

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

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	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 18, 1831.

NO. 22.

ORIGINAL.

ON CHARITY TO THE POOR.

Give, and it shall be given to you again, good measure, heaped up, shaken together and running over. Luke vi. 38.

To judge by the conduct of the generality of Christians, and even of those who are at some trouble to please God, and to secure their salvation; it would appear as if they imagined that nothing more were required of them, in order to attain to that endless bliss, for which they were created, than merely to repent for the sins they have had the misfortune to commit; and to avoid relapsing into them for the time to come. Still, however, when we have done all this, we have accomplished nothing more than the first necessary half of our duty. We have only just entered upon the path of righteousness, without advancing forward one single step towards that perfection, to which all the followers of Jesus Christ are called. *Be ye perfect,* says our Saviour, *as your heavenly father is perfect.* Mark v. 48. We are commanded not only to avoid evil, but also to do good: (1 Pet. iii. 11.) *and to use diligence by good works to make our calling and election sure.* 2 Pet. i. 10,

We have all of us here below our several tasks allotted us. Every one has the particular duties of his own situation in life to fulfil. It is only, however, the spiritual father, who can enter in private into all the varied, minute, and intricate detail of these particular obligations, with his penitent in the confessional; where he can adapt his instructions and advice to the capacity, disposition, and circumstances of every individual. The usual object of public exhortation is to recommend those duties, which are more or less incumbent on all. Of this class, but in the first degree, and above all others, is the duty which I am about to inculcate to you: I mean the great, the indispensable duty of Charity to the poor.

I shall next direct your attention to a particular case, which not only deserves, but imperiously calls for the immediate interference of your charitable exertions.

Charity to the poor is the most indispensable of all Christian duties, because it is inseparable from the very first and greatest of all obligations, that of loving God. *We have received this command from God,* says the Apostle St. John, *that he who loves*

God, loves also his brother. If any one says that he loves God, and hates his brother, he is a liar; for if he loves not his brother, whom he sees, how can he love God, whom he does not see? 1 John iv, 20, 21. The love of God supposes then the love of our neighbour. The one is but a necessary consequence flowing from the other. Whenever the cause exists, the effect must ensue. The love of God above all things must ever imply the love of our neighbour as ourselves.

But can such brotherly love, such fraternal charity exist in those, whose seeing a brother in distress, take not the least step to relieve him? Christians! here is an infallible rule laid down for you, by which you may judge of the degree of love which you bear to God; and calculate upon that, the chances you have to eternal salvation. *For he who loves not,* says the same apostle, *remains in death.* 1 John iii. 14. Do you wish to know if you really love God, as you should, and if your souls live in his grace? Look at your neighbour. Is there any one among your fellow-creatures, I do not say, whom you hate or dislike; but whom you love not as you would wish to be loved; whom you oblige not, even as you yourselves would wish to be obliged in similar circumstances? Say then without any doubt or hesitation; for, alas! it is too true: say, and shudder in uttering the sentence that you love not God—that consequently you remain in death. That your portion is not then with the friends but with the enemies of God. That heaven and endless felicity, is no more the object of your hope; but that hell is your doom and a miserable eternity. As you wish then, and expect to be saved, never be so mad in future as to think of separating in practice, what is absolutely inseparable in practice as well as in theory, the love of your neighbour from the love of God. These two virtues, so closely linked together, are the very hinges, on which the whole system of Christian morality and perfection hangs and turns. *On these two commandments* says our Lord, *the whole law and the prophets depend.* Matt. xxii. 40.

But can any one pretend to love his neighbour, who can view with cold indifference the sufferings of a fellow-creature, and not put himself to the smallest inconvenience in order to alleviate them? On whose callous heart the timid request, the meek imploring eye of want, the sickly, maimed, emaciated and tattered form makes no other impression but that of disgust? Who feels not that sweet, though sorrowing, sympathy for a brother in distress, which impels him almost blindly to afford the immediate relief, without allowing him to calculate the merit he bestows; to investigate the personal

merits of the needy craver; or, what is worse, to enhance his sufferings with the bitter taunt and scornful rebuff.

Charity to the poor is indeed nothing else but fraternal love, exerting itself, as occasion requires, in behalf of the needy and distressed. Whoever feels this charity stirring within him, has in the kindly sensations it excites inwardly, and the beneficent effects it produces outwardly, the clearest evidence that can be afforded him, that he loves his God; and, therefore, that he belongs to the society of the just: while the want of it is a certain and indubitable mark of reprobation.

So true is this, that our Lord himself, in the description he gives of the last judgment, seems to make the eternal happiness of each depend on the practice alone of this virtue. For addressing himself first to the just, he says: *Come ye blessed of my Father, possess the kingdom prepared for you from the beginning of the world. For I was hungry and you gave me to eat; I was thirsty, and you gave me to drink: I was a stranger, and you took me in: naked, and you clothed me; sick and in prison, and you visited me.—For what you have done to the least of my brethren, that do I account as done to myself.—* Then turning to the wicked, he says: *Depart from me, ye cursed, into everlasting fire, which was prepared for the devil and his angels. For I was hungry, and you gave me not to eat: I was thirsty, and you gave me not to drink: I was a stranger, and you took me not in; naked, and you did not clothe me; sick and in prison, and you visited me not.* Matt. xxvi 41;—Here indeed, Christians, is realized the beatitude spoken in favour of the merciful; *Blessed are the merciful, for they shall find mercy.* Here does our Lord at length fulfil his promise to those who are liberal to the poor; *Give, and it shall be given to you again, good measure, heaped up, shaken together and running over; for with the same measure as you mete to others, it shall be measured to you again.*

It were needless to cite further scripture authority to prove what is already thereby so clearly demonstrated; that charity to the poor is the most indispensable duty of all Christians. It suffices to say that there is no duty whatever so often and so strongly inculcated in holy writ, as this one; nor any, to the fulfilment of which Almighty God has annexed such high rewards: and for the neglect of which he threatens us with such dreadful and lasting chastisements.

Christians! are you aware of this, when you shut your ears against the piteous supplications of the poor, and turn away your eyes from all their wants? When instead of searching, as you ought,

in the cold and comfortless retreats of poverty, for modest pining worth and merit in distress; for virtue on the brink of ruin, from which your timely aid might snatch her; for the fatherless and the widow; when instead of causing to circulate among such the overflowings of your plenty; you spurn from your door, and frighten from your near approach, those of them, whom your inhuman and unchristian neglect, and strong imperious necessity have forced reluctantly upon the public.

Murmur not, ye poor, at the hard and mortifying treatment you so often meet with; nor at the very unequal distribution of the goods of this life.

Your sufferings and privations are but of short duration; as are also all the comforts and enjoyments of the rich and great. The time will soon come when they too shall mourn; and mourn in earnest, that their condition was not once like yours. Remember that the Lord of all nature chose himself to be poor; and so very poor, that he had not a home of his own, nor a house to shelter him from the inclemency of the weather. *The Birds of the air, says he, have their nests, and the Foxes have their lurking holes; but the Son of Man has no where to lay his head.* Luke ix. 58. If you resemble him, my dear Brethren, in your poverty, O take care to resemble him also in the sanctity of your lives. Then shall you not have cause to envy the condition of the wealthy and great. The Lord has declared you blessed in your poverty, provided you are poor not only in condition, but also in mind and affection; that is, contented with your lot, and not coveting more than God sees fit to allow you. *Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven.* Whereas he fulminates his woes against the rich. *Woe to you rich, he says, because you have your consolation.* Luke vi. 24.

