

body of teachers in communion with the See of Rome, is that *Eccelesia docens*; and lastly, by reference to the decrees of Councils, or Liturgies, that that Church, or body of teachers, does teach the doctrine which the Protestant calls in question. These premises established, the truth of every doctrine (the Mass a Sacrifice) follows as an inevitable consequence. We are always ready to discuss with our separated brethren the historical question—Did Christ establish a Church? and if so, which is the Church? But, as a general rule, we will never enter into any other discussion, until these preliminaries be finally settled. But, we will deviate a little from our rule in this instance, and shall endeavor to meet the objections of our Protestant objector—but no more. We are not attempting to prove that the Mass is a sacrifice, the authority of the Church is the *real* proof that it is so. We shall confine ourselves to showing, that the objection taken against—The Mass a Sacrifice,—because therein there is no shedding of blood, is unfounded.

And first, the Mass is called by the Church an unbloody sacrifice; it is, to say the least, a singular objection to bring against it,—that it is, what it professes to be—unbloody. But let that pass: the Protestant means that there can be no *real* sacrifice without shedding of blood; we maintain that there can be, because there has been. And firstly, it being always as well to know what we are talking about, let us define Sacrifice. The Protestant makes the essence of Sacrifice to consist in pain, suffering, the destruction, or *physical* immolation of the thing offered, or sacrificed; his ideas of Sacrifice are those of the tradesman, who announces himself selling off at a *great sacrifice*, or loss—his counter being the altar, his customers the victims, and the advertising tradesman himself the great divinity, to whose honor and profit the victims are immolated. Now, the Catholic meaning of Sacrifice is different. The essence of Sacrifice consists of the Oblation, and either the *moral* or *physical* immolation of the thing sacrificed; which Immolation may be coincident in point of time with, subsequent, or antecedent to the Oblation. In the Jewish Sacrifices of old, Immolation sometimes preceded Oblation; the victim being slain, or immolated, in the courts of the temple; and the Oblation of its blood being subsequently made by the priest, the Sacrifice was complete. Sometimes Immolation succeeded the Oblation, as in the "drink offerings," when the Oblation having been made, the victim was *morally* immolated, by being poured forth upon the ground. By Sacrifice then, we mean to denote the Oblation of some thing to God, and the moral, or physical Immolation of the thing so offered. And now comes the question—Were there in the Jewish dispensation, any sacrifices in which there was no shedding of blood, and in which the victim was *morally*, not *physically*, immolated? In a word, were there unbloody sacrifices in the Old Law? There were; there were many; therefore there can be again. In the first place, the Hebrew word which is often used to denote Sacrifice, Genesis ix. 8, for instance, is *מִנְחָה*—Minchah, a word which especially denotes an unbloody sacrifice, in opposition to *זֶבַח*—Zebach, or bloody sacrifice: they are, sometimes, as in Psalm xl. 7, used together, to denote a bloody, as opposed to an unbloody, sacrifice; but Minchah, when used alone, *invariably* denotes an *unbloody* sacrifice; and in support of this statement, we appeal to Gesenius, who was not only a first-rate Hebraist, but also a good Protestant, that is, a very bad Christian, and not likely to say anything in favor of Catholicity; we may mention also, that in the passage of the prophet Malachias i. 11, which the Church quotes as prophetic of the Sacrifice of the Mass, the word Minchah is the word made use of. Not only does the Hebrew word then denote an unbloody sacrifice, but, turning to the Old Testament, we find that unbloody Sacrifice was very common amongst the children of Israel. The scape goat was *morally* immolated, by being turned adrift into the wilderness, with all the sins of the nation on his head; but his blood was *not* shed, that is, he was not *physically* immolated. Again, in Lev. xiv. 53, we find that in the Sacrifice of the two sparrows, which the law of Moses commanded after the cleansing of the leprous house, one was killed, the other was let go "into the open fields, to make an atonement for the house;" (we quote from the English Protestant version.) Yet again, we find in Lev. v. 11, (we still quote the same version) that it was commanded "if he be not able to bring two turtle doves, or two young pigeons, then he that sinned shall bring for his offering" *Korban* "the tenth part of an ephah of *fine flour*, for a sin offering;" and further on, that the priest shall take a handful, and burn it on the altar, making an atonement for him, as touching his sin, that he hath sinned. Here most certainly was a Sacrifice, in which there was no shedding of blood; therefore there *could* be Sacrifice without shedding of blood, and therefore there *can* be Sacrifice without shedding of blood, which is all that we undertook to prove.

