

tholicity—or, in admitting that there is an “external authority” in matters of religion, and that that “external authority” is the ever living, ever present, and ever speaking, Catholic Church. Reject this authority, and every man capable of reasoning must reject all external authority—an act of Protestantism which, if consistently carried out, leaves its followers the victims of that “subtle unbelief”—which, according to the author of the work under review, is the principal peril that menaces religion in England, and which, sapping the religion of the people, will—if not checked, by and by, give the Romish bishops a better title to be called bishops *in partibus infidelium* than has always been the case”—or than most Protestant writers are willing to admit.

But infidelity, or full blown Protestantism, is not the only danger which menaces the Evangelical Zion. Simultaneously with the movement towards infidelity, or ultra-Protestantism, there is going on a movement in the opposite direction—towards Rome, or Catholicity. Upon both these movements, the author of the “Eclipse of Faith,” looks with equal aversion, combating one with arms purloined from the Papal armoury, and endeavoring to arrest the progress of the other, with the legitimate weapons of Protestantism, forged in the arsenal of Voltaire, Tom Paine, and the other champions of Denial. Upon this inconsistency the *Reviewer* pounces, and takes occasion to show how every intelligent Protestant is under the necessity of taking part with one, or the other, of these movements, and, of progressing towards infidelity, or falling back upon Rome; to the active and enquiring, it is impossible to remain where they are. It is between these two classes of Protestants—the infidelising and the Romanising—that the battle will have to be fought. The intermediate classes are, intellectually, too contemptible to be taken into account.

A notice of M. Garneau's History of Canada, is the second article on our list. Though ably written, and evidently by one who has spent some time amongst us, and has had opportunities of becoming acquainted with our Ecclesiastical, educational, and political institutions, we cannot agree with the writer in some of his opinions as to the future destinies of this country. We do not think, for instance, that in the event of an American war, the Canadas would be so easily abandoned by Great Britain, as he imagines, or that they would so easily fall a prey to American arms. Much, of course, would depend upon the spirit of the Canadians themselves; and though the Irish population have little cause to love British rule—though the loyalty of a great portion of the Scotch and English—especially of the Orange, or ultra Protestant faction, who are more than half Yankeeised already—is very doubtful—still, the French Canadians are essentially loyal, and would quickly rally round the standard beneath which they have long enjoyed a greater amount of prosperity than they ever knew, whilst under the regime of Louis of France. With great respect for the energy, and many noble qualities, of our republican neighbors, we are not inclined to look with unqualified admiration upon their social or political institutions; we are by far too fond of liberty to be lovers of democracy, to which—unless the progress of Catholicity in the United States tend to check it—their government and people are rapidly tending. Annexation, if ever it come, will be more owing to the extinction of the old chivalrous spirit of loyalty, by the baneful influences of that grovelling commercial spirit, which is one of the chief characteristics of the present day—amongst Protestant communities especially—and which would barter loyalty, honor, and country, for a trifling rise in the price of pork, or an additional per-centage on dry goods, than to the military prowess of our neighbors, or to any particular enthusiasm on our part, for their form of government, which may suit them well enough, but is not exactly adapted for us. One man's shoes may be a good fit for him; but it does not follow that they will fit every other person as well.

The third article contains an able reply to a controversial sermon lately preached by a Protestant minister of the Unitarian church at Baltimore—the Rev. William Burnap. The *Reviewer* replies to his objections against the Catholic Church, that she is too conservative: and that she has ceased to be, what she was, because she has ever refused to change. In the fourth article, we find an answer to a letter from the talented though somewhat opinionated, author of “*Alban*” in which the latter, whilst attempting to criticise Dr. Brownson's theory of “Rights and Duties” clearly shows that he does not understand it. An article upon a collection of essays from the pen of His Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, and the usual “Literary Notices and Criticisms” in which are contained some severe, but not unmerited, strictures upon Dr. Lingard's History of England, make up the contents of this interesting number of the leading Catholic periodical published in America.

“A PROTESTANT'S APPEAL TO THE DOUAY BIBLE.”