Is it then true, what is so very contrary to the received notions, and general opinion of mankind, that poverty is a blessing; riches a misfortune and a curse? Our Saviour most plainly affirms it is really so. And why? Because the portion of the poor is reserved for them in the next life, and is nothing less than the kingdom of heaven; while the rich, says he, have their consolation here. These seldom or never think of using but for their own comfort those goods, which God has only entrusted to their management and keeping; and for which, as his stewards, they shall have to render him one day a most strict account. Therefore does our Saviour assure us, if at it is not only difficult, but almost impossible, for a rich man to enter the kingdom of heaven. Matt. xix. 24.

Yet notwithstanding this dreadful denunciation pronounced against the rich by the mouth of Truth itself, we are assured by the same unerring and divine authority, that these very riches, which are to almost all who possess them, the cause of their perdition, might be made, as we have shown, and only in the way we have shown, the very means of securing their salvation. For charity, says St. James, covers a multitude of sins. Ep. v. 20. And in Proverbs we are assured that he who gives

to the poor, lends to the Lord: who will repay him. Prov. xix. 17. In this manner are we desired by our Saviour to make to ourselves friends of the mammon of iniquity; who, when we fail, may receive us into everlasting dwellings. Luke xvi. 9. Thus may the perishable riches of this world be exchanged for riches which shall never fail: for treasures laid up in the kingdom of heaven; where neither rust corrodes, nor moth consumes, nor thieves break through and steal. Matt. vi. 20.

But while the rich are so indispensably obliged to divide their earthly treasures with the poor; let not others imagine that their more limited circumstances exempt them altogether from a similar obligation. All are more or less obliged to practice charity to the poor. This is a duty incumbent on all Christians. Every one must contribute his proportional share to the relief of the distressed. If some have but a mite to give, even that mite is expected; and, like the widow's mentioned in the gospel, is often more acceptable in the eyes of God who knows and estimates the abilities of each, than the larger, but less generous donations of the rich. The smallest trifle given from a proper motive secures to us a recompense. *Even a cup of cold water, says our Saviour, given in my name shall not want its reward.* Mark ix. 40. Thus does God constitute himself our debtor for all that we give to a poor brother in his name; and he promises us besides a hundred fold in return for our gift. O what an easy opportunity is here offered of laying in stores for the here to come! We ourselves are debtors to Almighty God for all the good things we possess; and yet he gives us a rightful claim upon himself to be refunded, and with an interest infinitely surpassing the whole capital amount for whatever portion we can spare, and consent to bestow, on our indigent brethren.

But if at all times we are bound, according to our abilities, to practice charity to the poor; the obligation of doing so is still greater during this holy season of penitential exercise, in which we have now again entered. Indeed, without charity to the poor, and alms-deeds, our fasting, and all the other austerities we may subject ourselves to, were but of little or no avail. It were just like planting and sowing, without watering or manuring, in a dry and barren soil. "Imagine not," says St. Augustine, "that fasting alone is sufficient to heal the wounds of sin. No: you must accompany it with alms-deeds. And while you chastise yourself, be careful to bring comfort to your neighbour. Then will you find the benefit of your austerities, when you open your bosom, and pour forth your heart in relieving others." *Serm. 65. de Temp.* St. Chrysostom, St. Ambrose, and indeed all the holy fathers of the Church, unanimously affirm that Charity to the poor is essentially necessary in order to render our fasting and penance either profitable to ourselves, or at all acceptable to God.

And shall we then, for not complying with this indispensable duty, shall we my dear Christians, run the risk of losing the whole benefit to be derived

from this other Lent, which our merciful God has granted us; the last, perhaps, to be allowed us of such extraordinary helps to salvation. It will certainly be the last of the kind granted to thousands, and probably the last to several of those, who are at present here assembled. Yes, Christians! some of those, to whom I am at this moment addressing myself, who are just now hearing me, shall before this holy season recurs again, have bidden a long perpetual adieu to this world, and to all its vain soderies; that used so much to engross their attention: shall have accounted to the supreme Judge for the use they have made of this present warning and exhortation, and the advantages they have derived from this very Lent, the last to be numbered out to them in the course of their mortal existence.

Ah, Christians! you are little aware, perhaps of the misfortune it would be to render vain so great a grace; and to lose so precious an opportunity of effecting a thorough reconciliation with your offended God; and of securing to yourselves the one thing necessary, the salvation of your souls; an opportunity which occurs but seldom in the course of the longest life: when all the faithful over the whole world, in compliance with the command of their holy Mother the Church, join together in besieging the throne of mercy, and using on their heavenly Father that holy violence, which pleases him, and which is sure to prevail. *The kingdom of heaven says our Saviour, suffers violence; and the violent snatch it away.* Matt. xi. 12.

Now then, indeed, is the acceptable time, as the apostle exclaims in this day's epistle; now is the day of salvation. The sinner needs no more fear to approach his angry Lord, and to prefer his humble and repentant suit. He stands not now alone, as formerly; but as a member of the Church of Christ, and in communion with the saints, he comes to implore in company of all the just. And what he himself may not deserve to obtain; what on other occasions might perhaps be refused on account of his own particular unworthiness will doubtless now be granted him, for the sake and at the request of all. Now in particular is the time to shake off the yoke of Satan, and to vindicate to ourselves the glorious liberty of the children of God: to break loose once for all from our evil habits: like Sampson, to rouse ourselves, in sin, from the lap of pleasure, where we have slept too long a dangerous sleep: and in the might of that divine spirit, that is so profusely poured abroad upon the faithful at this holy time, to burst at once all the bands and fetters which have hitherto bound us over an unresisting, a willing prey, to our most cruel and inveterate enemies. Such dear Christians, and so precious, is the occasion, which you run the risk of losing by hard-heartedness, or even indifference for the poor.

In order to facilitate the recollection of the important truths, which I have been inculcating, and which it behoves us ever to keep in mind; let us gather up, and carry home with us, their brief sum; which is merely this: the love of God, without

which there is no salvation, cannot exist, without the love also of our neighbour: and the love of our neighbour necessarily includes in it Charity to the poor. Therefore, without Charity to the poor, there is no brotherly love. Without brotherly love, there is no love of God. Without the love of God, there is no salvation. Whoever then is not charitable to the poor, cannot be saved. He loves not God, he remains in death. His end is destruction.

SELECTED.

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. Continued.

BUT their simultaneous existence in various places is impossible, is it? The body of Christ passed through the rock of the sepulchre and the wood of the door, both uninjured, after his resurrection. What is the difference as to possibility, for two bodies to be in the one place, or for the one body to be in two places? None. Christ was seen by Paul after his ascension; not in a vision, but in reality. For Paul says: "He was seen by Cephas, and after that by the eleven. Then he was seen by more than 500 brethren at once. After that he was seen by James, then by all the Apostles: and last of all he was seen by me, as by one born out of due time." Paul then saw him as the others had done, namely in his body risen from the dead; for "See my hands and feet" said he to them, "that it is I myself, feel and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as you see me to have." Yet Christ had ascended into heaven, several months before Paul saw him on his way to Damascus—heaven he will not leave until he come to Judge the world—therefore the body of our Lord was in two places at the same time. If in two, why not in three? Why not in more? And if, out of the sacrament, why not in it?

