


Brain

2 vols

12⁰⁰



THE
TRUTHS
OF THE
CATHOLIC RELIGION
PROVED FROM SCRIPTURE ALONE.

VOLUME I.



THE
TRUTHS
OF THE
CATHOLIC RELIGION

PROVED FROM SCRIPTURE ALONE,
IN A SERIES OF POPULAR DISCOURSES CHIEFLY
ADDRESSED TO NON-CATHOLICS.

BY A CATHOLIC PRIEST.

“To the Greeks and to the barbarians—to the wise and to the unwise, I am a debtor.”
Rom. 1, 14.


“This is the word of faith, which we preach.”—Rom. 10, 8.

VOL. I.

FOURTH EDITION.

LONDON:
T. JONES, CATHOLIC BOOKSELLER,
PATERNOSTER ROW.

M.D.CCC.LVII.



P R E F A C E.

IN presuming to publish a Second Edition of these Scriptural Lectures, I beg to inform my Catholic and Protestant friends, that I have not merely confined myself to the amendments of the first, but, *under advice*, I have incorporated the notes of the former Edition in the text of the present; submitted the Scriptural proofs that so fully substantiate the “Trinity of Persons, and the Divinity of Jesus Christ;” and, independently of many material additions to the body of the Work, annexed a Lecture on the “Veneration paid by the Catholic Church to the Blessed Virgin Mary,” (the substance of a Discourse delivered in the Church of the Most Holy Trinity, Bermondsey, Sunday Evening, Jan. 5, 1840,) and another on the Supremacy of the Pope. Thus I indulge a fond hope, that if the First Edition, divested of the present improvements, was favourably received, the present will not be less acceptable. To conclude, I feel it a duty, in justice and candour, to add, that in arranging the Lectures, I am very much

indebted to the irrefragable writings of the venerable and learned Bishop of Melipotamus, the Right Rev. Dr. Wiseman, and to Fletcher, Husenbeth, Coombes, and Waterworth's excellent Apologies in defence of Catholicity.

LONDON:

*Feast of the Presentation
of the Blessed Virgin Mary.*

TO THE

PROTESTANT READER OF EVERY COMMUNION.

MY KIND FRIEND,

THE recent conversions to Catholicity, of so many distinguished Protestants of both sexes, and of every rank and state of life, inspire me with courage and confidence to submit to you the present work. "The object of which is to give unquestionable evidence, that the tenets of Catholics, controverted by Protestants, are delivered in the Sacred Scriptures; so that they who admit no other rule of faith than the Bible, must, if they be consistent with themselves, admit the doctrines in question."

The method I have adopted throughout is,—First, to state the Doctrine of the Catholic Church on each point, as defined by the Fathers of the Council of Trent. Secondly, to demonstrate that such Article of Faith is clearly delivered in the Holy Scriptures. Thirdly, to annex copious illustrative reflections, notes, and references, from eminent Protestant and Catholic divines, literary characters, &c.

Whilst I humbly entreat indulgence for the defects and imperfections you will discover in this work, I ask of you to peruse it *piously, consistently, candidly, prudently, and attentively.*

Piously—by fervently supplicating the Father of Lights for those aids and graces, which are necessary to fix in the mind the light of truth, and to dissipate the clouds of prejudice.

Consistently—placing before your reason the real articles of the belief of the Catholic Church; studying their harmony, and tracing out their connexion; following the chain of proofs, which establish, and the series of authorities which enforce them—placing the Catholic of ages past by the side of the Catholic of the present day.

Candidly—with no bias upon your mind but the love of truth; no propensity in your heart but the desire of eternal happiness; and every prejudice and partiality laid aside; weighing the answers of the Catholic with the same care with which you weigh your own.

Prudently—consulting not a man who, ignorant and prejudiced, misrepresents and vilifies the Catholic Religion, but a clergyman who has studied in the Universities of the metropolis of Catholicity, and has been long in the habit of teaching the Catholic

doctrine, as professor of Divinity in the same metropolis, and other Catholic cities,—who therefore, it may be presumed, knowing it, will represent it faithfully.

Attentively—with that degree of interest which is proportioned to so great a subject, and to the expectation of future happiness. Inattention to the discovery of religious truth is as real a moral depravity as is the neglect of religious practice.

To conclude, should any expression appear to you illiberal or severe, I trust you will neither attribute it to the feelings of my heart, nor to a prejudiced, bigoted mind, but justly appreciating my endeavours, you will believe that, animated by charity FOR ALL, my sole and earnest wish is, to instil and impress a conviction of truth. “Now to God and our Father be glory, world without end, Amen.” Philipians, 4, v. 20.

LONDON :

*Feast of the Finding
of the Holy Cross.*

CONTENTS.

LECTURE I.

	Page
On Transubstantiation.—Words of Promise	1

LECTURE II.

The Words of Institution	61
---------------------------------	----

LECTURE III.

The Doctrine of St. Paul	79
---------------------------------	----

LECTURE IV.

Scriptural Objections usually alleged by Protestants against Transubstantiation	94
---	----

LECTURE V.

Objections founded upon the Dictates of Human Reason against Transubstantiation	129
---	-----

LECTURE VI.

On Communion under one Kind	180
------------------------------------	-----

LECTURE VII.

Objections against Communion under one Kind ...	209
---	-----

LECTURE VIII.

	Page
On the Sacrifice of the Mass	224

LECTURE IX.

Objections against the Sacrifice of the Mass	256
---	-----

LECTURE X.

On the Use of the Latin Tongue in the Service of the Church, and Objections	276
---	-----

LECTURE XI.

On the Invocation of Angels and Saints	299
---	-----

LECTURE XII.

Objections against the Invocation of Angels and Saints	357
--	-----

LECTURE I.

ON TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

THE Doctrine of the Catholic Church respecting the blessed Eucharist, is thus defined by the Fathers of the Council of Trent, Sess. 13, c. 4., "As Christ our Redeemer truly declared *that* to be his body, which he offered under the appearance of bread; therefore it was always firmly believed in the Church of God; and the same this Holy Synod again announces, that by the consecration of the bread and wine, a change is made of the whole substance of the bread, into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine, into the substance of his blood. This change has been properly called by the Holy Catholic Church, *Transubstantiation*."* "If any shall deny, that the body and blood, together with the soul, and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and therefore the whole Christ, are *truly, really, and substantially* contained in the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, but,

* This word Transubstantiation is not to be found in the Scripture. The Church has adopted it to give its doctrine with more precision, since it fully expresses the change of the substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Jesus Christ, and of the substance of the wine into the substance of his blood.

shall say, that he is there, only, as in a sign, or figure, or virtually, let him be anathema." *Ibid*, Can. I. This same doctrine is adequately expressed in these words of our Profession of Faith, the Creed of Pope Pius 4th, " I profess, that in the most Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist, there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the Body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the Blood of Christ, a conversion which the Catholic Church calls Transubstantiation." Our doctrine therefore relating to the Holy Eucharist, is simply this, " We Catholics believe, that by an act of the same Almighty Power, which by a *word* called the whole order of nature into existence, and by His *all-powerful word* still governs, directs, and regulates the same, by the operation of the *same Omnipotence*, and, by virtue of the words, directed by Christ Jesus to be used and pronounced, by his Priesthood in the solemn act of consecration, namely, '*this is my body*' over the bread, and '*this is my blood*' over the wine : we Catholics, I say, believe, that the whole substance of the bread is miraculously changed into the substance of the 'body of Christ, and the whole substance of the wine, into the substance of his blood, the outward forms, accidents, or appearances of the bread and wine remaining still unaltered, and unchanged, that is, we do not believe, that the change which takes place is a visible or sensible one ; but, an invisible and insensible one, and, that it is not the exterior forms, or qualities of the bread and wine, that are changed in this divine mystery, but their substance. So that, what we believe respecting this incomprehensible mystery is, that, by virtue of the Divine Power of that God, who is the author both of the substance, and of its outward forms, or accidents, and by a miracle, imperceptible to our senses, so soon as the words of consecration are pronounced by the

Priest, in the Holy sacrifice of the Mass, the substance of the bread and wine is converted into the substance of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, the external surface, meanwhile, as a veil or curtain, concealing the eternal Being from our sight. As in the mystery of the Incarnation, the Divinity of this same sacred personage was concealed, and hid beneath the veil, or curtain of his flesh." It was from these considerations, and from the better knowledge of our doctrines, that Hallam has, in his candour, been induced to say—The doctrine of Transubstantiation does not, as vulgarly supposed, contradict the evidence of the senses,—since our senses can report nothing as to the unknown being which the schoolmen denominate "Substance, and which *alone* was the subject of this conversion."—(*Const. Hist.*)

"We also believe, that so long as these outward appearances do continue, so long, but no longer, do they contain under them the substance of the body and blood of Jesus Christ. We believe moreover, that though each part of the Eucharist bears the name of what it contains by virtue of its consecration, and though by the force of this consecration, the body only of Jesus Christ is present under the species of the bread, and the blood of Jesus Christ is only under the species of the wine, still we firmly maintain, that the blood of Jesus Christ is likewise present under the species of the consecrated bread, and the body under that of the wine; because, as Jesus Christ cannot die any more, so his blood must always be joined with his body, and in like manner the body concomitant with the blood." So that if the apostles had consecrated the holy Eucharist, whilst our Lord's body was in the sepulchre, at which time the body was separated from the blood, the body would have been without the blood, under the species

of the sacred bread, and the blood without the body in the holy cup.

“Likewise when we speak of the body of Christ as present in this sacrament, we do not speak of his body as present there, in the same manner, in which it existed whilst he dwelt on earth, and conversed with his disciples; that is, we do not mean a body in its ordinary, and natural shape and proportions. The substance of the body of our Lord, for which we are contending, is to be understood precisely in such a state, abstracted from all its natural properties, without solidity, and without extension, and of course, without any of those other properties, which are in a manner dependant on them, without colour, without size, without shape, without texture; without, in fine, any properties discoverable in the human body. And, still, it is a true and real body, but a body, which has passed into a different state from ours; a body, which is now glorified and impassable; in short, a body whose mode of being, since this is a mystery, is beyond the reach of our imperfect comprehension.”

Here, if any one objects, that we cannot form a clear and distinct idea of such a substance, I assert, that we can form as perfectly clear and distinct an idea of it, as we can of any spiritual substance,—and Locke will bear me out in the assertion. If, further, he objects, that divested of solidity and extension, it would not be any longer a body, but a spirit, I reply, that it would not be a natural body, according to its present and ordinary form of existence; but, it would be precisely, what St. Paul declares, that the human body will be at the general resurrection. ‘The body,’ says St. Paul—

Catholic Version.

1 Cor. 15.

42 '..... is sown in corruption, it shall rise in incorruption.

43 It is sown in dishonour, it shall rise in glory. It is sown in weakness, it shall rise in power.

44 It is sown a natural body, it shall rise a spiritual body. If there be a natural body, there is also a spiritual body.'

Protestant Version.

1 Cor. 15.

42 It is sown in corruption, it is raised in incorruption :

43 It is sown in dishonour ; it is raised in glory : it is sown in weakness ; it is raised in power :

44 It is sown a natural body ; it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body.

“ So then, to sum up, our doctrine is this, that the bread and wine placed on the altar, previously to the consecration, is truly bread in substance, and the wine is truly wine in substance ; but, that, in the instant the Priest has pronounced the words of consecration, namely, ‘ *this is my body* ’ over the bread, and ‘ *this is my blood* ’ over the wine, the one and the other become the real body and blood of Christ in substance, and nothing remains of the substance of either bread and wine but the outward appearances unaltered, and unchanged, and Jesus Christ is there, *truly, really, and substantially* present, body and blood, soul and body, divine and human nature, spiritual and immortal and living, God man, man God, as he is in heaven.”

To the above explanation I deem it necessary to add, that when we Catholics affirm, that we believe, that Jesus Christ is truly, really, and substantially present in the Sa-

crament of the Eucharist, we wish it to be understood, that these words, *truly*, *really*, and *substantially*, are not to be considered as synonymous terms. They condemn so many errors. *Truly* was directed against the Zuinglians, who pretended that the Eucharist was only a figure, a sign and image of the body of Jesus Christ: *really* was meant against *Calvin*, who admitted only an objective presence by faith: *substantially* was intended to exclude that pretended *virtue*, which was said to emanate from the body of Christ.

Here I also consider it necessary to submit, “that such is the doctrine of the Greek Church as that held by the Catholic.” In the attestation signed by the seven Archbishops of the East, we read—

1st. That the living body of Jesus Christ, who was crucified, who ascended into heaven, and, who sits at the right hand of the Father, *is truly present* in the Eucharist, but in an invisible manner.

2d. That the bread and wine after the invocation of the Priest and the consecration, *are substantially changed* into the true body and blood of Jesus Christ, and that the accidents which remain, are not bread and wine in reality, although they appear to be bread and wine.

3d. That the Eucharist is a sacrifice for the living and the dead, established by Jesus Christ, and, which the Apostles have left us by tradition.

4th. That the body of Jesus Christ is eaten whole and entire in an impassable state, by those who receive it, whether they be worthy, or unworthy. Such as are worthy receive it for their salvation, the unworthy to their condemnation; that it is also immolated without effusion of blood, and justly adored as God.

The appearance of this document, with the inevitable consequences to be drawn from it, had such an effect on

the illustrious Claud, the leader of the French Calvinists, that he could not believe his own senses, but he wrote to a learned Greek to verify the fact. We have the celebrated letter in answer, dated May 21, 1762, and in it we read "Be it therefore known to you, most excellent Sir, that the whole East, with the consent of the West, *does believe and has always believed, from the earliest period of the Church, that the bread and wine are truly and physically transubstantiated into the body and blood of Christ, laying aside their first substance,*' and this transubstantiation she (the whole Eastern church) holds among the *necessary Articles of Faith*; so that it is unlawful for any one to be ignorant of it, to call it into question, or altogether to reject it. This faith she has derived from Christ, and after Him from the Apostles and Fathers of the primitive Church, who were the pillars and foundations of Grecian Orthodoxy."—See *Perpetuite de la Foi*, tom. 3, p. 412, &c. See also book 8, tom. 3, p. 480—487.

Now, how is it possible to account for this perfect agreement on these articles between the Greek and Latin Churches, the former of which has been separated from the latter, with the exception of some short intervals, by a schism of nearly a thousand years, unless they had both derived the same doctrine from the earliest period of Christianity.

So far also as regards the Reformed Societies, I perfectly agree with Dr. Fletcher, that, not only have the largest and most learned portions of the Protestant Churches admitted this dogma, but that, moreover, they have advocated and defended it, with a greater degree of ardour than any other tenet of their belief. This was the case with all the Lutheran Churches and communions,—once the most widely extended societies of the Reformation. Luther, indeed,

informs us, that, “urged by rancour and hostility to his parent Church, he had strained every nerve, and conjured up every argument, in order, if possible, to persuade himself into the disbelief and denial of the mystery.” “But,” he adds, “in vain I wished to have denied the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, on purpose to have more effectually vexed the Papists, but the words of the Scriptures are so plain and strong in favour of the mystery, that, spite of all my wishes, and, although I strained every nerve to reject it, yet I could never bring my mind to adopt the bold expedient.” (Ep. Car. Amic.) In like manner, he allows, speaking of the belief of the ancient Fathers, (this is a testimony which should strike every Protestant,) he allows, that “amongst all the ancient Fathers of the Church, there is not so much as *one* that ever entertained a doubt concerning the mystery of the real presence of Christ in the Holy Eucharist.” (Defens. Verb. Cœnce.) Nay, he even goes so far as to declare, that the denial of the real presence “is a piece of downright blasphemy, an impeachment of the divine veracity, an act of treachery to Christ, and an artifice of seduction to the Public.” Whence also he elegantly calls the deniers and disbelievers of the sacred institution “a set of deviled, be-deviled, per-deviled, and super-deviled wretches.” Such as these were the sentiments, and belief of Luther, respecting the doctrine of the real presence, and such also, as his, were the opinions of all the Lutheran Churches; opinions, too, which they long laboured to propagate, not only by every effort of industry and learning, but even by every exertion of force, violence, and bloodshed itself. The doctrine is still the *professed doctrine* of these Churches; but alas! such is the progress of infidelity and indifference, it is a doctrine which *now*, neither their pastors, nor their

flocks, hardly any where, if any where believe. Add to this, it was from Luther principally and his disciples, that the first founders of the Church of England derived the chief part of their peculiar doctrines; from them they borrowed their doctrine concerning the Eucharist, professing along with them, their belief in the real presence. This belief accordingly, is no doubt the *genuine* belief and doctrine of the Established Church, referring for example to the Common Prayer Book, the most authentic document of this religion;—we find there the following question and reply—What is the inward part or thing signified (of the Lord's Supper)? the answer is—"the body and blood of Christ, which are *verily*, and *indeed* taken, and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper." In like manner, in the action of receiving the Sacrament, the Communicants are instructed to address themselves to God, in expressions such as these, "Grant to us, therefore, so to eat the *flesh* of thy dear Son, Jesus Christ, and so to drink his *blood*, that our sinful bodies may be made clean by *His body*." Delivering the Communion, the Minister says, "the *body* of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was *given* for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life. The *blood* of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was *shed* for thee, preserve thy body and soul unto everlasting life." Such is the language of the book of Common Prayer. And, surely, no terms, no possible form of expression, no language made use of in the Catholic Church, can better, or more clearly than this, point out the doctrine, or mark the belief of the *real presence*. And here, if there be any instruments of faith which ought to be clear, and easy to be understood, they should, of course, be those, which are designed for the use and instruction of the general body of society,—for the simple, the illiterate, and so on; for this reason, nothing ought to

be so plain as a Catechism, nothing so intelligible as the prayers addressed to Almighty God. The words should, in each case, exactly mean what they clearly and directly express. By this rule, then, let us consider the above words; the Catechism says, — “The *body* and *blood* of Christ are ‘*verily* and *indeed*’ received in the Lord’s Supper.” Now, what ideas, or what notions can a child, or any simple, or ignorant individual, form of these words, or borrow from them, save that, if the *body* and *blood* of Christ are *verily* and *indeed* received, the *body* and *blood* must then, of course, be “*verily* and *indeed*,”—that is, *really* and *truly*, present in the Sacrament? To suppose that a child, or any un-instructed person, would infer, *from such mode of expression*, that the body and blood are present only *in figure, or by faith, or as emblems*, are notions, it is quite obvious, that could never enter into heads or minds like theirs.

“Referring, in the next place, to the sentiments of the first Reformers, learned prelates, eminent divines, and other distinguished writers of this same Church of England,—men, who by their learning and talents have given the chief lustre to its annals,—we find that these, during a series of its brightest periods, were alike the believers and the defenders of the mystery.

CALVIN (second defence against Westphalius, p. 664) says, “The sense of the words of the institution, **THIS IS MY BODY**, taken literally, cannot stand, without a change of the bread into the body of Christ; so that the visible head may become the invisible body.”

ZUINGLIUS, writing against Luther, says, “If you are so obstinate as not to admit our figurative sense, then the Pope is in the right in asserting, that the bread is changed into the body of Christ.”

The immortal LEIBNITZ thus testifies, (*Systema Theolo-*

giæ, p. 226. Paris, 1819), "But pious antiquity plainly enough declared, that the bread was changed into the body of Christ, the wine into his blood, and the ancients in various places acknowledged herein a *metasoichesis*, which the Latins have rightly translated into Transubstantiation, and it has been defined that the whole substance of the bread and wine pass into the whole substance of the body and blood of Christ; and, therefore, as in other cases, so here also the Scripture is to be explained by that tradition which the Church as its keeper has transmitted to us."

GROTIUS (Vot. pro. Pace.) says, "I find in all the Liturgies, Greek, Latin, Arabic, Syriac, and others, prayers addressed to God, that by his Holy Spirit, he would consecrate the gifts offered up and make them the body and blood of his Son. I was therefore right in asserting, that a practice so ancient and universal must be considered as having come down from the first ages, and ought not to have been altered."

The learned Protestant Bishop of Oxford, Dr. PARKER (Reasons for abrogating the Test, p. 13. Oct. 30. Anno 1688), had the candour to make the following acknowledgment regarding Transubstantiation: "It is evident to all men that are but ordinarily conversant in Ecclesiastical learning, that the Ancient Fathers, from age to age, asserted the real and substantial presence, in very high and expressive terms. The Greeks styled it *Metabole*, *Metarrhuthinisis*, *Metaskenasmos*, *Metapoiesis*, *Metastoiceiosis*; and the Latins, agreeably with the Greeks, *Conversion*, *Transmutation*, *Transformation*, *Transfiguration*, *Trans-ementation*, and at length,—*Transubstantiation*; by all which they expressed nothing more nor less than the real and substantial presence in the Eucharist."

SCALIGER (Scaligerana, p. 78) says, " I have often wondered that all the Ancient Fathers should have considered the supper of the Lord as a real oblation, and that they should have believed, as they unquestionably did, the change of the bread into the body of Christ, for which reason, in vain do Protestants endeavour to prove the article of the Supper from their writings."

Dr. JEREMY TAYLOR says of the Holy Sacrament, " It has fared with this, as with other actions of religion which have descended from flames to still fires, from fires to sparks, from sparks to embers, from embers to smoke, from smoke to nothing."

Dr. COSIN (History of Transubstantiation, An. 1676) says, " that God's omnipotency can change one substance into another, none will deny ;" and he calls, same place, ' the miraculous change of water into wine, at the Marriage Feast of Cana in Galilee (John 2.) a true and proper Transubstantiation."

Again he says, " If any one make a bare figure of them, we cannot, and ought not, to suffer him in our Churches." " These Words of Christ," says the Dr., " THIS IS MY BODY,—mean—this to the worthy Receiver conveys my Body—and these, THIS IS MY BLOOD—convey my blood, truly, really, and substantially."

Dr. ANDREWS, Bishop of Winchester, writes to Cardinal Bellarmine, " None of the Protestant Churches doubt of the Real Presence of Christ's body and blood in the Sacrament.—We believe a Real Presence, no less than you ;" he also says, " The King (James 1st) acknowledges Christ to be truly present, and truly to be adored in the Eucharist. And I also adore the flesh of Christ in the Mysteries."

Dr. POINET, Bishop of the same See, thus says, " The Holy Eucharist is not only the figure, but containing in

itself the truth, nature, and substance of the body of our blessed Saviour.”

BISHOP MONTAGUE, in his Appeal, chap. 30, has these remarkable words—“ a Real Presence is maintained by us. The difference betwixt us and the Popish writers, is about the *modus* of Christ’s presence in the Sacrament.”

BISHOP BILSON says, “ God forbid we should deny the flesh and blood of Christ to be truly present, and truly received by the faithful, at the Lord’s Table. It is the Doctrine that we teach others, and comfort ourselves with all.”

BISHOP KEN (Exposition, an. 1685) has these words, “ O God, incarnate ! how canst thou give us thy Flesh to eat, and thy body to drink ? How ? Thy flesh is meat indeed ! How thou, who art in Heaven, art present on the altar ! I can by no means explain. But I firmly believe it all, because thou hast said it.”

BISHOP FORBES assures us, that the “ sounder Protestants make no doubt of adoring Christ in the Eucharist ;” and adds, that “ it is a monstrous error of the rigid Protestants to deny, that he is to be adored there.” And, speaking of such persons, he says, “ these people have not a right belief of Christ in the Sacrament, in which he is present after a wonderful, but real manner.”

BISHOP BRAMHAL (of Derry, Answer to Militaire, page 74,) writes, “ no genuine son of the Church did ever deny a true real Presence. Christ said, ‘ this is my body,’ and what he said we stedfastly believe. He said neither con, nor sub, nor trans, therefore, we place these among the opinions of schools, not among articles of faith.”

ARCHBISHOP LAUD (Conf. with Fisher), citing the general belief of the Establishment in his time, says, “ as for the Church of England, nothing is more plain, than that

she believes, and teaches the true and real Presence of Christ in the Sacrament."

Dr. THORNDIKE (in Epil. lib. 3. c. 30); "Not to baulk that freedom which hath caused me to publish all this, I do believe, that it was so practised in the ancient Church, and in the Symbols, before receiving."—He had before proved that "the *worship in the Papacy*, given to the Host, was no idolatry, as it is referred to Christ actually present."

HALLAM (Constitutional Hist.), after comparing together the three *leading* systems of the Christian World, in relation to that of the Eucharist—that of the Real Presence admitted by the Lutherans, that of the Calvinists, and that of the Catholic Church, makes the following observation: "It can hardly fail to strike every *unprejudiced* reader, that as the Romish tenet of Transubstantiation is the *best*, so that of the Calvinists (such is the doctrine of the Established Church of this day) is the *worst* imagined of the three."

The profound and justly esteemed divine, HOOKER, expresses himself thus, (Eccles. Polit. 13. 5. 67.) "I wish men would give themselves more to meditate with silence, on what we have in the Sacrament, and less to dispute of the manner *how*. Since we all agree that Christ, by the Sacrament, doth really and truly perform in us his promise, why do we so vainly trouble ourselves with so fierce contentions, whether by Consubstantiation, or else by Transubstantiation?"

ARCHBISHOP SECKER, in his Lectures, attests, that "the Church of England has always acknowledged the Real Presence."

The learned Reformer, BEZA, at the conference of Montbelliard, comparing our belief with that of those Protestant Churches which admitted the Real Presence but rejected

Transubstantiation, says, "of the two doctrines, that of the Catholics is the most consistent, and the most conformable to the institution."

HOSPINIAN asserts the same. "If the words of Christ," he says, "are not to be taken figuratively, then the doctrine of the Papists is true. For Christ does not say, *HERE* is my body, or my body is *WITHIN* this, or *OUT* of this, or this *CONTAINS* my body; but simply the words, *THIS IS my body.*"

"If the cause of the Protestants and Catholics," says FAUSTUS SOCINUS, "concerning Transubstantiation, were to be decided by the authority of the Fathers, the former, in such cases, must necessarily own themselves vanquished."

THE MAGDEBURG CENTURIATORS assert the same. I could cite a multitude of attestations to the same effect, and similar to these. But these, I conceive, are sufficient to convince any Protestant that the *genuine* doctrine of the *Established Church* is that of the *real presence*. Observe, however, that I speak only of the *genuine* doctrine of the Church, for I am very far from thinking that such is *now* either the doctrine its clergy teach, or which its members, with hardly an exception, anywhere believe. Its clergy have nearly all, if not all (such is the march of intellect), abandoned this once revered, and long defended tenet of their Church. By an unhappy though not a singular revolution *in them*, they now believe as Calvinists or Zuinglians, reducing thus the great mystery to no mystery whatsoever.

Having premised thus far, I shall now proceed to establish the doctrine of the Catholic Church on this truly momentous subject from the Holy Scriptures. The usual, and it is hoped the most satisfactory, method adopted by

Catholic Divines is to shew, first, that our beloved Redeemer promised to give us his real body and blood; secondly, that He performed his promise; and, thirdly, that the Apostles and first Christians understood and received the divine institution with precisely the same belief as ourselves.

The words of Promise are found in the 6th chapter of St. John.

The words of Institution, in Matthew 26, v. 26, 27, and 28; Mark 14, v. 22, 23, and 24; and Luke 22, v. 19 and 20; as also in the 11th of the first Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians, 23, 24, and 25 verses. In describing the words of *Institution*, the preference is given by Catholic Divines to St. Luke's recital. Not only because this Evangelist declares in the beginning of his Gospel, that he will relate things in order;* but, particularly because it is clear, he intended more than the other Evangelists, to relate the institution of the Holy Eucharist, with its circumstances in regular order. For so little did St. Mark design to relate every thing in order which passed at the institution of the Holy Eucharist, that he mentions the Apostles' participation of the sacred chalice before the benediction of it by our Lord: "Having taken the chalice," says he, "giving thanks, he gave it to them; and they all drank of it, and he said to them: This is my blood of the New Testament, which shall be shed for many."† And the silence of St. Matthew and St. Mark, concerning the supper prescribed by the law, shews plainly, that they did not intend to give an exact and minute description of all that passed at this last repast of our Lord. St. Luke, on the contrary, gives an accurate description of it, and relates every thing that was done in the legal Supper, what Jesus

* Luke 1, 3.

† Mark 14, v. 23 and 24.

Christ says of the Lamb, what he says of the Paschal chalice, and then goes on to the benediction of the Eucharistic Bread and of the Chalice. Nor is this a mark of disrespect for the Holy Scriptures to maintain, that words which St. Matthew and St. Mark relate after the consecration, were pronounced before it. For, it is manifest, from many examples, that the Sacred Writers did not always place the words and actions they describe in the order they happened. For example, in the 7th of Genesis, 13th verse, the entrance of the children of Noah into the ark is recited after the forty days' rain; and in the 24th of Genesis, Moses says in the 23d verse, that Abraham's servant took out the earrings and bracelets for Rebecca, before he asked who she was; and in the 47th verse, it is said, he first asked who she was, and then he gave the presents. We must also add to this, with reference to the point under discussion, that St. Mark generally seems to have copied St. Matthew, and to have followed him step by step.

Let us now to St. John, chap. 6, in which are contained the words of Promise.

Before I proceed to explain this chapter, I wish to answer the question so often proposed by persons who differ from Catholics in religious principles, namely, "How do we know that this 6th chapter of St. John is to be explained of the promise made by Christ to give us his real body and blood?" I answer, because otherwise, there would be no mention of this mystery in St. John, which none of the other three Evangelists have omitted. Besides, something of very great importance would be wanting in the word of God; I mean that part which treats of the effects of the Holy Eucharist; namely, that close union in which we are joined by it to Jesus Christ, and the life

which it causes us to find in him; thirdly, because it is impossible to give any other consistent explanation of the contents of this chapter; and, lastly, because, if this chapter be not understood of the promise, then Jesus Christ departed from his usual method of speaking of his mysteries before he accomplished them. For, it was occasionally the practice of Christ, before he was pleased to execute some great design, to prepare the minds of his disciples for their completion. He did so, for example, in relation to the sacrament of baptism; in regard to some of the mysteries of his death and resurrection, in this same chapter to his Ascension and return to Heaven; and to the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the disciples. And as, among all his various dispensations, there is none more wonderful than the Sacrament of the Eucharist, so also, we may conclude, that, by a similar act of his wisdom and benevolence, he was pleased, before he bestowed the hallowed gift, to prepare the minds of his followers for its reverence and belief; and this promise, we maintain, forms the subject of the 6th of St. John's Gospel.

It is worthy of observation, that the learned Mr. Johnson, in his treatise entitled "The unbloody Sacrifice," shows at large, that the primitive Fathers understood the 6th chapter of St. John as referring to the blessed Eucharist.

Proceeding now to the 6th of John, it is clear, that up to the 25th verse the narration is simply historical. The Evangelist informs us, that the Blessed Jesus fed in the desert, in a miraculous manner, the five thousand men who had followed him; that he withdrew himself by flight from the transports of their admiration, and the honours they wished to pay him by proclaiming him King; that towards night he rejoined the vessel of the Apostles in the middle of the sea of Tiberias, walking over the waters to them;

that in fine, he himself was rejoined the next day at Capernaum by the multitude he had fed the day before.

Catholic Version.

1 AFTER these things JESUS went over the sea of Galilee, which is that of Tiberias.

2 And a great multitude followed him, because they saw the miracles which he did on them that were diseased.

3 Jesus therefore went up into a mountain, and there he sat with his disciples.

4 Now the pasch, the festival day of the Jews, was near at hand.

5 When Jesus therefore had lifted up his eyes, and seen that a very great multitude cometh to him, he said to Philip: Whence shall we buy bread, that these may eat?

6 And this he said to try him; for he himself knew what he would do.

7 Philip answered him: Two hundred pennyworths of bread are not sufficient for them, that every one may take a little.

Protestant Version.

1 AFTER these things Jesus went over the sea of Galilee, which is *the sea of Tiberias*.

2 And a great multitude followed him, because they saw his miracles which he did on them that were diseased.

3 And Jesus went up into a mountain, and there he sat with his disciples.

4 And the passover, a feast of the Jews, was nigh.

5 ¶ When Jesus then lifted up *his* eyes, and saw a great company come unto him, he saith unto Philip, Whence shall we buy bread, that these may eat?

6 And this he said to prove him: for he himself knew what he would do.

7 Philip answered him, Two hundred pennyworth of bread is not sufficient for them, that every one of them may take a little.

Catholic Version.

8 One of his disciples, Andrew, the brother of Simon Peter, saith to him :

9 There is a boy here that hath five barley loaves, and two fishes : but what are these among so many ?

10 Then Jesus said : Make the men sit down. Now there was much grass in the place. The men therefore sat down, in number about five thousand.

11 And Jesus took the loaves : and when he had given thanks, he distributed to them that were sat down. In like manner also the fishes as much as they would.

12 And when they were filled, he said to his disciples : Gather up the fragments that remain, lest they be lost.

13 They gathered up therefore, and filled twelve baskets with the fragments of the five barley loaves, which remained over and above to them that had eaten.

Protestant Version.

8 One of his disciples, Andrew, Simon Peter's brother, saith unto him,

9 There is a lad here, which hath five barley loaves, and two small fishes : but what are they among so many ?

10 And Jesus said, Make the men sit down. Now there was much grass in the place. So the men sat down, in number about five thousand.

11 And Jesus took the loaves ; and when he had given thanks, he distributed to the disciples, and the disciples to them that were set down ; and likewise of the fishes as much as they would.

12 When they were filled, he said unto his disciples, Gather up the fragments that remain, that nothing be lost.

13 Therefore they gathered *them* together, and filled twelve baskets with the fragments of the five barley loaves, which remained over and above unto them that had eaten.

Catholic Version.

14 Now those men, when they had seen what a miracle Jesus had done, said: This is of a truth the prophet that is to come into the world.

15 Jesus therefore when he knew that they would come to take him by force, and make him king, fled again into the mountain himself alone.

16 And when evening was come, his disciples went down to the sea.

17 And when they had gone up into a ship, they went over the sea to Capernaum; and it was now dark, and Jesus was not come unto them.

18 And the sea arose, by reason of a great wind that blew.

19 When they had rowed therefore about five and twenty or thirty furlongs, they see Jesus walking upon the sea, and drawing nigh to the ship, and they were afraid.

20 But he saith to them: It is I; be not afraid.

Protestant Version.

14 Then those men, when they had seen the miracle that Jesus did, said, This is of a truth that prophet that should come into the world.

15 ¶ When Jesus therefore perceived that they would come and take him by force, to make him a king, he departed again into a mountain himself alone.

16 And when even was now come, his disciples went down unto the sea,

17 And entered into a ship, and went over the sea toward Capernaum. And it was now dark, and Jesus was not come to them.

18 And the sea arose by reason of a great wind that blew.

19 So when they had rowed about five and twenty or thirty furlongs, they see Jesus walking on the sea, and drawing nigh unto the ship: and they were afraid.

20 But he saith unto them, It is I; be not afraid.

Catholic Version.

21 They were willing therefore to take him into the ship ; and presently the ship was at the land to which they were going.

22 The next day, the multitude that stood on the other side of the sea, saw that there was no other ship there but one, and that Jesus had not entered into the ship with his disciples, but that his disciples were gone away alone.

23 But other ships came in from Tiberias, nigh unto the place where they had eaten bread, the Lord giving thanks.

24 When therefore the multitude saw that Jesus was not there, nor his disciples, they took shipping, and came to Capharnaum, seeking for Jesus.

Verse 25, a remarkable conversation commences between Jesus and the Jewish multitude.—

Catholic Version.

25 And when they had found him on the other side

Protestant Version.

21 Then they willingly received him into the ship : and immediately the ship was at the land whither they went.

22 ¶ The day following, when the people which stood on the other side of the sea saw that there was none other boat there, save that one whereinto his disciples were entered, and that Jesus went not with his disciples into the boat, but *that* his disciples were gone away alone ;

23 (Howbeit there came other boats from Tiberias nigh unto the place where they did eat bread, after that the Lord had given thanks :)

24 When the people therefore saw that Jesus was not there, neither his disciples, they also took shipping, and came to Capernaum, seeking for Jesus.

Protestant Version.

25 And when they had found him on the other side

Catholic Version.

of the sea, they said to him: Rabbi, when camest thou hither?

Protestant Version.

of the sea, they said unto him, Rabbi, when camest thou hither?

In the four following verses, we shall find, that He condemns the carnal motives, which induced them to follow him, and after having blamed their eagerness for perishable food, and their indifference in seeking for meat, that endureth to life everlasting, he tells them, that the means of obtaining it, *is to believe in Him, whom God had sent them.*—

Catholic Version.

26 Jesus answered them, and said: Amen, amen, I say to you, you seek me, not because you have seen miracles, but because you did eat of the loaves, and were filled.

27 Labour not for the meat which perisheth, but for that which endureth unto life everlasting, which the son of man will give you. For him hath God the Father sealed.

28 They said therefore unto him: What shall we do, that we may work the works of God?

29 Jesus answered, and said to them: This is the

Protestant Version.

26 Jesus answered them and said, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Ye seek me, not because ye saw the miracles, but because ye did eat of the loaves, and were filled.

27 Labour not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth unto everlasting life, which the Son of man shall give unto you: for him hath God the Father sealed.

28 Then said they unto him, What shall we do, that we might work the works of God?

29 Jesus answered and said unto them, This is the

Catholic Version.

work of God, that you believe in him whom he hath sent.

30 They said therefore to him : What sign therefore dost thou shew, that we may see, and may believe thee? What dost thou work?

31 Our fathers did eat manna in the desert, as it is written : *He gave them bread from heaven to eat.*

Protestant Version.

work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent.

30 They said therefore unto him, What sign shewest thou then, that we may see, and believe thee? what dost thou work?

31 Our fathers did eat manna in the desert; as it is written, He gave them bread from heaven to eat.

To understand these last verses, it is necessary to remark with the learned and eloquent Dr. Wiseman,* “ that the Jews in one of their earliest works after the time of Christ, that is, ‘ the Midrash Coheleth,’ or, Commentary on the book of Ecclesiastes, assert, that one of the signs which the Messiah was to give, was precisely this; that in the same manner as Moses had brought down the manna from heaven, so should he bring down bread from heaven. Indeed, we find, that the doctrine of Transubstantiation was in the early ages of Christianity acknowledged by several Jewish Teachers of the Law, on these words of

Catholic Version.

Osee, chap. 14.

8 They shall live upon wheat, and they shall blossom as a vine : his memorial shall be as the vine of Lebanon.

Protestant Version.

Hosea, chap. 13.

7 They shall revive as the corn, and grow as the vine : the scent thereof *shall be* as the wine of Lebanon.

* Lectures on Transubstantiation.

“Many of our Doctors” (says R. David Kimbi) “expound this text, that there shall be made a change of nature in *wheat*, in the times of our Redeemer Christ.” This being the persuasion of the Jews, it was natural that they should choose that criterion of Christ’s being sent from God, in the same way as Moses, and why our Saviour should give a parallel on his part to the former food from heaven, in a divine institution, whereby men should be nourished by something more excellent than manna, by the true living bread coming down from heaven.

But our beloved Redeemer at once tells them, the bread of which their fathers had eaten in the desert, was not the heavenly bread: that the bread of God is that which cometh down from heaven; that he himself is the true heavenly bread; that he is come down from heaven; that he had been sent by his Father to save them.

Catholic Version.

32 Then Jesus said to them: Amen, amen, I say to you; Moses gave you not bread from heaven, but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven.

33 For the bread of God is that which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life to the world.

34 They said therefore unto him: Lord, give us always this bread.

35 And Jesus said to them: I am the bread of

Protestant Version.

32 Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily I say unto you, Moses gave you not that bread from heaven; but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven.

33 For the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life unto the world.

34 Then said they unto him, Lord, evermore give us this bread.

35 And Jesus said unto them, I am the bread of life:

Catholic Version.

life: he that cometh to me shall not hunger; and he that believeth in me shall never thirst.

36 But I said unto you, that you also have seen me, and you believe not.

37 All that the Father giveth to me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me, I will not cast out.

38 Because I came down from heaven, not to do my own will, but the will of him that sent me.

39 Now this is the will of the Father who sent me: that of all that he hath given me, I should lose nothing; but should raise it up again in the last day.

40 And this is the will of my Father that sent me: that every one who seeth the Son, and believeth in him, may have life everlasting, and I will raise him up in the last day.

Protestant Version.

he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst.

36 But I said unto you, that ye also have seen me, and believe not.

37 All that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that cometh to me I will in no wise cast out.

38 For I came down from heaven, not to do mine own will, but the will of him that sent me.

39 And this is the Father's will which hath sent me, that of all which he hath given me, I should lose nothing, but should raise it up again at the last day.

40 And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life; and I will raise him up at the last day.

In the preceding verses it is clear, that the blessed Jesus enforces the necessity of faith, and of faith in His divine Mission. If it be asked why he discourses exclusively about

Faith? We answer, because the ideas of giving and partaking of food or meat, which our beloved Redeemer makes use of, were commonly applied by the inspired writers among the Jews, to teaching and receiving spiritual instruction, which is so intimately and closely connected with faith. We have many instances of this in the Old Testament. Thus, Wisdom is represented in the book of Proverbs, saying, "*come, eat my bread.*" Thus we have it said in the book of Isaiah, 55,—

Catholic Version.

1 All you that thirst come unto the waters, and you that have no money, make haste, buy and EAT, come ye, buy wine and milk without money, and without any price.

2 Harken diligently to me, and EAT that which is good.

Protestant Version.

1 Ho, every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money; come ye, buy, and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price.

2 hearken diligently unto me, and eat ye *that which is good*, and let your soul delight itself in fatness.

Here *eat* is applied to listening unto instruction. See also Amos, 8, v. 11; Proverbs, 9, v. 5; and Matthew, 4, v. 4.

And if it be required why we maintain, that he speaks exclusively on faith in His own divine Mission? We answer, in his own words in the 29th verse, "This is the work of God, that you believe in him whom he hath sent."

Again, it is worthy of consideration to observe how strictly the blessed Jesus, in the 35th verse, follows the received custom of the inspired writers, who, in the instances where the figure of food is applied to hearing or

believing doctrine, never say "come and eat or receive me;" thus, he never even speaks of eating this bread of life; he, at the same time, cautiously escapes from applying the phrase directly to his own person, and, when it would appear requisite to fill up the metaphor by the ideas of eating and drinking, as opposed to hunger and thirst, he carefully avoids them, and says, "he that cometh to me," equivalent to "he that believeth in me," "shall not hunger, and he that believeth in me shall not thirst." But the Jews appear to have understood him, for they never objected to his calling himself bread: they only murmur at him because he had said—

Catholic Version.

41 I am the living bread, which came down from heaven.

42 And they said, Is not this Jesus the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? How then saith he: I came down from heaven?

Protestant Version.

41 The Jews then murmured at him, because he said, I am the bread which came down from heaven.

42 And they said, Is not this Jesus the son of Joseph, whose father and mother we know? how is it then that he saith, I came down from heaven?

However, we shall find that Jesus insists on it, and repeats it again and again, even three times, saying, "that he had come down from heaven."

Catholic Version.

43 Jesus therefore answered and said to them: Murmur not among yourselves.

Protestant Version.

43 Jesus therefore answered and said unto them, Murmur not among yourselves,

Catholic Version.

44 No man can come to me, except the Father who hath sent me draw him ; and I will raise him up in the last day.

Protestant Version.

44 No man can come to me, except the Father which hath sent me draw him : and I will raise him up at the last day.

This last verse agrees with what we read in the 66th, "Therefore did I say to you, that no man can come to me, unless it be given him by my Father," thereby shewing, that his incarnation was an incomprehensible mystery, for the belief of which extraordinary succours of grace were requisite ; hence it was necessary, that his heavenly Father should draw, not by compulsion, not by laying the free-will under any necessity, but by the strong and sweet motions of his heavenly grace.

Catholic Version.

45 It is written in the prophets : *And they shall all be taught of God.* Every one that hath heard of the Father, and hath learned, cometh to me.

46 Not that any man hath seen the Father ; but he who is of God, he hath seen the Father.

47 Amen, amen, I say unto you : He that believeth in me hath everlasting life.

Protestant Version.

45 It is written in the prophets, and they shall be all taught of God. Every man therefore that hath heard, and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me.

46 Not that any man hath seen the Father, save he which is of God, he hath seen the Father.

47 Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that believeth on me hath everlasting life.

These verses are a continuation of the discourse on Faith.

Eminent Catholic polemic writers agree, that it comes to a close with the beautiful epilogue, or conclusion, contained in the 47th, where Christ says, “Amen, amen, I say unto you: He that believeth in me, hath everlasting life.” According to them, a transition takes place from one subject to another. Our beloved Redeemer adopts another form of phraseology, and makes use of expressions, which allow no choice between the real partaking of the body and blood, and a settled figurative signification. He says—

Catholic Version.

48 I am the bread of life.

49 Your fathers did eat manna in the desert, and are dead.

50 This is the bread which cometh down from heaven: that if any man eat of it, he may not die.

51 I am the living bread, which came down from heaven.

52 If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever; and the bread that I will give, is my flesh, for the life of the world.

Protestant Version.

48 I am that bread of life.

49 Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and are dead.

50 This is the bread which cometh down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die.

51 I am the living bread, which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever: and the bread that I will give, is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.

Thus, the 48, 49, 50, and 51st verses are regarded as prefatory phrases, or introductions to the 52d, in which it pleased our blessed Redeemer to give us a promise of His real presence in the Holy Eucharist. And, under this impression, surely the occasion which, in his wisdom and

goodness, he selected for this important purpose, was, of all others, the one particularly suited to the desired effect. He had just wrought a miracle by the multiplication of the loaves, which, of all the miracles he had performed, had the most striking resemblance to the still greater miracle, that occurs in the Eucharist ; and, consequently, was adapted to prepare the minds of his hearers for this great mystery. We must observe, likewise, that the Jews, having petitioned for a repetition of the miracle of the manna, a more seasonable occasion could never present itself of informing them, that that figure was passed, and what it represented was realized in our Lord, who was speaking to them. For this reason, Jesus Christ had previously instructed them concerning his divine origin ; the life he would give to men, and the eating of his body, which he intended to bestow on Christians ; and let us bear in mind, that these are the chief points in which the manna represented Jesus Christ. He had said enough to the Jews concerning the first of these points, when he told them several times, that he had come down from heaven, and had given life to the world, and when he repeated this to them, notwithstanding the murmurs these truths caused in them.* It was then a convenient opportunity to entertain them with the last, that is with the eating, by which his sacred body would give life to the faithful, and to repeat this truth several times to them,† notwithstanding any repugnance they might shew to it, that they might be thoroughly convinced he was the bread prefigured by the manna, and that he might remove the desire, which the Jews, who were, or should become his disciples, had of their ancient manna, and fix it entirely on himself.

But, to return to the Gospel. No sooner had our Bene-

* John, 6, v. 42.

† 52 verse, &c.

volent Redeemer made known to the Jews, that he intended to give them his real flesh to eat, than, as the sacred Penman has it —

Catholic Version.

53 They strove among themselves saying, How can this man give us his flesh to eat?

Protestant Version.

52 The Jews therefore strove amongst themselves, saying, How can this man give us *his* flesh to eat?

They are scandalized at the thought, equally as the disciples, who, crying out in the same sentiments, exclaim—

Catholic Version.

61 This saying is hard, and who can hear it?

Protestant Version.

60 Many therefore of his disciples, when they had heard *this*, said, This is an hard saying; Who can hear it?

How appropriate the remark of St. Cyril, on these words: “The Jews strove among themselves, saying: How can this man give us his flesh to eat? This *how* is quite a Jewish difficulty, and will be the cause of the severest punishment: for they will justly be reputed guilty of grievous crimes, who dare to attack by their incredulity the excellent and supreme Creator of all things, and who have the audacity to put the question *how*, respecting what he chooses to operate.....The rude and indocile mind rejects as an extravagance whatever surpasses its comprehension, because it does surpass it; its ignorant temerity leads it to the extremity of pride. We shall see that the Jews fell into this excess, if we consider the nature of the case. They ought,

without hesitation, to have received the words of our Saviour, whose divine virtue and invincible power over nature, which he had on many occasions displayed before their eyes, they had so often admired.....And yet, behold, they put the mad interrogation, *how*, to God, as if ignorant that the word contained a blasphemy, since in God resides the power to do all things without difficulty.....But if thou persistest, O Jew, in putting this *how*, I in my turn will ask of thee, how the rod of Moses was *changed* into a serpent? How the waters were *changed* into blood?.....It would be more becoming, therefore, to believe in Christ, and to give credence to his words; much more becoming to procure and pay eulogies to him, than rashly and inconsiderately to exclaim, How can this man give us his flesh to eat?.....For our part, in receiving the divine mysteries, let us have a faith free from all curiosity: this is our duty, and we should never again put the question *how* to the words that are said."—I cannot sufficiently exhort my Protestant reader, of whatever communion, to reflect upon this passage, and examine thoroughly the doctrine it teaches. But to return to the exclamation of the Jews, it is manifest, that Jesus had changed his discourse, and that the Jews and disciples understood Jesus to speak of a real eating. All the hearers of a preacher do not agree to give a false sense to his expressions where there is no common principle to mislead them into the same error. Yet this would have been the case here, if the words of Jesus did not imply a real eating, a sense in which they were understood by the Jews and disciples.

In the mean time, we have now the meek Lamb of God placed in one of the most critical circumstances of his mission. Equally as the pious among the Jews, we regard him as a guide, as man's best friend, as a physician, and as

a teacher, and as such, we expect he will assuredly remove all the apprehensions of the Jews, if on this point they are erroneous, otherwise their false impressions unremoved will and must lead to those consequences with which, even at this period of time, Protestants reproach Catholics. But what, under this most trying circumstance, was the conduct of the blessed Jesus? Did he soften down his expressions, or explain them in any other sense than what they had understood them? Does he tell them that they had mistaken his meaning, and that he was only speaking to them figuratively? So far from any thing like this, he, on the contrary, confirms it in the most decided manner, and in such forcible language, that, beyond all other, expresses the strongest confirmation of the reality, and cannot admit of another meaning; nay, he even threatens with the heaviest denunciations of vengeance those, who shall refuse to partake of his body and blood.

Catholic Version.

54 Then Jesus said to them: Amen, Amen, I say unto you, except you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you.

Protestant Version.

53 Then Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.

He proceeds to confirm and strengthen his meaning by a variety of repetitions, for the obvious purpose of imprinting it more deeply on the minds of his hearers; and he allures them to the promised banquet by the fairest and most splendid assurances of receiving life, grace, and immortality.

Catholic Version.

55 He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life, and I will raise him up in the last day.

56 My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.

57 He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, abideth in me, and I in him.

58 As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father; so he that eateth me, the same also shall live by me.

59 This is the bread that came down from heaven. Not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead. He that eateth this bread shall live for ever.

Protestant Version.

54 Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day.

55 For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.

56 He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.

57 As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father: so he that eateth me, even he shall live by me.

58 This is that bread which came down from heaven: not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead: he that eateth of this bread, shall live for ever.

He absolutely excludes all supposed figure in eating and drinking, by the force of the terms which he employs. Finally, he declares the eating of his body to be as real as his union with his heavenly Father, and his mission from the Father. Now, the union of the blessed Jesus with his heavenly Father is not imaginary, his mission is not figurative. Then, these assurances of eternal wisdom—these solemn asseverations made at the moment

when the Jews clearly apprehended his meaning—the repeated and direct confirmations of that meaning, when a mistake might with so much facility be corrected—the comparisons here introduced—all tending to produce the same conviction, unquestionably demonstrate the intention of our Redeemer to give us his body and blood under the Sacramental forms. But I shall proceed to give a more ample, and, I trust, a more satisfactory explanation of the proofs which these six verses supply. It is evident, the instant our beloved Redeemer had said the ever memorable words, “and the bread that I will give, is my flesh, for the life of the world,” the Jews immediately complain, they instantly murmur and exclaim “How *can* this man give us his flesh to eat?” They, therefore, believe him to propose a thing impossible to perform; but they cannot conceive how it was to be carried into effect. They, therefore, believe our Saviour’s words in the literal sense. Now how does our Saviour act? Often, during the course of his ministry, where he meant to be taken figuratively, his hearers took his words literally, and objected to the doctrine he proposed. But then, in every instance, and without exception, he corrects them.

Catholic Version.

John, 4.

32 But he said to them I have meat to eat, which you know not.

33 The disciples, therefore, said one to another: Hath any man brought him to eat?

(Jesus says correcting their mistake, and shewing that he is speaking figuratively,)

Protestant Version.

John, 4.

32 But he said unto them, I have meat to eat, that ye know not of.

33 Therefore said the disciples one to another, Hath any man brought him ought to eat?

Catholic Version.

34 My meat is to do the will of Him that sent me, that I may perfect his work.

John, 3d chap., wherein is related the celebrated interview of Chirst with Nicodemus.

Catholic Version.

3 Jesus answered and said to him: Amen, amen, I say to thee, unless a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.

4 Nicodemus saith to him: How can a man be born when he is old? can he enter a second time into his mother's womb, and be born again?

5 Jesus answered: Amen, amen, I say to thee, unless a man be born again of water and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.

Thus he does not allow him to remain in his mistake, which arose from a misinterpretation of the figurative expression.

Catholic Version.

Matthew, 16.

6 Jesus saith to the dis-

Protestant Version.

34 My meat is to do the will of him that sent me, and to finish his work.

Protestant Version.

3 Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God.

4 Nicodemus saith unto him, How can a man be born when he is old? can he enter the second time into his mother's womb, and be born?

5 Jesus answered, Verily, verily, I say unto thee, Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.

Protestant Version.

Matthew, 16.

6 Take heed and beware

Catholic Version.

ciples, Take heed and beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees.

7 But they thought within themselves, saying: Because we have taken no bread.

8 And Jesus knowing it, said, Why do you think within yourselves, O ye of little faith, for that you have no bread?

9 Do you not yet understand, neither do you remember the five loaves among five thousand men, and how many baskets you took up?

10 Nor the seven loaves among four thousand men, and how many baskets you took up?

11 Why do you not understand that it was not concerning bread I said to you: Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and Sadducees?

Protestant Version.

of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees.

7 And they reasoned among themselves, saying, *It is* because we have taken no bread.

8 *Which* when Jesus perceived, he said unto them, O ye of little faith, why reason ye among yourselves, because ye have brought no bread?

9 Do ye not yet understand, neither remember the five loaves of the five thousand, and how many baskets ye took up?

10 Neither the seven loaves of the four thousand, and how many baskets ye took up?

11 How is it that ye do not understand that I spake *it* not to you concerning bread, that ye should beware of the leaven of the Pharisees and of the Sadducees?

We see he lets them know that he was speaking figuratively.

Again, when his hearers take his words in the crude literal sense, and he meant them to be taken literally, He on every occasion repeats the expression, or very words which caused the objections they, on such occasions, were accustomed to make. In this chapter under discussion, we have an instance where the Jews say, "Is not this Jesus, whose Father and Mother we know; how is it then, that he saith, I came down from heaven?" They object to his assertion; they understand him to mean, that his words be taken in the literal sense, and he insists upon it, repeats the very words that gave offence, repeats them again and again, even three times, saying, "that he had come down from heaven." Thus also, Matt. 9th chap.

Catholic Version.

2 And Jesus, seeing their faith, said to the man sick of the palsy: Be of good heart, son, thy sins are forgiven thee.

3 And behold some of the Scribes said within themselves: He blasphemeth.

4 And Jesus seeing their thoughts, said: Why do you think evil in your hearts?

5 Whether is easier to say, Thy sins are forgiven thee: or to say, Arise and walk?

6 But that you may know

Protestant Version.

2 Jesus seeing their faith said unto the sick of the palsy: Son be of good cheer; thy sins be forgiven thee.

3 And, behold, certain of the Scribes said within themselves, This *man* blasphemeth.

4 And Jesus knowing their thoughts said, Wherefore think ye evil in your hearts?

5 For whether is easier to say, *Thy* sins be forgiven thee; or to say, Arise, and walk?

6 But that ye may know

Catholic Version.

that the son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins (then said he to the man sick of the palsy), rise, take up thy bed, and go into thy house.

Protestant Version.

that the Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins, (then saith he to the sick of the palsy,) Arise, take up thy bed, and go unto thine house.

Thus he insists on being believed, that he had spoken literally, as the Jews had understood him.

See also 8th chapter of John,

Catholic Version.

56 Abraham your father rejoiced that he might see my day: he saw it and was glad.

57 The Jews therefore said to him: Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham?

58 Jesus said to them: Amen, amen, I say to you, before Abraham was made, I am.

Protestant Version.

56 Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day: and he saw *it*, and was glad.

57 Then said the Jews unto him, Thou art not yet fifty years old, and hast thou seen Abraham?

58 Jesus said unto them, Verily, verily, I say unto you, Before Abraham was, I am.

Here, again, his words are taken literally,—the Jews are correct in so doing and object,—and he insists on being believed, and again repeats the same expressions.

Now, in our case does our Redeemer soften down the same hard words, which had not proved palatable? or stand to his words, and repeat again and again the obnoxious expressions, and require his hearers to believe them?

Yes, he not only repeats them six times, but he adds a severe penalty for their neglect. Then his words were to be taken in the strictest, and most literal sense. And this reflection comes with more weight when we see them so frequently repeated, affirmed with a most solemn oath, and to the oath a menace attached. We are aware, that one of the principal uses of repetitions in the Sacred Writings is to give additional force to a truth, or truths already proposed. Thus, in the Old Testament, Joseph tells Pharaoh, that the second vision which he had seen was only to confirm the certainty of what God had pointed out in the first.* And, in the New Testament, God three times repeats the vision of the sheet, filled with all manner of animals, to assure St. Peter that he ought to receive Gentiles as well as Jews in the Christian church.† Thus also, our Lord, in like manner, several times repeats his words concerning the eating of his flesh, to enforce the truth of this doctrine, and to impress it on their minds, notwithstanding the difficulties it contains. Add to this, besides the repetition of the expression that had given offence to the Jews, and the oath of the Saviour of the world,—I likewise observe a menace. Now, duties that are enjoined with threats, and the denunciation of penalties, are always proposed in clear terms, and to be taken in the sense in which the person understands them to whom they are directed. Thus God said to our first parents,

Catholic Version.

17 In what day so ever thou shalt eat of it (the tree of knowledge), thou shalt die the death.‡

Protestant Version.

17 But of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil, thou shalt not eat of it: for in the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.

* Genesis 41, v. 32.

† Acts 10, v. 16.

‡ Genesis 2, v. 17.

This eating of the fruit of the tree of knowledge was a clear term, that God made use of, in the sense understood by Adam. And we do not find in the Holy Scriptures, that duties accompanied with threats, are proposed in obscure terms, which they, to whom they are addressed, have signified they did not understand. Thus, since our Lord has added to this command of eating his flesh, a menace of eternal damnation, we cannot doubt but the expression must have been clear, and meant a real eating, in which sense our Lord knew the Jews understood it. And here also we should remark, that in the 54th and subsequent verses, our Saviour makes a nice distinction between eating and drinking; eating is applied to his body, and drinking to his blood; which was likewise well adapted to show, that he did not speak merely of an action of the soul, in regard of which, to eat and to drink are not two different things. If, then, our Lord had intended, in this place, to speak only of a spiritual manducation, he would not have introduced the distinction of eating and drinking in his answer, and he would on another account have avoided it, as he knew this distinction might tend to fix the Jews in the notion which they had formed of his meaning, instead of undeceiving them. Besides, nothing occurred at that time that could put him under any kind of necessity of proposing what he intended under the notion of drinking, as well as of eating. Mention had been only made of the manna, nothing had been said of the waters that flowed from the rock to quench the thirst of the Israelites: our Lord must have been so far from seeing anything that could induce him to propose to the Jews any of these articles, under the idea of drinking blood, that there were positive reasons why he should have rejected this expression, if it had not been absolutely necessary to express his intentions. For, besides the horror of drinking human blood, which

was common to the Jews and other men, every one knows to what a degree this was carried among them, even in regard to the blood of animals. Hence, it is manifest, that our Lord would never have made use of this expression, "Except you drink my blood you shall not have life in you," unless he had really intended to give his blood to Christians to drink. Coming now to v. 56, "For my flesh is meat indeed; and my blood is drink indeed." The word "*indeed*" is of great weight; for this word shows likewise that our Lord intended to enforce upon the Jews, whom he was answering, the belief, that his body would really be received into the mouths of Christians. In fact, this word "*indeed*" or "*truly*" (*vere* in the Latin Vulgate, and *alethos* in the Greek), is never used in the Holy Scriptures except in expressing some reality; it is never introduced by the Holy Spirit unless on occasions where there is nothing figurative. The following examples are taken from the history of our Lord's passion and death:

Catholic Version.

"Surely" (said they of the household of the High Priest of the Jews to St. Peter), "thou also art one of them."* "indeed this was the Son of God."† "this is of a truth the Prophet that is to come into the world."‡

Protestant Version.

MATT. 26, 73 Surely thou also art one of them; for thy speech betrayeth thee.

MATT. 27, 54. Truly this was the Son of God.

Hence, we conclude, that this passage also must be understood as expressing a reality.—"My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed." For we must recollect,

* Matthew, 26, v. 73. † Matthew, 27, v. 54. ‡ John, 6, v. 14.

that our Lord is answering the Jews, who believed he spoke of a corporeal eating. In such circumstances, he would not have used the word "*indeed*," which always in the Holy Scriptures conveys the meaning of reality, unless he had intended they should believe, that his body would be really received by Christians, notwithstanding any difficulty that might present itself against the belief of so incomprehensible a mystery. Finally, and with respect to the 58th verse, "As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father, so he that eateth me, the same also shall live by me," our Lord makes a comparison in this verse, between the reality of this eating, and that of his mission from above. And by this he furnished the Jews with another reason to believe that he treated of a real eating; for if he had condemned the interpretation of a real eating, which they gave to his words, he would not, in his answer, have compared it to an object so real as is his Divine mission. From which, and foregoing verses, I draw this general proof, "that if our Lord Jesus Christ had disapproved of the meaning of a real eating, his answer would never have been composed of so many things, so adapted to strengthen the idea of it in the minds of the Jews." This observation carries the more weight with it, as our Lord had then before his eyes not only the Jews, whom this notion of a real eating would alienate from his communion, but likewise so many millions of Christians in after ages, who would understand his words in the same manner. If this meaning then was opposite to eternal salvation, Jesus Christ never would have said to all, in words which the Gospel would cause to be heard from one end of the world to the other: "Amen, amen, I say to you except you eat the flesh of the Son of man, you shall not have life in you. My flesh is

meat indeed. He that eateth me, the same shall live by me." But to return to the Gospel, we are told that

Catholic Version.

62 Jesus knowing in himself, that his disciples murmured at this, said to them : Doth this scandalize you ?

63 If then you shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before ?

64 It is the spirit that quickeneth : the flesh profiteth nothing. The words that I have spoken to you, are spirit and life.

65 But there are some of you that believe not. For Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that did not believe, and who he was that would betray him.

66 And he said : therefore did I say to you, that no man can come to me, unless it be given him by my Father.

67 After this many of his disciples went back ; and walked no more with him.

68 Then Jesus said to the twelve ; will you also go away ?

Protestant Version.

61 When Jesus knew in himself, that his disciples murmured at it, he said unto them, Doth this offend you ?

62 *What* and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before ?

63 It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing : the words that I speak unto you, *they* are spirit, and *they* are life.

64 But there are some of you that believe not. For Jesus knew from the beginning, who they were that believed not, and who should betray him.

65 And he said, Therefore said I unto you, that no man can come unto me, except it were given unto him of my Father.

66 ¶ From that *time* many of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him.

67 Then said Jesus unto the twelve, Will ye also go away ?

Catholic Version.

69 And Simon Peter answered him, Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life.

70 And we have believed and have known, that thou art the Christ the Son of God.

Protestant Version.

68 Then Simon Peter answered him, Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life.

69 And we believe, and are sure that thou art that Christ the Son of the living God.

Now, what is the meaning of this answer of our Lord to his disciples;—Doth this scandalize you? if then you shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before? 1st. These words may be explained by those of our Lord to Nicodemus.* “If I have spoken to you earthly things and you believe not, how will you believe if I shall speak to you heavenly things?” that is, if you cannot believe the mystery of the eating of my flesh at present, whilst it is yet on earth, how will you believe it when my body shall be taken up to heaven? Will not its absence render it more incomprehensible to your minds? And this confirms more the truth of the doctrine of the real presence. For, if every doctrine concerning the eating of the flesh of our Lord, which his ascension does not render more difficult to comprehend, is not the doctrine of Jesus Christ, it follows, that the doctrine of Protestants, who hold that the body of Jesus Christ is not really in the Eucharist, must be false. For certainly, since the ascension of our Lord, there is no more difficulty in comprehending what they mean by the eating of his flesh, than there was before this ascension, that is, the necessity of embracing him by faith. This is even become more easy, because the ascension of our Lord has freed him from infirmities, which were a great obstacle

* John, 3, v. 12.

to faith, and hath brought succours to this faith, both by the miracle of the ascension itself, by others that followed it, and by the conversion of the world. On the contrary, in the supposition of a real eating, as Catholics believe it, the absence of the body of our Lord would heap a fresh difficulty in the way of the disciples that would concur to perplex their belief of this mystery. Hence it is, that Protestants frequently draw arguments from the ascension of our Lord to disprove the presence of his body in the Holy Eucharist, in which they rather support than prejudice our cause, because they show by this, that our doctrine hath one of the marks of that of our Lord, concerning the eating of his flesh, which is, that the consideration of his ascension has made it more inconceivable.

