

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 manquant

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

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

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 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	12X	14X	16X	18X	20X	22X	24X	26X	28X	30X	32X
									✓		

The Catholic.

Quod semper; quod ubique; quod ab omnibus.

VOL. I.

KINGSTON, FRIDAY, JUNE 24, 1831.

NO. 36.

SELECTED.

AMICABLE DISCUSSION.

Continued.

LETTER III.

ON THE INFALLIBILITY OF THE CHURCH.

So much excess, so many crimes, which were daily committed in the reform, at last opened the eyes of the leaders upon the principles which they had at first put forward, and made them understand that they must change both their method and their language. Blinded creatures! not to have known sooner, that to destroy, there is nothing more required than that enthusiasm & intoxication to which the multitude is so prone; whereas when they wish to rebuild, know they not in what manner to bring back to order and subordination the minds that have been once infatuated with their religious independence! However that may be, the reformers employed for this purpose all the resources of their mind, the credit they enjoyed with princes, and the little controul they still retained over the people. See with what ardour poor Melancthon set himself about it: "Would to God, would to God, said he, that I might be able, not indeed to confirm the domination of the bishops, but to re-establish their administration! for I see what kind of a Church we are going to have, if we overturn the ecclesiastical government. I see that tyranny will be more insupportable than ever.—What will be the condition of the Church (continues he) if we change all the ancient customs and there be no longer any fixed prelates, and conductors?"

"Our brethren blame me, because I give jurisdiction to the bishops. The people accustomed to liberty, after having once shaken off the yoke, are unwilling to receive it any more; and it is the towns of the empire that hate this dominion the most. They do not trouble themselves about doctrine and religion, but only about power and liberty."

Some time after this, it appears that the ministers and the principal persons of the party struck in with his opinion: for instead of saying, our brethren blame me, he says now: "Our brethren are agreed that the ecclesiastical mode of government by which bishops are recognised as the superiors of many Churches, and the bishop of Rome superior over all the bishops, is permitted. It has also been permitted to kings to give revenues to the churches: so there is no dispute about the superiority of the pope and the authority of the bishops; and the pope as well as the bishops may easily preserve this authority. For the Church stands in need of conductors to maintain order, to have an eye over those

who are called to the ecclesiastical ministry, and over the doctrine taught by the priests, and to exercise ecclesiastical judgments; so that, if there were no bishops, we must needs make them. The monarchy of the Pope would also tend very much to preserve agreement in doctrine among many nations. Thus we should easily agree upon the superiority of the pope, if we were agreed upon all the rest, and kings might themselves easily check the encroachments of the pope upon the temporalities of their kingdom." What reflections does this passage, and many others which I could produce, occasion on the irresistible force of experience and truth, which oblige men to recognise the principles which they themselves had overturned. Melancthon is not the only one who entertained these opinions in these times. You will have remarked this declaration; "Our brethren are agreed." In the confession of Augsburg, they had already proclaimed tolerably loudly the authority of the Church, the agreement of the ancient Church, of the Catholic Church, and even the doctrine of the church of Rome. I have given you the passages above. As for the Calvinists, without retracing here the multitude of professions of faith, and of synods, the object of which evidently was to instruct and to hold people's minds in subjection, by the voice of authority, I shall notice some sentences of the synod of Delft, because they have more closely imitated the language of the Catholic church, and almost adopted the same doctrine.

The remonstrants had advanced that the synod with which they were threatened would not be infallible like the apostles. It was not easy for the Calvinists openly to deny this; the synod of Delft, however, answered them in these words: "Jesus Christ who promised to his apostles the Spirit of truth, whose lights should conduct them in all truth also promised to his church to be with her to the end of ages, and where two or three are assembled together in his name, there to be in the midst of them:" from which they conclude, a little later, "that when pastors from several countries should be assembled, to decide according to the word of God, what must be taught in the churches, we must, with a firm confidence, be persuaded that Jesus Christ would be with them according to his promise." Now the declaration of a provincial synod (and this should be observed) was afterwards read and approved at the national synod of Dordrecht, called by all the party the almost oecumenical synod, because, in fact, in it were found deputies from England, Scotland, the Palatinate, Hesse; Switzerland, Geneva, Bremen, Emden, in a word, from the whole body of the reformation, not joined to the Lutherans, with the exception of the French, whom reasons of state kept away, but

who approved of it afterwards. We see here the whole of Calvinism brought back in its turn to the principle of authority, as was Lutheranism before it, in the confession of Augsburg.

The particular teachers who have since appeared, and who have shewn more learning and moderation, in both parties, have adopted the same principles and held nearly the same language. I do not even entirely except M. Jurieu, whom I could cite to you, were it not of more consequence to make you acquainted with a more grave and more solidly instructed personage, M. Molanus, the Abbe de Lokkum, the friend and fellow-labourer of Leibnitz, in the project of conciliation carried on for some time, between them and Bossuet, but which unfortunately failed. M. Molanus assigns as the third rule of faith "the interpretation of the scripture adopted by common consent or authorised by the practice of the ancient and modern church,—or which should be approved by a general council held legitimately and freely. All christians are agreed (says he) upon the following points: 1st, such or such councils are not always necessary of themselves, but only on account of certain circumstances, as when the troubles of the Church cannot otherwise be appeased. 2dly. It is agreed that the interpretation of scripture given by the council should be preferred, at least exteriorly, to that of any individual: on this account the confession of Augsburg declares that a general council is the ultimate means employed by antiquity to procure the peace of the church, and ought to be resorted to. The synod of Dordrecht, all the councils held by the two parties, and even that of the apostles confirm the same thing. In fine we find still another decided confirmation in the acts of the synod of Charenton, where it is said, that if it were permitted to all and to each one to adhere to private interpretations, there would be as many religions as parishes. 3dly. Again, it is agreed, that the oecumenical councils have very often erred, and that when we attribute to them the assistance of the Holy Spirit, or that infallibility to which all christians owe an inward submission, we have never pretended that such infallibility belongs to them, precisely because they are councils, but because of the subsequent consent of the greatest part of the Church, to which the assistance of the Holy Spirit, is promised." And in the new explanation of his method he says: "If

the church had decided in a council undoubtedly general, such as are, by the consent of all parties, the first of Nice, the three of Constantinople, that of Chalcedon and that of Ephesus, the contrary to that which the protestants decide, there is no doubt that this decision should carry the day." You have here then, according to the learned Abbe and according to M. Leibnitz, for they both laboured together, the authority of the church brought into honour and repute: and according to them and the acts of Charenton, it is not lawful for any one to adopt his private interpretations, because otherwise there would be as many religions as parishes: the oecumenical council should supersede all others, infallibility is attached to the greatest part of the church, because the assistance of the Holy Spirit has been promised it. Do we require more? Or did we ask more in the time of Luther and Calvin? Who would not feel himself vehemently moved with compassion at the sight of the fatal schism, that has been effected by means of crying down an authority, to which the reformers were one day to have recourse again? O the blindness and folly of man! Oh! the misery of your guilty reformers and their numerous descendants!

