

REMITTANCES TO
ENGLAND, IRELAND, SCOTLAND AND WALES.

DRAFTS from £1 upwards, payable at sight, free of charge, at the Bank of Ireland, Dublin, and all its branches; Messrs. Glynn, Mills & Co., Bankers, Lombard-street, London; the National Bank of Scotland, Glasgow; Messrs. Bowman, Grinnell & Co., Liverpool.

HENRY CHAPMAN & Co.,
St. Sacramento Street.

Montreal, March 1853.

THE TRUE WITNESS AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

PUBLISHED EVERY FRIDAY AFTERNOON,
At the Office, No. 4, Place d'Armes.

TERMS:

To Town Subscribers. . . . \$3 per annum.
To Country do. . . . \$2½ do.
Payable Half-Yearly in Advance.

THE TRUE WITNESS
AND
CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, NOV. 18, 1853.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

From the further prorogation of Parliament, and a slight upward tendency in the Funds, it may be presumed that hopes are still entertained of effecting an amicable arrangement betwixt Russia and Turkey. From the seat of war, the intelligence is scanty; but it may be gathered that the Turks have taken the initiative—that the heads of their columns have crossed the Danube—and that, in the trilling collisions which have occurred, the Russians have met with reverses; hereupon an armistice, for an indefinite period, has been proclaimed, and negotiations recommenced. With this view, the Austrian Envoy has submitted to the Sultan, the draft of a Note, the terms of which, it is said, had previously been accepted by the Czar, and which, it is hoped, may yet prevent matters proceeding to extremities. According to other accounts, however, little or no reliance can be placed upon the fact of the armistice; it being, in all probability, a ruse on the part of the Russian Commander-in-Chief, in order to gain time, in order to receive the reinforcements that were on the march to meet him. It is well known that the Russian invading army is in a very wretched condition. Its hospitals are crammed; dysentery and fever prevail to an alarming extent; and the "morale" of the troops is not much better. Under these circumstances, it is in no condition to cope with the masses which Turkey is prepared to thrust across the Danube; and it is therefore the interest of the Russian general to avoid a collision, and if possible, postpone active operations until the spring of next year, by which time the forces under his command will have been considerably augmented. As matters stand at present, the Turks have decidedly the best of it; and their unaccountable cessation of hostilities has given rise to some strange surmises, not very flattering to British integrity, or calculated to increase the popularity of a distinguished personage, nearest to the throne. It is whispered that Lord Redcliffe has been instructed to recommend this armistice, in order to give the Russians what they mostly want—time; and that, as the policy of Great Britain is to avoid war at any price, the latter Power, is by no means desirous of seeing the Turks gain any decided advantage over the forces of the Czar—that, on the contrary, the defeat of the latter would be very acceptable, as the British Government would then have it in its power to compel the Sultan to accept such terms as Russia might be pleased to dictate. It is rumored also, that Prince Albert, whose Russian predilections are no secret, exercises a very powerful influence over the decisions of the Cabinet of St. James; and that to that influence must be attributed the timid, vacillating policy of the Aberdeen ministry, and its unwillingness to come to an open rupture with the Russian Emperor, even for the sake of protecting its ally from destruction, and the vindication of the national faith. It is significant that the *Times* inserts a communication protesting against the proposition to erect a statue to Prince Albert, by means of a general subscription.

The difficulties betwixt employers and operatives still continue in England; and threaten results seriously affecting the tranquillity, and commercial prosperity, of the Empire. At Wigan, the masters having declared their determination to close their works permanently, unless, within a fortnight, the workmen should return to their work, and at their former rate of wages—the miners became desperate. Having collected in force, they proceeded to smash, pillage, and set fire to, the dwellings of the employers; the police were inadequate to resist the storm; and it was not until the military had been called out, that the rioters were dispersed, and peace restored. Much valuable property has been destroyed, and in an affray with the colliers, blood has been shed. Further outbreaks were apprehended, and an additional military force had been despatched from Manchester to the scene of disturbances.