Another form, in which the same objection is brought forward, is—"In the Mass there is no Immolation, therefore no Sacrifice." To this we think it sufficient to reply, that we have already shown, that in the Sacrifice of the Old Law, it was not necessary that Immolation, should be *synchronous* with the Oblation. In the Jewish bloody Sacrifice—Zebach—Immolation preceded the Oblation. To constitute Sacrifice, it was quite sufficient that Oblation should be made of the body and blood of the self-same victim as had previously been immolated. Now, in the Sacrifice of the Mass, Oblation is made of the body and blood of Christ; but the body and blood of Christ were once immolated on the cross; therefore, in the Sacrifice of the Mass, Oblation is made of the body and blood of a victim, previously immolated.

*—Sacrifice, whether bloody or unbloody—vide Gesenius.

Objection will be taken by the Protestant to our *major*—"In the Sacrifice of the Mass Oblation is made of the body and blood of Christ,"—an objection which immediately raises the question of the Real Presence, a question in the supernatural order, which can be decided only by an authority in the same order, that is, by Christ's divinely appointed Church. By that decision we are content to abide. It is enough for us, that Christ said it, that His Church teaches it; we will not ask, with the unbelieving Jews of old, "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" In a word, the thesis—"the Mass is a Sacrifice," is only another expression for the thesis. "In the Holy Eucharist, the Body and Blood of Christ, are verily, and indeed, present."

PROTESTANT MISSIONS AND THEIR RESULTS.

We are often amused by the bulletins, from time to time issued by our evangelical cotemporaries, giving an account of the glorious achievements of Protestant missionaries, or rather, of the glorious results that are just on the point of being achieved. As, according to these interesting records, Popery is always, as it has been for three hundred years, tottering to its fall, and destined to bury the Man of Sin in its ruins; so Protestantism is always just agoing to convert the heathen, and bring all flesh under the influence of sanctuary privileges. All that is wanted is, a little more zeal, a little more exertion, and a good deal more money. Protestantism estimates its profits, not by its income, but by its expenditure; it appeals boastfully to the large sums it collects and expends, as contrasted with the cost of Catholic missions. It piques itself on the fact, that whilst, in one year, the Society for the Propagation of the Faith spent but £156,000, the Protestant missionary societies collected and expended £549,000, or more than thrice as much; its costliness is its pride, and if it cannot boast of many converts, it is able to comfort itself with the reflection, that it has caused to be printed about 400,000 copies of the Scriptures annually, and has thus extensively patronised composers, and printer's devils, besides greatly augmenting the demand for old rags. It never thinks of asking, what has become of all the Bibles it has scattered broadcast over the earth? To what vile uses may they not have been applied? Or, are the Chinese better and happier, because copies of the Word of God are sold at six cents a-piece? We will frankly admit the justice of this Protestant boast; that Protestantism is very expensive; that it annually wastes more money than would have sufficed to send forth missionaries to every corner of the earth; and that it gets little or nothing in return. Much cry, and no wool.

We have, lying before us, a short account of what Protestant "England is doing for the conversion of the world." It is doing what the Apostles never did, and certainly, never thought of doing. It is expending about 3,000,000 of dollars annually, and can point to—according to its own account—170,000 converts, as the result of many years expenditure. Allowing only five years, as the time required to bring about this grand result, we find that Protestant converts cannot be done at a lower figure than about ninety dollars, or about £22 10s. currency per head. In Turkey, as we showed by an extract from the *Weekly Dispatch*, a man cannot be thoroughly converted under £1,000; famine-stricken wretches in Ireland can be had for a bowl of soup and a suit of clothes, but then their conversion don't last, thus verifying the old proverb, "cheap and nasty." Besides the 170,000 converts, there are said to be a good many half-converted—"under instruction"—attending Protestant schools and colleges, and very good Protestants these institutions turn out, if we may credit the account of them in the report of the Indian Missions. "Year after year they are sending into the bosom of society, thousands of young men who, though they may not have much in common with Christianity, *have utterly abnegated the superstitions of their forefathers.*" They have been taught to disbelieve, not to believe; they have been indoctrinated into a denial of their former superstitions, and been made infidels of; very good Protestants notwithstanding, and the cause of much rejoicing to their teachers. Whether the native society, into whose bosom, these thousands of young men, who have "not much in common with Christianity," are annually sent—is likely to be permanently benefited thereby, is another, and a very different question. It affords the *Friend of India*, however, the most sincere delight, to be enabled to record each successive step in the onward path of *improvement*; for abnegation is certainly a great step on the way to Protestantism. Well, our friends are right to be thankful for very small mercies.