But I am detaining you too long in a strange country: I hasten to conduct you again to your fellow-countrymen. From the time that England, which perhaps may claim the glory of superior knowledge in its temporal interests, and of excelling in the art of governing, had taken the fatal resolution to legalize schism and to form itself into a religious constitution, it felt the necessity of investing its new church with all the strength and power of the nation. One of the first concerns of the parliament was to carry a law for the establishing of uniformity of worship. The supreme governess acted upon the same plan. No sooner had she subordinated her bishops for those of the ancient church, but she gave them to understand that they must assemble and draw up a formula of faith, that might serve as the basis of the common creed of her subjects. They actually assembled in 1562, and drew up the thirty-nine articles, which afterwards received the approbation of the governess and the legal approbation of parliament. But what influence could the governess or the parliament have over the mind, after they had taught the people to despise the holy authority that Jesus Christ had given to his church? And, above all, what did the new spiritual lords mean by their twentieth article? With what face did they there claim for themselves the right of judging controversies, deciding upon matters of faith, of enforcing obedience to their decisions by all their spiritual censures, they who but lately had prided themselves on their abjuring the authority of the universal church, and had just made such a shameful display of insubordination against their legitimate superiors? How come they, now a days, to entertain so high an idea of the episcopal dignity and authority, much misplaced undoubtedly in their persons, and yet essentially most christian? There are then certain powerful truths with which men find themselves penetrated and as it were impregnated in spite of themselves; to which they are constrained to pay homage, when

their interests hold their peace. For then they lay down their principles in theory, as if they no longer remembered having combated them the day before in their actions. To conclude, all that they gain is to give a more scandalous display to the contradiction with which they were reproached between their actual doctrine and their public conduct. "Who are you? Said they to them: whence come you? Yesterday we knew nothing of you? Whose place do you occupy? It is the place of your masters in the faith, of your superiors, to whom the right of holding their sees still belongs, unless sheer violence makes them lose it. You have despised authority in them, and would you have it recognised in you? They at least held it from the universal church, with which they were in communion: they formed a part of the apostolic chain of succession; but have not you by breaking this communion, broken also the chain? Have you not gone out of the regular line? Intruders into these ancient sees your authority comes from yourselves* You have no existence, nor power except from your royal governess; you are her creatures as she is the creature of parliament; your authority comes from her; her's from it. Join together, as long as you please, in framing rules of policy, among you and yours. So far, so good. But do not pretend to subjugate our opinions: they are free, you know they are, you have taught us so, and without this, you would not be where you are." The dispute has continued since and still exists between the partisans of the established church and the numerous sects who wish for none. The first, agreeably with the institution of the divine Legislator, judge with reason that without authority there can be no unity in the church: the others, agreeably with the principles of the reformation and much more consistently, are of opinion, that if they must submit to a spiritual authority, there was no necessity for beginning by emancipating themselves from it, and that, all things considered, it would have been better to have kept to that which derived its origin from God himself. It is certain that the doctrine of the twentieth article is unwarrantable on

"* Ut fieri solet in ædificio collapsio, ut qui illud restaurare cupit, in veteri fundamento non ædificet, quia convulsus est et minus firmus, et plenum rudera, sed novum aliquod fundamentum ponit. ita in restauratione ecclesie factum est. Voluit enim Deus non in veteri fundamento, hoc est, in *successione episcoporum*, sed novo quodam et extraordinario modo illam instaurationem fieri."

"Nostris episcopi et ministri non sunt a papisticis episcopis ordinati." (a)

It is principle that he who withdraws himself from the authority of the Church loses by that act all the jurisdiction he had received from it; and there no longer remains any jurisdiction for him to communicate. Thus the bishops who were not papistical, of whom Whitaker speaks, supposing even they had enjoyed the right of conferring it before their defecton, would not have been able to transmit any after Cardinal Pole was then the last archbishop of Canterbury in the apostolic succession, and Parker the first in the parliamentary and royal establishment.

And should the consecration of Parker have been valid (and this even, according to Le Courayer, is at least doubtful, to speak of it in the most favourable manner possible) it is certain that the jurisdiction of the Church could never have been communicated to him.

the principle of the reformation, in England as well as upon the Continent." There was no other means of establishing it than by returning to the Catholic principle. It would have been necessary that the first reformers, instructed by experience, should frankly have acknowledged their mistake have loudly declared that they had gone astray, and that neither order, nor unity, nor salvation could be expected, unless under the protection of an infallible authority. A candid and spirited acknowledgment like this would have been too heroic to have been expected from the very persons who had raised the standard of revolt. But you who come so long behind them; you, who without partaking in their aggression, equally share in their errors and the fatal consequences of which they were the first witnesses, and which they so much deplored towards the end of their career, what prevents you from surrendering yourself to the clearness of the proofs, the force of truth and the lesson read by experience? Never lose sight of the day when the reformation took its rise in your country and elsewhere and say; 'The Church and its authority were then as before, as to day, and as for ever, solidly establishment upon the promises of Jesus Christ; this foundation is not less firm and immovable than that of the universe, for the finger of God supports them both alike, and promises to them the same duration.'

To be continued.

*See among others, Lord Sommers. Tracts, vol. 11. p. 460, where you will find an anonymous work, the author of which expresses himself in a strong and virulent manner, against the twentieth article, and against bishop Sparrow, the publisher of the thirty nine articles and the canons.

ON THE EDUCATION OF CANADA.

Kingston, May 1831.

To the Editor of the Catholic,

Sir—On the 11th of the present month there appeared in the Canadian Courant, a paper published at Montreal, an article upon the state of Education in Canada. The tenor of his remarks surprised me, not indeed in considering their source, but in reflecting on their nature. Daring statements unsupported by the least shadow of argument, erroneous notions, principles tending to the demoralization of society, apparent desire of working up religious prejudices in order to excite religious animosities, misrepresentation of the conduct of respected and respectable men and institutions.—Such is the idea which I formed of the production, on the first perusal of it. I cannot affirm that further reflection has caused me to alter it.

It is with the view of preventing the public mind from being misled, of doing away with the mist which such remarks have a tendency to excite, of affording reflecting and impartial men, men not governed by passion and prejudice, but by reason and principle, grounds for forming a prudent judgment on the system of education which is followed in the Catholic establishments of the province, that I undertake to offer a few reflections on the production of the Courant. I desire to make my communications to the public through the medium of your

journal. Its respectability and the merited esteem in which it is held will add new weight to my reflections if found correct.

It is my intention to examine more particularly that portion of his remarks which relates to the colleges of Canada. In the course of this discussion I may find the opportunity of noticing his remarks relative to the negligence of the clergy in establishing schools for the bulk of the population. In treating these subjects I shall speak with candor and with liberty. I shall not abuse the patience of my readers by vain declamation, common place remarks, vague principles, assertions without proof. When I make assertions I shall endeavor to prove them; when I allude to facts they shall be known facts, or facts easily verified. In laying down principles, I shall endeavor to establish them, if they are not self-evident; and if they are, I shall express them in clear and unequivocal terms.

Without further delay, let us enter upon the discussion.

The strictures which the Canadian Courant passes on the Catholic institutions of the province are comprised under the three following heads, in which I shall use his own words.

He complains 1st, That the Catholic colleges of Canada follow "a system of education introduced by the Jesuits."

2. That "the present defective system is the chief, if not the only cause of throwing Canadians into the back ground of commerce."

3. That there is cause of serious complaint on the part "of the protestant population, for the intolerant rule which compels all the inmates of these schools, of whatever sect they may be to attend to the worship of the Catholic church; which rule leaves them open to the suspicions of practicing an indirect system of proselytism."

Let us examine these causes of complaint. 1st, The system of education followed in the colleges of this province is complained of, and represented as worthy of public animadversion, because it is the system of the Jesuits.

