

see how the cat was let out of the bag, in this un-  
 guarded eagerness of the contending parties.

To be continued.

**THE CATHOLIC.**—The Catholic at Kingston, has been fit to be seriously offended with the Sentinel on account of the remarks of one of his correspondents respecting the popish doctrine, of the celibacy of the clergy, and has vented his indignation, not by showing that the word of God prohibits the marriage of the clergy, (for he knows that that word commands it as a general rule,) but by reviling the Church of England and her Scriptural services.

To set the departure of the Church of Rome from the word of God in this matter in a clear light, we here subjoin a few passages of Scripture. "And when Jesus was come into Peter's house, he saw his wife's mother laid, and sick of a fever." Mat. viii. 14. It is more than probable that St. John was a married man: for we find in John xix. 27, that he took the mother of our Lord to his own home. It is almost certain that the greater number of the Apostles were married men, as may appear by 1 Cor. ix. 5. "Have we not power to lead about a sister, a wife, as well as other Apostles, and as the brethren of our Lord, and Cephas?" or Peter.—*The rest of the Apostles, or the remaining Apostles,* is more literally after the Greek.—Here Paul asserts two things: 1. His Christian liberty to marry if he, as an individual, deemed it expedient. 2. That in so doing he would only conform to the common practice of the holy apostles. In Timothy iii. he says: "A bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife—one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in all subjection.—Let the deacons be the husbands of one wife, ruling their children and their own houses well." Then immediately following in the next chapter, he delivers a most remarkable prophecy of the anti-scriptural policy of papal Rome on this very point. "Now the Spirit speaketh expressly, that in the latter days some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits and doctrines of devils: speaking lies in hypocrisy; having their conscience seared with a hot iron: forbidding to marry, and commanding to abstain from meats, which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe and know the truth." So it is perfectly in character that the Catholic should return railing and abuse instead of attempting to vindicate by the Bible such gross corruptions of the word of God. Men do not in general appeal for justification to those witnesses whom they dare not meet face to face.

The Sentinel feels a little curious to know why his neighbour the Catholic has maintained such profound silence in regard to an article on Papal Supremacy which appeared in his paper, No. 32, of April 5th. That article gives a complete refutation of the Popish dogmas of Supremacy, Infallibility and Tradition; and what is a little singular, it does it on the sure warrant of Scripture and the history of the primitive Church, and in perfect accor-

dance with the legal sense and meaning of some grounds of argument laid down by Dr. Milner in his end of religious controversy. The Sentinel makes bold to request of the Catholic, that he will be kind enough to point out the particular defects in that piece of "the lowest methodistic abuse of that Church, from which his [the Sentinel's] own derives all she has to boast of Christian Doctrine, or priestly dignity." He conceives this the more incumbent on the Catholic, because the dogma of papal Supremacy is the key to the controversy between us and the Church of Rome. And he can at present, assign no cause for the long silence of the Catholic on that plain appeal to scripture and the early history of the Catholic Church, except it be a consciousness of the total absurdity of the claims of the Bishop of the Diocese of Rome to that supremacy of which he so long has boasted.

Christian Sentinel.

*Sed, tacitus pasci si posset corvus; haberet Plus dapis; et rixâ multo minus, invidioque.—Hor.*

**THE SENTINEL** boasts with a flourish of his pen, to have set, in this matter, the departure of the Church of Rome from the word of God in a clear light: and, in an article of his paper, No. 32, April 8, (which, like many others of his Numbers, has never reached us,) to have given a COMPLETE REFUTATION of the popish dogmas of supremacy, infallibility and tradition; and this too on the sure warrant of scripture, and the history of the primitive church!!!—Well done, *Three River Sentinel!* Thine, indeed, is a stupendous achievement! With a single dash of thy matchless pen, thou hast laid prostrate in the dust, the popish broad and lofty fabric of eighteen hundred years standing!!!—What was a Sampson's exploit to this? He but killed a thousand Philistines with the jaw bone of an Ass; but thou (and that certes in time of need,) hast dispatched at once, and in a trice, some thousand millions of the enemy with but a slightly brandished goose quill!!!

