

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur

Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur

Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée

Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées

Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée

Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées

Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque

Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées

Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur

Pages detached/
Pages détachées

Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)

Showthrough/
Transparence

Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur

Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression

Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents

Continuous pagination/
Pagination continue

Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure

Includes index(es)/
Comprend un (des) index

Blank leaves added during restoration may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming/
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.

Title on header taken from: /
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:

Title page of issue/
Page de titre de la livraison

Caption of issue/
Titre de départ de la livraison

Masthead/
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

Additional comments: /
Commentaires supplémentaires:

Wrinkled pages may film slightly out of focus.

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below /
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	14X	18X	22X	26X	30X
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12X	16X	20X	24X	28X	32X

The Catholic.

Quod semper; quod ubique; quod ab omnibus.

VOL. I.

KINGSTON, FRIDAY, MARCH 11, 1831.

NO. 21.

SELECTED.

The first Letter of the *Winter Evening's Dialogues*, having during our absence, been omitted by mistake; we think it too interesting not to give it in our present number. It should have preceded the one given in our No. 10.

Winter Evening Dialogue between John Hardman and John Cardwell, or THOUGHTS ON THE RULE OF FAITH, in a SERIES OF LETTERS, addressed to the Authors of "Letters to the Clergy of the Catholic Church, and more especially to the Rev. Thomas Sherburn, of Kirkham, in Lancashire," By John Hardman.

LETTERS.

1. Introduction. 2. The Authors not Catholics. 3. Tendency of Protestant Principles. 4. General remarks on the Performance.

Gentlemen, *Kirkham, 26th January 1813.*

1. You are truly a pretty pair of brothers, thus to sport with the credulity of your readers. Giving you ample credit for the apparent sincerity and apparent piety of your professions, and taking you to be what you pretend to be, two Catholics, who by searching the Scriptures, had discovered the errors of the Catholic doctrine, I felt an unusual joy, proportioned to the novelty of the cause. Within the limited sphere of my own observation and memory, I have known many Protestants, who by reading the Bible with diligence, and listening to the sermons of preachers first of one sect then of another, have become successively Churchmen, Methodists, Anabaptists, Presbyterians, and so forth: many some of my neighbours, who like myself were educated churchmen, have been successively members of all these different religions. But while we see daily instances of this experimental zeal, and daily admire the diligence of research, which the desire of salvation inspires in the breasts of Protestants of every description, it has always appeared to me a singular and unaccountable fact, that a Papist is never converted. He loves his faith with obstinate attachment; and if he does ever forsake it, his motives are generally as obvious, as his sincerity is questionable; and in most instances that have come within my knowledge, he soon becomes the disgrace of our communion, as he is an outcast or apostate from his own. This disedifying result most commonly mars the triumph of a Papist's conversion. I therefore learned with pleasure from your recent publication, that the sincerity of your conversion was likely to redeem this scandal. I rejoiced to find that two ingenuous young men, who had been diligently brought up in the religion of Popery, had, by a diligent and conscientious perusal of the Holy Bible, been blessed with light to discover their errors, and with grace to renounce

them; and I praised the Lord, for having, by the marvellous light of his word, withdrawn you from the darkness and bondage of Popery, into the light and liberty of the children of God.

Pleased with this discovery, I read over and over again your book entitled, "The Claims of the Catholic Church to be regarded as the true Church of Christ, briefly investigated; in a Series of Letters addressed to the Clergy of the Catholic church and more especially to the Rev. Thomas Sherburn of Kirkham, in Lancashire." I made myself master of all the arguments by which you combat the errors of Popery. I was at the pains to verify, in our great Family Bible, all the references which you make to Scripture without quoting the text. Thus instructed by your discoveries, and emboldened by the triumph of your conversion, now thinks I to myself; I know all the weak parts of Popery, now I can refute any Papist; I am now a match for Mr. Cardwell.

Mr. Cardwell, you know, is my friend and neighbour. His farm lies near my own. We have always lived together on good terms, and in a mutual intercourse of friendly offices. He is a kind neighbour, a faithful friend, an upright, sober, benevolent and good man. Having been blessed with the advantages of a good education, he amuses his leisure hours with reading, and has the reputation of being almost as learned as a priest. But notwithstanding all these good qualities he is a stiff Papist, and so religious in his way, that he has been heard to say, that he would not change his religion even if the King would make him Lord Lieutenant of the country. Though Mr. Cardwell is not forward to begin disputes about religion, he is always ready to defend his own, when it is attacked. Several of our neighbours and some preachers have at times been silenced by his arguments.

Said I to myself, I will visit my friend, and spend this long winter evening in his company, I will show him this new pamphlet; I mean your "Series of Letters," &c. It will serve to introduce a discussion on religious topics. I have no hope of converting him; but as I love a little fun in my heart, and have qualified myself, by reading this book, to hold an argument with him, I will see what he has to say for himself. I went accordingly and found my friend occupied with a book in his hand. Two or three others were lying on the table. He laid down his book, and received me with his wonted civility and kindness. After the usual compliments, and some observations on the badness of the times, the lateness of the harvest, and the extraordinary severity of the season, I took your book out of my pocket, and asked him whe-

ther he had seen it. He told me that he had. After the best preface that I could make, I asked him with a tone of triumph, whether he was not now convinced that the Church of Rome was unscriptural, erroneous, corrupt, and antichristian; whether Babylon was not at last fallen, or at least falling, since two of the sons of the scarlet w— had, by the aid of their own reason, and the light of the Holy Scriptures, discovered and denounced the abominations of their mother? This question led us into a long and interesting conversation on a variety of topics connected with your pamphlet. It is always gratifying to an author, to know what kind of reception his work meets with among readers of different descriptions. Of this conversation, therefore, it is my intention to give you a detail, as ample as my memory will enable me to give it, in this and my following letters.

2. To my first question, Mr. Cardwell replied by proposing another. With a look of earnestness mixed with good nature he asked me whether I really supposed that your book was the production of a Catholic pen. I answered without hesitation that I did: and that I considered your arguments against Popery as new, convincing, and unanswerable, I was not conscious that I was labouring under any delusion, or exciting his ridicule; but I flattered myself, that this bold and decisive tone would give me an advantage, and disconcert my friend. Judge then, how great was my surprise and chagrin, when he replied with a smile.

Mr. Hardman, I admire your simplicity in taking these writers to be Catholics. They are no Catholics, but Protestants who have hoaxed you. They have laid a baited hook for the avidity of your religious prejudices, and I am sorry to see you among the gudgeons who can swallow and digest it. If these authors pretend to put on the mantle of Catholicism, it is manifestly a suit that does not fit them. Their pretending to be Catholics is an obsolete and flimsy artifice, supported it seems, with sufficient art and ability to impose on your credulity: but it is an artifice sufficiently obvious to the penetration of the simplest Catholic. They begin with a sanctimonious air of moderation and candour, but soon dropping the visor, and forgetting the assumed character which they had borrowed to serve a turn, they misrepresent our doctrine perpetually: they slander our church and vilify our persons, with all the malignity of vulgar scurrility. It is clear that they have never learned our catechism, nor have been instructed in our doctrine. They know it only as it is disguised and caricatured in the misrepresentations of our enemies. Hence, like many other Protestant controvertists possess

of greater talents and more extensive learning than themselves, these writers combat a phantom of Popery, which exists only in their own misconception. I assert, and can prove my assertion by an appeal to their own words, that they are ignorant of the doctrine which they pretend to refute, and in reality prove that they are strangers to it. It is the glory of the Catholic doctrine, that it cannot be refuted, till it has been first misstated & misrepresented. It might appear harsh to accuse your friends of wilful misrepresentation; because it is possible they know no better: but it is a suspicious circumstance when a man begins with a lie in his mouth. At all events, their pretending to be Catholics is a stale device of controversial imposture.