The author is doubtless well acquainted with the system of education introduced by the Jesuits. He has doubtless visited their colleges, examined their mode of teaching, enquired into their reasons, conversed with their pupils. At all events he must be perfectly conversant with the works in which their system is explained. He has perused with attention the *ratio studiorum*, drawn up by six of the most eminent men of their society, and Jouvenci's *De arte docendi et discendi* in which their plan of studies is developed. For if he has done nothing of all this, he must be a rash and thoughtless man to judge what he is ignorant of; he must have but little respect for the public, to publish as certain what may probably or possibly be erroneous. But if he rendered himself master of his subject, before he published his judgment, why does he withhold from the public the reasons upon which he grounds his judgment? Is it a matter perfectly evident of itself, that a system of education followed in Europe for nearly three hundred years, and here, in this province, as the Courant says, for nearly a century

—is it perfectly evident that this system is bad? Or does he suppose that his empire over the public mind is so great, as to render it superfluous for him to adduce his reasons—the *ipse dixit* of the Canadian Courant being sufficient to decide the opinion of his readers? To me, I must confess, the matter is not so clear. It may be obtuseness of intellect on my part. That is not my fault. Neither is it my fault, that I do not sufficiently feel the magic influence of the Courant's authority to bow submissive to judgments which he deigns not to ground upon a single reason.

Had he given his reasons, I might have weighed them. Since he has not, all that I can do is to compare with his sweeping condemnation the authority of eminent men, incontrovertible facts, and solid reasons, which depose in favor of the system of education followed by the Jesuits. 1. The first authority which I shall bring forward is that of the immortal Lord Bacon. *Ad pædagogicam quod attinet, brevissimum foret dictu' consule scholas Jesuitarum: nihil enim, quod in usum venit, his meliorem. De dignit. et augm. scient. bb. 7, p. 183.* With regard to the art of teaching I have but one word to say: examine the schools of the Jesuits; nothing more excellent has yet appeared.

The authority of so great a man is enough to decide the question. Nevertheless to shew that he was far from being alone in his way of thinking I shall bring other authorities.

Catharine 2nd, Empress of Russia, in her letter to the Pope written in 1783 declares, "that she protects the Jesuits from motives of reason and justice, as well as from the hope that they will be useful to her empire—that none are more capable than they of instructing her subjects."

The celebrated Frederic 2nd, of Prussia, in his letter to Voltaire, dated 5th July, 1770, declares, that he loves the Jesuits. "I will preserve this precious seed in order to furnish it to those who may wish to cultivate a plant so rare." Now most assuredly no one will pretend that Frederick was actuated by religious zeal—his irreligious principles are well known. But let us return again to learned men—some who do not reflect that princes are guided in their judgments by the counsels of distinguished individuals would prefer the authority of men of known learning and talents. Open then the Belgic annals of the learned Grotius, and he will there tell you "that the Jesuits have acquired great authority by the sanctity of their lives and the success with which they instruct youth in literature and science." *Annal. de reb. Belg.*

"Who," says Mr. Kern, a Protestant, & Professor in the University of Gottingen,— "Who are now-a-days the enemies of the Jesuits? Atheists, revolutionary philosophers, Jacobins, and those who are unacquainted with them. But every true royalist should love those who are the objects of Jacobinical hatred; for we may be sure that there is question either of God, of religion, of justice, or of subordination. The re-establishment of this celebrated order, far from being a source of uneasiness, is, on the contrary, a happy omen for our age. It is so constituted as to be, according to the

acknowledgment even of many Protestants, the strongest barrier that can be opposed to the doctrine which tends to civil and religious anarchy. Mr. John de Muller goes so far as to say that *the order of the Jesuits is the common bulwark of every kind of authority.* The Jesuits strike at the root of the evil: they teach youth the fear of God and obedience. True it is, they do not teach Protestantism. But have we the right of obliging Catholics to teach any other doctrine than that which they profess? Did we ever hear of Jesuits' teaching any doctrine similar to that of our modern schools? Did they ever teach the doctrine of the sovereignty of the people, and all its fatal consequences, as it is now taught in our Protestant universities? They have been accused of being opposed to the authority of Princes. But they have been sufficiently justified on this point, both by Henry IV. of France, and by the assembly of the French clergy under Louis XV. And by what means could so disastrous a doctrine find place among men who taught nothing but what is grounded on the principles of christianity? Experience proves the rapid progress which irreligious and anarchical principles have made since the suppression of the Jesuits. Philosophical universities and philosophical faculties, says Dollas, an English Protestant, were substituted, on the continent, for the colleges of the Jesuits. Education under the united efforts of faith and reason ceased: reason, with all its errors was preferred. Faith was abandoned, reviled, and is now known only under the name of superstition. In the year 1772 the order of St. Ignatius was abolished; in 1793 a King of France was beheaded. Reason has been deified, and temples have been dedicated to its worship. During the space of two centuries, the Jesuits had educated in their college of Clermont at Paris the principal portion of the nobility of France in the principles of religion, in the sciences, and in the love of their country. But a few years after the dismissal of these able teachers, this very college issued into the world the Robispiers, the Camille Desmoulins, the Talliens, the Noels, the Frérons, the Cheniers and other demagogues. Is it then surprising that the Pope and Catholic Princes should re-establish men whose services have been appreciated by Protestants, by the great Leibnitz, by Frederick the II. and whom Bacon proposed as models when he said, *that when there was question about education, the shortest method was to consult the schools of the Jesuits.*"

Can any thing be more satisfactory than these authorities—satisfactory I mean to those who wish to know and make known the truth. They may perhaps be somewhat galling to the Canadian Courant.

It will be observed that none of the distinguished persons whose authority I have cited were Catholics. So that their judgment cannot be supposed to have received any bias in favor of the Jesuits system of education from their religious prepossessions. Their opinion evidently proceeds from the force of truth.

But let us proceed to undeniable facts which

depose in favor of this system of education. The first fact is the universal esteem in which they were held. This esteem is testified by the numerous colleges which were confided to their care all over Europe. Now it is absurd to suppose that the whole of Europe, could have been so far deluded, as to become infatuated, and that for nearly three hundred years, with a system of education so bad, as not to deserve that a reason should be given for its condemnation. Their system was so much esteemed and was found by experience so superior, as Lord Bacon observes, to every other, that the classes of other colleges were almost deserted for those of the Jesuits. Even Mr. Du Boulay, the historian of the university of Paris acknowledges this. "Students flock to the schools of the Jesuits, whilst those of the university are abandoned."—*Frequentantur eorum (viz. Jesuitarum) scholae magno numero scholasticorum, et Academicarum depopulantur.*—l. 6. p. 916. They enjoyed to such a degree the public confidence, that when they quitted France under Henry IV. who in the beginning of his reign expelled them, and a few years afterwards revoked the unjust sentence, which had banished them, the students preferred to follow them to other countries, rather than to place themselves under other teachers. A similar mark of esteem was shewn to them at their expulsion from France two years ago. Their colleges in Switzerland and Spain are filled with French students.

Another fact which deposes in favor of this system is the great number of distinguished men who owed to it the development of their talents. I shall first mention a few of those who distinguished themselves in the society, and afterwards a few of those who were educated in its colleges.