But, is it the divine body of Jesus alone, that can be in several places at once? No. Any body, any creature can be so, if Jesus please. He created all things: he therefore gave his creatures a place, when before they had none. The difference between no place, and place, is far greater than between one and ever so many places. He fed five thousand with five loaves, and four thousand with seven. Did he increase the number of loaves by the creation of new ones? Far from it. The text expressly says, that he distributed the loaves—the five—the seven—no more—to the disciples, and the disciples to the multitude. The same loaves then were in the hands & mouths of thousands at once—a sample of that miraculous power, by which the one sacramental body of the Son of God, without any pluralization of itself, is eaten by the faithful in all parts of the universe at one and the same time.

But the infidel who believes not the scripture, will tell me, that I am proving one impossibility by another. Scripture apart, then, for a moment—I will prove from naked reason, that God can make

a body present in many places at once. a body in motion can have its velocity increased *ad infinitum* to any degree; and the Almighty can at any moment, give it a velocity, not sensibly differing from infinite. Suppose then that such all but infinite velocity, is one of the attributes of the body of Christ. It evidently follows, that his body can pass from one end to the other of the universe, and through every single point of the universe, and in all directions throughout the universe, in a shorter time than the twinkle of an eye; and therefore can be present over and over again in every spot of the creation, at any one sensible moment of time. Thus not only is this simultaneous locality for the consecrated body possible to Omnipotence, but even our own weak minds can conceive a mode for its possibility. Nay, every body, while in motion must be at every single moment, in more than one place. For if for one moment it were in one only place, it would be so the next, and the next, and thus motionless for ever. It must therefore, every moment, be in more than one place; and the quicker it moves, the more places it it must be in, at every single moment of its motion. If then it be accelerated *ad infinitum*, it will be in every spot of all space at any one moment. Thus motion itself of any kind, which, because we see, we think we understand, is in reality not more possible, than the simultaneous existence of Christ's body in different places.

But is not this being in many places at once, the ubiquity of God? Nothing like it. A creature may be in many places; but yet the places, though multiplied forever, can never be infinite. God on the contrary, is every where, and more than every where; because he is infinite. And, yet he is a spirit, and occupies no space at all. Go proud and blind man! that would set bounds to the power of thy God, in the eucharistic mysteries—go, understand these two positions, if thou canst—every where—yet occupying no space! How apparently contradictory! And yet how true! Again: God is eternal; yet his duration is but one, standing, invisible, never passing moment. Go, comprehend that too, if thou canst. And wilt thou reject it, if thou comprehendest it not? Reject all revelation then; aye, and all reason too; for reason demonstrates these truths, though she cannot comprehend them. But, revelation apart, is there no incomprehensibility in nature? Do we understand all that our eyes see passing around us? The wonders of magnetism and electricity? The stupendous powers and phenomena of chemistry and steam? The daily prodigies of vegetation, so aptly compared by Paul to the general resurrection? The astounding multiplicity and operations of animals & insects? The motion of the earth and heavenly orbs? The complication and balance of the elements! The union of our souls with our bodies! Nay. The very nature of matter itself, which the more we scrutinize and subtilize its component parts, the less we understand! Do we not see all these prodigies? And yet do we comprehend any single one of them. Quite the reverse. The more we know of them, the more incomprehensible we find them. The naturalist, the chemist and the astronomer, willing or unwilling, must alike exclaim, "All na-

ture is a mystery." Shall not the God then, who made these mysteries in nature, be able likewise, to make a mystery in religion?

"But am I not to believe my eyes?" says the infidel. Most assuredly. What then do your eyes see in the eucharist? The sensible qualities of bread and wine," he replies. Well—they see aright; for the sensible qualities are there. And so necessarily are they there, that when they disappear, the body and blood of Christ disappear along with them. Your eyes convey to you only the appearance of things; & this appearance depends on the rays of light, which strike the optic nerve. You see a man in the street—you take him for another—he speaks—and you and your mistake. Did your eyes deceive you? No; they did their duty. They represented only what they ought, only what they could. The wrong conclusion was all your own. You see a straight stick half immersed in water; it appears crooked. Do your eyes deceive you here? No; they convey to you that appearance, which the refracted rays of light supply. You feel the stick—you find it straight—and you correct your false opinion. In the former case, then, the word of the man, and in the latter, your own touch rectified the wrong judgment you had formed, and thereby taught you that reason, experience, and the very senses themselves often prove, that things are not in substance what they seem. Joshua in one of his battles, saw an angel in armour. He took him for a man, and asked him whether he were friend or foe. "I am the leader of the heavenly host," replied the spirit; and Joshua fell prostrate. Magdalene saw Jesus at the monument. she took him for the gardener, until he told her who he was. The two disciples of Emmaus knew him not, before the breaking of bread. Was Joshua to belie the angel, or Magdalene and the two disciples their Saviour, because visual appearances seem to contradict their statements?

But, I shall be asked, "how is it possible for a human body, to be circumscribed in so small a space?" And I ask, in return; did not Jesus, as God, create his own body, as well as all other matter? Did he not make it visible or invisible, as he pleased, after his resurrection? Could he not even annihilate it? And if he could, can he not circumscribe it in the smallest particle of the sacrament? Annihilation, or even invisibility, is a greater act of power, than circumscription; and he that could do the greater, can do the lesser. Does not even nature, does not chemistry, every day, dilate and compress bodies to the most surprising degree. And shall we deny to the God of nature, the power which nature, and even art, hourly exercises?

"But," say the opponents, (and this they consider their principal argument,) "true; objects sometimes appear to our senses, what they are not as in the instances you have adduced; and then, we correct the mistake in the way you have said. But do we ever take a stick for a town, or a man for a mountain? When all our senses perceive a thing uniformly and always the same, we must believe them. How then can we think, that what uniformly appears to be bread, is the body of Christ? If u-

are not to believe this uniform testimony of our senses, what becomes of all the miracles of Christ? and, consequently, of all his revelation, which he attested by those miracles? Were all his miracles mere appearances, like that of bread in the sacrament?"

To this argument, which, as here applied, is but a sophism, I answer—The impressions made on our senses, even when they are uniform, are not, of themselves, evidences of the true state, or even the existence of bodies: for the same impressions are often produced, without that existence; as in visions, in dreams, in lunacy. We believe them, however, and ought to believe them, unless when reason, as in the cases I have just mentioned, or as in the present case, God cautions us against that belief—The Protestant Bishop Berkeley, has fully proved, that our senses are not demonstrative of the existence of bodies. We would believe them only on the principle, that God would not allow their uniform deception, without enabling us to detect it. Hence the apostles believed the miracles of Christ, on the testimony of their senses; because, so far from cautioning them against that testimony, he, on the contrary confirmed it by his own divine word, when walking on the sea, and appearing after his resurrection, he told them, that what they saw was not as they supposed, a spectre, but a reality. If then that same omnipotent Son of God, after having proved his divinity to their senses by innumerable miracles, were to tell them, that in one particular instance, they were not to trust to their senses—that what uniformly appeared to be bread, was not bread but his body—would they be authorized to set up their senses against his Almighty word? Or would their belief of that word be a contradiction, and not rather a confirmation of all his previous miracles.

Thus, my brethren, you see how ridiculous the sophism of our opponents is; as ridiculous, indeed, as their comparisons of a stick taken for a town, and a man for a mountain; just as if Christ could have a motive for making such silly changes; although, if he had made them, we should still believe his word, and not our senses. Thus you see that the testimony of Christ is superior to that of our senses; and that, so far from invalidating his miracles, the Catholic doctrine confirms them. For, would the apostles have believed his word: "This is my body," if he had not already attested his infallible truth by undoubted miracles?