Here I signified my dissent, and told Mr. Cardwell that I looked upon your book as a fair statement both of the Popish and Protestant doctrine: and insinuated that he was in danger of misrepresenting the character of your work. My friend continued. I repeat my assertion. You have quite mistaken the character of your favourite pamphlet. Its real character is, that one-half of it consists of misrepresentations of our doctrine and practice; and the other half of misinterpretation and misapplication of the Holy Scriptures. Look first at their statement of our doctrine and practice. They tell us: "We have it is true been taught what we should believe and what we should practice: but the evidence of the former, and the wisdom and propriety of the latter, have never been presented to our view: we are consequently unable to shew any reason why we believe this or practice that." p. 1. They tell us again, that "an acquaintance with the doctrine of Christ and his Apostles makes no part of our religious education." p. 6. that "with the New Testament, which contains all the will of Jesus Christ, we have no acquaintance, and that the generality of us are as ignorant of the words of Christ, as we are of the Alcoran." p. 46. They further assert, that "The faith our church is directly opposed to that of the Apostles; and that instead of making the word of Christ the only rule of faith and practice, in our church the authority of man is the standard of both." p. 46. From such wretched premises, they draw this equally wretched inference: that "we are taught that our church has authoritative power to teach whatever doctrines she pleases in matters of faith," p. 8. Consistently with such notions respecting the principles of our faith, your friends proceed to delineate our moral conduct, and favour us with such precious discoveries as these. All we naughty Papists, say they, "are under the dominion of the lusts of the flesh; they have not found one individual among us who is not manifestly serving one or more of the lusts of the flesh; women and wine and strong drink are the prevailing objects of our pursuit." p. 45, 6. These slanders are frequently repeated, and sometimes in terms which modesty forbids us to cite. But enough of this. The passages which I have quoted, while they are such as a Catholic child can refute, are to me, and I hope to you also, sufficient evidence both of the ignorance and vulgarity of the authors. These erroneous principles and contracted notions are the groundwork of your friends' boasted pamphlet: Thus beginning their controversial journey in the dark, they hurry their bewildered course o'er hill and dale, o'er hedge and

ditch, till they fairly flounder in the bog of scriptural misinterpretation.

3. But how came you Mr. Hardman, a churchman, to follow them in their wild career? You ought to know better. The drift of their reasoning from the letter of the Bible is more hostile to your religion than it is to mine, and calls for a refutation from your divines, rather than from ours. The blow is ostensibly directed to us, but it is really aimed at you. How then shall I account for your thoughtless commendation of such a work? I can easily account for it; but not without disclosing a secret, which reflects little honour on Protestantism. Modern Protestantism, like ancient Paganism, is not one religion, but an heterogeneous compound of many different systems of religion, differing from each other as much as they differ from us, in their creeds, in their modes of worship, and their forms of church government. Though said to be one, as God, the author of true faith is one, yet unity of faith never was found, and never will be found, among the discordant sects of Protestantism. The only unity discernable amongst you is of a base and spurious kind; sufficiently indicative of error, but no mark of religious truth: for it consists in an united hatred of that Ancient Church, from which all your various sects have revolted. For this reason the perverted education of the generality of Protestants teaching them to believe, that our religion is a wicked combination of every thing that is false in doctrine and corrupt in practice, teaches them also to hate it accordingly. Consistently with this hatred, which is the fruit of ignorance, they most loudly censure what they least understand. Trained in these habits, they not only consider any thing that is No Popery to be good Protestantism; but resemble the Jews, who, in former times, slandered St. Stephen, for having, as they were pleased to assert, "spoken blasphemous things against Moses and against God;" and who justified their hatred and persecution of "that pestilent fellow," St. Paul, by "crying out, men of Israel, help: this is the man that teacheth all men every where against the people, and the law and this place, and who brought the Greeks into the temple, and hath polluted this holy place." Acts vi. 11.—xxi. 29. The consequences of this evil spirit are lamentable both to us and to yourselves. To us, by rendering us apparently a just object of bitter hatred and religious execration, and teaching men to adopt in practice the bright thought of an original genius and profound Protestant casuist, that it is unlawful to tell a lie against any body but a Papist. Hounds, harriers, and curs, forget their several animosities, and join both in the cry and the chase to hunt down Popish game. To yourselves, by degrading faith from the dignity of a theological virtue, into a mere matter of human opinion. As the bond of unity amongst your various sects consists chiefly in a denial of Catholic tenets, for the very name of *Protestant* imparts this; so your faith is rather of the negative, than of the positive kind. It consists more of a strenuous denial of the fancied errors of Popery, than of a firm belief in those

truths which God has actually revealed. And what is the consequence of this negative faith? Mark well the answer. That as faith by this new fashion is made to consist in *protesting* or *disbelieving* rather than in believing, he that disbelieves the most of Catholic truths is the most consistent Protestant. The Calvinist, accordingly, is a more consistent Protestant than the Church of England man; the Anabaptist a more consistent Protestant than the Calvinist; the Unitarian more consistent than the Anabaptist; and perhaps the Freethinker, or Infidel, the most consistent Protestant of them all; because he protests against the greatest number of Catholic truths. This negative rule of faith, by which you all form your religion to your taste, just as a man chooses the colour and shape of his clothes, to please his fancy, and authorises and justifies every error and heresy which the wild imaginations of men can invent; and deprives you of the means of refuting any. Certainly it destroys every real principle of unity among you, except that which subsisted among the ancient heretics, a unity in protesting against and hating that original and perpetual church, by which they were all condemned. You indeed talk much about religion and the rule of faith; but you reason little on these important subjects. You quote texts of scripture often misapplied, often obscure, and sometimes incomprehensible. Provided you fancy that they are adverse to Popery, you rest perfectly satisfied, that they are both well applied, and clearly intelligible; whereas you shut your eyes to innumerable texts, that give the clearest testimony to the evidence of Catholic truth. I know that in your protesting or disbelieving system, you all pretend to follow the Holy Scriptures. But this is an illusion. The word of God misinterpreted is no longer the word of God. It is degraded from its rank and dignity, and resolved into the word of man. Your arbitrary interpretations of the sacred text, neutralizes its authority, by perverting its sense. Scripture is such, only in its true sense and meaning.

4. But, Mr. Hardman, you not only commend this Calvinistic pamphlet, but you tell me, that it contains new, convincing and unanswerable arguments against us. My idea of it is pretty much the reverse. All the arguments of these new foes to Popery, which have any weight, have been a thousand times objected by your divines, and a thousand times refuted by ours. I could easily shew you the refutation of them all. It is an ungracious as well as an unprofitable task, to prove that your authors are entitled to honourable distinction in the Duaciad. But it would be easy to shew, that their powers of argumentation are just commensurate with their powers of description; and that they are as little qualified to argue against our principles conclusively, as they are to state them correctly. Their knowledge and ingenuity are contracted within a very limited circle. They favour us with a specimen of their political knowledge, when they condescend to inform us that "that power which abrogates laws is greater than the power which first enacted them, supposing the latter to be in exist-

ence." As if God could not abrogate the old law to establish the new; or as if the legislature could not repeal, in one session, a law made in another. They have shewn some novelty and ingenuity in the following theological discovery: "This vaunted principle respecting the authority of the Church seems to ourselves," say they, "a sort of deifying of the Church: it has a tendency to wrest the sceptre from his Almighty hand, and to invest her with the powers of Omnipotence, while the practical exercise of this principle, if not actually, is nearly allied to the grossest idolatry." As if this newly discovered species of Popish idolatry, which is just as idle and visionary as the former ones, might not be retorted on themselves, by merely substituting the noun substantive *Scripture*, in the place of their noun substantive *Church*. If I allude to these specimens of their novelty and ingenuity in argumentation, it is not with a view of wasting any observation to correct the obliquity, or dissipate the darkness of ideas, which they exhibit; but to shew you, that your invincible polemics are safer when they stand behind the entrenchments of others, than when they attempt to raise any new ones of their own.