2dly. By these words our Lord intended to intimate to his disciples, that what he spoke of would not be perceived by the senses, and that as to the eating of his flesh, it was not necessary, as they imagined, that he should be visibly present, and in his natural form, since they should see him disappear in this regard, and ascend up to Heaven.

3dly. He designed to clear up another important truth, namely, that they were not to form the same notion of his flesh as they would of another man's, which cannot change itself into such a state as to be eaten by many, nor give life to those who should be partakers of it, and, that if he taught them such extraordinary things concerning his flesh, they should understand, when in a short time they should behold this flesh raise itself up to heaven, that it was a divine flesh, and even the flesh of the Son of God, of him who had reigned in heaven from all eternity, and who, of course, could impart an all-powerful virtue to his flesh, and that they ought to believe whatever he proposed. And this consideration admirably tends to establish the doctrine

of the Real Presence. For, in the opinion of Protestants concerning the eating of the flesh of our Lord, it would not have answered any purpose to them, by the ascension of this flesh, how much it surpassed, in power and efficacy, the flesh of other men, which never can give life to us. Nor would it have been to any end to have said, ascend up where he was before, rather than ascend up to heaven, for Protestants do not believe there is any incomprehensible mystery contained in it, for the enforcement of which, it would answer any end to recall the idea of our Lord's divinity.—But all these things are necessary agreeably to the Catholic Faith, which teaches that the body of Jesus Christ, by an act of Almighty power, the effect of which we cannot fathom, becomes invisibly present in the Holy Eucharist, and gives life to those who worthily partake of it.

Let us now examine the words “the flesh profiteth nothing, it is the spirit that quickeneth.”

Whatever meaning we give to these words, it agrees perfectly well with Catholic principles on the Real Presence. If, according to many Protestants, we understand by the *flesh* a carnal sense or acceptation, and by the *Spirit* a spiritual sense, it is entirely consonant with the belief of Catholics.

In reality, we give exactly the same explanation to Protestants, when they are so unjust as to impute to us the notions, which the Capharnaites imputed to our Lord. We answer them in the same manner, that Jesus Christ here answers the Jews: we tell them that, according to the Catholic Faith, the body of our Lord is in the Eucharist, not in a carnal or visible state, as the Capharnaites supposed, but in a spiritual state, and totally incomprehensible. In the next place, we apply to these words another explanation, which the Holy Scriptures supply us. St. Paul says,

Catholic Version.

1 Cor. 8.

1 Knowledge puffeth up,
but charity edifieth.

Protestant Version.

1 Cor. 8.

1 Knowledge puffeth up,
but charity edifieth.

to teach us that knowledge without charity, is only an incentive to vanity. He says after the same manner in another place,

1 Cor. 3.

6 I (Paul) have planted,
Apollo watered, but God
gave the increase.

1 Cor. 3.

6 I have planted, Apollos
watered ; but God gave the
increase.

to inform us, that the labours of the ministers of the Gospel are ineffectual without the blessing of God. Thus we may say, that our Lord speaks in the same manner in the present verse ; by the *flesh* he meant his body, and by the *spirit*, his soul and Divinity. He meant to tell the Jews, that his dead flesh, in a state of separation from the Spirit, as they imaged it to themselves, would not give life ; and that thus by the promises, which he had just made to those, who should eat his flesh, they were to understand a flesh animated by his soul, and by his eternal divinity, which would empower it to give life to Christians that should eat it.

However, according to both explanations, we see that our Lord neither here, nor in any other verse that precedes, or follows, contradicts the Jews and disciples regarding the eating of his flesh. He then certainly intended they should continue to believe they should eat it : but, as he did not intend they should continue to believe, they should eat it in a gross and carnal state, and even in a state of death, he

here destroys that false notion. One of the best means to help us to form to ourselves an accurate idea of the doctrine of Jesus Christ, concerning the eating of his flesh, is to embrace the idea, which he left in the minds of the Jews, and to reject that, which he endeavoured to remove. We must then reject this idea of a body considered as dead, or carnal, and as it affects the senses. This is what our Lord condemns in the Capharnaites, when he says: "The flesh profiteth nothing;" but we must receive with submission the faith of a *real* eating. This is an idea, which Jesus Christ saw in the Jews and his disciples, and which he did not endeavour to change.

But it may be said, that there are strong reasons for denying, that our Lord here meant his body *by the flesh*. For in reality, when Jesus Christ spoke of his body, he always said "my flesh," and never the flesh. He moreover says here of the flesh he was speaking of, that it profiteth nothing, whereas he had just affirmed several times of his body, that "those who eat it, should have eternal life."

I admit all this. I am aware that the word "flesh," in the Holy Scriptures, means either the external visible part of man, which is called our body, or, means the corruption of human reason. This latter signification, though not frequently adopted as the first in common discourse, yet often occurs in the word of God. For example,

Catholic Version.

Genesis, 6.

3 My Spirit shall not remain in man, because he is flesh.

Protestant Version.

Genesis, 6.

3 And the Lord said, My spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also *is* flesh.

Our Lord says to Peter,

Catholic Version.

Matthew, 16.

17 Flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father who is in heaven.

Protestant Version.

Matthew, 16.

17 For flesh and blood hath not revealed *it* unto thee, but my Father which is in heaven.

St. Paul tells the Romans,

Rom. 8.

1 There is now, therefore, no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus, who walk not according to the flesh.

Rom. 8.

1 *There is* therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit.

And he reckons up to the Galatians "the works of the flesh," and those of the Spirit.* *The Flesh* signifies in all these texts, the corruption of our souls, or of human reason. Then, according to this acceptation, our Lord designed to inform us, that the mystery, which he here proposes, would not be discoverable by the senses, nor even by natural reason, particularly in its present corrupted state, and, that the belief of it by mankind could only be effected by the relation and inspiration of the Holy Spirit. Thus our Lord here speaks to the Jews of the eating of his flesh, nearly in the same manner as he speaks to St. Peter, "flesh and blood have not revealed to thee what thou hast confessed, but my Father who is in heaven." The same likewise is the import of the words of our Lord to the Jews, "The flesh profiteth nothing, it is the Spirit that quick-

* Gal. 5, v. 19.

eneth," that is to say, the senses of the body and natural carnal reason are not the principles by which we can frame a right judgment of this mystery, which can be only discerned by the lights, which the spirit of God has revealed to us.

Hence, since the words of our Lord concerning the eating of his flesh contain one of those spiritual things, which man of himself is incapable of comprehending, and which can only be discerned by the Spirit of God, *every doctrine* concerning this subject, *which* we are helped by the senses and human reason to understand, *is not the doctrine* of Jesus Christ. But, in the opinion of Protestants, their sense and reason assist them to confirm *their* doctrine of the Eucharist, in which the faithful eat the flesh of the Saviour of the world, whereas neither the senses nor natural reason conduce to make us believe this eating, as taught by the Catholic Church. So incomprehensible a doctrine is received only by those, who are under the direction of the Spirit of God, and submit to his word. And here a striking characteristic, which is observable in the Catholic Religion, presents itself of the doctrine of Jesus Christ. This consideration should suffice to annul the greatest part of the objections of Protestants, "We see nothing but bread," they continually say, "we taste nothing but bread, and besides, our reason informs us that a human body cannot be in several places, nor even within one place in so small a compass." There is nothing in all these words but that flesh which our Lord rejects, as of no use towards the knowledge of this mystery. If such considerations as these could have conducted us to the true understanding of it, our Lord would not have uttered these words on the subject, "the flesh profiteth nothing."

Proceeding now to the 65th verse, "But there are some

of you that believe not. For Jesus knew from the beginning who they were that did not believe." In this verse our Lord reprehends his disciples for not believing, and yet, if the Protestant system be true, they believed what they were to believe; for they believed it impossible *to eat*, really and indeed, the flesh of Jesus Christ, which opinion Protestants maintain to be true. In a word, our divine Redeemer, though he knew in what sense the Jews took his words, did not reproach them with *misunderstanding* his meaning, but with *incredulity* in not assenting to his doctrine: whereas Protestants, on the contrary, condemn them, not for their incredulity, for they could not assent to that of which they had no idea, but for their want of understanding the meaning of our Lord. And here, bear in mind, that this observation on these words "but there are some of you that believe not," is founded upon the Holy Scriptures. For, whenever those, to whom our Lord addressed himself, did not take his words in their right meaning, he did not reproach them for not believing his words, but for misunderstanding them: thus when the Apostles mistook the advice, which he had given them concerning the leaven of the Pharisees, he said to them "How, do you not yet understand?"* why, do you not understand that it was not concerning bread I said to you: Beware of the leaven of the Pharisees?"† Again, in a discourse, the sense of which they had mistaken, he says, "Are you also yet without understanding? do you not understand?" &c.‡ Thus St. Luke observes, that the parents of our Lord did not understand the meaning of these words, "I must be about my Father's business,"§ and that his disciples "understood none" of the things he had said of his death.||

* Mark, 8, v. 21. † Matt. 16, v. 11. ‡ Matt. 15, v. 16.

§ Luke, 2, v. 50. || Luke, 18, v. 34.

But St. John neither reproaches the Jews, nor the disciples, for not having understood the words of Jesus Christ, about the eating of his flesh. Our Lord does not tell them, they had mistaken his meaning, but reproaches them for not believing what he had said to them. This makes it also clear, that our Lord's disciples, understanding his discourse of a real eating, had in that comprehended his true meaning; and that they were deserving of reprehension for not believing in this regard what they thought was the doctrine of our Lord.

“ 66 And he said : Therefore did I say to you, that no man can come to me unless it be given him by my Father.”

This text is likewise a proof of the Catholic doctrine concerning the eating of the flesh of our Lord. For, unless what Jesus Christ intended to teach the Jews, concerning this subject, had been an incomprehensible mystery, he would not have taken this opportunity to make them observe, how necessary his grace was to bring them to a right faith in him. Our Lord teaches us, that the supernatural lights of his grace are necessary to enable us to believe him to be the Son of God, as he remarks in the 44th verse of this chapter. In the same manner he observes in this place, that the supernatural lights of his grace are necessary for us to believe in the eating of his flesh. It was not then, merely, the manner of expression, that made the difficulty in the discourse of Jesus Christ on this eating. As it was not the bare expression, that could call any repugnance to his discourse, concerning his divinity, it was the murmuring of the Jews on that subject, which compelled him to say, “Murmur not among yourselves. No man can come to me, except the Father who has sent me, draw him,” thereby shewing, that his incarnation was an incomprehensible mystery, for the belief of which, extraordinary succours of

grace were requisite. The murmurs raised on occasion of this eating compel him to say, in the same: "There are some of you that believe not; Therefore did I say to you, that no man can come to me, unless it be given him by my Father." This eating, then, conveys likewise an incomprehensible mystery, and an extraordinary assistance of grace is required to believe it. This attention, to speak here of the necessity of his grace, shews, that the difficulty lay in the things themselves, and not in the expressions, as Protestants imagine.

" 67 After this many of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him."

From this text I infer, that our Lord was discoursing on an incomprehensible mystery, which, whatsoever explanation he could give of it, was of such a nature, as to alienate from him, not only those, who were not Christians, but even some disciples, who had believed other mysteries, and had beheld many of his miracles. Such is our doctrine concerning the eating of the flesh of Jesus Christ; though we divest it of all those gross notions, which are falsely imputed to it, it is still so incomprehensible, as to alienate from the Church not only those, who are not yet members of it, but even some of its children. This then, is a passage of the greatest importance, by which, even the retreat of those, who leave us, becomes a new proof of the truth of our faith concerning the eating of the flesh of our Lord; for this secession evinces, that our faith has one of the principal marks of the doctrine of Jesus Christ, since one of the effects of this doctrine was, that it impeded many Jews from believing in him, and caused many of his disciples to abandon him. This verse also shews, that the doctrine of Protestants, concerning the eating of the flesh of our Lord, has not the mark of his doctrine on the subject. We do not find in the mean-

ing which they give to our Lord's words, any incomprehensible mystery, which, notwithstanding any explanation that could be given of it, was of such a nature as to cause the disciples to apostatize, who had believed in Jesus Christ, had seen several of his splendid miracles, and had just been witnesses to the great prodigy of the multiplication of the loaves. If the ideas of our Lord had corresponded with those of Protestants concerning the eating of his flesh, he might have stopped his disciples with great facility, by saying to them, I propose nothing but what is easy to believe, I did not even mean to tell you anything, that you have not practised already ; when I spoke of giving you my flesh to eat, I only intended to teach you, that all ought to unite themselves to me by faith ; and are not you thus united to me, *you*, who are my disciples ? Why, then, do you forsake him, who by so many miracles, has proved, that he was sent by God, as you have hitherto professed to believe ? Some words of this nature might have detained his disciples, if our Lord had intended to enforce nothing more in his discourse on the eating of his flesh than what Protestants suppose. This is another evident proof, which shews, that in the discourse of our Lord, there was no difficulty or obscurity of expression as they pretend, but an incomprehensible mystery, as Catholics hold.

Disciples do not forsake a master on account of a mere difficulty in an expression, if there be nothing difficult to be conceived in the thing itself. Their reasoning then, must be wretchedly supported, who have nothing to allege but the misconception of an expression, when they are asked, what their weighty reasons could be, that caused those disciples to break off from the communion of Jesus Christ.

“ 68 Then Jesus said to the twelve: will you also go away ?

“ 69 And Simon Peter answered him, Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life.

“ 70 And we have believed and have known, that thou art the Christ the Son of God.”

Here the perseverance of the twelve Apostles is a proof of no less weight than the desertion of the disciples, for our Lord does not reproach these fugitive disciples for misunderstanding him, but for their incredulity; the disciples that continued faithful mention their faith as the ground of their perseverance, and not a different manner of understanding the discourse of Jesus Christ. They do not tell him, they will not quit, because they understand his words better than the disciples who had just turned their backs upon him; that they give them a different meaning, and that they see clearly that to eat his flesh, only signifies an obligation of uniting themselves closely to him by faith. They do not thus ground their perseverance on a different manner of understanding the words of Jesus Christ, which had removed the idea so unsuitable to human reason, that alienated the other disciples. On the contrary, their answer imports, that they likewise behold an incomprehensible mystery, and that they submit to it as we Catholics submit *to it*, and other mysteries of Christianity, because Jesus Christ, who is the only way of salvation, had said it, and being truly the Son of God, is of course able to accomplish more than men can comprehend. “ Lord to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal life. And we have believed and have known, that thou art Christ the Son of God.” From all which, Protestants should acknowledge with a holy fear, to what a degree they are inexcusable if they do not submit on this article. In reality, one may say, there is no error against which the word of God presents us with such powerful arguments as against this error, which denies the incompre-

hensible eating of the flesh of our Lord ; because the word of God represents those Christians who were the first engaged in this error as apostates and deserters from Jesus Christ. No other error has so express a declaration against the first abettors of it. And here how consoling for Catholics is it to reflect, that if Protestants by abandoning the Church, on account of this incomprehensible article, concerning the eating of the flesh of our Lord, have the unhappiness to see, that both in sentiments and conduct, they resemble the first deserters from the communion of Jesus Christ, Catholics have the comfort to see themselves followers of the example of the Apostles : they continue faithful to our Lord, notwithstanding the ineffable mystery of the eating of his flesh, because they know that Jesus Christ, who is the author of it, is the Son of God ; that he has power to do more than man conceive, and that, how incomprehensible soever his words might be, they are the only way by which we can come to eternal life. Thus his disciples, who here abandon Jesus Christ, were in some sense, the first Protestants, that is the first Christians, that would not submit to the word of Jesus Christ concerning the eating of his flesh. And, on the contrary, the Apostles were the first Catholics—I mean the first Christians, that believed this eating, how inconceivable soever it might appear to their reason. And thus, it is most evident, that the doctrine of Protestants, concerning this eating of the flesh of our Lord, has not the characteristics of that of our Lord Jesus Christ on this subject, and consequently, I tremble when I say it, their doctrine is not the doctrine of Jesus Christ ; on the contrary, the faith of the Church—the Catholic Church, which has them all, must be the sole, the only, the scriptural Doctrine of Him, who has the words of eternal life, and is the Son of God.

In the mean time I am fully aware, that how clear soever these proofs may appear, still they do not hinder Protestants from attempting to answer them. But, besides, that their answers are very weak, I beg to make one general observation to all they generally object to our reasons; that the weakness of their answers is not less palpable, whether there be any appearance of probability in those reasons, or, whether there be none. If the answers they give to the proofs taken out of the Sixth chapter of St. John, on the real presence, have not even the appearance of truth, their error is evident: nor would it be otherwise, if their answers should even have some semblance of truth, for then they would demonstrate, that the most evident proofs that can be taken from the Holy Scripture on any particular article of faith may be eluded by some artifice or other, and, that on this account it was indispensably necessary to establish an authority to determine the true meaning of these passages. A small share of sincerity would suffice to make every one acknowledge, that one may produce as specious answers to the proofs taken from the Holy Scriptures concerning the divinity of Jesus Christ, as any that can be opposed to the proofs taken from the Sixth chapter of St. John concerning the real presence. Thus, whenever Catholics prove any contested article by passages of the word of God, that appear very clear on their side, Protestants ought to be equally scandalised at, and own a defect in their religion, whether they be unable to answer these passages, or to think it is in their power to give a favourable turn to them. They either ought to own their error in the particular point then agitated, or in case apparent answers prevent their discovering by these passages that they err in the particular article, they ought to be convinced at least, and avow, that they err in the general principle, and that it is not true, that the

passages of the Holy Scripture, on all the particular articles of faith, are clear and demonstrative, if considered independent of any authority to fix the meaning of them. This reflection is likewise a means by which we may even reap an advantage from the most apparent reasons that Protestants can allege in answer to the passages of the Fathers, who are the most express against their cause. The true and best use that can be made of the versatile subtlety and dexterity that appear in their answers, is to take occasion from thence of acknowledging, that human language alone was little adapted to preserve all the truths of faith, and that it was necessary to give authority to the Holy Scriptures in order to determine the sense of it.

LECTURE II.

THE WORDS OF INSTITUTION.

HAVING discussed the Sixth chapter of St. John, in which is read the history of the *promise* of the holy dispensation, the next step is to consider the account of its subsequent *fulfilment*, by the establishment itself of the sacred gift. We have the account of the fulfilment of our Saviour's promise, or of the establishment itself of the divine mystery, in the gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, and in the first letter to the Corinthians, 11th chapter. I shall only cite the narrative, which is given by one of the sacred penmen. The following is that of St. Luke :—

Catholic Version.

Luke, 22.

19 And taking bread, he gave thanks, and brake: and gave to them, saying: This is my body, which is given for you. Do this for a commemoration of me.

20 In likemanner the chalice also after he had supped, saying: This is the chalice, the new testament in my blood, which shall be shed for you.

Protestant Version.

Luke, 22.

19 ¶ And he took bread, and gave thanks, and brake *it*, and gave unto them, saying, This is my body which is given for you: this do in remembrance of me.

20 Likewise also the cup after supper, saying, This cup *is* the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you.

Now, the better to conceive the force and import of these words, we must first examine them together with what had preceded, secondly in themselves, and thirdly, with what was afterwards to happen. When considered relatively to what had preceded, it is certain, that our Lord had delivered to the Apostles instructions of the greatest importance concerning the Eucharist before he instituted it, as has already been observed. It is most probable that he had given others, that are not come to us, to confirm them in the faith of this most incomprehensible mystery, which had met with so great an opposition when first proposed. The silence of the Evangelists cannot properly be objected here, as they only give us a part of our Lord's discourses on each subject. There is little room to doubt, but that something explanatory of this point was inserted in the blessing that preceded these words, "*This is my body,*" and, in the hymn of thanksgiving after communion. Protestants themselves have remarked, that the Jews, on their festivals, commonly added something on the subject of the feast to their usual benedictions, so that, from hence, we cannot doubt but our Lord spoke of the holy Eucharist, in the blessing, and in the canticle after supper.* But, here it may be said, that I ought not to propose anything but what I really find in the Holy Scriptures. Well, then, I limit myself to the discourse on the Eucharist, which is contained in the 6th chapter of St. John; and I say, the Apostles expected our Lord would accomplish his promise, by giving them bread to eat, that would be his flesh, that same flesh which he would deliver up for the life of the world, and this was to be by manducation. The reality of this manducation he had confirmed by an oath, and several

* Grot. in St. Matthew, 16. Gerhard. Buxtorf, Dissert. pp. 310, 325, and Camer. Myr. p. 114.

repetitions, to those who had been shocked by the sole proposal of it ; the possibility of it he had evinced by the miracle of his ascension, and by reminding them of his divinity ; the necessity of it, he had pointed out, by permitting those to quit him, who would not believe it ; and the belief of it, he had enforced on his disciples, by making them reflect, that their teacher was the Son of God, and the giver of salvation. The minds of the Apostles were then filled with those thoughts when our Lord instituted the Eucharist. From which I infer that the Apostles, who expected Jesus Christ would fulfil, in a manner incomprehensible and unfathomable to human reason, these words : “ *The bread that I will give to eat is my flesh for the life of the world,*” and heard him, just before his death, after blessing the bread with great solemnity, say to them, “ *Take eat, this is my body which is given for you,*” could not but conclude (without even any other idea presenting itself to their minds), that it truly was his body he gave them to eat, according to his promise. The agreement of these words of Jesus Christ, though pronounced at different times, was too near and striking not to be immediately perceived by the Apostles, and to determine them to explain the one by the other, that is to say, the words of the institution by those of the promise. And here we ought to call to mind a rule of great importance, received by all Christians, to explain the Scriptures by the Scriptures, that is to say, to interpret the obscure parts by the clear. Hence, notwithstanding all I have said, were I to grant that the word *to eat* is obscure in the 6th chapter of St. John, some explaining it of an action of the mouth, and others of an action of the soul, yet we ought, conformably to the rule I have just mentioned, to search for the meaning in the words of the institution, where it is very clear. For every

body agrees that Jesus Christ in these words, *take eat*, speaks of an action of the body. The eating, then, that is mentioned in the 6th chapter of St. John, is an action of the body ;—it is then a real eating. After the same manner, the meaning of the word *body* is contested in the words of the institution, some understanding by it the body itself of our Lord, and others, the figure of his body. We must, then, seek the meaning in the 6th chapter of St. John, where it is clear. For all are unanimous that the word *flesh* signifies the *flesh* itself of our Lord, “*the bread that I will give is my flesh.*” In the words, then, of the institution, we must understand by the body of our Lord, his own proper body itself. How true it is, that we may trace the most perfect accordance between the two narratives, insomuch, that if there were anything obscure in the promise, the obscurity would be done away by the clearness of its fulfilment, or, anything doubtful in the latter, it would be removed by recurring to the former.

Proceeding now to the force and import of the words of the institution, considered in themselves. They, without doubt, evidently prove the faith of the real presence. Our Lord, intending to teach us that what he held in his hands was truly his body, could not say it in more plain and express terms than these, “*This is my body ;*” moreover, we never say one thing is another, meaning to say it is a sign of it, unless those we speak to are prepared, or disposed to look on this thing as a sign. Now, the bread which Jesus Christ held in his hands was not a sign of himself, in any common acceptation, nor had our Lord in any discourse prepared the Apostles to look on it as a sign, so that they were bound, by the rules of language, to take in a literal sense these words of our Lord, “*This is my body.*” I may here add, without in a manner quitting the bounds of the

Scriptures, that the Syriac version of St. Mark, which is believed by many to have been made by that saint for the use of the converted Jews, whose vulgar language it then was; or, as some learned Protestants are of opinion, was at least made by some of the disciples of our Lord, represents our beloved Redeemer saying, "*Take, eat, this is my body itself.*"* But, to return to the words of the institution, we find, that they are related by St. Matthew, St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. Paul, whereas those of the institution of baptism are only mentioned by one Evangelist, as is the greatest part of the actions and miracles of the life of Jesus Christ. We do not observe a similar exactness of the Holy Spirit in repeating other deeds and words of Jesus Christ. This, then, must be an extraordinary mystery, and particularly worthy of attention. We ought to draw the same inference from the accuracy with which the sacred authors, who have mentioned the institution, relate that Jesus Christ said of the bread, that it was his body, and of the chalice, that it was his blood. They, who so frequently vary in relating his expressions in other places—all use the same words in the narration of the institution of the Holy Eucharist. We see in all the sacred historians a uniform adherence to the word *body*, and the word *blood*, nor does any of them give any other explanation of these words. How has it come to pass, that not one of them makes Jesus Christ say, *this is the figure of my body*, or *this is the virtue of my body*, or, *with this is my body*, or, *here is my body*, or, *in this is my body*, or, *this is my body in representation*, or, at least, that not one of them adds, in the recital of the words of Institution, that the disciples then understood very well, that when Jesus Christ had promised his body to eat, and his blood to drink, he only spoke of

* Walton Prol. Bib. Poligl.

this bread and wine, not indeed as mere figures, but as sacred figures of his flesh and blood. For, if the words of institution are not to be taken in their obvious meaning, or, if those holy penmen understood them in any other, would not they, or rather, ought not they too, both in charity and in justice, to have revealed the important secret? or, at least, ought not they to have presented some clue, or thrown out some hint or other, by means of which the happy discovery might be made? Whereas, what is the fact? The account which they give of the sacred institution, besides being related by each of them in precisely the same manner, is at the same time described in terms plain, clear, and intelligible, as anything that the simplicity of language could have suggested or supplied,—an artless narrative, without either comment, hint, or observation. Surely, then, if the words of Christ ought not to be taken in their plain and obvious sense, or, if the Apostles did not understand them thus, how strange, how passing strange, it is, that they should all have expressed themselves as they have done, in language, which conveys no other idea but that of a real and substantial presence? not even adding so much as the slightest insinuation to the contrary. The plainness, therefore, of their narratives on the one hand, and their silence on the other, are, unquestionably, to the open and unprejudiced mind, a sufficient evidence, that the words of our Saviour in the divine institution, ought certainly to be understood in their plain and only rational signification.

On the other hand, in regard of our Lord's discourse concerning the leaven of the Pharisees, which he had admonished them to beware of, one of the Evangelists tells us, that Jesus Christ reproached them for not understanding him, and another adds, that after they had reflected, they knew he spoke of the doctrine of the Pharisees. We also

find the same force in the words of the consecration of the chalice. For there Jesus Christ says, in the same clear manner, *This is my blood.* But, that we may better conceive the force of these words, we ought to remark, that Moses at the institution of the old alliance, took blood and sprinkled it upon the people, saying—

Catholic Version.

Exod. 24.

This is the blood of the covenant, which the Lord hath made with you.

Protestant Version.

Exod. 24.

8 And Moses took the blood, and sprinkled *it* on the people, and said, Behold, the blood of the covenant, which the LORD hath made with you, concerning all these words.

It is indubitable that these words of our Lord, used in the institution of the new covenant, “*This is my blood, the blood of the New Testament,*” have a manifest relation to the parallel words of the above passage, and that of course the Apostles, explaining the one by the other, understood the words of our Lord in the establishment of the new alliance as they understood those of Moses in the establishment of the old, and consequently believed, that he as really presented to them the blood of the Lamb of God, who is without spot, as Moses presented to their fathers the blood of the victims ordained in the old law. Again, we should observe, that our Lord was then speaking to his Apostles, to whom he usually declared his mysteries in open terms, and, though indeed on some occasions he had spoken to them in the language of parables, but, as if alluding to the great mystery, he had told them likewise, “*The time cometh when I shall no more speak to you in*

parables," if so, then never was there any other occasion when the fulfilment of this assurance was either so necessary, or so natural, giving, as he then was, his last instructions to his disciples, forming a new alliance with his followers; in other words, signing his last will and testament, and introducing a new rite, intended for the sanctification of mankind till the end of time, and designed also to be the strong and public tie of his Religion; in other words, instituting a Sacrament. Hence it was, that, kindly addressing his Apostles, he said to them, "With a strong desire have I longed to eat this passover with you before I die."

But, let us enter more nicely into these two circumstances: he was then signing his last will and testament, and instituting a sacrament. Surely a testator, who has the interest of his heirs at heart, does not express the most important part of his will in figurative and obscure words, which would be apt to involve them in endless litigation. And can we suppose, that on an occasion so solemn, the night before he suffered—a time so precious and endearing, the blessed Jesus would bequeath a valuable legacy in terms which would puzzle and perplex his friends? The old Testament is established in forms of speech which admit no doubt;* the wills of Jacob and David are couched in plain expressions.† Prudent men never fail to express their intentions in their last solemn deeds in such language as will prevent litigation; all human laws require, that the words conveying the will of a testator, should be understood in the plain and obvious meaning. If, on this principle, in the devise of real property, a legacy were left in this manner, "I leave such a house and such a field to my valued friend," and a near relation were to contend, that these

* Exodus, 25, v. 6, &c. † Genesis, 49.

expressions indicated only a picture, sign, or figure of the house and field, such a plea would be treated in a court of justice with scorn and indignation. And can a man who reads the scriptures, and calls himself a Christian, affirm, with his hand on his heart, that the Redeemer of the world has neglected precautions which were taken in the old law? That the eternal Son of God has less wisdom than is possessed by mere mortals? Or that, while all testaments among mankind are to be interpreted in the obvious and literal sense of the words, his last will is to be tortured by forced explanations, and left in doubt and uncertainty? Such a sentiment is not consistent with any principles of religion, wisdom, or common sense.* Our intimate conviction is also greatly strengthened when we investigate minutely the nature of the action, which he was then performing. It is agreed by all parties, that he was instituting a sacrament. Neither Luther, nor Melancthon, nor Calvin, nor Zuinglius, nor any one of the Reformation doctors, ever ventured to call this in question. Now let me ask, in a tone of decision, was it consistent with the wisdom of the Son of God, in the institution of the most exalted, the most dignified sacrament of the new law, to employ such figurative modes of speech as would involve the Christian world in endless disputes and palpable contradictions? Is such a supposition decent and respectful? Is it in any manner consistent with the reverence, which we owe to our divine teacher, our guide, our redeemer? If we examine the institution of circumcision in the old law,† of the sacrifice of the paschal lamb,‡ and of every ritual observance of whatever kind,§ we shall find every act to be explained and enforced in the clearest possible manner,

* Coombe's *Essence of Controversy*.

† Genesis 17, v. 10. ‡ Exodus 12, v. 3. § Levit. *passim*.

without disguise, without trope or figure : without the use of any term, that can occasion the smallest doubt or perplexity. In the new law, baptism is enforced in expressions equally clear and precise ;* and whenever our Redeemer, in his public addresses, employed any idea or term of an obscure nature, he was always careful to explain it privately to his disciples. And are we to suppose that after these precautions taken in the old law on similar occasions, our Redeemer, in opposition to his usual practice, would select the period of his last interview with his beloved friends, to institute the greatest of all sacraments, in terms dark, perplexing, and unintelligible? No! impossible! this cannot be for one moment admitted. Let Protestants view the matter in this light, deliberately and impartially, and I can have no doubt, but that they will deem the literal sense the only one admissible.

But, let us proceed to the force the words of the institution have, when considered in regard to future times. If we examine the words of institution, together with what was afterwards to happen, we must conclude, that as our Lord foresaw, that all the nations of which his Church should be composed, would firmly believe, during many ages, that the Eucharist was his body, so if he had disapproved of this belief, and had looked on it as a source of idolatry, he would not in the institution of the Eucharist, which is the part where he knew the Church would search for his meaning on this subject, he would not, we say, have made use of words, which are of all others the best calculated to induce us to this belief ; he would not have said " This is my body, this is my blood." He rather would have said in a part so essential to the subject, " Here is the figure of my body." And now, by way of bringing the question perhaps

* Matthew, 28, v. 19. Mark, 16, v. 16:

somewhat closer to reason, having examined the words of the institution with what had preceded; in themselves; and what was afterwards to occur, I will for a moment appeal to the feelings of the candid and liberal reader of the Holy Scriptures. Make with me the following supposition, it is the beautiful sentiment of the learned Dr. Fletcher:—“Suppose and imagine yourself present with your Saviour in the cœnaculum, when the great mystery is preparing and accomplished, and seated beside Him at the holy table, You behold Him there,—His whole soul absorbed in the sacred work,—with a strong desire, as He said, longing to eat the hallowed passover, you see Him lift up His eyes to heaven, with humble reverence address His Eternal Father; bless, with awful solemnity, the elements which he held in his hand; and then, these expressive acts completed, you see him present the now consecrated gifts to his Apostles, assuring them, in the clearest and most positive terms, that they were his body and his blood; ‘the body’ that was ‘given,’ the ‘blood’ that was ‘shed,’ for their salvation. Here, then, I appeal to your feelings; supposing yourself present on this awful occasion, would you, after witnessing the above scene, and hearing the aforesaid assurances, would you, or rather, could you, have refused to believe him? Or could you have conceived that he did not then mean what he so positively asserted; and that what he called his ‘body’ and his ‘blood,’ were not after all his body and blood, but merely a little blessed and unchanged bread and wine, or a pious figure? Making the supposition, that the Divine Being had presented with his own hands, the hallowed gifts to you, with the express declaration, that they were his own flesh and blood, I am convinced that you, so far from even doubting the exact truth of his word, would, just like the apostles at Capernaum, humbly

adoring his omnipotence and mercy, have exclaimed ‘ Lord thou hast the words of eternal life, and I believe.’ ”

I shall now proceed to recapitulate, in the shortest manner, the advantages Catholics have over Protestants, in regard to the words of Institution.

In the first place, Jesus Christ had prepared his disciples to believe he would give them a bread to eat, that would be his flesh, and never had prepared them to believe he would give them a bread to eat, that would be the figure of his flesh.

In the second place, our Lord has employed the most proper words to express the Catholic doctrine respecting the Eucharist, for he said, “ This is my body;” and he has not employed the most proper words to express the Protestant doctrine, for he did not say, “ here is the figure of my body.” The words of the institution are even so far from being the best chosen to express the Protestant doctrine, that they cannot possibly convey it. It is true, that a sign sometimes bears the name of the thing signified, but never unless those we address are previously advised of its being a sign. Now no intimation, as I have already observed, had ever been given to the apostles, that the bread, which Jesus Christ held in his hands, was intended to be a sign of any other thing. Thirdly, our Lord did not see any other reason in future times, that could induce him to call the Eucharist his body, if it was not really so: but he could see in future times, that is, in the belief of the real presence, which he knew his Church would embrace, many reasons to prevent him from saying of the Eucharist, that it was his body, if it had been only a figure of it. Fourthly, Catholics look for such expressions in the word of God, as may throw a light on the words of the institution, such as the discourse of Moses, which our Lord had evidently in view: “ This is

the blood of the covenant which the Lord hath made with you," and understand the discourse of Jesus Christ in the same manner, "this is the blood of the New Testament. Protestants, on the contrary, that they may bend the words of the Institution to their side, urge particularly some expressions of the Jews, that are not found in the Holy Scriptures; expressions, which there is no appearance our Lord had in view, and which are recorded only by some Jewish teachers of latter ages: for instance, "This is the bread of misery which our Fathers eat in Egypt."

It is from a consideration of these advantages, I am induced to draw a serious and awful conclusion, that the method pursued by Catholics in understanding the words of the institution in the crude literal sense, is both reasonable, and consequently conducive to salvation; whilst, I regret to say it, the method adopted by Protestants is unreasonable, and consequently exceedingly dangerous. And why is the method adopted by Catholics reasonable and conducive to salvation? Because Catholics follow the literal interpretation of the word of God, in a passage where the words of Jesus Christ are clear and formal; and they are warranted in so doing, by the unequivocal promise he made in the 6th chapter of St. John—a promise which, as recorded by three Evangelists and St. Paul, he made good on the eve of his passion, in these words: "Take ye and eat it, this is my body which is given for you." On the contrary, the explanation given by Protestants to these is unreasonable, and exposes their salvation to danger; and this, because, contrary to the obvious acceptation of the word of God, they attribute to it a figurative sense, an eating of his body by faith, and a virtual interior communication with this same body, notwithstanding all their expressions are so far from being found in the words of the institution, that they

cannot furnish any grounds or foundations for the same. This truth is so certain, that, were Catholics to propose the figurative and literal sense to a Protestant not led astray by prejudice and the sophistry of those, who invent a variety of different interpretations to destroy that of the real presence—were they, I say, to propose to him the two senses together, he would embrace that of Catholics, as being most agreeable to the words of Scripture; whilst the metaphorical sense of the figure of the body of Jesus Christ, of the eating by faith, of the communications with his body by an invisible, and an interior virtue, would never come into his mind; particularly after reading the 6th chapter of St. John, the other three Evangelists, and St. Paul, upon the Institution of the blessed Eucharist.

Add also to this, the method adopted by Catholics is not only founded upon the express words of holy writ, but it is also established by the unanimous consent of that great portion of Christians who, in all ages, have believed in the real presence—the first Councils. And that no doubt may remain in the minds of Protestants concerning this matter, I will here produce a most important document from the first General Council of Nice, held in the year 325, a period when the most distinguished among the Protestant controversial writers acknowledge the Church to have maintained the purity of faith unsullied. (Whitaker on Antichrist, p. 31; Jewel's Answer to Harding, p. 246; Fulke's Confutation of Purgatory, p. 373; Usher's Religion of the Ancient Irish, p. 87.) The words of the Council are:—“Again, let us not be in an abject manner intent on the bread before us, and the chalice on the divine table; but, raising up our minds, let us understand by the dictates of our faith, that on this sacred table is placed the Lamb of God, who takes away the sins of the world, and is in an

unbloody manner immolated by the priests, and that we *truly* take his precious body and blood, and believe those mysteries to be the symbols of our resurrection.”—*Concil. Nicæn. actis ejusdem e Cod. Vat.* This testimony is acknowledged by Calvin (Inst. lib. 4, c. 17, No. 36), though he labours unsuccessfully to explain it away. And here, what can be more appropriate to our present purpose, than this decisive testimony of the first General Council of the Church, in which the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist, both as a sacrament and a sacrifice, is forcibly held up to view, in terms of the clearest import? in which it is asserted, that the external appearances are not only to be attended to, but where faith is to lead the Christian to see that our Redeemer is really present—that he is sacrificed in an unbloody manner, and that his body and blood are really received by the faithful. Against this observation, I am aware that Protestant writers usually object, “that it was only twelve hundred years after Christ, and better, in the Council of Lateran (held in 1215), this doctrine of Transubstantiation was defined an article of faith, and consequently it is in every sense of the word “a mere novelty,” and never has been the “unvarying doctrine of the Catholic Church from the beginning.” To meet this objection, it is only necessary to recollect, that two things are required to concur in constituting any point an article of Catholic faith: the doctrine must have been divinely revealed; and it must be proposed to our belief by the Catholic Church. Until the Church authoritatively proposes and defines any point, various opinions may be started without heresy; but it will not follow, that there has not been one true belief traditionally delivered, though the Church may not have judged it necessary to make any definite decree upon the subject. For instance, in the great question of Christ’s being con-

substantial with the Father, though the divinity of Christ was always firmly believed, yet the Church did not enter into the question of his co-eternity, consubstantiality, and co-equality with the Father, until she was forced to explain those consequences of her faith in his divinity, by the attacks of heresy ; so in the present case, though she always and firmly believed, that what was bread and wine before consecration, became, by consecration, the true body and blood of Christ, she did not make any definite decrees upon Transubstantiation, till compelled to explain the consequences of her doctrine by the heretics of the eleventh century. Hence, before the decrees of this Council (the fourth Lateran), those who were given to curious searching into the mode of Christ's real presence in the Eucharist, were inclined to believe, some in consubstantiation, some in the annihilation or corruption of the bread and wine, and others in Transubstantiation ; but it was not to be supposed, that before the Church had clearly defined, the fathers, or others of the faithful, should speak more plainly on Transubstantiation than they had spoken of the consubstantiality of the Son of God, before that question was so expressly examined, and defined. However, in the present and similar cases, we may well affirm, with St. Vincent of Lérins—" In these matters, the Church does nothing more by the decrees of her councils than consign, by writing to posterity, that which she has received by tradition from those gone before, and for the most part for the light of the understanding, not marking any new sense of faith by the appropriation of a new name." " In his nihil aliud perficit Ecclesia Conciliorum suorum decretis, nisi ut, quod prius a majoribus suis traditione accepit, hoc deinde posteris per scripturæ chirographum consignet, et plerumque, posteris intelligentiæ lucem, non novum fidei sensum novæ appellationis pro-

prietate signando." S. Vincent. Lirinensis, Commonit. c. 23.

On the other hand, the rules of conduct followed by Protestants have no other foundation than the forced and exaggerated explications of the sacred oracles, without any other than their own private authority, which is directly contrary to the unanimous belief of the whole Church. The reason is obvious; because every individual is of the persuasion, that he has an unalienable right to examine the word of God, and to determine what is its precise meaning, even in matters of faith. It is most undoubtedly true, that the first Reformers, and their immediate successors, laid it down as a principle, that the Holy Ghost reveals all that is necessary for salvation to every individual; and that by means of this revelation, each one is enabled clearly to understand all the fundamental articles of faith. This principle of the Protestant Reformers is sufficiently explained by Mr. Le Clerc, in his Preface to the New Testament. Now, this is a principle the most dangerous, and most erroneous, that ever appeared in the Church; a principle, which tends directly to multiply religions to as many fold as there are members that embrace the Reformation; in a word, a principle, taken in its consequences, which opens a way to every species of heresy that the human mind is capable of inventing; and furnishes, in reality, arguments to the destruction of its votaries. For, certainly, Protestants do not presume to think, that the Holy Ghost has communicated to them alone the light necessary to understand the true sense of the Holy Scriptures, which is open to all the world, and from which it is in the power of each individual, by respecting and receiving the sacred oracles as the word of God, to draw from them that knowledge, which, according to St. James, is capable of saving our

souls. Socinians, Anabaptists, Zuinglians, Lutherans, and all others, whom this false principle has amazingly multiplied, claim this privilege with as much reason as any of the Reformers. Hence it is evident, to how great a dilemma all these persons must be reduced; it is manifest, that all their religion is finally resolved into endless inquiries, contradictions, and continual disputes, to know what parts have expressed the truth—inquiries which are completely impossible to the unlearned, and, at best, very uncertain to all, who are out of the pale of the Catholic Church. For, as it is certain that the Holy Ghost cannot deny himself, so it is equally true, that he cannot be the author of opinions that are in contradiction with each other. And, let me ask, what right have the Reformers to refuse to all Catholics this privilege of being inspired and enlightened by the Holy Ghost? To exclude them entirely from being admitted to it, they will not, I trust, have recourse to false charges, so frequently repeated, that Catholics are idolators. The world is not quite so credulous; and the leading and well-meaning among Protestants abstain from such groundless accusations, which, without a shadow of truth in them, at best are only calculated to make blind and passionate minds continue in the destructive errors of their own way.

LECTURE III.

THE DOCTRINE OF ST. PAUL.

HAVING established two of the scriptural evidences of our belief, in the Real Presence of Christ in the adorable sacrament of the Eucharist, I shall now proceed to examine the third and fourth, which convey St. Paul's belief and exposition of the same faith, and prove the important fact, that the first Christians received the doctrine from the Apostles, and so believed it as we Catholics do at the present day. He thus writes :—

Catholic Version.

1 Cor. 10.

16 The chalice of benediction, which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? and the bread which we break, is it not the partaking of the body of the Lord?

Protestant Version.

1 Cor. 10.

16 The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?

We see that the Apostle in this passage evidently declares his belief on this truly important subject, by boldly asking a question in a tone which pre-supposes an intimate conviction, that the body and blood of Christ are received by the faithful. His meaning must be then, that independently of receiving the body and blood of Jesus Christ in

reality; they who receive worthily the holy communion, become united members of Christ, united to him and to one another they become all as one body and the *body is Christ*; and as strict an union and communication is made between the united in one faith, in one hope, and in one heart, as there is an union between the members of a human body. All have the same view to worship God, "with one mouth, and with one heart;" all to arrive at eternal life, and to help one another towards obtaining it. This second relation corresponds to the article of the Apostles' creed, "The Communion of Saints."

Observe also, that the Apostle declares that the receiving of the sacred mysteries is "the communion of the blood and of the body of Christ." He uses the word *koinonia* not *metoche*, or any word, merely implying reception or participation, but a word, which particularly expresses the most intimate communion; that is, the closest union of what we receive with our own substance. His meaning, then, must be that the body and blood of Christ are received by us in reality; for otherwise there could not be a real union or communion of Christ's body and blood in all those who receive him in the Holy Eucharist. I have said in reality, for nothing is clearer than that he speaks of a real eating of the body of Jesus Christ. For, in this same place, he compares the Eucharist to those sacred repasts in which the Jews really eat the victim that had been immolated for them, that by this means they might partake of the merit of the sacrifice. "The bread," says he, "which we break, is it not the partaking of the body of the Lord?"

Catholic Version.

18 Behold Israel according to the flesh: are not

Protestant Version.

18 Behold Israel after the flesh: are not they which

Catholic Version.

they, that eat of the sacrifices, partakers of the altar?

Protestant Version.

eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar?

To see more clearly the force of this passage in favour of the real presence, we ought to observe that the eating of the victims was the ordinary means which God had established to make men partakers of the sacrifices. It even appears here, that this custom, in regard to the sacrifices of the true God, had been followed by those who, in imitation of them, afterwards instituted sacrifices in honour of idols. This St. Paul remarks when he speaks in this passage of the sacrifices offered to devils, and of the table of devils—

20 But the things which the heathens sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God. And I would not that you should be made partakers with devils.

20 But *I say*, that the things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God: and I would not that ye should have fellowship with devils.

As to the Jews, it was their common custom to partake of their sacrifices by eating the victims that had been immolated, as often as their sins did not preclude them from approaching. Even in the sacrifices, which they offered for their sins, they in some manner eat them by the priests, who were their mediators on these occasions. But all the Jews themselves eat the victims in the peace offerings and sacrifices of thanksgiving, because they were then at peace with God, and thus the state they were in did not make them unworthy to comply with that ordinary means which God had established to make them partakers of the sacrifices. St. Paul, then, intended to make us sensible in this

place, that the Eucharist was a repast annexed to the sacrifice of the cross, as the sacred repasts of the Jews and Gentiles were annexed to the sacrifices to make them partakers of them, and in this to teach us, that we there eat the victim offered for us on the cross, that is the body of Jesus Christ, as the professors of other religions received the body of the victim that had been sacrificed. It is true the sacrifice of the cross is a sacrifice for sins; but a sacrifice that perfectly atoned for them. Our Lord, in taking upon himself the weight of our sins on the cross, did not continue charged with them, as the ancient victims in some manner were, because they could not expiate them. He entirely abolished them. For which reason we ought to eat this victim, though immolated for our sins, otherwise we should not here comply with the rule established by God for partaking of the sacrifices. And, we may also say, it was a rule appointed by God, with a view to the sacrifice of our Lord, to which every action in the ancient sacrifices bore a reference, otherwise the types would not be accomplished. The type indeed of the sacrifices would be accomplished in regard to the immolation by Jesus Christ, our Pasch, having been immolated on a cross for us;* but would not be so in regard to the eating, as was done with the victims in the old law, unless this Lamb of God who takes away the sins of the world,† after being immolated, was eaten by those, whom he vouchsafes to make partakers of his sacrifice. These are the sentiments the Holy Spirit intends to inculcate, when St. Paul teaches that they who receive the Holy Eucharist partake of the body of the Lord, as the Israelites partook of the altar by the eating of the victims that had been sacrificed, and as the Gentiles, by approaching to the table of the devils,

* 1 Cor. 5, v. 7. † John, 1, v. 29,

partook of the sacrifices that had been offered to devils.* The Israelites, according to the flesh, by eating of the immolated victims, partook of the altar. Here is the type and the figure. Christians, by receiving the Eucharist, partake of the body of Jesus Christ which was sacrificed for them. This is the accomplishment of the figure. These things illustrate each other. It is agreed that, by a real eating of the victim, the faithful in the old law partook of the sacrifice that had been offered. We must then look for the accomplishment of this figure in the new, by a real eating of the victim, that was offered on the cross for us. But then this is not all that St. Paul says of the Eucharist in this passage. He manifestly alludes to it in—

Catholic Version.

1 Cor. 10 ch.

17 For we, being many, are one bread, one body, all that partake of one bread.

Protestant Version.

1 Cor. 10 ch.

17 For we *being* many are one bread, *and* one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread.

This is likewise a fresh proof of the Catholic Doctrine. For it is strictly speaking true, that in the Eucharist we partake of one bread. That which we receive does not, as in other reports, differ from that which another receives. We all in it receive the same bread, that is the flesh of our Lord, which is perfectly and entirely one. Besides, if the Apostle speaks here of material bread, which is broken into several parts, and received by us who are many, then it clearly follows, that this bread is not one, but many, whereas the Apostle absolutely says, that the bread of which he speaks is but one bread, which cannot be any

* 1 Cor. 10, v. 16, 18, 20.

other but that one immaterial bread—Christ's body, which also we are said to be, inasmuch as we are partakers of it. I now beg my Protestant readers will please to turn to the chapter that follows, where they will find, that St. Paul relates the institution in the same words as the Evangelists, making use of precisely the same simple and clear words as they—

Catholic Version.

1 Cor. 11 ch.

23 For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread,

24 And giving thanks, broke, and said: Take ye and eat: this is my body which shall be delivered for you: this do for the commemoration of me.

25 In like manner also the chalice, after he had supped, saying: This chalice is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as often as you shall drink, for the commemoration of me.

Protestant Version.

1 Cor. 11 ch.

23 For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus the *same* night in which he was betrayed took bread:

24 And when he had given thanks, he brake *it*, and said, Take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me.

25 After the same manner also *he took* the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink *it*, in remembrance of me.

If a real and substantial presence be not here revealed, and most expressly too, away with the perspicuity of Sacred Writ—it is a mere enigma. For, why did not the

Apostle, in writing to the Corinthians, in Greek, aware, as he must have been, that there were many words in that language expressing the term sign, say “this signifies my body, and not “this is my BODY?” But let us examine these verses more closely.

We see in the 23d verse the Apostle tells us, he was instructed by Jesus Christ himself in the account he has given of the institution of the Sacrament. We see it is precisely the same as that recorded by Matthew, Mark, and Luke, clear, simple, and devoid of any figure, and explained or understood in the ordinary and obvious acceptation of the words; it admits of no other meaning but that which I have been attributing to the language of those sacred writers. But, then, St. Paul does not confine himself to the mere narration of the words of the divine institution; he proceeds to draw some inferences, which ought to be carefully remarked—

Catholic Version.

27 Therefore whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and of the blood of the Lord.

28 But let a man prove himself: and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of the chalice.

29 For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to

Protestant Version.

27 Wherefore whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink *this* cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.

28 But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of *that* bread, and drink of *that* cup.

29 For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to

Catholic Version.

himself, not discerning the body of the Lord.*

Protestant Version.

himself, not discerning the Lord's body.

“Therefore,” says the Apostle, “whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and of the blood of the Lord.” Such is the first inference the Apostle deduces from the character of the mystery; we see he emphatically declares, that the unworthy communicant is guilty of a crime of the blackest dye, even of the profanation of the very body and of the very blood of Jesus Christ himself! To the man, who believes in the doctrine of the real presence this awful inference is clear and intelligible, but to him who denies this doctrine it is incomprehensible; for, how is it possible to imagine, that a man “can be guilty of the body and blood of Jesus Christ,” if, after all, the body and blood of the Son of God were not there—were not, I say, really and truly present in this sacrament? The words of the Apostle afford the plainest evidence, that he firmly believed the precious body and blood of Jesus Christ to be there really, truly, and substantially present, and, thence, his heavy denunciation of eating and drinking unworthily.

* After Henry the Eighth had made himself supreme head of the Church of England, six articles of religion were drawn up in the year 1536, and we find these articles consonant with Catholic doctrine respecting the Eucharist; for, in the fourth we read, that “as touching the Sacrament of the Altar, the people were to be instructed, that, under the forms of bread and wine, there was truly and substantially given the very same body of Christ that was born of the Virgin Mary, and, therefore, it was to be received with all reverence, EVERY ONE EXAMINING HIMSELF ACCORDING TO THE WORDS OF ST. PAUL.” Burnet, Part 1. vol. 1., p. 280.

“But let a man,” the Apostle says, “prove himself; and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of the chalice.”

We see here, in order that the faithful may avoid the guilt of an unworthy communion, or of an unworthy participation of the hallowed food, the inspired Apostle inculcates the obligation of a most rigid examination, which the communicant ought to institute before he ventures to approach to the holy table. Now, why this strict and more than ordinary previous probation as the only means of escaping this dreadful guilt? How can it be accounted for, except by the belief of the true presence of Jesus Christ’s body and blood? Without such a belief, no greater self-probation could be required, than for any other act of faith, or application for divine grace. Consequently, this precaution, alone, cannot but teach the candid Protestant, that the food which is thus to be received, is something more sanctified and awful than a portion of blessed bread and wine, or than a pious figure in commemoration of the suffering and death of Christ.

But, let us see how the Apostle proceeds: surely what follows explains—no human words could do so more forcibly—both the reason of the above precaution, and the nature of the heavenly banquet—“For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, not discerning the body of the Lord.* Now, why this

* It is equally admitted by all parties, Protestant and Catholic, that this letter to the Corinthians is a dogmatical Epistle: it may be then fairly presumed, that in a point of so great a moment as is the doctrine of the Real Presence, which the Apostle occasionally touches upon, he will be clear and explicit. Now, what is the fact, that besides his recital of the words of the Institution, without adding any gloss or comment to give it a figurative meaning (which is a tacit intimation of

solemn denunciation? why this unequivocal declaration of vengeance? why is the unworthy communicant to merit eternal everlasting reprobation if his whole crime be reduced to the act of eating a morsel of bread, and of drinking a small quantity of wine in honour of our Redeemer, though in a state of sin? Surely to attach the punishment of eternal damnation to a participation of such objects, is a notion at once cruel, extravagant, and foolish. The only consistent and rational method of explaining this frightful denunciation, or of reconciling it with the ideas of the Divine Justice and Wisdom, is to suppose, and not only suppose, but firmly believe, that Jesus Christ is therefore himself really present in the tremendous mystery. It is thus, and thus only, that "we discern," as the Apostle requires, "the Body of the Lord:" and, thus also, considering the Sacrament as the purest of all holy things, we of course clearly understand, that no crime is more justly deserving of "damnation" than its abuse and profanation by an unworthy receiver. According to this interpretation of the words of the Apostle, every thing is plain and intelligible; taking them in a different point of view, every thing is dark and incomprehensible.

his contrary belief), his reiterated charge on the unworthy receiver, of being guilty of the body and blood of Christ, is a corroborative proof of his steadfast belief of a corporal presence. For, in this sense, it is easily understood how the unworthy receiver is guilty of the abuse and profanation of Christ's body and blood. In this sense it is literally true, that he puts a direct affront and insult on Christ's sacred person; whereas in the other system it is merely indirect and respective, as every other breach of the commandments is an offence against Almighty God, and every violation of a law is a respective affront offered to our neighbour.

Catholic Version.

1 Cor. 11.

30 Therefore are there many infirm and weak among you, and many sleep.

Protestant Version.

1 Cor. 11.

30 For this cause many *are* weak and sickly among you, and many sleep.

This is also a farther proof and illustration, both of the real presence of Jesus Christ in the mystery, and of the truth of our doctrine regarding it, "For this cause," he concludes,—referring to the crime of unworthy communions,—“for this cause, many among you are weak and sickly; and many asleep.” That is, so insulting to the Divine sanctity are such communions—because the partakers of them “do not discern the body of the Lord”—that, in the severity of his justice and displeasure, God was pleased, in the Apostles’ days, to visit them sometimes with illnesses, sometimes even with death itself.

And now, having submitted to the deep and serious consideration of my kind Protestant readers the principal passages of the Holy Scriptures, that have reference to the doctrine under discussion, I trust, I may be permitted to indulge the fond hope, that these passages do just as clearly establish the certainty of the doctrine of the real presence of Jesus Christ in the holy Eucharist, as do any other portions of the same sacred pages establish or confirm the truth of any other mystery of revelation. Indeed, it is a fact, that there is not one particular article of faith, or tenet of the Christian Catholic Religion, more firmly attested, hung round with more convincing evidences, or more clearly revealed in the Holy Scriptures, than this truth; Almighty God, in his all-wise and merciful dispensations, having thought proper to distinguish by more abundant lights a mystery so incomprehensible in itself,

and, which would one day be opposed with such vehemence. For which reason, I tremble when I write it, they who will not submit to believe in the truth of it, ought to dread that they will at least be as inexcusable at the day of Judgment as those who have presumed to deny the other articles of faith revealed in the Holy Scriptures. Having, therefore, clearly established, first, from the Sixth of St. John, that our beloved Redeemer promised to give us his real and true body and blood; secondly, from the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke, and St. Paul's First Letter to the Corinthians, that he performed this promise the very night before he suffered; and, thirdly, from the same Letter of St. Paul, that the first fathers of Christianity—the Apostles, and the first Christians, equally understood and received this doctrine of the real presence precisely with the same belief as ourselves,—I shall, after one observation, proceed, in the following Lecture, to the consideration of the chief objections usually proposed by Protestants to Catholics against this doctrine.

My observation is this: Protestants and Catholics both equally admit, that superior advantages are enjoyed in the Christian dispensation over such as were possessed by the people of the Old Law. They and we have generally been taught, that these superior advantages consist in the excellence and superior nature of our Sacraments (and I may add, of our Sacrifice also). Now, in the present hypothesis of our Sacrament being only a figure—an unsubstantial figure, too—and a figure totally inadequate, and very inferior to those which the Law prescribed; what, I ask, becomes of our boasted superiority? How strangely have we been deceived! How much more noble, how much more dignified, how much more natural, and strikingly illustrative of the sufferings and death of our beloved Redeemer,

were the figures they made use of, when an animal was slain and offered up before the Lord, than the inadequate figure that we should be professing to have—the unmeaning ceremony of eating and drinking bread and wine! The religion of the Jews consisted wholly and entirely of figures,

Catholic Version.

1 Cor. 10.

11 all these things happened to them in figure.

Protestant Version.

1 Cor. 10.

11 Now all these things happened unto them for examples.

In the law of liberty and of grace, those figures were to be succeeded by realities,

1 Cor. 10.

6 were done in a figure of us.

1 Cor. 10.

6 Now these things were our examples.

We must, then, in the New Law, look for better promises—for realities; we must spurn the beggarly elements of the old, and with the type look for the thing typified. But, if we have no more than a figure, I again repeat it, how imaginary does not our boasted superiority over the Jews of old become! Add to this, if the manna of the desert was itself but a type of this Christian Sacrament, (and our blessed Redeemer declared that it was not more,) how degraded below the very forms of comparison would be this unworthy reality, were it ever viewed in contrast with that really illustrious type! In all its modes, in all its properties, in all its relations, and relative circumstances, the manna, as described in the book of Exodus, was really and truly a most wonderful food, descending from the clouds, and prepared without labour—having in it, accord-

ing to another book of Scripture, the flavour of all that is delicious, and the sweetness of every taste. But divest the Christian Sacrament of the real presence, and, behold, the manna is far superior in excellence to the Eucharist. 1st. The manna was produced by the immediate operation of the Most High; the Eucharistical bread by the manual operation of man. 2d. The manna descended from heaven; the Eucharistical bread is brought forth from the baker's oven. 3d. The manna was a particular food, miraculously given to the people of God; the bread in the Sacrament of the altar is a common food for all men, Jews as well as Gentiles, Turks as well as Christians. In the 4th place, The manna, when kept over during the week, putrified; on the Sabbath-day, however, it suffered not corruption; the Eucharistical bread makes no such distinction. Finally, The manna had the taste of all kinds of food, and yet was none of these kinds of food of which it had the taste and colour; the Eucharistical bread has the taste and colour of bread only.* Hence, in Protestant principles, the manna is far superior to the Eucharistical bread; but in Catholic, the Eucharist, in dignity and excellence, far exceeds the manna. But, divest it of the real presence, and how strangely is every thing reversed!—the whole order and economy of the Scripture history is at once thrown into confusion; the Mosaic dispensation towers above the Christian, and types and shadows assume an importance more real than the substances themselves. Restore the doctrine of the real presence, and order universally prevails; the ancient figures dwindle instantly into their original significance; the Mosaic ceremonial law, with all its portentous advantages, is seen at once in its real character—an illustrious figure of the Christian dispensation; but as far its inferior in dignity,

* Exod. 16, v. 31.

as shadow is inferior to its substance. Thus, and to conclude, the Synagogue, a figure of Christ's Church, may have contented itself with the figure without Christ; THE TRUE CHURCH OF CHRIST MUST HAVE CHRIST WITH THE FIGURE, as the New Jerusalem looks for Christ without the figure: such is the beautiful order the Catholic faith establishes. 1st. Religion, in its infancy, has had the figure without Christ. 2d. RELIGION, IN ITS MATURE STATE, HAS CHRIST WITH THE FIGURE. 3d. Religion, in its triumphant state, shall enjoy Christ without the figure. Religion when she has arrived in these happy mansions, wherein his light is seen—the light where Faith and Hope shall yield to Charity—WILL PERMIT THE UNCLOUDED SUN OF TRUTH TO SHINE ETERNALLY UPON US. Contrast Protestant principles with the Catholic doctrine of the real presence, and it will be immediately perceived on which side disorder reigns—who enjoy the light of infallible truth, and who sit in darkness and in the shadow of death.

LECTURE IV.

 SCRIPTURAL OBJECTIONS USUALLY ALLEGED BY
 PROTESTANTS AGAINST TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

IF the words of the Institution had been spoken in English or Latin at first, many Protestants allow that there might be some reason for supposing that our Saviour meant to be literally understood, but as they were spoken in Syriac, in which, as they pretend, there is no word that expresses to signify, represent, or denote, hence the expression *it is*, has the very same meaning, according to them, as it represents, it signifies. This objection, made by Adam Clarke in his "Discourse on the Holy Eucharist," London, 1808, was also adopted by Mr. Horne, in his "Introduction to the Sacred Scriptures." (In the seventh edition of this work, published in 1834, vol. 2, p. 449, Mr. Horne expunged this transcription, showing, consequently, that he was satisfied with the explanation of the confutation against the assertion of Dr. Adam Clarke. Dr. Lee, Professor of Oriental Languages at Cambridge, in his prolegomena to Bagster's Polyglott Bible, acknowledges, that his friend Mr. Horne was decidedly wrong in making such an assertion.) And by Mr. Pope, in his recent disputation with Mr. Maguire, and is thus answered by the Right Reverend Dr. Wiseman, so often mentioned in these Lectures:—"About eight years

ago," says the learned Bishop, "when more actively employed in the study of these very matters, I determined to examine it fully and impartially, and to look into it, as into a simple question of philological literature, to see whether the Syriac was so poor and wretched as not to afford a single word implying representation. I looked through the dictionaries and lexicons, and I found two or three words, supported by one or two examples, enough to confute the assertion, but still not enough to satisfy my mind. I saw that the only way to ascertain the fact was to examine the authors who have written in this language, and in a work entitled 'Philological Examination of the objections brought against the literal sense of the phrase in which the Eucharist was instituted from the Syriac language, containing a specimen of a Syriac Dictionary,' what do you think is the number that this list contains, which extends through upwards of 30 or 40 pages? In other words, how many expressions does the Syriac language, which was said by Dr. Clarke not to possess one word for 'to denote or represent,' how many do you think it does possess? The English language has only four or five, such as 'to denote, to signify, to represent, to typify;' and I think after these you are arrived pretty nearly at the end of the list. The Greek and Latin have much the same number. I doubt if there be ten in either. How many, then, does the poor Syriac language present?—UPWARDS OF FORTY!!!"*

But, independently of this very learned answer, the bare reading of the Holy Scriptures is sufficient to shew the futility of this objection; for it is common to find there, signs called signs of the things they represent. Thus, the rainbow is more than once called the sign of the covenant of God—

* Lectures, &c.

Catholic Version.

Genesis, 9.

13 I will set my bow in the clouds, and it shall be the sign of a covenant between me, and between the earth.

17 And God said to Noe : This shall be the sign of the covenant which I have established between me and all flesh upon the earth.

Protestant Version.

Genesis, 9.

13 I do set my bow in the cloud, and it shall be for a token of a covenant between me and the earth.

17 And God said unto Noah, This is the token of the covenant, which I have established between me and all flesh that is upon the earth.

In the same manner when God ordained circumcision, he said to Abraham—

Genesis, 17.

11 You shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin, that it may be for a sign of the covenant between me and you.

Genesis, 17.

11 And ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin; and it shall be a token of the covenant betwixt me and you.

St. Paul likewise gives circumcision the name of sign, (Abraham,) says he,

Rom. 4.

11 received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the Justice of faith, &c.

Rom. 4.