Among those who distinguished themselves in the society, we find the names of Bouhours, Cossart, Rapin, De la Rue, Jouvenci, Giannatazi, Vallins, Masenius, &c. in the annals of literature; the names of Arriaga, Scheiner, Kircher, Fabri, Buffier in those of philosophy. The erudition of Petau, Sirmond, Bollandus, Papebroch, Henschenius, Hardouin, Labbe, Tournemine Nicolai, men very different from the *moving libraries* of the Canadian Courant, is well known to the learned world. The talents of Clavius, Dechales, Fournier, Scheiner who first discovered, in the year 1611, the rotation of the sun upon its axis, (see his work *Rosa Ursina*) Grimaldi, Riccioli, Boscovitz, Pegenas are admired by mathematicians and astronomers. Bourdaloue, La Colombier, Cheminais, De la Rue Seigneri, Pallu, Neuville rank high among christian orators; and Mariana Strada, Maffet, Tursellin, Daniel, Bartoli Longueval, Charlevoix, Berruger, yield to none the palm of history.

From the Masters let us turn to the pupils.—This society with its *defective* system of education cultivated the talents of the Bourbons, the Condes, the Contys, the Bouillons, the Luxembourgs, the Villars, the Brissacs, the Montmorencis, the D'Etrees, the Broylies—names encircled with the laurels of military glory. This society with its *defective* system of education formed for the church

the Rochefoucaulds; the Polignacs, the Flechiers, the Bossuets, the Huets, the Fanelons, the Fleuryrs, This society with its *defective* system formed for the magistracy the Lamoignons, the Bignons, the Novions, the Potiers, the Pelletiers, the Henaults.—It formed for the sciences and for literature a Justus Lipsius, a Descartes, a Cassini, a Corneille, a Rousseau, a Crebillon, a Moliere, a Pompignan, a Gresset. Even the too celebrated Voltaire was their pupil. They formed his mind for literature, but their efforts to form his corrupted heart for virtue proved unavailing.

Hence we may conclude with the apologist of this celebrated order; either the education received in youth does not contribute to the success of great men, and in that case every education is good; or it does contribute to their success, and in this case the education of the Jesuits must be deemed excellent: at least it cannot be deemed so very *defective*.

3. Let us now see whether reason is as favorable to their system of education, as facts and authorities are.

In the Courant's remarks there is an evident, but, alas! an abortive attempt at depth and sagacity. He would wish for proper masters—nothing more reasonable. He would desire a supply from England and Ireland; that is fair—or *from the United States!* Doubtless to infuse into the hearts of the rising generation sentiments of loyalty, of patriotism, of attachment to the British government! Do you not then know, sir, how much depends upon the first impression which youth receives? But the education of the heart, the direction of the will, the enlightening of the conscience, the communicating of principles to regulate the conduct of men as good citizens or good christians, seem to form no portion of the Courant's system of education.

Let none be surpris'd at this assertion. I draw it from his own words. He would wish for a system of education *established on the broad basis of civil and religious liberty*. Now if this phrase means any thing, it means that during the course of education teachers should not inculcate any principles or maxims relative to religion or government, which may have a tendency to interfere with the religious or civil creed of students. For if he can complain of Catholic colleges for requiring that Protestant boarders should assist at the Catholic service, although, as we shall hereafter see, this is not contrary to Protestant principles and is required merely to avoid considerable inconveniences, he must complain much more of a direct and positive endeavor to engage the youth to alter their principles. Hence it immediately follows: that in his system, the doctrine of the Trinity cannot be taught because it would shock Unitarians; that the divinity of Jesus Christ, and the truth of the christian religion cannot be taught, because the first would shock Unitarians, and both would shock Jews; that the existence of God cannot be taught, because it would shock Atheists; that the essential obligation of the law of nature, and the essential distinction between right and wrong cannot be taught because it would shock the disciples of Hobbes,

of Helvetius, of La Metrie; that the civil authority has the right of punishing criminals with death, cannot be taught because this would shock Tous-saint, the Canadian Courant, &c.; in short it follows that no single truth relative to religion, morality or government, can be inculcated, because there is no truth however evident that has not, and may not yet meet with opponents: for as Cicero observes, there is no absurdity, however great, that has not been maintained by some philosopher; *nihil tam absurdum dici protest, quod non dicatur ab aliquo philosophorum.*—De Divinatione, lib. 2 p. 38.

Perhaps the Courant did not intend to carry his principle to such length. His expressions, however, authorise my assertion. If he did not mean to go so far, he ought to have reflected upon the tendency of his words. There is much danger in laying down principles couched in vague, undefined terms, which admit all the latitude of interpretation which passion, interest or impiety can desire.

Although I am willing to excuse the Courant as much as possible, I cannot help observing that besides the words upon which I have just animadverted, the tenor of the first half of his article on education leave him open to the suspicion of desiring an irreligious system of education. For what other tendency can his anxiety to exclude the clergy, that is to say the ministers of God to whom by right of office the moral and religious part of education belong, from all interference with education, even as committee-men? To whom then does England, does Europe in general, does Canada owe its scholastic institutions? How many schools have not the clergy established in various parts of the Province? And if more have not been established, it is not always owing to want of zeal on their part, but to other obstacles: sometimes to the want of means, at other times to the difficulty of finding masters worthy of confidence, (for their attention to this point, to say the least, is as scrupulous as that of the Courant) sometimes to the difficulty of collecting children from widely separated habitations, and sometimes to the stubbornness of parents who would not co-operate with the zeal of their pastors. All these circumstances are carefully kept in the back ground by the *impartiality* of the Courant. Neither does he observe that the portion of the Canadian population which possesses not the art of writing and reading, even that ignorant portion *whose nakedness has been exposed before the Imperial Parliament*, is as well, nay better instructed in the duties of religion and morality than the great bulk of the population of England. For the superior attention of the Catholic clergy to the duty of catechising children, and of instructing the ignorant is an indisputable fact.

Extraordinary assertions! some will be inclined to say—extraordinary as they may appear to the unreflecting, they are nevertheless correct. They who wish to enquire how far the knowledge of religion has flourished in England under the fostering care of the established clergy, would do well to weigh the following remarks. "The attention of the nation, says Dr. Lingard, has been lately turned to the subject (namely the state of religious

knowledge) by Mr. Whitbread's plan for the instruction of the poor: and the result has been a general conviction, that the ignorance, superstition, and immorality of the lower orders, are an evil of the most alarming magnitude. If the Bishop of Durham alone be ignorant of this truth, let him ask his venerable brother the Bishop of London, who will inform him that in several parts of his diocese, there are many hundreds of ignorant wretched young creatures, of both sexes, totally destitute of all education, totally unacquainted with the very first elements of religion; and who perhaps never once entered within the walls of a church.—Bishop of London's charge, 1790, page 14. Let him ask that intelligent magistrate Mr. Colquhoun, and he will inform him, that in the population of England alone, eleven hundred and seventy thousand children, it is much to be feared, grow up to an adult state, without any education at all, and also without any useful impressions of religion or morality. To these are to be added many of those who have had the advantage of some education, but in ill regulated schools, in which proper attention is not given to religious and moral instruction, so that in the present state of things, it is not too much to say that every thirty years (the period assigned for a new generation) at least four millions and a half of adults must, in case a remedy is not applied, mingle in the general population of England, without any fixed principles of rectitude, and with very little knowledge either of religion or morality.—Colquhoun's new and appropriate system of education, p. 72. Had the English clergy, like those of the Church of Rome, whose zeal the Bishop of Durham thinks highly worthy of imitation, made the diffusion of religious knowledge the great object of their labors and solicitude, we should not now have to view with fear and astonishment, the ignorance and immorality with which we are surrounded!" Remarks on the Bishop of Durham's charge.—See Coyne's edition of Lingard's controversies, p. 44, 45.