Moreover, reason and experience tell us, that, if we wish to know the true state of objects, we must employ all our senses in their investigation. Let us do so with the sacrament. Our sight, taste, &c. represent it as bread. But there is our sense of hearing too. What does that tell us? Why; we hear Jesus saying: "This is my body." Our hearing, therefore, which conveys to us his divine word, prevents the error into which our other senses would lead us. Besides we do not know, whether the first elements of matter are compounds or simples. If the latter, as Leibnitz maintains, a body can be reduced even to no space, without annihilation; and if the former, it can be compressed

into the smallest, as well as dilated into the largest. But the fact is, in the adorable Eucharist, there is not even a false appearance. The senses are not at all deceived, there is the colour, the size, the taste, and all the other sensible qualities and effects of bread and wine. Now, if the Son of God, when he instituted this holy sacrament, intended not to exist in it without these qualities; if he gave up his body and blood to be eaten and drunken; if for this purpose they must have the above qualities; if they cannot be present at the divine banquet without them, if in the literal meaning of the words, he said: "This is my body—This is my blood." who shall dare to give him the lie? Who shall dare to set up, not his corporal senses, (for they are not deceived,) but the false conclusion of his own proud and ignorant mind, against the word of Omnipotence? Who in fact, shall dare to say, it was impossible for Christ to make his body and blood exist with all these qualities?

Nothing is impossible to God, but what involves a self-destroying contradiction. He could not, for instance, make his body be, and not be, in the sacrament, at the same time: This absurdity attaches, not to the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation, but to the doctrine, if it deserves that name, of the Church of England, in the days of Elizabeth and James the First, and which doctrine is still to be found in the Protestant catechisms; namely: that the sacrament is truly and really bread, and truly and really the body of Christ, at one and the same time. If it be bread, it cannot be the body; and if it be the body, it cannot be bread. This, as it involves, a self-destroying contradiction is impossible even to God. Indeed, the absurdity was so evident, that the Anglicans have subsequently run off into the mere figurative sense of Calvin. Similar was that other absurdity of theirs—that what was the body in the mouth of one receiver, was bread in the mouth of another. A body is matter; and its existence cannot depend on the thoughts, or "faith," as they are pleased to call it, of either receiver. It must be there, or it must not; there is no medium; unless they choose to give to the whim of every individual mortal, that power of changing substances, which they refuse to an immortal God. But this reverie, too, they have given up, not for the Catholic reality, but for the visionary emblem of the Geneva school. These, indeed, are self-destroying contradictions, and absurd impossibilities. But, where is the contradiction or impossibility for God, to clothe, in the sacrament, with sensible qualities, that body, which, during his life, was clothed with mortal—in his transfiguration, with glorious—and after his resurrection, with immortal qualities? The difference between the mortal and immortal state, is far greater, than between the mortal and sacramental. Yet, even our own bodies shall be raised to that immortal state; a state, so far superior to the present, that St. Paul does not hesitate to call it *spiritual*; although, in it, our bodies shall still continue *real*. In this sense the eucharist, also, is sometimes styled the *spiritual* body of Christ; because, though still *real*, it is not in its mortal state, but in that state, which he chose,

in order to render it fit to be eaten. This state which I call sacramental, is far inferior to the immortal state, already assumed by Jesus: & which latter state, even we shall enjoy after our resurrection. The resurrection, therefore, is a greater miracle, than transubstantiation; and shall we deny the latter, while we admit the former?

The question of possibility, therefore, I trust, I have completely set at rest. Not only the believers of scripture, but the believers of a God, must confess that he can transubstantiate, if he please. The next, and though vast in its demonstration, the only remaining question is—Has he done so? But, this is so clear from that sole, that infallible means, which we have, of ascertaining past events, namely; history; under which term comes the scripture itself, as a part of history; that no one, who admits the possibility, can, with the least claim to common sense, deny the fact. For this reason, have I been diffuse on the former; for I am convinced, that the understandings of the Christian people would never have been insulted by all the idle quibbles of sectaries, about the meaning of the most precise and positive words, which ever fell from the lips of Jesus—about the most clearly, most universally, and most repeatedly expressed belief of the Christian Church in all ages—if these sectaries did not, at bottom, though ashamed to profess it, blasphemously reject the Omnipotence of their Saviour. On to-morrow then, (Friday) I shall prove the fact from Scripture; and refute the objections of its scriptural opponents.

ORIGINAL.

THE BIBLE! THE BIBLE! AND NOTHING BUT THE BIBLE.

THE BIBLE, as trimmed by Protestant Editors to meet the reforming spirit of the times; and dedicated in the most fulsome strain of flattery to James the First of England, the *pedant King*, by a set of time-serving hirelings, appointed to new model it, and fit it for being decreed the standard law of the Parliamentary Religion: THE BIBLE, which styles, in its prefatory adulation to Royalty, the infamous Queen Bess, that murderess and Harlot, the *bright occidental star*; at whose setting he, the dogmatic Sovereign, rose like the sun in his strength, to dispel the thick and palpable clouds of darkness, which overshadowed the land: THE BIBLE, so absurdly proclaimed by a fallible King and Parliament to be an *infallible* true translation from the Hebrew original; with which neither of the vouching parties were at all acquainted: this corrupted English BIBLE, in which the truly learned point out numberless errors, intentionally, as well as ignorantly made; in selecting from the many uncouth translations which were in circulation at the time: THIS BIBLE is hawked about all over the world, and pressed even on the wondering foreigner, as the only genuine code of scripture in existence; and all who refuse to receive it as such, are at once denounced as downright infidels, by a hungry crew of anglo-evangelical marauders; religious freebooters, and strolling gossellers; whom swart or wadton^{ss} has taught to raise the wind,

and quarter themselves upon the undiscerning public; though nothing is more obvious, one would imagine, than that they are merely the money-making tools of a joint-stock company of speculating Printers: who turn the sacred book, for which they have no copy-right to pay, to their own private advantage in the way of trade; after paying by discount or otherwise, the expense and trouble of their retailing peddlars: besides the vast sums in free donations, which, with pious puffing, they know well how to fish from the *would be godly, or godly thought, of the weak, vain and sinful posterity of Adam.* This bible is the *nostrum* of every spiritual quack: the all-sufficing panacea of every pulpit-thumping empiric. It is adapted, says he, to every age, circumstance and situation of life.—Nothing further is required for the health and well-being of the inward man. All other prescription is unsafe; and, as human, inadmissible.

THE BIBLE then, according to these roaming new lights; and, indeed, according to all, who reject the instructive authority of the Catholic Church: THE BIBLE without any explanatory note or comment; is the ONLY rule of faith for the christian believer. Indeed, to admit such notes or comments into their BIBLE, would be to admit an interpretive authority; and where then could they find one so great and durable, as that of the Church from which they all have separated?—To admit therefore of any such authority on earth, would, they well know, be cutting up by the very root the whole reforming scheme, on which they subsist. This would stop at once the *adversary's* work; and put an end to protestantism. They must then in their state of separation from that Church, continue to maintain that no man, nor any set of men, have a right to press upon others their interpretation of the BIBLE, as any thing better than their own mere opinions, surmises and conjectures; nor can any true protestant receive it, as more certain; for that were to admit an interpretative authority distinct from THE BIBLE; which, if he does, he should certainly prefer the greatest one of any existing in the world. As therefore no Protestant can give, as *absolutely sure*, his own interpretations to others: can he take it as such to himself? It were evidently absurd to say he can. Then it is clear as noon-day, that the whole Protestant system is an absolute uncertainty; and the very negation of all scriptural evidence. What then is all this loud trumpeted bible-traffic, but a barefaced, shameless, swindling concern? If not, let some of the bible-peddling firm, answer, if they can, the few following queries. They will pardon me, I hope, in the absence of their answers, for subjoining my own; which I shall submit, with theirs, when they are given, to the impartial judgment of the public.