11 And he received the sign of circumcision, a seal of the righteousness of the faith.

Moses, in this manner, usually gave the name of sign to things that were intended to be representations of other

things. For this reason this name is given in Exodus to the Sabbath, and to the blood, with which the Israelites sprinkled the transoms of their doors. Since, then, it is so common in holy writ to give this name of "sign" to figures that God establishes, how comes it to pass, that our Lord never says of the Eucharist, that it is the sign of his body, if he only intended to institute a mere figure of it? Why, at least in the establishment of so august a Sacrament, does not Jesus Christ say, "This shall be the sign of my body"—as God said to Noah, when he appointed the rainbow for a sign, "this shall be the sign for a covenant between me and the earth," and to Abraham, in the institution of circumcision, "This circumcision shall be a sign of the covenant between you and me?" Our Lord having declined to apply this word "sign," so common in the Holy Scriptures, to the Eucharist, either when he instituted it, or at any other time, gives us an evident mark of his intention, that we should look on it not as a mere figure of his body, but as his body itself.

The second objection is taken from the well-known words—

Catholic Version.

Matthew, 26.

29 I will not drink from henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day, when I shall drink it with you new in the kingdom of my Father.

Protestant Version.

Matthew, 26.

29 I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my father's kingdom.

Protestants thence conclude, it is not unwarrantable to look for figurative language in the words of the institution,

since Catholics say, there is one or two figures in this verse.

In answer, I beg to state, that these words are not in the essential part of the Institution. We should also bear in mind, that though a testator be particularly on his guard in expressing his intention with the greatest perspicuity, in that part of his will in which he disposes of his estates, he is not equally accurate in regard to other expressions, that may be found in the will. Moreover, these words, according to St. Luke, were not spoken of the Sacramental Cup, but of the wine that was drunk with the Paschal Lamb. This is the passage :—

Catholic Version.

St. Luke, 22.

17 And having taken the chalice, he gave thanks, and said : Take and divide it among you. For I say to you that I will not drink of the vine till the kingdom of God come.

Protestant Version.

St. Luke, 22.

17 And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, Take this, and divide *it* among yourselves :

18 For I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the wine, until the kingdom of God shall come.

“ And, (or as most interpreters of both Communion have it,) afterwards taking bread, he gave thanks, and brake ; and gave to them saying : This is my body.” By this narrative, St. Luke expressly and plainly declares, that the Eucharist was instituted after our Lord had said to his disciples, “ I will not drink of the fruit of the vine.” And from this I gather, that these memorable words are not admissible as a proof that the words of institution are to be understood in the figurative sense, or that there was wine

in the consecrated chalice after Christ had said over it "This is the chalice, the new testament in my blood, which shall be shed for you." For if Jesus Christ had not effected the miraculous change as Protestants deny, then he would have at one and the same moment taken wine when he had assured them he would not drink of the fruit of the vine till that day when he should drink it new in the kingdom of his Father.

Third Objection. These words "This is the chalice, the new testament, &c."* occur in the essential part of the institution, as well as these "this is my body," yet we have here two figures, the chalice signifies that which it contains, and this is called the New Testament, because it is the seal of it.

In answer, these figures are as clear as the most literal expressions, because the Apostles were accustomed to the familiar use of them. Every one says this glass, this cup, meaning the contents of it. The sacred penmen knew likewise that covenants ought to be confirmed by some visible sign, that should be the seal of them, and that the blood of some victim was commonly used on those occasions. The Jews, in particular, were possessed with this notion, who saw in the writings of Moses how he sprinkled the blood of victims upon the people and said to them "This is the blood of the covenant, which the Lord hath made with you." As the Apostles were filled with these ideas, it was manifest to them, that when our Lord said "This is the Chalice, the New Testament in my blood," he meant by "the Chalice" the blood contained in it, and, that this blood was

* I may observe appropriately, that the Evangelist adds "which shall be shed for you," hence, it clearly follows, that the chalice contained our Saviour's real blood, for assuredly it was not wine which was shed for our sins, or which dedicated the New Testament.

the miraculous seal, by which God intended to seal this truly admirable evangelical covenant. These figures, then, were properly introduced by Jesus Christ, as they were as clear to the Apostles, whose minds were full of these thoughts, as the plainest terms could have been. But the use of such clear figures could never authorise that of one so obscure, as would have been contained in these words "This is my body," if they were to be taken in a figurative sense. For, it is contrary to the rules of language, and without a precedent in the Holy Scriptures, to give a sign the name of the thing signified, when those we address are not prepared to look on it as a sign. Now, the Apostles were not prepared to look on the bread, which they beheld as the sign of our Lord's body. It was not evident to them when they looked on our Lord's body, that it was necessary to establish a sign to represent it, nor when they looked on the bread, which Jesus held in his hand, that it could be designed to be a figure of his sacred body. Nor had our Lord ever prepared them by any previous discourse to entertain such a thought, for he never had declared, he would one day give them bread that should be the figure of his body; he had, on the contrary, told them, that the bread he would give "should be his own flesh, which he would give for the life of the world."* Thus, as they had not then any reason to imagine that Jesus Christ would give this bread to be a figure of his body, it would have been the most obscure figure imaginable to say to them suddenly, and, without any notice concerning the bread he held in his hand, "This is my body," meaning to teach them it was a sign of it. The figure, then, which Protestants look for in these words, "This is my body," would have been at that time exceedingly obscure and

* John, 6, v. 52.

unintelligible. It is, in this view, I have said it is detracting from the glory of Jesus Christ to suppose he would have used it at the time, in which he spoke them to his disciples. For, when the Holy Ghost represents him as earnestly desiring to give them the most tender marks of his love, he would not have been obscure in the most essential clause of his will, in the institution of the most august of his Sacraments, of that, which he designed, in a more particular manner, to be a source of consolation to our souls, and a band of peace and union among Christians.

Proceeding to another objection, I will lay before my reader the argument which Protestants draw from these words, which our Lord added to those of the Institution as mentioned by St. Paul—

Catholic Version.

1 Cor. 11 ch.

24 This do for the commemoration of me.

Protestant Version.

1 Cor. 11 ch.

24 This do ye, as oft as ye drink *it*, in remembrance of me—

—We do not make a commemoration of a thing, that is present, for which reason, if the body of Jesus Christ had been present in the Eucharist, he would not have proposed it as a memorial.

In answer, I beg to state, that the Evangelists were so far from imagining that the explication of these words, “This is my body,” depended on these others, “This do for the commemoration of me,” that the latter are not mentioned either by St. Matthew, or St. Mark, who are the first that left in writing the words of the Institution of the Holy Eucharist. In reality, it is clear, they are not inserted to explain these words, “Take, eat, this my body;” but, to point out the dispositions of mind, in which we ought

to perform the action, which Jesus Christ had just ordained, that is, of receiving and eating his body. Moreover, Protestants are unable to prove from the Holy Scriptures, that we cannot, as they say, make a commemoration of an object that is present, neither does reason oppose it. It would indeed be absurd to exhort a person that has good eyes, to call to his remembrance a visible object that presented itself to him, as, on seeing the object, an idea of it would necessarily be formed in his mind; but, when an object, though present, does not strike the senses, one may, without the least impropriety, exhort others to think on it, and call it to their minds, because as such a presence does not fall under the senses, there is not always an idea of the object formed in the mind. Hence, no one ever thought of blaming those, who exhort us to remember our souls, the angels, or God, though these objects be present. So far from it, their presence itself is a consideration, that obliges us to exhort mankind to be mindful of them. It is not, then, improper to excite Christians to remember Jesus Christ in the celebration of the Holy Eucharist, though he be there present. We are, on the contrary, more strictly bound to think of him because he is there present, and of course our obligation is more indispensable of exhorting Christians to reflect on him. As Jesus Christ is not there present in a sensible manner, man would frequently fall into a criminal inattention unless roused by such an exhortation. But then we have many examples in the Holy Scriptures in which signs are images and memorials of things present. Moses often calls a part of the ancient offerings a memorial, though the offerings were present.* The dove that descended upon our Lord,† and the tongues of fire that appeared to the Apostles,‡ were signs of the

* Leviticus, 2, v. 2. † Luke, 3, v. 22. ‡ Acts, 2, v. 3.

Holy Ghost then present. Jesus Christ himself is called the image of God and the figure of his substance;* yet says, "The Father is in me, and I in the Father."† Why, then, may not the Eucharist be a sign, and memorial of the body of Jesus Christ though present? Independently, however, of what I have just said, I have another answer to the objection which is drawn from these words, "This do in commemoration of me"—it is this; it is not true, the thing to be commemorated in the Holy Eucharist is there present. In effect, St. Paul explains the commemoration recommended by our Lord of the commemoration of his death:—

Catholic Version.

1 Cor. 11 ch.

26 For as often as you shall eat this bread, and drink the chalice, you shall shew the death of the Lord, &c.

Protestant Version.

1 Cor. 11 ch.

26 For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come.

Now, the death of Jesus Christ is not a thing present in the Holy Eucharist, but is only represented in it.

If it be still asked, are there in Holy Writ any such examples of memorials, as may serve to shew, that our Lord's body, in the Eucharist, may be a memorial of this same body, that was before immolated on the cross? I beg to state, that there are. The manna, that was preserved in the ark, was a memorial of the same manna, which had fallen in the desert to feed the Jews. Aaron's rod, which was likewise preserved in it, was a memorial of this same rod with which Moses had once wrought so many miracles. Finally, all the victims, that the Israelites eat in their sacred

* 2 Cor. 4, v. 4, Heb. 1, v. 3. † John, 10, v. 38.

repasts, were memorials of these same victims offered on the altar. From all which I infer, that there is not any impropriety in saying, that our Lord's body in the Holy Eucharist is a memorial of this same body considered as hanging on a cross. Hence these words, "This do for a commemoration of me," favour the belief of the real presence, for, our beloved Redeemer does not speak there of a mere commemoration, but of the commemoration of a sacrifice. Now, in repasts, where the Jews made the commemoration of the sacrifices, and the application of them, the victim itself that had been immolated was always present. The body then of Jesus Christ, our victim, ought to be present in the commemorative repast of his bloody sacrifice.

And where, if it be asked, "does it appear from the sacred writings in regard to our Lord's body, that it can be a figure of itself considered in a different state?" I beg to reply, one may say, that our Lord's body, covered with the waters of the Jordan, and emerging from the river, represented his burial, and resurrection from the grave. Protestants and Catholics both agree, that this body when transfigured on Mount Thabor was a figure of this same body, glorified in heaven. Why, then, may not the body of Jesus Christ, covered with the appearances of his death, which are the sacred symbols, be adapted to represent this same body delivered up to death, as this body clothed with the appearances of glory was a striking representation of the same body in a state of celestial glory? But, without recurring to other parts of the Holy Scriptures, I beg to make one final remark on these words. It is this: since Jesus Christ, though visibly present, exhorts his Apostles to communicate with the remembrance of him, this commemoration, according to Jesus Christ, is not opposed to his

presence, not even his visible presence. It is, then, a great error to suppose, that this remembrance is inconsistent with the invisible presence of the body of Jesus Christ, which Catholics hold. But, to conclude, we Catholics believe, from the evidence, that has been laid before the reader, and from still further evidence, that may be adduced, that Jesus Christ, by his omnipotence, had changed the bread and wine into the real substance of his body and blood, and therefore, by these words "do ye this" and "do it for a commemoration of me," we believe that He invested the Apostles with power to do the same, and by it, in their successors, to continue through all future generations a perpetual commemoration of him to the end of time. Thus, this passage, in the rational estimation of a Catholic, does by no means invalidate the doctrine—it rather confirms the belief.

But, may not these words, "this is my body," be understood in the same manner with the following, "I am the door, I am the true vine?"*

I answer, saying, we find several differences between these things in the Holy Scriptures, that should hinder us from making a comparison between them.

1st. Nothing prepared the Apostles to believe our Lord ever intended really to become a vine, or a door. But express discourses made by Jesus Christ concerning the eating of his flesh, with all that happened at the time, led them to understand, that he would give them bread to eat, that would be his body.

2d. In these propositions, "I am the vine, I am the door," there is nothing more than a very common metaphor, which every one is always prepared to understand. For, it is very common thus to assimilate those things to one's

* John, 10, v. 7, and 15, v. 1.

self, the peculiar qualities of which are adapted to represent those we possess. Moreover, our Lord immediately mentioned the quality of these things, which had induced him to apply them to himself. If he says, "I am the door," he instantly shews the reason of it to be, because we must enter by a communication with him into the Church, which is the true sheepfold. If he says, "I am the true vine," he at the same time subjoins the reason, because we cannot subsist out of his communion. For in the same manner, as the branches of a vine wither for want of nourishment so soon as they are separated from the vine, so Christians cannot subsist spiritually if cut off from Him. Thus, the figure contained in these sentences, "I am the true vine, I am the door," was very clear, and proper to be used by Jesus Christ. The same cannot be said of that, which would be contained in this proposition, "this is my body," if our Lord had intended the Apostles should understand him in a metaphorical sense. Propositions, in which the sign bears the name of the thing signified, being much more uncommon than those in which one calls one's self by the name of things to which a person has some resemblance, and the mind not being prepared for them, they are not made use of, unless, at least, one be previously informed, that these signs have been established to represent particular things. Such a proposition cannot be, then, introduced into the first establishment of a sign; it would be unintelligible at such a time, to say nothing worse of it. For, it can only be in jest, or to puzzle others, that one may say one thing is another, meaning it signifies it, when they have been told, that we speak of a sign. Unless, for example, it had been known, that Daniel was interpreting the dream of the king of Babylon, he could not have begun his discourse by saying "A tree is a man," &c. The mind

is quite unprepared for such figures. In the same manner, as the Apostles were not prepared to believe our Lord intended to make bread the sign of his body, it would have been unbecoming the wisdom of Jesus Christ, to have begun such an establishment, by saying, the bread he held was his body. Besides, as I already have proved, our Lord makes no addition, that shews clearly, by these words, "this is my body," he intended to establish a figure of his body. No comparison, then, can be drawn between the figure contained in these words, "I am the door, I am the vine," and that, which the pretended Reformers attempted to find in the words of the Institution of the holy Eucharist, "this is my body." Again, words are only arbitrary signs of our ideas, and serve to no other purpose, except to the reciprocal communication of our thoughts. It is certain, that if we immediately saw what passed in the minds of others, words would be quite superfluous; it is also certain, that men would speak in a manner very different from that, in which they are accustomed, if they did not conjecture many things, which pass in the minds of others, according to which they regulate their expressions. The slightest reflection on language will shew, that it is founded on an imperfect penetration into the minds of each other; it is this, which causes us, when speaking, to suppress many things, which we would otherwise mention, because we suppose the thing already known by those, whom we address, and hence the origin of *ELLIPTICAL LANGUAGE*.

We thus accommodate our discourse to the thoughts of those with whom we hold communication. Now, there are certain objects, which we look on merely as things in themselves, and there are other objects, which we look on with less regard to what they are in themselves, than to what they signify. We not only look on certain objects as

things in themselves, and other objects as the representations of other things; but we know, from the commerce which we have with each other, that other men consider them also in two different respects; thus, *a book, a house, bread, &c.*, are considered merely as things; but *a picture, a map, &c.*, are rather considered as being signs or representations, than being composed of colours, canvass, and paper, &c. It is also clear, that when we know, that those to whom we speak consider any thing as a sign, we can affirm of the sign the thing signified; for instance, when speaking of a picture, "This," we can say, "is Alexander;" of a map, "This is England, France, Spain, Ireland," &c.; because we know, that those with whom we hold communication look on these things as signs, and attend not to what they are in themselves, but to what they represent. And, as we reasonably suppose, that they ask this interior question, "What is this picture in signification?" we reply, "It is Alexander," the words, "in signification," being omitted. It is also manifest, that objects, which are considered naturally as things, can be assumed as signs, if we first apprise those to whom we speak, that we have instituted them as signs. For instance, if I were to invent a certain system of mnemonics, I could choose any object to remind me of some particular thing, and I could affirm of the sign the thing signified, if I first forewarned those to whom I spoke, that by that sign I understood a particular object. For example, if by a tree I was to understand Alexander, I could afterwards say, "This is Alexander;" but should I affirm of a sign the thing, it signified in my mind, without having mentioned first, that I instituted it as a sign, I should be considered as insane. By the application of these principles, which must be admitted by all, we easily discover, that all the objections brought from scrip-

tural language against the Eucharist will immediately vanish. For instance, we read in the forty-first chapter of Genesis, that Pharaoh dreamt, that he saw seven fat kine coming out of the river, and that afterwards they were devoured by seven other lean kine; and also, that seven ears of corn, fair and beautiful, were devoured by seven others, —thin and blasted. When this dream was told to Joseph, he said, “The seven beautiful kine, and the seven full ears are the seven years of plenty.” Such a reply is correct, according to all the laws of language, because Joseph saw what passed in the mind of Pharaoh during the dream, and replied, “The seven beautiful kine are the seven years of plenty,” the words *in signification* or *signify* being omitted. But, suppose Joseph had seen the same dream, and that Pharaoh had not, and, that he had said to Pharaoh, “The seven beautiful kine and the seven full ears of corn are the seven years of plenty,” Pharaoh must have thought him insane; because he did not first apprise him, that the seven kine and the seven years were, *in signification*, the seven years of plenty.

That Christ could have instituted bread as a sign of his body cannot be denied, had he first declared, that afterwards he intended to affirm of the sign the thing signified; but, that he should do so, contrary to all the laws of language, and at the sacrifice of common sense, is by no means credible. Let us, then, examine whether Christ did institute bread as a sign of the body? We do not find, he has done so, either in what precedes, or follows the words of the institution of the Eucharist. The words of the Institution are recorded by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and St. Paul, and we find nothing in the narration, that warns us to hold this opinion. It cannot be said, there is any similitude between bread and the body of a man, for bread is an object, which is looked upon as a thing, and not as a sign or representation;

and hence we rationally conclude, since not even an insinuation is made of its being a sign, that it must be his true and real body, which he bequeathed to us under the appearances of bread and wine; because, if bread were a sign of his body, we must suppose, that Christ spoke to his Apostles in the same manner as if Joseph had said to Pharaoh, who for a moment, we shall suppose, had not seen the dream, "The seven fat kine and the seven full ears of corn are the seven years of plenty," which I have already shewn would be contradictory to common sense. By this mode of reasoning will be solved the difficulty under discussion, and the following objection, "the seven golden candlesticks are the seven churches," (Rev. 1.) and many such, taken from the Prophets.

3. Our beloved Redeemer did not foresee, that all the Church would believe, he really was "a vine or a door." If he had, his charity and wisdom would have induced him to have rejected these expressions. He even knew, that no Christian would adopt so strange a notion, and, that of course there was no inconvenience in his expressing the necessity of approaching, and being united to him by these words "I am the door, I am the true vine." On the other hand, our Lord foresaw, that all the Church would believe the Eucharist to be truly his body. So that, if he had not approved of that belief, he would undoubtedly have avoided an expression so fitted to confirm it as this is, "This is my body."

Finally, we do not find, when our Lord spoke these words, "I am the true vine," that any one present signified to him they were scandalized: that at this he repeated the expression, and affirmed with an oath, that he really was a vine; that this caused many of his disciples to quit him in disgust at his doctrine, and, that the twelve Apostles

were only withheld from doing the same by the consideration of his divinity, and the necessity of believing his words,—all these things happened on our Lord's using this expression, "The bread that I will give to eat is my flesh," as I have observed in the 6th chapter of St. John; therefore, there is no comparison between the words, "This is my body," and "I am the door, I am the true vine."

But, may not one understand these words, "This is my body," in the same manner as the following :

Catholic Version.

1 Cor. 10.

4 And the rock was Christ?

Protestant Version.

1 Cor. 10.

4 And that rock was Christ?

In reply, I beg to say, that this passage is very ineffectually quoted by Protestants as a foundation of the meaning they give to the words of the institution. For, it is not even clear, that the word *is* is to be taken for *signifies* in these words, "and the rock was Jesus Christ." "Our Father," says St. Paul, "drank of the spiritual rock that followed them, and the rock was Jesus Christ;" and is not Jesus Christ really that "spiritual rock" of which the Israelites drank? The material rock Horeb, was only the figure of Jesus Christ, but the spiritual rock represented by it was Jesus Christ. And, it is of this rock St. Paul speaks, when he says, "The rock was Jesus Christ, or Jesus Christ was the rock." If it be urged, in the supposition, that St. Paul speaks here of the rock Horeb, and that these words, "the rock was Jesus Christ," mean, that this rock represented Jesus Christ, could Protestants with any degree of plausibility apply this passage as an explanation of that, in which the Eucharist is called the body of the Lord?

By no means; we are not authorized by any thing in Holy Scripture to explain one of these passages by the other. Nothing but the imagination, and prepossession of our opponents could have induced them to make this passage, "the rock was Jesus Christ," the basis of the explanation, which they give to the words of the institution of the Holy Eucharist. And, we may even see in the Holy Scriptures that the words of the Institution cannot admit a figurative sense as these can, "The rock was Jesus Christ." Now, why are we not authorized by any thing in Holy Scripture to explain one of these passages by the other? The reason is this, St. Paul knew, that all those, to whom he wrote, were convinced, that the rock of Horeb was only a figure of the Messiah, whence he saw evidently that this expression, "the rock was Jesus Christ," would be universally understood in a figurative sense; besides, St. Paul had just shewn in the preceding verses, that he was treating of mysterious signs. He had proposed the cloud and the passage of the Red Sea as a figure of baptism. He had there proposed the manna, and the water of Horeb as a figure of the bread, and chalice of the Holy Eucharist. He had, even with this view, there called the manna "a spiritual food," and the water of the rock, "a spiritual drink." By this, he plainly showed the Corinthians, that he considered the rock as a mysterious symbol, as a representation of something else. These words, "the rock was Jesus Christ," followed immediately after, and could not be understood in any other, but a figurative sense, to which the preceding words were a natural introduction. Now, there is not any thing of this kind in the words of the Institution. The Apostles had never been accustomed to look on bread as a sign of the body of Christ; nor is there any previous discourse, in which Jesus Christ

evidently points out, that he intends to speak only of a mysterious sign. For which reason it cannot be said, that these words, "this is my body," might signify to the Apostles, that the Eucharist was only a figure of Jesus Christ, in as evident a manner as these, "the rock was Jesus Christ," could represent to the Corinthians, that the rock of Horeb was a figure of Jesus Christ. I even add, that we ought rather to look on it as a confirmation of the literal acceptation. For, as St. Paul could have expressed his thoughts concerning the rock of Horeb, either by saying, "The rock was a figure of Jesus Christ," or by saying, "the rock was Jesus Christ," it is manifest, he chose the latter expression, because he intended to compare this rock to the Holy Eucharist. He knew the Eucharist to be the body of Jesus Christ, and, that thus the comparison of the rock to the Holy Eucharist would be stronger, and more lively by his saying, "this rock was Jesus Christ." It is in this manner, that our Lord, intending to compare the concord, that ought to be found among Christians to his union with the Father, expresses this unity in words the most proper to represent that of the eternal Father and Jesus Christ, "That they may be one," says he, "as we also are one." St. Paul, also, meaning to compare the death of Jesus Christ to the mystical death of the faithful, who renounce sin, says, "Jesus Christ died to sin." It is common, in making a comparison of two things, to represent one by a form of words best suited to represent the other, though the expression, if rigorously examined, agrees with them in a very different manner. For this reason, St. Paul, in his comparison of the rock Horeb with the Eucharist, which is truly the body of Jesus Christ, said, "the rock was Jesus Christ." After proposing the miracle of the cloud, and the passage of the

Red Sea, he represents them as a baptism, in order that they might appear more clearly as a figure of the first among our Sacraments. In the same manner, after proposing the miracles of the manna and the rock, he subjoins a term best adapted to make them representative of the Holy Eucharist, which is Jesus Christ himself, "And the rock," says he, "was Jesus Christ." Now to another objection.

May we not explain these words, "This is my body," by those which Moses mentions in the institution of the Passover :

Catholic Version.

Exodus, 12.

11 You shall eat (the flesh of the Lamb) in haste, for it is the Phase (that is the Passage) of the Lord.

Protestant Version.

Exodus, 12.

11 And ye shall eat it in haste ; it is the Lord's passover.

We see in this text, the Lamb is called the passage of the Lord, because it was the sign of it ?

Answer. Though this remark were true, yet Protestants could not draw from it any conclusion in favour of the explanation, they give to the words of the Institution. There is a wide difference in giving a substance the name of an action, and giving one substance the name of another. In the first case, the two terms of the proposition one of which conveys the idea of a substance, the other of an action, are of a very different kind. A change in them is manifestly impossible, nor can such a thought enter any one's mind. But, there is not a similar impossibility in the change of two substances. We have many examples, such as that of water being changed into wine at the marriage in Cana.

This same answer is also applicable to the objection, they draw from our Lord's saying the chalice is the New Testament. Besides, the passage in question does not furnish an example, in which, a sign is called by the name of the thing signified, when the persons spoken to had not been prepared to look on it as a sign. And yet, Protestants should produce one of this kind, to shew, it was even possible, that our Lord, intending to institute a mere sign of his body, should have taken bread, and, without any intimation of a design like this, as well as without any preceding discourse, should have said abruptly to his Apostles, "Take eat, this is my body." There is nothing similar to it in these words, "it is the Passage of the Lord," even if they did signify that the Paschal Lamb was a sign of the Lord's passage; because, in all the verses that go before this passage, God clearly shews Moses, that this Lamb, which he commanded to be taken, was a mysterious object, and representative of some other thing. For, he commanded the Jews to take a Lamb without blemish, a male, and of one year, to keep it four days, to sacrifice it precisely in the evening of the fourth day, to put some of the blood on the upper door posts of the houses, to eat it only roasted at the fire, to consume the whole, without excepting the feet and entrails, to let no part of it remain until the morning, to eat it with bitter herbs, and in the habit of travellers. Hence, the Israelites were thoroughly prepared to look on this as a mysterious lamb. But, the Apostles were not prepared, by any discourse of Jesus Christ, to look on the bread he held in his hand as bread intended for a sign, so, then, we cannot compare these words, "This is my body," with these, "This is the passage of the Lord," though we were even certain, that these latter signified, that the lamb was a sign of the passage of God. Add, also, to

this, that on taking a nearer view of this text, it appears, there is no figure in it that we must take the words, "is" and "passage" in their most obvious meaning, and, that the lamb is not there called "the passage." I will quote the verse at length : "Thus you shall eat it; you shall gird your reins, and you shall have shoes on your feet, holding staves in your hands, and you shall eat in haste : for it is the Phase (the Passage) of the Lord." The clear import of these words is, "For then the Lord will pass," which is the reason of the commands contained in the preceding verse, that is, of the immolation of the lamb on the fourth day, of sprinkling the upper door-posts of the houses, and of eating it in haste. God himself explains in this manner the words "for it is the passage of the Lord," by adding immediately after, "and I will pass through the land of Egypt that night, and will kill every first-born," &c. These words, then, "for it is the Passage of the Lord," are not to be applied to the lamb, but, to that time, in which it was to be eaten, as when we say, eat meat, for it is Sunday. When the lamb is spoken of, the Holy Ghost does not call it the passage, but the victim of the passage ; for, he reminds the Israelites when their children, in the feast of the Passover, should ask the meaning of the lamb, to answer them by saying, "It is the victim of the Passage of the Lord, when he passed over the houses of the children of Israel in Egypt, striking the Egyptians, and saving our houses." Thus, if this text, "For it is the Passage of the Lord," be accurately examined, we may say, there is not even any figure at all in these words, which Protestants are perpetually citing, in confirmation of the figurative sense, they apply to the words of the Institution ; words which, nevertheless, were the first proof the Reformers made use of, who broached the figurative sense,

and which they pretend to have learned by a species of revelation.

And now to another objection : do not many passages in the Holy Scriptures represent the body of Jesus Christ to be in Heaven since his Ascension, which, as the Holy Ghost says, he was not to quit—

Catholic Version.

Acts, 3.

21 Until the times of the restitution of all things ?

Protestant Version.

Acts, 3.

21 Until the times of restitution of all things ?

Unquestionably. All Catholics believe this truth. But, then, the same Scriptures, which inform us, that our Lord's body is in Heaven say, likewise, that his sacred body is in the Holy Eucharist, for which reason we firmly believe both these things. We have many examples in the Holy Writings to justify us in so doing. For, as we believe the essence of God to be entire in the heavens and on earth, because the Holy Scripture asserts both, though we do not comprehend how a spirit can be entire in an infinity of places at the same time ; so, in like manner, we believe, that the body of Jesus Christ is in Heaven, and in the Eucharist, induced to it, by the authority of the Holy Writings, though we do not comprehend the manner of its existence in several places at the same time. Moreover, Protestants, who constantly assert, that our Lord's body was not to quit Heaven after his Ascension till his last coming, and who read in the history of St. Paul, that our Lord appeared to him, and spoke to him in the castle of Jerusalem, (Acts 23, v. 11) should there find some reason for entertaining a doubt, whether our Lord's body cannot be in several places at the same time, and this even in a visible state.

But, the Holy Scripture does not only say, that the body of Jesus Christ is in Heaven, but likewise, expressly, teaches its absence from the earth; as, for example, when our Lord says to his disciples:—

Catholic Version.

Matt. 26. Mark, 14.

11 For the poor you have always with you: but me you have not always.

Protestant Version.

Matt. 26. Mark, 14.

11 For ye have the poor always with you; but me ye have not always.

These passages import, that Jesus Christ is no longer present on earth, in that visible manner, in which he was subject to the infirmities of this life, conversed with men, and, was relieved by them in his bodily necessities; for example, by the anointing of his feet. So after the Angel had vanished out of the sight of Gedeon,* and that of Samson's parents,† they might have said, the Angel was no longer with them, without denying the possibility of his being present in an unknown manner. Add also to this, nothing occurs more frequently in the Holy Writings, than passages in which it is said, that God is no more in certain places, because he is no more there in the manner, in which he had before shewn himself, either there, or in other places.‡ Our Beloved Redeemer, speaking of his humanity, expresses himself in this same manner. For though he appeared to the Apostles after his resurrection, and was seen by them, yet because he was not then in a state of weakness, and mortality as before his death, he speaks to them as if he had been no longer with them. "These are the words," says he to them, "which I spoke to you while

* Judges, 6, v. 21 & 23. † Judges, 13, v. 21.

‡ Genesis, 4, v. 14 & 16; 18, v. 33; Exodus, 3, v. 8; 14, v. 20; Josue, 1, v. 3 & 4.

I was yet with you,"* and in other parts, Jesus Christ represents himself as if he were not in the world, because his presence was transient, and would be of short duration. "I told you not these things from the beginning, because I was with you.† I am not in the world, &c. while I was with them I kept them in my name."‡ The letter, therefore, should not be too closely adhered to in those passages, in which, Jesus Christ speaks of times posterior to his ascension as if he would then be absent, nor should any one maintain, that such passages preclude every kind of presence of his body.

But, the Holy Scriptures do not only teach that the body of Jesus Christ is no longer on earth, but, moreover, our Lord seems to have taken precaution, to prevent our belief of its presence in the Eucharist. This is deduced from the passage which warns Christians from believing such as should say,—

Catholic Version.

Matt. 24.

23 Lo, here is Christ,
(or there, &c.)

Protestant Version.

Matt. 24.

23 Lo, here is Christ,
(or there, &c.)

On a perusal of the chapter, from which this passage is taken, one clearly perceives, there is nothing in it concerning the Eucharist, and, that it is only to be understood of some pretended Messiahs, who would come and say, each one, "I am the Christ." Our Lord judged it expedient to fortify the faithful against these impostors, because he foresaw, that several would rise up from time to time, in different ages of the Church, and that, in particular, many would appear at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem,

* Luke, 24, v. 44. † John, 16, v. 5. ‡ John, 17, v. 11 & 12.

which was then at hand. And this explanation is clear from the part preceding the passage, the part following it, and, from the passage itself, considered at length. From what precedes the passage, we learn, that when our Beloved Redeemer delivered this discourse, it was when being on Mount Olivet, from which there was a splendid view of the temple; and his disciples being endeavouring to excite in him an admiration of the beauty of the edifice, he foretold them its ruin; and, when they questioned him concerning the time of a destruction so astonishing to them, our Lord answered them, that it would be preceded by many great events, and, among others, that many seducers would appear, each one calling himself the Messiah—sent by God to deliver the Jews from their miseries. It is evident, therefore, that he was then speaking of events that would happen before the destruction of the temple; it was foreign to his purpose to say any thing relating to the Eucharist, but, quite agreeable to it, that he should speak of those impostors, many of whom did actually appear before that destruction.

From what follows this prediction of our Lord, we learn that our Lord added, in his subsequent part of the discourse, “Amen, I say to you, this generation shall not pass, till all these things be done.” Therefore, he spoke of an event of which many then living would be witnesses. So that this explication is far distant from that of those, who apply these words, “they will say to you, Lo Christ is here, or there,” to something, they pretend to have happened in the latter ages of the Church. For the doctrine of the real presence, to which they apply this text, appears to them to have been a production of the ninth age. But, every one knows, that of the many impostors, who have assumed the character of the Messiah, several rose up just before the destruction of

Jerusalem. As that was the time pointed out by the Prophets for the coming of the Messiah, whom the greater part of the Jews expected to be a temporal King, and, as their great calamities made them redouble their wishes for his coming, so, many ambitious seducers took the advantage of those circumstances, and assembled troops to raise themselves to the sovereignty, each one pretending to be the Messiah so eagerly expected.

Besides, our Lord in the aforesaid passage expressly declares, that the reason for this warning was, because there will rise up false Christs,* and "many will come in my name saying, I am Christ."† This was verified in these seducers; they gave themselves out for the true Messiah; but, a dread of being put to death by the Romans for sedition, made them at first hide themselves in houses, or in the deserts of Judea, which were full of caverns, as we see in the history of Joshua and David. From these retreats, where these impostors concealed themselves, till they durst appear in public, and be enabled to resist the Roman power, they sent out companies on all sides to proclaim the Messiah was come. "Lo he is here," or, "he is there," said they. "Behold he is in the desert." He is in a hidden place, he waits for you to join his standard against the Romans. I have also to add, that as it is evident, that the Protestant explication of this passage, cannot be reconciled, either with the cause of the prediction, or the time of its accomplishment, so it is equally clear, that it is inconsistent with the passage itself. For, if Jesus Christ had intended to have spoken of the Holy Eucharist in these words: "If they say to you, Christ is here, or there, believe it not," it would have been foreign to his purpose, to have assigned as a reason for this advice: "For many

* Mark, 13, v. 21, &c.

† Matthew, 24, v. 5.

false Christs will rise up, many will come in my name, saying, I am Christ ;” for, this has not the most distant reference to the Eucharist. It would in like manner, have been equally foreign to have added, “ If then they say to you, Christ is in the desert, go ye not out ;” for, we do not retire to hidden parts of the desert, to celebrate the Eucharist. The whole passage is so dissonant to the notion our adversaries are desirous of affixing to it, that several of them, in order to make it in some manner plausible, have supposed, without any grounds, that in the original, the words were, “ if they say to you, Christ is in the Ciborium,” which neither can be reconciled to the text, nor to the subsequent part of the discourse of Jesus Christ. From all which, I conclude it is most manifest, that the passage is not to be understood of the Holy Eucharist, as Protestants assert, but, that it is to be explained, as Catholics say, of those false Messiahs, who started up from time to time, and particularly of those, who appeared at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem. This, however is a striking example of the manner in which our opponents distort the Holy Scriptures, as they incessantly recur to this passage, to prove their opinion concerning the Holy Eucharist, though it evidently has not the least reference to it. We have a similar misrepresentation of the proper sense given by very many Protestants to the celebrated words of the Apostle James, 4, v. 12, “ There is one lawgiver and judge, that is able to destroy and to deliver,” therefore they conclude there is no other visible judge in the church to end religious controversy ! As odd an inference as if one should conclude, because it is said in scripture, “ Be not you called masters, for one is your master,” no other ought to be called master. It is thus, that Protestant neologists, and modern unbelievers, torturing the Holy

Scriptures, and twisting the clearest texts and passages into metaphors, parables, hyperboles, and figures, are reasoning away all the mysteries of Religion. It is thus that the Socinian, the Unitarian, &c., "wresting the sacred volume to their own destruction," have converted into figurative meanings all the texts, however plain, which relate to the most essential Christian mysteries—the Trinity, the Incarnation, the Atonement, Original Sin, &c.

Last Objection:

But if the bread was changed into the body of Jesus Christ by the words of consecration, St. Paul would not give the appellation of bread to the consecrated element, as we read he does, 1 Cor., 11, v. 26. "As often as you shall eat THIS BREAD, and drink the chalice, you shall shew the death of the Lord, until he come. 27, Therefore whosoever shall eat THIS BREAD," &c.

Answer. If St. Paul calls the holy Sacrament BREAD, after the consecration, the reasons are clear: 1st. Because it retains the appearance of bread. 2d. Though it retains the outward appearance of bread, yet St. Paul distinguishes it from material bread, by saying, THIS BREAD. 3d. He puts the Corinthians in mind, that he spoke of THAT BREAD, of which, (as he just remarked,) Jesus Christ had said "it was his body;" and, he also recalls to their memory, all they had learned, at other times, concerning the Eucharist. 4thly. The holy Apostle, in giving our Lord's body the name of bread, follows the example of our Lord himself, who had repeatedly given it this appellation: "I am," said he, "the living BREAD which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this BREAD, he shall live for ever; and the BREAD that I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world." Finally, we should recollect, that the Apostle, in the chapter alluded to, declares the unworthy communicant of this-

BREAD to fall under the heaviest weight of divine vengeance. Now, why this denunciation of eternal vengeance, if the whole crime be reduced to the act of taking a morsel of material BREAD? Again, in many passages of the Holy Scriptures, we find the thing transubstantiated called after the name of the thing from which it had been transubstantiated; as, for example, Genesis, 2, v. 23, Eve is called the *bone* of Adam, because she was formed out of his *bone*. Also, chapter 3, v. 19, Adam is called *dust*, because he was taken out of *dust*. And, Exodus, 7, v. 12, Aaron's *rod* is called a *rod* even after it was changed into a serpent. Finally, in the New Testament, (John, 2, v. 9,) the *water*, changed into wine, is called by the Evangelist *water*; as those who had been *blind* and *deaf*, are still called *blind* and *deaf*, after their cure. (Matt. 11, v. 5.) It is likewise the manner of the Holy Scriptures, to call things by the names of the things they appear to be, though they are not such in reality. Thus, in the Old Testament, the Angels that appeared in human form are called men (Gen. 17, v. 16); and the figures of the cherubim, of oxen, and pomegranites, that were in the temple, had the denominations of the things themselves. Our Lord likewise gives the name of serpent to the figure of a serpent, which Moses lifted up in the desert. (John, 3, v. 14.) Thus, also, an answer may be given to the objection drawn from Acts of the Apostles, 2, v. 42, 46, where St. Luke (like unto Paul, 1 Cor.) calls the Eucharist, the "breaking of the bread." We should remember, that in those places it is not the body of Jesus Christ, that is called bread; this word signifies only the external part of the Eucharist, which may be denominated BREAD, because it appears such to all our senses. We may also observe, that it is common to attribute to the person himself, things that happen to his clothing: we say, for

example, we are wet, when our garments are so; and one may say, after the same manner, that the body of our Lord is broken in the holy Eucharist, because the species are broken with which he is covered. Thus, the Holy Scriptures attribute to God what, properly speaking, agreed only to the cloud and the ark; though the presence of God in the cloud and the ark, is far from being similar to the presence of Jesus Christ in the holy Eucharist. "The Lord went before them to shew the way," says the Holy Spirit, with reference to the pillar of a cloud. (Exodus, 13, v. 21.) When the ark advanced in the desert, Moses said, "Arise, O Lord, and let thy enemies be scattered;" and when it stopped, he said, "Return, O Lord, to the multitude of the host of Israel." (Numbers, 10, v. 35, 36.) David expresses himself in the same manner, when the ark entered Jerusalem: "Lift up your gates, and the King of Glory shall enter in." (Psalm 23, v. 7.) "We will go into his tabernacle." (Psalm 131, v. 7.) Says he again, in other places, speaking of God with reference to the ark: "O God, when thou didst go forth in the sight of thy people; when thou didst pass through the desert." (Psalm 67, v. 8.) "God is ascended with jubilee." (Psalm 46, v. 6.) All these actions of advancing, stopping, ascending, going in, and going out, are attributed to God, though strictly speaking, they are only applicable to the ark. It is manifest, that in this same style, we may say our Lord's body is broken in the Eucharist, though this agrees only with the symbols.

Having now replied to the principal Scriptural objections usually alleged by Protestants against Transubstantiation, after two observations, I shall proceed in the following Lecture, to the consideration of the chief objections, founded upon the dictates of human reason, which they

propose to us respecting the same doctrine. The first observation is, "In the case of Transubstantiation," Mr. Faber says: "the Romanist contends, that the expressions ought to be understood *literally*; the Anglican contends, that they ought to be understood *figuratively*." How is the dispute to be settled? Protestants will not admit of any infallible judge or interpreter of Scripture; but, they must be compelled to allow of some rational mode of ascertaining the real sense of Scripture, or the Bible must remain for ever a sealed book. Now, one such rational method must be, when the Scripture declares any point not incidentally but professedly, to interpret its words according to the plain ordinary sense in which men are wont to use such words. For, as God speaks to us in the Scripture in human language, it is rational to suppose, that he uses words in the sense in which men are accustomed to use them, for otherwise he could not be plainly understood. This, therefore, may be laid down as the first rule for a rational interpretation of Scripture: "To understand the words in the common ordinary sense, whenever they speak directly and professedly of any point." And a second rule must be: "That whenever the Scripture often and distinctly, and professedly affirms a thing, and never distinctly denies it, and when no such denial can be even inferred from Scripture, except through the medium of some human reasoning which the Scripture has not taught—then we ought rather to believe the Scripture to mean that, which it often and professedly affirms, and what it never distinctly denies." Now, if these two rules be admitted as just principles of rational interpretation, the Catholic belief of Transubstantiation is by them fully justified. The Scripture often, and distinctly, and professedly affirms, that the holy Eucharist is the body and blood of Christ; nor does it ever distinctly deny that it is

so; nor can such denial be inferred from any part of Scripture, without the aid of some human reasoning, which the Scripture has not authorized. Is it not, then, more rational to believe, that the words literally mean what they express? Or would it be rational to suppose, that the Scripture is the sole rule of faith, and yet, that it regulates, by meaning the direct contrary to what it often, and distinctly, and expressly affirms? Arguing, then, even upon the Protestant principle, of Scripture being a sole and perfect rule of faith, and guided in our interpretation of it by those rules only, which every rational mind must admit, the Catholic is fully justified in maintaining, that Transubstantiation is solidly founded upon the Sacred Scriptures.

My second observation is, "the best and safest commentary upon the words of Christ or the texts of the Scriptures, is the interpretation which has always, in every age, from the time of the Apostles to the present day, been attached to them by the pastors and members of the Church." There is not, in fact, any maxim of religion, that is more undeniable, and conclusive than this: "that whatsoever has been believed, always, everywhere, and by all—semper, ubique, et ab omnibus—is not therefore a human invention, but a revealed and certain truth." Indeed, not only this, but it is the case in reason itself, that no principle presents a more incontestible evidence of the certainty of any proposition, or of the reality of any fact, than the constant, united, and perennial agreement of mankind in their admission and belief. It is this striking harmony, founded alike on the immutable laws of providence and reason, that constitutes a moral certitude—a certitude not only excluding all rational doubt, but creating a conviction more powerful and satisfactory than any speculative argument whatsoever. Thus, let the question, or the fact be what

it may, whenever it so happens that it is, and always has been, admitted and attested by innumerable witnesses—men of different ages and different nations, of different characters, and of different interests—men whose ideas, prejudices, and passions are various and dissimilar—men, again, too enlightened to be deceived, and too virtuous to deceive—when such as this is the case, it is impossible to suppose—it would be worse than absurd to suppose, that this united testimony could be false. Their united testimony, thus grounded and recommended, forms an evidence, that nothing but the most obstinate incredulity and the blindest prejudices can pretend to call in question. Accordingly, let us apply the above considerations, or maxims, to the subject of our present investigation—the doctrine of Transubstantiation. Conducted by them, we will clearly discover, that there exists as manifest a chain of evidences in favour of this mystery, as any thing, that occurs either in the records of history, or in the annals of Christian literature. We will find men of every age, and every nation, of every character and station—men of opposite interests and different views—the bad equally with the good, the learned equally with the illiterate—you will find all these, everywhere, always and alike, united in the belief and combined in the worship of the sacred mystery, regarding it even as the chief and dearest object of their piety and adoration. Whence, also, this fact is true, that hardly anywhere in the whole history of controversy, can there be found a grosser attempt to impose upon the credulity of the public, than those daring assertions of Protestant writers, who unblushingly proclaim, that the Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation is but a modern invention, the effects of Popish artifice, and the dictate of superstition. See *Fletcher*.

LECTURE V.

 OBJECTIONS FOUNDED UPON THE DICTATES OF HUMAN REASON AGAINST TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

BEFORE I proceed to state the precise nature of the chief objections, founded upon the dictates of human reason, against Transubstantiation, I beg to recommend to the deep consideration of my Protestant reader, the following religious aphorisms :—

1. Faith is the gift of Almighty God. This, Protestants and Catholics equally admit.

2. We shall never understand that, which we must believe, unless we first believe that, which we do not understand. One of the principal errors of human wisdom, and which bewilders man in his imaginary strength of reason, is the insatiable and unprofitable desire of attempting to know every thing, and not to believe any article of faith, before he understands it. Surely, the Author and Creator of man never intended, after he had strayed from Him by disobedience, to save him by his reason—no; but by his faith. A God, therefore, united to man, should suffice to silence reason, and to render faith ever rational. But then, we are not to suppose, that religion forbids every use of reason, or proposes to us on all occasions mysteries that surpass our understanding: no; it has its light as well as its obscurity, in order that, on the one side, the obedience and submission of the believer may be consistent with reason, and, on the other side, not without merit. Those that would

know, are sufficiently enlightened to know, yet the same light is not sufficient to prevail with those to believe and know, who refuse to see. Religion carries with it proofs sufficient not to leave the believer without assurance and consolation; yet, to such, it is not sufficient to rid their pride and incredulity of reply. Thus religion, by its light on one side, consoles reason; and, on its obscure side, leaves to faith the whole of merit.

3. It is an error to attempt to explain, and to reconcile to sense and reason, the very mysteries that the first principles of religion teach us are incomprehensible, and, of consequence, are neither objects of sense nor reason, but of faith only—and of divine faith.

4. When reason is much offended by any particular dogma, or article of faith, or act of worship, it is too apt to reject the whole.

5. The text of Scripture alone, was it a hundred times more clear than it is, would never be sufficiently so to settle one point of doctrine, unless the meaning were determined by a Divine authority,—namely, that of the true Church of Christ. What, we ask, can influence the bulk of mankind, ignorant and stupid as they are, but authority? What can prevent schisms and heresies, but authority? What can preserve the Christian world from relapsing into the errors and impieties from which Christ redeemed it, but authority? What preserves unity in any Church or state in the universe, but authority? What fills, at the present day, these Islands, and Germany, with the most frantic opinions, but the want of an authority sufficient to coerce them? “Authority alone,” says St. Augustine, “can move the foolish to seek wisdom;” and again, “to confide in authority, is a short way and no labour.” (The ever-memorable J. K. L., or Dr. Doyle; on human reason.)

“Human reason is too weak to conduct man to any

certain knowledge of the truth. It is a principle of destruction, not of edification. Its great property is to create incertitude, and to turn about incessantly from right to left, in order to perpetuate doubts."—*Bayle (Art. Manich.)*

6. The finest truths are unprofitable to us, if He, who is the Eternal light, does not infuse them into our souls ; and the best reasons cannot persuade us, if He, who holds our hearts in his hand, does not teach them by his inspiration. Why so ? because self-love, self-sufficiency, self-conceit, pride, inordinate passions, &c., are very abundant sources of false light, and of false reasoning, and they are industrious in making us approve objects, however extravagant they may be ; and though they are only the monstrous productions of a disorderly mind, and weak reason or suggestion, we, notwithstanding, too often prefer them to the most evident and constant testimony. Hence will the finest truths be unprofitable to us, if He, who is the eternal light and eternal truth, does not infuse them into the soul ; and the very best reasons cannot persuade us, if He who holds our hearts in his hand, does not move them by his inspiration, grace, &c.

7. Reason, guided only by the corruption of our nature, pride, self-sufficiency, and conceit, cannot comprehend mysteries of faith ; but reason, guided by the light of grace, comprehends every thing that is possible to Him, to whom nothing is impossible ; and who, in his life, did so many things, that seemed incredible to human nature. The spiritual and truly faithful Christian takes not reason for guide, but Divine grace, the faith and testimony of the Church, guided by the Divine Spirit, the wisdom of God "bringing into captivity every understanding unto the obedience of Christ." 2 Cor. 10, v. 5.

Having premised these few religious aphorisms, which my kind Protestant reader will do well to carry with him,

as monitors and guides, in the serious perusal of the answers to the several objections founded upon the dictates of human reason against Transubstantiation, and which, I trust, will also show the unreasonableness of any repugnance to believe this doctrine : I will now enter upon the direct replies to these objections.

First objection.

“ The doctrine of Transubstantiation is absurd.”

Mr. Stanley Faber, one of the most strenuous and most ingenious of our modern Protestant antagonists, disposes of this objection of his Protestant brethren against the Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation, in a way very creditable to himself, and worthy of a better cause. “ While arguing,” he observes, “ upon this subject (the doctrine of Transubstantiation) some persons, I regret to say, have been far too copious in the use of those unseemly terms, absurdity and impossibility. To such language, the least objection is its reprehensible want of good manners. A much more serious objection is, the tone of presumptuous loftiness which pervades it, and which is wholly unbecoming a creature of very narrow faculties. Certainly God will do nothing absurd, and can do nothing impossible. But it does not, therefore exactly follow, that our view of things should be always perfectly correct, and wholly free from misapprehension. Contradictions we may easily fancy, where, in truth, there are none. Hence, before we venture to pronounce any particular doctrine to be a contradiction, we must be sure, that we perfectly understand the nature of the matter propounded in that doctrine ; for, otherwise, the contradiction may not be in the matter itself, but in our mode of conceiving it. In regard to myself, as my conscientiously finite intellect claims not to be an universal measure of congruities and impossibilities, I deem it both more wise and more decorous to refrain from

assailing the doctrine of Transubstantiation, on the ground of its alleged absurdity or impossibility. By such a mode of attack, we in reality quit the true field of rational and satisfactory argument. We believe the revelation of God to be essential—unerring truth. Our business, therefore, most plainly is, not to discuss the abstract absurdity and the imagined contradictoriness of Transubstantiation, but to inquire, according to the best means which we possess, whether it be indeed a doctrine of Holy Scripture. If sufficient evidence shall appear to the case, we may be sure, that the doctrine is neither absurd nor contradictory. Receiving the Scripture as the infallible word of God, and prepared with entire prostration of mind to admit His declarations, I shall ever contend that the doctrine of Transubstantiation, like the doctrine of the Trinity, is a question of pure evidence." (Difficulties of Romanism.) But, independently of this, in ascertaining the certainty of the Divine objects of Revelation, we must not consult the dictates of our reason, the suggestions of proud philosophy, or the report and testimony of our senses; and why the reasons for these restrictions? Because the mysteries of religion are objects placed beyond the pale of created things, and out of the circle of the senses—divine secrets whose properties, therefore, man can neither comprehend in this life, nor, with prudence, attempt to penetrate. The whole, and the only proof, which we do, and can, possess here, of the truth and certainty of any mysterious doctrine, is simply the fact of its revelation, and the evidence of the testimony,—that God has really delivered it to us. It is this alone, this fact, and testimony, that, as Christians, we ought to investigate, or can investigate, consistently; because it is only this, that we can pretend to understand. "Faith comes," says St. Paul, "from the hearing. It is the sub-

stance of things not seen." So that the consequence thus is, that the circumstance of any mysterious doctrine being more or less wonderful, or more or less obscure and incomprehensible, is, in the eyes of the enlightened Christian, completely immaterial, a subject neither of doubt, perplexity, or surprise. All that he looks to, or regards, is the fact, or testimony, that God has spoken and revealed it. This once ascertained he is satisfied. He then, like St. Peter, humbly bowing down his reason in calm submission, exclaims, "Lord, thou hast the words of eternal life, and I believe."

2d Objection.

"The doctrine of Transubstantiation is incomprehensible."

This we Catholics willingly admit. But surely, we cannot as Christians, pretend, with any thing like consistency, either to reject it, or so much as to object to it, on the presumed force of this objection. For, do not persons who propose this objection, firmly believe in other mysteries of faith equally incomprehensible? They believe, that God created the Heavens and the earth, all and every thing they contain, visible and invisible to their own eyes: that he said it, (it was his omnipotent will) and they were created. Now, can they explain how this has been done? Can they tell, how all things have subsisted; the heavens running in their course of motion, light and darkness, day and night, in four regular seasons, through the space of more than six thousand years, notwithstanding the clash of the four elements, the one with the other; the whole created from nothing? Can they explain how man was created, his body from the slime of the earth, and his soul endued with such super-eminent qualities above the brute, of will, memory, and understanding; capable even of knowing his incomprehensible and invisible Creator? Can they explain,

clearly and distinctly, who this God the creator of all is? How he exists from all eternity? How he sees, rules, and preserves all things? How he is obvious and occult, present and invisible in every place, in every creature, all living and moving by him, and nothing without him? How this same God, though one only in substance, is yet three distinct Persons divine: yet not three Gods, but one only God? Can they explain the mystery of the Unity and Trinity of God? The incarnation of the co-eternal Son, the word of God, how was this done? An infinity of similar questions if put to them, they can only answer saying with the Royal Prophet, "This is done by the Lord, and it is wonderful in our eyes." It is their bounden duty to admire and to relate these wonders, though the knowledge of them far exceeds their comprehension; and to pay the tribute of their reason and weak understanding, with submission to the infinite wisdom and omnipotence of Heaven. But to presume to investigate the works of Almighty power and wisdom, to dare ask how done, or the why, is too daring a question for any mortal to put. "He that is a searcher of Majesty, shall be overwhelmed by glory." (Proverbs, 25, v. 27). Suppose a Catholic were to say to the man, that refuses to believe in the doctrine of Transubstantiation because it is incomprehensible,—do you believe in the Unity, Trinity of God, Incarnation, &c.? Undoubtedly, the answer would be, Yes. Do you comprehend them? No. Is it consistent with your reason to believe what you cannot comprehend? Yes; when evident and eminent testimony corroborates the real truth. Whence do you derive that evident and eminent testimony? Either from the Bible, or the Church. Where in the Bible do you find any mention of Unity, Trinity, Incarnation, &c.? We do not find them explicitly mentioned; but, we deduce the belief

of them from the Bible, which we believe contains revealed truths, and the word of God. But whence have you any certainty of the Bible being such; and who deduced those articles from the Bible? By the testimony of the Church and tradition handed down from the beginning; and, we learn it from our ancestors, ministers, &c. By the testimony of what Church? By the testimony of our own Church—the reformed. Whence did your reformed Church learn it? Was not the Bible in existence, and was it not known to be such before that time? Unquestionably, and our Church received it as such from the Catholic Church then existing; from which our Church, or rather our founders, the reformers, separated themselves, and set up our new Church, which was not begun till then; consequently, it did not exist. And was it from the Catholic Church you derived the knowledge of other divine truths, that you believe, namely, the necessity of Baptism, even of infants just born into life;—of observing the Sabbath day on the Sunday, not on the Saturday, as in the old law? &c. Whence did your Church receive the certain knowledge of these different points? Was it not from the Catholic Church? Undoubtedly, you reply, we cannot deny it; to deny it, we must first deny, that Christ established a Church, and appointed Apostles in order to perpetuate it in succeeding ages, by their successors; that he gave them every power necessary to the ruling and guidance of that same Church; and moreover gave them a promise, that He would by His divine Spirit be with them, ruling, guiding, teaching his doctrine, against which no error should prevail, to the end of the world. Consequently, you believe that Christ fulfilled his promise, executed it to the full, and continues still to execute it? Undoubtedly, we do; it would not only be inconsistent with reason not to believe,

but moreover, blasphemy to deny it. Then, from what you now assert, and believe, with certainty, more than human, is it not a clear deduction, that the Church could not possibly err in what she believed and taught, seeing, that she had Christ's solemn promise, and Christ himself, ("behold I am with you,") to uphold and guide her? Certainly, it is a plain deduction. Was it ever ascertained in what she erred? Do you, as to any particular point, know? No, you must reply, Christ's words and promise are too solemn and sacred to be gain-said: it would be also blasphemy to harbour the very thought. But now, who was he that first dared to take upon him the reformation, to which you adhere? It was, as we learn from history, and our own teachers, Martin Luther. But, in the supposition, (which is impossible), that the Church had erred, was Luther the man commissioned by Christ, (as the Apostles were sent and commissioned by Him) to execute this reformation? The assertion would be blasphemous. Why so? From the character of the man (as we shall see in these Lectures). But to return, acknowledging therefore, as you do, your firm belief in the mysteries of the Unity, and Trinity of God, and, in the Incarnation of God the Son; though you find no mention of these terms in the Bible, but have only the testimony of the Catholic Church, why is the term Transubstantiation a stumbling block to you? As you, with the Catholic Church, deduce your belief of those mysteries from the Bible, so does the same Church deduce the belief of the real presence of Christ in the Blessed Eucharist, from the Bible, and from the very words and facts of Christ himself, and moreover from his command, "This is my Body," "Do this," &c., "As my Father sent me, so do I also send you; and behold I am with you," &c. This is the mystery of the real presence, which the Catholic Church expresses

by the word Transubstantiation, the change of the substance of bread and wine into the substance of his body and blood; as the same Church expresses the mystery of One God in Three distinct Persons, by the words Unity and Trinity; and the mystery of God the Son taking to Himself human nature, &c. by the word Incarnation. If, then, you believe the former, why not believe the latter, on the same ground and testimony? Is the latter more stupendous than the former, namely, that God should give, and in a manner should incorporate Himself with well-disposed souls to receive Him; than that, He himself, eternal, immense, infinite, and immortal, should become finite, bounded, mortal, &c. by human nature? Yet this he did, and continues to do, as Man-God, in the Blessed Eucharist, truly, really, and substantially, according to the doctrine of your own Liturgy; and yet to deny it, is this consistent with shrewd and unprejudiced reason? Why ask "how" can this be done? Know ye not, that no word, even "this is my body, this is my blood," shall be impossible with God, Luke 1, v. 37: the Incarnation was not, nor is Transubstantiation.

Besides, are not all the other mysterious doctrines of Revelation equally incomprehensible? Yes they are, all of them incomprehensible. And it is this precisely,—this incomprehensibility,—that constitutes their essence, and, that gives the merit to their belief. Let us bear in mind, to disbelieve and reject any mystery upon the pretence that we do not comprehend it, would prove equivalently, and in the order of consistency, the rejection of every mystery in religion. One may, perhaps ask, "What, then, such being the case, is the use of reason, in relation to the mysteries of Religion? Has not our reason, many say, been conferred upon us, in order to be the guide of our

spiritual concerns, as it is our director in the temporal interests of the world? Finally, has not St. Paul reminded us to take care, that our faith and obedience, ‘be reasonable?’ To these questions the reply is, the use of reason cannot of course, be a judge of objects, which are not within the sphere of reason; nor to fathom abysses, which cannot be fathomed; nor daringly to attempt to draw aside the veil, which the hand of the Almighty has hung before the portal of his sanctuary. The only right and consistent use of reason, with respect to these sacred objects, is simply this, to ascertain by the attestations and aid of testimony, “the fact,” whether it has been really revealed or not, whether there are just grounds for believing that God has indeed spoken and delivered it to us. The use of our reason is to conduct us to the threshold of his sanctuary, where He utters his Divine oracles, there to listen to his word; and having once heard this—humbly to adore,—Such is the sole use of our reason in relation to the “mysteries of religion.” “Faith,” says one of the best of the Bampton Lectures, “should repose on testimony. The mysterious doctrines of Religion should be considered, rather as matters of Fact than of Science. The Fact, once proved—our duty is belief, and acquiescence.” But, see how much these principles are violated by Protestant writers, whenever there is question of the mysterious doctrines of our Religion! Liberal minded Protestants cannot but frequently have remarked, that these men—many of the most learned and ardent defenders of the Protestant Church—in all their disputes and controversies with the unbeliever and the Latitudinarian—with the Deist, the Socinian, Unitarian, and so on—very forcibly condemn the practise; and reprobate the notion of treating the doctrines of religion, as “a science;” of comparing divine things with human ones; or

of judging of any mystery by the mystery itself. Reasoning with the aforesaid enemies of revelation, Protestant divines then reason as we Catholics do, contending that the only consistent and Christian method of ascertaining the truth, or of judging of the nature of any mystery is simply the authority of testimony, or the evidence of the fact, that it has certainly been revealed. In short, on all these occasions, they reason as the Christian should do. But, mark the conduct and the language of these same individuals, whenever there is question of our religion; that is, whenever they combat, or pretend to refute our mysterious doctrines; on all these occasions we see, that abandoning or forgetting all their Christian principles, they fiercely assail our doctrines with the very arms and arguments of the Socinian and the unbeliever. They do not contest the testimony or the fact of their revelation; but like so many philosophists or, just as the Deists do, in regard of all the Christian mysteries—they treat them as the objects of “science,” and declare them at once, “absurd, contradictory, and impossible:” adding moreover to the profaneness of their declarations, every indecent form of ridicule and insult that their illiberality can suggest. Such, we see it every day, is the almost universal method in which Protestant writers and divines treat the mysteries of our religion; reasoning always, in all their contests against us, like so many Socinians, Deists, or unbelievers. This is an observation, which has frequently been made by the disciples of the modern schools of infidelity. And it is owing, in part, to this circumstance, but still more to the leading principles of the Reformation, that these men, delighted with the dreadful thought, have confidently predicted that Protestantism will, and ere long must, terminate in complete Socinianism. “*Ses ramifications,*” says Diderot, “*se developpent, et s’étendant con-*

tinuellement, ne peuvent pas manquer de faire, bientôt, du Protestantisme en général un Socinianisme parfait, qui absorbera, peu-à-peu, tous les différens systèmes de ces errans." This prediction, already frightfully verified in most Protestant states, is unhappily in this country too very rapidly hastening, it is greatly to be feared, to its fulfilment; and above all amongst the higher orders of its society. Thus, speaking of the Protestant Clergy, Gibbon says, "They preserve the name of religion, without the substance; and subscribe the articles of their belief, with a sigh or a smile." Speaking of the Protestant gentry, Mr. Wilberforce says, "The time is fast approaching when infidelity will be held the necessary appendage of a man of fashion; and *to believe* will be the indication of a feeble and contracted mind."—*Fletcher*.

"The mystery is incomprehensible." "True," says the learned Dr. Fletcher, "but is not such even the case with the works of Nature itself? For, are not many of these just alike inexplicable as it is? They are indeed such, that no science, however profound, can penetrate them; no individual however enlightened and gigantic his mind, can so much as conceive them." "Nature," says Bayle, "is an abyss, which no human mind can fathom. Its springs are known only to Him, who has formed and directs them. I am sure, that no philosopher will deny or contest this. The essence of the most simple, ordinary, and inanimate objects, is buried in deep and impenetrable darkness."

Yes—Nature is full of mysteries. It is the seat of abysses, which no mortal eye can explore; the scene of wonders, which no earthly science can explain. To engage us, indeed, to adore his wisdom and admire his greatness, God has kindly unfolded to our view the excellences, the beauties, and the splendours of one great portion of the spectacle

of the universe. But, on the other hand, he has, at the same time, in order to humble our pride, and confound our curiosity, shed clouds of impenetrable darkness over all the rest. Thus, how little, for example, do we understand of that secret power by which nature is, each instant, producing and re-producing itself, under such an infinite variety of forms and appearances? How little of that process, by which the union of a little earth and water giving life and beauty to all the plants, and fruits, and flowers, that enrich and adorn creation? How little of that instrument, or hand, which moves and regulates those glorious orbs, which revolve above us? And, not only is this the case—but not even can any human ingenuity explain the essence or construction of the most trifling objects, of a blade of grass, or a grain of sand. The plainest sciences have their mysteries, which neither a Newton, a Locke, nor a Descartes, have been able to penetrate. We are, ourselves, mysteries to ourselves. For we neither understand how the soul is united to the body, nor do we comprehend the nature of its modifications, faculties, or operations. It is so, too, in regard of the Divinity himself: for, although every thing around us presents the plainest evidences of his power and wisdom, yet are the nature, as well as the measure of his divine attributes incomprehensible to our limited capacities. In short, the truth is, that nearly all we know of the objects that surround us, is the fact of their existence; nearly all we see is their superficialities. Their substance, essence, mode of existence, &c., are secrets, which no earthly science can explain, nor any earthly wisdom penetrate. Wherefore, seeing that nature itself is so full of mysteries, ought it not hence to appear but reasonable to admit that Religion also—and still more—should have hers? And if, without hesitation, we believe the former,

why so much repugnance to believe the latter? Or rather, why not with equal willingness, believe them? In the order of nature, those truths which, beyond all others, are the most exalted and sublime, are also, beyond all others, the most inexplicable, and profound. Therefore, judging by the rules of analogy, it is but consistent in like manner to suppose that, in the order of religion, those doctrines, which are the most incomprehensible, are likewise, beyond others, the grandest and the most important. "Mysteries," says Fenelon, "give no uneasiness to a pious and enlightened man, remarking that, in nature itself, every thing is incomprehensible to human reason, he is not therefore surprised that he cannot understand the secrets of the Divinity. His very weakness thus becomes strength, and his darkness light. Diffident in himself, he is all obedience to the voice of God." Thus, then, it is, that neither the greatness of our mysteries, nor their number, ought to form any real subject of annoyance to the feelings of a liberal-minded Protestant. Their greatness is rather the seal of their divinity;—their number, the attestation of God's mercy and benevolence.

