

From the Catholic Telegraph.

Hebrews Fifth Chapter First Verse, Examined.

Ques. What is the obvious, and rational meaning of these words: "For every high priest taken from among men is appointed for men in the things that appertain to God; that he may offer up gifts and sacrifices for sins?"

Ans. The meaning is that in the church of the New Testament, as well as in that of the old, there are priestly functions, the principal of which are the offering up of the august sacrifice of the body and blood of the Lord Jesus, and the remitting and retaining of sins.

Q. But are we certain, that the term "high-priest" can be applied to any among these who are called Priests in the New Testament?

A. We are infallibly certain that it can. 1st. From the sacred author of the Epistle to the Hebrews—who compares the New Testament, Altar, and Sacrifice; and Communicants, with those of the Old Testament. "We (the Christians) have an Altar (a place for sacrifice) whereof they (the Jews) have no power to eat (of the sacrifice) who serve the Tabernacle." Heb. xiii. 10. Let the one text be compared, and there will be no ambiguity. 2nd. From the fact of the Blessed Redeemer constituting, or ordaining, his twelve Apostles, high-priests, or priests, at the Eucharistic Supper, when He gave them power to consecrate the adorable sacrament of the Eucharist. His words are "Do this." We know what Christ did; he offered for us his body and his blood in sacrifice, and told his Apostles to do the same—"do this." Luke xxii. 19. 3rd. From the case of St. Paul elevating to the Priesthood his disciple Timothy: "Neglect not the grace, that is in thee, which was given thee by prophecy, with the imposition of the hands of the Priesthood." 1 Tim. iv. 14: "Impose not hands lightly upon any man." "Against a Priest receive &c." Let the Priests that rule well." Ibid. 22, 19, 17 verses. "Stir up the grace of God, which is in thee by the imposition of my hands." 2 Tim. i. 6. In these sacred passages we have all the requisites for a sacrament: the sensible sign—the imposition of hands; the giving of grace—"the grace which is in thee by the imposition of my hands;" and divine institution—for grace is infallibly given, but none can give grace, or annex grace, to any sensible sign but God alone. 4th.—Does not the adorable sacrifice of Christ's body and blood demand a distinct Priesthood in a higher degree than did the victims of the Mosiac Dispensation? Are the body and blood of the Lord common things?

Q. But as there is no word in the Greek Testament to designate a sacrificing Priest, how can we believe that any body of men are ordained for the work of sacrifice?

A. The assertion that the word *ireus* is not applied to the New Testament Priests, is too often urged against us without our contradicting it. The assertion is emphatically false. The word "*archieus*" is applied by St. Paul to those Priests

who are "to offer up sacrifices"—to minister at "that Altar where they have no power to eat, who serve the Tabernacle." Here we have the word "*iereus*" and we have more; for we have the compound and grand word, "*archieus*." 2nd. In the Apocalypse v, 10, we find the word "*iereus*" applied to the four and twenty ancients, who were redeemed in the blood of the Lamb, and who were therefore Saints of the New Testament. Now if the word "*iereus*" in the plural number be applied to twenty-four who have not lost their sacerdotal character in heaven, to how many more may it not be applied? 3d. Though the words were not used in the Greek, yet it would be illogical to infer that there is no order of sacrificing Priests in the New Testament. When we find our Saviour offering up his body and blood, and commanding his Apostles to do the same thing—"Do This"—we are as certain, that we have such an order of men for offering sacrifice, as we are that Jesus can do what he says, that Christ is in the flesh, that we have the body and blood of our Redeemer in the Eucharist. 4th. All ages, all times, all places, all people, and all heresies, and schisms, declare, that from the days of Christ up to the Apostacy of the 12th century, there is such an order. 5th. The idea of a religion without the idea of a sacrificing Priesthood is an absurdity, or an abortion. 6th. Look to the splendid temples of every nation in the universe, look to their massive and grand Altars, look to the splendor of the pontifical robes, look to the silver and golden censers, and ask why were all these things consecrated! And all things in the Christian universe, whether animate or inanimate, living or dead, will proclaim, these, all these, were ordained for the Victim, and the sacrificing Priests! 7th. How could the blessed Jesus allow his body and blood to be handled indiscriminately by all? 8th. The idea of men being set apart for mere talk, singing Psalms, and distributing a piece of bread, and a cup of wine, in that Church which is the sum, the splendor, the beautiful ideal of all the ancient types, of the desires of the holy of all ages, is shocking!! Where, Oh! Where is the reality in the camps of heresy of all the noble figures of the Israel of Jehovah!

Q. But do we not find the words, "ancient," "elder," "presbyter" "ruler" frequently applied to the New Testament Priests? But none of all these words designate a sacrificing Priest!

