

picture of the manner in which the feudal chieftains robbed one another, and then recklessly "set fire to the cottage of the poor laborer." And Gregory VII, in many of his epistles, weeps over the murders and confusion of his time, calling it appropriately "THE AGE OF IRON."

In this distracted condition of things, only one power was universally acknowledged and respected—that of the Church, and of its visible head, the sovereign pontiff. And we are not to be surprised at seeing princes often invoking this power whenever they got into difficulties with their subjects, or with one another. Nor was this always a mere mark of respect to the holy see—it was oftener a prudential measure for their own security. When by taking the oath of fealty to the pope, they became the feudal subjects of the holy see, they had a right to expect from it protection against foreign invasion of their kingdom or domestic usurpation of their throne. Thus, in return for a fealty, which included chiefly spiritual obedience to the Pope, with a very small annual offering to the papal treasury, they often received from the holy see the most substantial favors.—Any one who recklessly invaded a state thus placed under the "protection of St. Peter," after having been admonished to desist, incurred, if he persisted, the sentence of excommunication.

Such being the case, we are not astonished that kings and princes in those troubled times often placed their crowns at the pontiff's feet. Thus Demetrius, king of Russia, sent his son all the way to Rome to implore Pope Gregory VII, to receive his kingdom as a fief of the holy see; and Gregory in his answer, seems to grant his request with some reluctance, and requires of him what was usually required in such cases, that he should promise to assist his liege sovereign, (the holy see) "in all things just." Many kings in dying left their kingdoms under the protection of the Pope; & whenever a powerful baron or neighboring prince sought to violate this testamentary disposition, to the prejudice of the infant heir, the Pope interposed, as in the case of Vezelin, who attempted to usurp the throne of Dalmatia. Thus also Henry III, left his infant son Henry IV, under the guardianship of his widow, the empress Agnes, and of Pope Victor II.

It is not necessary to multiply facts to prove that one great feature of medieval jurisprudence was the express or tacit acknowledgment of a kind of universal protectorate in the Roman Pontiff. We find even the fierce Robert Guiscard bowing down and taking the oath of fealty to the holy see. It is proper however to observe here, once for all, that the oath of feudal vassalage did not imply unlimited obedience—much less did it enforce a slavish submission in all things to the will of the liege lord. Feudal allegiance was very different from that of modern times. The former was peculiar to the middle age, and its duties were few and clearly marked, requiring at the same time as a condition *sine qua non*, the compliance with certain correlative duties on the part of him to whom the oath was taken.

(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 19, 1843.

The following pretended *Jesuit's Oath*, copied into that foul amalgama of rank fanaticism, the so-called *Christian Guardian*, of the 12th instant, is one of the most barefaced forgeries ventured upon the ignorant and uninformed credulity of the Protestant public, by a set of remorseless villains—the hired scribes of the Lying Spirit Catholics all know, that according to the immutable doctrines of their church, such an oath would subject any one who should take it to excommunication *ipso facto*; and leave him thus doomed to eternal damnation, unless he truly repented and retracted the hideous anti-Christian and unprincipled engagement.

But this is all a Protestant fiction, like the diabolically invented *Secreta Monita*, and more recent Maria Monk's edifying legend; all got up by a set of shameless impostors to scare their ignorant and unenquiring dupes from ever listening to those capable of undeceiving them. This is the chief weapon yielded by the interested enemies of Catholicity: by whom, as St. Peter says, *the way of truth shall be evil spoken of*.—2nd Peter, ii. 2. This is the last shift which the agents of the *Father of Lies* have recourse to, in order to secure his bite, of which the growing spirit of enquiry and enlightenment is threatening to deprive them soon.

We would ask the Editor of his *Christian Guardian*, who receives our numbers in exchange, whether or not he has seen in our pages, that *all secret oaths*—and consequently such a secret oath as the pretended one of the Jesuits—are, and ever have been prohibited in the Catholic church, under pain of excommunication?

From the *Christian Guardian*.

Jesuit's Oath.—A correspondent of the *Western Christian Advocate* furnishes the editor of it with the subjoined copy of the secret *Oath* by which the Jesuits bind themselves to the Roman Pontiff; and as a number of such men have, not long since, found their way to Canada, and are about to establish themselves, it will not be unwise for us to publish the oath, that the Colonists may be aware of its mischievous and dangerous character.—We have no fear of truth—her triumphs will be multiplied; but her votaries are to act wisely and firmly.