"The mystery is incomprehensible." "Well," continues the learned Doctor, "but is it not again the fact, that in the order of Nature itself, nearly all its operations are conducted and its effects produced, by the very process and power of Transubstantiation? Those constantly varying forms and developments, which we every where trace around us; those wonderful changes and metamorphoses, which hourly take place in ten thousand objects, are all the effects of Transubstantiation. Thus, the small gelatinous molecule is transformed into an active and beautiful being; the crawling worm into a brilliant insect; the trifling seed into a stately tree. It is the simple union of a little earth

and water, that clothes our fields with verdure, loads our gardens with fruit, and, in reality, gives food to the whole creation. It is Transubstantiation that constitutes the source and basis of our very life, health, and vigour: converting, as it does, whatsoever we eat and digest, into blood, flesh, bones, &c. And again, how wonderful is that operation—an operation pervading the whole order of animal beings—by which, for the sake and support of their new-born progeny, the food of the female parent—which until now had been turned into blood, is now, at once, for the nourishment of their young, Transubstantiated into milk. These, and such as these, are among the numberless, endless transmutations, which we may, every instant, see taking place throughout the whole spectacle of nature. But, if so, if nature itself is thus full of incomprehensible changes, why then, upon the pretext of the incomprehensibility of that, which occurs upon our altars, why upon this pretext, either reject it, or even hesitate to believe it? To the omnipotence of God, one form of change is alike as easy as another: whilst, seeing, that the soul is so much more precious than the body, it is, hence, but reasonable to suppose that, as in his mercy he performs such and so many wonders for the benefit of the latter, so also he may, and does equally, perform them for the benefit and salvation of the former.”

“It requires,” says Mr. Fairholm, “but a glance around us to perceive, that, by the laws, to which all things have been submitted by the Almighty—to which we generally give the unmeaning name of “The laws of nature”—matter is constantly assuming a different form. The stately oak moulders into dust, and becomes food for the plants. The ox changes grass into flesh. His flesh passes at his death into other beings, who in their turn, undergo the

same metamorphose. All created beings move, without ceasing, from one form to another. Man himself being laid in the earth, fertilizes the soil. His flesh becomes food for plants, which are eaten by animals, which man, in his turn, devours. His Creator has announced to him this great truth, 'For dust thou art, and unto dust thou shalt return.' Even the most solid portions of the mineral world are not exempted from those general laws."—*Geology of the Scrip.*

"The mystery is incomprehensible." In stating this objection, my kind Protestant reader, you are not perhaps aware, that you appeal to an argument which militates equally, or rather far more, against the doctrine of your own Church respecting the Holy institution, than against ours. For, after all, great and incomprehensible as is the mystery of Transubstantiation, yet it is easy to conceive that Jesus Christ can, by virtue of his infinite power, without any difficulty, convert the substance of bread and wine into the substance of his own flesh and blood. To conceive this is easy; but to conceive the truth, or comprehend the wisdom of the doctrine of your Church respecting the mystery, this, to my apprehension, appears impossible. To the proof. Your Catechism teaches that "the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper," and that "the inward part or thing signified by the outward part of the Sacrament, namely, the bread and wine is the body and blood of Christ." Mind the words "verily and indeed." The word verily, in good English, means in truth, really, entirely; indeed, implies in reality, in truth, in verity. In like manner the same Catechism teaches, that the faithful of their Church take from the hand of their minister "the body and the blood of our Lord Jesus Christ," and still, both minister

and people deny the real presence of Christ, his body and blood, in the Sacrament of the Eucharist! Now, is this not a contradiction in terms? He is, and He is not! It is, “verily and indeed!!” and “it is not, verily and indeed!!” Go and reconcile this contradiction. Can common sense and reason explain it? You must, therefore, confess He is, or He is not, truly and really, or verily and indeed, present: bear in mind, presence and absence are not consistent. No wonder, then, Dryden, who had studied your doctrine with studious care, declared it a system of downright “nonsense.”

“ The literal sense is hard to flesh and blood,
But nonsense never can be understood.”

Hind and Panther.

No wonder that your learned Bishop Poynt, speaking of the methods in which many of your divines have undertaken to explain the mystery, allows it to be “unaccountable and unintelligible,” and why so? Because your Church teaches, at one and the same time, that it is still “verily and indeed” a substantial and unchanged portion of bread and wine. It admits a real presence, but it admits no way of accounting for such presence,—neither empanation nor companation,—nor of course Transubstantiation. It neither interprets the words of Christ literally nor figuratively, nor according to its own rules, “grammatically.” In short, it converts the sacred institution into a complete riddle. Whence we must not be surprised at the severe sentence of Dryden, denominating it a piece of “nonsense.” Dr. Hampden, in his “Inaugural Discourse,” as Regius Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford, thus expresses himself: “Our Church, indeed, has rejected the foundation of Transubstantiation, but does not, therefore,

the less hold a real vital presence of Christ in the Sacrament. The Church forbids our holding the doctrine of a corporal presence, and yet does not presume to overlook the strong words of Christ declaring, 'this is my body,' 'this is my blood,' 'and he that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him,' and will not, therefore, incur the impiety of emptying this Holy Sacrament of the gifted treasure of grace. And thus it is asserted in the Catechism, that the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in 'the Lord's supper.'" Therefore,—1st. Dr. Hampden applies the 6th chapter of St. John to the Eucharist, for he defends the faith of his Church on the Lord's Supper by a quotation from it.

2d. This question is strong enough to prove a real presence, but yet does not prove a corporal presence, which, he tells us, is rejected by his Church. Now Jesus Christ exists in the body, from which he is no more separable. How words, which prove his real presence any where, exclude his corporal or bodily presence, it is not enough to understand.

3d. This real presence, according to the learned professor, is demonstrated by the assertion that the flesh and blood, the constituents of a body, are there, and yet the real presence differs from a corporal presence, or from the presence of the body, whose flesh and blood are there.

4th. Christ is present because he said "this is my body," and upon this we are to ground a doctrine that Christ is there, but not his body.

Where, in Scripture, is this nice distinction drawn between "a real, vital presence, and a corporal presence?" Is this a distinction of sense for the Regius Professor of Oxford?

Third objection.

“The mystery of Transubstantiation is repugnant to the senses.”

“It is,” says the Bishop of Durham, Dr. Van Mildert, in his Bampton Lectures, “It is because Transubstantiation is repugnant to the senses, that it is rejected by many Protestants.” Now although it may be more or less true, in relation to ordinary cases, and to the general objects which surround us,—that we commonly judge of them and of their realities by the testimony of the senses,—yet, to assert, that their testimony should always be admitted, or even consulted, in extraordinary cases, and, in regard to the mysteries of religion, this is, indeed, neither the dictate of Christian theology, nor a principle of wise philosophy. It was precisely by this very argument, that the Jews were induced to reject the divinity of our great Redeemer. “Is not this,” they said, “the Carpenter’s Son?” They judged of Him by the testimony of their senses, and accordingly, for this very reason, refused to believe in him.

And still how many examples are there not in the Scriptures, in which, by the appointment of God, the senses of his servants were deceived. We see there that on many occasions, the Angels, bodiless beings, appeared in the shape of solid human bodies of men, in all the forms and attitudes of earthly creatures. In the case, for instance of Abraham, eating and drinking with him; in the case of Jacob, wrestling with, &c. The report, therefore, of the senses is not always, nor on extraordinary occasions, nor in the order of religion, the principle by which we ought to judge of the dispensations of God’s infinite wisdom, or of the institutions of his Almighty power. In fact, even in the order of nature itself, to pretend to judge of a variety of objects by their report, their senses would be not

only a source of mistakes and errors, but an absurdity. There is not one single sense—neither sight, hearing, taste, touch—but what often, or rather constantly misleads and deceives us.

“ The mystery of Transubstantiation is repugnant to the senses.”

Well, but let me observe with the learned Dr. Fletcher, “ how many beings and objects do there not everywhere exist, and which we know exist, of whose existence, nevertheless, we have neither any proof, nor any attestation, from the senses? We admit, for example, the existence of a multitude of spiritual beings; the angelic hosts, the soul, the Divinity itself, substances which no eye has seen, nor any sense reported. We believe and know the existence of a world of physical objects, animal, mineral, and vegetable; in which there are concealed properties, qualities, &c., so secret, that neither any art can discover, nor any science comprehend them. Why, even in the order of insects, a class of well organized and perfect animals, there are millions of these everywhere around us, so minute, as to be invisible to the sharpest eye, and undistinguishable to all the senses.” “ The mind is lost in wonder, and is incapable of conceiving what no tongue can express; that there are, in almost all fluids, animals, as perfect as ourselves in bodily structure and action, so minute, that it would require millions of them to form the compass of one single grain of sand”—(*Fairholm*). The same author tells us, in another place, “ That he had lately the opportunity of demonstrating in the most unequivocal manner, that it would require from one to three millions of some active animalculæ to form the bulk of one single grain of sand!”

There are, in the works of Dr. Roget, Professors Grant, Ehrenberg, &c., many similar, if not even more striking examples of the wonders of nature, than the above.

Well does Sir Humphry Davy say, "We cannot embrace the millionth part of the objects surrounding us. And yet we have the presumption to reason upon the infinite universe, and the Eternal Mind, by which it was created, and is governed. On these subjects I have no confidence in reason. I trust only to Faith. And so far as we ought to inquire, we have no other guide but revelation."

With the consideration of these wonders present to our minds, we must not be surprised, that religion also should have its wonders: neither can we reasonably infer, that because an object is invisible to the eye, or imperceptible to the senses, it does not therefore exist. "Miraculousness," says Sharon Turner, "is the true character of created nature." But if so, how much more appropriately still is it the true character of uncreated religion?

"The mystery of Transubstantiation is repugnant to the senses."

That one of the infidels of old should lay down the testimony of the senses as the fundamental rule of truth is not surprising. They were professed Materialists, or Atheists. But, that a man, who admits a revelation, who professes himself a Christian, should give it as the last criterion of truth, is the summit of contradiction and absurdity. The testimony of our senses, under proper conditions, may be, and is a rule of what the schools call "Physical Certainty;" a certainty great indeed, but always subservient to the intervening power of the Almighty. But, that if this testimony "were false in any one instance whatsoever, the authority of all Revelation would be overthrown, is a direct contradiction to what is undoubtedly revealed." Now, not to mention those instances, wherein our senses daily inform us wrong, are there not innumerable examples of this nature in the Holy Scriptures? Call to mind what I have said in the first answer to this objection. Yet I confess, that pro-

perly speaking, it is not the senses that are mistaken, but the judgment formed upon their testimony. For the senses can neither judge, nor think; and always relate what they should, according as they are applied. But, in a less strict sense, we may say that the senses are mistaken, when the judgment following the impression or relation of the senses is mistaken. Reason indeed might, in many cases, prevent the mistake; but in many others it cannot without the aid of Revelation.

“The mystery of Transubstantiation is repugnant to the senses.”

Why so?

“Because the sight, the feeling, and the taste, most positively assure us, that what we behold and see is mere bread and wine.”

One distinction will clearly shew the futility of this reasoning.

The sight, the feeling, the taste, most positively assure us, that what we behold or see is bread and wine,—in appearance, I have no difficulty to admit: is bread and wine in reality,—I deny. Therefore the mystery of Transubstantiation is repugnant to the senses, I deny the consequence.—The argument is altogether sophistical; it supposes the immediate object of our sense to be the inward substance of bread, which, as every novice in philosophy knows, is not the case; for the immediate object of the eye is the colour, or outward appearance, which remains after the consecration, as well as all the other accidents, but these sensible objects are in philosophical principles distinct from the inward substance of bread, which is not immediately visible, tangible, or tastible. Besides, our senses do not on any account deceive us in regard to this mystery. On the contrary, we believe the testimony of them. We believe, that all the outward forms and appear-

ances of the Sacrament,—for these are all that the senses can pretend to—are such precisely as we perceive them. If we contended that Transubstantiation were a visible, or sensible, change, then, it is true, we should, in such case, contradict the report of our senses. But, we do not maintain, nor believe this. We believe exactly the reverse. We believe, that it is not a visible and sensible change, but an invisible and insensible one; and consequently, that, as our senses are not the judges of invisible and insensible objects—so, of course, our senses do not deceive us. But, what then is the fact? We believe, that it is not the exterior forms and qualities of the bread and wine that are changed in the divine mystery, but their substance. Now, who, or what philosopher, can even pretend to deny this? For who, or what philosopher, can pretend either to understand the nature of substance, or even to know what substance is? “The substance of bodies,” says Locke, “is entirely unknown to us.” Newton says the same:—“*Intimas corporum substantias, nullo sensu, nulla actione reflexa, cognoscimus.*” What alone we can pretend, or should presume to reason upon, in regard of substance, is little or nothing more than its surface,—the outward forms and accidents which clothe it. Hence, therefore, the error of many Protestants; (unhappily the common error of nearly all), they mistake the external forms and accidents of substance for the substance itself. Whereas the fact is,—the former are merely the veils which shroud and conceal the latter.

But, it may be still urged, that reason tells us, there is bread even after the consecration. Why so? Surely the answer must be, because the senses upon the discovery of their immediate objects, colour, quantity, &c., induce the reason to conclude, that there is bread under these accidents. Allow me to answer, that reason thus far would well conclude, were it not, that a stronger principle enters

here, which over-awes (as it were), weak reason, and bids it yield. This strong principle, "the more firm prophetic word," 2 Peter 1, v. 19, is no less than the express words of the Son of the living God,* which the wit of man shall be never able to explain away, or draw to any other sense, but that which we Catholics hold. I beg to refer my Protestant reader to Matth. 14, where we have the fact of Peter walking upon the waves. Did not, let me ask, the senses and reason assure Christ's disciples before Peter was seen walking on the waters, that that liquid substance could not bear up a weighty body without sinking? Yes, most assuredly; still they saw Peter walk, and human reason following the guidance of their eyes, corrected their natural discourse, and acknowledged a miracle: Thus weak reason must yield in the present mystery when a stronger principle intervenes, and forces it to submit.

Guided by the senses alone; were we to have been introduced immediately after the birth of the blessed Jesus, into the humble habitation of the Holy of Holies, in the stable of Bethlehem, and see the lovely Infant in his swaddling clothes; were we, I say, on this occasion, to listen only to the dictates of the senses and reason, we would, I am sure, never come to the conclusion, that the Infant slumbering in the crib of the ox and of the ass, was that Word, eternal, God from the beginning, who brought all these things out of nothing, and, as Job says, chap. 9, "removes mountains," "shaketh the earth out of her place," "commandeth the sun," "shutteth up the stars as it were under a seal," "alone spreadeth out the heavens; and

* " 'Twas God the Word that spake it,
 He took the Bread and brake it;
 And what the Word did make it,
 That I believe and take it."

Queen Elizabeth on the words of the Institution.

walketh upon the waves of the sea," "who doth things great and incomprehensible, and wonderful, of which there is no number;" who is said to sport with the orbs in the firmament, as the child sports with its toythings; at whose mighty and unchangeable command, the obedient ocean on its tempestuous billows rolls its tribute of respect, and pays its homage to his law: "Thus far shalt thou come, and no farther." No, he would take him for a pleasing babe, yea, for anything but the Omnipotent. The sense of hearing, however, would correct the mistake of the other senses. The voice of the célestial choir re-echoing in his ears, would persuade him that *He* was born, and *then* present, who was to give glory to God on high, and to bring peace on earth to men of good will. Faith, also, which cometh from the hearing, getting the better of sense, would serve to remove the veil of infant humanity, and dispose him to fall down with the Magi, and adoring, to exclaim, "To-day is born to us in Israel, a little one, bearing principalities upon his shoulders; the strong, the wonderful God; the expectation of nations; the light for the illumination of the world."

Let my Protestant reader peruse the following parallel by Rutter:—

Protestants reject Transubstantiation,

1. Because the senses judge the host to be mere bread.
2. Because one body will be in two or more places.
3. Because the same body will move and not move, be visible and not visible,

The Socinians may equally reject the Incarnation,

1. Because the senses judge Christ to be a mere man.
2. Because one person will be in two natures.
3. Because the same person will be both God and man, visible and not visible,

- | | |
|--|---|
| mortal and immortal, possible and impassible. | mortal and immortal, possible and impassible, &c. |
| 4. Because Christ would be in the form of a wafer. | 4. Because an immense God would be in the form of a simple man. |
| 5. Because Christ's body would be in a form opposite to human nature. | 5. Because God would be in a form opposite to the divine nature. |
| 6. Because Christ's body would be eaten by sinners. | 6. Because God would be crucified by sinners. |
| 7. How can Christ's body be confined in the tabernacle, and be also in Heaven? | 7. How can Christ be confined in the womb of a virgin, and be also in Heaven? |
| 8. Because it appears absurd to adore Christ in the sacrament. | 8. Because it appears absurd to adore him who was born of a woman, and afterwards crucified by man. |

From all which, the reader will easily perceive the difference in the mode of proceeding on the part of the human mind, in acquiring theological and human knowledge? In the acquisition of the former, faith captivates the mind, reason, and understanding; and operates in such a manner as to set aside human reason with respect to Divine mysteries, as to the how, or the why, causes it to embrace the truth, without the least wavering or doubt; and commands the heart and will to obey, implicitly and explicitly. Reason, however, is not inactive with respect to the operations of faith; for her agency proceeds on the influence of grace, and the evident and firm testimony of the Church, guided by the Divine Spirit: when once she ascertains this, she proceeds no further as to the how and the why, but she acquiesces. Divine faith, the faith of the Church of Christ,

the Holy Catholic Church, is a reasonable conviction and assent to incomprehensible and obscure truths, as credible on the testimony of God and his Church. In acquiring the latter, the understanding acts, first, by taking thorough cognizance of the object, examining and divining into the veracity, merit, worth, &c., or the reverse ; then it presents it to the will, to receive or not to receive it ; to approve, or not to approve ; to obey, or not to obey.

Fourth objection.

“ The mystery of Transubstantiation, besides being so absurd, so incomprehensible, and so repugnant to the senses, is, moreover, so transcendently wonderful, as to appear quite incredible.”

Kind reader, allow me to remark that this objection, although very common among Protestants and unbelievers, is, at the same time, a very profane and unchristian one. It implies the bold presumption of pretending to measure the extent of God's Almighty power, and of presenting laws to his infinite mercy. Mercy, beyond every other quality, is the favourite attribute of the Divine Being ; and He has even done more to display this, in the order of religion, than He has done in the works of nature. The whole system of religion, is a system of mercy and love for man. The consequence, therefore, is, that the circumstance of Transubstantiation appearing, or being so peculiarly wonderful, so far from being an additional motive for its disbelief, is, on the contrary, in the eyes of Christian piety and wisdom, an additional reason for its admission, and the very principle which ought to awaken in our hearts a higher veneration for such a blessing. It is the very stamp of its divinity ; and the broad—deep seal impressed upon it by the hand of the Almighty. It is God alone, that could have conceived and invented so astonishing an Institution ;—He alone that,

with anything like confidence, could have proposed it as a certain truth;—He alone that, with the slenderest chance or prospect of success, could have at once engaged a corrupted and unbelieving world, not only to believe and adopt it, without murmur or hesitation, but even to cherish it, as the best source of their consolation, and the main object of their worship,—But then, do not Protestants, who make the above mentioned objection, believe, and sincerely revere the mystery of the Incarnation? Only reflect upon the nature of this truly incomprehensible mystery, which forms the subject of everlasting wonder to angels and men. The divinity itself, the Son of the living God,.....“ the brightness of his glory, and the figure of his substance, and upholding all things by the word of his power,” (Heb. 1, v. 3,)—the great King of Heaven, and the Creator and Lord of all things, “took upon himself the form of a servant,” and, in that mean and humble shape, suffered himself to be insulted, despised, and oppressed, to endure every kind of indignity and injustice, and, ere long, to be condemned to a cruel and ignominious death.—Protestants believe this, alike repugnant to the senses, alike wonderful and incomprehensible, and why reject Transubstantiation? Why believe that the Son of the living God, whose immensity is boundless,—whose centre is everywhere, and whose circumference nowhere, was shut up and confined within the narrow compass of a human body? Why, I say, believe this, and find it difficult to believe, that He is all powerful to give us this same body, now glorified, immortal, and impassable, under the pleasing and simple form of earthly food?—You cannot, you dare not, say he could not do it, else brief is the reply: unhappy man, have you measured the length and breadth of God’s omnipotence? Do you know the precise extent of His wisdom and His

mercy? Have you penetrated into the deep abysses of his counsels? Whilst among us, did he not change water into wine; raise the dead to life; give hearing to the deaf; and cure all maladies? Surely, to reject Transubstantiation on the pretext that it is too wonderful to be credible, and yet admit the Incarnation, which is still more wonderful, and admit Him, who gives us himself for food in it, to be an Almighty God, is a piece of inexplicable inconsistency. But, alas! by education, habit, and all the arts and artifices of vile misrepresentation, the Protestant mind is armed against the doctrine of Transubstantiation; whilst, owing to their brief capacities, the ministers, unable to comprehend the Divine mystery, I should exceedingly regret to add, and unwilling to ascertain the truth, treat it as an impossibility, a contradiction and an absurdity. “Blasphemant quod ignorant.”

Here it may be to the purpose to note, that this argument in favour of our senses, was urged before by Mr. Lesley, in his Case stated, and powerfully refuted, by the learned author of England's Conversion and Reformation compared. For the reader's information I will transcribe both.

Mr. Lesley.—“All our senses are contradicted in Transubstantiation; and I stand upon it, that since the creation of the world, God never said or did any thing which contradicted the sense of any man. It would be destroying the certainty of everything. Miracles are appeals to our senses, and without believing our senses, we can trust to no miracles, and, by consequence, to no revelation.”

Answer.—“You tell us that you stand upon it, that, since the creation, &c. Stoutly said indeed: but let us see whether you can stand your ground.

“Pray, sir, how long before the creation of the world did the Angel appear to Joshua in the likeness of a man? That

God the Father appeared to Daniel in the likeness of an old man? That the Holy Ghost appeared over our Saviour's head in the likeness of a dove? And to omit many other instances, that two angels appeared to the women at the sepulchre in the likeness of two young men? For I stand positively upon it, that in all these scriptural facts, the senses are contradicted as much as they are in Transubstantiation.

“But you tell me it would be destroying the certainty of every thing. That is, if things ever appear otherwise to our eyes, than they are in themselves, we must never trust them any more. Pray, sir, take care then never to look at the sun, moon, or stars; for they appear to your eyes much otherwise than they are in themselves: but reason corrects the misinformation of our senses. And it does so when revelation tells us that what appears to be bread is the body of Christ, verily and indeed, as your own Church catechism teaches.”

Mr. Lesley.—“I take it for a standing rule that we must either believe our senses in every thing, or in nothing.”

Answer.—“Now, sir, you speak out boldly, and like a true Protestant hero. But if this be true, it follows, first, that they who saw the likeness of a dove over our Saviour's head at his baptism, were bound to believe it a real dove, and not the Holy Ghost, and so the Evangelists are made the authors of a falsehood. It follows, secondly, that the women at the sepulchre acted absurdly in believing they saw two angels. Yet they believed it so, and told the disciples they saw a vision of angels.” (Luke 24, v. 23.)

“It follows, thirdly, from your rule, that St. Peter was grossly mistaken when he said, ‘Now I know, in very deed, that God has sent his Angel, and hath delivered me out of the hands of Herod.’” (Acts 12, v. 11.) “Lastly, it follows

from your certain rule, that though God should at any time tell me that my eyes misinformed me, I am bound not to believe him, or renounce the use of my senses for ever. Which, if it be not blasphemy, or madness, I desire to know what to call it."

This surely refutes abundantly the stale argument against Transubstantiation, taken from the contradiction it may seem to have to our senses; an argument so void of all solidity, whether examined by the standard of reason, Scripture, or tradition, that it should be deemed beneath a judicious divine's attention to propose it in a serious controversy.

Others seem offended at the pretended absurd and indecent indignities against the honour due to the sacred body and blood of Christ.—

1st. In being indecently conveyed into the human stomach.

2d. In being, as it were, continually ascending up again into Heaven, owing to the daily corruptions of the forms of bread and wine.

And, finally, in being made opposed to the laws of sound philosophy, which teach, that the same identical body cannot exist at the self-same time in several places.

In answering these objections I must premise with St. Augustin,* who, writing against similar pretended indignities of certain Jews, Pagans and Heretics, against other confessed mysteries of our Holy Religion, thus says "we should not believe even in Jesus Christ himself, if our Christian faith did but regard the scorn of the heathen." With these words before our eyes, I meet the first objection by submitting, that as the divinity of the Blessed Jesus

* In ipsum Christum non crederemus, si fides Christiana cachinum metueret Paganorum. August. Epist. 49, ad Deo Gratias, Quest. 6.

fillet all things, and all places, though ever so indecent or unclean, and is not defiled thereby, so likewise his precious body and blood cannot be defiled with the touch or impression of any infectious or unclean creature. During his ministry, in his great love and mercy, he was pleased to suffer the stench of sin and human imperfections, but did not become defiled therefrom; in like manner, it is not now more unseemly that he should permit his most precious body and blood to be received into the human stomach to testify the admirable effects of his immense love and grace. And, if it should be objected that the consecrated elements may be subjected to indecent violence—let it be remembered that the body of Jesus Christ being now immortal and impassable, is not subject to violence. Again, it is not improbable, that the Blessed Jesus, in such cases of profanation, should withdraw at his pleasure his real presence from the outward forms, restoring them to their former substances. As Aaron's rod, though turned into a serpent, was, in like manner, restored to its own original substance until the appointed time, that such miraculous change was necessary in the decrees of Heaven. With respect to the second difficulty, I beg to meet it by explaining from an example taken from the soul of man, how this may be done. The soul is confessedly whole and entire in every part of man's body; now, in case an arm or leg, or other member of the body is cut off, that portion of the soul that animated such member does not perish with it, otherwise the loss, say of an arm, would cause the loss of soul, neither does it remain in the air, because this element is not organized to receive animation from the soul, but ceasing to vivify the member now separated from the body, without any local motion from place to place, becomes only absent to the member so cut off, and still keeps the place and residence

in the body where it was before. So the body of Christ, the forms of bread and wine being corrupted in the stomach or otherwise, without any local motion from place to place, becomes only absent, and leaveth *that* abode, retaining the place which then, and before, it had in Heaven. As the Holy Ghost, appearing under the form of a dove, did without motion from place to place, cease to be under it when the dove vanished, or returned to nothing.

Finally, and with respect to the last difficulty : To be and not to be at the self-same time and place, or concomitantly to be, and not to be at all, is certainly a contradiction in nature, and, therefore, impossible ; but, to be in two, or many places at once, is no contradiction ; and, though above human conception, is possible to the Divine Power, which can do more than we are able to comprehend. Compenetration, as it is termed in the schools, that is, the co-existence of one body in the self-same individual space, with another body, or solid, is as inconceivable as for the same body to be in several places at once ; and yet of the first miracle the Gospels furnish us with incontestable instances, in Christ's ineffable birth, without prejudice to his Blessed Mother's virginity ; in his rising out of the sepulchre, " the heavy stone it was covered with being unmoved." (Mark, 15, 46.) And in his entering into the room where his disciples were met together after his resurrection, " the doors being shut." (John, 20, 19-26.) These are facts not more certain in themselves, as being transmitted to us by the inspired penman, than evident proofs that a glorified, and spiritualized body is not confined to the laws of a body in its condition of mortality and corruption : and who will be so hardy as to say, that replication is not equally compatible, as well as compenetration with a body in its glorious state, and possible to the Divine Power ? Our Blessed

Saviour, after his ascension up to Heaven, appeared to Saul on earth, in the way to Damascus; this the Apostle himself testifies :—

Catholic Version.

1 Cor. 15 ch.

7. After that, he was seen by James, then by all the Apostles.

8 And last of all, he was seen also by me, as by one born out of due time.

Protestant Version.

1 Cor. 15 ch.

7 After that, he was seen of James; then of all the Apostles.

8 And last of all he was seen of me also, as of one born out of due time.

—Now, whether in the last verse the Apostle alludes to the apparition he met with in his way to Damascus, or to any other, it is certain that he speaks of Christ's appearing to him in the same manner after his Ascension, as he had appeared to the rest of the Apostles before it: but, it is the opinion of Divines, that Christ on this occasion was in two places at once, in Heaven, and on earth; and whatever others may think to the contrary, this opinion must, at least, be allowed to carry with it the height of probability, and is partly founded on the following passage from the Acts of the Apostles, where it is written of Christ, "whom Heaven, indeed, must receive until the times of the restitution of all things," (Acts, 3, 21), which insinuates Christ's stability in his glorious state. The Church of England in its fourth article seems to espouse this opinion, and to allude to the authority just cited, saying, that Christ "ascended into Heaven, where he sitteth until he return to judge all men at the last day." Therefore, if according to this, Jesus Christ be permanently fixed in Heaven, he must, so often as he appeared on earth, have been here and there at the

self-same time and therefore, why not in ten thousand, in the sacrament of the Eucharist, since the "multiplication of a miracle can cost the Divine Power no more than its single operation?" I beg, my kind reader to peruse diligently the answers to similar objections by the venerable Author of the "Amicable Discussion."

If Jesus Christ were really present in the Eucharist, he would then, say others, be abandoned to the mercy of the wicked: he would have put himself into the power of his creatures, by giving them the power of offering to his adorable body the most shameful indignities; of casting him to animals, of dragging him in the mud, and treading him under foot.

But, in the first place, these persons do not reflect, that similar objections might be made against the presence of God, which they admit, in the universe. They will reply, no doubt, that God is not present in all places in substance, as we say he is in the Eucharist, but only by his infinite knowledge and by the action of an unlimited power. Were the observation correct, the objections would not the less forcibly recur: for, does it not seem unworthy of his Supreme Majesty, that his pure and immortal eye should be open to every scene of horror and debauchery? What representations, what works full of folly and turpitude, what disgusting and infamous images find place in the Divine conceptions, and become reflected upon the increated word? Far from us, however, be such allusions! God sees all crimes, and his eye is not defiled: he knows them, and the purity of his essence remains uninjured. Saint Peter Chrysologus, Archbishop of Ravenna,* speaking of the woman who came secretly behind our Saviour, and touched the hem of his garment, as if to gain from him by stealth the cure of the flux

* Ann 334.

of blood under which she had laboured for twelve years, makes the following reflection: "She knew that the Divinity could neither be tarnished by the touch, nor offended at the sight, nor injured by the hearing, nor stained by the thoughts of man. For if the sun by its rays comes in contact with dirt and filth without being defiled, with how much more reason can the Creator of the sun come in contact with any thing whatsoever, without contracting the least stain or defilement?"*

Origen had said before him: "Celsus imagines that the Divine nature is defiled or that it is mixed up with defilement, whether in remaining in the womb of a woman until its body was formed there, or in assuming this same body. It is like those who believe that the rays of the sun are sullied by passing over sloughs or bad smells, and that they do not preserve all their purity."—*Against Celsus*. Book iv. n. 326. Let us equally be on our guard how we believe, that the profanations exercised upon a consecrated host can touch and affect the person of Jesus Christ. The only right he has granted his ministers over it, is to be able at their will, to render it present upon the altar, and that in a manner which it is not given them to comprehend. The wicked may, indeed, profane the veils under which he conceals himself, may prostitute them to unclean animals; may throw them into the mud or under their feet: for he abandons to their mad outrages the cover he places between himself and them, of itself contemptible and common, it is true, and yet most deserving our respect and our veneration from the presence of the sacred guest, whom it holds concealed from our eyes. Here their profanations stop: they reach not his adorable body, on which he gives them no hold: inaccessible to all their senses, he is also screened from all their attempts:

* Sermon 35.

and not less impalpable than invisible, in the midst of the most shameful outrages, his divine person remains eternally impassable and inviolable.

Others borrow arguments from still more abstrated metaphysical sources, and with an air of triumph display to us their pretended demonstrations of the impossibility of one body existing in many places at the same time.

Their triumph, without dispute, would be certain, did the question turn upon a body existing in the Eucharist under the same forms, and with the natural qualities and proportions of a human body; for, certainly, it will never enter any one's mind to believe, or propose to be believed, that a body such as yours or mine can be simultaneously in many places. But we are speaking of a body which has passed to a state entirely different from our own, and has become impalpable, invisible, inaccessible to all our senses; we are speaking of a presence, the manner of which we pretend not to explain, which we acknowledge to be above our understanding. In what manner would they shew the impossibility of such a presence being simultaneously multiplied, and of the existence of such a body in many places at once? Would they maintain it to be more impossible than impalpability and invisibility? If they allow, that our Lord could derogate from the ordinary laws of matter to such a degree as to conceal his body from all our senses, can he not still further derogate from them so as to render it present in many places at once? Have we a sufficient knowledge of the properties of matter to deny this? Have we sufficiently penetrated into its essence? For, to affirm the impossibility of any thing whatsoever, is to assert, that the qualities that are attributed to it are repugnant to or mutually exclude one another. This cannot be proved, if we do not know them. The first step, then, is to know

them; and up to this time, the primitive elements, the intimate qualities of matter, the modifications of which it is susceptible under the hand of the Almighty, are mysteries to man. Whatever progress may have been made in the analysis of bodies, their formation and organization always elude our inquiries; in this respect, as in every thing else, the secret of the Creator has not yet been discovered. I am sorry, I confess, for those transcendant geniuses, who, to justify their incredulity and overturn our belief, transport us with them into unknown regions, and would have us adopt, as luminous demonstrations, the arguments they produce for us out of sight, in the void and the night of chaos. What is remarkable, is that they make no difficulty in admitting other mysteries, not less incomprehensible than this. You believe, with us, I would say to them, the Trinity and Incarnation, and have not these dogmas their inaccessible heights? Does not the Socinian imagine, that he discovers in them impossibilities and absurdities? You reply to him, that his objections prove only the limits of the human mind, and in no wise the impossibility of these dogmas: it is just so that I answer you respecting the Eucharist. Does not the birth of Jesus Christ appear repugnant to our ideas of things? That he should have taken a body, and come into the world from the womb of a virgin, what is there in appearance more impossible than this, according to all that we observe of the laws of nature and the properties of the human body? That after his resurrection, his disciples being assembled, "and keeping the doors shut for fear of the Jews," he should have twice appeared in the midst of them—how are we to explain this prodigy, and make it accord with the notions we have formed of matter? And after his ascension, that he should have appeared to St. Paul in the same manner as he shewed himself after his

passion to St. Peter, to his disciples, and to more than five hundred brethren together—do you more easily conceive this? For we have manifestly here the presence of Jesus Christ in two places at once—in heaven at the right hand of his Father, and on earth before St. Paul, to whom he shewed himself as he was before. To convince his Apostles of his resurrection, he had caused to be seen by their eyes, in his complete humanity, the same members, the same features that they had known him to possess before his death. What will you say, again, of the dogma of the general resurrection, the belief in which is common to us both? Can your imagination comprehend this mystery? Do you readily conceive the state in which our bodies will then be changed? Are you able to conceive, that they can, without ceasing to be the same, divest themselves of all their sensual and terrestrial qualities, and put on those that are spiritualized and angelical? for there, there is neither eating nor drinking; there, they shall not marry, or be married, says our Saviour, but shall be like angels.* And according to the sublime theology of St. Paul, the body “is sown in corruption, it shall rise in incorruption: it is sown in dishonour, it shall rise in glory: it is sown in weakness, it shall rise in power: it is sown a natural body, it shall rise a spiritual body: if there be a natural body, there is also a spiritual body.”† After these incontestible truths, admitted and yet unintelligible, what mean the difficulties you object to us? To what purpose do you create imaginary impossibilities upon a state of things that far surpass our comprehension? If God, as you doubt not, destines our sensual and gross bodies for a state of spirituality, which we do not understand, why should not our Lord be able to put his body in another spiritual state still

* Matth. 22, v. 30. † 1 Cor. 15, v. 42.

more incomprehensible? You reason upon matter such as we see it, and upon bodies such as they strike our senses; but here we are treating of a matter that is imperceptible, of a body that eludes all our senses. You speak to us of an animal body, whereas you should speak of a spiritual body. But, you will reply, what do you mean by a spiritual body, and how are we to join these two ideas together? In truth, sir, I am sure that they are joined; for we are taught so by St. Paul; but how, and in what manner, I know not, any more than you do. And here it is that all our metaphysical reasonings upon the Eucharist come to a termination in our ignorance.

I submit to the reader the following objections with their respective answers in juxta-position.

- | | |
|---|--|
| <p>1. How can accidents exist without a substance?</p> | <p>1. How did human nature subsist without its proper personality in Christ? Unless, with Nestorius, we say, that in Christ are two persons — which is heretical doctrine.</p> |
| <p>2. How can one and the same body be in many places at one and the same time, as it must be if the real presence be true?</p> | <p>2. How can one and the same soul—Angel and God—be in many places at one and the same time, which they must be, if their spirituality and God's omnipresence be true.</p> |
| <p>3. How can the parts of our Redeemer's body so penetrate one another that the whole body may be con-</p> | <p>3. How can the component parts of the soul of man, so penetrate one another, that the soul is confessedly—</p> |

tained in the least part of the host, or in the smallest drop of the consecrated wine ?

4. How can the body of Christ in the consecrated host be distinguished from others not consecrated, when placed amongst them ?
5. If our Redeemer's body and blood are really present in this sacrament, then it may be eaten by unclean animals ?
6. How is it possible that a man's body should be so light as to be contained in a small pyxis, or consecrated vessel ?
7. If the doctrine of the real presence be so miraculous, why is it not so conspicuous as were the other miracles of Christ ?
8. How can we possibly conceive a body without any

wholly in each part of man ? Or, how could the body of our Saviour pass through his mother's womb, and the door—the womb and door remaining closed ?

4. How could a particle or drop of our Saviour's blood be distinguished from the blood of other men, if during his passion, it had been mixed with it ?
5. If, during the passion, the blood of the blessed Jesus was shed in every part near the wood of the cross, was it not subject to similar treatment ?
6. How was it possible that our Saviour's body was so light as to ascend up to Heaven, like a flame of fire ?
7. If so many miracles were performed at the Incarnation, as we must hold, why were they not so conspicuous as to lead the Jewish nation to believe that Jesus was born ?
8. How can we possibly conceive human nature sub-

extension of parts, or local form and figure?

9. What difference will there be between a body without all extension and local figure, and a spirit?

10. If the doctrine of the real presence be true, then wicked persons and sinners may receive his body and blood into their sinful bodies.

11. If there be nothing visi-

sisting without human personality? (See obj. 1st.)

9. What difference is there between the soul of a newly-born infant, and that of a brute beast, which cannot actually understand? You may say, the one has power to understand, and the other has not; but has not the one that has not power to understand, power to be extended and have a local figure, and the other has not?

10. If our Saviour's body was truly in the desert, then the Devil carried it in his arms and placed it on the pinnacle of the temple; and if it were a true body, during his passion, then the traitor Judas kissed it; then the Jews abused it, scourged it, nailed it to the wood of the cross and trampled upon it—surely this is not so disgraceful as when it is received by unworthy communicants.

11. If there were nothing but

ble but accidents, how can worms be generated from a corrupted consecrated host? These worms consist of matter and form, and must be produced from some material substance.

12. But how can an accident perform the office of a substance?

13. The son of God united the divine personality to human nature, and so it subsists by it, as supplying the want of its own.

human nature in Christ, as man, without human personality, how could he perform the actions of a human person? You may say, the person of the Son of God supplied the place of a human person in Christ, so I say, that the Divine Power supplies the place of nature in this Sacrament, by producing a matter, after the species of bread is corrupted, and the body of our Saviour ceases to be present.

12. How can the personality of one perform the office of the personality of another?

13. God unites a matter produced at the exigency of nature, to the accidents which were of bread, and which in the production of worms, &c., from a putrified host supplies the want of their own.

Last Objection.

But, if this doctrine be scriptural, why has not the Son of God so proposed its belief accompanied by such evidence, as to captivate the opposition of every understanding however opposed to it?

Allow me to reply, with the venerable and learned Author of the Amicable Discussion, by asking,—Was it not easy for God to point out so clearly by the Prophets the Redeemer expected by an entire nation, that he could not have been mistaken for any other? Why are the Trinity, the immortality of the Soul, and eternal happiness so concealed, so buried in the books of the Old Testament, which are received in the Jewish Canon? Why did not Jesus Christ, aware as he was of all the heresies that were to occur in his Church, decide before hand formally upon them, and thus suppress them by anticipation? Why did he not avoid so many expressions, which he foresaw would be abused by Heretics? Why did he not make known his Divinity in such clear and distinct terms, as would have made evasion impossible? Why have the Apostles given so scanty a narration of his divine words and actions, though St. John tells us, the history of these actions would have filled an infinite number of books? Why has he permitted the apparent contradiction which is found in his Evangelists? Why have the Apostles spoken so obscurely on so many points? Why did they not prevent, by formal decisions, so many controversies they ought to have foreseen would excite trouble after their death? Why did they not leave us upon the Trinity and the Incarnation a symbol of faith as clear as that which bears the name of St. Athanasius? How many millions would have been retained in the bosom of the Church, had it been the will of God to decide articles of faith as clearly by the Scriptures as they have been by Councils. Surely, all these things were very easy to God. God might have obviated all the evils I have enumerated. God might have prevented the doubts of mankind. But it was not his will to do so.

It is his will to exercise his goodness towards his elect,

as it is equally his will to show his rigour towards the wicked. If in his mercy, he reveals his mysteries to the one, he wills in his justice to conceal them from the other. And as his justice, no less than his mercy, enter into his Providence, it may be said, that the darkness which encompasses the mysteries is as much in accordance with the order of God, as the light, which reveals them; and thus we may every where observe indications of this two-fold design of God, of concealing himself from the wicked, and of making himself known to the elect.

Finally, in the words of the same learned Author. " Putting aside all discussion of texts and monuments, I undertake to prove, that the doctrine of the Catholic Church, on the Eucharist, necessarily goes back to the Apostles. The argument will be somewhat abstract and metaphysical: I do not, however, believe it to be above the reach of ordinary capacities: it must, in my opinion, suffice to convince a very reasonable mind. We will, then, for a moment, forget all that we have discoursed from Scripture, the sacred discipline, the liturgies and testimonies of the fathers, and, in place of authority, we will listen to reason alone. I start with you from a fact, and I say, at whatever point of time you may choose to fix upon (at the present time if you please, that we are now discussing this question,) millions of persons, differing in climate, customs, nations, governments, prejudices, and religious communions, all agree, not only in believing the change of substance, and the adoration in the Eucharist, but in believing them as dogmas believed and taught in all preceding ages. The above proposition demands your most serious attention; reperuse it, before you proceed further. You have read the most authentic testimonies on the belief of the Greek and Oriental Churches. You know that upon these dogmas they are perfectly in

accordance with the Latin Churches. It is certain that they, like ourselves, believe in these doctrines, as having invariably been believed by preceding generations. This being established, I pass on: and I maintain that from this fact, we of necessity have a right to infer nothing than the Apostolicity of these dogmas: although it be customary to divide the generation of men, and count four of them to a century, it is evident, notwithstanding, that they are neither distinctly separated, nor independent of each other, but greatly intermixed and linked one within another, so that a very considerable portion of persons, existing in any given generation, belong also to the one preceding. Whence it follows, that a very considerable proportion of persons, existing at any one given epoch, are perfectly acquainted with what was believed and taught in the preceding generation, particularly when the dogmas are of great importance, connected with daily and general observance, and requiring of each individual, the most sacred acts of religion, as in the case with the dogmas of the Eucharist. If such doctrines are not to be retraced to the Apostles, there must have been some later period, when, for the first time, they sprang to light, and were taught, and believed in the world. But, at this epoch, when for the first time, mention was made of it, a very great proportion of persons, then living, knew for certain that not a word had been said about it the day before, neither had it been mentioned in the preceding generation; they knew perfectly well, for example, that instead of the reality, nothing more than the figure had been recognized, instead of the change of substance, nothing was admitted but bread and wine; instead of adoration, nothing more than a recollection of Spirit. Well, then, supposing that I admit, what nevertheless is inadmissible, that these same persons consented to pass from the figure to the reality,

from the substance of the bread to that of the body, from recollection to adoration, they must have gone over, to say the least of it, to what they considered a novel opinion, and a novel practice : but, in substituting them for the opinion and practice with which they had till then been acquainted, it is utterly impossible, that they should have adopted them as having been held and taught during the preceding generation—the contrary would be notoriously manifest to all ; the falsity of the fact is too evident to admit such a persuasion. It is contrary to nature, that so great a proportion of mankind should spontaneously, or from persuasion, with one impulse, unite in admitting as true what they all positively knew to be false. I cannot conceive a man to exist so much the victim of folly, as to propose to his fellow-creature, to believe that, as the doctrine and faith of the year before, which he knows, which they all know, was no such thing ; and were an individual found extravagant enough to venture upon such an experiment, the nature of things, and good sense, alike forbid us to suppose that success would crown his enterprise.

“ And yet, if our dogmas on the Eucharist were not derived from the Apostles, it would inevitably follow that, in some intermediate generation, men began to hold them as the belief of their predecessors, although most notoriously they had never been so. There is an absurdity in this hypothesis that is quite repugnant to our moral condition. Consequently, it is proved, that these doctrines are Apostolical by the naked and single fact, that so many persons of the present day believe them, as having been believed and taught in preceding generations, and reaching from our age to that of the Apostles inclusively.”

ADDENDA

TO THE LECTURES ON THE REAL PRESENCE.

IN answering the scriptural objections against the Doctrine of the Real Presence, I said "that the Reformers pretended to have learned the figurative sense of the words of the Institution by a species of revelation." I now beg to submit, that Zuinglius, in his book, "De subsidio Eucharistiæ," after stating that he had been disputing with the magistrates of Zurich with little success, proceeds thus: "Early in the morning of the 13th of April (I speak the truth, though unwillingly, for I know how I shall be laughed at; but my conscience forces me), I seemed in my sleep to be disputing with much difficulty against my adversary, and to be struck dumb, so that I could not defend what knew to be the truth, when, most opportunely, a monitor seemed to be present (whether he were white or black, I do not remember, for I relate a dream), who exclaimed, 'why, you blockhead, answer what is written, Exodus 12, it is the Pasch, it is the Passover of the Lord.' As soon as I had seen this phantom, I awoke, leaped out of bed, examined the passage, and by means of it dispelled every difficulty from the minds of my audience"!!! Luther's opinion of this nocturnal vision of Zuinglius, which many orthodox

Protestants will, no doubt, declare a divine revelation, is curious. His assertion is, "that Zuinglius, and all who adhere to his doctrine, are insatanized, supersatanized, and persatanized; that they have the devil infused, perfused, and transfused into them." Yet Luther himself owed the discovery of the proofs for the abolition of the Mass to a monitor of the same description. The whole conference is related by Luther in his book, "*De Missa privata, et Unctione Sacerdotum*," Wittemberg edition, Tom. 7, fol. 228, edited by Melancthon. One night, he relates, just as the clock struck twelve, Satan tapped him on the shoulder as he lay in bed, and with a deep hollow voice addressed him as follows: "Hark, ye, right learned Dr. Martin; do you know that for the last fifteen years you have been daily committing acts of Idolatry, and, instead of the body and blood of Christ, have adored and exhibited to others to adore, nothing but bread and wine?" To this most serious question, Luther replied, "I am a Priest, I was ordained by a true Bishop, I acted according to the commands of my superiors; why, then, should I not be said to have truly consecrated?" Satan, to convince him of his error, replied, "This is all true, but Turks and Pagans in their temples perform their rites according to the commands of their superiors." In these difficulties, in this struggle with the devil, I wished to repel my enemy with the arms to which I was accustomed while under Popery. But Satan, urging with greater strength and vehemence, exclaimed, "Nonsense; tell me where it is written that a sinner and an infidel can consecrate the body and blood of Christ?" !!! Are my Protestant readers aware of these pitiful tales? Are they aware that in consequence of as pitiful delusions as are recorded in the history of fanaticism,

or in the annals of religious folly, the doctrine of the real presence was first denied? Finally, are they aware that the frantic ravings of these two madmen are supported by Act of Parliament, and that this alone has rendered them orthodox?

END OF THE LECTURES ON TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

LECTURE VI.

ON COMMUNION UNDER ONE KIND.

THE Doctrine of the Catholic Church, regarding Communion in one kind, is thus defined by the Fathers of the Council of Trent. Session 21.

“The holy Synod, following the judgment of the Church (as pronounced at Constance),* and its usage, declares and teaches, that neither laity nor unofficiating clergy are bound, by any divine command, to receive the Sacrament of the Eucharist under both species; and, that it cannot be doubted without a breach of faith, that communion in either kind suffices for them. For, though Christ, at his last supper, instituted this venerable Sacrament under the forms of bread and wine, and thus delivered it to his Apostles, yet that institution, and that delivering, do not show, that all the faithful, by the command of Christ, are bound to receive both kinds. Nor can it be fairly collected from the discourse of our Saviour (John 6) that communion in both kinds was commanded by him, however according to the various interpretations of the holy fathers and other learned men, that discourse be understood. For he who there said: ‘Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you’—54;—also said: ‘If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever’—

* Con. Constant. Sess. 13. Basiliense Sess. 30. S. Thom., 3 p. q. 80. Art. 12. *Alouinus de ordine celebrandi Missam.*

52. And he who said; 'He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life'—55;—likewise said: 'The bread that I will give is my flesh for the life of the world'—52. He, in fine, who said: 'He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, abideth in me, and I in him'—57;—said notwithstanding: 'He that eateth this bread shall live for ever,'—59."

"Therefore, though in the early ages the use of both kinds was not unfrequent, yet the practice, in process of time, being widely changed, the Church, for weighty and just reasons, approved the change, and pronounced it to be a law which no one, without the authority of that Church, is allowed to reject or alter."—*Ibid.* c. 2.—"It must be acknowledged, that the whole and entire Christ and the true Sacrament are taken under either kind; and therefore as to the fruit, that they who thus receive are deprived of no necessary grace."—*Ibid.* c. 3.

A serious and truly awful charge is instituted against the Priests of the Catholic Church. They are accused "of no less than defrauding the laity of the sacred blood of Christ, by denying them the use of the cup in the administration of the Sacrament of the Eucharist." And this, "contrary to the express testimony of the Sacred Scriptures, in which, we are informed," say their opponents, "we read that the Son of God authoritatively instituted the Eucharist under two kinds, administered it to the Apostles under both, and commanded the same to be given to the laity under the two forms." — But how inconsistent and irrational is not this clamour! With what consistency can the practice of the Catholic Church be arraigned on this point by those who have rejected five sacraments out of seven, and who have reduced the most holy and dignified of all these sacraments to a mere commemorative right? Is the reader

aware of other changes the Reformers have made in this august Sacrament? I will here enumerate a few—1st. They have declared of their own private authority, that in those places where there is neither bread nor wine, the Eucharist may be celebrated by taking for a symbol any thing which in that country supplies the place of bread, or is commonly used for drink. (Beza, Epist. 11, ad. Thoman Frei. & Epist. 25. Du Monl. Nouveaute du Pap. and Bouclier, de la Foy, 76. Rivet in Grat. Drel. Faush. Part 144). 2d. They have retrenched the quality of sacrifice, which the New Testament ascribes to the Eucharist, in those passages which inform us that Christians have an altar; that is to say, a place on which they offer a sacrifice. “We have,” says St. Paul, “an altar, whereof the Jews, who serve the tabernacle, have no power to eat.” (Heb. 13, v. 10). 3d. The word of God represents Jesus Christ blessing the Symbols of the Eucharist, but the French reformed Church has laid aside this benediction by which they are sanctified. They only say: “The bread which we break, is the partaking of the body of Jesus Christ; the chalice of benediction which we bless, is the communion of the blood of Jesus Christ.” These are the words in which St. Paul tells us what is the nature of the Holy Eucharist, and not the words by which it is consecrated. Thus, the saying that the Holy Eucharist is the means by which we partake of the body of Jesus Christ, is not a consecration of it. Add also to this, they do not even say these words but over the first cup; for when it is consummated by the first communicants, they give the others wine that hath not been blessed at all. It is true that some of their ministers say when they distribute it: “This is the blood of Jesus Christ,” but without any design of consecrating it by those words. For which reason some

of them never say them, as they are allowed by an express article of their discipline, and they barely exhort the communicants to remember the death of Jesus Christ. (Ch. 12, art. 8. *Observ. sur l'art. 9, de la Discipline*). And at Geneva itself, at the beginning of the Reformation, they said nothing during the distribution of the symbols. Hence it may be justly said, that having retrenched the consecration of the cup, and even of both the symbols, on them, properly speaking, the guilt falls of having abolished the use of the chalice, not to say that they have totally annihilated the Eucharist, for unconsecrated symbols are not the Eucharist instituted by our Lord. 4th. The word of God informs us, that the Apostles distributed the Eucharist, or as St. Luke says, "broke bread from house to house." (Acts 2, v. 46.) But the French reformers have retrenched the communion from those who by infirmity are confined to their houses, and our English Protestant reformers also, in case they have no one to communicate with them. This is retrenching it from such as are in the greatest want of it; namely, the sick who frequently cannot be removed out of their beds for many years together. This is retrenching it from all Christians at a time when most necessary for them; that is, at the hour of death. 5th. The word of God teaches us, that the first Christians were not less diligent in communicating than they were in receiving instructions, or in saying their prayers: "They were persevering," says St. Luke, (Acts 2, v. 42), "in the doctrine of the Apostles, and in the communication of the breaking of bread, and in prayers." But the followers of Calvin's Reformation have deprived every body of the Eucharist for the greatest part of the year. For, amongst them, one can only communicate from three months to three months, how ardent soever may be one's desire of receiving, or however pressing a person's

wants. Now, what will my kind reader say for these retrenchments, especially when I assure him (body of this lecture), that it is easy to find traces of communion in one kind, both in the Holy Scriptures and in all ages of the Church. But there are no vestiges of the retrenchments made by the Reformers either in the Scriptures or the practice of the Church throughout all past ages. And mind their retrenchments are essential. I admit that many of them see the inconsistency of their accusations against us on this point, as many theologians of the Church of England assert, that Christ never ordained the use of Communion under both species, and that therefore its participation under both species is not essential. Such is the doctrine of Montague, Forbes, White, &c., &c. Luther, the great champion of the Reformation, says positively, "They sin not against Christ's Institution who use one kind only, seeing he has no where commanded us to use both." (Lib. de Capt, Bap. Cap. de Euchar). And in his Epistle to the Bohemians, he says, "Though it be an excellent institution to use both, and that Christ has commanded nothing positive therein, it were better to follow peace and unity than contest about the kinds." Melancthon, who, in the judgment of Luther, surpassed all the Fathers that ever wrote, expressly says, "They sin not who use either kind." (Hist. Sac). The sufficiency of one kind was plainly admitted by the Reformed Church of France, in their ecclesiastical discipline, printed at Saumur, chap. 12, art. 7: "The Minister must give the Bread in the Supper to them, who cannot drink the cup, provided it be not in contempt." And in their Synod, held at Poitiers, an. 1560, the same is allowed. The Church of England, (stat. Edw. 6), orders, "That the Sacrament be commonly administered in both kinds, if necessity does not re-

quire otherwise." Now, if commonly, therefore not always. If for necessity, one kind may be administered; therefore it is not essential to receive both. The learned Bossuet (lib. 2, Var.), tells us, that Luther, because he had not yet done it himself, took it ill of Carlostadius to have given the cup to the laity, and complained, "that he had made Christianity consist in trifles," such as communion in both kinds. Soon after, in his book de Rom. Missa, he establishes Communion in both kinds, but says, "If a Council should either appoint it or permit it, he would, in spite of the council, either receive it in one kind or another." !!!

Again, those persons who charge the ministers of the Catholic Church with defrauding the laity of a part of the Lord's Supper never reflect, that by contesting the real presence of Christ's body and blood in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, *they take away the whole*. And is not this truly *straining at a gnat and swallowing a camel*? Solicitous about the shell and throwing away the kernel; a mere pharisaical virtue, to lay aside Christ's express ordinance and institution with respect to the essence of the Sacrament, where it is plain and evident; and to be litigious for the ceremonial part—the manner of dispensing it. But now to the awful impeachment. "Are the laity deprived of the sacred blood of Christ by receiving the Sacrament of the Eucharist in one kind only, namely, under the form of bread?"

Before I answer this important question, I consider it necessary to lay down a few preliminaries, which, I trust, will very much tend to illustrate it. 1st. "We must not regard any thing in the Sacraments as indispensable, but what is essential; and a thing may be essential in a Sacrament, either intrinsically, that is, from its own intrinsic nature, or extrinsically, namely, in force of an outward

precept." The truth of this preliminary will be clearly seen by referring to some given point in which we all agree,—for example, baptism. Now, from the Holy writings we learn, that, from the beginning, baptism was administered by *immersion*. The Greek word, translated by "to baptize," properly signifies "to dip," as Calvin says on this subject, and this dipping or immersion is confirmed by the example of the Jews baptized by St. John, in a place where there was much water (John 3, v. 23), by the baptism of our Lord in the Jordan (Matth. 3, v. 6), and that of the Eunuch of Ethiopia. (Acts 8, v. 38.) We do not see any example clearly expressed in the Holy Scriptures of baptism administered in any other manner except by immersion or dipping, though we conjecture with reason, that the three thousand Jews who were converted by the first sermon of St. Peter, after the descent of the Holy Ghost, and the five thousand, by the second, were baptized by aspersion, as it does not appear there was a sufficient time to baptize so great a number by immersion, in one day. However, the majority of Protestants and we do not any longer commonly practise dipping, and Protestants maintain that it is not necessary. (Book of Common Prayer, Bapt. of such as are of riper years. Confess. of faith, Scots, c. 38, v. 3.) Now, why has the practice of baptizing by *immersion* been changed into that of *pouring*, as is done by us, and into that of sprinkling, as is done by the generality of our opponents? But, because, the administration of this Sacrament in either way does not affect the essence of the Sacrament, it was not prescribed by Jesus Christ, but, being a matter indifferent in itself, was left by Him for the Church to determine, as circumstances might require. Therefore, my first preliminary stands indisputable. "We must not regard anything in the Sacraments as indispen-

sable, but what is essential ; and a thing may be essential in a Sacrament, either intrinsically, that is, from its own intrinsic nature, or extrinsically, namely, in force of an outward precept."

2d preliminary.—“ The essence of a Sacrament is to be gathered from the grace, or fruits expected to result from the same.”

This, being so clear, does not, I presume, require any lengthened explanation ; but to place it in its proper point of view, I will make an application of it to the Sacrament of baptism. The proper effects of this Sacrament consist in the forgiveness of all sins, whether contracted by original corruption or by our own fault, and of the punishments due to the same sins. D. Thom., 3 p. q. 69, a. 2. But, as I have just observed, this Sacrament was originally practised by immersion, which has been long since laid aside, and principally for two reasons ; 1st, because the essence of this Sacrament does not consist precisely in the quantity of water (provided there be a sufficiency), but in its quality ; nor in the manner of administering it, but in the words of the Institution, which determine the action to its proper meaning, (“ For, according to the Fathers of the Council of Trent, those that are baptized are either *plunged into the water*, or *water is poured upon them*, or *they are sprinkled with water*. Now, whichsoever of these three ways is observed, we ought to believe baptism to be valid. For water is used in baptism to signify the washing of the soul, which it effectuates, and therefore the Apostle calls baptism a *Laver*. But he cannot be more properly said to be washed who is plunged into water, which was long observed in the primitive times of the Church, than he who has water poured over him, as is done in these days, or

than he who is sprinkled with water, as it may be supposed St. Peter did, when, in one day, he baptized three thousand.") 2dly. Because the blessed Jesus left this to be determined by the Church,—a point in which our opponents must agree with us, in order to screen themselves from the guilt of sacrilege, in departing from the original custom. But that the judgment of the Church may stand clear from the least imputation of being *arbitrary*, arise the great and important questions.—1st. Whence are we to be assured, that the essence of the Sacrament, and the grace and effects resulting from this essence are annexed to such given signs? In other words, that sin is forgiven, either by *immersion, or pouring, or aspersion*? 2nd. How are we to know the will and pleasure of our beloved Redeemer in such cases? These important questions lead me to my—

3d Preliminary.—“Where any law is not clear in itself, tradition and the practice of the Church are the only sure interpreters of it.”

This rule is so agreeable to common sense, that we find it takes place with regard to human laws. When human laws are disputed, the settled opinions of men are considered their best expositors, so that when the tenor of a law is obscure, men invariably go back, and see how it was understood and explained from the beginning. And surely this rule must hold much stronger with respect to Divine laws than human. Hence, we find that Apostolic tradition and Scripture are equally the word of God, the one written and the other unwritten; the one the support of the other—Scripture the basis of tradition, and tradition the expositor of Scripture when it is *hard to be understood*, 2 Pet. 3, 16; and a supplement to it *when it is defective*, Thess. 2, 14., which induced St. Augustin to declare that

“ He would not even believe the Gospels themselves were he not induced thereto by the authority of the Church,” Ep. Iund. 4, 5. But, waiving this point for the present as foreign to my subject, I boldly say that the authority of the Church is the only guide we can rely upon with regard to the ceremonial part of the law, under which the administration of the sacraments is certainly to be reckoned. This truth is clearly seen if we only enter into a partial examination of the Jewish covenant. For, although each and every observance were laid down in the most distinct and exact manner, still they were not so detailed as to leave no room for glosses, interpretations, exceptions, and dispensations. On an examination, for instance, of the law of the Sabbath, we find it was most minutely prescribed—in fact, with reference to the necessities of life, it peremptorily forbade, under pain of death, cooking meat on such days, or even making a fire, and still, notwithstanding the severity of this ordinance, it was customary with the Jews on those days to untie a beast, to lead it to water, to draw it out of a ditch, and to exercise several corporal works of mercy, which the Blessed Jesus, far from condemning, highly approved of by example and word. Again, regarding the Sabbath in another point of view, I mean with respect to *the observance of the day itself*, no law could be more explicit and positive : therefore, only the legislator that enacted the law could absolutely reverse or alter it, and still the observance of the Saturday has been transferred to the Sunday ; Protestants have also come into the change, notwithstanding there is not a passage in the written word to bear them out. In vain, they allege, that the Sunday was sanctified by the resurrection of Christ from the grave ; they must bear in mind, that the institution of a new day for the service of God cannot be regarded as an abrogation

of another fixed upon by Divine commandment. Therefore, we have nothing but the living oracle of tradition and Church authority to justify the alteration, and which looked upon the law of the sabbath, as it was attached to any particular day, to be merely ceremonial, and to affect only the Jewish people, to whom such law was given.

The prohibition of eating things strangled and blood, was another law of most ancient date, delivered to Noah and to his children (Genesis, 9), even long before the Mosaical observances; the latter, however, were abrogated by the Gospel, the other, on the contrary, confirmed by the Apostles in the general council of Jerusalem. (Acts, 15, 29.) And still the former have been long since abrogated by tradition and Church authority.

The reason of the Church for so doing has never been contested by our opponents, who have universally received the dispensations from them by practice. But what, in my humble opinion, places the 3d Preliminary on a most firm basis is this, that the Sacraments themselves, in many material circumstances agreed to by our opponents, have been made subject to the same rule. Not to depart from baptism, how many things, even essentially relating to it, have been decided by tradition and the authority of the Church? 1st. The very minister of baptism would be unknown, had not the Church declared who *should be*, and who occasionally *might be*. At its institution, the power of baptizing was immediately given to the Apostles, who were priests of the first order, that is, Bishops; still, in the Catechism of the Council of Trent, we are instructed, that priests of the second order have this power—the right in themselves to baptize; and, by concession, even deacons; and in their absence, that an infant or adult should not be deprived of the necessary means of salvation, as in case of necessity,

the practice of the Church empowers lay-persons to baptize. 2dly. Whether heretical baptism be valid, was for a time controverted in the Church, and determined at last, from the practice of the Church, in the affirmative. 3dly. The manner of administering it, whether by immersion or *pouring*, as has been mentioned, was decided *only* by the Church. 4thly. The necessity of infant baptism is another disputed point; and although it is deduced from the Sacred Writings, still it is not so, or with such a degree of evidence, as completely to silence the many who, on other texts of the same holy records, condemn it. Now, who has decided this great question, if not the Church? And if it be asked, "Why the necessity of infant baptism should prevail, whilst infant communion, which was formerly practised, is laid aside?" what answer is given, but that the practice of the Church pleads for the necessity of the one, and disavows the necessity of the other. *Praevaleat ergo veritas*—let then truth prevail, let us cheerfully and willingly subscribe to what we admit in practice, namely, that "what is indifferent, not essential in the Sacraments, and being left undetermined in the written word, must be supplied from tradition, and the constant and uninterrupted practice of the Church." So true is it, "that where any law is not clear in itself, the practice of the Church and tradition are the only sure interpreters of it." An application of each of these principles to the point under discussion will, I flatter myself, be its fullest vindication.