"There are among us, says Mr. Wilks, those not less in darkness and ignorance, than those that are to be found in the pagodas of China, or who amidst the deep wilds of Indian forests, sacrifice their children, or prostrate themselves before demons, at whom they tremble, but whom they adore.—Home Missionary Mag. Jan. 1820, p. 22.—Speech of J. Wilks, Esq., chairman at a home missionary meeting.

"The populace of England, are more ignorant of their religious duties than they are in any other christian country. It would make any one christians heart bleed to think, says Bishop Croft, how many thousand souls there are in this land that have no more knowledge of God than heathens.—Thousands of the mendicant condition, and thousands of the mean husbandry men, as they grow up to be men, grow mere babes in religion, so ignorant as scarce to know their heavenly Father. At this day the case is worse than Bishop Croft represented it."—Quarterly Review, Sept. 1818, p. 20.

"It appears from the official documents, which Mr. Yates has collected and compared, that within

the small circle of ten miles round London, no less than 977,000 persons are shut out from the common pastoral offices of the national religion. Shut out, says Mr. Yates, from the pale of the church, from all participation in its benefits, they are necessarily driven to join the ranks of injurious opposition, either in dissent and sectarian enthusiasm, or in the infinitely more dangerous opposition of infidelity, atheism and ignorant depravity. Well may he add, such a mine of heathenism and consequent profligacy and danger, under the very meridian of christian illumination cannot be contemplated without terror.—Quarterly Review, Oct. 1820, p. 554.

So much for the meridian of protestant illumination. Compare the state of Canada with this.—Compare with this even the nakedness of the land.

From this painful, and appalling scene let us turn to more pleasing objects. "I myself," says Dr. Fletcher, Spirit of Controversy, p. 121, "have had some opportunities of ascertaining the comparative knowledge, which the vulgar French, and the lower classes of my own countrymen possess of their respective religions. I say it without partiality after making the comparison, I do sincerely believe, that, speaking in general, the religious knowledge of the poorer French, was erudition, compared with the slender notions of the poorer English. If this assertion should, to any one appear the dictate of prejudice, I will present a single cause, which alone, may seem to account for the striking difference:—it is the method, by which the minds of the French were trained to the science and practice of religion. No sooner had a child, in France, been taught to lisp the language of reason, than its parents (who it is already supposed had taught it the usual prayers for children,) were compelled to usher it into the parish church, to learn and repeat its catechism. These repetitions were enacted every Sunday of the year, with the exception sometimes of the season for the harvest. During some parts of the year, in Advent and Lent, they were enacted more frequently. A catechism in France, was not, like our common protestant catechism in this country, the immense length of half a dozen questions, with the same formidable number of answers; it was a book, adequate from its size, to contain, and by its clearness, convey, a very comprehensive, and accurate knowledge of religion.—This was learnt, verbatim, by heart. The cure, or his vicar, explained it: and as the French possess an easiness and happiness of expression, which we in general do not, they explained it clearly, naturally and pleasingly. The series of these instructions was continued, during the space of several years; always, till the period, when the child was deemed sufficiently informed, to be admitted to the participation of the holy Eucharist. The degree of knowledge, which was required for this purpose, was not inconsiderable. It was required, that the person to be admitted, should not only understand the importance and obligation of this sacred action, and the nature of the sacred rite, but, should also be able to conceive, and give a tolerable account of all the great mysteries and precepts of religion."

Instead of the words France, and French, read Canada and Canadians, and the whole of this passage is perfectly applicable to the province.

I think that I have sufficiently proved what I advanced, both as to the relative attention of the Catholic and Protestant clergy in instructing, and the relative knowledge of religion in the bulk of the population of England and the ignorant portion of the Canadian population.

The Courant's misrepresentation of the conduct of the Canadian clergy, his desire of excluding all clergymen from education-committees, the irreligious and anarchical tendency of his code of instruction on the broad basis of civil and religious liberty, authorise me to say, that the education of the heart, the direction of the will, the enlightening of the conscience, the communicating of principles to regulate the conduct of men, as good citizens and good christians, form no part of his system of public instruction.

To be continued.

Who can deny this to be the age of reason; in which all are on every subject, sacred or profane, such magisterial reasoners: such hopeful theorists, such fertile scheming system builders, and tireless reformers? It was but one in a thousand formerly who, after long study, deep research, and practical experience, could think of offering himself as a guide in any branch of science to the less instructed portion of the public. But now knowledge flows in upon us, like a deluge from the press; though in so impure and jumbled a state; that, like kennel-water, (for every one empties his household filth into it) without passing it through a proper filtering and rectifying machine, which few possess; it were death to drink it. Such purifying process is seen aptly applied in our correspondent's strictures on the illiberal effusion against Canadian education; sent forth by the Canadian Courant; that supra sapient anticatholic reformers.

ANSWER.

To The Editor of the Catholic.

Rev. Sir,

The fact that I have been absent about three weeks and only returned on the evening of the 16th instant will, I am sure, be received by you as a sufficient apology for my not duly acknowledging, at an earlier period the receipt of your very gentlemanly reply.

I am happy that you have acceded to my proposal, and have done so in a manner worthy of a christian and a christian minister.

I have long since felt myself virtually called upon to say something in defence of some of the principles of Protestantism, in reply to your sundry strictures; but knew not how to do so in a manner least offensive to you and most beneficial to all concerned in such a discussion. The way is now opened and I sincerely hope, that our amicable discussion may proceed, as I trust it has commenced, with the best feelings on both sides.

By referring to the best authorities, I think you will find that my use of the term discover was strictly proper, even according to our own views of the subject; and I doubt not but upon farther consideration you will admit that you write to disclose truth to bring it to light to make it known to expose it to view; otherwise to discover it.

On the propriety or impropriety of your strictures upon other Editors, it is not my province to remark; as far as I am concerned your explanation is perfectly satisfactory.

The correctness of the proposition, that the doctrines of the Catholic Church are the easiest to be

tained of any, depends upon their agreement with the word of God which is a point now to be decided.

Whether either Protestant or Catholic polemics have most indulged in "misrepresentation, calumny and even forgery," is of no sort of consequence to our argument. Our object is to ascertain if possible, who can produce "Thus saith Jehovah," for his peculiar faith, the Protestant, or the Catholic.

Whitaker's remarks may be true as to the conduct of the Protestant enemies of Mary Queen of Scots, in reference to whom he made them, and yet not justly applicable to Protestant writers generally. Whether they are so or not, I do not think it necessary to affirm or deny.

I agree with you as to the awfully serious responsibility of those whose situations give them an extensive influence over public opinion, especially in matters on which human happiness or misery for an eternity depends." I trust I feel in a degree this responsibility; and I endeavour as far as I can to divest myself of every feeling that would prevent my embracing that truth, in favor of whomsoever it might decide, which is founded upon the Word of Him; who is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever.

I shall proceed with extracts from the Catholic at my earliest convenience.

I have the honor to be,

Rev. Sir,

Your humble & obed't

Servant,

EDITOR OF THE GUARDIAN

We can easily perceive from the confused and coarse tirade of the Church of England Sentinel, No. 40, against the Catholic doctrine of the real presence; that the master subject is by far too great for his comprehension to grapple with. Let him keep to his *Children's department*. He will there seem at home among the little ones. We give here for his better information on the subject in question the following extract from that excellent, and admirably well conducted paper, the *Catholic press*.

EDITOR.

The real presence of the body and blood of Christ demonstrated from Scripture, and the unanimous testimony of the ancient Fathers and Doctors of the Catholic Church.