Well now, let us first see, on the Sentinel's own showing, how clearly he has set the Church of Rome from the word of God in the matter of celibacy: though, indeed it was not an over Godly act of him, to have done so. Peter, he proves from Scripture, had a wife! who ever denied it? But let him prove next from scripture, if he can, that Peter cohabited with his wife, after he had become the Apostle. His next clear proof is an absurd and ambiguous surmise; in one sense so revolting to every Christian's feeling, that I really shudder to transcribe it. It is, says he, more than probable that Saint John was a married man: for we read that he took the mother of our Lord to his own home, John, 19, 27. Can he mean that St. John took her to his wife, whom the Saviour had recommended to him as his Mother?—Ye Church of England followers, one and all; how do you like this Scriptural surmise of your admired oracle? And do not his words most clearly bear this meaning? But his words, though not so clearly, bear another sense, He (St. John) took the mother of our Lord to his own home. Therefore, concludes the Sentinel, It is more than probable that St. John was a married man. Did he, who can argue thus, ever stu-

dy dialectic's? Must every one having a home of his own, be therefore accounted a married man? Besides, the word home is a parliamentary, and hence a legal addition to the sacred text. The early father's of the Church, with whose writings, the Sentinel seems wholly unacquainted, infer the very contrary of his profane conjecture from the scripture text alluded to: affirming that the virgin son made over his virgin mother to St. John, his beloved disciple, just because he was a virgin.

It is almost certain, continues he, (then it is not quite so,) that the greater number of the Apostles were married men, as may appear by 1. Cor. 9, 5, (he should have said from: but Granmer here is not the question,) and of this text he will have us swallow, without a wince, his purposely falsified english Translation, which is as follows: have we not power to lead about a sister, A WIFE, as well as other Apostles; and as the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas! The English reformers, to sanction their uxorious propensities, translate here *Gunaika* in the Greek text, which signifies a woman; as if it were *Akoiten*, a married woman, or *Stochos*, a wife. In the ancient Latin version also, we read, not *Uxorem* a wife, but *Mulierem*, a woman. By this cunning shift, and almost imperceptible substitution, they sought to assume to themselves, in the eyes of their ignorant dupes, a scripture right to lug about with them, wherever they went, not sisters, but wives and children: because the Apostles, to avoid too frequent intercourse with female Neophytes, may have allowed some devout and charitable women occasionally to follow them; dispensing their alms to the indigent; and pious initiative counsel to those of their own sex.

But the odd fancy of the man to rank St. Paul among those claiming a right to carry about with him a wife, &c., the one who declares himself unmarried, and who so exalts the state of celibacy, or virginity, above the matrimonial one, 1, Cor. ch. 7, verses 7, 8, 26, 27, 32, 33, 34, 35.

We cannot sufficiently wonder at the supreme ignorance of antiquity betrayed by this mouth piece of Episcopacy, in citing from Timothy 3, the words of the same Apostle to prove marriage an indispensable requisite in Bishops and Deacons.—*A Bishop then must be blameless; the husband of one wife, one that ruleth well his own wife, having his children in all subjection. Let the Deacons be the husbands of one wife; ruling their children, and their own houses well.* We presume the Sentinel himself is not without these scriptural appendages of his ministry; for we know he says, that the marriage of the Clergy is commanded by the word of God, as a general rule. He seems then not to know what the History of the primitive Church will teach him, that the Apostle's words were always understood to imply, not a command to be the husband of one wife, and a carnal parent, but a prohibition to ordain any as Bishops or Deacons, who had been more than once married. For in the infancy of the christian church it was not easy to recruit from the Jewish or Heathen world a virgin priesthood, like that alluded to by the prophet Isaias, ch. 56, ver. 4, 5. But this much we