Having premised thus far, I shall now proceed, under the divine assistance, to the important question—"Are the laity or others, who receive communion under one kind, defrauded of any part of the Sacrament?" I answer, at once, by no means, and this for many reasons:—1st. The

body of Christ is not without his most precious blood in the Host. 2d. The blood of Christ is not without his most holy body in the cup. For "at all times it has been the belief of the Church of God, that, immediately after consecration, the true body of our Lord, and his true blood, together with his soul and divinity, are present under the species of bread and wine; but that the body is there under the species of bread, and the blood under that of wine, by virtue of the words of consecration: moreover, that the body is there under the species of wine, and the blood under that of bread, and the soul under both, in virtue of that connexion and concomitance, whereby the whole Jesus, who, being now risen from the dead, can die no more, is united in all his parts; and the divinity, by that admirable union with the body and soul, which is called hypostatical. It is, therefore, most true, that as much is contained under either species, as under both: for Christ, whole and entire, exists under the species of bread, and under each (divided) particle of that species; and whole under the species of wine, and under its (separated) parts."—*Sess. 13, c. 3.* Hence, it plainly follows, that Christ, whole and entire, is received in either kind; and I thus argue: Whoever receives Christ, whole and entire, body and blood, is not defrauded of his sacred blood; but they who receive the Sacrament in one kind only, receive Christ, whole and entire, body and blood; as has been proved in the Lectures on Transubstantiation; therefore the laity, by participating of the Holy Eucharist only under one form or kind, are not deprived of his sacred blood; consequently, Communion in one kind is not a defrauding of any part of the heavenly banquet.

3. The blessed Jesus, says the Apostle—

Catholic Version.

Rom. 6.

9 rising from the
dead, dieth now no more.

Protestant Version.

Rom. 6.

9 Christ being raised
from the dead dieth no more.

Hence it follows, that wherever his body is it is a living body, not a dead one; a body animated by a soul, and consisting of blood and all the other properties of a living body, but such is the case under either of the forms of bread and wine after the consecration; then Christ is wholly taken and received without division, or diminution under either kind; then, it must be granted, that the receiver is in no way cheated, or defrauded of any share of the Heavenly Gift. 4. The divine person of Jesus Christ subsists in two natures, from which it follows, that as the body of Christ has no other subsistence than that of his Godhead, which is really one with His essence, so, wherever His Body is, there is—there must be, His Divinity. Then, the body, the blood, the soul, and Divinity, the whole Christ himself, is perfectly contained under each species, for whatever is said of the bread after consecration, must by *concomitance* be said of the consecrated cup. 5. John, 6. 57, we read “He that eateth my flesh abideth in me and I in him.” But Christ is not eaten, but under the form of bread, therefore under this form is not only His most sacred body, but His most precious blood—the whole Christ. 6. The belief of the great portion of Christians, who hold the doctrine of the real presence is, that in the Holy Eucharist they receive the true, living, and entire body of Jesus Christ, but in the principles of our opponents, who maintain that they receive not Christ whole and entire under the form of the bread, it comes to pass that so often as their ministers celebrate the Lord’s Supper, and in the suppo-

sition that they had power to consecrate, they put to death the Lord and Giver of Life by separating his body from his blood; a thing impious and absurd. But did not the Blessed Jesus institute this Sacrament under the two forms? Most certainly Christ instituted the Sacrament under the two forms; but let us bear in mind that the institution of a thing means its production only, whereby its nature and substance are established and ordained, but the institution of anything *in itself* does not prescribe the use of it: a precept is farther required. Besides, there is a difference between instituting the Holy Eucharist under the forms of bread and wine, and obliging all to receive them. God instituted marriage, but all are not obliged to marry. Christ likewise instituted the priesthood and episcopacy, but all are not obliged to be priests or bishops. Therefore, unless there be a direct, a positive precept produced, which obliges all, without exception, to receive the Sacrament in both kinds, the institution alone cannot import any such general obligation. But our opponents urge, that although the institution of anything does not prescribe the use of it, and that a precept is further required, still, according to them, it imports a precept that when it is administered it be done in the manner it was instituted, as appears in other Sacraments. Therefore, as our Saviour was pleased to institute the Holy Eucharist, both in the Consecration and Communion, under both kinds, it follows, that under both forms it is to be administered. In answer I beg to reply—1st. That certainly the institution of a Sacrament imports a precept, that when it is administered nothing substantial or essential be omitted; a rule which has no room in what is only accidental, and does not affect the essence of the Sacrament. 2d. There is something peculiar in this Sacrament which is in no other, even concerning the substance of it. For

the same substance, whole and entire, being contained under either of the forms, it must be granted, that whoever receives either the consecrated bread, or drinks the consecrated cup, receives the whole substance of the Sacrament, and consequently a true Sacrament. 3d. Again with regard to the substance of this Sacrament, all that can be gathered from the words of the institution, is that it is to be consecrated and received by the officiating priest under both forms ; no command is given about the laity, because no one of them was then present. But did not our Beloved Redeemer say, drink ye all of this ? (Matth. 26, v. 27). Before I explain to whom these words were directed, I beg to remark—The principle of Protestants is this, to admit nothing as certain in religion, but what is evidently taught in the word of God. Standing now to this principle, by what authority do they say, that wine must be put into the cup, and administered in the dispensation of this Sacrament ? There is no passage of the Holy Scripture evidently clear concerning this point, there is not a single passage in the Holy Scriptures that points out the liquor to be used in the chalice. Strange, that they who profess they have no certainty but what the word of God evidently teaches, cannot tell whether water or wine should be used in the sacred cup. And no Christian, according to their principle, would ever drink of it, were he to defer till they had shewn what ought to be the matter of it. They may contend that our Lord says, “ I will not drink of the fruit of the vine till the kingdom of God come.” (Luke 22, v. 18.) But then these words were, according to St. Luke’s relation, pronounced before the institution of the Eucharist. For, after the relation of them, he adds, “ and,” or, as those of Geneva have translated it, “ afterwards, he took bread and broke it.”

But to return to my subject.

I grant that Christ has said, “ Drink ye all of this ;” but I beg to premise that, 1st. It must be allowed by all parties that some of the many things our Beloved Redeemer said and did at the institution of this Sacrament, as well as at other times, were addressed to the Apostles *personally*, several were directed to them *as priests*, and, through them, to their successors in the ministry, and neither the former nor the latter to the whole body of the Church.

2. Whenever our Beloved Redeemer enjoins, or his faithful interpreter St. Paul inculcates to the Church in general the use of this Sacrament, under the notions of eating and drinking, it is evident, from comparing the several texts together, that it is not these distinct actions, or the manner of partaking of the Sacrament, that are prescribed, but only its substance and reality, or, in other words, that by eating and drinking is meant no more than receiving Christ’s body and blood.

3. In the institution of this adorable Sacrament, the Catholic Church wisely judges two things are to be duly considered and properly distinguished, namely, that it is not only a Sacrament, but also a Sacrifice ; the former refers to the whole body of the Church, the latter belongs to her ministers—bishops and priests. The candid reader will please not to lose sight of these premises when he reads my answer.

I grant, therefore, that Christ has said, “ Drink ye all of this ;” but, it must be observed, that he then made the Holy Eucharist a Sacrifice as well as a Sacrament, and that he ordained his twelve Apostles only (who were then present) to consecrate this Sacrament, and offer this Sacrifice. Now, for the perfection of the Sacrifice, it is requisite that the victim should be not only really present, and, at least

mystically immolated, but also, for its completion, that the officiating priest—he who had immolated the victim, by mystically separating its body and blood—should consummate it in both these kinds. Hence, the command of Christ was directed to the Apostles, or priests alone, and not to the laity, as communicants.* Conformably to this doctrine, neither our priests nor our bishops receive under more than one kind when they do not offer up the sacrifice. In fact, St. Mark confines them to the Apostles alone in his recital of the Institution of the Holy Eucharist: “And they all drank of it.” (Mark, 14, v. 23.) We must not, therefore, extend the meaning of these words of our Lord, “Drink ye all of it,” farther than St. Mark has done in the following, “And they all drank of it.” The precept contained in the first sentence manifestly extended only to those included in the last, namely, to those who just before received from their Divine Lord and Master’s hands the consecrated bread, but without the formal injunction with which he delivered to them the cup, of bidding them partake *all* of it, such a caution being entirely unnecessary, because, blessing the bread and breaking it, he gave to each one his respective portion; but in giving them the cup, he further admonished them to divide it among them, that the last might not be deprived of his share. Thus, taking into consideration all the circumstances of this injunction, it does not appear that it was, or even could be, directed to any others than to the Apostles or to their successors in the same capacity,

* The acute apologist of the Quakers has observed, how inconclusively Protestants argue from the words of the institution. He says, “I would gladly know how these words, ‘Do this,’ or take, bless, and break this bread, and give it to others, must be understood of the Clergy; but take and eat, but do not bless, &c., of the Laity.” Barclay’s Apology. Prop. 13, p. 7.

to whom in the person of the Apostles Christ said presently after, "*Do this in remembrance of me;*" to them to whom he gave the power to do what he *then* did, namely, to consecrate and distribute the Eucharist as well as to receive it. This makes good the observation, that many things were addressed to the Apostles personally, and many in their priestly capacity. For several other circumstances that accompanied this act of our Blessed Lord at the Last Supper besides what I have just mentioned, confirm the alleged injunction to have been spoken to them in *one*, or *both* of these manners. For they were the privileged persons selected from the rest of his Disciples, to become eye-witnesses of the many mysteries that preceded his sacred Passion. They were distinguished with the honour of having their feet washed by their Divine Lord and Master. They alone were admitted to eat with him the Lamb of the Passover, to see this figure consummated in a change thereof into the blessed Body and Blood of the Immaculate Lamb of God, then immolated by Himself in an unbloody manner under the forms of bread and wine, in commemoration of the bloody immolation, which was to be made the next day for the sins of the world. Finally, they were on this occasion, as I have before remarked, made priests of the new law, and empowered by Him to do what he did, that is, consecrate and minister the Sacrifice of his Body and Blood. Our opponents may still reply, that although several discourses were addressed by the Blessed Jesus to the Apostles in their personal, and in their priestly capacity, still others were addressed to them as the representatives of the whole Body of the Faithful, and that they look on the two precepts, "*Drink ye all of this,*" and the other, "*Do this in remembrance of me,*" to have this different relation, namely—the former belongs to all the Faithful, the latter to themselves

and their successors. But, admitting for a moment the objection in general, I beg leave to ask, how are we to collect and determine the different direction of Christ's discourses? He himself has not qualified them; they were usually addressed to the same persons, and in the same manner. Again, the Evangelists have not unfolded the mystery, therefore it is to tradition, at last, one must be obliged to appeal and to accept for our guide. And with respect to the two precepts under discussion, tradition has declared them both to affect the Apostles in their personal and in their priestly capacities; the close connection of the one with the other, and joined to the above recited circumstances, shew their relation to be *one* and the same, and therefore the comment of our opponents upon them must be judged, I regret very much to say so, *wholly arbitrary and without foundation*.

Again, it is worthy of observation, that the word *all* in the Scriptures is not always taken for all men or all things, but often for *all* of a certain kind; otherwise that of St. Paul (Philippians, 2, v. 21,) "all seek the things which are their own" should comprehend the just: "and all have sinned," (Romans, 3, v. 23,) should comprehend Christ himself: "and all cried crucify him," (Matth. 27, v. 22,) should also refer to the Apostles—which are most untrue; therefore, if the word *all* is to be taken universally for all, then the Sacrament is to be given to Turks, Jews, and heathens, and will our opponents admit this? Besides, if the words "drink ye all of it" be supposed to have been addressed to all the faithful, it must be further shewn, from the Holy writings, that this precept is essentially binding; for there are several precepts in the Holy Scriptures that are not essentially so. Jesus Christ, for example, said to his disciples, "If, then; I, being your Lord and Master, have washed your feet, you ought also to wash one another's

feet." "For I have given you an example; that as I have done to you, so do you also." (John, 13, v. 14, 15.) Our Lord even spoke in this manner after he had told St. Peter that without this washing he should have no part with him. Yet, it is agreed, the Apostles did not regard this command of washing one another's feet as absolutely necessary. And the Church teaching that Jesus Christ did not then institute a Sacrament, but only performed an act of humility, it is not believed to be of indispensable obligation. In the same manner, the Apostles assembled at Jerusalem prohibit the eating of blood, calling their prohibition a necessary thing, and join it to that of idolatry and fornication. (Acts, 15, v. 28, 29.) Yet, in regard of this prohibition, the testimony of the Church is depended on, which confines the necessity to the first ages of Christianity, when charity required great condescension, owing to the weakness of the Jews. Thus, in the present case, we ought to believe the Church when it testifies that the receiving of the chalice is not absolutely necessary.

But why believe the Church? 1st. Because, when any law is not clear in itself, the practice of the Church and tradition are the only sure interpreters of it, which St. Paul seems, as the Fathers of the Council of Trent have it, not obscurely to insinuate when he says—

Catholic Version.

1 Cor., 4.

1 Let a man so account of us, as of the ministers of Christ, and the dispensers of the mysteries of God.

Protestant Version.

1 Cor., 4.

1 Let a man so account of us, as of the ministers of Christ, and stewards of the mysteries of God.

2dly. Because, he who said, "Unless you shall eat of the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood you shall not have life in you,"—has likewise said, "If any one

shall eat of this bread, he shall live for ever." And he who has said, "Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath life everlasting,"—has also said, "The bread which I will give, is my flesh, for the life of the world." And lastly, he who has said "He who eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, abideth in me, and I in him,"—has nevertheless said, "He who eateth this bread shall live for ever." (Sess. 21, c. 1.) Thus, since our beloved Redeemer has given no warrant for Communion in one kind, nor made prohibition against it, we easily arrive at the legitimate and practical conclusion, that the matter was left free by our Lord, as a point of discipline, to be regulated by the authority of his Church. But, then, the Church bases her practice of giving Communion in one kind alone on the very example of Christ himself, who, if the night before he suffered, celebrated the Eucharist in two kinds, still, on the very day of his triumphant resurrection from the grave, administered it under one kind; namely, of bread, to the two disciples that were going to Emmaus. And, independently, that, in the style of the New Testament, the breaking of bread signifies the Eucharist; and particularly, in the writings of St. Luke, we have the authority of Calvin, (on St. Luke, 24, v. 30,) who says, that St. Augustine and several other Fathers understood this passage of the Holy Eucharist: and adds from himself, that it will appear pleasing to say, that Jesus Christ was discovered in the spiritual mirror of the supper.

The language of St. Luke on this fact is peculiarly striking—

Catholic Version.

St. Luke, 24.

30 And it came to pass,

Protestant Version.

St. Luke, 24.

30 And it came to pass,

Catholic Version.

whilst he was at table with them, he took bread, and blessed, and brake, and gave to them.

31 And their eyes were opened, and they knew him : and he vanished out of their sight.

Protestant Version.

as he sat at meat with them, he took bread, and blessed *it*, and brake, and gave to them.

31 And their eyes were opened, and they knew him ; and he vanished out of their sight.

So; vanishing out of their sight immediately after he gave the bread and they knew him, no time was left for the benediction and consecration of the chalice. Unquestionably this fact speaks volumes for the truth of our doctrine. But to return.

We find the same thing in the Acts of the Apostles, in the second chapter, v. 42 and 46, where St. Luke speaks twice of the Eucharist of the first Christians of Jerusalem. And in the 20th chapter, v. 7, he speaks of the Eucharist of the Christians of Troas of whom Antiochus was one, mentioning in all these places only the species of bread, "When they were assembled," says he, "to break bread." 2, v. 46, "breaking bread from house to house." 2, v. 42. "They were persevering together in the doctrine of the Apostles, and in the communication of the breaking of bread, and in prayers."

I am aware that Kemnitius (in Examen. Conc. Trident.) says, that the *breaking of the bread* means also the consecrating and giving of the chalice by the figure *Synecdoche*, by which part is taken for the whole. This is, however, only an imaginary explanation of these texts, and by no means grounded on good authority ; by a similar liberty of explaining away passages of the Holy writings, any doc-

trine, though ever so impious and absurd, may be said to be read in any text, be it ever so plain.

Again, we have, likewise, the authority of St. Paul, who, in speaking of the Eucharist, represents it under one kind only. He says—

Catholic Version.

1 Cor., 11.

27 Therefore, whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and of the blood of the Lord.

Protestant Version.

1 Cor., 11.

27 Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink the cup of the Lord, unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.

Here the Protestant version is corrupted! by putting “and drink,” (contrary to the original “he pine,”) instead of “or drink.” The Rev. Mr. Grier, who has attempted to vindicate the purity of the English Protestant Bible, has nothing else to say for this alteration of St. Paul’s epistle than that in what they falsely call “the parallel texts of St. Luke and Matthew,” the conjunction “and” occurs! What an absurd excuse for so gross a corruption of the Holy Scriptures! How truly melancholy must not that cause be which cannot be supported without falsifying the sacred word of an inspired Apostle!

In the mean time, we see the Apostle’s solicitude is not for the number of kinds we are to receive, but regarding the dispositions with which we are to approach to this august Sacrament; hence, he teaches us, that by receiving one kind only unworthily, we are guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.

But, independently of all these direct scriptural proofs, I

find in the Holy Eucharist, received under one kind only, the principal uses for which this Sacrament was instituted.* It was instituted for three principal reasons :—

1. That, by approaching to it, we might receive the body and blood of Jesus Christ, and both one and the other are found in each of the two species, as the body and blood of the Saviour of the world cannot be separated any more ; because, as St. Paul says, (Romans 6, v. 9), “ He dieth now no more.”

2. The Eucharist was instituted to impart to us the grace merited by Jesus Christ (John, 6, v. 52), and this grace is wholly communicated to us in each of the species, as it is not a sensible object divided between the two.

3. The Eucharist was instituted to be a memorial of the death of Jesus Christ, and nothing hinders the faithful, who receive one kind only, from applying their minds in a lively manner to this commemoration ; and the reception of the second is not necessary for the acquittal of this duty ; for which reason, our Lord, having distributed the consecrated bread, said immediately, without waiting for the consecration of the chalice, “ Do this for a commemoration of me.”

* We see that the faithful of the Old Testament, who partook only of the Lamb, that had been immolated for them, nevertheless received the whole effect of the sacrifice. With how much more reason may we say, Christians will partake of the sacrifice of the Lamb of God, who takes away the sins of the world, when they receive only the species of bread in which the blood is united to the body. We may likewise observe, that in regard of the manna and the water of the rock, which were very distinctive, and clear figures of the body and blood of Jesus Christ as present in the Holy Eucharist, for our spiritual nourishment, the Jews did not keep the water in the ark, but the manna only, (Heb. 9, v. 4), as Catholics reserve the sacred bread in their tabernacles, and not the consecrated wine.

Referring, however, to the Holy Writings, I beg to call attention to two unquestionable principles :—

1. Though the Scriptures should not even say any thing, as Protestants pretend, to induce us to approve of Communion under one kind, still they cannot justly condemn it ; for,

2. They themselves practice many things regarding the administration of the Sacraments not found in the Holy Scriptures.

To the proof of the first. The Scriptures nowhere say, that the imposition of hands should be discontinued in the Church, which Christians received after baptism, and which we now call Confirmation ; (Acts 8, v. 17) : yet this has been abolished by many of the Reformed churches. They do not say that the same unction should be laid aside, which the primitive Church administered to the sick for the recovery of the health of their bodies, and particularly for the remission of their sins ; (James, 5, v. 14) : yet this also has been abolished, without hesitation. And in regard of the imposition of hands, which the Holy Scriptures represent in all the ordinations of the Apostolic times, many of them have, without the authority of any passage of the Sacred Writings, declared it an unnecessary ceremony, not appertaining to the substance of ordination, and called the contrary superstitious. For which reason, in some of the Protestant Churches, the imposition of hands was omitted in the ordination of their ministers. From which I conclude, that they who totally abolish several Sacraments manifestly established in the Holy Scriptures, cannot justly condemn the Catholic Church for laying aside the use of the sacred chalice in the Holy Eucharist,—they who declare, without supporting it by any passage of the word of

God, that the imposition of hands, so solidly established in it, is not essential to ordination should not assert that the union of both kinds is essential to the Sacrament of the Eucharist, because the union of the chalice with the sacred bread is proposed in the word of God. For after having retrenched the imposition of hands, which was received after baptism, which is expressly said, (Heb. 6, v. 1, 2), to appertain to the foundation of the Christian religion, as faith, penance, baptism, the articles of the resurrection, and of the last judgment, they should blush to reproach the Church with the retrenchment of the chalice, which the Holy Ghost never thus pronounced essential or fundamental.

Now to my second principle.

It is impossible to have a certain knowledge from the Holy Scriptures that we are not bound to administer the Eucharist to infants by the force of these words: "Except you eat my flesh, and drink my blood, you shall not have life in you." Nothing can be more unreasonable than upon this occasion to allege the duty of commemorating our Lord's death in the Holy Eucharist, which infants are not capable of doing, since they are equally incapable of being instructed in faith and repentance, belonging by authority of the Holy Ghost to the Sacrament of Baptism, which is, notwithstanding, administered to them. The Holy Writings do not evidently teach that priests of an inferior order have the power of consecrating the Eucharist, for at the institution, Jesus Christ speaks only to the Apostles, who were the first bishops of the Church. The Holy Scriptures do not manifestly say what prayers or words are necessary for the consecration of the Symbols; even Protestants themselves have not regarded as necessary for the Eucha-

rist the words spoken by Jesus Christ in the institution of it since in many places they have left it to the option of their ministers to say what they please. At Geneva, they distribute it in profound silence, and this without being able to support either one or the other way by evident declarations of the Scriptures. Thus, there being several practices which are regulated without the direction of any clear light of the Gospel, it is manifest, that the Church may regulate the dispensation of the chalice though the Gospel should not have in any manner intimated a liberty of abstaining from it.

But to conclude.

1st. If, according to the principles of the Catholic Church, Christ, whole and entire, is received under either of the species.

2. If he has not authoratively ordered the Sacrament to be administered under the two kinds.

3. If he himself administered it under one—namely, of bread.

4. If the Apostles, as St. Luke testifies, have done the same.

Finally. If Protestants believe and practise many things which are not clearly set down in the Sacred Scriptures, why then reproach the Catholic Church with laying aside the use of the sacred chalice, and only permitting, conformably to the command of Christ, the officiating priest to partake of it? Why, I say, reproach her with defrauding the laity of half a Sacrament?

Surely, this comes with bad grace from those who, by denying the real presence, take away from their followers the whole and entire Sacrament—the whole source of grace—Christ himself under the Sacramental forms. But,

in spite of these clamours and calumnies, the Catholic Church, *guided by the Spirit of Truth*, will ever continue as *irreproachable* in her discipline as she is in her articles of credence without error—“*the gates of hell shall not prevail against her.*” Matth. 16, 18.

LECTURE VII.

OBJECTIONS AGAINST COMMUNION UNDER ONE KIND.

Catholic Version.

John, 6.

54 Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you.

Protestant Version.

John, 6.

53 Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.

From this our opponents infer, 1st, that we are commanded not only to eat, but likewise and expressly to drink; 2d, that this command is given indiscriminately to all; and 3d, that the Institution by Christ was under the two forms, which, so far from presuming to alter, we are most strictly bound to observe. I might reply, that this text is in an useless manner urged by our opponents, since the majority of them hold, that the sixth of John has no reference whatsoever to the holy Eucharist; consequently nothing can be alleged from it against Communion under one kind. But such is the belief of the Catholic Church; namely, that in it is contained the *promise*, and are also mentioned the admirable effects of the Sacrament of the holy Eucharist; so I might meet the objection by replying, that the text in question necessarily imports a precept, but whether it be one of necessity, and binding under sin, as in other cases;

so in the present, recourse must be had to the Holy Writings to know the meaning of the speaker. For instance, Matthew, 9, we read, that the blessed Jesus, having cured two blind men, charged them—

Catholic Version.

30 saying, see that no man knows this.

31 But they going out, spread his fame abroad in all the country.

Protestant Version.

30 saying, see that no man know *it*.

31 But they, when they were departed, spread abroad his fame in all that country.

Now, I ask, will our Protestant friends say that these two men sinned, or that Christ intended to bind them to silence? But, even supposing that the question implies a precept—unquestionably it is one that regards the thing received, and not the mode or manner of receiving it. For is not one of the principal means for the preservation of the spiritual life, acquired by baptism, contained, as I have proved, under either of the forms, and conveyed when so received? Hence, the blessed Jesus says, “..... he that eateth me, the same also shall live by me.” Which is more clearly seen by considering, 1st, the occasion when the words “Except,” &c. were said; it was when the Capharnaites appeared incredulous to believe that the Redeemer could give them his flesh to eat and his blood to drink—their doubt was then not regarding the reality, but the *possibility*. 2d. In the text alluded to, no mention is made of either the bread or wine, but of what is contained under them. 3d. We should bear in mind that when the blessed Jesus speaks of the forms, he more frequently does so of the bread. 4th. And the concluding words of the discourse, “he that eateth this bread shall live for ever,” (v,

58,) teach that no question was then instituted regarding one or other of the forms, but of the possibility. 5th. The copulative conjunction is usually taken in the Holy Writings for the disjunctive. Acts, 3, 6. "Silver and gold I have not," in this verse, the sense is disjunctive, and means, I have neither silver nor gold. Thus, when St. Paul says, "he that eateth and drinketh unworthily," means he that eateth or drinketh, which is done, as is proved, under either of the forms. 6th. We should also observe, that the particle, "except," or "unless," includes in it a denial or negation, and, when found at the beginning of a copulative proposition, affects all the members of the sentence, according to the idiom of the Hebrew language. Thus, in the Hebrew, we have—"The wicked do not rise in judgment, and the sinners in the council of the just;" in the Catholic Bible it is thus read—"the wicked shall not rise again in judgment, nor sinners in the council of the just." So, when we read—"except you eat of the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood," we are to understand, if you shall not eat the flesh, &c., and if you shall not drink, &c., you shall not have life eternal; and from this arises this affirmative disjunctive proposition, "he that shall eat," &c., or, "he that shall drink," &c. That such is the true meaning of the text is manifest from the verses that precede: "I am the living bread which came down from heaven; if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever;" and from the verses that follow: "he that eateth me, the same also shall live by me, and he that eateth this bread shall live for ever." From all which, it is clear, that our beloved Redeemer clearly states, that the receiving of the Sacrament under one form is sufficient to life eternal; since he speaks of the bread as *of his own flesh, his flesh and blood, and himself*, and promises to all who receive the bread life eternal. Finally, with respect to what is objected from the Sacra-

ment being instituted under the two forms, which they say we are most strictly bound to observe, I confess, that they cannot consistently maintain that all our Lord's commands, in the institution of a Sacrament, are indispensable. I, at least, cannot see any connexion in their doctrine on this subject. They will have it, that the union of the two species, found in the words and example of our Lord, in regard to the Eucharist, is essential; and yet they will not allow that immersion, which is likewise recommended in baptism by the express command and example of our Lord, is essential. If they would consider these two points impartially, they would acknowledge, that they cannot shew from the Holy Scriptures, that it is more essential in the Eucharist to make use of the holy chalice, by drinking it, than it is essential in baptism to use the water of immersion. The water of which Protestants receive some drops on their faces in baptism is not applied to their bodies in the manner pointed out by the Holy Scriptures, which only speaks of dipping. In the same manner, the precious cup, which the faithful only see, is not received by them in the form pointed out by the Holy Writings, which only speak of drinking it. There is not, therefore, in this regard, any theology consistent with itself but that of Catholics, which equally relies on the testimony of the Church, both where it says that our Lord's command respecting immersion does not enjoin a form absolutely essential for the reception of baptism, and which teaches that our Lord's injunction concerning the chalice does not point out a form absolutely essential for the reception of the holy Eucharist.

2d. Objection.

Luther (*L. de Captiv. Bab. C. de Eucharis.*) thus argues —“ To the same persons is said *to eat* to whom also *to drink*. Therefore, the Sacrament under the two forms is to be given either to the priests only, or to the laity. If to the laity,

then it follows that to all is said *eat and drink*, and they must get the cup; if to the former only, then no part must be given to the laity." The great Father of the Reformation then adds, "I confess myself to be overcome by this unanswerable reason, neither have I read, heard, nor found what to say against it!!" But, that the reader may see how weak this specious reasoning is, and consequently how superficial the reading of Luther, I beg, in reply, to admit, that to the same persons is said to eat, to whom also to drink—namely, the Apostles. I grant also, that the Sacrament, whole and entire, is to be also given to the laity, but I deny what is inferred from these truths—namely, that to receive this Sacrament whole and entire, it is necessary for the laity to drink of the cup, for I have already proved, that the whole and entire Sacrament is truly and essentially under either form. Neither do I admit, that if the whole Sacrament under the two forms be given to the priests, and not to the laity, then are they not to receive any portion of it; for though Christ himself did not give it to them, still he commanded his Apostles to do so when he said, "Do this," &c., which words were said after the consecration of the bread, and not of the chalice. And if St. Paul says, "This do ye, as often as you shall drink, for the commemoration of me," (1 Cor. xi, 25) these words do not mean the necessity of drinking, but the manner and end thereof.

3d. Objection.

The practice of communicating under one kind only is condemned by the contrary practice of the Church, which, during the first thousand years, administered Communion under both kinds to the laity.

In answer, I beg to reply, that the practice, for the first thousand years, certainly favours Communion under both

kinds; but as, agreeably to what we read in the writings of eminent sacred historians, the Church allowed during the whole of that period, the sick, the traveller, the persecuted Christians, to receive under one kind only, it becomes perfectly clear, that the reception of the Sacrament by the faithful under both kinds was never judged essentially necessary, but that it was uniformly considered as a matter of variable discipline. Proceeding upon this, as upon all other points of changeable discipline, the Church has varied her practice, according to persons, time, and circumstances. In the earliest times, the sick were frequently communicated in one kind only. Infants, newly baptised, were allowed to receive under the form of wine only. It is well known, that for domestic Communion, the faithful used to carry home the sacred species of bread only, in little gold caskets, specimens of which have been found in the Vatican Catacombs, and may be seen delineated and described in that curious and elaborate work, *Hierurgia, or the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass*, by Rev. Dr. Rock, vol. i, p. 273. In the learned and interesting Section II. of Chapter Second of this work, which treats of Lay Communion, will be seen Communion under one kind, proved to have been administered even from the time of the Apostles, as testified by the Acts of the Martyrs, by Tertulian, St. Cyprian, St. Dionysius of Alexandria, and others. In after ages, the Church thought proper, for prudent reasons, to abolish the reception of the cup by the laity, opposing, as Dr. Rock well observes, the faith of the Hussites, "who asserted the use of the cup to be necessary," by an article of discipline, according to the circumstances. But this might be changed again, if other circumstances called for such an alteration.

"Those who profess the slightest knowledge of Christian antiquity (says the learned Dr. Coombs),* must be aware,

* Coomb's *Essence of Controversy*.

that during the above-mentioned period, it was usual to communicate the faithful in the Church, and, during the Sacrifice, under both kinds; but, as it was necessary to attend to the wants of the absent, and particularly to the sick, it was customary to reserve for that purpose particles of the consecrated bread only. Of this practice relating to the sick, to children, to persons on journies, and to those who lived in times of persecution,* there are incontestible monuments beyond calculation." Hence, the great St. Thomas of Aquin, deservedly styled the Angel of the Theological School, remarks, " that the perfection of the Sacrament of the Eucharist consists not in the use of the faithful, but in the consecration of the matter; and that, therefore, it is no derogation from the perfection of this Sacrament, that the people should receive the body without the cup, provided the priest who consecrates receive under both kinds." (3 Par. Que. 80, art. 12, ad. 2.)

4th. Objection.

Was it not in the Council of Constance, held in 1416, first determined to deprive the laity of the cup? No, by consulting ecclesiastical history we find that in the twelfth century, only the officiating priest and infants received under the form of wine, which discipline was confirmed at the beginning of the fifteenth century by the Fathers of the Council of Constance. I shall here set down, for the information of my kind Protestant reader, the substance of the thirteenth canon of this Council regarding this important matter. It barely defines that some circumstances of the Institution, (namely, that it took place after supper—that

* Infants, St. Cypr. de lapsis.

Persecuted Christians, Tert. lib. 2, ad Uxorem C 5, and St. Cypr. de lapsis.

Sick, St. Dyonisius Alex. Apub Euseb. lib. 6, Hist. c. 44.

the Apostles received without being fasting, and that both species were consecrated,) are not obligatory on all Christians. However, we have several instances of Communion under the form of bread only, and in the very first ages of Christianity. I beg to refer my reader to the very interesting story of Serapion, preserved by Eusebius.* (Hist. lib. 6, c. 144.) The great St. Basil,† and the illustrious St. Ambrose,‡ the distinguished lights of the fourth century, were both communicated, under one kind only, a little before death, as we learn from the respective historians of their lives. (Amphil. de Basil. Paulin de Ambros. No. 47.)

But then, in the order for administering the sacrament, prepared by certain bishops and clergymen, and enforced by a royal proclamation, issued by King Edward 6th in 1548, it is expressly required, that all persons are to receive

* Eusebius was Bishop of Cæsarea, in Palestine, and the confidential friend of Constantine the Great. Besides his invaluable Ecclesiastical History, in Ten Books, he is the Author of other invaluable works, some of which are extant. He died in the year 338.

† Basil, surnamed "The Great," for his admirable eloquence and profound erudition, was raised to the See of Cæsarea, in Cappadocia, and died in 379, leaving many valuable works.

‡ St. Ambrose died in 397, having held the See of Milan twenty years, with great profit to the Church; he edified and instructed the Western Provinces by his writings. These are numerous, comprising "Commentaries on many parts of Scripture," and moral treatises.

St. Augustine was Bishop of Hippo, in Africa, and himself an African: his works are very numerous, and his name, on account of the erudition of these works, their vast researches, and their deep insight into all the ways of the Divine economy, has ever borne the greatest weight in all the Christian churches. He illustrated the close of the fourth and the beginning of the fifth centuries, in the Latin Church, while St. John Chrysostom, (the most learned and accomplished scholar of an age, which in every branch of science could boast of great men,) shone in the East. St. Augustine died in 430.

under both kinds, except necessity otherwise required. Now, I appeal to the candour and impartiality of my reader, and ask, if certain individuals, supported by the civil authority only, could pronounce that in cases of necessity, persons might receive under one kind alone, does it not follow that the question is not a matter affecting the essence of the Sacrament, but a point of discipline, and that the whole Church of Christ, assembled in a general council—assisted by our Redeemer, agreeably to his promises—and taught by the spirit of God—could alter and modify the practice according to the existing circumstances of the times?

Fifth Objection.

All the Eastern Churches at this day communicate the laity in both kinds, and think it unlawful to do otherwise.

I beg to reply by saying that, though I admit the general practice of the Greek Church is to receive under both kinds, yet there is a splendid exception, which is exhibited during a considerable portion of the year. There is no Consecration in Lent, except on Saturdays and Sundays, and whenever priests or laymen communicate on other days during that season, they receive under one kind only, and use the consecrated bread preserved for the purpose. A vestige of this discipline is still maintained in the Western Church in the service of Good Friday. This appeal, therefore, to the Eastern Churches proves, that both kinds are not necessary to the use of the Sacrament. Besides, amidst all the angry controversies between the Greek and Latin Churches, we find not the smallest contention, not even the beginning of any discussion, on this subject.

Sixth Objection.

But has not Pope Gelasius stigmatized the profane innovation of administering it only under one kind? And has

he not said, " Let the people either participate of both parts of the Sacrament, or be hindered and kept from both ?"

Kind reader, Gelasius succeeded to the pontificate thirty-two years after St. Leo,* and finding still that the Catholics occasionally did not receive the cup, and that the Manicheans could not be effectually detected, commanded all to receive under both kinds. But he did this, not because the reception of one kind alone was unlawful in itself, but lest the Catholics should by degrees become imbibed with the errors of the Manicheans, who abstained from the cup, because they held wine to be the gall of dragons, and did not believe that Christ truly died and shed his blood, as is evident from the words of St. Augustine. (Lib. de Hæres, c. 46). Gratian,† who relates the

* The Pope St. Leo the Great, understood that certain Manicheans, the better to conceal their heresy, communicated with the Catholics, but privately assembled at other times for their own heretical worship. The zealous pontiff, to mark them out effectually, proclaimed that those who always abstained from the cup, should be considered Manicheans; for these heretics abhorred wine as the gall of dragons, and therefore when they communicated they only received under one kind. This makes it evident that the Catholics frequently did the same, though on a different principle; otherwise the Manicheans would not have ventured upon a practice which must at once have betrayed them by its singularity. The Pope, then, proceeded to the most effectual means of detecting who were Manicheans by urging the reception under both kinds, as a disciplinary regulation required by the circumstances of the time. What he denounced as a sacrilege, and is often cited against Catholics, was not the abstaining from the cup, for the Catholics occasionally did this, not holding its reception necessary; but the abstaining of the Manicheans from principle, because these heretics abhorred wine, as created by the evil spirit.

† The following are the words of Gratian: " Erant quidem sacerdotes, qui ordine debito, consecrabant corpus et sanguinem Christi :

fact, considers Gelasius's words as directed to certain priests who received the sacred host alone when they officiated or celebrated mass. Gelasius wondered at this, and orders them to receive both kinds, because it is sacrilegious to separate the sacred mysteries. However, it is to the purpose to remark, that the authenticity of this Epistle of Gelasius is very doubtful; it is not found in his genuine works; it was never quoted before the twelfth century; and as Dr. Hawarden remarks, Gratian and Metaphrastes, are of pretty equal authority.

And here, I trust, these answers will suffice to satisfy my kind Protestant reader. I hope he has long since seen that the clamours against the Catholic Church on account of communion in one kind are wholly unjustifiable. I shall now conclude this Lecture in the words of the learned Manning: "Surely, if there were any positive command to oblige all to receive the Sacrament of the Eucharist in both kinds, I may confidently say, it is wholly improbable the universal Church, in any age whatsoever, could be so blind as not to see it; and if they saw it, I ask, what motive her bishops and pastors could have to combine together in a resolution to commit a damnable sin, by forbidding what Christ has commanded, when there was neither honour, nor interest, nor pleasure to induce them to it? And yet it is an incontestible fact, that two general Councils (and general Councils have always been regarded as the representatives of the Universal Church) decreed that the Sacrament should not be administered to the laity in both kinds. It

corpus sumebant, sed a sanguine abstinebant. De quo miratur Gelasius, et dicit se nescire, qua superstitione hoc faciebant; et præcipit, ut aut ambo sacramenta, sicut consecrant, et accipiant; aut ab utrisque cessent; quia in sacrificante unum sine altero accipere sacrilegium est." Apud Gratianum.

is therefore plain that when they made this law, they were convinced in their hearts of two things. 1st. That the people were not injured by receiving it in one kind. 2d. That there was no command to oblige them to receive it in both. And if neither they nor the great lights of the primitive church could ever discover any such command, it looks rather like a chimera than a probability, that a set of "obscure factious persons, without mission, or authority from any lawful superior, should be more intelligent and clear-sighted in divine matters than they, and see things wholly unseen before."

ADDENDA

TO THE

LECTURES ON COMMUNION UNDER ONE KIND.

THE Council of Constance, held in 1416, was convened, not only for the purpose of extinguishing the celebrated Western schism, but also to condemn the errors of Wickliff, John Huss, and Jerome of Prague. John Wickliff was a native of Yorkshire, was educated at Oxford, and Professor there of Theology, with great reputation. Being disappointed in his expectation of the principality of Canterbury College, and the Pope Clement VII. refusing him the bishopric of Worcester, to revenge himself, he became "one of the household," a most violent enemy to the Church, and broached, among forty-five errors condemned in this council in forty-five propositions, the following, which he taught publicly:—"That the Church of Rome was not the Chief Head or Supreme Mother of all other Churches, but the synagogue of Satan; nor the Pope the immediate vicar on earth of Christ, and the successor of St. Peter; that neither Pope, nor Archbishops, nor Bishops, had or have any pre-eminence above other prelates. That the substance or material part of the bread and wine remained in the blessed Sacrament of the altar after Consecration; and that Jesus Christ is not really present, but only in figure. That when a man is contrite or sorry for sins he may have committed, the confessions of sins to a Priest is superfluous and to no purpose. That after Urban VI. no longer any Pope was to be acknowledged, but thencefor-

ward people were to live according to their proper or special laws. That it is ridiculous to give any credit to the benefit of indulgences granted by the Pope or Bishops." Besides these errors, similar to those of the Arch-Reformer, Luther, and his followers at the present day, and many others, he endeavoured to establish equality and independence among mankind. This created a general insurrection among the peasants, and great mischief ensued. His heresy spread throughout this nation, and elsewhere. Wickliff was condemned in a National Council, held at London in 1381, and King Richard published a declaration against the Wickliffites. His errors were condemned, as I have just said, in the Council of Constance. He died at Lutterwood, in Yorkshire, in 1384, but his body was taken up from the grave, and his bones were burnt to ashes.

John Huss, a Bohemian, was Rector of the University of Prague, and being highly delighted with the doctrines of Wickliff, commenced to deliver them from the pulpit, and by his persuasive and eloquent manner attracted vast crowds of disciples. How true it is, that if the pulpit, designed to be the principal mover of human opinions and of human actions, be managed with dexterity, then must its operations be peculiarly injurious. But to return to Huss, he was not only satisfied with teaching what was subversive of the then established religion, but also breaking down the fences of civil and ecclesiastical power; he boldly maintained this damnable principle, "That princes and magistrates, and all others in the state of mortal sin, are deprived, *ipso facto*, of all power and jurisdiction." Who does not see the direful consequences which must necessarily follow from such a diabolical doctrine? After Huss had broached such heresy, and made Bohemia the theatre of anarchy and tumult, he obtained a passport from the Emperor Sigismund,

commanding the governors of the provinces through which he was to pass, not to molest him on his journey to the Council of Constance, but to afford him every aid and protection. Instead of standing his trial and retracting his errors, he attempted to make his escape, and disseminate his errors at Constance! Then it was he was arrested and confined, that he might stand his trial, after having broken his promise, and returned the passport which was granted him, for the purpose of exculpating himself or retracting his errors. The Council, after having used every lenient measure, pronounced sentence of deposition against him, and delivered him over to the secular power. (*Brachio Sæculari*). It is to be observed that the Church and State are two different powers, each having its peculiar line; the Church has no power to decide on any thing except what is spiritual, and the Fathers assembled at Constance did no more than exercise their spiritual authority or power, as appears from the sentence of deposition pronounced against Huss. "This Sacred Synod of Constance, considering that the Church of Christ has nothing farther to do, decrees to leave John Huss to the judgment of the State." In the mean time he was tried by the Secular Power, and according to the then existing laws of Germany, was committed to the flames as an obstinate heretic. And still this is imputed to the Catholic Church. But why charge the Catholic Church with the severity of the Imperial laws? Is my reader aware that the 27th Canon of the third Council of Lateran pronounces "that Ecclesiastical discipline does not inflict bloody punishment?" Huss was condemned to the flames in 1415, and Jerome of Prague underwent the same fate in 1416.

LECTURE VIII.

ON THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS.

THE Doctrine of the Catholic Church respecting the Sacrifice of the Mass is thus defined by the Fathers of the Council of Trent. (Sess. 22, C. 1.) “ Although Christ our Lord was to offer himself once to his eternal Father on the altar of the Cross by actually dying to obtain for us eternal redemption, yet as his priesthood was not to become extinct by his death, in order to leave his church a visible Sacrifice suited to the present condition of men, a Sacrifice which might at the same time represent to us the bloody Sacrifice consummated on the Cross, preserve the memory of it to the end of the world, and apply the salutary fruits of it for the remission of the sins which we daily commit ; at his last supper, on the very night on which he was betrayed, giving proof that he was established a priest for ever according to the order of Melchisedech, he offered to God the Father his body and blood under the appearances of bread and wine, and under the same symbols gave them to the Apostles, whom he constituted at the same time Priests of the New Law. By these words, ‘ Do ye this in remembrance of me,’ he commissioned them and their successors in the priesthood to consecrate and offer his body and blood, as the Catholic Church has always understood and taught. For, after having celebrated the ancient Passover which the children of Israel immolated in remem-

brance of their delivery from the bondage of Egypt, he established the New Passover, giving himself to be immolated by his priests in the name of his Church under visible signs, in memory of his passage from this world to his Father; when, redeeming us by his blood, he delivered us from the power of darkness, and translated us into his kingdom."

Our doctrine, therefore, is simply this: "We believe that the Mass is a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice, offered for the living and the dead." I am aware that Protestants are displeased that the Sacrifice of the Mass is made available to the faithful departed, and that not a word to this effect can be found in the New Testament. Let them hear a short and satisfactory answer. Our Redeemer at his last supper expressly, and without any limitation and reserve, declared, (Matth. 26, v. 28) that the sacred oblation was offered for the remission of sins; and as we may infer from his words (Matth. 12, v. 32), that some sins are forgiven in the next world, it will therefore follow by an inevitable consequence, that what is offered to God for the remission of sins in general, will benefit the faithful departed as well as the living. But to return. "We believe that the Mass is a sacrifice commemorative of that offered once upon the cross, and a continuance of the same, the victim being the same Jesus Christ who is truly offered on our altars; and the priest being the same, our High Priest Christ Jesus, by whose authority and in whose name the priests of the Catholic Church act, and by which the merits of Christ's passions are applied to our souls.* We also believe that the Sacrifice of the Mass differs from that of the Cross only in

* I beg my kind Protestant reader to peruse and ponder the following eloquent and feeling testimony of the great Leibnitz:—"Nor do I see what is here wanting to the true nature of a sacrifice, for why may

the manner in which it is offered ; namely, that it is offered in an unbloody manner ; and in its effects, the merits of the atonement being applied to our souls by the oblation of the Sacrifice of the Mass. We also hold that the Sacrifice of the Mass does not detract more from the merits of Christ's passion than baptism does." For though, according to the Sacred Scriptures, the propitiation and expiation of sin cannot be acquired without the real effusion of blood, still, according to the same written word, this propitiation may be applied several ways without a present effusion of blood, as by baptism. It is on account of this application of the blood of Jesus Christ made therein to the souls of the faithful, that we say the Mass is a propitiatory sacrifice, that is to say, a sacrifice that renders God propitiatory to men, and that it does not detract more from the merits of Christ's passion than baptism does. But to return. " Finally, we believe that though the Mass is sometimes offered in honour of the Saints, and in commemoration of their triumphs, it is never offered to them, but to God alone, from whose grace those triumphs were derived. Hence, the priest does not that which is present under the symbols be offered to God, since the species of bread and wine are proper for an oblation ; and in these consisted the oblation of Melchisedech ; and because what is contained under these in the Eucharist is the most precious of all things, and most worthy to be offered to God ? Therefore by this most admirable invention, the divine goodness enables our poverty to bring a gift which God cannot reject ; and as he is infinite, and whatever else could proceed from us could bear no proportion with his infinite perfection, so no libation could have been found capable of propitiating God, which was not in itself also infinite : for in a wonderful manner it is effected, that Christ in this Sacrament so often as the consecration takes place, always giving himself over again to us, may be always again offered to God, and by that means may represent and signify the perpetual efficacy of his first oblation which was made upon the Cross."—*Leibnitz. Systema Theologiae*, p. 284.

not say ' I offer this sacrifice to thee, Peter or Paul,' but he presents the victim to God alone ; and while he returns thanks for the favours bestowed on the saints, he implores their patronage, that they, whose actions are recorded on earth, would interpose in favour of poor mortals before the throne of grace." For, in regard to the adoration which is due to the Divinity, the doctrine of the Catholic Church upon this subject is, that this important act of religion consists chiefly in believing that God is the Creator and the Lord of all : and in attaching ourselves to Him with all the feelings and faculties of our souls by the exercises of faith, confidence, and love, as to a Being who alone is capable of imparting happiness to our affections, by communicating to us an infinite good, which is Himself. To this interior adoration, which we pay to God in spirit and in truth, there are always appended certain exterior marks, the principal of which is sacrifice. Sacrifice, therefore, is a tribute which can be presented solely to the Almighty ; because it is a public testimony, and a solemn protestation of His sovereignty, and of our absolute dependence upon Him. Here I deem it necessary to add, that when we say that the Mass is offered in an unbloody manner, we mean, with Bossuet, not by effusion or separation of Christ's blood from his body, as took place once upon the cross ; for Christ is now immortal and impassable. And when we say that the Mass is an unbloody sacrifice, it is for this reason, that although the effusion of our Redeemer's blood is represented by the separate consecration of the wine, yet there is a mystical and not a real separation or effusion of the sacred blood. But still this does not hinder us from firmly believing, that the sacred blood is materially present, and materially offered. Nor does this belief render our retention of the phrase " unbloody" at all inconsistent with the doctrine of

Transubstantiation. A bloody sacrifice is one where the victim is killed, and its blood poured out : but Christ died once, and can be slain no more ; therefore, though we offer his real blood, our sacrifice is rightly styled unbloody. To be more explicit. The Sacrifice of the Mass is exceedingly different from the sacrifices of the Jewish law ; it is a sacrifice spiritual and worthy of the sanctity of the new alliance ; a sacrifice in which the victim is seen only by the eye of faith ; in which the word is the sword that mystically separates the body and the blood ; and in which consequently the blood is shed, but “mysteriously,” and death exhibited only as a memorial ; a sacrifice, however, that is truly real, because Jesus Christ is really therein contained ; and really in it, under these symbols of his passion, offered up to his eternal Father :—a sacrifice still of commemoration which, so far from detaching us, as the Protestant pretends it does, from the sacrifice of the cross, does, on the contrary, by all this variety of circumstances, attach us even the more forcibly to it ; because, not only is the former in our belief referred wholly to the latter, but it subsists solely by this relation, and from it derives the whole of its sacred efficacy.

Such is our doctrine regarding the Mass, which, before I proceed to substantiate from the written word, I must premise by respectfully submitting that the word Mass* is not to be found in the Holy Scriptures ; it is taken

* Special mention is made of the Mass not only in St. Augustin (237 Sermo de Tempore), St. Ambrose, (C. 5, Ep. 33,) St. Leo (Epist. ad Dioscorum, 81) ; but also in several ancient Councils, as 2d of Carthage, Can. 3 ; 4th, C. 84. Valentinum, Can. 1, 2. Vaseuse, Can. 4. 3 Arelatense, Can. 3. 1 Aurelianum, Can. 28 ; and 3 Aurelian, Can. 14 ; and Conc. Milevat, Can. 12 ; and Rom. Sub. Silvestro, 1 ; and the Council called Agatheuse, Can. 47. Surely the ancient usage in the

from a Latin word, which the primitive Church had inserted in the Liturgy, to acquaint the people that the office was finished, and that they might go away. But the Church might learn from the Holy Scriptures to use the name of a part to signify the whole: for example, in the Old Testament, the word Ephraim often signifies the ten tribes; and in the New, the whole week is often signified by the word Sabbath. How unworthy, therefore, of a Christian is it to condemn the sacrifice of the Mass, because the word Mass is not to be found in the Holy Writings! There is no Christian who does not know, that all the words which express the most important truths of the Christian religion, as, for example, that of Sacrament, that of Trinity, are not in the Gospels. In like manner, none would certainly insist on our having every word pointed out in the Holy Scriptures of which the Liturgy of the Mass is composed. No Christian Church ever pretended to shew in it all the words and ceremonies it employs in the celebration of the Holy Eucharist. But then, we must remember, that the essence and substance of our Holy mysteries, in the celebration of which the Church has established some ceremonies and different prayers, are found in the Holy Writings, and, in this sense, we say that Jesus Christ and his Apostles said Mass. The first Mass was said by Jesus Christ when he instituted the Holy Eucharist. Our Lord then took bread and wine, and blessed them: he made them his body and blood. (Matt. 26, v. 26.) Thus he placed the victim that expiates our sins upon the sacred table, and put it there in the form of a victim, because he made a mystical separation, by putting his body under the species of bread, and his blood under the species of wine. Thus, the sacred primitive Church, of words not to be found in the Holy Writings, argues greatly for the antiquity of the doctrines signified by them.

table became an altar, on which our Lord, having lifted up his eyes to Heaven, exposed to the view of his Father the victim of our reconciliation. He afterwards took it up from the altar to give to his Apostles to eat; they partook of these sacred gifts, and recited a canticle of thanksgiving. These are the facts we find in the account which the Gospel gives us of the institution of the Eucharist: there is no Catholic that does not see here every thing that is essential to the Mass. Now that the Apostles said Mass, St. Luke teaches, when he says, (Acts 13, v. 2,) “as they were ministering to the Lord, and fasting, the Holy Ghost said to them; separate me Saul and Barnabas.” For this ministration is what we mean at this day by the word Mass. The same truth is found in Acts, 2, v. 42, where the same Evangelist says, the first Christians—

Catholic Version.

42 Were persevering in the doctrine of the Apostles, and in the communication of the breaking of bread, and in prayers.

Protestant Version.

42 And they continued stedfastly in the Apostle's doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers.

That is to say, according to the language of these times, they assiduously attended at Mass; for the Mass is nothing but a composition of instructions and prayers, and of the celebration of the Holy mysteries of which St. Luke speaks in this passage. Christians are, then, bound to believe this doctrine, though the word Mass is not to be found in the Scriptures. I shall close this remark in the beautiful language of St. Paul to the Philippians, 2, v. 17, where he says,—

Catholic Version.

17 Yea, and if I be made a victim upon the sacrifice and service of your faith, I rejoice, and congratulate with you all.

Protestant Version.

17 Yea, and if I be offered upon the sacrifice and service of your faith, I joy, and rejoice with you all.

We see the Apostle declares, in the most forcible manner, that the sacrifice of the Mass was a truth, in defence of which "he was prepared to shed his blood." He says, "If I be made a victim upon the sacrifice of your faith." Now what was "the sacrifice of their faith" but the sacrifice of the Mass, the great sacrifice of the New Law, as "the High Priest of our confession," (Heb. 3, v. 1,) signifies Jesus Christ, the sovereign sacrificer, in whom we profess a belief? The Apostle then speaks in this verse of a sacrifice that was the object of the faith of the primitive Christians, and he speaks of it in a sort of Holy transport of love, and affirms, that he would be happy to lay down his life for it.

Having premised thus far, I beg leave to lay down a few unquestionable principles, which, I trust, will elucidate more clearly the important subject under discussion—

1st. Religion, or the true worship of God, must be divine by institution, ordinance, and revelation. It is too sublime to have originated in, or to have proceeded from any mortal man, much less from the reveries, rhapsodies, &c., of illiterate, self-conceited, modern philosophers, fanatics, &c.

For, it is evident from the Sacred Scriptures, that God did not leave the ordinance or arrangement of the worship which He exacted of man, to the will, choice, arbitration of man himself—to his option and institution; by no means; God himself, the creator of man and his Sovereign Lord, reserved that to himself as man's Sovereign lawgiver

also. Hence, no sooner had God created man, and settled him in Paradise, than he exercised his dominion over him by a command and a forbiddance; by the observance of which man was to testify to his Creator and Lord his dependence on him and his subjection to Him, and his Creator's absolute dominion over him. This was the religion of man in his state of original justice and innocence. But, alas! short the duration! man shortly fell from that happy state by his disobedience to his Maker. On this unhappy event God was pleased to appoint anew the rite or rites by which man should continue to testify the dominion of his Creator over him, and his own dependence on his God, of whom he held his being and life. Thus we clearly see, that as well in his original state of justice, as, after man's fall, God was the author of religion. Hence, we conclude, it is divine by institution, ordinance, and revelation. Now, if it be asked how God signifies his will, or how he speaks to man? we answer, either by special inspiration, revealing to man his will, or by the ministry of an Angel. St. Paul to the Hebrews, 1, v. 14, says, speaking of the Angels, "Are they not all ministering spirits, sent to minister for them, who shall receive the inheritance of salvation."

2d. Man alone, by the image which his Creator has stamped of himself on his immortal soul, is capable of knowing, loving, and glorifying his God and supreme Lord: "The light of thy countenance, O Lord, is signed upon us. Thou hast given gladness in my heart." Psalm 4. "That was the true light, which enlighteneth every man that cometh into this world." St. John, c. 1, v. 9. Hence, as this capacity in man is the basis of excellence, it must be the prime object and duty of man to know his Creator, and thence to acknowledge Him by adoring and glorifying Him. And as God is the Sovereign and independent Lord

of all things, and man himself dependant on Him, this calls on man, an intelligent being, not only for the interior submission of his mind, will, and whole soul, but also for the exterior homage of his body. It also engages man to address himself, under all his wants and necessities, whether of soul and body, to this his Supreme Lord.

3d. This address man makes to God, by humble and confident prayer, and by the several exercises of Religion, of which the principal are, adoration, praise, thanksgiving, supplication, all contained in that primary act, namely, Sacrifice. Hence it must be regarded as fully essential to Divine Religion; and as we cannot suppose man to exist without holding an intercourse with his Creator, which is only kept up by acts of Religion, so Religion cannot be supposed to be Divine where there is no sacrifice.

4th. This, therefore, principal act of worship, by which God would have man pay Him homage, and which we call sacrifice, was from the beginning the ground act of true Religion, both in the law of nature, and under the law of Moses; continues yet to be such, and will continue to be so to the end of ages. "Cain, the first-born of Adam and Eve, offered to God by sacrifice, the fruits of the earth. Abel, the second Son, offered by Sacrifice to God, the best of his flock." Gen. 4. Noah, in going forth from the ark after the deluge, sacrificed to God, according to God's own appointment, beasts and birds that had been preserved in the ark for that very purpose. *Ibid.* 8. Melchisedech offered in sacrifice bread and wine. *Ibid.* 14.

In the law of Moses, there were three sorts of sacrifices; Sacrifices of Holocaust, Eucharistical sacrifices and propitiatory and impetratory sacrifices. In the sacrifices of Holocaust, the victim was entirely consumed, to shew the sovereignty of God, and to impress on the mind of man a more

lively idea of God's infinity. The Eucharistical sacrifices were ordained in order to praise God for his favours and graces conferred upon his creatures. Lastly, the propitiatory and impetratory sacrifices were appointed to obtain pardon of God for our sins and other necessary blessings and graces men stand in need of. Now, all these represented the great sacrifice of the new law, but the Eucharistical sacrifices, in particular, were an admirable figure of it.

There the people, being reconciled to God, to whom they had offered a sacrifice of peace, ate the victim that had been offered to him, which for this purpose was carried from the altar, that was, as it were, the table of God, to the private tables of the Israelites. Thus also, God being perfectly appeased by the victim presented to him in our sacrifices, the faithful and well-disposed Christians enjoy the ineffable advantage of receiving Jesus Christ, and of thus celebrating the most holy of all sacrifices. Among the Eucharistical sacrifices, we ought here to take particular notice of that of the Passover. It was, at the same time, a sacrifice and a sacrament; a sacrifice, because the Paschal Lamb was offered to God on his altar; and a sacrament, because after it was offered, it was eaten by the Israelites, and was to them a memorial of their deliverance from the slavery of Egypt. In the same manner, the mystery of our altars is a sacrifice, because Jesus Christ, our Pasch, is there offered to God on the altar; and a sacrament, because the faithful receive him there, to nourish them in the hope of everlasting life, and to recall to their minds the redemption purchased by the blood of Jesus Christ. In the same comparative manner, our baptism, which succeeded Circumcision, is only a sacrament, as circumcision was only a sacrament; and our Eucharist is, at the same time, a sacrifice and a sacrament, as

the Passover, which preceded it, was also a sacrifice and a sacrament.

5th. Though sacrifice in general is every rational, Christianlike, and moral act of man, whether internal or external, offered to God with the intention to worship Him, the Supreme Being; hence, prayer, praise, adoration, supplication, sorrow for sin, in a word, every thought, word, and deed, may be made a sacrifice to God. "Offer to God," says the Royal Prophet, "the sacrifice of praise." Ps. 49. "A Sacrifice to God is an afflicted Spirit." Ps. 50. "The lifting up of my hands, an evening sacrifice." Ps. 140. Still, sacrifice, in the proper sense and meaning, is, in the New Law of Christ, an "external offering of some one or more things visible and perceptible, made to God by a lawful and duly appointed minister, attended with the destruction or total change of the thing or things offered and sacrificed." By this destruction or total change, the sovereign and absolute power and dominion of God over man and the whole creation is acknowledged as to life and death, also his wisdom and goodness, and mercy to man, and man's total dependence on God his Creator and Sovereign Lord.

6. Hence, to effect properly a sacrifice, the act of offering and the thing offered must be—

1. External and perceptible by the senses. Hence, acts, purely internal and occult, are not a sacrifice in the appropriate meaning.

2. The sacrifice must be made to God alone, for to Him alone is sacrifice due and permitted to be offered. "The Lord thy God shalt thou adore, and Him only shalt thou serve." Matt. 4, 10. "I the Lord, this is my name, I will not give my glory to another, nor my praise to graven things." Isaiah, 42, v. 8. Wherefore, at no time did any man or set of men offer sacrifice except to God the Su-

preme Being ; or, as the Infidels did to an object that they blindly and erroneously conceived to be the Supreme Being, and would set up and honour as such.

3. Sacrifice true and proper must be offered by a minister lawfully appointed to that purpose by a lawful ruler, divinely authorized and empowered to ordain and appoint the person to perform that ministry. “ Do this for a commemoration of me,” said Christ to his Apostles, “ and to no others.” Luke, 22, v. 20, and St. Paul, Heb. 5, v. 4. “ Neither doth any man take the honour of the ministry to himself but he that is called by God, as Aaron was.”

4. The victim, or thing offered in sacrifice, must be either destroyed, or totally changed as to its substance.

..... “ It is thou, O Lord ! that hast power of life and death.” Wisd. 16, 13. Moreover, to acknowledge that mankind, by his original disobedience to God his Creator, merited the death implied by the destruction, or total change, of the victim substituted in his place, through the pure mercy and clemency of his offended God.

Lastly, that God has a sovereign right to dispose of man and of all things according to his will. “ Whatsoever the Lord pleased, He hath done in Heaven, in Earth, in the Sea, and in all the deeps.” Psalm, 134, v. 6. Even to reduce them to their original nothing, whence his Almighty hand had created them.

Having laid down these unquestionable principles, I shall now proceed to support the Catholic doctrine of the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass from the Sacred Writings.

The first scriptural citation to be noticed is from the Prophet Malachi,*—

* This name signifies the Angel of the Lord : he was contemporary with Nehemiah, and by some is believed to have been the same person as Esdras. He was the last of the Prophets, in the order of time, and

Catholic Version.

Malachi, 1.

10 I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord of Hosts: and I will not receive a gift of your hand.

11 For from the rising of the sun even to the going down, my name is great among the Gentiles, and in every place there is sacrifice, and there is offered to my name a clean oblation, for my name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of Hosts.

Protestant Version.

Malachi, 1.

10 I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord of hosts, neither will I accept an offering at your hand.

11 For from the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same my name *shall be* great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense *shall be* offered unto my name, and a pure offering: for my name *shall be* great among the heathen, saith the Lord of hosts.

In this text of the Prophet, three things are conspicuous: 1st. The pointed rejection of the ancient sacrifices, accompanied with a severe reproach of the Jewish priests: "I have no pleasure in you, and I will not receive a gift at your hands." 2d. The substitution of a new and better sacrifice in their stead: "And in every place there is sacrifice, and there is offered to my name a clean offering." 3d. A plain intimation or prediction, that this one new and clean sacrifice should be offered in every place: "And in every place," &c. But a Protestant may say with Calvin and Chemnitz,* that we are to understand this sacrifice, not in the real and absolute meaning of the term, but only flourished about 400 years before Christ. He foretold the coming of Christ: the reprobation of the Jews, and their sacrifices; and the calling of the Gentiles, who, he says, shall offer up to God in every place an acceptable sacrifice.

* Instit. lib. 4, c. 18. No. 4, et 2 parte Exam. p. 760

of a spiritual sacrifice. This, however, cannot be the case, for the Prophet uses the same word *mincha* in both places, (or, according to the Parkhurstian method, *menché*,) where he speaks of the sacrifices rejected, and the new sacrifice to be instituted. Add, also, to this, in foretelling the rejection of the Mosaic sacrifices, the Prophet only repeats what had been previously foretold by the other great Prophets. Isaias had said that the Lord hated and would not abide the Sacrifices, Sabbaths, and festivals of the Jews, but he also predicted another sacrifice in their place—

Catholic Version.