The Dublin Exhibition was closed on Monday, the 31st ult., by His Excellency the Lord Lieutenant, who, amidst the loud and hearty cheers of the assembled multitude, conferred the honor of knighthood upon Sir Cusack Patrick Rooney. With three cheers for Mr. Dargan, the ceremony concluded. The Committee of Management have refunded to the latter gentleman the sum of £40,000, which he had advanced for the undertaking.

From Australia, we have news up to the 20th of August. From the *Catholic Tribune*, of Melbourne of that date, we learn that fresh discoveries of gold had been made on the Goulburn river, some 30 miles from what are known as the MacIvor "digging." "The accounts are of the most glowing description;" gold is described as being in large quan-

ties, and very easy of access, it being scarcely necessary to dig to a greater depth than three or four feet. This new discovery has given a great impetus to trade; provisions of all kinds are high, and the rates of wages are well sustained.

By the arrival of the *Arabia*, we learn that hostilities have recommenced in the Principalities. Flour has declined from 1s to 1s 6d.

IRISH CATHOLICS OF QUEBEC.

We have received from a friend at Quebec a statement of the sums collected in the St. Patrick's Church of that city, within the last two months.

On the 10th of September, the collection for the Rev. Mr. Moore, of Holy Cross, Massachusetts, amounted to	£60 0
On the 2nd of October, a collection in aid of the Rt. Rev. Dr. Rapp, Bishop of Cleveland, was taken up, amounting to	90 0
On the 6th of November, the sum collected for the relief of the Irish poor of Quebec was	60 0
And again, on Sunday last, the 13th inst., the Rev. Father Dominic received the sum of	73 10
	£283 10

In addition to these contributions—the greater part of which have been devoted to the support of Catholic charities and Catholic institutions, in the United States—the Irish of Quebec have contributed liberally towards the building of a new presbytery for their own clergy, and the support of their own poor. Indeed, we may say that scarce a week passes but what the Irish Catholics of Quebec and Montreal are called upon for their subscriptions for some religious or charitable purpose; and, no matter how often they may occur, never are these appeals made in vain. If it be the last dollar he has in the world, the Irish Papist will not withhold it, if the interests of his religion, or the cry of the poor, demand it of him. Verily he shall have his reward, for God loveth the cheerful giver.

The total amount of the collections taken up in St. Patrick's Church, Quebec, during the past year, comes to—One Thousand, Eight Hundred, and Twenty-Six pounds.

The quarrel, that has so long scandalised the Faithful of the Diocese of Buffalo, has become more embittered than ever; a reconciliation, or rather the dutiful submission of the refractory, seems almost hopeless; and, from the final answer of Mgr. Bedini, we may expect shortly to hear the sentence of excommunication pronounced by the Church against her unworthy, and degenerate, children. The facts of the case are shortly these:

In 1829, M. L. le Coultreux, gave, to the Bishop of Buffalo, and his successors for ever, a piece of land, subject to the conditions that it should be devoted to the erection of a Catholic Church, and the establishment of a cemetery. The right therefore of the Bishop of Buffalo to the property in dispute is incontestable.

In 1838, the Legislature of Albany passed a law incorporating the members of the Church thus built, and conveying to them the right to administer its revenues. Thus setting aside the intentions of the donor, clearly expressed in his deed of gift, made ten years previous to the act of the Legislature at Albany.

Mgr. Timon refused to acknowledge the right of the laity of his Church to deprive him of the right of administering the property which he held, in virtue of M. Coultreux's donation; but he consented to the appointment of a committee, chosen from amongst the congregation, to administer the revenues accruing from the said property. To this reasonable concession the demagogic portion, unfortunately the majority, of the congregation refused to accede, but threw themselves on their pretended rights derived from their Act of Incorporation.