Query 1.—If, in reading the bible, as I am bid to do, I must depend on no human interpretation of it, as *absolutely sure*; can I depend upon my own, as such?

Ans.—Certainly not, because your own is also human.

2. Is your interpretation of it surer than mine?

Ans.—I should say *yes*, in thus offering myself as your needful guide, and competent director: but I must not so compromise our protestant cause, by admitting, as *absolutely sure*, upon any grounds, what is, after all but mere human interpretation.—For then the Catholics, whom we oppose, would, with their weight and numbers, beat us off these grounds; and leave us, beyond our scripture fence, not a single inch to stand upon.

3. Then still, within our scripture fence, we stand upon uncertainty?

Ans.—How can it be otherwise, since with us no interpreter dares claim infallibility?

4. What then have I got to direct me safe in my faith and morals?

Ans.—The printed bible.

5. But if I misinterpret it, as, according to St. Peter, *there are things in it hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable wrest, to their own destruction*—2 Pet. iii. 16—Am I then left in our protestant system, without any unerring interpreter?

Ans.—Without any visible one. But then you have the surest interpreter of any; even the holy ghost, the spirit of truth.

6. That is all very comforting, could I know, when he interprets for me. But, Ezra, my dissenting neighbor, has as good a claim to him perhaps as I, yet our discordant interpretations cannot both be from the same blest inspirer. One of them must be from the spirit of error; the devil himself, man's original deceiver. Can you shew me then in our protestant system any absolutely certain and sensible sign existing, by which I may know that the spirit of truth is my only interpreter?

Ans.—Why, the granting you such, would make you *infallible*; a quality allowed to none in our reformed religions.

7. Then our whole glorious reformation is a glorious uncertainty. Is this the utmost directing light afforded us, in the Saviour's revelation; a printed bible, full of things, hard to be understood, which the unlearned and unstable, may wrest, and for the most part evidently do wrest, to their own destruction; and no sure interpreter, no unerring guide appointed to direct me!!! To supply the dire deficiency, you come loaded with what you call *religious tracts*: (a cheap bait for the small fry) made up of the incongruent conceits and random, rash averments of drivelling, doltish ignorance; the rant and cant of lucre-loving hypocrites: the leprous oozings of deep rooted prejudice, the rancorous railings of bigotry, and raging ravings of fanaticism. And still you tell me the BIBLE alone is all-sufficing. No human works or words must ever be relied on. The BIBLE alone is our admitted criterion of truth; the bible our only acknowledged rule of faith. Tell me then; am I to rely on your works and words, as any thing more than human? If not, as you say, why all this fuss about tract peddling, and endless preachings? Leave me, as you tell me, I should be left, with my sole sufficing rule of faith, THE BIBLE. But no: that would cut short your missionary supplies. It would spoil at once your trade of vending wind

for wealth, and reverend gentility, &c. into the bargain. It would send back the broken mechanic to his tools; the weaver to his shuttle; the taylor to his goose; and the cobbler to his well known stall, his apron and his bodkin. It would force their dames and damsels to lower their costly coils; and return to seek their living in the sudseething wash-tub. Besides the deadly blow it would deal to the evangelical press: and the ruin it would entail on our gospel-moulding Printers. Our Watchman Ely himself might then turn tinker, if he choose; and our Christian Guardian a retailer of blue ruin.

*Qui me commorit (melius non tangere clamo.)
Sibi; et insignis tota cantabitur urbe,*

From Cobbler's stall a preacher bright
Who comes, but neighbor Simon?
Fir'd sudden with Prophetic light,
The poor, unletter'd layman!

How, as he vends his windy ware,
From lungs of bellow's leather;
The motley mob, as to a fair,
Or rare-shew, fast gather!

Instead of sole, the sinner's soul
With gospel-awl he's pricking:
And of their cash his customers
Still for a botch is tricking.

As hard he plies his horny fist
On pulpit loudly drumming;
As e'er he'd wont to hammer hides,
To beat off cold benumbing.

The thread of his discourse he draws
With wicked speed as nimble;
As when he stitched, at elbow-stretch,
The ruptur'd slipper trimly.

More aptly can he shape the text
To just what suits his hearers,
Than late the leather by the Last
He cut, to fit the wearers.

No scholars of the mystic page
Were e'er such bold expounders
Through high and low, obscure and deep
Alike he fearless sounders.

Thrice blest Reform, whose meaneast wight,
Unfetter'd with Indenture,
In cobbled creeds, secure of gain,
May deal without a venture.

By Councils, Pope, and Fathers all,
Old-fashion'd Faith preferring;
Thy swarthy sons unmatch'd remain,
Still varying; never erring.

Yet, if to curse, whom God has bless'd,
A boon some Balaac grant them:
The veriest ass, in phrase like mine,
May for their folly taunt them.

See Numbers, ch. 22, verse 28.

THE CANADIAN WATCHMAN, NO. 31.

The letter of Camillus admitted into our paper, could be no libel on the ladies of Kingston; as our well-wishing neighbour, the Watchman declares: for what ladies would lend themselves as proselyting tools to a set of untaught exhorters, and preavling adventurers, hawling for bread in the name of the Lord; instead of earning it in their several crafts by honest industry? Whereas they are seen, these birds of Paradise, ever on the wing; like a flock of hungry rooks; or of seamews in a storm; ever screaming out monotonous: *the Bible! the Bible!* No: the ladies of Kingston never herd with such. They are proof by their habits and education against the vulgar mania and pitiable delusion.

EVANGELICAL PREVARICATION !!!

The Watchman is hereby called upon to retract the notorious falsehood, which he has dared to insert in his pious miscellany of slander, viz. that Catholics give to their supreme pastor, so blasphemous a title as OUR LORD GOD THE POPE. O, for shame, thou godly impostor! It was no printing mistake, the insertion of the word GOD into the Pope's title. No. The man know the gross ignorance of his subscribers: and for such he would venture, at the expense of honour, honesty and truth, to throw in a word that was sure to scandalize their simple and credulous minds; and fire them with holy indignation at this fresh instance of popish idolatry. Is not this really scattering abroad the dark blinding, & hate-kindling fire of the abyss; the very opposite of the enlightening & heart-soothing fire of charity; which the Saviour came, as he says, to cast upon the earth, and, which he desired, so much to be enkindled. Shew such an expression, as our Lord God the Pope, to have ever been used by any Catholic on earth: or else stand convicted a wilful slanderer before the indignant public. And for such concocted villany there are those, who can subscribe; and pay their fellow-mortal for so openly deceiving them !!!

THE CHRISTIAN SENTINEL NO. 27.

The Christian Sentinel, whom we wished not to disturb in his quiet career; has thrown down the gauntlet to us: and that too in rather an uncourteous manner: Since, in challenging us so to open combat, he should, like a truly gallant and valorous knight, have given us our rightful titles, and long worn honours.—Instead of this, he assails us in the low vituperative slang of the roving bigot Dr Gordon; whom he has chosen for his bench-man, and dubs us all over with nicknames, ignored in our law; such as *Romish, Romanism, popish, papist, papistical, &c.* though he might have as distinctly designated us by our well known appellation of *Catholic* or *Roman Catholic*. Had his olfactory organ been clean and delicate, he should have perceived that the terms he uses, already begin to smell rancid and musty with age. Is he then ignorant that, as vulgar and obsolete, they are now quite repudiated by every genteel and classical writer: and are only to be met with in Grandam's old almanack; or the sickening effusions of our religious Tract scribblers? But, as to challenges, while we court them not, we shall never decline them.