Isaiah, 19 ch.

19 In that day there shall be an altar of the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt.

21 And (the Egyptians) shall worship him with sacrifices and offerings.

Protestant Version.

Isaiah, 19 ch.

19 In that day shall there be an altar to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt, and a pillar at the border thereof to the Lord.

21 And the Lord shall be known to Egypt, and the Egyptians shall know the Lord in that day, and shall do sacrifice and oblation.

And Jeremias, also, foretelling the perpetuity of Christ's kingdom of the Church, promises that there shall be a perpetual priesthood, and sacrifice :—

Jerem. 33 ch.

18 Neither shall be cut off from the priests and Levites a man before my face, to offer holocausts and to burn sacrifice, and to kill victims continually.

Jerem. 33 ch.

18 Neither shall the priests the Levites want a man before me to offer burnt offerings, and to kindle meat offerings, and to do sacrifice continually.

Here, then, under the type of the Levitical priesthood, is foretold the perpetuity of the Christian priesthood. The Prophet Malachi, therefore, plainly foretells the rejection of the real sacrifices of the Jews; and he uses a word which implies true and proper sacrifice, both when he speaks of what were to be rejected, and of what was to be substituted. Consequently he must have meant a true, and not merely a spiritual sacrifice.

Besides, the word he uses is invariably found in other parts of the Scriptures to express the ancient sacrifices properly so called; but, when the spiritual sacrifice of prayer and good works is mentioned, there occurs on every occasion an additional word, which either expressly or by implication conveys the intended meaning. Again, how can this clean oblation, which was to be introduced in opposition to the sacrifices of the law, be understood of the performance of good works, when this latter kind of sacrifice, figuratively so called, had been already enforced in the strongest terms, both by the Law and the Prophets? Had not the Mosaic dispensation already required a love of God, which was to regulate every faculty of the soul, and to control every action of the creature? Had not the Prophets continually enforced the necessity of good works, in the strongest and most energetic language? Is there a single virtue or perfection which can adorn the soul of a Christian to the attainment of which the most earnest exhortations may not be found in the immortal strains of David or in the venerable remains of the other Prophets? How, therefore, can we, by any possibility, understand the promised oblation of the new law as referring to good works, when such works of every description had been before so powerfully recommended? The words of the Prophet must then be understood of the great sacrifice of the new law, the Mass. I am

aware that some Protestant writers may possibly apply them to the great sacrifice of the new law, but as they say this is not sufficient to prove that this sacrifice is a propitiatory one, I beg to answer, "The Prophet foretells one sacrifice to be instituted for the many of the old law, it must, therefore, answer all their ends ; one of these was propitiation for sin, therefore the new sacrifice of the Mass must be propitiatory." Again, the prophecy cannot be understood of the actual sacrifice of the "Cross," for that was offered only in one place, and not among the Gentiles. Nor can it be merely understood "of spiritual sacrifices," I again repeat it. For this must be offered by all the faithful, and not by priests only, as Malachi has it. Again, we must remember, the Prophet speaks expressly of priestly sacrifices ; foretells the rejection of such alone ; predicts a new and clean sacrifice to be offered in place of the sacerdotal oblations ; and, further on, promises a purified priesthood to offer acceptable sacrifice to him : "He shall purify the sons of Levi, and shall refine them as gold and as silver, and they shall offer sacrifices to the Lord in justice." Malachi, 3, v. 3. If such be, and such unquestionably is, the interpretation of the prophecy, what must be said of the Reformed Church ? Long since has it rejected and entirely abolished the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, the only one of the new law from the Liturgy. This fact is attested by unquestionable testimony. They have, therefore, no sacrifice. Their service consists in nothing more than in praise and thanksgiving to the Lord, in chaunting and organ, supplication, a commemoration of the Lord's last supper, and in hearing sermons, and the whole resting more on human persuasion than on Divine Revelation with divine faith in the Church of Christ. May it not be said of it, "They sit without sacrifice, without altar, and without ephod, and without

teraphim." (Osee, 3, v. 4.) "Neither is there at this time holocaust, or sacrifice, or oblation, or incense." (Daniel, 3, v. 38.) But to return to my subject. In close connexion with the prophecy of Malachias, may be presented those remarkable words of the Blessed Jesus to the Samaritan woman, in which he not only seems to allude to the words of the Prophet, but plainly foretells the great sacrifice of the Mass. The woman said to our Blessed Saviour—

Catholic Version.

St. John, 4.

20 Our fathers adored on this mountain, and you say,* that at Jerusalem is the place where men must adore.

21 Jesus saith to her: Woman, believe me, that the hour cometh, when you shall neither on this mountain, nor in Jerusalem adore the Father.

22 You adore† that which you know not: we adore that which we know; for salvation is of the Jews.

23 But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true adorers shall adore the Father in spirit and in truth.

Protestant Version.

St. John, 4.

20 Our fathers worshipped in this mountain; and ye say, that in Jerusalem is the place where men ought to worship.

21 Jesus saith unto her, Woman, believe me, the hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, nor yet at Jerusalem, worship the Father.

22 Ye worship ye know not what; we know what we worship; for salvation is of the Jews.

23 But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth.

* Deut. 12, v. 5.

† 4 Kings, 17, v. 41.

It is clear that the Samaritan woman's question was certainly on the public adoration of sacrifice, for private adoration and prayer might be offered everywhere. She wished our Beloved Redeemer, whom she had discovered to be a Prophet, to settle for her the so long disputed question between the Jews and the Samaritans, "Which was the proper temple for the exclusive Adoration of Sacrifice, that at Jerusalem, or that on Mount Garizim? You say that at Jerusalem is the place where men must adore." Let us bear in mind, the word *adore* is often used in Scripture to mean the supreme adoration of sacrifice.* But what now was the answer of the Blessed Jesus? "Woman, believe me, the hour cometh when you shall neither on this mountain, nor in Jerusalem, adore the Father..... But the hour cometh, and now is, when the true adorers shall adore the Father in spirit and in truth." Is it not clear that our Saviour's answer was, that the time was close at hand when the sacrifices of both temples would be abolished, and, as Malachias had foretold, a clean oblation should be offered, not in any particular place, or temple, but in Christian Churches in every part of the world? The Jews and Samaritans offered carnal sacrifices, but our Lord foretells spiritual sacrifices in their places: "The true adorers shall adore the Father in spirit." But the sacrifices of old were only figurative, whereas the new are real and true; spiritual, but real, as distinguished from carnal, but true, as distinct from figurative. These words, therefore, "The true adorers shall adore the Father in spirit and truth," can allude to no other than to the great sacrifice of the New Law, for if it be said that they refer only to the spiritual sacrifices of praise and thanksgiving, I answer, that such could have been always offered; whereas our

* Genesis, 22, 5. St. John, 12, 20. Acts, 8, 27.

Beloved Redeemer speaks of new oblations for which "the hour cometh and now is." I answer further, that merely spiritual sacrifices of prayer and praise might be offered in private, but our Lord speaks not of private offerings of the heart, for his words directly answer the inquiry of the woman, which was of the public adoration of sacrifice.

Kind reader, in the foregoing interesting discourse of the Blessed Jesus, you have heard "salvation is of the Jews;" permit me to submit to your religious feelings, that "Besides the Jews, the Samaritans were perhaps the only nation upon the earth, that believed and adored one God as a spiritual and a perfect Being, and, as appears from St. John, they alone, like the Jews, expected a Redeemer and a Messiah. Not one grossly erroneous tenet of faith or morals can be substantiated against them; they, perhaps, only erred in not admitting all the sacred books of the Jews as canonical, a difference which no modern liberality would dare to condemn, as wounding the essentials of religion. In fact, their only crime was schism, in its most mitigated form: they had a rival temple, yet even in this, their Priesthood was derived in unbroken succession from Aaron, and their worship was in strict conformity to the Mosaic institutions. In addition to those extenuating circumstances, there was much in their character which pleaded strong in their favour. Their hospitality was so remarkable, that a Roman Emperor erected a statue in their city to the hospitable Jupiter, in conformity, says an ancient historian, with the genius of the nation. Their charity was so superior, that our Saviour chose it as the model proposed in the most beautiful of his parables. (Luke, 10, v. 33.) He had also expressly remarked, that the only one of the ten lepers who returned to give thanks, was a Samaritan. (Luke, 17, v. 16.) Their docility was such that,

though in a state of rivalry and jealousy with the Jews, he made in two short days a considerable number of disciples among them. (John, 4, v. 39.) In a word, so prepared were they for the sublime truths of the Gospel, that with a docility not equalled among their neighbours, they instantly yielded to it on the preaching of Philip, (Acts, 8, v. 5 and 9,) and with such unanimity, that it could be said, that in consequence 'there was much joy in that city.' It was with a woman of this nation that Jesus held a most interesting conference at the well of Jacob, and though her life had evidently been far from regular, he accosted her with that winning affability which ever distinguished his sacred deportment. He concealed his real character, but she soon discovered him to be a prophet, and accordingly appealed to him, saying, 'Our fathers adored on this mountain, but you say that Jerusalem is the place where men should adore.' (John, 4, v. 20.) In other words, she begged him to settle the great question of the religious differences between the Jews and Samaritans. Now, what was the answer of the Blessed Jesus? Her very appeal to a Jewish prophet shewed that she was sincere and confident in her persuasion; did Jesus fear to unsettle her belief, and therefore, by evasion, soothe her in her false reliance? She argues upon the most specious and most common palliative of error. 'Our Father,' says she, 'adored upon this mountain.' Does he dread to wound her feelings, or to shock the prejudices of her education? Slight as were the dissenting principles of these sectaries, amiable and charitable as may have been their characters, ripe as they were for Christianity, affable and conciliating as the interview had hitherto been, no sooner is the important question put, than he makes no allowance, no compromise, but answers clearly and solemnly, 'Salvation is of the Jews.' (John,

4, 22.) Yes, notwithstanding the faith and good works of the Samaritans, still, "Salvation was not found among them; because they were a schismatical society, whose leaders and assemblies had not come down in an uninterrupted line from the leader which Moses had established. On the contrary, notwithstanding the dreadful disorders that then reigned among the Jews, salvation was to be sought for in their society, because they were descended from the leaders and assemblies which Moses had established." Salvation is of the Jews. In vain the woman flies to the usual subterfuge of delay; she hints at the difficulty of decision, and puts off the inquiry till a more favourable opportunity, when she may have the advantage of the Messiah's determination. But, that she might have no further plea for her errors, and, above all, that the principles which he had just formally laid down might want no sanction, he instantly throws off his disguise, and stands revealed: 'I am he who am speaking with thee.' (*Ibid.* 26.) Thus, did this benign and charitable Saviour, who came to seek and save what was lost, and whose first principle it was 'I will have mercy and not sacrifice:' thus, did he hesitate not a moment to pronounce in the clearest term, that no deviation from the true religion, however trivial, can be justified or excused in his sight." (Dr. Wiseman and others.)

I now beg to refer my reader to Psalm 109, where we read—

Catholic Version.

Psalm 109.

4 The Lord hath sworn,
and he will not repent:
Thou art a priest for ever
according to the order of
Melchisedech.

Protestant Version.

Psalm 110.

4 The Lord hath sworn,
and will not repent, Thou
art a priest for ever after the
order of Melchizedek.

—which St. Paul confirms. (Heb. 7, v. 17.) The Apostle says, that he was not “called a priest according to the order of Aaron,” (*Ibid.* v. 11,) intimating of course that he would not offer sacrifices such as were prescribed by the Levitical Law ; but “according to the order of Melchisedech.” Now of Melchisedech, it is recorded in the Holy Scriptures that he offered sacrifice in bread and wine : “But Melchisedech, the King of Salem, bringing forth bread and wine, for he was the priest of the most high God, blessed him.” (Abraham). Gen. 14, v. 18, 19. If Christ therefore was to be a priest according to the order of Melchisedech, it is plain that he must have offered sacrifice with the same external symbols used by Melchisedech ; namely, bread and wine. Now he did not offer in this manner upon the cross, but only at the last Supper. In the Eucharist, therefore, the Eucharistical sacrifice is a true sacrifice offered by Christ, a priest according to the order of Melchisedech. Moreover, he was to be a priest for ever, according to the same order, therefore he was to continue to offer sacrifice with the outward symbols of bread and wine ; and this he cannot be said to do, but by the great sacrifice of the New Law offered continually in his Church, Christ being always the great High Priest thereof, as well as the victim.

But let us refer to the very words of the Institution. They unquestionably prove of themselves that he did offer a true sacrifice, and with the outward symbols of bread and wine. Our Saviour said, according to Luke, 22, v. 19, (Protestant version,) “This is my body which is given for you,” and 20, “This cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for you.”* And St. Paul relates it in

* The Greek participle is undoubtedly in the present tense ; but in the Syriac idiom, which was that used by the Evangelist, the present participle is very frequently used in a future signification.

the Greek, (1 Cor. 11, v. 24,) " which is broken for you." And St. Matthew has it, " this is my blood which is shed." (26, v. 28.) Our Blessed Saviour did therefore, at the last Supper, offer a real sacrifice of his body broken, and his blood shed. For how can the body of Christ be said to be given for us, how can this sacred blood be shed for us, unless we understand this most sacred and solemn action as a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice? But, then, it may be said, that there was a real offering of Christ before his offering on the Cross, a real atonement before the real atonement of Calvary. I answer first, " The Lamb was slain from the beginning of the world." (Apoc. 13, v. 8.) Secondly, I refer to the 17th of Matthew, v. 2, where we read, " And he was transfigured before them. And his face did shine as the sun; and his garments became white as snow." Christ is here transfigured and glorified in the days of his afflictions. If therefore Christ could be transfigured and glorified in the days of his patience and of his sorrowings, before his glory was consummated after his Ascension, why, in like manner, could not Christ offer himself in a mystical, but after a real manner, before that grand and visible and bloody offering on the cross, by which all things were consummated? See, kind reader, how faith and revelation lead us Catholics out of all the difficulties which sophistry—the fruit of a weak yet arrogant reason, may throw in our way. But to return. When He uttered the ever memorable words, " this do in remembrance of me," (Luke, 22, v. 19,) he commanded his Apostles, and in their persons the priests of his Church, to do the same; namely, to offer the same sacrifice, with the outward symbols of bread and wine, in commemoration of Him.

It may be objected, that the present tense is, in the

words of Institution, used for the future ; but even so, the text will only prove that as the real body was then offered under the appearance of bread, and the real blood under that of wine, in representation of the future bloody sacrifice upon the cross, so the words foretold, that the body should continue to be really offered under the species of bread, and the blood under the species of wine, to the end of the world, in the unbloody sacrifice of the Eucharist or the Mass. For which reason nothing can be thence deduced against the reality of our Saviour's sacrifice at the last Supper. It only differed from that of the Cross as our Mass differs ; namely in the manner of offering.

Proceeding to other scriptural references, St. Luke says, speaking of the Apostles :—

Catholic Version:

Acts, 13.

2 And as they were ministering to the Lord, and fasting, the Holy Ghost said to them, &c.

Protestant Version.

Acts, 13.

2 As they ministered to the Lord, and fasted, the Holy Ghost said, &c.

The Greek word which corresponds to ministering indicates the public ministry of sacrifice, for by no other ministry, either of the word, or of the sacraments, could the Apostles have been said to “minister to the Lord.” This was so plain to Erasmus, that he translated the word “sacrificantibus,”—“as they were sacrificing to the Lord.” It appears therefore that the Apostles offered sacrifice, and of course it could have been no other than the sacrifice of the Mass.

Referring now to St. Paul. This illustrious Apostle, (Heb. 13), thus says—

Catholic Version.

10 We have an altar, whereof they have no power to eat who serve the tabernacle.

11 For the bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the holies by the High Priest for sin, are burned without the camp.

12 Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people by his own blood, suffered without the gate.

And 1 Cor., 10, he says—

18 Behold Israel according to the flesh: are not they that eat of the sacrifices, partakers of the altar?

21 you cannot be partakers of the table of the Lord, and of the table of devils.

Protestant Version.

10 We have an altar whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle.

11 For the bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest for sin, are burned without the camp.

12 Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate.

18 Behold Israel after the flesh: are not they which eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar?

21 ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and of the table of devils.

Now, in the latter passages, the Apostle contrasts the Eucharistical altar with the altars of the Old Law; but in the one to the Hebrews, he distinctly teaches, that we have a real altar and a real sacrifice, since he compares them with the altar of the tabernacle and its sacrifices. Mind, if he had meant the altar of the Cross, he would have said, "we had an altar," not "we have an altar." His expression, therefore, plainly points to an altar on which sacrifice

is continually offered. Moreover, he clearly establishes a real participation of our Eucharistical sacrifice by saying that we are privileged to eat of the altar, to the exclusion of the Jews. Now if he had only spoken of a spiritual participation, he would not have said that the Jews had no power to eat of our altar; for, assuredly, the holy servants of God of old did spiritually partake of the sacrifice of the Cross when they ate of the legal sacrifices, with faith in the future Redeemer, whom they typified. The participation of which he speaks, is of the same kind in both cases: He compares altar with altar, victim with victim, eating with eating; the sacrifice in both cases is real, and also the manducation. In the Old Law the victims, of which the blood was brought into the Sanctuary, were burnt outside the camp; and St. Paul teaches that Jesus, coming to sanctify us with his own blood, suffered without the gate. Therefore, if we are allowed to eat of this victim in preference to the Jews, whom the law forbid to eat of victims burnt outside the camp, it is plain that the Apostle teaches, that we partake of a real victim, no other than Christ himself: and a real manducation, of the real victim of Christ, can only take place in the Eucharistical sacrifice of the Mass. Therefore the Apostle speaks, in the texts I have adduced, of this great sacrifice.

I suppose it unnecessary to direct my reader to 1 Cor. c. 10, v. 16, where the Apostle speaks in the clearest terms, and assures us, that Christ instituted a sacrifice at the last Supper. I only beg to refer him to my last Scriptural proof, taken from the Apocalypse, chapter 5.—

Catholic Version.

6 And I saw, and behold,
in the midst of the throne

Protestant Version.

6 And I beheld, and, lo,
in the midst of the throne

Catholic Version.

and of the four living creatures, and in the midst of the ancients, a lamb standing as it were slain.

This must be considered, in connexion with some other passages of the same book, such as the following :—

Apocalypse, 1.

10 I was in the spirit on the Lord's day,

12 And I saw seven golden candlesticks ;

13 And in the midst of the seven golden candlesticks, one like to the Son of Man, clothed with a garment down to the feet, and girt about the paps with a golden girdle.

4.

2 and behold there was a throne set in Heaven, and upon the throne one sitting.

4 and around about the throne were four and twenty seats, and upon the seats, four and twenty ancients sitting, clothed in white garments.

Protestant Version.

and of the four beasts, and in the midst of the elders, stood a Lamb as it had been slain.

Apocalypse, 1.

10 I was in the spirit on the Lord's day.

12 I saw seven golden candlesticks ;

13 And in the midst of the seven candlesticks, *one* like unto the Son of Man, clothed with a garment down to the foot, and girt about the paps with a golden girdle.

4.

2 a throne was set in heaven, and *one* sat on the throne.

4 And round about the throne *were* four and twenty seats : and upon the seats, I saw four and twenty elders sitting, clothed in white raiment.

Catholic Version.

Apocalypse, 5.

8 and the four and twenty ancients fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, &c.

Protestant Version.

Apocalypse, 5.

8 and four and twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps.

It is to be observed, that St. John was favoured with the vision of these remarkable things on the Lord's day, when the Christians always assembled to celebrate the Eucharist; that he describes an altar, and the Lamb of God appearing, as it were slain, as the victim; that he describes the pontiff presiding on the throne, and the priests around it; that he mentions candlesticks, music, and incense; so that he appears to point out, in mysterious language, the sacrifice offered in the assemblies of the faithful, when they celebrated the most Holy Eucharist.

I admit this text may be considered as an arbitrary and fanciful application; it is not, indeed, adduced as a positive proof, but it may well be cited as an auxiliary evidence; and I must also add, that many eminent Catholic commentators supposed that the Evangelist, in his book of the Apocalypse, adopted the imagery with which he represents his mystic revelations, from the ceremonies observed by the early Christian Church in offering up the Mass, or Eucharistical Sacrifice of the Lamb of God—Jesus Christ. Another text from Revelations is also similarly explained in answering the question proposed by many well-meaning Protestants. From what part of the Holy Writings do we Catholics find directions for the peculiar form of the Host used at the sacrifice of the Mass?

Answer: From the 2d chap. 17th verse of Apocalypse,

where Christ thus promises, — “To him that overcometh, I will give the hidden manna; and I will give him a white counter (in the Protestant version rendered stone), and on the counter a new name written, which no man knoweth, but he who receiveth it.” Classical scholars are of course aware that, amongst the ancient Greeks, it was the custom to vote on public occasions with white or black pebbles, gathered from the sea-shore or banks of rivers, and that, in process of time and at the period of St. John’s vision, these stones were superseded by small circular pieces of wood or ivory, like our modern counters, upon which the name of the candidate was inscribed. Now, according to the doctrine of the Catholic Church, to the communicant is given in the blessed Eucharist the body and blood of Jesus Christ; this is the “hidden manna,” under the appearance of bread and wine. And in the sacramental host is he given a white counter, and in the initials of the Saviour of mankind,” stamped on every host, is he given that “new name written, which no man knoweth but he that receiveth.” This interpretation is full of meaning when the Catholic faith on this awful question is considered; but if in the Sacrament there were nothing but bread, how could the Christian’s “hidden manna” be there? If Jesus Christ be not truly imparted, how can that new name remain unknown to all, save to him who receives in faith the living bread that cometh down from Heaven?

In the mean time, having established the Catholic doctrine of the Mass by incontestible arguments of Scripture, I will now request the attention of my reader to the following most important, urgent, and irrefragable argument: “If a doubt were to exist, whether any particular practice formed a part of the law of this land, a specific declaration of the legislature would unquestionably be deemed decisive

as to the nature of the contested point. In vain would individuals be permitted to allege 'that they have before them the statute or written law; and that all things necessary for the welfare of society, and connected with the fundamental principles of the British constitution, are expressed so clearly as to admit of no doubt.' The obvious reply would be, that such a plea would not only supersede the necessity of judges, councillors, pleaders, and attorneys, but would subvert the authority of the governing powers by which laws are made and explained. And is not this sensible and appropriate reply equally admissible in the concerns of religion as well as in those of a temporal nature? Is the authority left by Christ in his Church of a less sacred nature than that power by which kings govern and judges expound laws? I must, therefore, be allowed to assume an inevitable inference, that when this Church, which Christ has promised to protect for ever, has pronounced that a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice is left by our Redeemer in the Holy Mass, it becomes indispensably necessary for all members of this Church to admit such a truth, as well as every other proposed by the same authority."—*Coomb's Essence of Controversy*,

When he has sufficiently meditated on the above, let him then peruse the following acknowledgments of celebrated Protestants:—

"It is certain," says Dr. Grabe, in his notes on St. Iræneus, "that Iræneus and all the Fathers, either contemporary with the Apostles or their successors, whose works are still extant, considered the blessed Sacrament to be the sacrifice of the New Law. And this was not the private opinion of any particular Church, but the public doctrine and practice of the Universal Church, which she received from the Apostles, and the Apostles from Jesus Christ."

The Centuriators make frequently the same concession, at the same time condemning the opinion which they describe. "St. Iræneus," they say, "taught the new oblation of the New Testament, which the Church, having received from the Apostles, offered up to God throughout the world." (Cent. 2.) "St. Cyprian," they add, "says, that the priest performs the functions of the vicar of Jesus Christ, and that a sacrifice is offered up to God the Father." (Cent. 3.) "Tertullian," they also complain, "makes frequent mention of oblations for the dead." (Cent. 3.) "Ambrose," they angrily own, "makes use of the very terms which we do,—to celebrate Mass, to offer; to offer sacrifice," &c. (Cent. 5.) Even Luther himself, although he rejects the Mass, still cites, in his letter to our Henry, the passages of the Fathers, attesting their veneration for it. But the "daring innovator," triumphantly adds,— "What care I for a thousand Austins, or a thousand Cyprians," &c. "We are wrongly accused," says the confession of Augsburg, "of having abolished the Mass. We have always continued and celebrated it with great respect."—(Art. 22.)

LECTURE IX.

OBJECTIONS AGAINST THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS.

SEVERAL Objections are brought against the Sacrifice of the Mass from the Epistle of St. Paul to the Hebrews, and particularly from the ninth and tenth chapters.

But let us attend to the whole tenor of the Epistle, and consider the occasion which called it forth. Many churches had been established in Palestine before it was written, and the new converts still remained much attached to the rites and ceremonies of the Jewish Law. This is manifest from different parts of the Epistle; they believed, it is true, that Christ was the Son of God, but would not refrain from the ancient sacrifices, attributing their justification to the Law. The Apostle, therefore, takes occasion to explain the dignity and grandeur of the priesthood of Christ above the priesthood of Aaron, and the Sacrifice of the cross above the sacrifices of the Old Law; and exhorts them to persevere in the doctrines which he had already delivered. In the beginning of the Epistle, he proves how incomparably greater Christ is than the angels, by many arguments taken from the Old Testament. In the second chapter, he exhorts them to perseverance, telling them that they "ought more diligently to observe the things which they have heard, lest perhaps they let them slip." In the third chapter, he proves how far superior Christ was to Moses, and concludes

it by exhorting them to adhere to Christ by faith and obedience. In the fourth chapter, he treats of the Christian's rest—that we are to enter into it through the man-God.

How beautiful the following texts :—

Catholic Version.

14 Having therefore a great high priest that hath passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God : let us hold fast our confession.

15 For we have not a high priest, who cannot have compassion on our infirmities : but one tempted in all things like as we are, without sin.

16 Let us go therefore with confidence to the throne of grace : that we may obtain mercy, and find grace in seasonable aid.

Protestant Version.

14 Seeing then that we have a great high priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast *our* profession.

15 For we have not an high priest which cannot be touched with the feeling of our infirmities ; but was in all points tempted as *we are*, yet without sin.

16 Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace, that we may obtain mercy, and find grace to help in time of need.

In the fifth chapter, he continues to speak of the office of our great High Priest. There are, however, two texts in this chapter, which my kind reader will do well to reflect upon seriously.—

4 Neither doth any man take the honour to himself, but he that is called by God, as Aaron was.

4 And no man taketh this honour unto himself, but he that is called of God, as *was* Aaron.

Catholic Version.

7 Who in the days of his flesh with a strong cry and tears offering up prayers and supplications to him that was able to save him from death, was heard for his reverence.

Now, from the fourth verse, nothing is clearer than that the Apostle intimates, that no person can take on himself the office of the priesthood, unless he be called immediately of God, as was Aaron, (Exodus, 28, v. 1, 2,) or receive it in a regular succession from those whom God immediately called. Hence Christ himself, the Apostle adds in the verse that immediately follows, did not take to himself this office, until called by him who said, "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee." This is also manifest from John, 10,—

1 Amen, amen, I say to you: he that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold, but climbeth up another way, the same is a thief and a robber.

2 But he that entereth in by the door, is the shepherd of the sheep.

3 To him the porter openeth; and the sheep hear his voice: and he calleth his own sheep by name, and leadeth them out.

Protestant Version.

7 Who in the days of his flesh, when he had offered up prayers and supplication with strong crying and tears unto him that was able to save him from death, and was heard in that he feared.

1 Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that entereth not by the door into the sheepfold, but climbeth up some other way, the same is a thief and a robber.

2 But he that entereth in by the door is the shepherd of the sheep.

3 To him the porter openeth; and the sheep hear his voice: and he calleth his own sheep by name, and leadeth them out.

Catholic Version.

4 And when he hath let out his own sheep, he goeth before them : and the sheep follow him, because they know his voice.

5 But a stranger they follow not, but fly from him, because they know not the voice of strangers.

Protestant Version.

4 And when he putteth forth his own sheep, he goeth before them, and the sheep follow him : for they know his voice.

5 And a stranger they will not follow, but will flee from him : for they know not the voice of strangers.

In this parable, the sheepfold means the church of Christ, and the stranger or hireling who enters not regularly into the fold, is declared to be a thief and a robber, coming but to steal, and to kill, and to destroy. "He that receiveth you, receiveth me ; and he that receiveth me, receiveth him that sent me. (Matthew, 10, v. 40.) From all which we see the absolute necessity of being sent by God before any man can attempt to perform the duties of the ministry ; for as St. Paul says (Romans, 10, v. 15), "How shall they preach unless they be sent?" Now, kind reader, are the ministers of the Established Church able to prove that they have got a divine call immediately from Jesus Christ, or have regularly succeeded to his Apostles ? Suppose we say to them, in the words of St. Augustine against the Donatists, lib. 3. Who are you ? From whence do you come ? From what Heaven have you descended ? What sea cast you forth ? From what earth did you spring ? What will these reverend gentlemen answer ? Will they tell us satisfactorily whether they have received their mission from God, or from man ?

The book of Homilies (Peril of Idolatry, which all Protestant ministers are bound to believe), declares, that

“Laity and clergy, learned and unlearned, all ages, sects, and degrees of men, women and children of whole Christendom, have been at once drowned in an abominable and damnable idolatry ; and that for the space of eight hundred years and more, to the destruction and subversion of all good religion universally!!!” Well, then, I will only propose to the ministers the following dilemma :—the Church, in communion with Rome at the period your predecessors separated from her, was an heretical, idolatrous, and un-Christian Church, or she was not? If she was not, therefore there was no just cause of separation ; and you ministers are schismatics in dividing from her, and heretics in rejecting articles of faith. But if she was heretical, idolatrous, and antichristian, her power became extinct ; she could not confer orders or missions on your predecessors, and consequently you have neither. Your predecessors did not attempt to prove by miracles that they were divinely sent. You have therefore no divine authority—no divine mission.

Now to the other text contained in the 7th verse. The reader, I trust, has seen the difference between the two versions — Catholic and Protestant. I tremble when I write it. This text was originally corrupted by Calvin, and as such was inserted by Beza in the Protestant version—(but we shall hear more of these corruptions of the word of God in the Lectures on the Rule of Faith). The blasphemous doctrine of Calvin was, “that Jesus Christ upon the cross was horribly afraid of damnation, and that he was in the very sorrows and torment of the damned ;” but that “by strong crying and tears (see text Protestant version) unto him that was able to save him from death, and was heard in that he feared ;” that is, he was delivered from damnation and the eternal pains of hell, of which he was

much afraid!!! Are Protestants aware of this corruption of the word of God? I trust the reader will pardon these two digressions.

Now to the explanation of the Epistle under discussion. In the last verse of the fifth chapter the Apostle tells them, "that strong meat is for the perfect; for them who by custom have their," &c. This clearly proves, that there were many things that had been omitted in the Epistle of which the Apostle intended to speak afterwards; and among these was probably that of the sacrifice of the Mass.

In the sixth chapter he warns them of the danger of falling by apostacy, and exhorts them to patience and perseverance. In the last verse of the same chapter he proves that Christ was made "a high priest for ever, according to the order of Melchisedech."

In the 7th chapter he proves that Melchisedech was a more perfect type of Christ than any other; as king of peace and king of justice, without father or mother, beginning of days, nor end of life, &c.—

Catholic Version.

1 For this Melchisedech was king of Salem, priest of the most high God, who met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the kings, and blessed him.

2 To whom also Abraham divided the tithes of all: who first indeed by interpretation, is king of justice: and then also king of

Protestant Version.

1 For this Melchisedech, king of Salem, priest of the most high God, who met Abraham returning from the slaughter of the kings, and blessed him.

2 To whom also Abraham gave a tenth part of all; first being by interpretation King of righteousness, and after that also King of Sa-

Catholic Version.

Salem, that is, king of peace,

3 Without father, without mother, without genealogy, having neither beginning of days nor end of life, but likened unto the Son of God, continueth a priest for ever.

Protestant Version.

lem, which is King of peace.

3 Without father, without mother, without descent, having neither beginning of days, nor end of life; but made like unto the Son of God, abideth a priest continually.

And that, as in the person of Abraham, Levi paid tithes to Melchisedech, and as Melchisedech was only a type of Christ, therefore Christ's priesthood was superior to that of Levi: and consequently, the Hebrews ought and should not attach such importance to the Law; for another priest after the order of Melchisedech was to arise. From all which the Apostle beautifully collects, that the law was to be abrogated; because, the priesthood being transpired, it was necessary that the law should be transferred. This is also established by the Apostle in the eighth chapter, which he concludes by saying, "And that which decayeth and groweth old is near its end."

Now, in the ninth chapter, we have the celebrated texts, from which Protestants would impugn the doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass.

They object to this dogma.

1st. Because it involves the doctrine of Transubstantiation.

2nd. Because that according to the explanation of this doctrine by the Council of Trent it sanctions an unbloody sacrifice as propitiatory, contrary to the statement of the Apostle, (Hebrew, 9, v. 22,) in which he says—

Catholic Version.

22 That all things, according to law, are cleansed with blood; and without shedding of blood there is no remission.

3rd. Because it would make Christ have been often, yea, continually offered, contrary to the express declaration of the Scriptures, that it was by one offering Christ preferred for ever those that are sanctified. Same Epistle, the ninth chapter.—

26 But now once at the end of ages, he hath appeared for the destruction of sin, by the sacrifice of himself.

28 So also Christ was offered once to exhaust the sins of many;

And tenth chapter,—

10 In the which will we are sanctified by the oblation of the body of Jesus Christ once.

4th. Because it would make Christ's sacrifice inefficient, according to that reasoning of the Apostle, (Hebrews, 10th chapter,) where we read—

Protestant Version.

22 And all things are by the law purged with blood; and without shedding of blood is no remission.

26 But now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself.

28 So Christ was once offered to bear the sins of many.

10 By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all.

Catholic Version.

1 For the law having a shadow of the good things to come, not the very image of the things : by the self-same sacrifices, which they offer continually every year, can never make the comers thereunto perfect :

4 For it is impossible that with the blood of oxen and goats sin should be taken away.

5th. Because it would interfere with the intercession of Christ ; for he is said to ever live to make intercession for his people ; but the Sacrifice of the Mass would represent him as ever dying.

Finally : because that if Christ be often offered, as daily in the Sacrifice of the Mass by the Church of Rome he is stated to be, then would there be no remission of sin, as the Apostle argues same chapter—

18 Now where there is a remission of these, there is no more an oblation for sin.

Protestant Version.

1 For the law having a shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things, can never with those sacrifices which they offered year by year continually make the comers thereunto perfect.

4 For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and of goats should take away sins.

18 Now, where remission of these is, there is no more offering for sin.

In reply, I beg to be permitted to indulge the fond hope, that as these objections are grounded upon misconceptions of our doctrine of the Sacrifice of the Mass, the kind reader will see they do not militate against it. Let it be recollected that we firmly believe that Jesus Christ, agreeably to the suggestion of St. Paul (Hebrew, 9, v. 25, 18, &c.), was

offered but once on the altar of the cross for our redemption, and once in a violent, painful, and bloody manner; and by this one sacrifice upon the cross he has furnished the full ransom, redemption, and remedy for all the sins of the world. But, then, this does not hinder that he may offer himself daily in the sacred mysteries in an unbloody manner for the daily application of that one great sacrifice of redemption to our souls. His priesthood was not to be extinguished by his death, and the very night before he suffered, he left a visible sacrifice as a perpetual memorial of the great one of Calvary, and as a means of applying its transcendent virtue for the remission of sins. For this purpose he offered, under the appearances of bread and wine, his own most sacred body and blood, and commissioned his Apostles—whom he then ordained priests, and their Successors in the ministry, to do the same. “Do this in remembrance of me.” Hence, we believe that the Mass is the same sacrifice as the one which Christ offered upon the cross, differing only in the manner and in its effects. Nor must it be supposed that we consider the Mass to originate in any supposed imperfection of the great sacrifice of the cross; or that by offering it we do injury to the atonement of Christ. I again repeat it, we believe that it is the same sacrifice offered in an unbloody manner by the injunction of the Redeemer himself. “Do this in remembrance of me,” and we console ourselves that we do no more injury to the atonement of Christ by offering it than Protestants themselves when they baptize; because the efficacy of baptism, namely, that of blotting out original sin, is derived from the atonement. Finally, we maintain that all the glory and happiness which the pious of every age now enjoy in heaven—the bliss of Abraham, of Isaac, of David, and other Saints of the Old, as well as of the New Law, is all

derived from the sacrifice of the Cross; hence, we Catholics hold, as Protestants, the atonement of Christ to be sufficient to satisfy for the sins of the whole world.

The second objection regards the intention which the priest should have when offering the sacrifice of the Mass, or enforcing a sacrament. Many Protestants say that, if he be a wicked person, and have not the intention of consecrating, there would be nothing but bread and wine; and thus would the people, instead of assisting at the sacrifice of the new law, be actually guilty of idolatry.

To this specious argument I beg to reply, that we Catholics do not adore the bread, nor do we adore what is, strictly speaking, the sacrament; for we adore Christ in the sacrament of the Eucharist.* This is clear from the 13th session and 6th canon of the Council of Trent: "If any will say that in the holy sacrament of the Eucharist, Christ, the only begotten Son of God, is not to be adored, even by the highest external adoration, &c., let them be anathema." The external appearance of bread in the Eu-

* If it be asked why the officiating priest calls the unconsecrated bread and wine, "the unspotted victim," long before the consecration?

I answer, saying, this is done by us precisely as it was by the primitive Christians by way of anticipation, even as our Lord himself anticipated his own sacrifice on the cross in that sublime prayer in the 17th chapter of St. John, in which he speaks as if he was actually on the cross. This is also well explained by Hofmeister, (*Bona, Rerum Liturg. Lib. 2 Cap. 9, § 2.*) "We do not call the bread and wine 'an unspotted victim,' but the body and blood of the Lord, which are produced from them (*conficiuntur*). Therefore, they are esteemed worthy of such an appellation, not on account of what they are but what they are soon to be, and this by a certain way of speaking not unusual in the Sacred Writings. Thus Judas was called the traitor from the beginning of his vocation, because he was to become so in the end."

charist, is what Theologians call the sacrament, or sign, that Christ's body is present; for a sacrament is a sensible or visible sign, permanently instituted by Christ, and conferring grace. Now this sacrament or external sign is not what we adore, but Christ under the appearances of bread and wine. The adoration, therefore, is paid to Jesus Christ, who is present in the sacrament; hence, if even the consecration was invalid, the bread would not be adored, since the adoration is directed to Christ alone. If, then, all the priests in the Catholic world were internally to renounce the Christian faith, and become infidels in heart, and, to carry on the delusion, would seem to the people to celebrate truly the divine mysteries, (a thing which would be repugnant to the promises of Christ, and which the providence of God would never permit,) not one single Catholic would be guilty of idolatry. For, in the supposition that Christ was not really in the sacrament of the Eucharist, Catholics could be only charged with supposing Christ to be where he is not; nothing but uncharitable calumnies, or gross inattention to their real principles, could accuse them of idolatry.

But to explain what intention means. These are the words of the Fathers of the Council of Trent regarding it: "If any one will say that the intention, at least of doing as the Church does, is not required in the ministers, when administering the sacraments, let him be anathema." (Sess. 7, can. 11.) The intention which is sufficient is, according to some Theologians, internal, according to others, external. The internal intention, for instance, when the Sacrament of baptism is conferred, is this: if the minister intended in his heart that the child should be cleansed from original sin, taking water and pouring it on the child, says, "I baptise you in the name of the Father, and of the Son,

and of the Holy Ghost," all are agreed that the child is validly baptized. Other Divines explain the external intention in the following manner. Suppose the minister does not intend that the child should be freed from original sin, but to satisfy the people around pours the water on it, and pronounces the words instituted by Christ for conferring the Sacrament, appearing to act in a serious manner, not as representing a thing on a stage, it is held that the child is validly baptized; for example, if a woman professing the Christian religion were placed in such circumstances, that no Christian could be found to baptize her child, and that she were to request a Jew or a Pagan to perform this function, and he, to gratify the woman, would act in the manner I have just described, the child would be validly baptized although he did not believe in the Christian religion. The words internal and external are terms used in the schools, although, properly speaking, there is no such thing as an external intention; for an intention is a mere operation of the mind, but it is called external as being opposed to the internal. The canon of the Council of Trent does not say that the internal intention is required, and, consequently, it is not contrary to Catholic doctrine to hold that the external intention is sufficient. I shall close this by assuring my readers that what I have said concerning the intention required to confer validly the sacrament of Baptism, is equally applicable to any other of the Sacraments instituted by Christ.

Others insist, that we must be guilty of idolatry every time we hear Mass, unless we are sure that there is a change made of the bread into the body of Christ in that host which is proposed to our adoration. And by what means, say they, can we be sure of this? The Catholic Church declares that it is necessary that he that consecrates

must be a priest, and that he have an intention of consecrating. Now, it may happen that he may not be a priest, because not baptized, or, that he had no intention of consecrating. In these cases they who worship the host must be guilty of idolatry.

In replying to this apparently great scruple, I shall not say absurdity (for it is exceedingly absurd to suppose that the deficiency, or wickedness of another man should make me incur the crime of idolatry whether I will or not), I beg to ask, what kind of certainty is it they would have? A certainty of faith, or an evidence of the senses? Again, I beg to ask what *certainty* has a child, or husband, that the persons, whom the one venerates as a father, and the other loves as a wife, are so *indeed*? Surely our opponents are not such rigid casuists as to suppose that a child must not respect its parent, nor a husband to act as such until the former has a *certainty* divinely revealed that he whom he looks up to as his father is such, and the latter equal evidence that Lia is not put in the place of Rachel, and when this is known an additional certainty, that she is not married to another man, for this is no new thing in this kingdom. Again, unless we have such a strong certainty as I suppose, what will become of the communicant? When he calls to mind the dispositions required to approach to the table of the Lord, how is he to act? Is he to abstain from approaching till he has a certainty that he has them? But if in human actions such a certainty is not even spoken of, why look for it at the altar? A wife may forget *from crime*, her duty; but a child is surely not criminal in respecting him whom he believes to be his father; and unquestionably, though the wickedness of a priest may make him a devil, still it cannot make another man an idolater. For, whilst the adoration is directed not to the bread which

no Catholic supposes to be there, but to the person of Jesus Christ, true God and true man, whom Catholics firmly believe to be in a host duly consecrated, and have not the least reasonable cause to suspect the contrary, it follows that the action on their part is good and lawful, and so far from being an act of idolatry, it is a real honouring and adoration of Jesus Christ, and as such will be by him received.

And here, having, I trust, said enough on the great Sacrifice of the new law, I will now close this Lecture with the following observation. From the fourth century great hostilities prevailed between the Church of Rome and the Eastern Churches. This is a fact well known to all those who are acquainted with ecclesiastical history. That all the churches in the East, whether Nestorians, Eutychians, Arians, Armenians, Copts, Egyptians, Arabians, or Persians, offer the sacrifice of the Mass is equally certain. For no adversary to the Catholic religion can shew from authentic history that any of these reject the sacrifice of the Mass. Now I ask, how could it be possible that, if this doctrine had not been coeval with the Apostles, these Churches which had broken off all communion with the Church of Rome, would have retained the sacrifice of the Mass which they had received from her? For the Eucharistical sacrifice is not merely a speculative but a practical dogma. Therefore, we must say that it was coeval with the Apostles, or introduced either before or after their entire separation from the Western Church. It would be contrary to the moral constitution of man to suppose that they would borrow a dogma of their belief from those whom they looked on as their most avowed enemies; therefore, it could not be since their separation. Neither could it be before their division from the Western Church; because, if

they had borrowed this tenet before the period of their separation, they would immediately have disclaimed it, and pointed out the precise time in which it was introduced. It is, then, morally impossible, that it could be introduced into the Church either before, or after the separation of the Eastern churches, and, consequently, it must be coeval with Christianity, because what is practised by the whole Church, and the precise time of its introduction cannot be assigned, must be, and is, unquestionably, coeval with the Apostles.

A D D E N D A

TO THE

LECTURES ON THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS.

IN consequence of the anti-Apostolic and anti-Catholic Reformer's (Martin Luther) declaration against the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass, his abettors and followers shortly abolished the same; at Zurich, in 1526, at Strasburgh and Basle in 1529, and thus in several places of Germany. In England, this Holy Sacrifice, notwithstanding Henry's defection from the Pope, &c., was continued during his reign. In the reign of his successor, Edward VI., it was abolished by Edward, Duke of Somerset, the young king's tutor, and by an act of Parliament of Nov. 4th, 1547. In the reign of Queen Mary, a Catholic, the Holy Sacrifice was re-established; but short was its continuance. Elizabeth, the clement and good Queen Bess, who succeeded in 1558, continued it some time in her own private chapel; but, in the year 1568, when she had, by an act of Parliament, procured to herself the spiritual supremacy of the Church, and the same was publicly proclaimed, she shortly abolished altogether the Holy Sacrifice, and other sacred rites. I shall now set down for the information of my Protestant reader, the character of each of these individuals, who were instrumental in abolishing the Sacrifice of the Mass. Luther claims the first place; "I burn," says he, "with a thousand fires in a flesh untamed. I feel excited towards women with a fury that borders upon madness. I, who ought to be

fervent in spirit, am only fervent in impurity." (Luther's Table Talk.) "Strong in my knowledge, I would not yield either to Emperor, King, or Devil, no, not even to the universe." (Reply to the King of England.) "I tremble," writes Melancthon, "when I think of the passions of Luther; they do not yield in violence to the fury of Hercules!" (Letter to Theodore.) "This man is absolutely furious," says Hospinian. "He does not cease to combat the truth against all justice, and even against the cry of his own conscience!" "He is," says Œcolampadius, "inflated with pride and ignorance, and seduced by Satan!" "Yes," exclaims Zuinglius, "Satan has so made himself master of Luther, as to make us believe, that he is determined to possess him entirely!" "He has written," (The Church of Zurich against the Confession of Luther, p. 61,) "all his books by the impulse, and under the dictation of the Devil, with whom he had an interview, and who, in the struggle, appears to have overthrown him with victorious arguments." "Truly," said Calvin, quoted in C. Schlussenberg, "Luther is very wicked. Would to God, that he had taken care to put more restraint upon the intemperance, which rages on all sides of him! Would to God that he had thought more of gaining a true knowledge of his vices!" O! what an honourable personage to bring about a reformation in religion!

Zuinglius is the next on the stage. "I cannot," he says of himself, in *Parenes. ad Helvet.* fol. 44, "conceal the fire which burns me and urges me to incontinency; since it is true, that its effects have brought upon me already but too many disgraceful reproaches among the Churches." Luther declared openly, that "Zuinglius was the progeny of hell, an associate of Arius, a man not deserving to be prayed for by any one." See *Tom. 2, fol. 36*, quoted in

Florimond ; and in the same place he says, " Zuinglius is dead and damned, wishing, like a thief and a seditious man, to force others by arms to follow his error." Brentius, whom Bishop Jewel called the grave and learned old man, declares that " the doctrines of Zuinglius are diabolical, full of impieties, depravity and calumnies : that error of Zuinglius on the Eucharist, (namely, that of a figurative presence) led to many others still more sacrilegious." (See Brentius in recog. Proph. et Apost. in fine.) " Blessed is the man who hath not gone into the council of the Sacramentarians ; blessed is the man who hath not stood in the way of the Zuinglians, nor sat in the chair of Zurich." (Luth. ep. ad Jacob. prestb.)

Now of Calvin—" Calvin," says Bucer, " is a real mad dog. That man is bad, and judges of people according to his own love or hatred of them." In 1588 there appeared in London a writing approved by the Anglican Bishops against the Calvinist sect : " A survey of the pretended Holy Discipline, by Bishop Bancroft." Calvin and Beza are in it represented as proud and intolerant men, who by open revolt against their lawful prince, had established their gospel, and assumed the government of the churches with a tyranny more odious than that with which they so often reproached the Sovereign Pontiffs. The English Bishops protest before Almighty God, that among all the texts of scripture cited by Calvin or his disciples, in favour of the church of Geneva against the church of England, there is not one which is not distorted to a sense unknown to the Church, and the Fathers from the days of the Apostles. Mind, kind reader, when this writing appeared, the Church of England professed the doctrine of the real presence, which she did not abandon till seventy-four years afterwards.

I shall close this rough sketch of Calvin, by submitting to my reader only two of his religious principles. "It is plainly wrong to seek for any other cause of damnation, than the hidden councils of God." (Instit. 1, 3, cap. 23.) "Men by the freewill of God, without any demerit of their own, are predestinated to eternal death." (*Ibid.* 1, 3, c. 23.) Now, kind reader, if these first reformers were never able to confirm their ministry by attestations of sanctity,—by miracles: and you will see in these Lectures, that it was more necessary that *they* should work miracles than the Apostles: if the most scandalous animosities existed between them,—incurable divisions regarding the most important points of doctrine: if, as they assure us, they were instructed by the father of lies—the devil: finally, if they were notorious for their licentious lives, can you reconcile it to yourself, that they were raised up by God to reform or correct abuses in Religion? I beg and earnestly entreat of you, to answer this question between God and your own heart.

END OF THE LECTURES ON THE MASS.

LECTURE X.

 ON THE USE OF THE LATIN TONGUE IN THE SERVICE OF THE CHURCH.

THE Doctrine of the Catholic Church regarding this point is thus declared by the Fathers of the Council of Trent, Sess. 22, p. 8, c. 194: "Though the Sacrifice of the Mass contains great instruction for the faithful, the Fathers judged it not expedient that it should be everywhere celebrated in the vulgar tongue. Each Church, therefore, will retain its ancient and approved rights. But that the sheep of Christ may not hunger for want of food, and that little ones may not ask for bread, and there be no one to break it to them, the holy Synod orders all pastors and them that have the care of souls, frequently, and especially on Sundays and Feasts, to expound some portion of what is read, and some mystery of the holy Sacrifice."

The reader will observe, I have not headed this Lecture "On the Use of an Unknown Tongue,* in the Public Service."

* Strictly speaking there is no tongue in the world that can be absolutely said to be either a known or unknown tongue, but only such in relation to persons. Thus every tongue or language is in respect of some persons known, and in respect of others unknown. But the Catholic Church being but one body, of which the Lord Jesus Christ is the head, it is meet that in its service one tongue should be adopted, and a tongue which, unlike modern languages, is not confined to any one given part of the world, but is general throughout all, and may be understood by the greater portion of persons.

"The

I do not consider the Latin as such. It is the language of the Scholar, and besides the officiating Minister, great numbers of the people, and even of our opponents, understand it. I must also add that the method of not performing the Service in the vernacular language, is not peculiar to the Catholic Church alone; all the Oriental Schismatics, how different soever, as Greeks, Ethiopians, Indians, Muscovites, &c., say Mass, but no one in the vulgar language. The Greeks use the Liturgies, which (according to their tradition) were made use of by St. Chrysostom and St. Basil; that is, in the old Greek, of which the common people, as Mr. Brerewood in his *Inquiries* says, understand little or nothing. (ch. 2, p. 12.) This is also reluctantly acknowledged by Moshem, who owns "that the language of the Divine Service is absolutely unintelligible to the multitude." (Mosheim: edit. Maclaine. cent. 2, part 2, c. 4, vol. 2, p. 575.) The Ethiopians and Armenians say Mass in the old Ethiopian and Armenian tongues, which none but the learned understand. (P. Sim. Crit. p. 7.) The Syrians, Indians, and Egyptians say Mass in Syriac, though Arabic be their vulgar language; as it is to the Melchites and Georgians, who yet say Mass in Greek;

"The Latin language is vernacular in Hungary and the neighbouring countries; it is taught in all the Catholic settlements of the Universe, and it approaches so near to the Italian, Spanish, and French, as to be understood, in a general kind of way, by those who use these languages." (Milner's end of Controversy). Dr. Hey, Norisian professor of divinity at Cambridge says, "that such an ancient language, in the service of the Church, is fixed and venerable, free from vulgarity, and even more conspicuous." (Lect. vol. 4, p. 191.) The Patriarch Luther maintained against Carlostad, that the language of public worship was a matter of indifference. Hence his disciples professed in their Augsburg Confession, to retain the Latin language in certain parts of their service.

which the Muscovites also do, though it be not the language of the people, who speak nothing but a kind of Slavonian. So that those who declaim so violently against their Mother Church for not having the public Service in the vulgar tongue, have the universal practice of Christendom against them. And it is very remarkable, that no nation in the world upon its first conversion to Christianity, ever made any difficulty to submit to this part of the Church's discipline, so fully were they convinced of the prudence and expediency by which the Church was guided on this point. The Church, inspired by the Holy Ghost, was aware of the baneful consequences of exposing its service to the constant changes of arbitrary and fleeting sounds; hence it determined for the preservation of the public Liturgies, to have them performed in languages like the Greek and Latin, not subject to the fluctuations experienced by the living ones. It is also necessary to observe, that the Latin is only used in that part of the service which is destined for edification in prayer—it is not made use of in preaching. In reality, as the end of preaching is to instruct, it would be absurd to preach to a people in a language they do not understand. What will the reader say when he is informed that it is recorded by Dr. Heylin, that “when the new Liturgy was sent over to Ireland, and afterwards to Wales, no precaution was taken to translate it into the language understood by the people? And thus,” adds this writer, “we have furnished the papists with an excellent argument against ourselves, for having the divine service celebrated in such a language as the people do not understand!” (Heylin Hist. ann. Reg. Eliz. 2, 1560, p. 128, edit. Lond. 1661.) Surely, good and impartial Protestants, in the plenitude of liberality, will permit the Catholic Church to pursue a line of conduct, of which the pious founders of their imma-

eculate establishment have left so distinguished an example.

I am aware, however, that a serious charge is instituted against the Catholic Church, for retaining the use of the Latin tongue in the Liturgy. It is roundly asserted that the object is to keep the people in ignorance, and to deprive them of the benefit and comfort of public prayer. "Were our Sacraments administered in English," says a modern clergyman of the Church of England, "and our mysteries celebrated in the same, then our wooden house would soon fall, and our bubble of Romanism would soon burst." Assuredly nothing can justify the nomenclature, systematically and advisedly adopted, of styling Catholics Romanists, and their religion Romanism; but nicknames have always much weight with the thoughtless and ignorant. In politics, their efficacy has long been acknowledged. The cry of revolution and republicanism has wonderfully helped many a weak party. So it has been, and is, in religion. Papists and Romanists were as pretty words as could have been selected by interested bigots—bigots in the pulpit, the press, and the world; who for three generations have been wading through the filth accumulated in the Augean stable. But, would that Protestants would think and examine for themselves, and not be, as Thorndike says, "led by the nose" by interested declaimers who, if they have an appearance of outward respectability, derive that respectability from the very men whom they are base enough to traduce and nickname. Yes, did every Protestant but act on the golden principle of doing unto others as he would be done by, and examine into the truths or falsehoods of the statements concerning us, whether made from the pulpit or from the press—then we should not be much longer condemned to hear such vile expressions; but we feel them

not as grievances, we have been well trained by three centuries of opprobrium to smile at such practices, and cheerfully do we commiserate those who employ them.

However, the people are not ignorant of our Liturgy ; there is no Catholic, if he can read, but knows it from his prayer-book, and if not, from the instructions of his pastor. For, let it be remembered, nothing in our holy religion is so strongly inculcated as, that the pastors should with unremitting zeal afford to their respective flocks the sacred food of the Holy Scriptures, and furnish them a clear exposition of whatever regards the administration of the Sacraments, together with every other point connected with religion. (See Conc. Trid. sess. 24, de Reform., c. 4 et 7.) Hence, if a dispassionate Protestant do but compare the regular systematic mode of conveying religious instruction to the people, adopted by Catholic pastors, with the weak and puny efforts made by Protestant teachers, he will soon discover that we need not dread the comparison, and will be speedily convinced that the charge of keeping the people in ignorance is invented by malice, and propagated by incredulity. But, if it be asked why the Catholic Church should persist in having the service of the Mass performed in the Latin tongue ? I answer, saying, that as the Sacrifice of the Mass, the pure oblation pointed out by the prophet Malachi, was to be offered in every place under the sun, so in order to connect all Christians in the profession of the same faith, it was thought highly advantageous, as a point of discipline, to extend the same unity and stability to the language of the worship. A sacrifice common to the whole Church of Christ is best preserved and perpetuated by a general uniformity of rite ; and where this cannot be effected to the utmost extent, all unnecessary deviations are to be avoided. “ Neither can it be suspected that it is in any manner neces-

sary that the sacrifice should be offered in a language understood by the people. It becomes only requisite, that they should completely apprehend the nature of the action performed, and unite their devotion with that of the priest. This they are enabled to do by the constant instructions given by their pastors ; by the nature of the sacrifice so repeatedly explained ; by the translation of the Liturgy in the hands of the people ; and by prayers corresponding to every part of the great action. The prayers said by the priest at the altar belong professionally or ministerially to his sacred character or office, and it becomes in no manner necessary or even proper that the laity should recite the same, and consequently that they should understand the language in which they are conveyed. “Had the faithful Christians who assist at the Sacrifice of the Mass attended the crucifixion of their Redeemer, and witnessed his pure and disinterested love in the shedding of his blood for all mankind, it would have been wholly unnecessary to have understood his language, or the language of his bloody and unrelenting foes. And if we have the same sacred tragedy acted repeatedly on millions of altars in an unbloody manner, is it necessary to understand the language in which the offering is made ? Are not our minds sufficiently enlightened on the subject ? Are not our wills animated and inflamed with love at the sight of that real and efficient token of divine benevolence ? Do not our hearts glow with all the fire of devotion when we behold the Lord lying as a victim on the altar ; the priest leaning over the sacrifice, and the people around praying in silent supplication ? Do we then think of the language in which the offering is made ? Do we not rather leave to the priest the care of reciting his own prayers, and of performing all the rites connected with his office, while with the most enraptured devotion we endeavour to join in the

sacred action, while we labour to unite our mean efforts in offering our best adorations to God ; in making a just and natural return for all his favours ; in arresting his anger, and in obtaining his blessing ? All this, it is perfectly clear, may be accomplished without understanding the language of the priest ; especially when we consider the perpetual injunctions given to the pastors to explain the nature of the sacrifice, and the sublime ends for which it is offered.”

—(*Coomb.*)

But let us see what was the conduct of the Jewish Church with regard to her Liturgy. We find that during the Babylonish captivity, the people lost the knowledge of the Hebrew language, in which the Scriptures were written. This is so clear that upon their return from captivity, when Nehemias and Esdras the priest read the law to the people, they were obliged to interpret the words of it. (*Nehemias*, 8, v. 13.) And after that period the language commonly used was the Syriac, into which the Sacred Scriptures were not translated from the Hebrew till after our Saviour's time ; yet all their public offices were taken out of the law, psalms, and prophets in the old Hebrew.

This is also clear from the New Testament. For we find there in several passages some words of the language then in use among the Jews that are Syriac, and widely different from the Hebrew words, as *Raca*, *Sabbathani*, *Talitha*, *Gabbatha*, *Aceldama*, *Tabitha*. (*Matt.* 5, v. 22 ; *Matt.* 27, v. 46 ; *Mark*, 5, v. 41 ; *John*, 19, v. 13 and 17 ; *Acts*, 1, v. 19 ; *Acts*, 9, v. 40). It also appears from the same Holy Writings, that though the Hebrew language was become unintelligible to the people, still it was approved of by our Lord and his Apostles as the language to be used in the service of the Temple, for he and his disciples assisted at it ; as also the faithful of those times, as the

Blessed Virgin, St. Joseph, St. Ann the Prophetess, and St. Elizabeth; and still these latter did not understand it. Add also to this our beloved Redeemer and his disciples always severely condemned the abuses they found among the Jews, and strange we do not see they ever censured the language of the service.

Besides, we find this command given by God himself.—

Catholic Version.

Lev. 16.

17 Let no man be in the tabernacle when the High Priest goeth into the sanctuary, to pray for himself and his house, and for the whole congregation of Israel, until he come out.

Protestant Version.

Lev. 16.

17 And there shall be no man in the tabernacle of the congregation when he goeth in to make an atonement in the holy *place*, until he come out, and have made an atonement for himself, and for his household; and for all the congregation of Israel.

In consequence of this it is recorded of Zacharias, St. John the Baptist's father, that when—

Luke, 1.

9 According to the custom of the priestly office, it was his lot to offer incense, going into the temple of the Lord;

10 And all the multitude of the people was praying without at the hour of incense.

Luke, 1.

9 According to the custom of the priest's office, his lot was to burn incense when he went into the temple of the Lord.

10 And the whole multitude of the people were praying without at the time of incense.

Here, then, by God's express command, public prayers were made by the priest for the people, and the sacrifice of incense offered for them, though none of them were permitted to be present, much less understood what the priest said to God for them. They assisted without, joined the priest in spirit, and were no less partakers of the benefits of them than if they had seen and heard the whole.* Even in the time of Christ the Scriptures were read and sung in the temple in the old Hebrew, though it was not the vulgar language at that time. This we know from the words of Christ when raising the daughter of Jairus,

Catholic Version.

Mark, 5.

41 And taking the damsel by the hand, he saith to her: Talitha cumi, which is, being interpreted: damsel, I say to thee arise.

Protestant Version.

Mark, 5.

41 And he took the damsel by the hand, and said unto her, Talitha cumi; which is, being interpreted, Damsel, I say unto thee, arise.

Hence the vernacular language at that time was not Hebrew, but Syriac, or Syro-Chaldaic; as "Talitha cumi," the language used by Christ, is Syriac; for the Hebrew of damsel would be "Yaldah." Hence, though the language was changed, the divine office was read in the temple, and the psalms sung in Hebrew, though the people understood it not. Many Protestants, however, are of opinion that they find conclusive arguments in the 14th chapter of Corinthians against the use of the Latin tongue in the celebration of the Mass. I shall here subjoin, for the consideration of my

* They were also edified, and still they did not understand the language of the service, for they were praying without.

kind Protestant reader, the principal texts in this chapter which they object to us :—

Catholic Version.

1 Cor. 14.

2 For he that speaketh in a tongue, speaketh not unto men, but unto God : for no man heareth. Yet by the Spirit he speaketh mysteries.

4 He that speaketh in a tongue, edifieth himself ; but he that prophesieth, edifieth the Church.

5 And I would have you all to speak with tongues, but rather to prophecy. For greater is he that prophesieth, than he that speaketh with tongues : unless perhaps he interpret, that the Church may receive edification.

6 But now, brethren, if I come to you, speaking with tongues, what shall I profit you, unless I speak to you either in revelation, or in knowledge, or in prophecy, or in doctrine ?

9 So likewise you, except you utter by the tongue

Protestant Version.

1 Cor. 14.

2 For he that speaketh in an *unknown* tongue speaketh not unto men but unto God : for no man understandeth *him* ; howbeit in the Spirit he speaketh mysteries.

4 He that speaketh in an unknown tongue edifieth himself ; but he that prophesieth edifieth the Church.

5 I would that ye all spake with tongues, but rather that ye prophesied : for greater *is* he that prophesieth than he that speaketh with tongues, except he interpret that the Church may receive edifying.

6 Now, brethren, if I come unto you speaking with tongues, what shall I profit you except I shall speak to you either by revelation or by knowledge, or by prophesying, or by doctrine ?

9 So likewise ye, except ye utter by the tongue words

Catholic Version.

plain speech, how shall it be known what is said? For you shall be speaking into the air.

13 And therefore he that speaketh by a tongue, let him pray that he may interpret.

14 For if I pray in a tongue, my spirit prayeth, but my understanding is without fruit.

18 I thank my God I speak with all your tongues.

19 But in the Church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that I may instruct others also; than ten thousand words in a tongue.

21 In the Law it is written: *In other tongues and other lips I will speak to this people: and neither so will they hear me, saith the Lord.*

22 Wherefore tongues are for a sign, not to believers, but to unbelievers: but prophecies, not to unbelievers,

Protestant Version.

easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken? for ye shall speak into the air.

13 Wherefore let him that speaketh in an *unknown* tongue pray that he may interpret.

14 For if I pray in an *unknown* tongue, my spirit prayeth, but my understanding is unfruitful.

18 I thank my God, I speak with tongues more than ye all:

19 Yet in the Church I had rather speak five words with my understanding; that *by my voice* I might teach others also; than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue.

21 In the law it is written with *men* of other tongues and other lips will I speak unto this people; and yet for all that will they not hear me, saith the Lord.

22 Wherefore tongues are for a sign, not to them that believe, but to them that believe not: but prophecy-

Catholic Version.

but to believers.

23 If therefore the whole Church come together into one place, and all speak with tongues, and there come in unlearned persons, or infidels, will they not say that you are mad?

26 How is it then, brethren? When you come together, every one of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a revelation, hath a tongue, hath an interpretation: let all things be done to edification.

27 If any speak with a tongue, let it be by two, or at the most by three, and in course, and let one interpret.

28 But if there be no interpreter, let him hold his peace in the Church, and speak to himself and to God.

39 Wherefore, brethren, be zealous to prophesy; and forbid not to speak with tongues.

Protestant Version.

ing *serveth* not for them that believe not, but for them which believe.