To heal the consequent disputes, the Papal Nuncio lately visited Buffalo, heard, and thoroughly investigated the claims of both parties, and finally gave his decision in favor of the Bishop. To this decision, the congregation has refused to submit: and as it is certain that the Church will, on her side, never submit to the dishonest claims of her undutiful children, it is likely, that, unless they soon change their course, the latter will be cut off from the communion of the Faithful.

From the above statement it is very easy to perceive on which side is justice. On the one hand, the Bishop, not only in virtue of his office, and the laws of the Church, but in virtue of the donation made to him by M. Coultreux, claim the right of administering the revenues of his church: the laity, in virtue of an Act of the Legislature, claims the right of taking possession of the Bishop's property; their conduct is therefore, as opposed to every principle of justice, as it is eminently Anti-Catholic. If Mons. Coultreux had the right to do with his own, what he thought fit, then is the property in dispute the property of the Bishop of Buffalo, to the exclusion of all other pretenders: in spite of all the Acts of Incorporation that may ever be passed.

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

We have shown, from the ancient liturgies, and from the writings of the early Doctors of the Church, that the "OLD RELIGION" had a true and proper Sacrifice—though "unbloody"—to offer; and, from the fact that the altars, whereon this Sacrifice were offered, were material, or sensible, altars, we concluded that the Sacrifice thereon offered was also a sensible, and material Sacrifice—as distinguished from the figurative sacrifices, which Mr. Jenkins, and his fellow-worshippers, offer up on their figurative altars. We have still to notice the objections against the Catho-

lic doctrine of the Mass—a true and proper Sacrifice—based upon the assumed absurdity of the doctrine of the Real Presence, or Transubstantiation—which, most certainly, the doctrine of the "Mass, a Sacrifice," implies.

"They" (the Protestants) "protest against the doctrine of Transubstantiation"—p. 135.

1. "On the authority of the Word of God"—p. 141.
2. "On the authority of the Fathers, who support the Protestant disclaimer"—p. 154.
3. "Because of the differences of Roman Catholics themselves respecting this doctrine"—p. 155.
4. "Because it is opposed to both reason and sense"—p. 158.

We propose to examine these four reasons, for protesting against the Catholic doctrine, separately; and, if we can show—that it is not contrary to the Word of God; or rather, that, without doing violence to language, and the *usus loquendi* of the sacred writers, that Word may be so understood as to favor the Catholic doctrine—that the Fathers do not support the Protestant disclaimer—that Roman Catholics do not differ amongst themselves as to the fact of Transubstantiation—and lastly, that it is not opposed to reason, or sense—we shall have the right to conclude that, Mr. Jenkins' arguments are of no force against the Mass, as a true and proper Sacrifice; and that the doctrine of Transubstantiation may, in spite of the Protestant disclaimer, and Mr. Jenkins' rhetoric, be the true doctrine, revealed by Christ to His Apostles. That it is true, forms no part of our thesis.

On the authority of the Word of God, Mr. Jenkins rightly concludes that Christ is in heaven; and assuming—on the authority of his very limited intelligence—that a body cannot be in more than one place, at the same moment of time, he concludes, that Christ cannot be on our Altars in the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. Mr. Jenkins also concludes—that, because some passages of Holy Writ must be understood figuratively, therefore, the words of Our Lord—in which He promised to give His *flesh* for food, and pronounced, that which appeared to be bread, to be His body—may also be understood figuratively—therefore must be understood figuratively; and that Catholics, who understand these words literally, must be in grievous error. We need hardly add that, betwixt Catholics and Protestants, there is no difference of opinion as to whether Christ be in heaven, or, as to whether certain passages of the Bible may be understood figuratively. The real points at issue are:—Is Christ in heaven, after such a manner that He cannot be present upon earth? Must the words of institution of the Eucharist be understood figuratively? Unless Mr. Jenkins can prove the affirmative to these two questions, his objections are naught; and the conclusions which he draws against Catholicity, are unfounded.