You seem to think, Mr. Hardman, that because these authors quote the Bible, and declaim against Popery, they are profound divines, conclusive reasoners, and enlightened apologists of your parliamentary church. To this opinion I cannot subscribe. Their religion differs no less from the Church of England, than it does from the Church of Rome. Their religion, Sir, like that of many others, who follow Protestant principles, is a clumsy and ill assorted piece of scriptural patchwork, consisting of scriptural shreds tacked together, according to their own capricious taste and fancy, without either the justness of proportion, the beauty of symmetry, or the rule of truth. They set out it is true, on the ground of Protestant principles; but being bolder than you in the art of protesting, they soon leave you many a furlong behind them. They affirm that the Bible contains the whole will of Jesus Christ, and the whole and sole rule of a Christian's faith. They affirm as warmly as you do, "the Bible, I say, the Bible is the only religion of Protestants." We deny these principles. We prove them to be false, delusive, and enthusiastic: We are therefore authorized to reject the conclusions which result from them. You churchmen admit these principles. They are your own. Consistency requires therefore that you should admit the conclusions which these authors legitimately draw from the premises. You are a stout church and king man, Mr. Hardman, and can call out, *No Popery*, in an ale-house, or at a vestry-meeting, as loudly as any inhabitant of our parish. Now let me point out to your reflection one specimen of the reasoning of these authors, in a case which comes home to your own feelings; a case which clearly decides either that your principles are false, or your church is erroneous. It will not only change your opinion as to the merits and orthodoxy of these authors, whom your aversion to our religion has taught you blindly to commend: but will at once

shew you how the Bible may be abused by wanton interpretation; and how inadequately your own favourite Protestant Church of England can defend itself, by Scripture alone, against the arbitrary construction of mere bible-men. These authors take up the Bible, they read it; and what does their contracted and vulgar cast of mind discover? That the Church should be without a clergy, a flock without pastors, save such as are of a presbyterian description. What, you will say, are there to be no Protestant deacons, priests, vicars, rectors, deans, archdeacons, bishops, archbishops, with a king at their head, the Defender of the Faith? No. The independency of their ideas and presbyterian optics can discover none of this Popish trumpery in the Scripture. They tell you, that all such authority is an usurpation of the prerogatives of Christ! In the New Testament they can discover nothing but the laity and *Office-bearers*. They say "the laity constitute the church, and teachers and pastors are its office-bearers." p. 15. I must remark that they have not pointed out either the chapter or verse where this phraseology occurs in the Bible. Following your own authorized version, they find, that a bishop is but an *overseer*, (Acts xx. 28*); a priest is but an *elder*; (Acts xiv. 23.—xv. 4.), a deacon but a *servant* (Acts vi. 2.) As to an Archbishop of Canterbury, a Bishop of Chester, a Dean of Peterborough, a Prebendary of Westminster, or Durham, a Vicar or Curate

* The present authorized English version of the Bible still retains a taint of that Calvinistic spirit, which Foreign and British reformers imported from Geneva, and which they copiously infused into the travestied English translations commonly used in the reigns of Edward VI. and Elizabeth. But as the English version stands at present, this spirit is perhaps no where more apparent, than in the translation of the Acts of the Apostles, particularly chap. xx. v. 28. Instead of translating this most important passage, as it is correctly translated in the Latin Vulgate, and the English Catholic Testament: "take heed to yourselves, and to the whole flock, wherein the Holy Ghost hath placed you Bishops, to rule the church of God, which he hath purchased with his own blood." it has contrived to mutilate the sense and degrade the expression to a degree scarcely exemplified in any grave translation from other languages, thus: the Holy Ghost hath made you overseers to feed &c. I shall not stop to prove, what every scholar must admit, that though the metaphor derived from the simplicity of primitive manners and pastoral life *Poisinano*, in its lowest sense, means to feed, as a shepherd does his flock, yet when it is applied by the sacred writers to David, to Christ, or, as in this place, to Bishops, and when it is applied by profane writers to kings, as it is by Homer to Agamemnon, (Iliad. B. II. v. 55,) the verb *feed* does not express one half of its meaning. The word *overseer* is duly qualified to keep company with its degraded associate, *feed*. The lowest degradation to which ingenuity can possibly reduce the etymon *Episcopus*, may be inspector, superintendent, looker-on, overlooker, supervisor, or *overseer*. But does this express half the meaning of the term? As well might we say, that the overseer or supervisor of Durham, is the Bishop of Durham; and with equal propriety might we translate, Christus Pontifex noster, Christ our Bridgebuilder, instead of Christ our High Priest. Much more than an overseer is implied in the venerable term which has been religiously incorporated into the language of almost every Christian nation. No pedigree in the Herald's Office is more honourable or authentic than the etymology of the English word Bishop: in the original Greek, *Episcopus*: in Latin, *Episcopus*, in Italian, *Vescovo*; in French, *Evêque*; in Spanish, *Obispo*; in German, *Bischoff*; in Dutch, *Bischoep*; in Anglo-Saxon, *Bircop*; in English, *Bishop*. If the English Protestant translators of the Bible, in Acts xx. 28. overlooked the English word *Bishop* which never had more than one exclusive meaning, and have degraded the first officer of the church into the lowest underling of a parish, it is not from accident, but design. Perhaps they intended it as a compliment to the Overseers of Nag's Head memory. Certain it is such translating is not the word of God. Mr. Nolan has ably vindicated the authenticity of the Vulgate, in this verse, as well as in the first Epistle of St. John. ch. v. v. 7. from the scepticism of Griesbach and other nibbling critics,

of Kirkham, all these institutions are but the filthy rags of Babylon. These institutions, say they, changing the word Popish for Protestant, are all unscriptural, all an usurpation of Christ's sole and exclusive priesthood. "The application of scripture to such authority," they further tell you, "is such a manifest wresting of the words of Christ, that they find some difficulty in resisting the conviction that your Church has wilfully perverted the Sacred Scriptures, to support her claims to such authority. Their argument stands thus: "The Apostles justly considered that the words of Christ, All power is given to me, peremptorily excluded all separate or conjunct authority. How then shall we reconcile the claims of your church in matters of authority, (even your Protestant church, consisting of a regal head, with bishops, priests, &c., with the offices of Jesus Christ! Her pretensions to such authority, appear to us to be an usurpation of the prerogatives of the Saviour. All authority in matters of religion, except that of Christ, is strange to his people. He is the alone Prophet and King in the Church of God." Our divines are apt to smile, and yours to writhe at these leveling arguments of John Calvin.

Now, Mr. Hardman, I beg leave to observe, that if this mode of reasoning, from the bare letter of the Scripture, be formidable and unanswerable, it is only so to you, and your church authority, not to ours. We stand on more solid ground. This very spirit of your authors, among the Puritans, Presbyterians, and Independents, of former times, employed the same process of the *Bible alone interpreted by fanaticism*, both to overturn your church, to destroy the monarchy, and to deluge England with blood. They justified their rebellion by proclaiming no authority but the authority of Christ: no priest but priest Jesus: no king but king Jesus. To the Bible alone, as interpreted by themselves, they appealed both to justify their wickedness, and to sanction their atrocities. Our reverence for the Bible condemns such a flagrant abuse of the Holy Books, whether it proceed from an ancient Puritan or from the modern Praise-God Barebones, who have written this new, convincing and unanswerable pamphlet. If I did not feel an invincible repugnance to imitate your authors, in wantonly perverting the meaning and profaning the sanctity of the Bible, I could prove from express texts, that you are religiously obliged to wear only one coat; and that when you leave my fire-side, and return home, this cold, stormy, winter evening, you ought to leave both your great coat and your pockets behind. The puritanical pamphlet which you so inconsiderately commend, without perceiving its tendency, is a tissue of confident ignorance, of coarse vulgarity, and blind enthusiasm. It has not convinced me of one error in the Catholic faith: but it has strengthened my conviction, that the Protestant Rule of Faith cannot lead men to the unity of truth; but only into a multiplied variety of errors.

I shall resume the subject of our conversation in my next letter. In the mean time, I am,

Gentlemen,

Your, &c. &c.
JOHN HARDMAN.

Arguments in favour of the Catholic doctrine of *Transubstantiation and the real presence*; Selected from the sermons preached on that subject by the Reverend Richard Hayes.

The preacher addresses thus the Saviour, as seated at his last supper with his Apostles.