Near three centuries have now elapsed, since those who pretended to reform the Church of Christ began to censure her faith concerning the mystery of the holy Eucharist; and the disputes then commenced have continued to the present day. The Catholic Church believes, that in this mystery—after the words of consecration—are truly, really, and substantially present—the Body and Blood, together with the soul and divinity of Jesus Christ,—under the outward forms or appearances of bread and wine; and that, by virtue of our Saviour's words pronounced by the priest at the Consecration is made a true and real change of one substance into another which we term transub-

stantiation. On the other hand, the adversaries of the Catholic church contend that Christ's body and blood are not truly and really present in the sacrament—in their own substance, but by faith only and in figure; or, according to some—if it be there at all it is accompanied with the substance of bread. Both sides appeal to Scripture; both profess their readiness to stand by what is there defined.

The institution of the Blessed Sacrament is recorded by three different Evangelists, St. Matthew (c. xxvi.) 26.) St. Mark, (c. xiv.) and St. Luke (c. xxii.) In these we may expect to find something decisive. What then did our Saviour institute and give to his apostles at the last supper? For the Sacrament which the faithful receive at this day is the same which the apostles then received, as both Catholics and their adversaries are willing to concede. In the twenty-sixth chapter of St. Matthew we read thus: "Whilst they were at supper Jesus took bread, blessed it, and broke it, and gave it to his disciples, saying; THIS IS MY BODY; and taking the chalice he gave thanks & gave it to them, saying; Drink ye all of this. for THIS IS MY BLOOD of the New Testament which shall be shed for many unto the remission of sins." St. Mark (c. xiv.) gives our Saviour's words as follows: "This is my Body; this is my Blood of the New Testament which shall be shed for many." And St. Luke to the like import. "This is my Body which is given for you; do this for a commemoration of me; this is the chalice of the New Testament in my Blood which shall be shed for you, (c. xxii.)" St. Paul, in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, (c. xi.) agrees in substance with the Evangelists. How then can our Protestant brethren have the confidence to assert, that the doctrine of transubstantiation is contrary to the plain words of Scripture? Can any thing be more plain, or more expressive of the real presence and transubstantiation than the above texts? Particularly as it is here inculcated, that it was that Body which should be delivered up for them, and that Blood which should "be shed for many to the remission of sins?" Was it not then his true and real body, which was delivered up to death upon the cross? Was it not his true and real Blood which was shed for the remission of sins? Beyond all doubt it was. On the supposition, therefore, that our Blessed Redeemer really did intend to change bread and wine into his body and blood—as Catholics firmly believe he did—could he have expressed himself in more clear terms, than for instance those that follow;—"This is my body which shall be delivered up for you, this is my blood, which shall be shed for the remission of sins." On the contrary, if he had designed to give only an empty figure—excluding the reality of his Body and Blood, this manner of expressing himself would be exceedingly obscure, nay palpably absurd; as will appear in the sequel.

That the expression is very obscure in the Protestant acception, is abundantly demonstrated from the fact that all Christian churches throughout the world actually followed the contrary sense for many ages, and constantly held that these words

implied—not a figurative but the real presence of Christ's Body and Blood in this adorable Sacrament. It is remarkable through the whole series of the gospel, that when our Saviour spoke in parables, any thing obscure, he carefully explained his meaning to the Apostles. "When they were alone, he explained all things" to them, says St. Mark, [c. iv.] Now at the institution of the Blessed Sacrament, every circumstance required that he should express himself in the most intelligible terms, when, in fact, do all prudent men endeavor to explain their mind in the clearest manner possible? Is it not when they are giving their commands of importance? Is it not when they are treating with and taking leave of their dearest friends? Is it not, above all, when they are devising their last will and testament? All these circumstances concur in the institution of the Blessed Sacrament. On this occasion our Lord Jesus Christ commands that a clean oblation be made which the prophet Malachy had foretold;—Do this, saith he, in remembrance of me. (Luke xxii.) He institutes a sacrament, the use of which is to be daily and perpetual in his church; he is taking leave of his friends; I will not now call you servants he says but friends, (John xv.) friends and confidants whom he had appointed to teach all nations his gospel and divine law. In a word he is forming a treaty, a covenant, an alliance which is to last to the end of time, and can any circumstances be conceived to exist, which require greater clearness and accuracy.

Moreover, it is observable, that when our Blessed Saviour designed to confer any very singular favor upon his church, he usually foretold and promised it; that it might more easily find credit when realized. Thus, for instance, he promised the sacrament of Baptism, and the power of forgiving sins; thus, he foretold his passion, his death, his resurrection; thus, in a word, he foretold and promised this inestimable benefit of the holy Eucharist. His words are these, in the sixth chapter of St. John; "The bread which I will give, is MY FLESH for the life of the world, the Jews therefore strove amongst themselves, saying: How can this man give us his flesh to eat? Then Jesus said: verily, verily, I say unto you, unless you eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his Blood, you shall not have life in you. Whosoever eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath life everlasting, and I will raise him up at the last day; for my Flesh is meat and my Blood is drink indeed; He that eateth my Flesh and drinketh my Blood dwelleth in me, and I in him." From those words of Jesus, "How can this man give us his flesh to eat!" It is evident they understood our Saviour's promise was to be fulfilled by really giving them his flesh and blood, and our Lord, instead of explaining, affirms in still more positive terms, that except they eat his flesh and drink his blood, they shall not have life in them; and that his flesh is meat indeed, and his blood is drink indeed. These words were spoken in the presence of his Apostles; so that when he told them at his last supper: "This is my body which shall be given for you; this is my blood

which shall be shed for you;" they could not reasonably understand it in any other sense than as he had promised; namely, as his real flesh and blood, which he had told both them and the Jews, were meat and drink indeed.

Again; would our Redeemer, who came to die for all mankind, and who commanded his followers to avoid, with all possible care, even the least occasion of scandal, would he, if he had spoken only of figurative eating and drinking of his flesh and blood, have neglected to explain himself, when he saw not only the Jews, but even some of his disciples, so far shocked at this, his promise, as even to forsake him? How much less, when he fore saw that his whole visible church upon earth would be involved, on that supposition, during many ages, in so gross an error and so serious an inconvenience? This cannot be admitted on any prudential grounds whatever.

In vain would Protestants contend—that it is a usual thing in Scripture, and common in discourse, to give to the sign the name of the thing signified. For when a thing neither naturally represents another, nor is known to be used as the representation of another, it is contrary to all laws of discourse, and highly absurd, to give it the name of what you intended it to signify, without first preparing the minds of the hearers. This would evidently be the case in the present instance, as the fact of the whole church of Christ for ages being led astray by the supposed omission, plainly demonstrates.

But some may still object—although we should suppose our blessed Saviour to be truly present in the sacrament, what need of allowing transubstantiation, or a change of bread & wine into his body and blood? May not his words signify, that his body and blood are given in and with the bread and wine, agreeably to Luther's doctrine! To this I answer—If our Lord had intended to give us his body and blood in or with the bread and wine, he should have said—Here is my body, in this is my blood. Whereas he did say—This is my body—words which could not by any means be verified, without a substantial change of the bread into his body. When he changed water into wine at the marriage feast of Cana, had he said this is wine, would not these words evidently have implied a substantial change of what was in the vessels into wine? The present case is exactly similar.