It is a melancholy fact that it is impossible to read a few pages even, of any Protestant controversial work, without being convinced, either of the ignorance, or bad faith, of the writer: and these lectures of Mr. Jenkins against Catholics, afford no exception to the rule. We have seen how—by suppressing those passages in which, St. Liguori, explains that he applies to the Blessed Virgin, *only* in a restricted sense, titles which if taken in an absolute sense belong to God alone—Mr. Jenkins seeks to impress upon his readers that the Catholic Church raises Mary to a level with her Son; and sets up, for the adoration of her children, Gods many, and Lords many. This is a common artifice with Protestant divines: but Mr. Jenkins goes further: he not only suppresses truth, he asserts that which is positively false.

Of this we have already adduced proof, in the case of his mistranslations from the Italian: we will give another:—

At page 203 of these lectures we read:—
“In the Roman Catholic Missal for the use of the laity, page 85, we have the following:—‘May this communion O Lord cleanse us from sin, and, by the intercession of blessed Thomas à Beckett, thy martyr, make us effectual partakers of this holy remedy? And in the same service—‘Do thou, by the blood of St. Thomas which he spent for us, grant that we may ascend whither he has ascended.’ Could language more devout, or work more sacred, be applied to our Divine Mediator?”

But what if this statement of the Rev. Mr. Jenkins should turn out to be a deliberate falsehood?—what if it should happen, that, neither in the “Roman Catholic Missal for the use of the laity”—nor in any other Missal whatsoever, there should be such a prayer as that which we have marked in Italics? Could language too severe be applied to the deliberate falsifier, and maligner of his brethren? These questions we propound to the Rev. Mr. Jenkins, hoping that either he, or some of his friends, will give a straightforward answer. Until he, or they, shall have done so, we have the right to tax him with deliberate falsehood.

In the mass for the festival of St. Thomas of Canterbury, the 29th of December—the prayer at the Post Communion, is pretty nearly as given in Mr. Jenkins' quotation. The Church prays that the communion of the body and blood of Christ may cleanse us from sin; and that, St. Thomas interceding for us—“*intercedente beato Thomá*”—we may be made effectually partakers of that heavenly remedy—through Christ our Lord &c. This would not suit Mr. Jenkins' purpose, of establishing that Papists ignore the sole mediatorship of Christ; so, drawing upon his imagination, he finds “*in the same service*,” a prayer in which the Church prays that, “*by the blood of St. Thomas which he spent for us*” it may be granted to us to ascend whither he has ascended. We assert that no such prayer occurs in any Roman Catholic Missal, and challenge Mr. Jenkins to the proof: calling upon him to produce the copy of the Missal in which the said prayer occurs—a task not very difficult for him to perform, if he has the truth on his side. We will now return to the subject which we partly discussed last week, and endeavor to show that the Invocation of Saints was practised by the early Church, was recommended by the Fathers, and that therefore Protestantism, which rejects it, is not the “*Old Religion*.”

From the testimony of Protestant and Pagan writers, we have learnt that, in the Anti-Nicene age, it was the belief—that the departed prayed for the living, as the living prayed for the departed; that there was indeed a Communion of Saints which death itself could not sunder; and that, as a necessary consequence of this belief, the early Christians—when as yet, owing to the troublous times in which they lived, and the persecutions that were directed against them, they had no public places of worship—sembled in the catacombs to offer the Christian Sacrifice on the tombs of the martyrs, whose memories they honored in their oblations, whose intercession they sought, and in the efficacy of whose prayers they believed: the tombs of the martyrs were the first altars of the Church. But when the fury of persecution had ceased, and, under the protection of the laws, the Christians were enabled to meet together in their stately basilicæ, they still continued their ancient custom; and no altar was deemed fit for the celebration of the Sacred Mysteries, unless it contained some portion at least of a Saint or Martyr. Thus, writing against Vigilantius—A. D. 404—St. Jerome asks, if those Bishops of Rome erred who offered sacrifice to God over the bones of the departed SS. Peter and Paul, and who looked upon the martyrs' tombs as the Altars of Christ? In the same spirit St. Ambrose cries out—“*Succedant victimæ triumphales in locum, ubi Christus hostia est, sed ille super Altare—isti sub Altari*”—See Geiseler c. 99—who admits that St. Chrysostom recommends (*de Sanctis, martyr, Sermon 68*) the worship of martyrs, and their relics, as a means of procuring the forgiveness of sins, and virtues.” Now we must confess that we attach more importance to the opinion of St. Chrysostom, than to that of a Mr. Jenkins.

