me in this life; and make me like him, to whom there is no need of that purging fire, in reserve for those who shall be saved, yet so as by fire. Wherefore—but because, upon the foundation, they have built wood, hay, stubble? Had they built gold, silver, precious stones, from either fire they would have been secure; not only from that eternal fire, which shall torment the impious to all eternity, but from that, as well, which purges those who shall be saved by fire. It is said, 'he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire.'—1 Cor. iii. 15. And because it is said—'he shall be saved'—the fire is despised; though it is certain that, though he shall be saved by fire, that fire is more grievous than anything that man can suffer in this life."—*Enarr., Ps. 37.*

From this passage it is clear that, in the days of St. Augustine—long ere it may be said that the corruptions of the Church of Rome had commenced—the doctrine of a future Purgatory, and future Purgatorial punishments, from which, however, there was redemption, was taught and insisted upon in the Catholic Church; whilst at the same time, and by the same Church teachers, the doctrine that the final state of the departed, was twofold, and irreversible, was equally strongly insisted upon. The same doctrines are taught by the Romish Church at the present day; and as the one is perfectly compatible with the other, we need not tax the Fathers with inconsistency, because they also held, and taught both.

By bearing in mind this distinction betwixt a future, and the final, state of all men after this life, we can easily reconcile those passages in which St. Augustine speaks of Purgatory, and Purgatorial punishments redeemable by the prayers, alms-deeds, and sacrifices of the living, with the following extract given by Mr. Jenkins:—

"We read of heaven and hell; but the third place we are utterly ignorant of; yea we find it not in Scripture."

This passage occurs in the fifth book of the *Hypomnesticon*, usually attributed to St. Augustine, though its authorship is doubtful, and has been the subject of much controversy. The writer is arguing against the error of the Pelagians, who affirmed that unbaptised children were the heirs of eternal life; an error which the author of the *Hypomnesticon* meets with the assertion that, in Scripture, we read but of two final, or eternal, states, for man after this life—heaven and hell. And that he speaks of the final state only, or of the state subsequent to the last judgment, is evident from the context, and the words immediately following the passage cited by Mr. Jenkins, in which the Pelagians are called upon, if they can, to tell in what place are the souls of children, departed from this life without the Sacrament of Baptism:—

"Ecce non baptizatus, vitali etiam cibo poenaeque privatus, dividitur a regno caelorum, ubi fons viventium permanet Christus. Da mihi, praeter hunc locum, ubi vita possit requies esse perennis." Then comes the passage cited by Mr. Jenkins; after which we read—"In dextera igitur justi sunt constituti; in sinistra, operarii iniquitatis; in regno requies baptizatorum, in Gehenna poena incredulorum. Qui baptizatus ego non est, in iis quae sunt regni caelorum non potest reperiri; et si non ibi, quia vero non ibi, putasne, Pelagiane, jam sentis ubi? aut certe dic ubi."

From this, and the rest of the passage, which is too long to transcribe, it is clear that the author of the *Hypomnesticon* was treating of the final state of all, after the day of judgment; and not of a future state, betwixt that day, and the day of the individual's departure from this life. Even admitting St. Augustine to be author of the work in dispute, which is very probable, the passage quoted is in perfect harmony with other passages in which he asserts an intermediate state betwixt heaven and hell, before the day of judgment; a future, though not necessarily the final and eternal, state. Mr. Jenkins is unfortunate in his selections from the Fathers; the one just quoted, though it does not contradict Purgatory, asserts in the strongest and plainest language the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, and the necessity of Infant Baptism; doctrines which Protestants for the most part reject, as rags of Popery, and modern Romish innovations. For the unbaptised, there is no Purgatory, or intermediate state, betwixt heaven and hell, according to the author of the *Hypomnesticon*; and the Catholic Church teaches that Purgatory is for those only who die in a state of Grace, and who therefore have been baptised. Where then is the discrepancy betwixt her teaching, and the language of the author of the *Hypomnesticon*?

But St. Augustine sometimes speaks of this intermediate state, as of something that may be enquired into; therefore he did not hold, as an article of faith, that there was such an intermediate state. Here too we may admit the premises, without adopting the conclusion. For St. Augustine doubted, not of the fact that there was a Purgatory, but only of the nature of that Purgatory, and of the punishments therein inflicted; and whether the souls therein confined were subject to corporeal afflictions. On these points St. Augustine pronounced no opinion, because the Church has received no revelation thereon; consequently at the present day, whilst the Church teaches that there is a Purgatory, wherein that Purgatory consists, what its duration, on the nature of its inflictions, as points upon which she preserves a prudent silence, as upon matters which the ingenuity of man may inquire into, but upon which he will never be able to arrive at any certain decision. In common with all the Western Fathers, St. Augustine had, as we have shown, a strong opinion that the punishment of Purgatory was by fire; but he never presumed to propound that opinion as an article of faith; leaving it, as the Church does at the present day, a matter of opinion, which, if no one can positively affirm, it would be exceedingly presumptuous for any one to deny.