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

Continued.

XXII.

OF HOLY DAYS.

PROTESTANTS have abolished all Holy Days, except the Sun days.—*They said in their heart, the whole kindred of them together, let us abolish all the Festival Days of God from the land.*—Psalm lxxiii 3. For, not to speak of the Holy Days kept in honour of the Saints and Angels; with whom, as we observed above, they have renounced all communion; they have besides, almost all of them, abolished the sacred Festivals of the Church, kept in

her from the earliest ages, in commemoration of chief mysteries of our redemption.

And is not this still the work of ABADDON, the *the Destroyer*: who strives thus to obliterate from our minds, and banish from our recollection, all that God has done to save us from endless misery; and revalidate our claim to that perfect bliss, for which he had created us: inducing us at the same time so wholly to engross our minds with the vain concerns of this fast passing life, as to overlook quite the one thing necessary, our eternal salvation. Luke x. 42.

Strange that, in the Protestant systems, every supposed improvement consists in the denial of some truth affirmed; or in the suppression of some duty enforced. It is always, in Faith and morals, a pulling down; never, by any chance, a building up: an ever adverse working principle; still opposing, negating, and subverting the Saviour's Revelation: in one word, what is fully and properly implied and designated by the well known terms of Protestant and Protestantism.

XXIII.

ON PURGATORY.

Protestants deny the existence of a Purgatory, or a middle state after death; in which the just expiate by sufferings their venial transgressions; for, according to scripture, the just man fallth seven times a day, and still is called just:—Prov. xxiv. 16: a state, in which they shall render an account for every idle word, Matt. xii. 36. should they have neglected to render that full account during their life in this world; and pay up to Divine Justice whatever remains of the debt of temporal punishment due for sins, the eternal punishment of which has, in consideration of their timely repentance, been mercifully remitted to them. For, as in the case of David, 2 Kings, 12, 13, 14. it does not necessarily follow, when God remits the sin, and consequently the eternal, that he also remits the temporal punishment due for it.

But, to what other state, or place does the Saviour allude, when he exhorts us to be reconciled with the adversary, while we are in the way; lest he deliver us over to the judge; and the judge to the officer; and we be cast into that prison, out of which he assures us, we shall not come, till we have paid the last farthing? Matt. v. 25, 26. He cannot here allude to any pecuniary debt, or earthly prison, as is evident from the context.

Besides, if, as Scripture affirms, the just man falls seven times a day, and as our Lord declares, we shall render an account for every idle word; how few die so perfect as not to have at least some slight falls, or so much as an idle word to account for? Where then is this account to be rendered? Not in heaven, for all accounts must be rendered, before one enters there. Not in hell, for the accounts of the damned can never be cancelled, or if, for an idle word, one may be eternally damned; who of all the human race could expect to be saved? Reason then shews us, as well as Revelation, the necessity of a middle state, such as that affirmed by the Catholic Church.

When our Saviour also tells us, Matt. xii. 32. that certain sins against the Holy Ghost, shall not be forgiven in this world; would he so superfluously add, nor in the world to come, if no sins whatever remained to be forgiven in the world to come?—Would it be like a wise man's speech, in saying, you shall not see the sun, during the day, to add nor during "the night?"

Protestants generally allow that none of the human race could be admitted into heaven, till Christ with his precious blood, poured out for their ransom, had blotted out the hand-writing, that stood against them. Coloss. ii. 14. This is what the Saviour himself declares. No man, says he, hath ascended into heaven, but he, who descended from heaven; the Son of Man, who is in heaven.—John iii. 13. Where then were the souls of the just detained from the beginning of the world, till the death, resurrection, and ascension of the Redeemer? Not in the hell of the damned; for out of that hell there is no redemption: Not in heaven, for no one had ascended up thither, before him, who led captivity captive, and gave gifts to men.—Ephes. iv. 8.—Then necessarily in a middle state: in that hell, or prison, into which the Saviour after his death descended, and preached, as Saint Peter informs us, to the spirits of those detained there; who had been some time incredulous, when they waited for the patience of God, in the days of Noah, when the ark was building.—1 Pet. iii. 19. To those prisoners of hope the Prophet Zacharias alludes, when addressing thus their deliverer: *Thou hast by the blood of thy Testament sent forth thy prisoners out of the pit, in which there is no water.—Return to thy strong hold, ye prisoners of hope; &c.*—Zach. ix. 11, 12.

Now, though our Lord at his descent into that prison, may have set all free, who were then detained in it: does it follow that none henceforth should ever be detained in such a place for their slighter offences? Let Protestants then shew me scripture that such a place, which they own to have once existed, no longer exists.

The Saviour, they will say, having now laid open to us the gates of heaven; there is no further necessity for our detention in such a place. None surely, for such as leave this world, without having so much as an idle word to account for. But, as mortal sin excludes for ever from heaven all those who die guilty of it; so venial sin excludes from heaven those who die in it, till it is purged away: for into heaven nothing unclean can enter.—Apoc. xxi. 27.

The belief in such a middle state was always that of the true believers; of the Jews before, and of the Christians since the coming of the Saviour.—The belief of the Jews on this head, which in nothing differs from that of the Catholics, is clearly exposed in the twelfth chapter of the second Book of Maccabees. And, though Protestants deny these books to be canonical scripture; they must admit them, as indubitable historical evidence of the doctrine and practice of the Jewish people on the

subject in question.—The passage alluded to, is, as follows.

“ Judas Maccabæus, having made a collection, sent twelve thousand drachmes of silver to Jeru- salem, that sacrifice might be offered up for the sins of those, who had fallen in battle: thinking well and religiously of the resurrection: for unless he hoped that they, who had fallen, would rise again, it must seem vain and superfluous to pray for the dead: and because he considered that they who had fallen asleep in godliness, had great cause laid up for hope. It is therefore a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from their sins.”—2 Maccab. vii. 48.

This doctrine and practice of the Jews, the Savi- our never found fault with. I could wish there- fore to know upon what authority, scriptural, or unscriptural, Protestants venture to condemn this article of the ancient faith, still held by the Jews as well as by the Catholics.

Or, scriptural authority, which they as readily produce, as the Devil did, to tempt then the Savi- our; but it is always on scripture misunderstood, or misapplied, as in their present, and sole remain- ing quotation. They cite again, a middle state after death, the following text from the Ecclesiastes 3. *If the tree fall to the south, or the north, in whatsoever place it shall fall, there it shall lie.*— Their sole and constant argument, against such a middle state, is: *as the tree falls, so it shall lie.*— And so it surely shall, says the Catholic also: for we all acknowledge that at death is decided the eternal fate of every one. To whatever side we then fall, to the south or the north, to the side of heaven, or of hell, on that side, to which we fall, we shall lie. Yet may those, who fall to the side of bliss, not deserve to be put at once in full possession of it; though it is now to them inalienably secur- ed.

To be continued.

BIBLICAL NOTICES AND EXPLANATIONS.

Continued.

NUMBERS.

Chapter xxi.—The Israelites again murmuring against God and Moses; *the Lord sent among them frey serpents,* (that is, serpents, the bite of which excited in the wounded a burning pain.) *These bit and killed many of the people.* But on their humble acknowledgement of their sin to Moses; and on his prayer in their behalf, God orders Moses to make a brazen serpent, and set it up for a sign: declaring that, *whosoever, being struck, shall look upon it, shall live.*—Verse 8.