The language too of these Fathers, when speaking of the Saints, the efficacy of their intercession—and above all, of the dignity of the Blessed Virgin—would sound strange in the ears of modern Protestants. Thus St. Ambrose—a good man, but a sad Papist, and much given to Maryolatry—sees in the Virgin Mother, that “*gate of the Sanctuary*”—*porta sanctuarii*—spoken of by Ezechiel the prophet—c. xlv. v. 2.—and hesitates not to speak of the martyrs as:—

“*Nostris præsules, speculatores vitæ actuumque nostrorum. Non erubescamus eos intercessores nostræ infirmitatis adhibere*”—*De Viduis*.

If it be objected against this language, and the practice of an Ambrose, a Jerome, a Chrysostom, and the Christian writers of the IV. and V. centuries, that already in their days, corruption had commenced, and that they had not escaped the contaminating influences of the prevailing superstitions—we would reply by reminding Mr. Jenkins, in the first place, that, according to him, “*it may be said that the corruption of the Church of Rome commenced towards the end of the VI. century*,” and secondly—that if the testimony of intelligent and trustworthy eye witnesses may be accepted as sufficient to establish the truth of a miracle—we have, in the records of the signs and wonders which attended the worship of the Saints, and the honor paid to their relics, ample proof of the abiding presence of the Lord with His Divine Spouse the Church: and consequently of her freedom from any spot or taint of corruption at the period when these miracles were performed. God, we say, Who

alone worketh great wonders, testified His approbation of the honor which the Christians of the IV. century paid to the Saints, by miracles, as stupendous and as well established, as any of which we read in the Old or New Testament.

Of the truth of these latter miracles, if we reject the attestation of the Church, we have no proof except human testimony—the evidence of intelligent, and trustworthy men, whom we believe, from their conduct in trying circumstances, to have been incapable of deceiving, or of being deceived. If human testimony be sufficient to establish the truth of a miracle in one case, human testimony of precisely the same nature, and given under the same circumstances, is equally credible in another; nor can we assign any reason for rejecting the evidence of a St. Ambrose, or a St. Augustine, which would not be equally valid for rejecting the testimony of St. Mark, or St. Luke. If we reject the testimony of the former it must be upon the principle of Hume that it requires a miracle to prove a miracle.

Now, that God deigned to manifest His approval of the worship of the Christians of the IV. century, we have abundant testimony in the writings of the most illustrious men of that age, who have recorded the miracles, of which they themselves were eye-witnesses: testimony which we cannot reject without endangering the historical basis of Christianity itself. That the miraculous powers conferred upon the Apostles did not die with them, but were transmitted for several centuries at least, is admitted by most Protestant historians, even by those who are most desirous to acknowledge as little of the supernatural as possible in Christianity. Neander, who cannot be suspected of Romanising tendencies, recognises the miraculous gifts to have been continued “*subsequently to the Apostolic age*,” and even the Protestant historian Gibbon—as in the case of the miracle of Tivoli in the V. century, and in that of the restoration of his sight to the blind man Severus, mentioned by St. Augustine, *De Civit. Dei* l. xxii. c. 8—can find no reason for denying their truth, save in the incredibility of the doctrines in favor of which they were wrought. “*I would recommend this miracle to our Divines*” says the learned Protestant historian, “*if it did not prove the worship of relics, as well as the Nicene Creed*.”—*Decline and Fall*—c. 27.

And here, we would cite the testimony which St. Augustine, adduces in support of his thesis, that, in his time, miracles were wrought in the name of Christ, both by the Sacraments, and the prayers and relics, of the Saints—“*Etiã nunc sunt miracula in ejus nomine, sive per Sacramenta ejus, sive per orationes vel memorias sanctorum ejus*,” *Civ. Dei*, l. xxii. c. 8. This testimony of St. Augustine, we can reject only upon the hypothesis that he, in common with hundreds of other eye-witnesses, were either fools or liars. For the miracles wrought at the intercession of the Saints, which St. Augustine records, were not done in a corner; but publicly, and in the face of thousands, of friends and foes; to whom, he appeals, as to competent judges of the truth of the facts which he relates. “*Tam clarum atque illustre miraculum, at nullum arbitror esse Hippocensium, qui hoc non vidit vel didicit, nullum qui oblitisci ulla ratione poterit—ih. ih.*” Protestants may reject this testimony if they please; but they should remember that their belief in the Resurrection of our Lord, rests upon no surer basis, than that which they reject as insufficient to uphold the Catholic doctrine of the lawfulness and utility of invoking the prayers of the Saints. If the testimony of an eye-witness like St. Augustine be not sufficient to establish the truth of a miracle, neither is that of a St. Paul.