"From sittest. O loving victim of mankind! thou art now, for the last time of thy mortal life, at table with thy beloved and grieving friends; thou biddest them thy last adieu; an hour hence, and the garden of Gethsemani, steeped in thy sweat of blood, shall see thee torn from them by thy ruffian foes. Thy time is short, O Jesus: man's redemption hurries thee away; haste, haste; Say—announce—declare the legacy thou hast to bequeath to thy infant Church. What may it be? worthy, (who can doubt it?) of thy boundless love, thy all-commanding power. Is it thy heavenly doctrine? That thou hast already taught to thy apostles, and they, of course, will teach the same to us. Is it thy history? That thou hast not written; and though thy servants shall hereafter write it, the gift is not peculiar to thy church. To infidels, as well as to thy faithful, to thy blasphemers and to thy adorers thy written history is alike presented. Is it some emblem, some figure of thyself? The Jews, who soon shall crucify thee, have, in the sacrifices of their law; emblems and figures innumerable of thee. Hast thou nothing better, to give thy Church, than Moses had to give the Synagogue? Hast thou no divine bequest to leave thy children, not only in their collective, but in their individual capacity? no divine memorial to convey the memory, grace, and fruit of thy approaching death, to every single soul, who, from this last and awful night, until the trump of thy Archangel sound, shall clasp thy faith, and love thy blessed name? Search, search, O Jesus! the depths of thy wisdom, the riches of thy mercy, the immensity of thy power, and the abyss of thy love. Descend—create—bequeath to us a legacy, worthy of thy omnipotence, worthy of thy affection—worthy of thy new covenant, worthy of thy eternal Father—worthy of thyself, worthy of thy dying hour, worthy of an expiring God.

Everlasting praises laud thy love through heaven and through earth, thou lover of our souls! My humble prayer thou hast anticipated. For lo! thy Apostle says: "I have received of the Lord, that which I also delivered to you, that the Lord Jesus, the night in which he was betrayed, took bread, and giving thanks, broke, and said; Take ye, and eat: this is my body which shall be delivered for you: do this for the commemoration of me." In like manner also the chalice, after he had stepped, saying: this chalice is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye shall drink it for the commemoration of me. 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. c. 11.

A mystery! the bare announcement of which carries the stamp of the divinity; for none but God himself could have even devised it. And how shall I, then, my brethren, perform the awful task for

which I stand before you? A mystery! so far above the reach of flesh and blood, yet, so constantly and universally professed by the whole Church of Christ, from the night of its institution to its present anniversary; so obstinately contradicted by Scripture readers, yet, so clearly and solemnly laid down in scripture; so blindly rejected by the carnal man, in whom "the flesh profiteth nothing," yet, so steadfastly believed, so fervently loved, so beneficially received by him, to whom "the words of Jesus are spirit and life." A mystery such as this, overpowers a preacher: not by the difficulty, but by the multiplicity of its proofs.—May its divine donor direct my tongue to announce with dignity, and inspire my audience to hear with faith, and receive with rapture this last legacy of redeeming love! And as "the weapons of my warfare are not carnal," do thou, O Jesus, render them, according to the saying of thy great preacher Paul, "powerful, through thee, to the destruction of fortifications, subverting of councils, and every height that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God, and bringing into captivity every understanding to the obedience of Christ!"

The Catholic Church believes, that when the respective words of consecration, 'This is my body—This is my blood,' were, on this night, pronounced by Christ, he changed the substance of the bread into that of his body, and the substance of the wine into that of his blood; which change of substances she designates by the expressive term, *Transubstantiation*. She believes, that although the whole substance of the bread is changed into the body alone, and the whole substance of the wine into the blood alone, yet nevertheless, the body is always accompanied by the blood, soul and divinity, and the blood by the body, soul and divinity; not through the respective changes, which have been effected in the bread and wine, but through the necessary and inseparable connection between the body, blood and soul, united, all and each in the one divine person; so that where any one of them is, all of them must be. This point was either ignorantly misunderstood, or wilfully misrepresented by the Reverend Mr. Griens, who, in his late pretended reply to the Right Rev. Dr. Milner's justly celebrated work, intitled 'The End of controversy, ridiculously charges with inconsistency the General Council of Trent, for saying, in one canon, that the bread and wine are changed into the body and blood; and in another that under each species, and each particle of each species, are contained the body, blood, soul and divinity, and consequently Christ entire. There is an essential difference between the words 'contained' and 'changed'; the former denotes presence, no matter from what cause; the latter a presence caused by the change. The Jews nailed Christ's body on the cross; they did not nail his blood thereon, it was liquid; they did not nail his soul thereon, they could not touch it; much less his divinity; yet, where the body hung, there blood and soul, and divinity were present. So, in the Eucharist, the bread is changed into the body, not into the other three, although the other three accompany the

body; and the wine is changed into the blood, not into the other three, although the other three accompany the blood.

The Catholic Church further believes, that this mystery is a real sacrifice, consisting in the separate transubstantiation of the bread into the body alone, and, of the wine into the blood alone; and as far as these two separate acts of consecration operate, the body alone is produced under the species of bread, and the blood alone under the species of wine; although, by the union of the divine person with the humanity, where the one is, the other must be, together with the soul and the divinity. The Jews, by murdering our Divine Redeemer, separated the blood from the body, and the body from the soul; but owing to the intimate union of the divine person with the humanity, they could not separate that person from either; and the divinity was as present with the body in the sepulchre, as it was with the soul when she descended into hell. Now, however, 'Christ dies no more,' and, therefore, though his body and his blood are produced by separate acts, and under separate species yet, the presence of the one necessarily brings with it the presence of the other, together with both soul and divinity. Hence the Catholic Church teaches, that, to perform the sacrifice, it is necessary to consecrate separately, and consume under both species; but, on the contrary, to receive Christ as a sacrament, either species is sufficient; as either species, and every particle of either species contains Christ entire in his whole humanity and in his whole divinity; not by the change effected in the consecration, for that produces the body or the blood alone, but by the intimate union of his divine person with his body, blood and soul; which, having once assumed, the Son of God never relinquished, nor allowed to separate, except at his death; when his body, blood and soul were separated, not from the divinity, but from each other, for the short space of three days.

The Catholic Church further holds, that Christ is present in the sacrament, as long as the appearance and qualities of bread or wine continue; and that when these are destroyed, either in the stomach of the receiver, or by any other means, then Christ is no longer there. Finally, the Catholic Church believes, that by the words, "Do this in commemoration of me," our all-powerful Redeemer ordained his Apostles Priests of the new law, empowering and commanding them to do what he had done; namely, to change bread and wine into his body and his blood, and offer them up in sacrifice: that this power, together with all the others necessary for the permanency of his religion, is transmitted to their successors, the priests of the Catholic Church: that, consequently, Christ, in his humanity and divinity, is present on every altar where Mass is celebrated: that this daily sacrifice, is substantially and ineriorously, the same, as the bloody sacrifice of the cross, because the divine victim is the same in both: and, that it is likewise a commemoration of his death, because the mode

and only the mode of oblation is different; the former being effected by the real effusion of his mortal blood from his mortal body, producing that separation of body & soul which constitutes death; the latter consisting in the two separate acts and effects of consecration, as I have above explained; by which, the reality on the altar representing the reality on the cross—and the separate change of the bread into the body, and of the wine into the blood, representing the mortal separation of the blood, & consequently, of the soul, from the body on the cross—

we "shew the death of the Lord until he come." Such my brethren, is the doctrine of the Church; such is the prodigy of transubstantiation in the blessed Eucharist; such is the legacy our dying Jesus left us. And is there herein any thing impossible to God? Who dares ask the blasphemous question? Shall He, who made all things out of nothing, not be able to change one thing into another, preserving still the same appearance? A creation is far more difficult than a change. Shall He, who converted water into wine with all its qualities, not have power to convert bread into his body without the change of qualities? If there be a difference in the miracles, the former was the greater, because the change was greater. Shall He who, in his own divine person, caused God, that is, himself to become man, be born, live, and die as man, and rise again—shall he not have power to make the bread become his body? The distance between the latter, (for both bread and body are creatures,) is nothing to the distance between the former—the creator and the creature—God and man. Shall he, who is the same being with the Father and the Holy Ghost, and yet not the same person; He, who is really distinct from both, yet subsists, with both, in the one, simple, uncomposed, and undivided essence—shall he not do what we cannot comprehend? Oh! let those, who deny this power to Jesus, cast the scriptures altogether aside, and deny, on the same ground of incomprehensibility, his creation, his miracles, his incarnation, and his consubstantiality with the Father and the Holy Ghost! The change, therefore, of the bread into his body, or of the wine into his blood, that is, Transubstantiation, has in it nothing impossible to Christ.