23 If therefore the whole Church be come together into one place, and all speak with tongues, and there come in *those that* are unlearned, or unbelievers, will they not say that ye are mad?

26 How is it then, brethren? When ye come together, every one of you hath a psalm, hath a doctrine, hath a tongue, hath a revelation, hath an interpretation. Let all things be done unto edifying.

27 If any man speak in an *unknown* tongue, *let it be* by two, or at the most *by* three, and *that* by course; and let one interpret.

28 But if there be no interpreter, let him keep silence in the Church; and let him speak to himself, and to God.

39 Wherefore, brethren, covet to prophesy, and forbid not to speak with tongues.

Now I ask my kind Protestant reader whether the Apostle, in the verses he has just read, has one single word relative to the Liturgy, or the celebration of the Divine mysteries? The whole scope, as we shall see, of St. Paul, is to shew the Corinthians the inutility of supernatural gifts, if not employed unto edification. I repeat it, the Apostle has not spoken a single word of a public authorized Liturgy, translated for the use of the people, and carefully expounded by the pastors; for such is the Liturgy of the Catholic Church; and the severe epithets he employs regard only a private and ostentatious display of the gift of tongues exhibited by individuals, who were rather pleased pompously to manifest a supernatural favour to excite admiration, than to expound the mysteries of faith for edification. But to the proof, up to the 14th verse, St. Paul censures the practice of prophesying; that is, preaching, exhorting, and teaching in an unknown tongue, in the assemblies of the faithful. And, from the 14th, &c., he censures praying and blessing in an unknown tongue; but it is evident that his censure is directed to that vain ostentation of the gift of tongues which some of the early Christians were fond of displaying in their assemblies, so as to cause great confusion and disedification. We see, as I have just remarked, he makes no allusion to the public authorized Liturgy; for, as the service among the Corinthians was in Greek, their own vernacular language, so there was no abuse in the public Liturgy of which St. Paul could have complained; but the abuse of which he did complain was, that those who had received the gift of tongues that they might instruct and edify others, used them in such a manner as to cause only confusion and disedification. Again, the Apostle does not forbid the celebration of Divine Service in an unknown tongue, but the interruption of Divine Service, and the

disedification of the assembled faithful, by unintelligible displays of the gifts of tongues. Neither does the Apostle forbid the use of unknown tongues in circumstances where they might instruct and edify, for in verse 39, he expressly says, “forbid not to speak with tongues:” but he checks an abuse which the Catholic Church has ever condemned. Since, then, the Scripture does not contain one word concerning the public liturgy, or a set form of prayer addressed to God alone, the Catholic Church has not contradicted Scripture, in confirming the disciplinary regulation of the earlier days of Christianity, namely, of forbidding the celebration of the Divine mysteries in the vulgar tongues.

I am aware, however, that notwithstanding the explanation which I have given of the 14th chapter of St. Paul, many still persist in asking, how can we reconcile this chapter with the use the Catholic Church makes of the Latin tongue in her service? I answer, saying, that this use and that which St. Paul blames in the Corinthians differ in four or five points.

1st. The Church was then in its infancy. But a Church at such a time, that is, at its first establishment, cannot see any cause in the dispositions of its people to oblige it to give its service in a language unknown to them; on the contrary, the state of their minds generally inclines them to their own maternal language. This made the Apostles appoint the service in Greek to the Greeks, and in Arabic to the Arabians, at the same time they gave it to the Latins in Latin. But we cannot draw any consequence from a Church in its infant state with a Church that is so many hundreds of years in existence. In this last state it cannot be said to have it in its option to choose the language of its service, but is necessarily fixed in the continuance of the

ancient language by the people who are accustomed to it. Besides, at the first establishment, the people do not know what the service contains, so that it is proper to give it to them in a language they understand; but afterwards as they know the different parts of which the service is composed, so in whatever language it is performed, one may employ one's mind before God in thoughts suited to it, as Catholics do at present who assist at the service with devotion according to the spirit of the Church.

2d. The language which St. Paul condemns in the sermons and prayers of the Corinthians was truly an unknown tongue, for neither did the people understand it, nor was there even any one in the whole assembly that could interpret it, so that they could not fairly answer "Amen." They could not tell whether that man who prayed in an unknown tongue prayed to God or blasphemed, or whether in his exhortations he taught truth or heresy.

2d. The Corinthians only acted through a spirit of pride, and shewed the most scandalous contempt of public edification, and this in a manner so much the more reprehensible, as they abused the miraculous gifts of the Holy Spirit to attract the admiration of Christians. They entered into their religious assemblies, and, without the least concern whether any one understood them or not, broached their new languages, the gift of which they had received. They did not trouble themselves whether others were speaking before them, but were determined at all rates that all should know that they could speak strange languages. How opposed, however, to the conduct of the Corinthians in this regard is not the conduct of the Catholic Church? Acting solely from a spirit of charity for her children, and from an ardent desire of their edification, she is convinced, that if she had determined to change the language of the liturgy

in conformity to the various alterations of the living languages, two or three ages would not elapse without great dissensions in many parts among the people, who cannot bear to have the use of those things taken from them to which they are habituated, and which they know by heart—dissensions which would have reigned among their conductors themselves, who, on account of their different notions and passions, would never be induced to agree about the mode and manner of making these changes. It is hence a subject of edification to see that almost all Catholics, though spread over the whole world, speak the same language; which is a mark that they are the children of the same mother, and an encouragement to them wherever they meet, since in all places they see the same service they have been accustomed to. And the experience of an infinity of Catholics proves to a demonstration, that their service, though not understood by many of them, excites in them a spirit of attention, of respect, of recollection, and application to all the parts of prayer. Hence it cannot be true, whatever Protestants may allege, that their service is more edifying than ours—I mean, better adapted to inspire a spirit of recollection and interior adoration.

4th. The Corinthians acted by their own particular authority, without the orders of the Church, and even contrary to its commands. Can there be a subject of greater scandal than to see a simple individual take upon himself to change the customs of the Church? Who can doubt but that its authority extends to the outward parts of religion, such as the language of the service? The use of the Latin language is not in this matter a recent attempt of a few individuals, contrary to the authority of the Church; it is a custom which the Church itself keeps up by a peaceable and general practice. Indeed, I may add here, that

Protestants, in this regard, resemble the Corinthians whom St. Paul reprimands, since they are bold enough to oppose the Church in the choice of its language.

And, finally, I beg the most serious attention of my kind readers to the following observations. Protestant translators, in this chapter, have deceived Protestants themselves, in the same manner as I shall observe on the subject of traditions. As there are in the Holy Scriptures traditions that are approved, and traditions that are condemned, they have retained this word in those passages that treat of those that are condemned, and they have suppressed it in those passages that speak of those that are approved, because they wanted their people to condemn them all. So, in the same manner, in the 14th chapter of the 1st to the Corinthians, where there is mention of a language unknown to the people which St. Paul condemns in the service, and of another unknown language which he approves, they have used the word *unknown* in the 2d, 4th, 13th, 14th, 19th, and 27th verses, where this language is condemned; but in the 18th, 26th, and 39th verses, where this language that is unknown to the people is approved in the service, though the same word occurs in the original, they have not, as in the other verses, made use of the word *unknown*. This plainly shews that they wished to excite in the people an abhorrence for the use of an unknown language in the public service, and for this end did not hesitate to give a fallacious translation of the Scriptures. I shall now close these remarks with the following observation:—In one verse of this chapter it is expressly said, that the people answered “Amen” to the public acts of blessing. This is observed in the Catholic Church; but among Protestants that follow Calvin’s reformation, the people do not answer “Amen” to the public prayers. They have abolished this

practice of the Apostles, and introduced into their public prayers that tedious prolixity which our Lord condemns. As the human mind is easily disgusted with these long uniform prayers, our Lord has given a short prayer to be the model of all prayers; and the Apostolic Church, respecting this method of our Lord, interrupted its prayers by the acclamations of the people, who annexed Amen. The pretended Reformers, at least they who follow Calvin's reformation, therefore, have abandoned the method of service to which our Lord and his Apostles gave the preference.

I shall now close this Lecture by answering the following question. "Has not every national Church an indisputable right to regulate and reform its own discipline as it may deem proper?" No; no authority can change laws but that which makes them; and, therefore, laws made by the authority of the whole Church can only be changed or reformed by the same legislative power. Hence it is, that though every national Church may have a right to regulate its own discipline, in such things as are not contrary to any ecclesiastical constitution of the universal Church, yet no national Church can have a right to break in upon the laws established by and for the Church in general. For these, when once received by common consent, are binding everywhere till they are repealed by the same power that made them. And if it were not so, every particular parish might reform away the ecclesiastical laws of its diocess, and every diocess those of its national Church: conscience, at least, would not restrain them from doing it; and so no Church laws would be binding in the court of conscience, since not only every nation, but every diocess and parish might reform and regulate their own discipline just as they pleased: nay, I see no reason why every individual person

might not claim the same right. This shews that the first reformers acted uncanonically, and exceeded their lawful power, when they pretended to reform the Liturgy, which had not been introduced or established by a mere national law, but by a superior spiritual authority which they themselves had acknowledged for several years, and had been acknowledged by the whole nation for nine hundred years together. And if such authority can be thrown off at pleasure, we must strike out of the Bible this express command of St. Paul: "Let every soul be subject to higher powers," (Rom. 13, 1.), and conclude he was grievously mistaken in saying "that they who resist power, resist God, and shall receive damnation to themselves." (v. 2.)

ADDENDA

TO THE LECTURE ON THE USE OF THE LATIN
TONGUE IN THE SERVICE OF THE CHURCH.

“THERE is a point of general discipline in our Church which is the subject of much comment—I mean that of performing the public service in Latin. Lest you should be misled by insinuations that at first appear plausible, I shall hazard one or two observations. I wish, however, to avoid every discussion that savours of controversy, as I advance nothing in opposition to those who avowedly dissent from us. They stand upon fair ground, and are entitled to respect: provided we are good and virtuous citizens, I believe they are disposed to leave us in peaceable possession of our opinions. My object is only to lay open the perfidy and combat the depravity of false brethren and licentious teachers; to guard you against the poison of those serpents that lurk in the shadow of our own altars; to warn you from the example of unnatural children, who attempt the peace of a venerable parent—children nursed in her bosom, fed with her milk, sheltered under her wings! Great God! one would think that an age of seventeen hundred years was entitled to some reverence and respect, and should make even the infirmities of decrepitude sacred. But to our Liturgy.—

“That of the Western Church has always been in Latin.

The Church was planted in the West whilst subject to the laws and arms of the Roman empire. The language of that empire survived its fall, and is to this day the most universally understood through all Europe. There is no individual of decent education ignorant of it; and in many parts of the Continent it is familiar even to the peasantry, such as Hungary, Bohemia, Poland, &c. Yet, as the case is not general, to obviate that inconvenience, the Liturgy is literally translated into every modern language, and those who cannot read are carefully instructed by their ministers as to the purport and import of divine service. In St. Austin's time, which is generally termed the purer era of the Church, the Liturgy was in Latin; still he mentions, in his 209th letter to Pope Celestin, and many other passages of his works, that in various parts of Africa it was little understood. It is, again, certain, that on the introduction of Christianity into the West, the vulgar in Germany, France, and England, and other Northern countries, laboured under the same disadvantages, yet the public service was universally performed and recited in Latin. Thus far I conceived the present practice to be conformable to the sense of antiquity; nor can I induce myself to believe the alteration so wisely recommended would be a salutary amendment. 1st. Because natural languages are subject to decay and corruption, and in the space of a century may have undergone a total change as to the meaning and acceptance of words and phrases: the consequence must be, that error and obscurity might insensibly steal into the Liturgy. 2dly. Because in the same kingdom, for instance, in this Island, which is but a speck upon the expanse of Europe, public service would be read in three different tongues—English, Welsh, and Erse. Hence what confusion would arise, even in the Liturgy of this nation? insomuch that

were one of you present at the Mass in Wales, or in some parts in Scotland, not to speak of Ireland, you might as well hear it in the language of Indostan. What inconveniences would not clergymen labour under? They would on many occasions, through unacquaintance with the language of this or that particular country, be debarred from the privilege of offering the holy sacrifice, and possibly in circumstances when there existed a necessity of administering the Sacrament.

“In whatever point of view I consider the matter, I am persuaded, that to alter the present practice would be an unwise and dangerous reform. That such a measure might have been demanded in too insolent a manner, may perhaps be true, but that it has not been acceded to because we are irritated by petulant reflections, or not disposed to pray in the language of a Luther, a Calvin, or an Elizabeth, is not the case, but because the Church judges it expedient to preserve uniformity in her service, and secure it from change, corruption, and confusion!”—(*Part of a Discourse delivered by W. B. Kirwan, in 1787.—He apostatized soon after from the Catholic faith.*)

“We contend that a written language and a dead language is the most appropriate depository of inspired truths, and the best medium of their communication. A written language has its defined and characteristic elements, is fixed in its structure, and therefore conveys whatever it is intended to make known with clearness and precision; but, should it long continue to be a language spoken by any very considerable portion of mankind after it has been constituted the written medium of divine revelation, it would be liable to innovations and admixtures, to changes and corruptions, which, if they did not endanger the integrity

of the inspired pages, might yet involve them in an obscurity which would render them wholly unintelligible. A dead language, as the medium of plenary instruction, is greatly to be preferred to a living one. It is an incorruptible and immutable standard ; and, disused among men, it becomes peculiarly and appropriately the language of God."—(*Editor of Eclectic Review.*)

END OF THE LECTURE ON THE USE OF THE LATIN TONGUE
IN THE SERVICE OF THE CHURCH.

LECTURE XI.

ON THE INVOCATION OF ANGELS AND SAINTS.

THE Doctrine of the Holy Catholic Church on the Invocation of Angels and Saints is thus defined by the Fathers of the Council of Trent:—"The Saints reigning with Christ offer up their prayers to God for men; it is good and profitable suppliantly to invoke them, and to have recourse to their supplications and assistance, in order to obtain offers from God, through his Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who is our only Redeemer and Saviour."—Sess. 25.

In another declaration contained in the same Session, the Council, as if anticipating future calumnies regarding this point, antithetically declares in express terms that, whilst "we *adore* Christ we only *honour* the Saints:—"Christum adoramus, et sanctos veneramus."

It is then untrue, not to say worse, to assert, that the Catholic Church teaches that the Saints are to be adored. "And still, in some few of the writings of our opponents, this Lecture is headed as follows:—Saint-Worship, Image-Worship, Relic-Worship, Cross-Worship. Such a nomenclature is very disgraceful, and is only to be found in the pages of the few who are determined to be the last in bigotry and prejudice. Now by such words they charge us at once with the abominable crime of idolatry—the grossest crime the creature can commit against the Creator. No matter that such accusations are met by every Catholic in the wide

world with a solemn and emphatical denial. No matter that Catholic divines have been scrupulously careful to show that if ever the word worship is employed in reference to these creatures of God, it is never intended to convey divine adoration, but a very inferior and relative honour; and that to preclude all mistake they have appropriated terms to express the precise kind of honour given to creatures, and distinguish it in the clearest manner from the divine adoration due to God alone. All this is shamefully set at nought by those who stand ready with the first stone in the ranks of uncharitableness and injustice. 'We have no special concern,' they say, 'with those ingenious distinctions between Positive Worship and Relative Worship, they often vanish altogether in practice, and they have been merely borrowed from Paganism;' Now, suppose we were to retort such ingenious shuffling—let us say in the case of Transubstantiation, and tell them that we would have no concern with the ingenious distinction of moral change, which has been devised for the purpose of escaping the very natural and obvious charge of gross absurdity, in maintaining that a body can be really present, and yet not substantially present: what would be their reply? They would repeat the frequent admonition, that we are not to attend to what is said, but what is meant, and that every one must be allowed the very small privilege of explaining his own meaning. Thus they evince their injustice in arrogantly setting aside our mode of explaining the precise degree of honour which we pay to saints, images, relics, and crosses. Protestants bow at the holy name of Jesus; they reverently kiss the Bible when they take an oath; they bow before the king's picture in some of the colonial governments (I myself—the Lecturer, can testify the truth of this); they declare that with their bodies they worship

their wives in the marriage service : what, then, could they say if we were to head a Lecture against their Church, accusing her of Name-Worship, Book-Worship, Image-Worship, and Wife-Worship ? They will have no special concern with our distinctions, because, as they allege, “ they often vanish in practice, and sometimes in the declarations of exaggerating doctors !” However, our actual practice is perfectly in accordance with our professed principles. And our principles are clear and evident from our authoritative professions of faith. By these our practices should in justice be interpreted, instead of a faith being fabricated for us from a prejudiced and malignant interpretation of our prayers. Catholics secure in the principles of their creed are in no danger from the occasional use of some figurative or exaggerated expressions. Every one knows that the import of words must ever depend on the intention of the person who employs them, and that it is mere insanity to persist in telling any man that in using such or such words he must mean what others have determined to be the meaning. Yet this is precisely the process tenaciously persisted in by many of the present day against Catholics, though in what regards themselves they loudly insist on the justice of considering not what is said, but what is meant. We lay down our real principles—we prove them to be in perfect accordance with Scripture,—and still our opponents ask in respect to the fact of naked actual practice ‘how stands the matter?’ Again, by others we are told that they disregard our principles, ‘because indeed they have been borrowed from Paganism.’ It is impossible not to feel, and difficult not to express disgust and indignation at the gross, palpable, and disgraceful dishonesty of such a declamation. And are we then to waste time, and trifle with the patience of our fellow-men by as-

sureing the world for the thousandth time that we worship God alone? Or are the Catholic millions who overspread the globe to be obliged 'gravely to sit down in the present day' to demonstrate that they believe the plain natural truth, which even the Muezzin calls aloud from his minaret: 'There is no God but God?' This is past endurance. The Bible prohibits the worship of any but one God. To this doctrine we cordially and sincerely subscribe, and we most solemnly disclaim in principle and practice any worship of Saints or Images, except in the sense of inferior and relative honour."—(*Husenbeth*).

Persons who thus calumniate the Catholic Church should bear in mind that they commit an injustice, of which the Jews were often guilty against our Lord. When he said, speaking of an everlasting death, "If any man keep my word he shall not see death for ever," (John 8, 51,) the Jews explained his discourse of a temporal death, and without asking in what sense he ought to be understood, they precipitately took occasion from the mistaken notion which they had conceived to vent the most horrid outrages against him: "Now we know," said they, "that thou hast a devil. Abraham is dead, and the Prophets, and thou sayest if any man keep my word he shall not taste death for ever." (*Ibid.*, 52.) This was likewise the sin of the false witnesses, produced in order to bring about our Lord's condemnation. He said, "I am able to destroy the temple of God and after three days to rebuild it." (Matt. 26, 61.) It is true that Jesus Christ had pronounced these words which seemed, as the Jews pretended, to relate to the temple of Jerusalem, but our Lord did not speak these words with a view to it; he only meant them of his body, which might likewise be called a temple. If the minds of the Jews had not been prejudiced with a spirit of calumny,

they would before they condemned him have asked whether or no, when he spoke those words, he intended to apply them to the temple of Jerusalem. In the same spirit they accused our Lord of an intention of forming designs against the authority of Cæsar, because he called himself Christ their king. (Luke, 23, 2.) Hence, Protestants ought to ask Catholics for an explanation of the expressions and ceremonies that give them offence, and they ought readily to admit the favourable interpretation Catholics themselves lay before them in order to elucidate them. There is a very remarkable example on this subject in the conduct of the people of Israel, with regard to the two tribes and the half who had built an altar different from that of the tabernacle, when they returned to their own country. (Josh. 22, 13.) The Israelites, far from passing immediate sentence on the two tribes, showed a readiness to lay aside the impression which the erection of such an altar might justly have caused in them. They sent to them deputies of distinction to inquire into the reason of this conduct, and the two tribes and the half having answered them, that they detested the idolatry of which they had suspected them; that they adored only the God of Israel, to whom they sacrificed in the tabernacle, and that the altar which raised their complaints was only a memorial designed to instruct posterity; that, notwithstanding the separation of the Jordan, they were still a part of God's chosen people; the deputies of the people of Israel did not endeavour to enforce their suspicions; they did not tell them there were other ways of showing the union of the two tribes and the half with the people of God, and that it was sufficiently pointed out by their submission to the same conductors, by their conformity to the same civil and religious customs, by their triple attendance at the tabernacle on the great Festivals, &c. They

were instantly satisfied with the answer of their brethren. They admitted it most willingly, says the Scripture, and they did not compel the two tribes and a half to destroy this altar, of the erection of which they had given so favourable an explanation. Protestants ought to observe the same method in regard to the Catholic Church when they find in it practices that seem to them to leave room to suspect her of idolatry; they ought to inquire whether the Church uses them in the wicked sense they suspect; and if the Church abhors this meaning, and gives a contrary explanation, they ought to admit this favourable exposition—be no more scandalized at those expressions and ceremonies, nor any more offended if they continue to be practised. Thus they ought to act, particularly in regard of those expressions and practices that have given occasion to Protestants to believe that we give to Saints an honour that is due to God alone.

But, then, with respect to the doctrine under discussion, the doctrine of our opponents seems not to differ from us. Do they not dedicate churches in the names of the Saints? Do they not celebrate feasts in their memory? We Catholics do no more. Neither the Council of Trent nor any other General Council has defined that this honour is a *religious one*. We merely, in the Saints of God, admire the powerful effects of God's grace, and after their departure from us, continue to shew them that respect which we considered ourselves bound to pay them whilst on earth. And does not the Anglican Church profess to do the same? Unquestionably she does. Does she not venerate those who on earth appear filled with the Divine Spirit? Certainly she does. Well, then, if the Protestant Church thinks it not in the least injurious, nor lowering, nor derogatory to the supreme honour that is paid to God, to pay a

tribute of praise or honour to such persons while living in their mortal bodies here, why should it be deemed idolatrous, when paid to these same persons now blessed and rewarded by God, and happy with Him in Heaven?

Again, has she not placed the names of many Catholic Saints in her Calendar? But, perhaps, as Protestants have, I believe, ceased to notice the days of abstinence and fasting, so carefully specified at the beginning of their Prayer Book, and even denounced these actions as useless and superstitious, they may consider the placing of their names as the sainted friends of God in their Liturgy as sufficient evidence that their Church honours and venerates them.

Indeed, at the celebrated discussion held in Derry, in 1828, it was asserted by a clergyman of the Church of England, that the names of so many saints occur in the Protestant calendar for civil purposes—to regulate law terms, and so forth!!! If so, it is lawful to ask, if it be for civil purposes that the vigils, fasts, and days of abstinence, are inserted in the calendar? Do lawyers require fast days and days of abstinence to assist them in determining the dates of charters, or regulating court days, or law terms? I fear the Protestant Church may be compared in this point to the Jews, who carefully preserve the letter of the Prophecies, and leave to Christians the task of marking the application. To admit the words of an instrument, and to deny or overlook the natural and obvious meaning of it, is to build with one hand and to destroy with another. Of such an architect it may be safely said

Diruit, Œdificat, mutat quadrata rotundis.

But we must remind them that, at least, they are pledged to abide by whatever is contained in their Book of Common Prayer. Do they not venture, even in the same Liturgy, so

far as to pray that they may be succoured and defended by the ministering Spirit? I beg my kind reader to peruse the beautiful collect for the feast of St. Michael, which, like the rest, or at least like most of the Protestant Liturgy, is a literal translation from some part or other of the service of the Catholic Church. In the present instance, the same collect is read by us at Mass in the same festival.

“O everlasting God, who hast ordained and constituted the services of angels and men, in a wonderful manner, mercifully grant, that, as Thy Holy Angels always do thee service in Heaven; so by thy appointment, they may succour and defend us on earth, through Jesus Christ our Lord.” Here the Church of England prays for succour and defence from the Angels! And I presume one way the Angels have of succouring us, is by their prayers, which by consequence must be granted to the Saints, for in this they are both upon the same parallel. Now from this principle, namely, that the Angels and Saints pray for the Church Militant upon earth, I infer that it must certainly be good and profitable for every particular Christian to beg a share in their prayers. So that the whole question concerning the invocation of Saints and Angels is fully decided by a principle not only grounded on the word of God, but agreed to by Protestants themselves.

In addition to the above practices, I beg to refer my Protestant reader to the 21st article of the Confession of Augsburg and to the 5th article of the Helvetic Confession, in which we find it expressly defined “as sound Protestant doctrine, that relative and inferior veneration is due to the Saints and Angels.”

The Centuriators allow that even so early as at an early part of the third century the invocation of the Saints was practised in the Church. “You may trace,” they say,

“ manifest vestiges of it, in the writers of this century. Thus in Origen you have this form of address : ‘ O blessed Job, pray for us.’ ”

“ It is confessed,” adds the learned and impartial Thorn-
dyke, “ that all the Fathers of both the Greek and Latin
Churches, *viz.* the Saints Basil, Nazianzen, Nyssen, Am-
brose, Jerome, Austin, Chrysostom, the two Cyrils, Theo-
doret, Fulgentius, Gregory the Great, Leo, and *all* after
their time have spoken to the Saints, and desired their assist-
ance.” The same learned writer, in *Epil.* part 3, p. 353,
says, “ To dispute whether we are to honour the Saints or
not, were to dispute whether or no we are to be Christians.
And whether this be religious or civil, nothing but the
equivocation of words can make disputable.” And in his
just weights and measures, c. 16, p. 107, he tells us that
“ all the members of the Church triumphant in Heaven, ac-
cording to their degree of favour with God, abound also with
love to his Church Militant on earth, and though they know
not the necessities of particular persons without the revela-
tion of God, yet they know there are such necessities so
long as the Church is militant on earth. Therefore it is
certain, both that they offer continual prayers to God for
those necessities, and that their prayers must needs be of
great force and effect with God for the assistance of the
Church Militant in this warfare. Which, if it be true, the
Communion of Saints will necessarily require that all who
remain solicitous of their trial be assisted by the prayers
of the living for present comfort and future rest. ‘ That
the living beg of God a part and interest in the benefit of
those prayers which they, who are so near to God in his
kingdom, tender him without ceasing for the Church on
earth.’ ” Such is the testimony of this eminent and impar-
tial scholar on this subject.

Amesius, writing against Bellarmine, confesses, "that there is an honour of a more eminent degree due to the Saints than what we owe to men upon earth, and that it comes under the second table of the Decalogue."—And, again, he owns that God's creatures are to be honoured from a motive of Religion towards God, and not towards themselves; whence he calls it, in the language of the School, "Actus a Religione imperatus, non elicited."

Kemnitius, in Exam. Conc. Trid., says, "It has been abundantly proved above, that the Saints should be honoured and venerated."

Chamier, a Calvinist divine, writing also against Bellarmine, Tom. 2, Panstratiæ, l. 12., says, "The reformed Churches agree that there is some kind of worship due from us to those excellent creatures (the Saints and Angels) and that there are examples and sacred precepts for it."

Grotius calls it a religious worship: "Et religiosus est, qui ob Deum defertur (cultus) et Angelis, et Apostolis!!" In animad. Priva, p. 43.

A late Protestant Bishop of Oxford, in his edition of St. Cyprian, says (p. 291), "We do not doubt but the Saints in Heaven pray earnestly to God that he may shew mercy to us on earth!!"

Similar language is used by Dr. Montague, a Protestant Bishop of Norwich, who makes this candid acknowledgment: "I grant Christ is not wronged [in his mediation]; it is no impiety to say, as they (Catholics) do, Holy Mary, pray for me—Holy Peter, pray for me!!" And again, "I see no absurdity in nature, no incongruity as to analogy of faith, no repugnance at all to Scripture, much less impiety, for any man to say, Holy Angel Guardian, pray for me." (Invoc. Sanct.) Such was the language of this venerable Protestant divine, who, in the same work, acknowledges this

to have been the practice of the earliest and most venerable period of the Church. (*Ibid.* p. 97—103.) But what will my kind Protestant reader say when he hears that the great Patriarch of Protestantism, Martin Luther, did not find anything idolatrous in the doctrine or practice of the Church with respect to the Saints. So far from this, he exclaims : “ Who can deny that God works great miracles at the tombs of the Saints ? ” I therefore, with the whole Catholic Church, hold that the Saints are to be honoured and invoked by us. (In purg. quorund. Artic, Tom. 1. Germet. Ep. ad Georg. Spatat.) In this same spirit, he recommends this devotion to dying persons :—“ Let no one omit to call upon the Blessed Virgin and Saints, that they may intercede with God for them at this instant.” (Luth. prep. ad. mort.)

The impartial reader, on attentively perusing the above authorities, will clearly see that I am fully borne out in laying it down, that the Anglican Church does not differ from us on this point. I shall now proceed, under the Divine assistance, to submit the Scriptural authorities in support of the Catholic doctrine of the respect due to the Angels and Saints. At the same time the reader will bear in mind, that when I say *respect*, I do not mean religious respect. It is true many Catholic writers imagine that this respect is, and ought to be called, an act of *religious honour*, and such probably it is ; but it does not, therefore, follow that this is an article of our faith, much less that it is an act of *divine* or *supreme* honour. This can be rendered to God *alone*, and never to any created being.

Referring now to the Holy Writings, we find that respect may be paid to the Angels and Saints, without incurring the enormous guilt of idolatry. The following references will, I trust, satisfy any candid Protestant on this point :—

Catholic Version.

Genesis, 18.

2 And when he (Abraham) had lifted up his eyes, there appeared to him three men standing near him : and as soon as he saw them, he ran to meet them from the door of his tent, and adored down to the ground.

19.

1 And the two Angels came to Sodom in the evening, and Lot was sitting in the gate of the city. And seeing them, he rose up and went to meet them : and worshipped prostrate to the ground.

Numbers, 22.

31 Forthwith the Lord opened the eyes of Balaam, and he saw the Angel standing in the way with a drawn sword, and he worshipped him falling flat on the ground.

Josue, 5.

13 And when Josue was in the field of the city of Jericho, he lifted up his eyes, and saw a man standing over

Protestant Version.

Genesis, 18.

2 And he lift up his eyes and looked, and, lo, three men stood by him : and when he saw *them*, he ran to meet them from the tent door, and bowed himself toward the ground.

19.

1 And there came two Angels to Sodom at Even ; and Lot sat in the gate of Sodom : and Lot seeing *them* rose up to meet them ; and he bowed himself with his face toward the ground.

Numbers, 22.

31 Then the Lord opened the eyes of Balaam, and he saw the Angel of the Lord standing in the way, and his sword drawn in his hand : and he bowed down his head, and fell flat on his face.

Joshua, 5.

13 And it came to pass, when Joshua was by Jericho, that he lifted up his eyes and looked, and, be-

Catholic Version.

against him, holding a drawn sword, and he went to him and said: Art thou one of ours, or of our adversaries?

14 And he answered: No; but I am prince of the host of the Lord, and now I am come.

15 Josua fell on his face to the ground, And worshipping, said: What saith my Lord to his servant?

Protestant Version.

hold, there stood a man over against him with his sword drawn in his hand: and Joshua went unto him, and said unto him: *Art* thou for us, or for our adversaries?

14 And he said, Nay; but *as* captain of the host of the Lord am I now come. And Joshua fell on his face to the earth, and did worship, and said unto him, What saith my Lord unto his servant?

15 And the captain of the Lord's host said unto Joshua, Loose thy shoe from off thy foot; for the place whereon thou standest *is* holy. And Joshua did so.

But will Protestants dare charge Joshua with idolatry by so doing? Yet do they falsely charge Roman Catholics with idolatry; whereas they do no more when they, according to the doctrine of their Church, venerate and invoke Angels and Saints, than what Joshua did on this occasion. By his external action he did not worship the Angel with that Supreme honour due to God alone, and to be paid to no other; that, indeed, would have been idolatrous worship in some degree, particularly as he was told, and he knew for certain, the person who appeared was not God, but only a prince of His heavenly hosts. Nor was Joshua's

worship a civil honour and veneration, such as is paid to temporal kings and princes ; such honour is not adequate to that which is due to celestial spirits and princes of the heavenly hosts. Joshua's veneration, therefore, was infinitely inferior to Divine worship, yet of a higher degree than civil honour ; and such is the honour that the Catholic Church pays to the Angels and Saints. And yet Joshua's veneration of the Angel might have been Divine honour, without the guilt of idolatry, as his external veneration may have been referred to God, whose representative the Angel was at that time, and who spoke to him the will and command of God, who is adored, honoured, and worshipped—is the only source of all sanctity and excellence—the first beginning and ultimate end of all good—" for of Him, and by Him, and in Him, are all things ; to Him be glory for ever, amen." (Rom. 11, v, 36.) Even when He deigns to represent himself to us, or to speak to us by His Angels, and He condescends to receive through them the homage of worship we pay to Him. It may, moreover, be here observed, that the angel not only accepted the honour Joshua paid to him, but he moreover required of him a further token: " loose," says he, " thy shoes from off thy feet, for the place whereon thou standest is holy." (Joshua, 5, v. 16.) Holy for what reason ? Unless by that of the Angel's presence, who represented God, and who was his messenger, for otherwise the ground was no other than the common field of Jericho. The like external respect Moses was commanded to exhibit when he approached the burning bush. (Exodus, 3, v. 5.) Hence, reverence is due to Holy places. On the same religious principle, the Catholic Church has ordained, that in the ceremony of Good Friday, the officiating priest should put off his shoes before he approaches to salute the crucifix, which represents to him

Christ crucified on that day for the redemption of mankind. This ceremony of putting off the shoes, and approaching even bare foot, is, in some places, observed by all in general, priest and people.

To a Protestant it looks like idolatry, because we bow down three times before it and kiss it; but then, by these outward actions, we mean no more than to express that love and veneration which is due to the Cross and other Holy things, and to our Redeemer, who on that day died for us; and by it we pay, on the part of the Church, an acknowledgment and thanksgiving to Christ, for preaching the Gospel of Salvation. It is no more than if, being on Mount Calvary, on Good Friday, we should prostrate ourselves, and, on our knees, kiss the ground where the Cross stood. Now a grateful acknowledgment of faith and love is due to our Redeemer, in a more special manner on that day of our Redemption; and if, instead of our being on Mount Calvary, we humble ourselves in our Churches and kiss the Cross, so to express our acknowledgment of love to Christ, I cannot but hope, that we may do it without being guilty of idolatry, however it may look to others, who, through ignorance, may take exception against it.

Therefore, on how weak and fallacious grounds, even a want of common sense and reason, do Protestants reprobate, as idolatrous or superstitious, this, or any such like ceremony and practice used in the Catholic Church? They profess to believe in the Holy Catholic Church, and yet reprobate her precepts, discipline, ceremonies, &c. How do Protestants explain that celebrated text of Revelations, 3, v. 9: "Behold, I will make them to come and adore before thy feet." If, by the Angel of Philadelphia, we are to understand the Bishop of it, then it is lawful for us to worship before the feet of the Bishop of any Church, and

more particularly before the feet of the Chief Bishop of the whole Church ; and consequently we must not be censured for practising this : but if these words are directed to the Angel, to whose care the Church of Philadelphia was confided, then the conclusion is, that God Almighty declares that he would cause the Philadelphians to worship Angels, —but surely not give them a worship sinful and idolatrous, but as the Catholic Church of this day gives them. But to return to the Scriptural proofs. It is clear, then, from Genesis, Numbers, and Joshua, that external marks of respect were paid to, and received by the Angels of God, as might be and was exhibited to God himself. The intention of the Giver alone confining itself to give veneration and not worship to the Saints.

The same respect, we learn from the Sacred Volume, was extended to the Prophets, and other Holy men of God—1 Samuel, otherwise called the 1st book of Kings, 28.*

Catholic Version.

14 And he (Saul) said to her : (the woman that had a divining spirit at Endor), what form is he of? And she said : an old man cometh up, and he is covered with a mantle. And Saul understood that it was Samuel, and he bowed himself with his face to the ground, and adored.

Protestant Version.

14 And he said unto her, What form *is* he of? And she said, An old man cometh up; and he *is* covered with a mantle. And Saul perceived that it *was* Samuel, and he stooped with *his* face to the ground, and bowed himself.

* The first and second books of Kings are called by the Hebrews the books of Samuel, because they contain the history of Samuel and of the two kings Saul and David, whom he anointed.

This instance is sufficient to shew, that after death the Prophet was still respected and honoured.

Before proceeding further, it may be well to remind my kind Protestant reader, that language seems to have been as indeterminate amongst the Jews as amongst us ; since, in all the instances cited above, the same word is made use of in the original Hebrew, though a mere inferior respect is intended, as is elsewhere employed to designate the supreme worship due to God. A singular instance of this poverty of language occurs in 1 Para. 29—

Catholic Version.

20 And David commanded all the Assembly : Bless ye the Lord our God. And all the assembly blessed the Lord the God of their fathers : and they bowed themselves, and worshipped God, and then the king.

Protestant Version.

1 Chron. 29.

20 And David said to all the congregation, Now bless the Lord your God. And all the congregation blessed the Lord God of their fathers, and bowed down their heads, and worshipped the Lord and the king.

“ Were an infidel, on perusing this passage of the sacred text, to conclude that idolatry is thus clearly inculcated—that the same worship was paid to the King of Israel as to the great King of Kings, would we not smile at that obliquity of judgment which could lead him to so illogical a conclusion. Were he, again, to have heard, when a Protestant leads his future partner to the altar, that the same Protestant declares, in the presence of God and his Angels, that ‘ with his body, he her (his wife) worships,’ and thence have concluded, that a most singular species of idolatry was a tenet and practice of the Protestant Church, would they not again have wondered, that his charity and common

sense should not have interposed and have induced him to consider whether these expressions may not bear a more favourable interpretation. Would they not remind such a one, that the language of devotion and passion is bold and figurative ; that words, abstractedly, are but empty sounds, nor are they calculated to convey any impression other than that which common practice attaches to them ; that the conventional phraseology has at all times existed in various branches of science, the key to which is possessed by all who are interested in this subject ; that we are to explain ‘ words by things, and not things by words.’ These and other similar observations would they employ to explain away the unsubstantial difficulty. Let them be applied to extracts from Catholic Prayer books, and the consequences will be obvious.”—*Waterworth.*

But to return. That during life this respect was shewn to the character of Holy persons needs no proof—it may be collected from almost any book of the Old Testament. I will adduce one example—

Catholic Version.

1 Kings, 18.

7 And the women sung as they played, and they said : Saul slew his thousands, and David his ten thousands.

Protestant Version.

1 Samuel, 18.

7 And the women answered *one another* as they played, and said, Saul hath slain his thousands, and David his ten thousands.

Again. In the Old Testament nothing is clearer than that the departed servants of God were respected by the Jews. Who were more honoured than the Prophets, or the Holy men of Israel ? The memory of the early Patriarchs was cherished by the Jews ; the places rendered Holy by their actions were carefully noted and respected, and

their practices recorded as examples to their children. This was even carried to an almost superstitious extent, as may be seen in the writings of the Jews, which are filled with their real or supposed sayings, and with details of what is said to have been their conduct on the most trifling occasions.

And here, having shewn that the practice of honouring the Angels and the Saints of the old law during life and after death is purely scriptural, and is also (as we have seen) in accordance with the practices of the Church of England, I shall now pass to the lawfulness of soliciting their prayers.

I have said lawfulness, for I hope my kind Protestant reader will bear in mind there is no injunction or command to be found in our catechisms or books of devotion to pray to them. I beg to subjoin the authority of a few Catholic writers on this point—

1st. Bossuet, in his Exposition of the Doctrines of the Catholic Church, page 34, says :

“ The Council of Trent only teaches that this practice is good and beneficial, without saying anything more about it. So that the intention of the Church is only to condemn those who reject this practice either through error or through contempt.”

2nd. Veron, Rule of Catholic Faith, p. 84, observes,

“ It is another of Du Moulin’s calumnies to pretend that we are ordered to invoke the saints. This is untrue, as is evident from the Council of Trent, which merely says that it is good and profitable,” &c. &c.

3rd. Bishop Milner, in his End of Controversy, page 261, letter 33, notices,

“ That the Council of Trent barely teaches that it is good and profitable to invoke the prayers of the saints ;

hence our Divines infer that there is no positive law of the Church incumbent on all her children to pray to the saints." The learned Bishop refers in the margin to Petavius, Suarez, the brothers of Wallenburgh, Muratori, and Natalis Alexander.

4th. Similar to this is Dr. Lingard's language, as may be collected from his miscellaneous tracts.

5th. The learned Bishop Trevern, in his Answer to the Difficulties of Romanism, part 3, page 413, says :

" Be it known to him (Faber) that though we admit the invocation of saints as useful and profitable, we do not hold it to be absolutely necessary acting according as the Council of Trent has decided." And in " Amicable Discussion" he proves, that it is of faith the Saints intercedes for us, but that it is not an article of faith that we must pray to them.

6th. Husenbeth, in his admirable work, Faberism Exposed and Refuted, sec. 1, c. 7, In vocation of Saints, p. 645, says :

" There is no question here of a command the saints ; we never contend that Almighty God has required us to invoke them, and the Church has merely declared that such invocation is good and useful, consequently not strictly necessary for salvation.

7th. Waterworth (Letters to Simpson) declares :

" That there is no decree of our general Councils, no Creed or Declaration of our catechism, which requires the Catholic to worship the saints and angels."

8th. Des Mahis, who, after having officiated for several years as minister to the Calvinists of Orleans, embraced the Catholic faith, and was soon after advanced to the order of priesthood, and became celebrated for his excellent scriptural defence of Catholicity, says :—

" We speak of recourse to the prayers of saints, not as a

thing absolutely necessary to salvation, but only as a thing that is helpful, and that may be profitable.”

9th. Pembrige, in the *Catholic Church and Religion Vindicated*, page 204, says—

“ Wherefore the actual praying to the saints, or invocation, is not of absolute necessity to eternal salvation, in the manner of belief of divine mysteries, of the necessity of baptism, and the actual reception of it, where the act is possible ; otherwise by desire with due disposition, or by martyrdom, being baptized, by shedding his blood and laying down life in defence and testimony of the Catholic Faith, Religion, and Church ; without this belief, &c., no man can be saved. Whereas, though it may happen occasionally that a person has never invocated or prayed to any saint, (provided the omission was not occasioned through any obstinate denial of the benefit arising from the practice by the ‘ communion of saints,’ or through contempt) he may be saved ; as in the case of a very ignorant Roman Catholic, who never had the opportunity of being sufficiently instructed in that point, nor taught to say the ‘ Hail Mary!’ (a case very rare.) In the like manner, a Protestant or Infidel converted during a dangerous illness, or before he could possibly be instructed ; who, therefore, never actually repeated the ‘ Hail Mary!’ or prayed to any particular saint ; the same person may, notwithstanding, attain eternal salvation. Sufficient, then, is it in the strict sense to believe the ‘ communion of saints,’ as believed, taught, and practised by the Holy Catholic Church.”

10th. The Rev. F. Martyn in his fifth lecture, page 123, observes—

“ The Church does not say that it is necessary that we ask their prayers, but teaches her children that it is good and useful to do so.”

11th. The Rev. T. Green, in his sermon on the Invocation of the Saints, wishes

“That it be distinctly understood that although we contend that the angels and saints may be lawfully and profitably invoked, we do not inculcate that any of these practices are of precept.” p. 23.

I will close this list of authorities with one from among Protestant Divines :

“In this whole matter of the Invocation of Saints this is the only point which wants to be accommodated between the two Churches—for this is the only thing the Church in communion with Rome has declared in the Council of Trent—that it is good and profitable to call upon the saints.” An Essay for Catholic Communion, by a Minister of the Church of England, p. 32.

I will now proceed to the lawfulness of soliciting the prayers of the Saints and Angels. The real Doctrine of the Catholic Church on this matter is thus laid down in Pius’s Creed—

“I firmly hold that the Saints reigning together with Christ may be venerated and invoked, and that they offer prayers to God for us.”

My kind Protestant reader will recollect that the Council of Trent explains more fully this doctrine when it says “that it is good,” &c. And we have the following declaration in the catechism of the Council—

“God and the saints are not to be prayed to in the same manner; for we pray to God that he himself would give us good things and deliver us from evil things: but we beg of the saints because they are pleasing to God, that they would be our intercessors, and obtain from God what we stand in need of.”

From the above quotations, it is easy to collect the real

Doctrine of the Catholic Church on the Invocation of Saints. We believe therefore in one Mediator, the man Christ Jesus, who alone is our Saviour and Redeemer, and through whose merits alone can we obtain any favour or grace. Yes, the Catholic Church, rigorously speaking, has but one mediator, the Son of God, who as *man* redeemed us; who alone could do it, alone has been able to cleanse us from our sins in his most precious blood, alone could intercede efficaciously for us in heaven: from him and his merits alone our prayers and good works receive all their value; it is only through him that they can become agreeable to his Father, only through him that they must reach him, whether we ourselves present them directly to him, or whether to render them more acceptable, we employ the ministry of his elect. "Christians," says St. Augustin, "recommend themselves to each others' prayers; but he who intercedes for all, without standing in need of being interceded for by any one, he is the only and true Mediator." (Lib. II. *Contra Parmen.* C. VI.) We acknowledge consequently that the Saints of themselves can confer no benefit upon us; "that they are not to be prayed to as the Almighty giver of all good gifts;" that they are in a word dependent beings, merely enabled, as the friends of God, to promote our eternal interests at the throne of mercy; we profess that God often, to use the words of the Protestant Liturgy, "Makes use of their ministry to succour and defend us." We appeal to them precisely in the same manner, with the same feelings, with the same views, as we do to the prayers of our friends on earth. "I always recollect with pleasure," says Bishop Trevern, "having often heard Englishmen recommend themselves to one another's prayers, and sometimes also, those with whom I was more intimately connected, say to me on taking leave, Adieu,

pray for me. I never failed immediately to comply with their request ; and in so doing I felt an inexpressible pleasure, which was always succeeded by sorrow and sadness of soul. How affecting is this recommendation, said I to myself, and how it savours of ancient and primitive manners ! it reminds one of the Apostles, and shews that we still practise a lesson which they so frequently taught their disciples ! But, alas ! these people do not hesitate to beg prayers from me, a poor and miserable sinner, full of imperfections, and loaded, God knows, with so many sins ; and they would consider it a crime to beg the prayers and intercession of the Saints in Heaven ! they pronounce me highly criminal in addressing them the same invocation ! and treat it as vain, superstitious, and something even idolatrous !” But to return to my subject. Evidently the person who intercedes for a benefit, is essentially different from him who bestows it. The two ideas are so distinct that they cannot be confounded. So long as I consider the Saints as intercessors for grace and salvation, I cannot consider them as the bestowers of grace and salvation. The only difference, therefore, between the belief and practice of the Protestant Church and the Catholic, is this, that Protestants believe it to be good and profitable to beg the prayers of poor sinners whilst they are here on earth, but they assert that when they are beyond the grave, to implore their assistance is no longer of any use or benefit ; they fancy that “ between us and them there is placed a great chaos,” which renders all appeal to their intercession profitless ; that though their intercession is profitable whilst they are on earth, it is of no avail to confide in their aid, when they have been received into Heaven ; that whilst doubtful of their friendship with God, we may beg their prayers, but that when removed from this place of trial and sin, they repose in the

bosom of their God, spotless and pure, honoured with his friendship and love, we must no longer implore their assistance. All this, they contend, would be superstition, —would be idolatry—would be to infringe on the mediator-ship of Christ. Thus, like the dying wanderers in the desert, when the water seems to spring to our lips, it is dashed thence by a cruel and unseen hand, and we are lost to hope and help, when we had most reason, to all human calculation, to hug the expectation to our breasts. The Catholic Church, on the contrary, teaches that not only may we solicit the aid of prayer from the mortal and sinful creature, who is tempted and tried in all things as we are, but also from the glorious and happy beings that have put on immortality. The Catholic believes that “charity never falleth away,” that it extends beyond the grave, that the parent still prays for, and forgets not the beloved pledge of affection, even after death has divided them; and that the lonely abandoned child may still look up to Heaven and derive succour thence, aided and supported by imploring and obtaining the assistance of the dearest object of his love; he believes that there is a “Communion of Saints,” and that between this world and that of spirits there is a close and tender connexion. Such is the doctrine of the two Churches. How feeling and suited to the nature of man, his wishes and his dispositions, is the one, and oh! how cold, withering, and heart-rending, the other. How appropriately the Right Rev. Dr. Wiseman remarks, “We are told likewise by St. Paul, that those virtues which existed on earth are annihilated in Heaven; all except one, and that is charity or love. Faith and hope are there extinguished, but charity and affection remain unimpaired, and even become the essence of that blessed existence. Who will for a moment imagine, who can for an instant

entertain the thought, that the child which has been snatched from its parent by having been taken from a world of suffering, does not continue to love her whom it has left on earth, and sympathise with her sorrows over its grave? Who can believe that when friend is separated from friend, and when one expires in the prayer of hope, their friendship is not continued, and that the two are not united in the same warm affection which they enjoyed here below? And if it was the privilege of love on earth, if it was one of its holiest duties, to pray to the Almighty for him who was so perfectly beloved, and if it was never surmised that injury therefore was inflicted on God, or on the honour and mediatorship of Christ, can we suppose that this holiest, most beautiful, and most perfect duty of charity, hath ceased in Heaven? Is it not, on the contrary, natural to suppose, that as charity is infinitely more vivid and glowing there than it was here, so in its exercise it also must be infinitely more powerful; and that the same impulse that led the spirit, clogged and fettered with the body, to venture to raise its supplications to the clouded throne of God for its friend, will now after its release act with tenfold energy, when it sees the innumerable pitfalls and dangers, the immense risks and the thousand temptations to which he is exposed, and the infinite joys he is destined to possess, which experience now teaches it are thousands and millions of times more than earth can possibly give or take away. Seeing clearly in vision the face of God, enjoying the fulness of his glory and splendour, having the willingness and power to assist, can we believe that it will not, with infinitely more effect, raise its pure and faultless prayers, in a tone of confident supplication, in favour of him to whom it was linked here below? Can we believe that God would deprive charity of its highest prerogative when

he has given it its brightest crown? Truly, then, my brethren, there is nothing repugnant to our ideas of God or of his attributes or institutions in all this; on the contrary, it seems absolutely necessary, to fill up the measure of his mercy, and to complete the picture of his Church here, as connected to that above, which he has exhibited to us in his word."—*Lectures.*

Proceeding now to the important question. Is it lawful and profitable to implore the assistance of our brethren in Heaven, or may we merely beg their prayers whilst they are on earth? The Articles of the Established Church speak cautiously on this subject. They do not expressly declare the Catholic practice to be opposed to the word of God, but, with their usual ambiguity, merely assert that this practice is not enjoined in Scripture, and is even "rather" repugnant to the divine word. I submit the article itself— "The Romish doctrine concerning Purgatory, Pardons, Worshipping, and Adoration, as well as of Images or Relics, and also Invocation of Saints, is a fond thing vainly invented, and grounded upon no warranty of Scripture, but rather repugnant to the word of God." *Article Twenty-two Common Prayer.*—It is acknowledged that there is no text of Scripture which forbids us to solicit the intercession of the Saints. That the word of God contains a clear statement of all the articles professed even by the Church of England will not, I think, be readily asserted. The doctrine of the Holy Trinity, the consubstantiality of the Son, the obligation of keeping the Sunday holy, the necessity, or even the lawfulness, of baptizing infants—these, and many other points, are evidently, not clearly at least, laid down in the sacred text. So that it must be granted, that a doctrine may be Scriptural and revealed without being clearly and explicitly taught in express words in the divine volume. If

the analogy of faith, the general tendency of a number of incidental observations and practices favour a custom, that custom may thereby claim our respect, and even command our compliance. Such, I contend, is the real state of the case in the matter before us. This opinion I rest on the following passages which I have closed under distinct heads, that my kind Protestant reader may the more easily comprehend the nature of the argument, which I conceive satisfactorily establishes the lawfulness of the Catholic practice—establishes it as clearly as any of the above-mentioned practices or tenets are established by Scripture. Though I am persuaded no one will deny that we may beg the prayers of our brethren who are here on earth, still I deem it advisable to refer to some passages, and having them before us, I will draw a consequence or two from them—

Catholic Version.

Gen. 20.

7 Now, therefore, restore the man his wife, for he is a prophet, and he shall pray for thee, and thou shalt live.

1 Kings, 7.

5 And Samuel said, gather all Israel to Mizpah, that I may pray to the Lord for you.

1 Thess., 5.

25 Brethren pray for us.

Protestant Version.

Gen. 20.

7 Now, therefore, restore the man *his* wife, for he *is* a prophet, and he shall pray for thee, and thou shalt live.

1 Sam. 7.

5 And Samuel said, gather all Israel to Mizpah, and I will pray for you unto the Lord.

1 Thess., 5.

25 Brethren pray for us.

Here, St. Paul, animated with great zeal for the glory of God, wishes to have the prayers of others joined to his own. He earnestly desires them to pray for him, and when by pious multiplication of prayers he had obtained his

petitions, he never omits begging that God might, in like manner, be thanked by a holy multiplication of praises. In the same manner, and with a view to God's glory, Catholics, who know that their prayers and homage are imperfect, endeavour to assert that petitions should be made to God, and praises given for them by many of the other faithful, and particularly by the Saints, whose prayers and praises are more perfect. Again,—

Catholic Version.

Hebrews, 13.

18 Pray for us. For we trust we have a good conscience, being willing to behave ourselves well in all things.

19 And I beseech you the more to do this, that I may be restored to you the sooner.

It is also clear from Scripture that we may beg the prayers of others, in order to obtain some specific and determinate object—

Rom. 15.

30 I beseech you therefore brethren, through our Lord Jesus Christ, and by the charity of the Holy Ghost, that you help me in your prayers for me to God.

31 That I may be delivered from the unbelievers that are in Judea, and that

Protestant Version.

Hebrews, 13.

18 Pray for us: for we trust we have a good conscience, in all things willing to live honestly.

19 But I beseech *you* the rather to do this, that I may be restored to you the sooner.

Rom. 15.

30 Now I beseech you, brethren, for the Lord Jesus Christ's sake, and for the love of the Spirit, that ye strive together with me in *your* prayers to God for me.

31 That I may be delivered from them that do not believe in Judea; and

Catholic Version.

the oblation of my service may be acceptable in Jerusalem to the Saints.

Collossians, 4.

3 Praying with all for us also, that God may open unto us a door of speech to speak the mystery of Christ (for which also I am bound.)

4 That I may make it manifest as I ought to speak.

Ephesians, 6.

18 By all prayer and supplication praying at all times in the spirit; and in the same watching with all instance and supplication for the Saints.

19 And for me, that speech may be given me, that I may open my mouth with confidence, to make known the mystery of the gospel.

20 For which I am an ambassador in a chain, so that therein I may be bold to speak according as I ought.

Protestant Version.

that my service which *I have* for Jerusalem may be accepted of the Saints.

Collossians, 4.

3 Withal, praying also for us, that God would open unto us a door of utterance, to speak the mystery of Christ, for which I am also in bonds.

4 That I may make it manifest, as I ought to speak.

Ephesians, 6.

18 Praying always with all prayer and supplication in the Spirit, and watching thereunto with all perseverance and supplication for all Saints;

19 And for me, that utterance may be given unto me, that I may open my mouth boldly, to make known the mystery of the gospel.

20 For which I am an ambassador in bonds: that therein I may speak boldly, as I ought to speak.

Now, if it be granted, as it must be, that it is not opposed to the Mediatorship of Christ to invoke the assistance of a

fellow mortal, weak and subject to offence as we are ourselves, and of whose virtue and favour with God we are not and cannot be without a direct revelation assured, there can, I think, be little difficulty in admitting that it cannot be injurious to the Mediatorship of the God Man to invoke the assistance of the Saints, of whose virtue, happiness, and favour, with God we are certain. This is too evident to be denied; or if it be contradicted, I should wish to learn in what that essential and most important difference consists, which renders it superstitious and idolatrous to beg the prayers of our brethren who are in Heaven, and yet to allow us, as good and profitable, to beg the prayers of those same individuals when confined in the tabernacle of the flesh? Is it distance? But St. Paul begged those who were distant from him to pray to God in his behalf. Besides, mere proximity or distance does not change the nature of the vicarious assistance. This is to make it a mere question of place and relative position, and not one of mediatorship. Or will the Saints, because in Heaven, be likely to find less favour with God? This will not be pretended, nor will it be fancied, that in those whose charity subsists after faith and hope have been lost in vision, love and interest for us have been diminished. I am willing to admit that the Almighty, though he has allowed us to honour and respect the Saints, and to beg the prayers of our fellow-creatures on earth, might have forbidden us to extend this principle so far as to invoke their assistance when received into Heaven. As beings deriving all their excellency and power from God, and consequently, as dependant agents, they are clearly incapable of themselves of conferring any benefit upon us; and as benefits received or hoped for, are the principal motives of prayer, it follows evidently that it would be foolish and

impious to address them as the sources of a power which they do not possess, or to consider them as gifted with an underived excellence, which is all from the hand of their Maker. The Saints, therefore, cannot be invoked as able of themselves to do any thing in our favour; their sufficiency is from God. The Almighty, I have observed, might even have forbidden us to apply to them to move Him in our favour, and have commanded us to pray to Him only. But has He issued this prohibition? Has he adopted this system? Is any command to this effect known to have emanated from His Almighty will. For if the Invocation of Angels and Saints were really inseparable from the dreadful consequences our opponents attach to it, it is inconceivable how it should not come within the list of divine prohibitions. But our Protestant friends must admit that there does not exist such a prohibition or divine ordinance forbidding it; therefore since such a practice is not liable to the censure our opponents would fasten upon it, we are of course at liberty to follow the dictates of reason, which compels us to propitiate those in our favour, who we believe are his dearest friends; and who being raised in dignity and honour, far above ourselves, are more likely than we are to move His bounty in our regard.

It would—if these remarks be correct, it would be perfectly logical and sound reasoning to stand merely on the defensive and sufficient to deny that there is any evidence in the Sacred Writings, from which it can be with the slightest reason deduced, that we are forbidden to beg the Saints to intercede for us. The Scriptural evidence, on the contrary, clearly favours the Catholic System, and, so far from being merely silent or negative, which I have contended, would still justify me in considering the Catholic Doctrine as sound and true, is positively in support of our practice. For it can be shown—

1st. That the Angels and Saints pray for us.

2nd. That they are acquainted with, and take an interest in our concerns.

3rd. That they offer up our prayers to God.

4th. That they were actually invoked by the great and good of the Old Testament.

1st. The Angels and Saints pray for us—

Catholic Version.

Zach. 1.

12 And the Angel of the Lord answered and said, O Lord of hosts, how long wilt thou not have mercy on Jerusalem, and on the cities of Judah, with which thou hast been angry? This is now the seventieth year.

13 And the Lord answered the Angel that spoke in me, good words, comfortable words.

Rev. 5.

8 And when he had opened the book, the four living creatures, and four and twenty ancients fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of odours, which are the prayers of Saints.

Protestant Version.

Zach. 1.

12 ¶ Then the angel of the Lord answered and said, O Lord of hosts, how long wilt thou not have mercy on Jerusalem and on the cities of Judah, against which thou hast had indignation these threescore and ten years?

13 And the Lord answered the angel that talked with me *with* good words *and* comfortable words.

Rev. 5.

8 And, when he had taken the book, the four beasts *and* twenty elders fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of odours, which are the prayers of Saints.

Catholic Version.

Rev. 8.

3 And another Angel came, and stood before the altar, having a golden censer, and there was given to him much incense, that he should offer of the prayers of all Saints upon the golden Altar, which is before the throne of God.

4 And the smoke of the incense of the prayers ascended up before God, from the hand of the Angel.

Protestant Version.

Rev. 8.

3 And another Angel came and stood at the altar, having a golden censer; and there was given unto him much incense, that he should offer *it* with the prayers of all Saints upon the golden altar which was before the throne.

4 And the smoke of the incense, *which came* with the prayers of the Saints, ascended up before God out of the Angel's hand.

The book of Tobias being rejected by the Protestant Church, I cite its authority on the same grounds as I shall the books of Maccabees. The Angel Raphael, when he makes himself known to Tobias, tells him that "when he prayed with tears and buried the dead, and left his dinner, and hid the dead, by day in his house, and buried them by night, he (Raphael) offered the prayers of Tobias to the Lord." (Tob. 12, v. 12.) We find that this book was cited as canonical Scripture by the following early authorities—

3rd century—Clement of Alexandria, lib. 2, Stromatum, p. 791.

St. Calixtus, epist. 2.

St. Cyprian, lib. de Opere et Elemos, et lib. 3 ad Quirinum.

Origen, epist. ad Julium Africanum.

4th century—St. Ambrose, lib. de Tobia, cap. 1.

St. Basil, Oration, de Avaritia.

St. Chrysostom, Hom. 12, in epis. ad Hebræos.

5th century—St. Augustin, In speculo, et lib. 2, de doct. Christiana, cap. 8.

Again, as the Protestant Church has thought proper not to admit the two first books of the Maccabees in the canon, I merely refer to the following passage as a direct historical testimony, shewing the opinion of the Jews on this subject.

“ The vision was in this manner : Onias, who had been high priest, a good and virtuous man, modest in his looks, gentle in his manners and graceful in his speech, and who from a child was exercised in virtues, holding up his hands, prayed for all the people of the Jews. After this there appeared also another man, admirable for age and glory, and environed with great beauty and majesty : then Onias answering, said, ‘ This is a lover of his brethren and of the people of Israel : this is he that prayeth much for the people and for all the holy city, Jeremias the prophet of God.’ ” (2 Mac. c. 15, v. 12—15.)

It is necessary here to inform the reader that the first and second books of Maccabees were cited as canonical Scripture by the following authorities—

3rd century—Clement Alex. lib. 5, Stromatum.

Origen, in Ev. Johann, Tom. 10, 13.

St. Cyprian, epist. ad Fortunatum, xi.

Apostolic Canons. Can. 85.

4th century—St. Gregory Naz. Orat. de Macchabæis.

St. Ambrose, lib. 2, de Job. c. 10, 11, 12;
et lib. 1, Offic. Cap, 40, 41.

St. Chrysostom, Orat. de 7, Maccab.

5th century—St. Augustin, lib. 18, de Civ. Dei. Cap. 36,
et lib. 2, Contra Epist. Gaudentii, Cap.
23.

2nd. The Angels and Saints are acquainted with, and take an interest in our concerns.

To the preceding texts may be added the following—first with respect to living saints, Eliseus sees, as if he were present, what passes between Giezi and Naaman :—

Catholic Version.

4 Kings, 5.

26 Was not my heart present, when the man turned back from his chariot to meet thee? So now thou hast received money, and received garments, &c.

27 But the leprosy of Naaman shall also stick to thee and to thy seed for ever.

Protestant Version.

2 Kings, 5.

26 And he said unto him, Went not mine heart *with thee*, when the man turned again from his chariot to meet thee? *Is it* a time to receive money, and to receive garments, and oliveyards, and vineyards, and sheep, and oxen, and menservants, and maidservants?

27 The leprosy therefore of Naaman shall cleave unto thee, and unto thy seed for ever. And he went out from his presence a leper *as white as snow*.

The same prophet knows what is said in the secret council of the king of Syria, who thinks that he is betrayed by his confidential friends—

Catholic Version,

4 Kings, 6.

11 And calling together his servants, he said: Why do you not tell me who it is that betrays me to the king of Israel?

12 And one of his servants said: No one, my lord, O king, but Eliseus the prophet, that is in Israel, telleth the king of Israel all the words that thou speakest in thy privy chamber.

Protestant Version.

2 Kings, 6.

11 Therefore the heart of the king of Syria was sore troubled for this thing; and he called his servants, and said unto them, Will ye not shew me which of us is for the king of Israel?

12 And one of his servants said, None, my lord, O king: but Elisha, the prophet that is in Israel, telleth the king of Irsael the words that thou speakest in thy bed-chamber.

St. Peter knew the fraudulent transaction of Ananias and Sapphira, who, confident of being undiscovered, wished to have the merit of a generous contribution of their whole property, while at the same time they withheld a part of the sum for which it was sold.

If, then, Almighty God has revealed to his servants on earth the knowledge of what was deliberating and doing in their absence, why should he not be able to favour his elect in Heaven with a similar revelation? Shall the distance of place prevent it? This to the Almighty is nothing. Shall the privation of bodily organs in the saints in Heaven be an obstacle? Such a privation, so far from being an obstacle, would afford a greater facility. The organs of the body oppress and shackle the faculties of the soul, which when once disengaged from gross and lumpish matter must acquire more energy and perceptibility. This is laid down by St. Paul—

Catholic Version.

1 Cor. 13.

9 For we know in part, and we prophesy in part.

10 But when that which is perfect is come, that which is in part shall be done away.

12 We see now through a glass in a dark manner; but then face to face. Now I know in part; but then I shall know even as I am known.

But then the Holy Writings afford us unquestionable testimony of the knowledge the blessed have in Heaven, and the interest they take in our concerns—

Exodus, 23.

20 Behold I will send my Angel, who shall go before thee, and keep thee in thy journey, and bring thee into the place that I have prepared.

21 Take notice of him, and hear his voice, and do not think him one to be contemned for he will not forgive when thou hast sinned, and my name is in him.

Psalm, 33:

8 The angel of the Lord

Protestant Version.