A. In the version of King James' Bible we do find those words frequently used. but they are not so found in the Douay Version. What hinders a sacrificing Priest to be both an "ancient,"—and an "elder"—and a "presbyter"—and a "ruler." Is his office incompatible with the ideas conveyed with, or in, or by those words? Verily not. Why have Protestants either falsified, or rendered ambiguous, the holy Books by running to the mere etymology of a word in order to destroy its ecclesiastical, and Theological, meaning? Ask the scholar is the mere radical, or etymological meaning, of a word the key to its ecclesiastical

meaning, and he will be surprised at your ignorance. What has the primary meaning of the word martyr to do with its ecclesiastical meaning? True, in the sense of our church, it carries with it a remnant of its original acception, but it has been used in a wider, and nobler sense. The Psalmist, and Christ, have said "ye are Gods." Now, if you argue from the etymology of the word God how many *Eternals* will you have!—How often is the word *Christ*, or anointed, applied to others, as well as, to Christ our Lord, in the scriptures, and would it, therefore, be logical to infer that all who are thus denominated, are equal in every thing? It is painful to have to deal with such sophistry. But when did heresy blush? It is not from any one single word, or from any garbled portion, of the word of God, that a Catholic reasons. He reasons from the *universal whole*; and from the living, infallible and authoritative voice of that tribunal, that expounds *the whole*. The thousand shames on the sophist of etymology! on him that garbles to please a mob! If no man can be a Priest but an ancient—an elder—what are Protestants doing with so many juvenile dandies, so many nice young men, as they have put into their pulpits? "Jam satis est." "*Claudite jam rivos, pueri.*" "*O pueri! fugite hinc.*"

Q. But as no man is now "called by God," as the "high-priest" Aaron was, can we have any sacrificing Priests?

A. Every high-priest, that succeeded Aaron up to Annas and Caiphas, was no less divinely, authoritatively, and legitimately, called by the order of God than Aaron himself. Can any Jew deny this? Can any Christian affirm the contrary? Aaron was not ordained by God for the office of sovereign Pontiff, but was ordained by Moses. Aaron ordained his successor, and this successor was called in the ordinary way, as Aaron was. The mission of Moses was extraordinary.—The ordination of Aaron was ordinary. The ordination of the Apostles was extraordinary. The ordination of Timothy, Titus, Mathias, Clement, the seven Bishops of the churches of Asia, and other Bishops, and Priests, of the Apostolic days, was ordinary. God the Father elevated Moses to the Priesthood, God the Son elevated the Apostles. The Bishops who are now living in the church of the New Testament can show as good a title for their episcopal order, mission and jurisdiction, as being received from God, as could any of the Pontiffs of Aaron's successors. As every Pontiff who succeeded Aaron "was called by God, so has every Bishop who has succeeded the Apostles, been called by God." Deny the former, and you destroy the Old Testament Covenant when in all its glory; deny the latter, and you annihilate the grand scheme of Christianity. Blaspheme against the hierarchy of the New Testament, and you blaspheme against the Old.

Q. Does not the Epistle to the Hebrews declare that there is but one High Priest? that there is an absolute abrogation of

every Priesthood except that of the Blessed Redeemer?

A. The Epistle does declare that Christ, as the "sovereign, eternal, and unchangeable" High-Priest can have no successor vested with sovereignty, eternity, and immutability. The successors of Aaron were equal to himself in order, authority and jurisdiction. The Priests of the New Testament cannot succeed Christ in such a way. They represent the Priesthood of Christ. Their ordination, jurisdiction, are derived from, and dependent on, our sovereign High-Priest Christ Jesus. Our Priests are the visible, and instrumental, yet divinely consecrated, and duly authorized, ministers of the sacrifice of the New Law, but Christ himself is the invisible, Principal, and Eternal, Priest of the Sacrifice. The key to the sophism is easily found.

P. McL.

The Bible in Public Schools.

From the First number of the Quarterly Review of the American Protestant Association.

A pamphlet of 16 pages, with the above title, has, we are informed, been distributed in the Public Schools of this city to all the Teachers. Whether it was published at the expense of the Protestant Association, or from the School Funds, we know not, but the fact of its public distribution marks so strongly the sectarian and anti-Catholic character, which is attempted to be given to the Schools, that it cannot be mistaken. Who distributed the pamphlet we know not. If the School Directors connived at it, which we are unwilling to believe, the public must feel that they have betrayed their trust. The Schools should be free from the polluting breath of sectarian animosity. The Teachers are bound by law to respect the religious predilections of the parents of the children. But henceforth the Schools are to be the battle ground on which the Protestant Association will struggle against the rights of conscience. The Teachers and their pupils must be taught on the authority of *Jewish Rab-bies*, to prize the Protestant version of the Bible; they must see how vain are the scruples which Bishop Kenrick would excite as to common prayers; and hymns and devotional exercises, to suit all creeds and tastes, but the sincere and enlightened Catholic. These are to be the topics, if not of public instruction, at least of private and frequent discussion.

Let the controllers of the Public Schools look to it in time; let Catholic parents, and Catholic Teachers look to it, let all citizens who value liberty of conscience, liberty of education, and the peace and charities of social life, look to it; let the friends of common schools look to it. If the fountains of public instruction be poisoned, if sectarian bigotry be allowed to bias the minds of the rising generation, it is vain to talk of rights of conscience, and of liberty. The Protestant Association will take charge of our youth, and provide them with a Bible, hymns and prayers, according to their judgment, and we shall have been prepared for the bless-