To be continued.

ORIGINAL.

In allusion to the letter of Camillus, which appeared in the last number of *The Catholic*; we cannot help observing that on no rational principle of their persuasion, ought Protestants of any denomination to seek to make proselytes. For their sole rule of faith being, as they all declare, *their own private judgment*; it is evident that their particular creed, be that whatever it may, is founded on nothing else but their own private opinion. Now, this they all allow to be fallible, or liable to err. Then their persuasion, whatever it may be, may possibly be a mistaken one: and if so, they have missed that *faith, without which, according to Saint Paul, it is impossible to please God.* Heb. 11. 6. They be-

lieve not that, which, as the Saviour said, *he who does not believe shall be condemned.* Mark. xvi. 16.

Is it not then enough for them to stake their own salvation upon a principle so unsure, since a confessedly fallible one; without at the same time making themselves answerable to God for the loss of others; whom, perchance, they have led astray, and blindly decoyed into the by-path of error: a path which, if Scripture testimony is sure, can never conduct us to that God, who is the *Truth*; and which therefore leads us to destruction. *For if the blind lead the blind, both fall into the pit.*—Matt. 15, 14

Besides, in seeking to make proselytes to their particular sects; Protestants act in evident contradiction to their professed and constituent principle; which is, that *every one is to judge for himself in matters of faith; and not to be swayed by any human authority.* Was it not even on this very plea that they rejected the instructive authority of the catholic church? And is it not still on the same pretence that they scorn to hear her voice; or the voice of any one dissenting from themselves? Each acting up, in his turn, to their common protestant rule, is bound to shut his ears against every human advice or testimony: and abide by the sole decisions of his own private judgment.

With what possible arguments then can one Protestant convince another of an error in judgment; and prove himself alone to have followed the only sure criterion of truth? The very reasons adduced by him in support of his own particular opinion, are equally admissible in favour of every one's opposite mode of thinking.

The fact is, the Protestant's rule, for settling religious differences, seems purposely made and calculated to multiply and perpetuate them. And, indeed, where ever, or when, was any error corrected by it? The right of private judgment, that essentially protestant principle; which they, who first assumed it against all Church authority, were under the necessity of bequeathing to their rightful heirs and followers; is not an uniting, but a dividing; not a gathering, but a dispersing principle. Matt. xii. 30. By it none dare affirm any thing assuredly, definitively: nor can they cite the wildest theorists and worst blasphemers before any avowedly competent or sensible tribunal; and condemn by any unquestionable authority those, who have an equal right with their judges to judge for themselves. They have, it is true, the letter of the law, the Scriptures; that is to say, those who think they should retain them. But who ever in a law suit would explain the letter of the law against himself; were he, as every Protestant is, in the religious sense, allowed to be its rightful interpreter?

How different is the case with Catholics! Their *Rule of Faith* is a principle of union and concord; the invariable testimony of the universal Church; and the very one laid down in the clearest terms by the Saviour himself in the sacred Scriptures. *He who will not hear the Church,* says he, *let him be unto thee, as a heathen and a publican.* Matt. xviii. 17. And, *he who hears you,* says he again,

speaking to his lawful pastors, *hears me: and he, who despises you, despises me.* Luke x. 16. *Go,* says he, *and teach all nations—and lo! I am with you at all times, even to the end of the world.*—Matt. xxviii. 20. *The paraclete, the holy Ghost,* said he, *whom the father will send in my name; he will teach you all things; and bring all things to your mind, whatsoever I have said unto you.* John xiv. 27. *When he, the spirit of truth is come; he will teach you all truth.* Ibid. ch. xvi. v. 13.

The Catholic therefore in a matter of such moment relies not on his own opinion and conjectures? His religion, as a revealed one, is independent of his private judgment; her truths once pronounced, are unchangeably the same, in spite of all our reasonings upon them, or surmises against them; and their evidence exists in the consentient testimony of all nations, since their revelation by the Deity himself incarnate. It is on this testimony of lawfully commissioned pastors every where teaching and people every where taught, the same truths, that the Catholic rests his faith, as on a firm unshaken rock. He is not like those, who making their own judgment the criterion of their faith, are carried about by every wind of doctrine. *Always learning,* as Saint Paul describes them, *but never arriving at the knowledge of truth: always growing worse and worse: erring and driving into error: not enduring sound doctrine; but, according to their own desires, heaping to themselves teachers, having itching ears.* 2. Tim. iv. iii. No, he abides by the word already spoken, *the sound of which has gone forth to the uttermost ends of the earth.* He adheres and clings fast to the majestic, universal and only Church of the Redeemer; that Church, which the Apostle Saint Paul designates *the pillar and ground of faith:* the only one of the Saviour's founding; to which therefore all his promises were made, and among the rest, that *the gates of hell should never prevail against her.* Who, calling themselves Christians, dare give him the lie; and say that *the gates of hell have long since prevailed against her;* nay, that she has become the very gate of hell, a deep sink of falsehood, idolatry, and corruption? *Heaven and Earth,* said her Divine founder, *shall pass away; but my word shall never pass away.* Heaven and earth remain as yet; but your words, say our reformers, have passed away, unrealized; and all your magnificent promises to your Church are broken. Such was the blasphemous import of the language held by a perjured Monk, and his Apostate associates; the boasted fathers of the Protestant reformation. But listen to me, said their daring Chief. Though the whole Church of Christ has erred in her head and members; all truth is centered in my german brain. Mine is the light to enlighten the world, which, but for me, would remain in the *darkness of error and the shadow of death.* His selfish monopoly of such transcendent wisdom, was soon usurped upon, and rivalled too by his earliest associates; and is still claimed, as their rightful inheritance, by his or their reforming progeny down to the present day. Their *Magna Charta,* or common charter, transmitted down to them by their

protesting ancestors, allows them all an equal and unlimited right to protest against any or every doctrine revealed; which either battles their private judgment; their worldly interest, or thwarts their carnal propensities and sensual inclinations. Nay, it allows, without lawful mission, without learning, knowledge, or any thing estimable to recommend them, the very dregs of society, every broken up tradesman; ruined spendthrift; out of place menial, and money-hunting hypocrite; to become an Apostle, and more than Apostle, the founder every day of some new fancied religion. They who, according to St. Peter, with feigned words make merchandize of you. 2 Pet. ii. v. 3.

The zeal which each of these must have to augment his little flock, may account for the exertions used by some of our simple town's women, (the easy dupes and cat paws) to make proselytes to their whimsical sects of the bribe-won Irish innocents: though, by what I understand, in the teeth of want, and threats of no charitable description, the poor, but conscientious and high-minded descendants of Saints and heroes; the humble professors of that same Catholic faith, which was preached to their ancestors by the great Saint Patrick; have afforded small encouragement to our sectarian kidnapers to renew their base bribing efforts of seduction.

When were Catholics, with all the certainty of truth upon their side, confirmed not only by the Redeemer's promises to their Church; but by the unanimous belief of the countless millions for so many ages attached to her communion:—When were ever Catholics seen, however desirous of making proselytes to their Religion; and sure of thereby incurring no responsibility before God for the souls of their converts; but on the contrary, of deserving from him the highest promised rewards:—When, I say, with all this, were Catholics ever seen, like our screaming enthusiast, petticoat missionaries, obtruding themselves upon their Protestant neighbours; taking advantage of their necessitous circumstances; and tempting them, as the Devil did the Saviour, when he was hungry; to give up their children to their fanatical training, for a bit of bread, or some worn out shreds of needful clothing; charging them otherwise in all their wants and distresses never to look up to them for the smallest assistance?