Verse 9.—*Moses therefore made a brazen ser- pent, and set it up for a sign; which, when they who were bitten, looked upon, they were healed.*

Here, according to Protestants, God orders his own express commandment to be broken: since, according to them, he had made it a distinct part of his mandatory code never to make any graven image; or the likeness of any thing in the heaven's above, or in the earth beneath, &c. On the contra- ry, however, and according to Catholics, though he expressly forbade all idols, likenesses and graven things to be made, in order to be worshipped; as having in themselves the power of seeing, hearing or helping us; that which the ignorant and benight- ed Pagans imagined; he shews by this order given

to Moses, that likenesses may be made, for most holy and instructive purposes; as that was of THE BRAZEN SERPENT: which, as our Saviour him- self informs us, was a figure of himself crucified. *As Moses, says he, lifted up the serpent in the desert; so must the Son of Man be lifted up.* John 8, 14. The brazen image of the serpent was there- fore the first crucifix: or figure of the Saviour crucified: a miraculous too, and wonder-working image: but an image which the devil cannot but abhor, as the sign of the Man-God's triumph over him; and of the salvation of our race, whom he thought to have ruined for ever. To whom then can such a sign be odious, but to those, who are called his brood; and over whose minds he has obtained a blind-folding influence? The Saviour calls it his own sign; the sign of the son of man; and surely whatever belongs to him, should be dear to the christian.

But how, one may say, could a brazen serpent have represented the Saviour? That it did so, is evident from his own words. Let us see then how his likeness is found in the serpent; which, one would think, represented rather the devil, who, under that form, had tempted and seduced our first parents in Paradise.

In order to understand the justness of this similitude to the Saviour, we must know, what none but the learned in languages can tell us; that the He- brew name of the Serpent is *HEVE*, a word at the same time which signifies LIFE, whence is de- rived the Latin word *EVUM*, signifying the dura- tion of life; and its compounds *primævus cœvus* in English, *primæval*, or living before; *cœval*, or liv- ing at the same time. *Eve* too, the name of the first woman, the mother of all mankind, from whom they were to derive their life, is from the same verbal root. Life then in Hebrew is the name of the serpent, & the figure traced of the serpent, be- fore perhaps the invention of letters, was equivalent to the written word life, on the Egyptian monuments, the most ancient of any, the figure of the serpent, always signifying life, is seen frequently traced: and life eternal, an attribute of the Deity, is there indicated by the serpent formed into a circle; which has neither a beginning nor an end; placed over the heads of the Egyptian divinities, *anubis, oovris, isis, serapis* as their distinguishing sign, or hieroglyph. We find also on the forehead of the Egyptian Mummy the figure of a serpent coiled up, indicating thus the seat of life.

As the art of medicine is for restoring health, and preserving life: the emblem of that science is the serpent. Hence Esculapius, a renowned Egyptian physician, was distinguished in the representations made of him, by the accompanying sign of his art, the serpent: and his daughter, Hyggria, who pre- pared his medicines, by her cup, and a serpent re- presented drinking out of it when full; or rising out of it, when drained: indicating that the sick wish- ing for life, must drain her cup; and that whoever drains it, shall have life. Both these were finally worshipped by most of the Heathen nations; the one as the God and the other as the Goddess of medicine.

The serpent then signified life; or rather was the word of life itself; and the very thing it signi- fied. It was therefore the fittest figure possible, to denote him, who is life itself: and the author and restorer of life to all who live. *I am the way, the truth and the life,* says Jesus Christ. But he, who is the essential life, assumed our mortal humanity; and dying as man, delivered us from death; which must else have ensued from the mortal bites of the frey serpents; that is, from the poisonous, and unfortunately prevailing temptation of the serpent fiend whispered to our first mother in Paradise, and still plyed by him and his snaky legions against her envid posterity. The Israelites looking up for a cure to the dead serpent on the pole, shew that mankind must look up for salvation to life's

author slain: to the Saviour crucified. Why then did the Devil assume the figure of life, the serpent? Because he promised life; he was the false serpent, who promised life but gave death.— And God allowed him to take that form; that the Saviour might shew forth under the same hiero- glyphic form the ease with which his wisdom infi- nitely can defeat all the arts of the crafty fiend: and turn all his mischievous machinations to his own utter confusion, and discomfiture.

Verse 14.—*Wherefore, as is said in the book of the wars of the Lord, &c.* This book, which, like several others quoted in the sacred text, has been lost; shews that the scriptures, the protest- ant's pretended only rule of faith, is deficient.

Chapter xxii.—Balaam is represented by Saint Peter, as the prototype of those, who for the sake of filthy lucre and worldly advantages, turn aside from the way of truth; and pour out their calumni- ous vituperations against the camp of Israel; the church of the Saviour, leaving, says he, the right way, they have gone astray: following the way of Balaam, the son of Bosor, who loved the wages of iniquity: but had a check of his madness; the dumb beast used to the yoke; which, speaking with man's voice, forbade the folly of the prophet. 2 Peter, 2, 15.

Verse, 19.—The inclination of Balaam to gratify Balac: for the sake of worldly gain, appears from his desiring that king's second messengers to stay with him, till he should know what the Lord would answer him once more. For he had already been fully informed that it was not God's will that he should go with them to Balac. Yet, on a second application, God allowed him to go; though not to curse the Israelites. He was suffered thus, on ac- count of his covetous propensity, to fall deeper and deeper into sin; till he came at last to give that abominable counsel against the people of God, which ended in his own destruction: so sad a thing it is to indulge a passion for money. D. B.

Chapter, xxiii.—It is evident from the choice and number of Balaam's victims, that he had re- tained the faith of the Ancient Patriarchs. His victims were the same as theirs; which, as has been shewn, pointed at the final all sufficing victim; and his seven altars thrice erected; on each of which he placed a calf and a ram, alluded to the seven ways in which the propitiating merits of the Saviour would be offered up, to the most holy trinity, and made applicable to the salvation of mankind; Jews and Gentiles, denoted by the double victim: the calf and ram: in other words to the seven sacra- ments of the Saviour's church.

Verse 9.—*This people shall dwell alone; and shall not be reckoned among the nations.* The church of God, as we observed above, never asso- ciated before, nor since the Saviour's time, with any other. She has ever stood, and still stands ALONE, insulated and unconnected with all other churches of man's invention. She thus preserves entire and pure the sacred depositum of faith and morals, entrusted by her divine founder to her keep- ing: and were it not for her uncompromising nature we should have witnessed long ere now the light of his revelation quite extinguished, his redeeming dispensation rendered null and void; and mankind plunged in deeper mental darkness, from the num- berless wild and contradictory theories of blasphem- ing sectaries, self-styled reformers; than even the benighted Pagans were, before the coming of him, whom the holy Simeon so emphatically proclaimed: *a light to enlighten the Gentiles, and the glory of thy people, Israel.* Luke 2, 32.

To be continued.

SELECTED.

MUSNBETH'S DEFENCE OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH.

Continued.