It is also objected, that St. Paul calls the sacrament, after consecration, bread. (1 Cor. xi.) and consequently excludes all idea of a change. This argument is but very weak; first, because the Scripture sometimes calls things after their change by the name which they had before, though it positively affirms them to have been substantially changed. Thus, though the water was changed into wine at Cana, the Evangelist calls it water made wine, (John ii. 9.) Thus again, (Exod. ii.) that Aaron's and the magicians, rods were changed into serpents: yet after the change, it calls them rods: *Aaron's rod devoured the magicians, rods.* The Scripture also frequently gives a thing the name of what it resembles. For instance, angels

are called men in the sixteenth chapter of St. Mark; the fourteenth chapter of St. Luke, and in various other passages of Scripture, because they appeared under the disguise of men. It ought not, therefore, to seem extraordinary if St. Paul calls the sacrament bread; since it has still the outward appearance of bread, and was in reality bread before the all-powerful hand of God had wrought the change.

Hitherto a short statement of scriptural authority relative to the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation and the real presence, has been given; it remains that we briefly examine the sentiments of the primitive fathers and doctors of the church on this subject. In the second age, St. Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, a disciple of the Apostles who suffered martyrdom about the year 107, and certainly could not but know the meaning of their doctrine; in his epistle to the Christians of Smyrna, calls the Eucharist "the flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins, and which the Father raised by his bounty." In the same age St. Justin, martyr, in his apology to the heathen emperor for the Christian religion, affirms, "That as our Saviour Jesus Christ was himself by the word made flesh, and took for our salvation both flesh and blood; so we are taught, that the Eucharist is the flesh and blood of the same Jesus incarnate." (Apol. 2 ad Antonin.) Would any man possessed of common understanding, write thus to a heathen, if he understood the words of Christ in a figurative sense? Contemporary with Justin, though somewhat younger, St. Irenæus, in his fifth book against heresies, speaking of the bread and wine, says; "by the word of God they are made the Eucharist, which is the Body and blood of Christ."

In the third age, St. Cyprian, in his sermon of the Lord's Supper, says;—"The bread which our Lord gave to his disciples, being changed—not in shape but in substance—by the omnipotency of the word, is made flesh." He likewise says that in the Eucharist "we eat the body of Christ, and drink his blood." (Lib. de orat. Dom.) About the same time, the learned Origen tells us, (Hom 7, in Lev. it.) "that in the Old law, the manna was a figurative food, but now the flesh of God, the Son made man, is meat in reality, as he himself says—my flesh is meat indeed." And their contemporary—though a little older than the two last mentioned fathers—Tertullian, says; [1. 4. cont. Marcion. c. 40.] "The bread which Christ took at his last supper, and distributed to his disciples, he changed into his body."

In the fourth age after St. Basil, St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. Gregory Nyssen, St. Ephrem, St. James of Nisibis, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, &c. the great St. Chrysostom delivers—if possible, in still clearer terms—the doctrine of the Catholic church upon the point in question. "Let us always," says he, "believe Almighty God; nor contradict Him, though what he says, seemed contradictory to our reason and sense. His word cannot deceive us; our senses are easily mistaken: His words never err; our senses frequently beguile us: since therefore, He says—this is my body; let us rest convinced it is so. He who did these things at his last supper, still continues to do the same: wo

are only his ministers: it is he who sanctifies it; it is He who changes these things." [Hom. 83. in Matt.] St. Chrysostom's words are equally plain in numerous passages of his excellent works, "How many now exclaim, Oh! that I could see him in his natural state, or his apparel only! you desire to see his apparel; whereas, he gives you himself not to be seen only, but to be embraced by you, to be eaten, to be received within you—Oh! how pure ought not that tongue to be, which is purpled with his adorable blood?" [Hom. 87. p. 787. t. 7. ed. Ben.] Can any thing be stronger or more decisive in favor of the Catholic doctrine?

St. Ambrose, another great doctor and father of the same age, writes thus, [Lib. de his qui Mysteriis initiantur, c. ix.] "Perhaps you will say, I see quite another thing; how can you assure me that I receive the body of Christ?—If the words of Elias were powerful enough to command fire from heaven, shall not the words of Christ be able to change the nature of the elements? You have read of the whole creation—*He said and they were made he commanded and they were created.* Cannot then the word of Christ which made out of nothing that which was not, change those things which are, into what they were not."

BIBLICAL NOTICES AND EXPLANATIONS.

Continued.

THE THIRD BOOK OF KINGS.

Chapter 18 Verse 31. *And he took twelve stones, according to the number of the tribes of Jacob, &c.* The twelve patriarchs were, as we observed before, the carnal fathers of the people of God; the twelve apostles are their spiritual fathers; On these last, as on twelve stones, is built the altar of the Lord, the church of Christ; in which supreme worship is offered in sacrifice to the deity. On the former was built the synagogue, the temporal figure of Messiah's church.

Verse 33. *And laid it on the wood.* The victim to be offered, was, like the Saviour, (whom every victim in some sense or other represented,) laid upon the wood. He was laid upon the wood of the cross.

Verse 34. The four buckets of water, represent the purifying water of baptism imparted to mankind in all the four quarters of the globe. The water was thrice poured out; because poured out in the name of the most blessed trinity,—when all the water is poured out; when all, in every quarter of this world, that are to be saved, are finally baptized: when the number of the elect is completed: when the trench round about the altar is filled with water; then will descend the final all consuming fire; and all at last shall know that the Lord is God: v. 39, and the wicked shall be destroyed, like the priests of Baal.

Verses 43, 41. We find here again the number seven used in its mystical sense.

Chapter 19—verse 8. *In the strength of that food, &c.* This bread, with which Elias was fed in the wilderness, was a figure of the bread of life, which we receive in the blessed sacrament; by the strength of which we are to be supported on our journey through the wilderness of this world, till we come to the true mountain of God, and his vision in a happy eternity. D. B.

Verse 10. *I alone am left.* Viz. of the prophets in the kingdom of Israel; or of the ten tribes: for in the kingdom of Juda religion was at that time in a very flourishing state under the kings Asa and Josaphat. And even in Israel there remained several prophets, though not then known to Elias. See ch. 22, 19, 23, 35—*Ibid.*

Verse 11. *A great strong wind before the Lord, overthrowing the mountains, and breaking the rocks to pieces, &c.* This wind is the preaching of the

gospel, which subdues the loftiest dignitaries of the earth to the yoke of Christ; and breaks with contention the hardest hearts. It is the voice of the Saviour's precursors, crying in the desert of this world: *prepare ye the way of the Lord, &c.*

Verse 17. *Shall be slain by Eliseus.*—Eliseus did not kill any of the idolators with the material sword; but he here joined with Hazael and Jehu, the great instruments of God in punishing the idolatry of Israel; because he foretold to the former his exaltation to the kingdom of Syria; and the vengeance he would execute against Israel; and anointed the latter by one of his disciples to be king of Israel, with commission to extirpate the House of Ahab. D. B.

Verse 20. *And, when Elias came up to him, he cast his mantle upon him. And he forthwith left the oxen, and ran after Elias.* God with any instrument can work what wonders he pleases. What a wonderful change did he not here work on the mind of Eliseus, with the touch of the mantle of Elias:—Are Protestants aware that all the difference between them and the Catholic Church on the subject of RELICS, is, that she affirms, with scriptural proof on her side; & they deny, without it, that God can work any wonders with such things; which is nothing less than blasphemy.

Chapter 20—Verse 11. *Let not the girded &c.* Let him not boast before the victory. It will then be time to glory, when he putteth off his armour, having overcome his adversary. D. B.

Verse 56. The one, who would not strike, at the word of the Lord, represented Ahab; who spared the life of the blasphemous king Benadab; whom he therefore should have slain. And hence he like the disobedient prophet, doomed himself to was perish.