A missionary, writing from Africa, makes a most startling attack upon the "Principles of the Reformation;" no less than, that Polygamy is an obstacle to the Gospel. We knew that long ago; we knew that one of the great difficulties the Catholic Church had to contend with, was the custom of Polygamy amongst savage nations; and that it was not without many a struggle with the corrupt heart of man, that she succeeded in enforcing the Divine law—"One with one only—and for ever;" but we did not expect to hear a Protestant minister condemn Polygamy, when every one, who knows anything of the history of the Reformation, and the early Reformers, knows that Polygamy was by them explicitly tolerated, and is, in almost every Protestant country, at the present day, more or less practised—under another name. We have it, under the hands of Luther, Melancthon, Bucer, and the most distinguished Reformers, that a man may have two wives at a time, only "care must be taken that plurality of wives be not introduced into the world by way of law for every man to follow as he thinks fit." It was to be done secretly, because "inferiors are no sooner informed what their

superiors do, but they imagine they may do the same;" and really, we do not see why they should not, Luther and Melancthon notwithstanding. If Philip of Hesse might have two wives, why not Tom, Dick, and Harry? But they do have them, because, as we said, Polygamy is practised, only under another name, in most Protestant countries. In the moral! United States, for instance, a man is *by law* allowed to dismiss his wife, and to take a concubine, who enjoys the name and privileges of a wife; this may be repeated again and again, only there must only be one *wife* in the harem at a time; it is Polygamy, with an extra link to the chain, and is called divorce. Polygamy is, no doubt, an obstacle to the Gospel, but then, Protestants should not avow it, for, by so doing, they pronounce judgment upon themselves; Mr. Tyler should not be so severe upon the Zulus, for practising what the fathers of modern Protestantism preached.

But Protestantism has done gloriously of late. In Florence, more than 2,000 persons are under the influence of the Gospel; some have found it, others have not, but are "still seeking it," from whence we conclude, that the Protestant Gospel must be a precious hard thing to find. Besides all this, the *Methodist book concern* turned out well last year, the sales having exceeded \$200,000; whilst the profits on the new hymn book, were \$4,761. Not a bad investment; evangelical scrip is at a premium.

ECCLESIASTICAL INTELLIGENCE.

A Quebec correspondent informs us that the following appointments are in contemplation:—The Rev. Mr. Nelligan, Curé of St. Sylvester, to be Chaplain of St. Patrick's Church, Quebec; Rev. Mr. O'Grady, of Jacques Cartier, to be Curé of St. Sylvester; Rev. Mr. Dunn, Frampton, to be Curé of Jacques Cartier; and Rev. Mr. Kerrigan, the highly esteemed Coadjutor of the late Rev. Mr. M'Mahon, to be Curé of Frampton.

The *Mirror* has the following remarks upon Ecclesiastical Corporations:—

"Again, there is the cry against Ecclesiastical Corporations—a cry as ill-understood by thousands who indulge in it as it is, stupid in itself. What constitutes an Ecclesiastical Corporation? The right of certain parties to hold property to a limited amount, in trust for the religious body to which they belong, and, with the advice and consent of that body, to dispose of the same, or any part of it, when deemed necessary to do so. How can this interfere with others? Does it take a penny out of the public Funds or out of the pockets of those who do not choose to give freely? If the Catholics of Toronto think proper to buy a lot of land for the purpose of building a school-house or a Church, are they to be debarred from doing so because, forsooth, the *Globe* and *Mail* do not approve of it? Or should they desire to dispose of property already belonging to their Church, are they to be prevented from doing so for the same reason? All the Catholics require, is the simple legal right to manage their own affairs as a religious body, and as this cannot be done without an act of incorporation, would it not be gross injustice to deprive them of that right? If the religious bodies to which the Editors of *Globe*, *Examiner*,—(twenty or thirty followers)—*Mail*, &c., belong, do not desire these things, why in the name of common sense should they attempt to prevent others who do desire them, from having their wishes gratified? It is the fable of the "dog in the manger" all out with them—they will not have ecclesiastical corporations themselves because they don't want them, *therefore* those who do want them shall not have them either! Could anything be more tyrannical, more selfish, more *gritish*?"