"Could St. Jerome be a believer in the doctrine of Purgatory, while he penned the following consolatory words to Marcella on the death of Lea. 'Instead of

her short trouble, she is already in the enjoyment of eternal blessedness!'"—p. 379.

Certainly he might; for it is not the doctrine of the Church that all must suffer in Purgatory. Martyrs, and they who in this life have suffered the "short trouble," alluded to by St. Jerome, pass from this mortal state to the "enjoyment of eternal blessedness."

"Chrysostom, in his second homily on Lazarus says—'When we shall be departed out of this life, there is no room for repentance; nor will it be in our power to wash out any spots we have contracted, or to purge away any one of the evils we have committed.'"—p. 397. Therefore, concludes Mr. Jenkins, St. Chrysostom did not believe in Purgatory."

Here again we have to complain of Mr. Jenkins' impudent falsification of the text of the author quoted. The passage marked in Italics is not to be found in St. Chrysostom, whose words literally translated are:—

"But when once we shall have departed hence, there is to us no place to repent, or wash away crimes committed."

Which is the very doctrine of the Catholic Church at the present day. After death, there is no place for repentance; neither can he, who in this life has neglected to wash away his crimes, committed after Baptism, in the Sacrament of Penance, wash them out in Purgatory. Betwixt St. Chrysostom, and the Council of Trent, there is no discrepancy whatever. Again, Mr. Jenkins is unfortunate; even his falsification of St. Chrysostom, even his impudent trick of putting words into the Saint's mouth, which he never uttered, will not serve his turn.

But both St. Cyprian, and St. Chrysostom condemn immoderate grief for the dead in Christ; for whom we should rejoice, as called to a place of rest and shelter from the storms of life. Yes; but it does not follow that, because called to that calm haven, all so called have already entered therein; though, that ultimately such shall be their lot, is certain. And if St. Chrysostom discourages inordinate grief for the departed, it is because the tears, and mourning of the living help them not. "Weep for them," says St. Chrysostom—*Hom. in Joannem*, 51, al. 52—"but moderately, modestly, and with the fear of God." But weeping the departed is not enough, he adds within a few lines; for the tears of the living profit not the dead. "Rather," says St. Chrysostom—"are those things to be performed which can profit the departed—such as alms-giving, and the oblations—*elemosynas kai prophanas*." And again, in his 41st Homily on 1. Cor., the same advice against immoderate, and useless tears is given. "Let us have resource, not to tears, but to prayers, supplications, alms-giving, and the oblations. For, not in vain, nor rashly, do we make commemoration, in the Divine Mysteries, of the departed; approaching, and invoking for them the Lamb set forth to take away the sins of the world; but that they (the departed) may thereby receive consolation, *paranuthia*." And he adds—"These things are done by appointment of the Holy Ghost."

We have now passed in review those passages from the Fathers, on which our author bases his Protest against the doctrine of the Catholic Church, that there is a Purgatory—or state after death intermediate betwixt heaven and hell—in which the souls of the faithful departed may be assisted—or "receive consolation," as St. Chrysostom has it—by the prayers, almsdeeds, and good works of the living; but, above all, by the Holy and Tremendous Sacrifice of the Mass. We have been compelled to do so at some length; and our only excuse for our prolixity is—that even a Jenkins can start more objections, and ask more questions, in an hour, than either a St. Augustine, or a St. Chrysostom, could solve, or answer in a year.

The Almoner of the Irish poor begs gratefully to acknowledge the handsome sum of £50 2s 6d., presented by the "Young Men's St. Patrick's Association," for the orphans of the St. Patrick's Asylum, being the net proceeds of their Annual Soiree.

We have been requested to mention that the hours of attendance of the medical staff at St. Patrick's Hospital, are from 9, a.m., to 10 a.m.

We are happy to learn from the *Catholic Mirror* that the majority of the intelligent and honorable minded Non-Catholics of Baltimore, are by no means in favor of the petition, set on foot by some of their Protestant brethren, praying for legislative action against the Convents. The *Mirror* adds that such a petition would not be received by the Maryland Legislature, with any degree of respect.

The Cincinnati Grand Jury have refused to find a Bill against the Police, who, by their courage, saved the life of Mgr. Bedini from a savage band of Protestant cut-throats.

ST. PATRICK'S SOCIETY.—At the last meeting of the St. Patrick's Society, the large sum of £30 was paid into the funds, besides £12 10s, subscribed and paid, as a gift to the Ladies Benevolent Society, in connection with the Catholic Church. Thirty new members were enrolled; the Society decided upon procuring a new silk banner—"The Sun Burst." The Society is now in a most prosperous condition. It numbers over 500 members, and expects an addition of 200 before St. Patrick's Day. On that day there will be a splendid turn out. It is yet undecided whether the evening will be celebrated by a dinner or a grand St. Patrick's Ball.—*Kingslon Herald*.

Acknowledgments in our next; also book notices.

#### Married.

In this city, on the 20th inst., at the French Cathedral, by the Rev. Mr. Connolly, Mr. John Anderson Burn, to Miss Mary Henry, both of this city.