No, the Catholic is no kidnapper of infant proselytes to his Church. His religion allows him not to tempt his fellow creatures with a bribe to act against his internal conviction. He is taught that he cannot do the least evil even to effect the greatest good. He would not damn the parent, by inducing him to commit a crime, were it even to save the child. If he ever pleads in favour of his religion; it is only either in its defence, with the ignorant aggressors, who scoff at it, and scorn it; or with those wishing to be made acquainted with its real tenets, so disguised and misrepresented by its enemies. In no other way do Catholics ever attempt to make proselytes. Let others then bring down their hot burning zeal to the same degree of moderate tempera-

ture; and then we need never apprehend from the high pressure of fanaticism the danger of any sudden explosion.

O, laugh, or mourn with me, the rueful jest!
Cateper.

IGNIS FATUUS.

Jack and the Lantern, or Will and the Wisp, a new song, to the tune of Killicrankie.

Was ever so saintly a people as ours?
Was e'er so religious a nation?
His tools thrown by, ev'ry tradesman now scours
The country, and preaches salvation,
With bible in hand; black coat and white band,
These Apostles are ev'ry where swarming;
The text they expound; and, in sanctified sound,
They descant in a manner so charming;
That young run, and old run, and all run to hear them:
The light skipping folks are the first to get near them:
The old hoppers last on their tiptoes must rear them,
To catch th' evangelical echo.

You Carrier of skins, bark 'now he begins
His ditty so drawing and holy.
The crowds in amaze on their oracle gaze;
Then melt at the sound melancholy.
"Dear brethren, alas! you have all gone astray;
"And your back-sliding guides have betray'd you.
"But mine is the light that will shew you the way:
"And this bible the torch that will guide you."
Against the proud Philistines while he's inveighing;
For the ark of the Lord they are fainting and dying:
They're sobbing and sighing, they're weeping and crying:
And the spirit of sadness broods o'er them.

"But hark ye, beloved! and mark what I say!
"The day of our glory's approaching;
"When the Lord will his enemies put in dismay;
"And humble the Heathen reproaching.
"Though now his abode is established in peace,
"While we in the wilderness wander;
"To make for us room, soon he will them displace,
"Who dare his own people to slander."
Then loud they're exulting: the foes they're insulting:
With blows they would bang them; while others
would hang them:
"Twere pity to spare them, who thus would ensnare
them:
And Hell's gaping jaws shall devour them.

"But, now for the gospel if such is your zeal,
"Give charity's mite to support it.
"Nor would I, though lab'ring thus hard for your weal,
"By force, like the hireling, extort it.
"What you give to you: Pastor, you lend to the Lord;
"And he, in his time, will reward you.
"From each he's expecting what each can afford;
"So may he in mercy regard you.
Then coppers resound in the hollow hat jingling,
Their counterfeits some sons of Belial are mingling.
The chosen their thin silver sixpence drop tlingling.
A sound to the Preacher so cheering,

The Protestant, or negative faith, refuted, and the Catholic, or affirmative faith, demonstrated from Scripture.

Continued.

XX.

OF PERSONS, PLACES, AND THINGS BLESSED AND CONSECRATED FOR HOLY PURPOSES.

Protestants still deny, in the very teeth of that Scripture, by which they pretend to regulate their faith, that persons, places and things may be duly consecrated and set apart for holy purposes; and the service of the sanctuary: or that one place can thus be made holier than another. They ridicule and condemn all the Catholic consecrations, styling them, in their vituperative slang, mere mummeries. Was then, holy Jacob's act a *mummery*, when he consecrated the stone, on which he rested his head, the night he saw in his sleep the vision of the mystical ladder: pouring oil upon the stone, and vowing a vow to the Lord. Gen. xviii. 18. Were all the ceremonies, expressly ordered by God himself, in the consecrations of his priests, and of every thing

appertaining to his worship, mere mummeries? Were those also mere mummeries, which the Saviour used himself in working certain miracles; his making clay with his spittle, and anointing with it the eyes of the man born blind; desiring him at the same time to go and wash in the pool of Siloe, which is interpreted Sent? His touching again with his spittle, the tongue; and his thrusting his finger into the ears of the man presented to him, who was deaf and dumb after leading him aside from the multitude? His looking up to heaven, and groaning? His finally crying out with a loud voice. *EMETA!* be opened? His breathing upon the Apostles, when he gave them the Holy Ghost, with the power of forgiving and retaining sin? Were all these mystical signs, or ceremonies, mere mummeries? If not, why should they be accounted such, when used with the same meaning by his Church? What then is a mere mummery? A low mocking Protestant term, invented, like many others, to the laudable purpose of throwing ridicule on the sacred, but misrepresented, rites of the Catholic Church. It is the last argument of nonplused folly; the spiteful idiot's lolling tongue. It is one of the many derisive epithets which the hissing, true brood of the Serpent incessantly spit forth against the spotless spouse of Christ: such as *Papist, Popish, Papistical, Romish, Monkish, &c.* Yet, with all their viperous ists and ishes, darted forth with forked tongue against her, they have never been able to deprive her of her own universally acknowledged and distinguishing title, *Catholic*: a title too lofty, long-lasting and great, for any of their mushroom and ephemeral sets to lay claim to.

The ceremonies of the Catholic Church in her consecrations and benedictions, in her sacrifice and sacraments; are all scriptural; and have all their sacred and instructive meanings; which, from careless, uninquiring and wilful ignorance, Protestants blindly ridicule and condemn. Yet every creature, says St. Paul, is sanctified by the word of God, and by prayer.—1 Tim. iv. 5.—But those creatures are particularly so sanctified, which are set aside, and exclusively devoted to holy purposes. Thus, the Ark was so holy, that some for touching it; others, for only looking irreverently at it; were struck dead upon the spot by Almighty God.—1 Kings, vi. 19.—2 Kings, vi. 7.—The Jewish monarch, for daring to usurp the priestly function of offering up incense to God in the temple; on his seizing the censor, was smitten with the leprosy, a disease which excluded one from the house of God, and from all society. He was therefore immediately expelled the temple; shut up from the public, as a leper, till his death; and finally buried apart from the Kings of Juda.—2 Parab. xxvi. 19.—The King of Babylon, for profaning the sacred vessels, taken out of the temple of Jerusalem, by drinking out of them at his feast himself, together with his courtiers and concubines; had his dismal doom denounced in the mysterious hand-writing, which he saw traced upon the wall of his banquetting room; and which the

Prophet Daniel interpreted to him.—Dan. v. 3, 6.

Need I mention the *holy oil of unction*: the sacerdotal vestments—the High Priest's mitre, with the mystical name of God, engraved on a plate of the purest gold, and placed on the front of it: the *ephod*: the oracular *urim* and *thummim*; the *Altars*: the perpetual *holy fire*, &c. Lev. 16, 12. the presanctifications of the priests, the people and the victims? Even the *holy water*, which Protestants so dislike, and make a mock of, was kept and sprinkled by the order of God, and with the same allusion in the Jewish Church, as in the Catholic. Lev. 5, 17. Num. 5, 7. *Wafers too of fine flour*, were offered up, and styled the *holy of holy oblations*. Lev. 2, 4, (a striking emblem of the real *Holy of Holies* offered up in the Catholic Church.

Now, if Protestants allow, as they must, or deny at once all scripture authority, that these things in the Jewish Church were rendered holy by the priestly consecrations: on what ground do they deny the consecrations of Messiah's priesthood, at least an equally sanctifying efficacy? Will they say that nothing appertaining to his religion is so holy and venerable, as ought that appertained to the Mosaic dispensation? That the shadow is preferable to the substance? The figure more august than the reality?

As to the peculiar sanctity of certain places, there are numberless instances of such mentioned in the sacred scriptures. *Terrible is this place*, said Jacob, on awaking from his dream. *This is nothing else but the house of God, and the gate of heaven; and, arising in the morning, he took the stone, which he had placed under his head; and raised it up, as a monument, pouring oil upon it.* Gen. xxviii. 17, 19.—*Come not near*, said God to Moses from the burning bush. *Put the shoes from off thy feet; for the place on which thou standest, is holy ground.*—Exod. iii. 5.—The like warning and command was given to Joshua by an Angel. Josh. v. 16.