Oath.—In presence of Almighty God, and of all the saints, to my ghostly father I do declare that his Holiness the Pope is Christ's vicar-general, and the only head of the universal church throughout the earth; and that, by virtue of the keys given him by my Saviour Jesus Christ, he hath power to depose heretical kings, princes, states, commonwealths, and governments; all being illegal without his

sacred confirmation; and that they may safely be destroyed. Therefore, and to the utmost of my power, I shall and will defend this doctrine, and will defend his Holiness' rights and his customs against all usurpers. I do renounce and disown any allegiance as due to any heretical (i. e. Protestant) king, prince, state, named Protestant, or obedience to their inferior magistrates or officers. I do further promise and declare, that though I am dispensed with to assume any religion heretical for the promotion of the mother church's interest, to keep secret and private all her agent's counsels, &c.; all which I, A. B. do swear by the blessed Trinity, and the blessed sacrament, which I am now about to receive. And I call the heavenly and glorious hosts above to witness these my real intentions to keep this oath; in testimony hereof I take this most blessed sacrament of the eucharist, and set to my hand and seal.

We beg to acknowledge the receipt of two copies of the *U. S. Catholic Magazine* for March. The following are the contents:

- I.—Sketch of the Life of St. Thomas of Canterbury, by W. G. Lead, L. L. D. (Original)
- II.—Poetry.—Virtue and Vice.—Eternity.
- III.—The Episcopalian Church a modern sect.
- IV.—The priesthood in the Church, No. 3 (Original).
- V.—Ceremonies of Holy Week at Rome, No. 3.
- VI.—Catholic Melodies, No. 3. Intelligence. Notices of Books, &c.

"Parker's Consecration again" in our next.

EUCCHARIST.

The difficulties which the mystery of the Eucharist presents to a Protestant mind are set forth, and met by the *British Critic* in a manner to satisfy us that the writer holds the Catholic faith on this subject to the extent of the Tridentine definition.—*Catholic Herald*.

Mr. Goode will himself give us some assistance in our present task; though the reflections, to which the considerations now about to be adduced lead the mind, are of a very melancholy nature. He considers himself justified on the ground of Scripture evidence in rejecting the Catholic doctrine on the Eucharist. His own opinions he thus expresses, and we commend them to the consideration of those who may be inclined to regard him as a serviceable auxiliary against the extravagances of the "Tractators," but as orthodox on main points of doctrine.

"The flesh and blood of Christ offered on the Cross become life to the soul when we rest upon them by faith as the foundation of our hopes before God. . . . He who by faith eats the flesh and drinks the blood of Christ [possesses] spiritual life; but at the same time 'there may be such eating and drinking by faith only without the external symbols;' though 'doubtless the effectual operation of this spiritual food upon the soul may be more especially looked for [his italics] in the celebration of

that sacramental rite which is an ordinance of Christ's own appointment for the faithful, and thankful commemoration of His death." (vol. ii. p. 244—246.)

In what respect this differs from plain Zuinglianism we are at a loss to conceive. And now in the very outset of his Scripture discussion he shows the extravagant unreality and impracticability of his whole professed principle. "The inquirer," he says "staggered as he must naturally be with the notion," &c. Why, let us ask, will he be staggered? Because he has been educated in disbelief of it; the prejudices of his education must be admitted, Mr. Goode cannot avoid it, in determining his interpretation of Scripture. On the other hand the believer in the sacred truth which Mr. Goode impugns finds every day a deeper harmony between it and scripture. The whole Scriptural idea, e. g. of the union of Saints with Christ and with each other, acquires an awful reality through the consideration of the Eucharistic Presence, which will make all the Protestant attempts to prove that such is really not the Scripture doctrine fall powerless upon the ear. Such arguments as this, however, Mr. Goode from his system is obliged wholly to discard, and would urge the importance of divesting one's self of antecedent prejudices, and regarding the question as a mere matter of external evidence. How then, upon Mr. Goode's principles, how is it that an "inquirer will be staggered," at being told of Christ present in the sacrament, and not be startled also at hearing of "God manifest in the flesh?" The idea that to a Christian believing all the astounding mysteries which are contained in the doctrine of the Incarnation, the further belief in the Real Presence, even to the extent of the Tridentine definition, is a serious additional "tax on his credulity" is not tenable for a moment. It could not, indeed, ever have prevailed, but for the fact that we are educated to believe the one and disbelieve the other, and, moreover, that it is so little the habit of the present generation to realize by meditation the fulness of those truths which they profess to hold. But let any one try to imagine himself not to have imbibed the former doctrine in his whole education; nay, more, to have been habituated from infancy to hear it associated with those harsh and contemptuous expressions, those impassioned exhibitions of its apparent contradiction in terms, those comparisons from profane and carnal images, with which we are unhappily so familiar on the subject of the Real Presence; and then let him set himself seriously to consider all that involves of mystery and apparent contradiction, when we think, e. g. of our Lord's infancy and "growth in wisdom," and many other particulars which might be mentioned; he may then form some notion, though probably but a faint one, of the indefinite *a priori* improbability which an unbeliever would perceive in the sacred doctrine in question. What then would be the result in the case of this imaginary person, with this sense of its utter strangeness and apparent childishness vividly before his mind, should those texts be put before him as plainly teaching it, which