Setting out, as usual, with a false assertion,—that the object of the Catholic Church is “to deprive men both of their understanding and their will, and make them blind tools of her own,” Mr. White next speaks of confession. He misrepresents its nature and effects, and of course its origin. He says, erroneously and insultingly: “the Romanist Church makes the confession of every sin, by thought, word, and deed, necessary to receive absolution from a priest.” This he knew to be a wrong assertion in two respects, for 1st. We are not obliged to confess any sins which are not mortal and 2dly, We are only obliged to confess such as we can remember after a diligent examination; whereas Mr. White’s proposition would mean, that we could not be absolved unless we confessed all our sins, and would leave no hope of forgiveness for those we have forgotten. We believe that sins inculpably forgotten are forgiven as well as those confessed. Mr. White next declares that confession “has changed the repentance of the Gospel, into a ceremony which silences remorse at the slight expense of a doubtful, temporary sorrow.” Mr. White knows, on the contrary, that we only believe confession profitable, as far as it is joined to a true contrition or repentance for sin, accompanied with a firm resolution to sin no more, and to make satisfaction to God and our neighbour. As confession is difficult and humbling, a sinner will seldom be brought to it, unless he has already conceived some sentiments of repentance, and desire to be reconciled to God; and, so far from confession, “changing the repentance of the Gospel,” we uniformly find that those who are abandoned to vice, desert the tribunal of confession, while those who are moved to repentance always return to it. Many Protestants have wished for the re-establishment of confession, and have admitted the depravity of morals which followed from its abolition among them, a proof that they did not consider it as “changing the repentance of the Gospel.”

Having thus misrepresented the nature of confession, it was to be expected that Mr. White would be equally unsparing as to its effects. Accordingly, we find him affecting indignation at what he terms “the paltry plea” that confession often causes restitution of ill-gotten goods. “The truth is,” he adds, “that restitution is not a whit more probable among Roman Catholics,” than other Christians; and he splendidly confirms this by saying, that in the course of fifteen years that he has lived in England, he has known one restitution by a poor person of a sum of money, without confession! To this he might answer, that where confession is in use, theft is less likely to prevail, and restitutions are not so often to be made; but we are content with observing, that Catholics have all the motives to urge them to make restitution which others have, such as repentance, remorse, &c.; and in addition to them, they have the serious remonstrances and exhortations of every Confessor who does his duty, as also the delay or refusal of absolutions in cases of neglect or unwillingness on the part of the sinner to restore. Where then is the greater probability of restitution being duly made? In the one case the sinner has no human being to admonish him, but is left to his own conscience; in the other, besides his conscience, he has the exhortations and threats of his Church to urge him to his duty still more powerfully. An instance was published in the newspapers not very long ago, of a gentleman in London receiving a box of valuable jewellery from Italy; restored to him, through the hands of a priest, by a servant maid who had robbed him of it in England; and this was effected by

the ministry of confession. There is no Catholic Confessor who could not furnish many instances of restitutions which he has known and been instrumental in procuring; but it will readily be conceived that there are many imperious reasons which forbid the disclosure of such examples. Mr. White however, makes a curious confession himself. He says he can assure his readers as Penitent, as well as Confessor, that “confession is exceedingly injurious to purity of mind.” This is rather an awkward acknowledgment, for a man who was very anxious in his first Dialogue, to have it believed that he had been so innocent before he fell into infidelity: it leads us to suspect that he was not remarkably correct in his duty, either as Penitent or Confessor, and if so, it is no wonder if the laver of grace and regeneration should have proved to him a source of defilement: *ab immundo quid mundabitur?*

But now comes a graver charge: “a Confessor can promote even treason with safety, in the secrecy which protects his office.” How so, Mr. Blanco White? If the Confessor endeavours to excite his penitents to treason, surely they can denounce him to the civil powers; and he must be very stupid if he thinks himself secure by virtue of the secrecy of his office. He is quite as liable to punishment in such a case as any other promoter of treason, and he would be more richly deserving of it, for having impiously profaned his sacred ministry. But if it is here insinuated that a Confessor can promote treason in which the penitent confesses himself implicated, this is more improbable than the other case; for a penitent concerned in treason would not be likely to present himself at the confessional, or if he did, he would not confess his treason if he had not resolved to renounce it; for Mr. White knows perfectly well that no man implicated in treason could be absolved by a conscientious priest, but would be earnestly exhorted by every means to renounce such iniquity, and to give information to the proper authorities. For the rest, there is nothing so holy that men will not abuse; and whatever abuses Mr. White’s confessional practice may have brought to his knowledge, they cannot justly be urged against the real good of the institution, nor weigh a feather against its manifest and acknowledged utility.

Now to attend to Mr. White’s account of its origin: he puts this speech for the reader in his Dialogue. “I cannot help wondering how the Church of Rome could persuade men to submit to such a revolting and dangerous practice as that of confession.” It would certainly be matter for wonder if the Church of Rome could have persuaded men to submit to confession. That mankind have in every age submitted to it, is a solid proof that it is no invention of Rome. Confession is too painful and humiliating for any human authority to have been able to establish it in every age and nation, as we know it to have been established; and we thank Mr. Blanco White for thus unintentionally reminding us of one very powerful proof of its being of Divine institution. It is a strong argument of the truth of Christianity, that, opposed as it is to human passions, it was firmly established on the wreck of Paganism; and it is a powerful proof of the Divine institution of confession, that it has been in every age observed by the great majority of the Christian world. It will be well, however, to remind Mr. White again, that if, as he would have it, confession was imposed upon the world by the Church of Rome, he must tell us how it comes that the Greeks, the Jacobites, the Nestorians and Armenians, have ever retained the practice of sacramental confession the same as Catholics. These sects separated from the communion of Rome 1200 years ago; and therefore confession must have been the usage of the universal Church at that time; and then what becomes of Mr. White’s

attempt to shew that Rome invented it in the ignorance of the dark ages!

But confession did not grow up gradually with what Mr. W. opprobriously terms the “Roman system.” In the second century, Origen speaks of confession made to the priest. In the third, St. Cyprian speaks of secret sins confessed to the priests, and of remission granted by them. St. Irenaeus, Tertullian, and others testify to the practice of secret confession to the ministers of the Church. And though Mr. White pretends that there is nothing in Scripture to support the practice, we can shew him that it is solidly grounded upon Scripture.

To be Continued.

ORIGINAL.

VANITY OF VANITIES! AND ALL IS VANITY.
Ecclesiastic. Chap. I, Verse 2.

Human life is, but a dream,
Passing like a sunny beam,
When the cloud across the sky
Flitting darkens Phœbus’ eye

See you curling vapour’s train
Proudly sweeping o’er the plain!
The breeze is up, it fades away,
So shall the pride of life decay.

Pleasures, honours, wealth and pow’r
Seem to last but scarce an hour:
Death approaches; lo, they take
Their sudden flight, and us for ake.

The Butterfly on spangled wings
Hovers round in airy rings:
Worldlings, like the thoughtless boy,
Fast pursue the fleeting toy.

On to ruin’s brink they press,
Panting eager in the chase:
While, around them sends deride,
Angels blushing turn aside.

Mortals! stop your mad career!
Lo the precipice how near!
Turn ye! further if you strive,
Down the dreadful steep you’ll drive.

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, Merch. nt. York
 - Mr. Macan Do Niagara
 - Mr. L. O’Brien Town of London
 - Rev. Mr. Crowley Peterboro
 - Rev. Mr. Brennan Belville
 - 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 Mariatow
 - Rev. Wm. Fraser Saint Andrews & Cornwall
 - Mr. Cassidy, Student, St. Raphael’s Glengary
 - Angus McDonell, Esq. P. M. Alexandria Ditto
 - Col. J. P. Leprohon, Compt of Customs Coctau du Lac
 - Mr. Moriarty Schoolmaster at the Recollets, Montreuil
 - Hon. James Cuthbert Manorhouse, Bertibie
 - Mr. Jon. Byrne Lower Town Quebec
 - Rev. Mr. Camusky New York
 - Rev. Dr. Purrell President of St. Mary’s College,
[Emmet’s Burgh, Maryland
 - Mr. Michael Fitzgerald Augusta, Georgia