We thank the writer of the following letter, for the truly Catholic sentiments, therein boldly expressed. He is right. Religion is either *nothing* or *something*: if the former, mixed education is all very well; but if the latter, then most assuredly, Catholic children must receive their education, apart from their Protestant brethren, lest they become, what, in the cant of the day, are nicknamed *Liberal Catholics*, that is neither one thing or the other—neither honest Protestants, nor honest Catholics:—

To the Editor of the *Mirror*:

DEAR SIR,—Having seen in your paper of the 10th instant, a letter signed "Peter Murtagh," and which purposed to defend and throw some light on the system of mixed education as practised in Canada, I beg to state that that letter does not contain the views or sentiments of the Catholics of London on the all-important subject of education. I would not trouble you on this subject only for fear the idea might go abroad that the Catholics of this town were favorable to mixed education.—Perhaps it would be better for children to get a good secular education, even in a mixed school, than none at all; but that is a question which I am not a sufficient authority to decide upon. But I, for one, say emphatically that I would rather my children should get no education at all, than get an education in a school where the precious gift of Faith would be endangered. If a deal of those who talk so loudly about the benefits to society to be derived from mixed education can only impregnate the minds of Protestant children with hatred of, and contempt for Popery, and give Catholic children an indifference about their own religion, their object is gained; and if Catholic children now get that cold and lukewarm training which a mixed education is sure to impart, what may you expect of Catholic feelings in the next generation? As there is but one God, there can be but one Faith, and one true religious way of adoring that God, anything which the advocates of mixed education may say to the contrary notwithstanding. Either religion is nothing or it is something. If it is nothing, give us a mixed education system;—if it is something, as it assuredly is, let us have it pure and uncontaminated by the foul touch of a godless education. I say, then, that the Catholics of London are decidedly in favor of Separate Schools. The writer of that letter has been himself trained in one of those mongrel mixed schools somewhere in the north of Ireland, and is now teaching in the Union School in this town. Every man prizes the bridge that carries him over. It may not be very blameable to let a man rave and talk nonsense about politics and elections, which are open questions; but when a matter of so grave importance as the education of children, the temporal and eternal welfare of all most dear to man is at stake, it would be very culpable to be silent. Dr. Cullen's, Archbishop of Armagh, letter in your last impression, embodies the sentiments of the Catholics of London, and, indeed, should, of every right minded Catholic in the world. Hoping you will give the above remarks insertion in your valuable journal, I remain, Dear Sir, your obedient servant, P. P. London, (C. W.) Oct. 20, 1861.

ALICE RIORDAN, THE BLIND MAN'S DAUGHTER: A Tale for the Young. By Mrs. J. Sadlier.—Boston: Donahoe.

From this interesting little story, chiefly designed for the young, much amusement, and no little profitable instruction, may be derived. The talented authoress seeks always to combine pleasure and instruction; the philosophy she teaches is that of the wise king, who said, "Fear God and keep His commandments, for this is the whole duty of man." The Catholic press in the United States, speaks highly of this little work, and we can cheerfully recommend it to our young Catholic friends.

THE FIRST BOOK OF READING LESSONS, by the Brothers of the Christian Schools, Montreal.

This is the First, of the "Revised" and "Enlarged," series of Readers, by the Brothers of the Christian Schools, now in course of publication, by the Messrs. Sadlier & Co.

We cannot but express a desire to see these Readers introduced into every Catholic School in the land, as they are altogether superior to the numerous Readers put forth, in many of which something is to be found offensive to Catholics.

REMITTANCES RECEIVED.