Chapter 21—Verses 27, 28, 29. In these verses we see, confirmed the doctrine of the Catholic Church; that fasting and penitential exercises appease or mitigate the wrath of God.

Chapter 22—Verse 15. *Go up &c.* This was spoken ironically, and by way of jesting at the flattering speeches of the false prophets, and so the King understood it, as appears by his adjuring Micheas in the following verse to tell him the truth in the name of the Lord. D. B.

Verse 20—*And the Lord said &c.* God standeth not in need of any cancellor; nor are we to suppose that things pass in Heaven in the manner here described. But this representation was made to the Prophet, to be delivered by him in a manner adapted to the common ways and notions of Men. Ibid.

Verse 22. *Go forth and do so.* This was not a command, but a permission; for God never ordaineth lies: though he often permiteth the lying spirit to deceive those, who love not the truth.—2 Thess. 2. 10; & in this sense it is said in the following verse: *the Lord hath given a lying spirit in the mouth of all thy prophets.*—Ibid.

Verse 44. *He took not away, &c.* He left some of the high places, viz. those, in which they worshipped the true God; but took away all the others, 2. Paral. 7. 6.—and note, verse 11, of ch. 15, 3, Kings.—Ibid.

Verse 50. *And Josaphat would not.* He had been reprehended before for admitting such a partner; and therefore would have no more to do with him.—Ibid.

End of the third book of Kings.

THE FOURTH BOOK OF KINGS.

Chapter 1—verse 10. *Let fire &c.* Elias was inspired to call for fire from Heaven upon these captains, who came to apprehend him; he did so, not out of any desire to gratify any private passion but to punish the insult offered to Religion; to confirm his Mission: and to show how vain are the

efforts of men against God, and his servants, whom he willeth to protect. D. B.

Verse 17.—*The Second year of Joram,* counted from the time that he was associated to the Throne by his Father Josaphat.—Ibid.

Chapter 2,—verse 1. By Heaven, here is not meant the final Heaven, of the blest, where God is seen face to face for no man can see God and live: but some lower heavenly region, the Prophets' appointed place of temporary residence.

Verse 3.—*The Sons of the Prophets;* that is, the Disciples of the Prophets; who seem to have had their Schools, like Colleges, or communities in Bethel Jerico, and other places in the Days of Elias and Eliseus.—D. B.

Verse 8.—Here is mentioned another miracle wrought with the mantle of Elias; which again is repeated with the same precious Relic by the prophet Eliseus, who had received with it the Double Spirit of its first Owner.—Verse 14.

Verse 15. *They worshipped him, falling to the ground.*—These sons of the prophets were no Quakers; no, nor Protestants, who hold it unlawful so to worship the Creature, from any religious motive; or for any Spiritual excellency.

Verse 20. *The clean vessel with salt in it,* represent the just whom the Saviour calls the salt of the Earth because by their virtuous conduct and conversation they correct the impurities of guilt in others; preserve them from the corruption of sin; and render them fruitful in good works.

Verse 24—*Cursed them.* This curse, which was followed by so visible a judgment of God, was not the effect of passion; but of zeal for Religion; which was insulted by these boys in the person of the Prophet and of divine inspiration; God punishing in this manner the inhabitants of Bethel, (the chief seat of the Calf worship;) who had trained up their children in a prejudice against the true religion and its ministers.—D. B.

Chapter 3.—Verse 14 *If I did not reverence the face of Josaphat, King of Juda, I would not have hearkened to thee nor looked upon thee.*—Here we see, as the Catholic Church teaches, that the wicked and unbelieving, are often saved, for the sake of the Faithful and just.

Verse 25.—*Brick walls only remained.* This was the proper name of the Chief City of the Moabites, in Hebrew *Kir-Haraseth.* D. B.

Chapter 4.—Verse 29. *Salute him not.* He that is sent, to raise to life the Sinner spiritually dead, must not suffer himself to be called off, or diverted from his enterprise by the salutations or ceremonies of the world.—Ibid.

Verse 31. St. Augustine considers a great mystery in this miracle wrought by the prophet Eliseus; thus, by the staff sent by his servant, is figured the rod of Moses, or the old law; which was not sufficient to bring mankind to life, then dead in sin. It was necessary that Christ himself should come; and by taking human nature, become flesh of our flesh and restore us thus to life. In this Eliseus was a figure of Christ, as it was necessary that he should come himself to bring the dead child to life, and restore him to his mother; who is here, in a mystical sense a figure of the Church. Ibid.

Verse 37. *And the child gaped seven times and opened his eyes.* An allusion is here made to the spiritual reanimations and enlightening effect of the seven sacraments, at the last exertion of the prophet; that is, under the final dispensation of the Saviour.

Verse 39. *She came and fell at his feet and worshipped upon the ground.* Did she do wrong, in thus worshipping the creature; not as God, but as his minister!

Verse 39. *Wild gourds.—Colocynthidas.* They are extremely bitter and therefore are called the gall of the earth; and are poisonous, if taken in a great quantity. D. B.

Verse 41. *Bring some meal.* This represents the flour, of which that bread is made, which is changed in the Eucharist into the living and life giving bread of the saviour.

Verse 41. *And they eat; and there was left, according to the word of the Lord.* Who sees not here the figure of the wonderful reroduction of the living bread in the eucharist; in the same manner as our Saviour alluded to it, by the reproduction of the few loaves in the desert, to feed the hungry multitude?

To be continued

Extracted From Charity.

A M. S. POEM.

What treasures vast in earth's rich bosom stor'd
Of mineral kind; all for our various use
And comfort destin'd! Whence materials fit
We for each choice or needful purpose form:
The ores metallic; and the pitchy stone,
Their stubborn force ignited to subdue:
Or warm in wintry colds our chilly frame
With kindly blaze; and sweet repast prepare.
Imprison'd thus, and ever close at hand,
In many a substance sleeps the embryo flame;
So would'rously compress'd; since nought on earth
So volatile and fugitive is known.

Say, Chemists, whence and how your drugs & dyes
Ye mix and decompose; with all your art
Pharmatic tried, and still progressive found I
Such from her store exhaustless earth supplies
And bids to man, her Lord and ruler own'd,
Her ev'ry element submissive yield.

For him her viewless winds careering fly,
Far from his lowly home intent to sweep
The dank contagion, brew'd in loit'ring fogs,
And lurking; shrouded in the stagnant gloom.
The misty fluid caught, they bear aloft;
Roll into clouds; and wait all around our globe
On sounding pinions borne; till, where abrupt
Yawns the wide chasm, by heats dilating caus'd;
They sudden drop their charge in welcome show'rs,
Irrigous spread, to drench our thirsty soil.

Through foaming ocean's tide they too impel,
Like steeds aerial tugging at his Car,
Man's vent'rous bark; and urge to distant climes
Its course; like fleet wing'd eagle's airy flight,
Thus, ev'n the wat'ry world, at first that seem'd
The bound'ry plac'd impervious to man's sway;
Free access, and convenient now affords
To all the realms remote of his domain.

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. Lacark
- Alexander McMillan, Esq. Prescott.
- Mr. Tench Merchant. Mariavtown.
- Rev. Wm. Fraser. Saint Andrews & Cornwall
- Mr. Cassady, Student, St. Raphaels. Glengary
- 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. Majorhouse, Bertier
- Mr. Jon. Byrne. Lower Town Québec
- Rev. Mr. Canusky New York
- Rev. Dr. Purcell. President of St. Mary's College [Emmet'sburgh, Maryland]
- Mr. Michael Fitzgerald. Augusta, Georgia