Mr. Jenkins lays great stress on the text—"The poor you have always with you; but me you have not always."—St. John xii. 8. "Did Christ mean that His bodily presence would be altogether removed from His disciples, or did He not? If he did, then would His doctrine be opposed *in toto* to the doctrine of Transubstantiation; if he did not, his words were vain and meaningless."—p. 143.

The conclusion by no means follows; for it might so have happened that Christ only meant to teach His hearers, that they would not have Him always with them after the manner—under the human form, visibly, and sensibly—in which He was present with them at the time He thus addressed them. We do not assert positively, but we are strongly inclined to believe, that this was His meaning, from another passage in Holy Writ, of which Mr. Jenkins takes no notice—"Behold I am with you all days, even to the consummation of the world."—St. Matthew xxviii. 20. Upon this passage, we might comment in the style of Mr. Jenkins—"Did Christ mean that He would be *really* present with His Church, or did He not? If he did, then would His declaration be easily reconciled with the doctrine of Transubstantiation; if He did not, His words were vain and meaningless."

But Mr. Jenkins will reply—"We admit Christ's Spiritual presence, but we deny His bodily presence; because His body is in heaven, and the same body cannot be in two places at the same moment of time. Indeed; and how know you that, Mr. Jenkins?—What do you know about bodies at all, or the properties of bodies, such as Christ's body? To assert, and to prove that such a body cannot be in two, or more, different places at the same moment of time, are two very different things; and we defy you to prove your assumed impossibility. Besides, if you could, it would be as fatal to Christ's Spiritual, as to His bodily presence; the same arguments which would prove the impossibility of the one, would establish the impossibility of the other."

The argument against the possibility of one, and the same, body being in two, or more, places at the same moment of time, is—that the unity of the body would be destroyed—that it would no longer be one, but two bodies. "*Ratio cur corpora non videantur posse esse in pluribus locis, non tam est moles, quam unitas.*" *Bellarmin, de Sac. Euch. l. iii. c. 3.* But, for a spirit to be present, in two, or more, places, at the same moment of time, would, if the above reasoning be correct, be equally destructive of its unity—and, therefore, if one body cannot be, in two or more places at once, then neither can a spirit.

That a body may be in a thousand different places at once, if God so wills it, is not contrary to reason, though it may be repugnant to the prejudices of the ignorant: the philosopher, however, finds nothing startling, or paradoxical in the proposition. Hear Leibnitz, the greatest philosopher of whom the Protestant world can boast:—

"So far from its being demonstrable, as some flippantly boast, that a body cannot be in many places at once, it may, on the contrary, be solidly proved, that

though the *natural* order of things requires that matter should be definitely circumscribed, yet no *absolute* necessity requires it."—*Syst. Theol.*