It would be easy for us to cite passage after passage from the writings of the Fathers in support of the antiquity of the “*cultus sanctorum*,” and of the favors, by God accorded to the prayers of the Saints; for there is not an argument which Protestants of the present day urge against the Catholic Church, that has not been urged by some one of the heretics of the third, fourth, and fifth centuries. Mr. Jenkins says nothing but what Vigilantius said long ago; and, in repelling the charge of idolatry which the former brings against us, we can say nothing but what has already been far better said by a St. Jerome, or a St. Augustine, when repelling the same charge brought against them by the Jenkinsons of their age. The monuments on which are traced in ineffable characters, the names, sufferings and faith of the martyrs during the ages of persecution, whilst as yet, in caves and catacombs the faithful assembled to celebrate the Sacred Mysteries—the unanimous consent of the Fathers—the unambiguous language of the oldest Liturgies extant—proclaim the antiquity of the faith of the Catholic Church as defined by the Council of Trent—“*That the Saints reigning with Christ offer their prayers to God, on man's behalf; and that it is good and useful for man to invoke them*.” To such a mass of evidence it would be as presumptuous on our part to believe that we could add any thing, as it is foolish on the part of Mr. Jenkins to fancy that, by his oft refuted cry of “*idolatry—injury to Christ's honor as sole mediator*” he can convict the Catholic Church of apostasy—or rather—the Son of God Himself, of falsehood. For He promised to be with His Church all days: she could not have fallen into error until He had withdrawn His presence from her: and if, within four hundred years after His Ascension, she lapsed into superstition and idolatry, it is clear that, within that period, He must have been false to His promise, and have abandoned her. But, if the Church was not idolatrous in the fourth, and fifth centuries, neither is

• The following extract from the Liturgy, called of St. James—because from the earliest ages attributed to that glorious Apostle—will show the conformity betwixt the faith of the ancient, and modern Church.

“*Præcipue vero sanctæ et gloriöse Semper Virginis, beatæ genitricis Dei, memoriam agimus. Memento illius, Domine Deus, et per ejus orationes puras et sanctas, parce et miserere nobis, et exaudi nos*.”

she now; for, as a St. Ambrose, and a St. Jerome, a St. Augustine, and a St. Chrysostom, as St. Athanasius, a St. Basil, and a St. Cyrill worshipped, even so do we worship at the present day.

We have left ourselves no space to reply to our author's objections against the use of pictures and images as adjuncts to Christian worship: these objections we propose to notice in our next; and in the meantime, as the last, and most conclusive witness to the innocency of the Church of Rome of the crime of idolatry, we will call into Court no less a person than Mr. Jenkins himself. Having quoted a question and answer from a Catholic catechism, in which the teaching of the Church is fully set forth, our logical divine concludes:—

“*From this it is clear that the Church of Rome regards positive prayer and dependence upon any creature, as idolatrous and sinful*”—p. 96.

To be sure she does: and yet within a line or two we read:—

“*The Reformed Churches protest against the Church of Rome because its members are taught in their devotional works to present absolute prayer and praise to the Virgin, and to place absolute dependence upon her*”—p. 96.

Then must the protest of the Reformed Churches be based upon a lie, because, by Mr. Jenkins' own avowal—the Church of Rome regards such prayer and dependence “*as idolatrous and sinful*.” Even Mr. Jenkins will hardly have the impudence to assert that the Church of Rome teaches its member to do that which it teaches to be “*idolatrous and sinful*”—and yet it is only upon this hypothesis that he can sustain his charge against us. Perhaps the solution of the mystery is to be found in the very confused ideas that Mr. Jenkins has of the nature of idolatry, as we shall have occasion to show in our next.