To say nothing of the temple, from the sacred precincts of which the Saviour cast forth the buyers and sellers, who profaned it with their worldly traffic. Nay, we find in the Scripture, holy, and miracle-working wells, brooks and rivers: such as the *pool of Siloe*, the waters of which were good for restoring sight:—the *probatic pond*, which, when stirred by an angel, cured every debility in the human frame: and the waters of the Jordan, better as Naaman found them for curing the leprosy, than those of the Damascian rivers, *Abana and Pharpar*.—1 Kings, 5, 15.

XXI.

OF MIRACLES.

Protestants deny that Christ has left with his Church the power of working miracles; contrary to his own express declaration, recorded in scripture. *Them that believe, says he, these signs shall follow; in my name they shall cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents; and, if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them: they shall lay their hands upon the sick, and they shall recover.*—Mark xvi. 17,

&c. This, as we read in the same holy scripture, was but the renewal of that ample promise, which he had made before, in the following most solemn manner: *Amen, amen, I say unto you: he, who believeth; the things that I do, he shall do also; and greater than these shall he do, because I go to the father.* Where then in all scripture do Protestants read; for they say they believe nothing but scripture; that the Saviour ever retracted, or limited these his promises to time, or place? It is true, he limited them to the true believers; that is, to his own Church. And Protestants, by acknowledging, as they all do, and must, that the power of working miracles was never with them; avow themselves *not the believers*, to whom the Saviour granted it.

To be continued.

BIBLICAL NOTICES AND EXPLANATIONS.

Continued.

NUMBERS.

Verse 15.—*Only for the first born of man, thou shalt take a price: and every beast, that is unclean, thou shalt cause to be redeemed.* This order evidently points at the redemption of man: and that in particular of every sinner, represented by the *beast that is unclean*.

Verse 17.—*The firstling of a cow, and of a sheep and of a goat, thou shalt not cause to be redeemed: because they are sanctified to the Lord. Their blood only thou shalt pour upon the Altar; and their fat thou shalt burn for a sweet odour to the Lord.*—These, all innocent emblems not of the redeemed, but of the Redeemer himself, whose blood was to be shed for the atonement of our guilt; were sanctified to the Lord; and not to be redeemed.—Their fat represents their good condition, from having throve upon their food; which in the spiritual sense is the word of God; by ruminating on which one's spiritual well being is improved. It is this that kindles at the fire of charity; and feeds the sacred flame. Their flesh too, was proper to be eaten, like that of the final victim, whom they represented: of him, who said: *my flesh is meat indeed*.

Verse 20. *And the Lord said to Aaron; you shall possess nothing in their land; neither shall you have a portion among them. I am thy portion and inheritance in the midst of the children of Israel.*

Verse 23.—*It shall be, an everlasting ordinance in your generation. They shall not possess any other thing.*

By this ordinance, declared an everlasting one, and therefore one to be continued in the realization of the figure; the clergy are to be detached from every earthly tie; and to take the Lord alone, when they are called to serve in his Tabernacle, for their portion and inheritance. They are not then to encumber themselves with wives and families; who necessarily divert their attention from their sacred duties: for he who has a wife says Saint Paul, *mindeth the things of the world, and how to please his wife; but he, who has not a wife, mindeth the things of the Lord; and how to please the Lord.* Their family is their flock. And to them, (the Saviour's priesthood,) the prophet Isaiah thus clearly alludes: *Let not the son of the stranger who adhereth to the Lord, speak, saying; the Lord will divide, and separate me from his people. And let not the Eunuch say, (he who makes himself such in will for the kingdom of Heaven,) behold I am a dry tree. For thus saith the Lord to the Eunuchs, I will give to them in my house, (that is in his Church) and within my walls, a name better than sons and daughters. I will give them an everlasting name which shall never perish.*

Isaiah 56. 3, 4, 5. A carnal offspring prolongs but for a time the name of its progenitor: but a spiritual offspring, like that, which Saint Paul says, he has begotten in Christ, prolongs its progenitor's name in Heaven for eternity. The Saviour's Priesthood, at his call, left father and mother, sister and brother, wife and children to follow him: for unless they did this, as he declared, they could not be his disciples.

Chapter 19. *The red cow of full age, without blemish.—delivered to the priest, and brought forth without the camp to be immolated in the sight of all; into whose blood the priest is to dip his finger, and to sprinkle it over against the door of the tabernacle seven times; Is a most striking figure of the Saviour, the immaculate one of full age: delivered over to the High Priest, and led forth beyond the gate, all red in his sacred blood from the scourging; to be immolated in the sight of all.* Heb. 11. 13.

Jesus Christ is the eternal wisdom of the father; represented to us in the figurative language of scripture as of either sexe, though in reality of neither; for in God there is no sex. This, however shews us the propriety of the feminine emblem ordained in this and in other sacrifices: and also for the reasons already given, that as in the ram the bullock, the he goat &c, he is represented as the father of the flock or herd; that is, of the clean animals, his holy followers; so, under the appearance of the heifer, the she goat, &c. he is represented as the mother, feeding and rearing, in the Eucharist, with her own proper substance her cherished offspring.

Verse 5. The burning of the cow, represents the Saviour's death for the love of mankind. He was our expiatory victim consumed in the fire of his own divine charity. For, *greater love than this, said he, no man hath, than that he lay down his life for his friend.*

Verse 6. The cedar wood alludes, as we observed, to the cross: the hyssop, to the antileprous and sin cleansing efficacy of the sacrifice: and the scarlet twice dyed, like the colour of the victim, to the bloody ransom paid for our guilty race.

Verse 17. *Living waters* are to be poured upon the ashes of the burning of the red cow: and with these waters every one that is unclean is to be sprinkled on the third day, and on the seventh.

Verse 20. *If any man be not expiated after this rite, his soul shall perish out of the midst of the Church.*

Verse 21. *This precept shall be an ordinance for ever.*

The unclean are those in the state of original or actual sin. The cleansing virtue of the living waters is all derived from the ashes of the red cow, into which they are poured. So the virtue of the water of baptism, which cleanses original sin; and of penance, which cleanses from actual sin; is all derived from the death of our Divine victim. The number three alludes to the Trinity, in whose name both these sacraments are administered: and the number seven, to the whole purifying and sanctifying dispensation in the seven sacraments; or, as some interpret, to the purification of the elect, on the seventh day, the final sabbath of eternity. The unclean, who neglect to be sprinkled with this cleansing medium during life; and all remaining unclean on the seventh day, are separated from the just; and doomed to perish.

Chapter 20. Verse 11. The rock was a figure of Christ; the rock on which is built his Church; the rock, when struck with Moses' rod, yielded water in abundance to refresh and purify the whole host of Israel. So the Saviour, when dead as the rock, sent forth from his side, pierced with the spear, an inexhaustible stream to refresh and purify his people; wandering in the dry and barren desert of this world.

To be continued.

ERRATUM.—In the Hymn at Compline, in our last number, line 3d of 1st verse, for "Mary's" read "mercy's."

SELECTED.

HUSENBH'S DEFENCE OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

Continued.

The belief is not the offspring of tradition alone; we find it asserted even in the Old Testament that it is "a wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from sins." 2Macch. ch. xii. and though Protestants reject the book of Machabees (perhaps on this very account), they are still obliged to admit, that this passage proves that the Jews were accustomed to offer sacrifices and prayers for the dead, and that Judas Machabeus, of the priestly race, would not have ordered such sacrifices, if it had not been a received doctrine that they were beneficial to the departed. In St. Matt. ch. xii. our Saviour speaks of a sin which shall not be forgiven in this world, nor in the next. This clearly indicates that some sins are forgiven in the next world; and if so, there must be a purgatory. In St. Matt. ch. v. and St. Luke ch. xii. mention is made of a prison whence there shall be no deliverance, till the prisoner has paid the last farthing. This prison Tertullian and others understand to be purgatory; and the well known passage (1 Cor. ch. iii.) where it is promised that a man "shall be saved, yet so as by fire," has been understood of Purgatory by St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, and many other venerable authorities. Purgatory is also proved by reason itself: God is infinitely just, and must render to each according to his works. Now as some men die in mortal sins, there is hell to punish them; as some few die without any sin, there is heaven for their immediate reward; but as others die in small sins or under the guilt of neglected satisfactions, there must be a middle place of punishment for a time, for such souls. They are too good to be condemned to hell, and yet too defiled to enter heaven. The middle place in which they must be purified, we call Purgatory. Hence Mr. White has not truly said that "Tradition alone must have been brought to the aid of Purgatory." But if it rested solely on tradition, that tradition which supports it is of too venerable antiquity to be overlooked by any consistent mind. Luther and Calvin, who "founded Mr. White's Church," both acknowledge that it was the common doctrine of the Fathers. We need only add, that Tertullian mentions the custom of praying for the dead as an ancient usage, even in his time, that is, in the third century. St. Cyprian, St. Ambrose, and also the Greek Fathers, as St. Epiphanius, St. Chrysostom and innumerable other authorities, bear testimony to it.