Quebec, M. Enright, £5; Chatham, J. B. Williams, £2; Peterboro', B. Boyd, £1 2s 5d; Milbury, U. S., Rev. Mr. Leveque, £1; St. André, Rev. Mr. Doucet, 12s 6d; Henryville, O. Campbell, 12s 6d; Cote de Neige, Jas. Reynolds, 6s 3d.

All the persons who were presented by the Grand Jury at the last Criminal Term as accessories in the acts of violence committed at the last civic elections, have been honorably acquitted by a Jury of their countrymen. It will be observed, moreover, that so lame, so utterly destitute of evidence was the charge against the accused that their council declined to call any witnesses, and that the Honorable Judge from the Bench ordered their acquittal by the Jury.—*Pilot*.

On Friday evening last, the Coroner's Jury, empanelled in the case of the unfortunate man, named William Hall, who recently died in the Hospital, from injuries received from some evil disposed person or persons, brought their proceedings to a close. The Jury could not agree in a verdict, eight of them implicated Henry Connor, as the guilty party, four setting forth, that the injuries were inflicted by some person or persons unknown. These different conclusions were of course arrived at from the evidence submitted. A warrant, it is said, has been issued for the arrest of Connor.—*Pilot*.

ARRIVAL OF THE EUROPA.

HALIFAX, OCT. 28.—The "Europa" from Liverpool, arrived at 9, a. m., with 106 passengers, including 12 for Halifax. Kossuth had not arrived. It was confidently stated that he would come to Southampton in the steamer *Madrid*, leaving Gibraltar on the 17th, and reach Southampton soon after the 20th. The *Mississippi* had arrived at Gibraltar, and Kossuth's intention had been learned from himself. His family and the Hungarians who accompany him are 57 in number. The Great Exhibition finally closed on the 15th. The Prince was present, but not the Queen. Many of the lighter articles were removed the second day after the close. London was already wearing a different aspect. The awards of the Jurors did not give general satisfaction, and in one instance the Council and Jury came in direct collision. Beyond the closing of the Council of the Crystal Palace, and the breaking up of the Exhibition, and distribution of medals and prizes, nothing of interest has transpired. The enormous extent of Irish emigration recently was attracting great notice from statesmen and journalists. The news from the Cape is the most disheartening since the outbreak. On the 12th of August, British Caffraria was quiet, but heavy fighting had been heard in the direction of Fish River, where Sterke and Tula were in force. Various districts had been devastated by the enemy. Forty of the Boers intended to join the enemy. The *Monitor* says, the *Post* brings the usual tidings of devastation and plunder in the frontier districts of Somerset and in the neighborhood of Sumburg. A few miles from the former the Kafirs were swarming and the inhabitants were fleeing. Sheep were lying in large numbers from drought. There was alarm—apparently too well founded—of defection among the Cape Corps at Oakland; universal desertion was prevented by the Captain with the aid of the British residents. Matters were altogether in a very dangerous state, and residents were compelled to act on the defensive till the receipt of reinforcements.

Married.

At the Parish Church, Templeton, on the 27th inst., by the Rev. Wm. Ginguet, Mr. Daniel Lanigan, Grocer, of this City, to Sarah, eldest daughter of Thomas McGoey, Esq., J.P., of Templeton, near Bytown.

Died.

In this city, on Thursday, the 23rd instant, Mr. Jas. Gallagher, a native of Clones, County Monaghan, Ireland, aged 70.

GREAT BARGAINS!

SELLING OFF AT COST PRICE, A STOCK WORTH \$65,000; CONSISTING OF READY MADE CLOTHING AND DRY GOODS.

The Subscriber begs to inform the Public of Montreal, that on MONDAY NEXT, the 3rd November, and Following Days, he will commence Selling Off his Stock at COST PRICE.

L. PLAMONDON, No. 122, St. Paul Street, Sign of the Beaver. October 30, 1861.

WANTED,

FOR the English Elementary School, connected with the St. John's Academy, a TEACHER, to whom a liberal salary will be given. The course to be taught this year will merely consist of Reading, Writing, and Arithmetic. Application to be made to the Rev. C. Larocque, P. P., St. John's, or to Thomas Maguire, Esq., St. John's. N.B.—References as to character and competency, will be required. St. John's, October 30th, 1861.