That the body of Christ is not subject to the ordinary, or what may be styled the natural—laws of matter, is evident from Holy Writ. Without injury to the perpetual virginity of His mother, He came into the world: and this, though an article of faith—"born of the Virgin Mary"—is no whit less repugnant, to what Mr. Jenkins calls reason, than that His body should be in heaven, and in ten thousand places upon earth, at the same moment of time."—p. 142. Contrary to all Mr. Jenkins' preconceived notions of matter, to "his reason, and sense," Christ rose from the tomb, where His body had lain, and with that body passed forth from the sepulchre, without disturbing the great stone wherewith its mouth was closed, and which the angel, after His resurrection "rolled back;" in order to give the women access to the spot "where the Lord was laid."—St. Mat. 28, c. Again, setting at defiance "the natural order of things," the real body of Christ, passed into the room where the eleven were gathered together, with the doors firmly shut for fear of the Jews. The disciples were frightened, supposing that it was a spirit, thus at once disposing of the arguments of Calvin, and Oecolampadius, who, finding this part of the sacred narrative "opposed to both reason and sense" and utterly subversive of all their preconceived notions of the laws of matter, tried to make it out that Jesus came in at a window—or down the chimney, perhaps—and that there was nothing mysterious, or supernatural, in the mode of His entrance at all. This wretched attempt to evade the force of the Catholic argument—that the body of Christ is not subject to, and cannot therefore be judged by, any of the ordinary or natural laws of matter—is at once rebutted by the effect of Christ's appearance in the midst of His chosen followers. They thought "that it was a spirit"—not simply because of the appearance of one whom they believed to be dead; for they all knew of their Lord's resurrection, and some of them had not only seen Him, but had "taken hold of His feet and worshipped Him."—St. Mat. 28 c. 9 r.—but because of the supernatural manner of His appearance—"when the doors were shut for fear of the Jews"—St. John, xx. c. 19 v. Bearing then all these facts in mind—knowing from Holy Writ, that the body of Christ is not subject to what we, with our limited faculties, call the "laws of matter"—we can see no valid reason for denying the possibility of that body being in more than one place at the same moment of time; and if we once admit that possibility, Mr. Jenkins' argument, which is based solely upon the assumption of the impossibility of Christ's body being, at the same moment of time, in heaven, and upon our altars, falls to the ground.

This answer applies to all the texts which our author cites relative to Christ's Ascension, and reception in heaven "until the times of the restitution of all things." To the theories, and vague assumptions of the Protestant objector, we oppose facts. Christ—though since His Ascension, He has never left heaven—has appeared in His bodily presence upon earth—He appeared to St. Paul, as we read in the Acts of the Apostles; and in such a manner as to constitute that Apostle as competent an eye-witness to the truth of the resurrection of His body, as were St. Peter, and the other Apostles, with whom our Lord conversed during the forty days intervening betwixt His resurrection, and Ascension into Heaven. We conclude, therefore, that—after His reception into Heaven, Christ, without ceasing to be in heaven, was also bodily present upon earth—or else St. Paul could not have been a competent witness to the truth of the resurrection of Christ's body—and that, therefore, the body of Christ is not so in heaven, that it cannot, also, at the same time, be upon earth.

There is also recorded in Holy Writ, another instance, which should teach us to be very careful how we attempt to limit the Divine power; or to pronounce it absurd to admit the possibility of a body being in two, or more, places at once. We allude to the miracle recorded in St. Matt. xiv. c.; where our Lord is represented as feeding, with five loaves and two small fishes, five thousand men, besides women and children, who all eat and were filled; and yet, of the fragments of these identical five loaves, and two small fishes, there were gathered up, after the repast, twelve baskets full; more in bulk, than there was in the beginning, ere, upwards of five thousand persons had eaten their fill. If we can admit the truth of this miracle, it does indeed seem a miracle of inconsistent scepticism to hesitate at admitting that a body may be in two, or more, places at once—and that millions, and tens of millions may receive that body—a whole Christ—in the Eucharist; and yet that that body of Christ be not consumed, or diminished; all of which is, nevertheless, "opposed to both reason and sense."

Mr. Jenkins next finds a very strong disclaimer against the doctrine of the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist, in the language of St. Paul—

"For as often as you shall eat this bread, and drink this chalice, you shall show the death of the Lord until He come."—1 Cor., xi. 26.

If, by the "coming" of the Lord, may be understood His second manifestation in great glory to judge the world—and it thus that most commentators understand the "coming" of Christ—the passage would mean that, by the celebration of the Lord's Supper, Christians show, or commemorate, His death "until He appear" to judge the quick and the dead; in which we can find nothing repugnant to the Catholic doctrine that He is, in the mean while, really and truly present with us on our altars, in the Sacrifice of the Mass. Besides, when Catholics affirm Transubstantiation, they do not affirm a "coming" of Christ—or a local change, from place to place; but a change, from the substance of bread and wine, to the substance of Christ's body. This by no means