As to the assertion that Purgatory is grounded on the notion of pain and suffering being pleasing to God, it only need be observed, that if suffering inflicted for sin has not the power of turning away the anger of God and procuring his pardon and favour, Mr. White must show how it was that Ahab's punishment was averted, when he humbled himself in sackcloth and fasting; how the Ninivites were spared, when they did penance in fasting and suffering; and how, if voluntary austerities are not pleasing to God, St. John the Baptist made so grievous a mistake as to lead such an austere and penitential life in the desert. But it is very natural for those to preach against voluntary suffering, who have no relish for it!

But Mr. White says we are taught, that the Pope can "relieve or release the souls in Purgatory by means of indulgences." If by this, he means to insinuate that the Pope claims jurisdiction in the other world, and can relieve or release souls in Purgatory at pleasure, he knows that Catholics never held such a belief. They believe that indulgences only profit the souls in Purgatory in the way

of suffrage, that is, in much the same way as prayers and other good works performed and offered for the benefit of those souls; and hence they do not consider that any indulgence, granted even by the Pope, is infallible in its effect but that it always depends upon the free acceptance of God's mercy. Mr. White's derision of Purgatory is beneath notice. The wisest of men has said: *Qui erudit derisorem, ipse injuriam sibi facit: et qui arguit impium, sibi maculam generat.*

The next subject with Mr. White is, naturally, "Indulgences." It is a bad way of reasoning, to argue from the particular abuse of any practice, against its general utility, and we are sorry, though not surprised, to find Mr. White falling in with former revilers of the Catholic Church, and grounding his chief arguments against Indulgences upon certain alleged abuses of them. He treats us to a strange account in his "Evidence" of the sale of indulgences in Spain, and the profits of them being divided between the Pope and the King, and so forth. In his "Preservative," he tells us that the Pope has the key of an infinite treasure of merits, by which, if a man had been condemned to lie in Purgatory millions of years, he could send him at once to heaven by a plenary indulgence! And he absolutely asserts that his reader has only to look into our *Lady's Directory*, and he will find the appointed days, when any one of us "is empowered by the Pope to liberate one soul out of Purgatory, by means of a plenary indulgence." How foul and monstrous are such assertions, in the mouth of a man ordained a Catholic Priest! So far from every individual being empowered to release a soul, we do not believe that all the Catholics on earth, Pope and all, have any direct power to release a suffering soul, by any indulgence, or any number of indulgences; but only that we can, as above explained, apply certain indulgences for their intention, in the way of suffrage, devoutly hoping that God, in his mercy, will be moved to accept such suffrages for their relief, as far as it shall be his blessed will. Mr. White's readers might look through our *Directories* a long time before they would find a word about releasing souls by indulgences; and if they were invented, as Mr. White insinuates, for the profit of the Pope, how came the Greeks to hold them, as they undoubtedly do, and ever have done! (See *Farpetuits de la Foi*, tome iii, page 724.) It has been already stated, that we do not believe the Pope to have any jurisdiction over Purgatory, and therefore the idea of his enabling a soul to fly to heaven by a plenary indulgence, is widely removed from our doctrine, which only teaches that indulgences may profit the dead in the way of suffrage, offering to God in their behalf, the infinite merits of his divine Son and those of his Saints through Him. As to the sale of indulgences and other abuses, the Council of Trent expressly urges, that all such profanations be remedied and abolished, and commands all Bishops diligently to correct them in their respective Churches. On this subject the venerable Dr. Milner thus expressed himself: "I am far from denying that indulgences have ever been sold:—alas! what is so sacred, that the avarice of man has not put up to sale! Christ himself was sold, and that by an Apostle, for thirty pieces of silver. I do not retort upon you the advertisements I frequently see in the newspapers about buying and selling benefices, with the cure of souls annexed to them, in your Church; but this I contend for, that the Catholic Church, so far from sanctioning this detestable simony, has used her utmost pains, particularly in the general Councils of Lateran, Lyons, Vienne, and Trent, to prevent it."

To be continued.

THE MADONNA AND CHILD.

When from thy beaming throne,
O high and holy one!
Thou cam'st to dwell with those of mortal birth,
No ray of living light
Flash'd on th' astonish'd sight,
To shew, the Godhead walk'd his subject earth

Thine was no awful form
Shrouded in mist and storm,
Of scorch walking on the viewless wind,
Nor did'st thou deign to wear
The port, so sublimely fair
Of Angel heralds, sent to thine mankind.

Made, like the sons of clay,
Thy matchless glories lay
In to m of feeble infancy conceal'd.
No pomp of outward sign
Proclaim'd the power divine:
No carthly state, the heav'nly guest re-call'd

Thou did'st not choose thy home
Beneath a lordly doom:
No regal diadem wreath'd thy baby brow,
Nor, on a soft couch laid,
Nor in rich vest array'd,
But with the poorest of the poor wast thou.

Yet she, whose gentle breast
Was thy glad place of rest;
In her the blood of royal David flow'd:
Men pass'd her dwelling by
With proud and scornful eye;
But Angels knew, and lov'd her mean abode.

There softer strains she heard
Than song of ev'ning's bird,
Or tuneful minstrel in a Queenly bow'r.
And o'er her dwelling lone
A brighter radiance shone,
Than ever glitter'd from a Monarch's tow'r.

For there the mystic star,
That Sages led from far,
To pour their treasures at her infant's feet;
Still shed its golden light;
There, through the calm clear night,
Were heard Angelic voices, strangely sweet.

O, happiest thou, of all,
Who bear the deadly thrall,
Which for one mother's crime to all was giv'n!
She first of mortal birth,
Brought death to reign on earth:
But thou bring'st life and light again from heav'n.

Happiest of virgins, thou,
On whose unruddled brow
Blends maiden meekness with a mother's love!
Blest in thy heavenly son,
The high and holy one,
Who here so veils his glory, spied above.

The Catholic

Will be published weekly at the Office of the Patriot and Farmer's Monitor, Kingston, Upper Canada, and issued on Friday. Terms—\$2 per annum (exclusive of postage, which is four shillings a year payable in advance.

All Communications to be addressed "to the Editors of the Catholic, Kingston," and Post Paid AGENTS.

- Mr. Bergen, Merchant. York
- Mr. Macan. Do. Niagara
- Mr. L. O'Brien. Town of London
- Rev. Mr. Crowley. Peterboro
- Rev. Mr. Brennan. Belleville
- Mr. MacFall. Wellington
- Patriot Office. Kingston
- Rev. J. Macdonald. Perth
- Mr. Hugh O'Beirne. Yarmouth, near St. Thomas
- Mr. J. A. Murdoch, P. M. Larak
- Alexander McMillan, Esq. Prescott
- Mr. Tench, Merchant. Mariatou
- Rev. Wm. Fraser. Saint Andrews & Cornwall
- Mr. Cassidy, Student, St. Raphael's. Ditto
- Angus McDonell, Esq. P. M. Alexandria. Ditto
- Col. J. P. Leprohon, Compt. of Customs Coteau du Lac
- Mr. Moriarty. Schoolmaster at the Recollets, Montreal
- Hon. James Cuthbert. Manorhouse, Berthier
- Mr. Jon. Byrne. Lower Town Quebec
- Rev. Mr. Camusky. New York
- Rev. Dr. Parcel. President of St. Mary's College [Emmet's Burgh, Maryland
- Mr. Michael Fitzgerald. Augusta, Georgia.