We have received an anonymous pamphlet, published by Mr. Pickup of Great St. James Street, full of the usual falsehood and scurrility against Catholicity and Jesuitism. We cannot condescend to notice its contents, whilst the writer preserves his *invognito*: but if the anonymous slanderer will come forward in his proper name, we promise him the castigation he deserves.

The Canadian Steam Navigation Company have concluded their arrangements for running a line of steamers direct, between Liverpool and Montreal during the summer months, and Liverpool and Portland during the winter.

Our Irish friends will be gratified at hearing that it is the intention of Her Majesty to confer the honor of knighthood upon their distinguished countryman, Mr. Roney, Secretary of the Great Trunk Railway, immediately upon his arrival in England.—Mr. Roney is to sail on the 15th instant.

A young man educated for the priesthood, and who has the highest testimonials from his ecclesiastical superiors in Ireland, is desirous of finding employment as a teacher, either in a school or private family. Enquire at the TRUE WITNESS Office.

The Provincial Board of Medicine has just closed its Session at Quebec, and we are pleased to notice the name of Mr. McKean, of this city, on the list of successful candidates. We wish Dr. McKean every success in the profession.—*Pilot*.

A serious accident happened to the steamer Quebec, on her passage up to Montreal on the 10th inst. The captain was obliged to run her ashore near Lavaltrie to keep her from sinking.

REMITTANCES RECEIVED.

Bytown, £12 10s; J. O'Meara, £2s 6d; Quebec, M. Enright, £10; Belleville, Rev. M. Brennan, £3 10s; London, J. Wright, £2; St. Andrews, Rev. G. A. Hay, £1 1s 3d; Prescott, P. White, £1 5s; T. Buckley, 12s 6d; Bradford, J. Lewis, £1 5s; Kingston, M. Rourke, £1 5s; Stanfold, J. Parry, 15s 9d; Perth, J. Moran, 18s 9d; Sorral, P. Tobin, 12s 6d; Batiscan, Rev. Mr. Frechette, 12s 6d; Longueuil, Ireland, Rev. C. O'Brien, 12s 6d; Cook's Bay, J. Holland, 12s 6d; St. Martine, Rev. Mr. Brown, 12s 6d; Edwardsburg, P. Kirby, 12s 6d; Toronto, Mr. Rev. Dr. Charbonnell, 12s 6d; Pembroke, T. J. Green, 12s 6d; University of Notre Dame du Lac, J. McDonnott, 12s 6d; Barton's Corners, J. McEvoy, 6s 3d; Norton Creek, J. Fitzwilliams, 6s 3d; S. Monaghan, M. Conroy, 6s 3d; St. Columban, J. Murphy, 6s 3d; Lachine, O. Hennigan, 6s 3d; Cornwall, D. Daley, 6s 3d; West Port, J. Cutting per T. S. Kelly, 10s; Cobourg, M. McKenny, 10s; Penetanguishene, Rev. Mr. Charest, 10s; L'Assomption, F. Vezeau, £1 5s.

Births.

In this city, on the 10th inst., Mrs. Francis Farrell, of a daughter.
At Bytown, on the 10th instant, the wife of Robert Farley, Esq., J. P., of a daughter.

Marriages.

In this city, on Saturday the 8th inst., by the Rev. J. J. Conolly, Mr. T. T. Cartwright, to Miss Caroline Lepage.
At Buckingham, on the 6th inst., by the Rev. J. Brady, P. P., John Lynch, Esq., of Allumette Island, J. P. and Crown Land Agent, to Miss Mary Ann O'Neill, daughter of John O'Neill, Esq., of Buckingham, and formerly of Cratloe Castle, County Clare, Ireland.

At Penetanguishene, on the 3d inst., by the Rev. Am. Charest, Mr. Thomas McGrath, to Miss Elizabeth Juissauve, daughter of Mr. Francis Juissauve.
On the same day, and in the same place, by the Rev. Am. Charest, Mr. Robert Robinson, to Miss Mary Kegan, daughter of Mr. Michael Kegan.

Died.

In this city, on the 11th instant, Marianne, wife of D. S. Stuart, Esq., Inspector of Revenue.