1 Cor. 13.

9 For we know in part, and we prophesy in part.

10 But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away.

12 For now we see through a glass darkly; but then face to face: now I know in part; but then shall I know even as also I am known.

Exodus, 23.

20 Behold, I send an Angel before thee, to keep thee in the way, and to bring thee into the place which I have prepared.

21 Beware of him, and obey his voice, provoke him not; for he will not pardon your transgressions: for my name is in him.

Psalm, 33.

7 The angel of the Lord

Catholic Version.

shall encamp round about them that fear him: and shall deliver them.

Psalm, 90.

11 For he hath given his angels charge over thee: to keep thee in all thy ways.

12 In their hands they shall bear thee up: lest thou dash thy foot against a stone.

Matt. 18.

10 See that you despise not one of these little ones: for I say to you, that their Angels in heaven always see the face of my Father who is in heaven.

Luke, 15.

10 There shall be joy before the Angels of God upon one sinner doing penance.

Protestant Version.

encampeth round about them that fear him, and delivereth them.

Psalm, 90.

11 For he shall give his angels charge over thee, to keep thee in all thy ways.

12 They shall bear thee up in *their* hands, lest thou dash thy foot against a stone.

Matt. 18.

10 Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you, That in heaven their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven.

Luke, 15.

10 Likewise, I say unto you, there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth.

Surely, if the blessed spirits feel joy and exultation on any sublunary event, they must, consequently, be aware of what passes in this world, and deeply interested in our concerns. Besides, let it be remembered, nothing can be more difficult to be ascertained than the true repentance of a sinner. True repentance is not to be learned from verbal protestations; it is not because we see a man striking his

breast and weeping—not because he covers his body with sackcloth, and reduces it by fasting and penitential austerities—nor finally, because he gives his body to the flames, or distributes his substance to the poor—that we may conclude he is truly penitent. These are but external symptoms, and unless the heart be converted, they are but empty shadows. These, then, are not sufficient to give joy to the Angels; their rejoicing is occasioned by the sinner's true repentance, and this may take place without any external symptoms. The seal of true repentance is in the interior of the heart; there alone does heavenly grace perform its silent operations, and there alone must the Angel search, and into its inmost recesses must the Angel be empowered to penetrate, who would know if true repentance really takes place or not. And if, then, these blessed spirits are so far gifted as to know, most assuredly, when the sinner does repent, and if they are so far interested as to make his true repentance a subject of their joy, who shall dare assert that they do not incessantly pour forth their prayers for his repentance? And who shall dare assert, that they cannot be informed when he prays for his own repentance, and implores them to unite in the fervour of his supplications? But is it not clear from many passages in the Holy Scriptures that even the infernal spirits know much of what transpires on this our earth? Satan is represented in the book of Job, as complaining of the prosperity of that Holy servant of God, and requesting permission to assault him. We are admonished by St. Peter to be sober and vigilant, for “our adversary the devil, as a roaring lion, goeth about, seeking whom he may devour.” (1 Peter, 5, v. 8.) We are informed again, in the book of Revelations, of an evil spirit who accused the brethren before God, day and night, “the accuser of our brethren is cast forth, who

accused them before our God day and night." (Rev. 12, v. 10.) And shall it be supposed that the devils possess more power than the ministering spirits around the throne of God? And while demons are permitted to go about the earth, seeking whom they may devour, and accusing, before God, day and night, whomsoever they can draw into sin, no equivalent power, no competent prerogative is granted by Heaven to its choicest favourites, to those most excellent and most perfect beings, that God in his goodness ever created? So strange a position is not consistent with reason, or religion, or the attributes of the Deity, or the true sense of Scripture, or with any declaration to be found in the sacred volume. To the proof—

Catholic Version.

Luke, 16.

19 There was a certain rich man, who was clothed in purple and fine linen : and fared sumptuously every day,

20 And there was a certain beggar named Lazarus, who lay at his gate, full of sores,

21 Desiring to be filled with the crumbs, that fell from the rich man's table, and no one did give him, moreover the dogs came and licked his sores.

22 And it came to pass

Protestant Version.

Luke, 16.

19 There was a certain rich man, which was clothed in purple and fine linen, and fared sumptuously every day :

20 And there was a certain beggar named Lazarus, which was laid at his gate, full of sores,

21 And desiring to be fed with the crumbs which fell from the rich man's table : moreover the dogs came and licked his sores.

22 And it came to pass

Catholic Version.

that the beggar died, and was carried by the Angels into Abraham's bosom. And the rich man also died : and he was buried in hell.

23 And lifting up his eyes, when he was in torments, he saw Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom ;

24 And he cried and said : Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, to cool my tongue, for I am tormented in this flame.

25 And Abraham said to him : Son, remember that thou didst receive good things in thy lifetime, and likewise Lazarus evil things : but now he is comforted, and thou art tormented.

26 And besides all this, between us and you there is fixed a great chaos : so that they who would pass from hence to you, cannot, nor from thence come hither.

27 And he said : Then,

Protestant Version.

that the beggar died, and was carried by the Angels into Abraham's bosom : the rich man also died, and was buried ;

23 And in hell he lifted up his eyes, being in torments, and seeth Abraham afar off, and Lazarus in his bosom.

24 And he cried and said, Father Abraham, have mercy on me, and send Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his finger in water, and cool my tongue ; for I am tormented in this flame.

25 But Abraham said, Son, remember that thou in thy lifetime receivedst thy good things, and likewise Lazarus evil things : but now is he comforted and thou art tormented.

26 And beside all this, between us and you there is a great gulf fixed : so that they which would pass from hence to you cannot ; neither can they pass to us, that *would come* from thence.

27 Then he said, I pray

Catholic Version.

Father, I beseech thee that thou wouldest send him to my father's house, for I have five brethren,

28 That he may testify unto them, lest they also come into this place of torments.

29 And Abraham said to him : They have Moses and the Prophets ; let them hear them.

30 But he said : No, father Abraham, but if one went to them from the dead, they will do penance.

31 And he said to him ; If they hear not Moses and the Prophets, neither will they believe if one rise again from the dead.

Then Abraham heard the rich man's prayer ; and the latter had a perfect knowledge and recollection of what was then actually being done in this life ; and though the former had departed life long before the Law was written, still he knew this circumstance, and shews that he is also acquainted with the prophecies.

3. The Angels and Saints offer up our prayers to God.

Protestant Version.

thee, therefore, father, that thou wouldest send him to my father's house.

28 For I have five brethren ; that he may testify unto them, lest they also come into this place of torment.

29 Abraham saith unto him, They have Moses and the Prophets ; let them hear them.

30 And he said, Nay, father Abraham : but if one went unto them from the dead, they will repent.

31 And he said unto him, If they hear not Moses and the Prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the dead.

Catholic Version.

Genesis, 19.

20 There is this city here at hand, to which I may flee, it is a little one, and I shall be saved in it: is it not a little one, and my soul shall live?

21 And he said to him: Behold also in this, I have heard thy prayers, not to destroy the city for which thou hast spoken.

Revelations, 5, v. 8, and chapter 18, v. 3, 4, I have cited above.

4. The Patriarchs, and the great and good of the Old Law, presented to them their requests.

Genesis, 19, v. 20, 21, are already quoted.

Genesis, 32.

26 And he (the Angel in human shape, with whom Jacob had wrestled,) said to him: (Jacob) let me go, for it is break of day. He answered: I will not let thee go except thou bless me.

27 And he said: What is thy name? He answered: Jacob.

28 But he said: thy name

Protestant Version.

Genesis, 19.

20 Behold now, this city *is* near to flee unto, and it *is* a little one: Oh, let me *escape* thither, (*is it not a little one?*) and my soul shall live.

21 And he said unto him, See, I have accepted thee concerning this thing also, that I will not overthrow this city, for the which thou hast spoken.

Genesis, 32.

26 And he said, Let me go, for the day breaketh. And he said, I will not let thee go, except thou bless me.

27 And he said unto him, What *is* thy name? And he said, Jacob.

28 And he said, Thyname

Catholic Version.

shall not be called Jacob, but Israel : for if thou hast been strong against God, how much more shalt thou prevail against men ?

29 Jacob asked him : Tell me by what name art thou called ? He answered : Why dost thou ask my name ? And he blessed him in the same place.

Again, chapter 48,—

15 And Jacob blessed the sons of Joseph, and said : God, in whose sight my fathers Abraham and Isaac walked, God that feedeth me from my youth until this day ;

16 The Angel that delivereth me from all evils, bless these boys : and let my name be called upon them, and the names of my fathers Abraham and Isaac, and may they grow into a multitude upon the earth.

Protestant Version.

shall be called no more Jacob, but Israel : for as a prince hast thou power with God and with men, and hast prevailed.

29 And Jacob asked *him* and said, Tell *me*, I pray thee, thy name. And he said, Wherefore *is* it *that* thou dost ask after my name ? And he blessed him there.

15 And he blessed Joseph, and said, God, before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac did walk, the God which fed me all my life long unto this day,

16 The Angel which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads, and let my name be named on them, and the name of my fathers Abraham and Isaac ; and let them grow into a multitude in the midst of the earth.

The writer of the book of Revelations also implores their assistance, chap. 1.—

Catholic Version.

4 John to the seven Churches which are in Asia. Grace be unto you and peace from him that is, and that was, and that is to come, and from the seven spirits which are before his throne.

Protestant Version.

4 John to the seven churches which are in Asia: Grace *be* unto you, and peace from him which is, and which was, and which is to come; and from the seven spirits which are before his throne.

Some Protestant writers say, that by these seven spirits we are to understand the Holy Ghost, who is so called on account of his different gifts. But in reply to this, I beg to observe, that there is not an example of such an expression in the whole word of God. Besides, it does not place the Holy Ghost before the throne. This is the place it usually assigns to Angels, to represent them to us as ministers, that are always ready to receive the orders of God, and to execute them all over the earth: thus Rev. 7, v. 11, we have, "And all the Angels stood round about the throne."

Again, the word of God represents in particular seven principal ones, in this manner, in the presence of God, thus Zach. 4, v. 10,—“these are the seven eyes of the Lord, that run to and fro through the whole earth.” So that we cannot doubt but that the seven spirits before the throne are seven principal Angels. The Scriptures, therefore, are evidently favourable to the Catholic belief, that it is good and profitable to invoke the assistance of the Saints and Angels. For the information of the Protestant reader I beg to subjoin the following texts, taken from the Protestant Bible, which are proofs that the Church Triumphant is full of sympathy and good offices to the Church Militant.

First—*Their knowledge of what passes upon earth.*

“ Wherefore seeing we also are compassed about with so great a cloud of witnesses.” (Heb, 12, v. 1.)

“ Which things the angels desire to look into.” (1 Peter, 1, v. 12.)

“ We are made a spectacle unto the world, and to angels, and to men.” (1 Cor. 4, v. 1.)

“ God was manifest in the flesh—seen of angels.” (1 Tim. 3, v. 19.)

“ Then shall I know, even as also I am known.” (1 Cor. 13, v. 12.)

(This is an excellent answer to the objection from Ecclesiastes, 9, v and vi, where we read “ The dead,” says the wise man, “ know nothing more, neither have they any part in this world, and in the work that is done under the sun.” It is evident that this cannot be understood of the Saints, since St. Paul says of himself, “ Then shall I know, even as also I am known,” that is, he shall know fully. Besides, David tells us, “ The righteous shall be in everlasting remembrance.” Psalm, 121, v. 7. Nor can we say their love and hatred have perished; for they always love God and hate sin, “ charity never falleth away.” 1 Cor. 13, v. 8. However, if the whole of the passage of Ecclesiastes be read, we shall plainly perceive, that it contains no proof on this subject. “ The dead know nothing more, neither have they a reward any more: for the memory of them is forgotten; their love also, and their hatred are all perished, neither have they any part in all that is done under the sun.”)

“ And they cried with a loud voice saying, How long, O Lord, (holy and true,) dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth?” (Rev. 6, v. 10.)

Secondly—*Their active agency.*

“ The God of Shadrach, &c., who hath sent his angel, and delivered his servants.” (Dan. 3, v. 28.)

“ My God hath sent his angel, and hath shut the lions’ mouths.” (Dan. 6, v. 22.)

“ Bless ye the Lord, all ye His Hosts—ye ministers of His, that do His pleasure.” (Pś. 103, v. 21.)

Here we should remark, that if David entreats the angels to praise God for him, it is lawful for us to desire them to pray to God for us. Some are of opinion that this is figurative language: it cannot be such since the Royal Prophet well knew, that the blessed spirits, whom he invoked, could give most perfect praises to God, and that they heard his words, inviting them to do so.

“ The angel of his presence saved them.” (Isaiah, 63, v. 9.)

“ Behold the angel of the Lord appeared to him in a dream, saying, &c.” (Matt. 1, v. 20.)

“ Behold the angel of the Lord appeared to Joseph in a dream, saying,” &c. (Matt. 2, v. 13.)

“ An angel of the Lord appeared in a dream,” &c. (Matt. 2, v. 19.)

“ Behold angels came and ministered unto him.” (Matt. 4, v. 9; Mark, 1, v. 13.)

“ For the angel of the Lord descended from Heaven,” &c. (Matt. 28, v. 2.)

“ And the angel answered and said,” &c. (Matt. 28, v. 5.)

“ And entering into the sepulchre, they saw a young man.” &c. (Mark, 16, v. 5.)

“ And there appeared unto him an angel of the Lord.” (Luke, 1, v. 11.)

“ But the angel said unto him,” &c. (Luke, 1, v. 13.)

“ And the angel answering, said unto him, I am Gabriel,

that stand in the presence of God; and am sent to speak unto thee, and to shew thee glad tidings." (Luke, 1, v. 19.)

"And in the sixth month, the angel Gabriel was sent from God, unto a City of Galilee, named Nazareth." (Luke, 1, v. 26, &c.)

"And, lo; the angel of the Lord came upon them, and the glory of the Lord shone round about them." &c. (Luke, 2, v. 9, &c.)

"And there appeared an angel unto him from Heaven, strengthening Him." (Luke, 22, v. 43.)

"And it came to pass, as they were much perplexed thereabout, behold two men stood by them, in shining garments," &c. (Luke, 24, v. 4.)

"For an angel went down at a certain season into the pool, and troubled the water," &c. (John, 5, v. 4.)

"And seeth two angels in white, sitting," &c. (John, 20, v. 12.)

"And while they looked stedfastly towards Heaven as he went up, behold two men stood by them in white apparel." (Acts, 1, v. 10.)

"He saw in a vision evidently about the ninth hour of the day an angel of God," &c. (Acts, 10, v. 3.)

"And, behold, the angel of the Lord came upon him," &c. (Acts, 12, v. 7.)

"And, immediately the angel of the Lord smote him," &c. (Acts, 12, v. 23.)

"Are they not all ministering spirits, sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation?" (Heb. 1, v. 14.)

"Be not forgetful to entertain strangers: for thereby some have entertained angels unawares." (Heb. 13, v. 2.)

"And he sent and signified it by his angels unto his servant John." (Rev. 1, v. 1.)

“ And the Lord God of the holy Prophets sent his angel to shew,” &c. (Rev. 22, v. 6.)

Thirdly—*Their communion in prayer with the Church on earth.*

“ That there should be no schism in the body ; but that the members should have the same care one for another.” (1 Cor. 12, v. 25.)

“ Praying always with all prayer and supplication in the spirit, and watching thereunto with all perseverance and supplication for all saints.” (Eph. 6, v. 18.)

“ But ye are come unto Mount Sion, and unto the City of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels.” (Heb. 12, v. 22.)

“ To the general assembly and Church of the first-born, which are written in Heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the Spirits of just men made perfect.” (Heb. 12, v. 23.)

Therefore the Church Militant is “ a general assembly” under God the “ judge of all,” comprising, first, “ an innumerable company of Angels ;” secondly, “ the spirits of just men made perfect ;” thirdly, the members not yet received into glory. Now in this Church of the first-born, there is to be no schism, “ for the members have the same care for one another”—“ and charity never falleth away”—they therefore pray for us—there is therefore a “ Communion of Saints.”

“ *It is then lawful to ask the intercession of the Angels and Saints.*” I shall now conclude this lecture in the language of the learned Bishop Wiseman.

“ Perhaps many who have repeated the Apostles’ creed again and again, may not have thought it necessary to examine what is the meaning of these words, or what is the doctrine they inculcate. It is a profession of belief in a

certain communion with the Saints. How does this communion exist between us and the Saints? May any friendly offices pass between us, or if no sort of intercourse exists, in what can this communion consist? What is the meaning of communion among the faithful, among the members of a family, or among the subjects of a state, but that there is among them an interchange of mutual good offices, and that one is ready to assist the other in any way. If therefore we believe in a communion between us and the Saints, assuredly there must be acts, reciprocal acts, which form the bond of union between them and us. Where then does this exist? The Catholic Church has always been consistent in every portion of its doctrines. It does not fear examining to the quick any proposition it lays down, or any dogma or profession of faith to which it exacts submission from all its subjects. It is not afraid of pushing to the furthest scrutiny all the consequences that flow from its doctrines; and consequently, if you ask a Catholic what does he mean by the communion of Saints, he has no hesitation on the subject; his ideas are clear and defined, he tells you at once that he understands by it an interchange of good offices between the Saints in Heaven, and those who are fighting here below for their crown; whereby they intercede on their part on our behalf, look down upon us with sympathy, take an interest in all that we do and suffer, and make use of the influence they necessarily possess with God towards assisting their frail and tempted brethren on earth. And to balance all this, we have our offices towards them, inasmuch as we repay them in respect, admiration, and love; with the feeling that those who were once our brethren having run their course, and being in possession of their reward, we may turn to them in the confidence of brethren, and ask them to use that influence with their Lord

and Master which their charity and goodness necessarily move them to exert.

“ This is a portion of the doctrine, and seems to enter so naturally and fitly into all our ideas of Christianity, as to recommend itself at once to any unprejudiced mind. For what is the idea which the Gospel gives us of the Christian religion? As I showed you on another occasion, the very expressions and terms used of religion in the old law were continued in the new, whence I deduced that the religion of Christ was the perfection, the completion, but still the continuation of that which preceded it. Well, in like manner, do we find that the very same terms and expressions applied to the Church of Christ on earth, are constantly adopted in allusion to the Church in Heaven, the reign of the Saints with God. This likewise is spoken of as the kingdom of God, the kingdom of the Father and of Christ, precisely as the Church on earth; as though it formed with us but one Church and community of brethren—they in a glorified and happy, and we in a suffering and tempted state—still having a certain connexion implied, and being considered in the same manner under the guidance and direction of God. It is spoken of in these terms by St. Paul. Instead of representing the Blessed in Heaven as removed immeasurably from us, as Lazarus in Abraham’s bosom was from the rich man, he speaks as if we already enjoyed society with them, as if we had already come to the heavenly Jerusalem and to the company of many thousands of Angels, and to the Spirits of the just made perfect; thus showing that the death of Christ had actually broken down the barrier or partition wall, made all extremes one, and joined the Holy of Holies to the outward precinct of the Tabernacle.

“ We are told likewise by St. Paul, that those virtues which existed on earth are annihilated in Heaven—all except one,

and that is Charity or Love. Faith and Hope are there extinguished, but Charity and affection remain unimpaired, and even become the essence of that blessed existence. Who will for a moment imagine—who can for an instant entertain the thought that the child which has been snatched from its parent by having been taken from a world of suffering, does not continue to love her whom it has left on earth, and sympathise with her sorrows over its grave? Who can believe that when friend is separated from friend, and when one expires in the prayer of hope, their friendship is not continued, and that the two are not united in the same warm affection, which they enjoyed here below? And, if it was the privilege of love on earth—if it was one of its holiest duties to pray to the Almighty for him who was so perfectly beloved, and if it never was surmised that injury was therefore inflicted on God, or on the honour and mediatorship of Christ, can we suppose that this holiest, most beautiful, and most perfect duty of charity, hath ceased in Heaven? Is it not, on the contrary, natural to suppose, that as that charity is infinitely more vivid and glowing there than it was here, so in its exercise also it must be infinitely more powerful; and that the same impulse that led the spirit, clogged and fettered with the body, to venture to raise its supplications to the clouded throne of God for its friend, will now after its release act with tenfold energy, when it sees the innumerable pitfalls and dangers, the immense risks, and the thousands of temptations to which he is exposed, and the infinite joys he is destined to possess, which experience now teaches it are thousands and millions of times more than earth can possibly give or take away? Seeing clearly in vision the face of God, enjoying the fulness of his glory and splendour, having the willingness and power to assist—can we believe that it will not with infinitely more

effect raise its pure and faultless prayers, in a tone of confident supplication in favour of him to whom it was linked in affection here below? Can we believe that God would deprive charity of its highest prerogative, when he has given it its brightest crown? Truly then, my brethren, there is nothing repugnant to our ideas of God or of his attributes or institutions in all this; on the contrary it seems absolutely necessary to fill up the measure of his mercy, and to complete the picture of his Church here as connected to that above, which he has exhibited to us in his word."—*Dr. Wiseman.*

LECTURE XII.

 OBJECTIONS AGAINST THE INVOCATION OF ANGELS
AND SAINTS.

FIRST Objection.

What do we Catholics profess by invoking the Angels and Saints?

Answer.

To glorify Almighty God in them as we glorify Him in all his other works, and as the three children in the Babylonian furnace (Dan. 3) summon all creatures, spiritual and corporal, rational and irrational, and even the inanimate part of the creation, to declare the praises of their Maker. For how much more becoming is it to glorify our heavenly Father in the wonderful operations of his grace, especially since he has signified to us by the royal Psalmist that in these he takes the greatest complacency, and would be chiefly admired: "*Wonderful,*" says he, "is God in his Saints!"

2. That engaged as the Angels and Saints are in offering to the blessed Jesus immortal acts of thanksgiving for the happiness they possess through his grace and mercy, so they would make fervent supplications to Him that he would vouchsafe to make us partakers with them of eternal glory. Hence we regard the Saints as mediators of intercession only with the blessed Jesus, whom we look up to as our sole and only Mediator of redemption, and whose all-powerful intercession with His Father is found in the eter-

nal virtue of his sacrifice on Calvary—renewed daily on our altars, and in the presence of that sacred body which has been our victim, and in that humanity which, being once assumed, he retains for ever. With this merciful Redeemer, the Saints, I repeat it, are but mere mediators of intercession, who have every thing to ask for and nothing *of themselves* to give, and who are only heard but in the name of Christ, always through him and through his blood and merits. Kind Protestant reader, ponder well on this—remember the Saints in heaven are now enjoying the reward of the labours and combats which they here below endured for the name of their divine Lord and Master; they, then, like unto Moses, who lifted up his hands in prayer for the Israelites fighting the battles of the Lord, are offering up their supplications in behalf of us actually engaged in the field of battle and in the same combats in which they came off so happily victorious; and though you may refuse to invoke their intercession, allow me to add, **THEY PRAY FOR YOU**. Permit the venerable Bishop Trevern to address you: “This ancient and salutary custom of having recourse to the prayers of the blessed in heaven should greatly enlarge your ideas on the article of the creed, which you have so often repeated without ever perceiving its magnificence or extent—I mean the communion of Saints. Hitherto, you have conceived this communion to have been confined to our globe and its inhabitants—and again, among its inhabitants, to the small number of those whose prayers you conceive may be of advantage to you. Form now more exalted ideas; leave the narrow limits of this world; the communion of Saints knows no such confinement—it reaches to infinity, even to the throne of the Creator. It joins heaven to earth by the religious communication it keeps up between the inhabitants of both—between those who live

in glory and eternal beatitude, and us mortals who linger on through this obscure and transitory existence. It opens to your view the heavenly Jerusalem, and represents the innumerable multitude of the Angels and Saints, and, above them all, the first of creatures, the Virgin Mary, mother of God, contemplating unveiled the objects of our faith, enjoying the objects of our hope, all united in charity, which inflames them with a love for God and a mutual affection for each other, a love and affection that overflow in desires, wishes, and supplications for our welfare. On the other hand, it shews you in this world weak and miserable sinners, confounded at their past transgressions, alarmed at the relapses that threaten them, mistrusting themselves and their acceptance with God, addressing themselves to his elect and friends, and requesting their support and assistance by the union of their prayers and fraternal intercession."

But to return to my subject. We profess, finally, by invoking the intercession of the Angels and Saints to give greater glory and honour to Almighty God through so many supplicants, and also to receive in the mercies of an indulgent Heaven, the profit of so many prayers.

Second Objection.

Then, strictly speaking, Catholics do not invoke the intercession of the Angels and Saints, so as to make them the end and object of their prayers, in which sense Protestants understand this doctrine.

By no means. The Catholic Church only prays *through* the Saints—she never intends to *pray to them, so as to make them the end and object of her prayers*. Guided by the Holy Spirit of Truth she carefully distinguishes between her formal prayers, namely, those she makes use of at the altar, and in the administration of the sacraments; and

anthems, hymns, versicles, and such like pious ejaculations. Her formal prayers are ever directed to God alone; the others being taken from the Holy Writings, in which they are frequently used in a figurative sense, so she makes use of them. For instance. "Send down your dew, O ye heavens, and let the clouds rain down the just one. Let the earth open and produce a Saviour." Unquestionably in this versicle the Heavens and the Earth are not invoked, but by a *Prosopopeia* (a figure by which things are made persons), she begs of God Almighty to effect mercifully for her children the grace of a spiritual birth with Jesus Christ. Hence, if her Missals are examined by an impartial Protestant, it will be found, that they contain no prayer directed to any Saint—all being made directly to God alone, or to Jesus Christ in the unity of the other persons of the Blessed Trinity. At a Council held at Carthage, 1397, under Pope Siricius, it was ordained, that all public prayers in the Church should be directed to God the Father only. And it is a fact, that at Mass, until the Consecration, no prayer is even made to God the Son, or to God the Holy Ghost, but to God the Father alone.

Third Objection.

Christ tells us—

Catholic Version.

John, 16.

23 If you ask the Father anything in my name that will I do.

Protestant Version.

John, 16.

23 Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give *it* you.

It is therefore not only unnecessary to invoke the intercession of the Saints and Angels, but moreover injurious to Christ's assurance, and mistrustful of the efficacy of his mediation.

In answer, I beg to state I have, I trust, sufficiently elucidated in the preceding pages after what manner Catholics pray to the Saints and Angels, and how all their prayers to them redound ultimately to God himself through Jesus Christ. I shall therefore merely explain what is meant by praying "in the name of Christ." To pray, then, "in the name of Christ," is 1st. Whenever we offer our prayers to God to cover our unworthiness, to appear before the Divine Majesty, and our demerits, under the dignity and merits of our head, Lord, and Redeemer, Jesus Christ, assured that he is our only Mediator of Redemption,—our only Redeemer,—our only absolute and Sovereign Mediator, in whose name we are to be saved. 2nd. To unite our prayers and join them with those which as Man-God he here poured forth to His Eternal Father, and now God-Man in Heaven, he makes in our behalf to the same Majesty. 3rd. To ask nothing in our prayers but what may contribute to the honour and glory of God, and to our own eternal salvation, accordingly as Christ has taught us in the most excellent of all prayers, the Lord's Prayer. Finally. To pray not only with hope, but moreover a firm confidence of obtaining (if we ask with due dispositions, and for proper things), what we ask through the sole merits of the Incarnation, life, passion, and death of Jesus Christ, who is the sole ground of our claim, and hope of our receiving.

Fourth Objection.

But this seems contrary to the practice of many Catholics, who often address the Saints, and particularly the Virgin Mary, as if they, independently of the merits of Jesus Christ, were able to confer the favours they ask for.

Answer.

The Catholic Church does not vindicate excesses on this subject which may occur in the expressions of private per-

sons who are at least chargeable with imprudence. All exaggerated expressions should be reduced to, and determined by the doctrine of the Church of Christ, which is always wont to reduce to the analogy of faith even the texts of the Holy Scriptures that appear to be contradictory. Thus, the number of verses in the Holy Writings that represent God as having a body, raise no difficulty, because we explain them according to the idea which we have of God as of an immaterial being. This is a sufficient answer, I trust, to all that can be objected to us from the occasional use of words which may appear at first sight unwarrantable, but are not really employed in any improper manner.

Besides, “Unusquisque loquitur prout affectus est,” says Aristotle, “every one judgeth as he is affected,” may well be said of many of our opponents; hence we are to receive with caution what they allege regarding certain expressions which are read in our books of devotion. Nothing, assuredly, is more subject to different constructions than words. They are well compared to the Pillar of a Cloud, which on one side gave light to the Israelites, but on the other appeared dark to the Egyptians. For instance, these words of the Blessed Jesus to his Apostles, “Ye are the light of the world,” appear to the Jews, who look upon Christ as a seducer, to be blasphemous, not as such certainly to our Protestant friends, even though they read in their Bible that Christ calls *himself* the light of the world. Hence, all those words which are read in our prayer books, and appear *overstrained*, or *exaggerated*, will be found on strict examination not to be so. And why? but because words are dead letters in themselves, it is only the intention of the speaker that gives them life, and makes them to be regarded as *prayers*. On this account, a prayer

directed to God under such words as *deliver us, O Lord*, means deliver us, O Lord, *who alone can deliver us*, and a prayer to a Saint—to the Virgin thus expressed, means obtain our deliverance from the Lord. Do our opponents not reflect that there are expressions to be found in the Holy Writings that seem *also* overstrained?—

Catholic Version.

Jos., 10.

14 There was not before nor after so long a day, the Lord obeying the voice of a man, &c.

Luke, 12.

37 Blessed are those servants, whom the Lord when he cometh shall find watching, Amen I say to you, that he will gird himself, and make them sit down to meat and passing will minister unto them.

Protestant Version.

Jos., 10.

14 And there was no day like that before it or after it, that the Lord hearkened unto the voice of a man.

Luke, 12.

37 Blessed *are* those servants whom the Lord when he cometh shall find watching: verily, I say unto you, that he shall gird himself, and make them to sit down to meat, and will come forth, and serve them.

Assuredly, the former expressions do not denote a *real obedience in God to the voice of man*, but his readiness to *do the will of those that fear Him*, nor the latter, that *Christ will really serve the Elect at table*, but only signify the great care he will take, that nothing shall be wanted to complete their joy and satisfaction. Thus, to return to the words “*deliver us, Holy Virgin Mary,*” are to be understood in the sense, that she would use that grace and favour with the Blessed Jesus in our behalf, which as His Mother it may be presumed she has.

Fifth Objection.

Granted, say many Protestants, but why not correct such words?

I beg to ask, even suppose, "instead of deliver us," we read "obtain our deliverance," would this suffice to hinder them from telling us, that, "Once upon a time was such a blasphemous expression to be found in all Catholic prayer books—as 'Deliver us, O Mary?'" But why should we, to comply with the fancies of persons whom no reason can satisfy, be debarred from the natural mode or manner of expressing ourselves? Finally, Why do not such persons compile a *Dictionary*, or *Speaker's Assistant*, in which we may find words to express *fully* and *adequately* our thoughts, and the different tempers and motions of our minds?

Sixth Objection.

But is it not *superstitious* to make addresses to one in particular, rather than to another?

By no means, for let it be remembered that this is not a division of *spiritual offices* among the Saints, each one of whom may *equally* intercede for us without encroaching upon another. Such *particular* invocation is grounded upon a signal grace or virtue, for which that saint in *particular* was distinguished, or for the peculiar circumstances of his martyrdom, or singular miracles which he performed, or peculiarly striking life he led, all which serve very much to excite our hopes, *particularly* in these cases which bear upon them. Hope being the foundation of the efficacy of prayer, it is very natural for us to expect to find redress where others have found it; or when it may be more reasonably expected owing to the particular qualifications of the person whom we address. Hence, although the Divine attributes are really one and the same indivisible perfections in God, still we have recourse to his mercy for pardon, to

his wisdom for knowledge, and to his almighty power for protection, &c. Thus St. Paul assigns the pardon of sin to the passion of Christ, but our justification—by which we rise to a new life—to His Resurrection.

Catholic Version.

Rom. 4.

25 Who was delivered up for our sins, and rose again for our justification. Hence, also, the great Apostle tells the Hebrews—

Heb. 2.

18 For in that wherein he himself hath suffered and been tempted, he is able to succour them also that are tempted.

Protestant Version.

Rom. 4.

25 Who was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification.

Heb. 2.

18 For in that he himself hath suffered being tempted, he is able to succour them that are tempted.

Thus laying down the sufferings of the Man-God as a powerful argument to persuade men to place their hopes in them for their reconciliation with God—the blessed Jesus being so peculiarly *qualified* and *fitted* for that work for which he suffered. Why, then, after the example of Paul, may we not in consideration of the qualities of some Saints over others, take from them motives to address them in particular? The Holy Scriptures, exhorting us to patience, bid us call to mind the patience of the prophets, and in particular of Job—

James, 5.

10 Take, my brethren, for an example of suffering evil, of labour and of patience,

James, 5.

10 Take, my brethren, the prophets, who have spoken in the name of the Lord,

Catholic Version.

the prophets, who spoke in the name of the Lord.

11 You have heard of the patience of Job.

Protestant Version.

for an example of suffering affliction, and of patience.

11 Ye have heard of the patience of Job.

And when Jacob blessed the two sons of Joseph, Ephraim and Manasses, he begs of *that* angel in particular to be their guardian who had delivered him from his many troubles. (Gen. 48, 16.) And why so? Because he considered that he who had been so careful of himself would be as careful of his sons. On this account I would not be surprised if a man in danger of being shipwrecked should invoke the intercession of St. Paul in preference to other Saints, since, as we read in the written word, he had by his prayers saved all his fellow-passengers from being drowned. (Acts, 27, 24.) So, then, there can be no crime if travellers invoke the Angel Raphael, since he protected Tobias in his journey—if those infected with *plague* invoke St. Roch, since he was so peculiarly charitable in assisting similar persons; or those suffering from tooth-ache, St. Appollonica, whose teeth were violently struck out for her noble and free confession of Christ; or finally, in cases of war, if we require deliverance from our enemies, St. Michael and St. George; the former being acknowledged by the Scriptures to be the protector of the people of God (Dan. 10, 21, & 12, 1), and the latter a valiant soldier and martyr of Christ. But to conclude, suppose Martha and Mary, who are now glorious Saints in Heaven, were again upon earth, assuredly a person guilty of breaches against incontinency might conceive a stronger hope of obtaining God's grace of chastity through the intercession of Mary, owing to the parallel example of her conversion and the particular zeal she must

have for the conversion of similar persons, than through Martha, though more innocent. The case is the same now that she is in Heaven, for she has not lost her charity by being there; and the case is the same in addresses made to other Saints on similar grounds.

7th Objection.

It is against common sense to pray to a person who is not present to hear us.

Answer.

I have already adduced several texts of the Scriptures to prove that the Angels and Saints are aware of many things that occur here on earth. Besides this, every Catholic divine admits, that we are not certain that the Saints hear our prayers, or know them with absolute knowledge of their own. This, though it seems to follow from our believing it good and profitable to invoke the Saints, yet it is no article of our faith in itself; it has never been declared such by the Church. St. Augustine doubted whether the Saints actually hear our prayers, and yet he had no doubt they ought to be invoked. The whole system did not depend, in his mind, upon this acknowledgment; for he believed, that we are certainly helped by the Saints, and was content to remain ignorant by what precise means God omnipotent and omnipresent is pleased to make our prayers known to them, and convey to us the benefits of their intercession. But if, as I have stated in the body of the preceding lecture, the Saints when living had a knowledge of things done in their absence, why, I ask, in general should they after death be less acquainted with distant objects than when living. Surely the Spirit of God, which discovered remote transactions to them when living, has not withdrawn himself from them since their death. Does not our Lord expressly say that the Saints, who by their victories

have obtained the crown of glory, govern nations? (Rev. 2, v. 26.) And can any one have power over men on this earth without a knowledge of any thing they may say? Can one govern people without knowing what they do? Can a glory conformable to our Lord's in regard to this power over nations be joined with total ignorance of the transactions of this world? Has not the royal prophet David, speaking of the joys of heaven, the following sublime passage: "With thee is the fountain of life: in thy light shall we see light?" (Ps. 35.) (Protestant Bible, 36.) May not, then, the Saints in heaven see in the light of God whatever he chooses to communicate? Or who can tell the extent of that light and science which illuminate the blessed in Heaven?

But then it is necessary to observe, "That the Saints actually hear us, is not essential to be known, in order to justify our doctrine and practice of piously invoking their intercession." For, when we are assured that the Angels rejoice at the conversion of a sinner, we may well conclude that they are made acquainted with what passes on earth, and for our purpose this is "amply sufficient." We may safely adopt the conclusion of the learned Dr. Hawarden: "As it is an article of our belief, that all our blessings flow from God through Jesus Christ, so in the desires and language of the heart, it is only to God through Jesus Christ that all our prayers are chiefly directed; without which they would not be prayers. Hence, it necessarily follows, first, that when we desire to partake of the prayers of the blessed Angels and Saints, it is enough that our desire is known to God. Secondly, that it is the same thing in effect, whether we say, 'Holy Peter, pray for me,' or 'O God, grant me a share in the prayers of St. Peter.' Thirdly, that supposing that the Saints pray for us, the

great controversy concerning their invocation is only a zealous fighting about words and phrases.”—(Dr. Hawarden. *The True Church of Christ Shewn, &c.*, vol. ii., p. 288.)

Eighth Objection.

But St. Paul expressly condemns the service of the Angels :

Catholic Version.

Col. 2.

18 Let no man seduce you willingly in humility, and religion of Angels.

Protestant Version.

Col. 2.

18 Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility and worshipping of angels.

Answer.

This term, “ religion of Angels,” is totally equivocal ; for the Mosaic law might have been called thus, which several teachers endeavoured to renew in the Church, because, as St. Paul says, “ the law was given by the ministry of Angels.” And as the original word signifies not only the worship of Angels, but likewise the superstitious worship of them, magic may be meant here, which is practised by means of wicked Angels, a fondness for which the Gnostics, impious heretics of those times, endeavoured to instil into the Christians. This passage, understood either of these ways, proves nothing against the Invocation of Saints, such as is practised in the Catholic Church. But it is more probable that St. Paul had in view some ancient heretics, whose religion was a mixture of Judaism and Paganism. They revived the legal ceremonies ; but at the same time taught, that God was a supreme sovereign, too high to be addressed by so mean a being as man ; that betwixt this infinite Being and men there were intervening spirits ; and that all worship was to be paid by mankind to these Angels, as they brought to them all favours from God. They

invented a thousand fabulous stories concerning these Angels, and particularly relating to their different generations, and by these means diverted Christians from the service of God, and all recourse to Jesus Christ, the true Mediator. Catholics, however, have no affinity with such perverse heretics. They do not mean that the humility of men should deter them from addressing themselves to God, and necessarily make them pray to Angels so as to give them all the worship due to the divinity; on the contrary, they believe that every Christian is bound, under pain of eternal damnation, to pray to God, and have recourse to Jesus Christ; that it is only profitable to apply to Angels and to Saints; and that when we address ourselves to them we ought to be careful not to give them any honour, which God has reserved to himself, and should only beg the assistance of their prayers.

Besides, it is worthy to be observed, that those ancient heretics, to whom St. Paul alludes, taught that our Beloved Redeemer was not the *principal* Mediator between God and man; they consequently denied their dependence on Him, and his power over them, as appears from the text that follows—

Catholic Version.

19 And not holding the head, from which the whole body by joints and bands, being supplied with nourishment, and compacted, groweth unto the increase of God.

Protestant Version.

19 And not holding the head, from which all the body by joints and bands having nourishment ministered, and knit together, increaseth with the increase of God.

Here I regret to have to observe, that Protestant translators have not been faithful in translating the word of the

Apostle, *threskeia*, which, according to Seapula, an eminent Protestant Greek scholar, in his Lexicon, means *religion*, as is read in the Catholic Testament. This was the ordinary practice of the Reformers (to make their newly-fangled doctrines sound well in the ears of the unlearned and unstable), in those places of the Holy writings, where the Hebrew and Greek works have different significations, to put down invariably that signification which appeared to militate against any doctrine of the Catholic Church. This appears evident from their translating the word *threskeia* religion, in James, 3, where we read—

Catholic Version.

26 And if any man think himself to be religious, not bridling his tongue but deceiving his own heart, this man's *religion* is vain.

27 Religion pure and undefiled before God and the Father is, to visit the fatherless and widows in their tribulation: and to keep one's self unspotted from this world.

Protestant Version.

26 If any man among you seem to be religious, and bridleth not his tongue, but deceiveth his own heart, this man's religion *is* vain.

27 Pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father is this, To visit the fatherless and widows in their affliction, *and* to keep himself unspotted from the world.

Why, I ask, in these verses, not translate *treskeia*, worship, as in Colossians, 2, 18? But, because no advantage could be derived by so doing. Is not this a powerful argument to induce a Protestant to doubt of the purity of the translation of the Scriptures, which is put into his hand as the pure word of God?

Ninth Objection.

Notwithstanding all you have said, the Angel that

appeared to St. John would not allow him to prostrate himself before him.*—(Apoc. 19, 10.)

I answer, there must have been some other reason different from that which regards the Invocation of Saints. Protestants themselves could not be displeased, if on the apparition of an Angel, one should honour him with a profound salutation. Elias permitted the holy man Abdias, the governor of King Achab's house, to prostrate himself before him; he likewise allowed another captain to fall on his knees before him to beseech him (1 Kings, 18, v. 7, and 2 Kings, 1, v. 13.) Abraham and Lot likewise prostrated themselves before the Angels that appeared to them, yet the Angels did not reject the honour paid them by the Patriarchs.—(Gen. 18, v. 2, and 19, v. 1.)

But we may assign two reasons why the Angel disapproved of St. John's prostration before him. 1st. If the word to adore is to be taken in a strict sense, when it is said, that St. John prostrated to adore, this Apostle might have believed, from the splendour of the apparition, that it was Jesus Christ himself, and that this was a symbol of the miraculous presence of God, similar to that of the burning bush, and the fire of Mount Sinai. Besides, very many of the Fathers opined that it was not an Angel, but our Beloved Redeemer; this they collect from the preceding verse, "*behold, I come quickly,*" which was the usual phrase and speech our Saviour was accustomed to make use of when he appeared to John, as is manifest from c. 2, v. 6, c. 3, v. 21, c. 16, v. 15, c. 22, v. 12. Hence, St. John says, "And when I had heard and seen I fell down to worship." For we can never suppose that an inspired Apostle would willingly commit a sin of idolatry, by giving to an Angel

* Did not Abraham prostrate himself before the Hetheans, and Jacob before Esau, and Solomon before Bersabee?

the worship due to God *alone* : and still much less would he have fallen a second time into the same sin, as we read in c. 22, v. 8. But if, according to other fathers, we take the word to adore for a profound reverence, as when it is said that an " Amalekite fell upon his face and adored David," the Holy Ghost intended to tell us, that on St. John's prostrating himself so low before the Angel, the Heavenly Messenger represented to him, that as they both had the same commission, he should not salute him with so great a humility ; for as they were companions in the same and in so great a work, they only ought to humble themselves in that manner before God, for which reason the Angel, in accounting for this action, says, " I am thy fellow-servant, and of thy brethren who have the testimony of Jesus ;" and he adds, " the spirit of prophecy is the testimony of Jesus," (Apoc. 22, v. 8), to shew that the spirit of prophecy with which St. John was filled, being an extraordinary appointment to give testimony of Jesus Christ, equalled him to the Angels, whose most honourable employment it is to serve our Lord. It is in the same manner St. Peter's refusing Cornelius to prostrate himself before him is to be explained, (Acts 10, v. 26), either because Cornelius wanted to give St. Peter the adoration due to the Divinity ; or rather as Cornelius was not an Idolater, as were the inhabitants of Lystra, Peter's humility did not suffer him to permit a Roman officer, distinguished by his rank and eminent piety, to fall down before him ; but he chose by these humble words to decline his homage : " Arise, I myself also am a man." For though St. Peter did not permit Cornelius to prostrate himself before him, still he did not condemn Simon, who said to him, " Pray you for me to the Lord," (Acts 8, v. 24.) Besides, did not the same Apostle say, " I will do my endeavour, that after my decease also, you may often

have, whereby you may keep a memory of these things?" (2 Peter, 1, v. 15.) From which many of the Greek Fathers concluded, that "the Saints in Heaven remember us on earth, and make intercession for us."

For the information of the reader, I beg now to meet objections based upon higher grounds, the solution of which will very much tend to illustrate the preceding difficulties of our opponents.

Tenth Objection.

Catholic Version.

Matt. 4.

10.....It is written the Lord thy God shalt thou adore, and him only shalt thou serve.

Protestant Version.

Matt. 4.

10.....For it is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him only shalt thou serve.

God, therefore, say they, is *only* to be worshipped, consequently the Saints must not be invoked.

1st. Answer. But the text does not say, "*Thou shalt worship only* the Lord thy God," hence, it cannot be inferred that *God only* is to be worshipped. As no Protestant, from the words "*Thou shalt fear the Lord thy God,*" (Lev. 19, v. 14), is at liberty to infer that *God only* is to be feared, since the Apostle commands wives to fear their husbands (Ephes. 5, v. 22), and subjects their magistrates and governors (Rom. 13, 4), much less may they infer that *only* God is to be loved because the Blessed Jesus says, "*thou shalt love the Lord thy God,*" (Luke 10, 27), otherwise we might omit to love our neighbour, which is also strictly enforced by the written law; and husbands are also commanded to love their wives. (Ephes. 5, v. 25.) Again, the Scriptures command us in several places to worship other things besides God, as—

Catholic Version.

Psalm 99.

5 Adore his footstool.

Protestant Version.

Psalm 99.

5 Exalt ye the Lord our God, and worship at his footstool.

—in which the same word is used in the Hebrew and Greek as is used in the text under discussion. Isaiah also says—

Isaiah, 60.

14 All that slandered thee (the Church) shall worship the steps of thy feet, &c.

Isaiah, 60.

14 And all they that despised thee shall bow themselves down at the soles of thy feet,

which cannot be said of God ; therefore, in the verse “ Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God,” God *only* is not to be worshipped. If our opponents should urge that the word *only* is placed before *serve*, and that this is sufficient, since according to them *worship* and *serve* are one and the same, and have one and the same force, I beg to remind them, that in the Greek (in which the difference between *worship* and *serve* is *clearly* seen) is a difference between the two words—the one signifying worship in general, and the other a service due to God alone. Besides, *serve* has a more extensive signification than worship. We worship God by acts of religion only—we serve him by faith, hope, charity, obedience, and every other good work and act, as appears from

Hebrews, 12.

28 Whereby (grace) let us serve, pleasing God, with fear and reverence.

Hebrews, 12.

28 Let us have grace whereby we may serve God acceptably with reverence and godly fear.

2d Answer. Suppose it was thus read, "Thou shalt worship only the Lord thy God," even then, I contend, that it cannot be so understood as to forbid every sort of worship, but only such as is due to God alone, and which, without sacrilege and the crime of idolatry, we cannot give to any created being.

Thus, although the Apostle says (1 Timothy, 6, 15), "who only hath immortality," this is to be understood of that divine, infinite, and uncreated immortality proper to God alone, and not of that immortality which is *by grace* attributed to man, according to the same Apostle (1 Cor. 15, 54), where he says, "*and when this mortal hath put on immortality.*" Thus are to be explained the words of our Redeemer (Luke, 18, 19), "None is good but God alone," when compared with those of Luke, 23, 50, "And behold there was a man named Joseph, who was a counsellor, a good, and a just man;" namely, the words of our Saviour refer to that essential and incomprehensible goodness inherent in God, and those of Luke, as also those of the Acts, 11, 24, regarding Barnabas, "For he was a good man," to be understood of a participation of the same divine goodness by grace. As, therefore, according to the Holy Writings, immortality and goodness are two-fold, and may be attributed in one sense to God and in another to a created being, so, standing to the authority of the same written word, there are several sorts of worship, according to the several excellencies that are. 1st. There is a supreme worship, which is due, and must be given to God alone, whose excellence is supreme—divine—infinately surpassing every other; and from which every other excellence is derived, as from the divine source; the second is that which is called even by our opponents *civil worship*, and is given by them to persons in authority; the third is supe-

rior to it, but infinitely inferior to what is due to God, and is by the Catholic Church given to the Saints, whom God Almighty by his grace enlivened when on earth with his divine spirit, grace, and gifts, by means of which they were good and holy, and now enlivens them with glory and bliss in the Heavenly Jerusalem. Again, worship is either internal or external; the former resides in the mind and soul, the latter is expressed by some bodily humiliation. And although the internal may exist without the external, still no act of true external worship can exist without the internal: thus, for instance, when the soldiers bent their knees to the Blessed Jesus during his passion, this act was not one of true external worship, because it was not accompanied by the internal, but one of mockery or derision. It follows, therefore, that every external act of worship is constituted only a true one by the internal. Hence, the same outward gesture, such as bending the knee, may be made use of at the altar; to a crowned head, to a bishop, or priest. When the priest bends the knee at the altar, it is of course an act of divine worship, and can be given but to God alone. When he bends it to a crowned head, it is one of civil worship. When he bends it to a person in whom he acknowledges a dignity neither divine nor human, but finite and created, and still neither civil nor rational, but spiritual and supernatural, the act is said to be one of religious worship; but, as I have remarked, infinitely inferior to what is due to God alone; and this is precisely what is paid by the Catholic Church to the Angels and Saints. Thus, then, according to these principles, even were the text so read, "thou shalt worship *only* the Lord thy God," this could never exclude civil, and in a less imperfect sense, religious worship. I am aware that many of our opponents seem displeased with this division of worship, but I ask why it may not be so

divided as love and fear? Adam conceals himself from God through a religious fear. Adonias flees from Solomon from a civil fear—the fear of the primitive Christians, for Peter, on seeing Ananias fall dead at his feet, was a *religious* one. Isaac loves Esau with a civil love, Peter loves his Lord and Master with divine love, but the first Christians loved St. Paul with a religious love. Thus, to come to the point in question, Moses worships the infinite Majesty of God with a *divine worship*, the children of Jacob worship the power and excellency of their brother Joseph with a civil worship, and the Sunamites worshipped Eliseus, and the Captain of fifty-men, Elias, with a religious worship. And the paying such religious worship to a creature is so far from derogating in the least from the worship due to God, that it would be an unpardonable insult to Heaven, to assert that God might be worshipped by it. The Almighty has to this effect assured us that His glory he will not give to another.

With respect to what they urge in consequence of *serve* being preceded by *only*, I beg to remark, that in order that this may have force, it must be supposed that *serve* means every sort of service; so that the words, “Him only shalt thou serve,” means no service must be given to man, but to God alone. But this position cannot hold good. St. Paul says (Ephes. 6, 5), “Servants be obedient to them that are your lords according to the flesh:” 6, “Not serving to the eye:” 7, “With a good will serving.” And in Genesis, 25, v. 23, we read, “The elder shall serve the younger.” Thus, then, it is clear that not God *only* is to be served. When our opponents cite passages from the Scriptures to uphold their religious opinions, special care should be taken that such passages be not directly opposed to other texts, for in this case they are inadmissible as proofs, and cannot but lead into error; although I must

confess, that the error of our opponents regarding the text in question does not proceed from want of reflection, but from ignorance of the Greek word made use of by the sacred penman. In the Hebrew, Latin, and English, there is but one word to express the serving of God and of created beings. In the Greek there is a proper word, which means only the service of God, or the service proper to Him alone, and this word is never used for the religious service paid to any creature. This word in Greek is *latreuin*. That the reader may more clearly understand this, I presume he is aware that many words have a two-fold signification—one in force of their first institution, or which they have had from the beginning, and amongst heathen writers; the other by use and application to some one particular sense, and this owing to use and custom, which in process of time acquired so much force as to confine or limit them to that particular sense. Thus, the word *turannos*, a tyrant, amongst the ancient Greeks meant a king, and was taken in good sense; but by late writers, and indeed, it may be said, universally by all, it signifies a tyrant, or a cruel and unjust oppressor. And as the unanimous consent of approved authors and law-makers have power to give new significations to words, or rather to limit and confine the old, so also the unanimous consent of approved Ecclesiastical writers and the common voice of Christians possess the like power to alter the ancient signification of words, and confine them to some particular sense. Thus, *Baptismus*, that originally signified any kind of washing, is now by them meant for the sacrament known by that name. Thus, *Evangelist*, which originally signified a messenger of good tidings, means now a writer of the gospel. Thus, *latreuin*, which the infidels of old made use of to signify any kind of service, is now understood by Ecclesiastical writers to

mean only that religious service due to God alone, and is never used in the Holy Writings for the religious service paid to any creature. And as the Catholic Church teaches that such service is to be given to God alone, and never to any created being, so nothing can be inferred from the text in question.

11th Objection.

Many Protestants draw an objection against the Invocation of Saints from the silence of the New Testament on this subject.

To this I beg to answer, that though this silence were real, it ought not to cause any difficulty, because we speak of recourse to the prayers of the Saints not as a thing absolutely necessary to salvation, but only as of a thing that is helpful and that may be profitable; so that it is not necessary to produce express passages. But, then, I must add this silence is but imaginary, since the Holy Scripture speaks as clearly of recourse to the intercession of the Saints as it does of the substitution of the Sunday for the Sabbath, and of the baptism of infants. It evidently lays down all the principles of it, for what it says concerning the recourse of the faithful on earth to the prayers of their brethren shows that God is pleased when we give a value to our prayers by joining those of others to them; and what it says concerning the knowledge which the Saints have of many things here on earth points out to us that they are of the number of those brethren whose prayers we may desire. One cannot shew any thing clearer in the word of God for the baptism of infants, or the institution of Sunday.

12th Objection.

An attempt is also made to invalidate the Invocation of Saints from a confession of Cardinal Perron, who owns that

no traces of such a practice can be found in the authors nearest the times of the Apostles, and he accounts for this by alleging that most of the writings of that early age have perished. This miserable excuse, say many Protestants, amounts to an acknowledgment that the "unscriptural practice of Invoking the Saints is totally unsupported by any ancient historical testimony." This, however, is their own conclusion, and not that of the cardinal. In opposition to such a conclusion, I must observe that it is notoriously false to assert that the Invocation of Saints is totally unsupported by ancient historical testimony. Before such a conclusion could be valid, it must be proved that the Apostolic men wrote much, or professed to write, on all points of religious belief and practice, and if they did, that their writings have been preserved to our times. These facts never can be proved: for it is well known that the holy men nearest the times of the Apostles had neither occasion nor disposition to write much. The teaching of the Apostles was fresh in the recollection of all, and too recently sealed with their blood, to require their immediate successors to write treatises to explain or defend it. And the first Christians were too much occupied with preaching the truths of religion, or preparing to witness them by hourly expected martyrdom, to have much leisure or inclination to write books. Thus, in the earliest times comparatively few books were written, and of those few, a very small number indeed have descended to our times. Some persons may say, perchance, that this amounts to an acknowledgment that the doctrine in question is "totally unsupported by any ancient historical testimony." "Not so fast; this does not follow. I have spoken of the ages immediately succeeding the Apostles: after that age books were multiplied by Christian writers, and very satisfactory evidence is found in what re-

mains to us of the writings of the second and third centuries. But the same causes in a great measure contributed in those ages to render such evidence rare, and still more is it rare to us at this immense distance of time, knowing as we do that so many valuable works of those ages have long ago perished. But when we come to the fourth century, and read the brilliant, overwhelming evidences of such illustrious men as St. John Chrysostom, St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. Gregory of Nyssa, St. Basil, St. Ambrose, and other glorious names, for the Invocation of Saints: and when we recollect that those men possessed so many more of the writings of their predecessors, and had so many more opportunities of knowing what had been the doctrine and practice of the preceding ages than those puny pretenders of this day—a distance of fifteen centuries—it would be raving insanity to assert that the Invocation of Saints is unsupported by historical evidence, or that those illustrious fathers could have inculcated a doctrine or practice not founded on the primitive, uniform, and perpetual testimony of the Church from the very days of the Apostles.”—*Husenbeth*.

Finally, another objection is taken, from the creed of Pius 4th, where we read, “sanctos venerandos atque invocandos esse,” which words, our opponents say, mean “that the Saints must be invoked,” and hence conclude that it is an article of faith necessary to salvation. But then this translation is evidently incorrect. It tends to introduce an idea and a command into the creed which no Catholic will admit. It renders it imperatively incumbent on him to pray to the Saints. Now this is neither the belief of the Catholic Church, nor the meaning of the original. The literal meaning of the words is that the Saints are to be invoked; that we may or ought, and not that we must, beg

their intercession. The words of the creed mean the same as those of the Council of Trent, which are, that it is good and profitable to have recourse to their intercession. It is, in fact, no where defined that we are obliged to pray to the Saints. Add also to this, it may be good and profitable to do a thing, and yet not necessary. But, then, Catholics and Protestants will be, I am sure, quite content to rest the correctness of the translation of these words upon grammatical authority. Referring, therefore, to Zumpt's Grammar, which is acknowledged to be the best published, at page 360, Kenrick's Translation, 8vo., we read as follows: Note 1. "In the Latin authors of the best age, the participle in *dus* is not generally used to denote possibility. In such passages as *Cæs. de Bell. g. 'Maximeque p̄movebantur, quod vix erat credendum;'* *Cic. de Orat. 'Vix optandum erat;'* *Si Circe et Calypso mulieres appellandæ sunt;* the idea of propriety rather than mere possibility is intended." In fact, the meaning of propriety is so indisputable, that Rennick Englishes his participles in *dus* invariably by deserving or requiring; *legendus, docendus, &c.*, deserving or requiring to be read, taught, &c. Alvares says, "*Participia in dus cum verbo substantivo necessitatem, officium, aut dignitatem adsignificant, et eleganter pro oportere, debere, seu Dignum esse usurpantur.*" The example cited for this last meaning is from Cicero's Offices, Lib. 5. "*Egomet qui consolari cupio, consolandus ipse sum.*" Valpy, in his "*Elegantiaë,*" page 56, says, "The participle future passive with the dative of the person, is more elegant than the verbs *debeo, oporteo, necesse est;* as '*Diogenes being asked at what age a man ought to marry, said, young men not yet, old men never, Diogenes interrogatus qua ætate ducenda sit uxor, juvenibus inquit, &c.*' Surely these authorities are sufficient to satisfy every candid mind.

I shall close this Lecture in the beautiful language of the learned Waterworth, who on this subject thus admirably says:—

“ Nor is this opinion the growth of a few years, or peculiar to a few men ; it has been the constant belief and practice of the Church in all ages ; of the Martyr and the Confessor, the Bishop, the Priest, and the Layman, of the ornaments of human nature and of Christianity. Scoff not, I beseech you, at this argument. On the testimony of these men, you rest your belief in the Scriptures themselves, and truly you cannot require greater evidence of any doctrine than that which you deem sufficient to establish the authenticity, the genuineness, the incorruption, and the inspiration of the sacred volume. These men, these great and good men—these Patriarchs of Christianity, who learned their faith from the Apostles, or from their immediate and personal disciples, assert, that in their days, the Scriptures were received as the inspired word of God ; we trace this testimony from age to age till the Apostolic times, and on this uniform evidence we eventually rest our belief, and acknowledge the Scriptures to be God’s word. If, then, it can be shown by a similar process, that these men not only bear testimony that it was at all times and in all places considered as a part of the deposit of faith that the sacred Scriptures are inspired, but also that the intercession of the Saints may be solicited, we must arrive at the same conclusion, we must view this doctrine as divinely revealed ; or if we deny the sufficiency of the evidence in one case, we must reject it in the other : then must we give a triumph to the Infidel and the Pyrrhonist, who assert that tradition cannot assure us, beyond the possibility of doubt, that the Scriptures are really genuine and inspired.”—(*Waterworth to Simpson, Curate of Newark.*)

To this I will add the following from the most learned of living Bishops, the Right Rev. Dr. Wiseman :—

“ Let us begin with the very first ages of the Church, and let us not take ambiguous words, but the simplest, and most natural expressions of the feelings of the earliest Christians.

“ Every part of Rome is undermined with catacombs, in which the bodies of the Saints and Martyrs were deposited after their deaths ; the tombs are even some of them as yet sealed up and unbroken ; some with inscriptions on them, or perhaps a palm branch rudely sculptured, to show that there repose the martyrs of Christ. We have phials adhering, and fastened to the covers of the tombs, in the walls of the catacombs, in which are sponges, or sediment, still tinged with the colour of their blood : indeed, the very instruments of torture are constantly found in them. Certainly, these were men who knew Christianity, who fully appreciated what was due to Christ, for whom they died, were fully convinced that nothing on earth was to be preferred before him, and that no creature could pretend to one particle of the honour reserved to himself ! Surely we cannot want purer or more satisfactory testimonies to what Christ instituted, than they who shed their blood to seal its truth ; we cannot want teachers better imbued with the spirit of Christianity than those who were ready to lay down their lives to defend it ! Let us see what was their belief regarding their brethren, when they deposited them in these tombs and sealed them up, and inscribed on them their regrets or their hopes. Nothing is more common than to find a supplication, a prayer to the Saints or Martyrs to intercede for them with God.”—*Wiseman*.

“ In the year 1694, was discovered a remarkable tomb of

the martyr Sabbatius in the cemetery of Gordian and Epimachus. On the one side was the palm branch, the emblem of martyrdom, and on the other, the wreath or crown given to the victors, with this inscription in a rude latinity:—

SABBATI · DVLCIS · ANIMA · PETE · ET · ROGA
PRO · FRATRES · ET · SODALES · TVOS

‘Sabbatius, sweet soul, pray and entreat for thy brethren and comrades.’

These early Christians, then, pray to the Martyr to intercede for his brethren on earth.

“In the cemetery of Callixtus, is another inscription of the same antiquity, which runs thus:—

ATTICE · SPIRITVS · TVVS
IN · BONV · ORA · PRO · PAREN
TIBVS · TVIS

‘Atticus, thy spirit in bliss : pray for thy parents.’

“In that of Cyriaca, we have an inscription in much the same terms :—

IOVIANE · VIBAS · IN · DEO · ET
ROG

‘Jovianus, may you live in God and pray.’

“In that of Priscilla, we have another, very touching and beautiful in the original :—

ANATOLINVS · FILIO · BENEMERENTI · FECIT
QVI · VIXIT · ANNIS · VII
SPIRITVS · TVVS · BENE · REQUIES
CAT · IN · DEO · PETAS · PRO · SOBORE · TVA

'Anatolinus made this monument to his well-deserving son, who lived seven years. May thy spirit rest well in God, and thou pray for thy sister.'

"Marini gives us another old Christian inscription, to this effect.—

ROGES · PRO · NOBIS · QVIA · SCIMVS · TE · IN · CHRISTO

'Pray for us, because we know that thou art in Christ.'

"These are most of them inscriptions on the tombs of Martyrs, whose bodies were deposited therein during the very first centuries of Christianity, when men were ready to die for the faith of Christ."—*Dr. Rock's Hierurgia.*

"An inscription discovered two years ago; which was erected by a person of considerable consequence, being governor of the district around Rome. The inscription is in these words;—ANICIVS · AVCHENIVS · BASSVS · V · C · ET · TVRRENIA · HONORATA · C · F · EIVS CVM · FILIIS · DEO SANC-TISQVE · DEVOTI.—'Anicius Auchenius Bassus, who had enjoyed the consular dignity, and his wife Honorata, with their children devout to God and the Saints.' We find God and the Saints here joined together; nor does it appear that any apprehension was entertained of thereby derogating from the honour of the Deity."—*Letters to J. Poynder, Esq., by Dr. Wiseman.*

ADDENDA

TO THE

LECTURES ON THE INVOCATION OF ANGELS AND
SAINTS.

THE reader will have observed that I have frequently referred to the Exposition of the Doctrines of the Catholic Church, by Bossuet; for his information, I beg to add, this work was the result of long and profound meditation. When Bossuet had finished it, he caused twelve copies of it to be privately printed, and circulated them among the prelates and theologians, by whose opinion and advice he considered it most likely he should be benefited. They returned the copies to him with their written remarks. These he weighed with great attention, and finally, in December, 1671, gave to the world the immortal work. It was accompanied by the formal approbation of the Archbishop of Rheims, and of ten other bishops. Cardinal Bona, then the oracle of the Roman see, to whom Bossuet sent a copy, wrote him a letter, commending it in the warmest terms. It was translated into almost every European language: into English, by the Abbe Montague, in 1672; into Irish, by Father Porter, and printed at the press of the Propaganda, in 1673; into German, by the Prince Bishop of Paderdom, in the same year; into Dutch, by the Bishop of Castorie, in 1678; into Italian, by the Abbate Nassari, under the inspection of Cardinal d' Etrées, who himself corrected the proofs of the impression. This translation was

formally approved of by Ricci, the Secretary to the Congregation of Indulgences, and Lawrence Brancati, Librarian of the Vatican, and with their permission was dedicated to the Congregation of Propaganda. It was translated into Latin, under the immediate inspection of Bossuet, by the Abbe de Fleury, the author of the invaluable History of the Church. But the Bishop of Rome and the great body of the French clergy had hitherto remained silent. In due time their opinion was pronounced. In 1679, Pope Innocent, though the work favours the Cisalpine opinions on the scholastic questions of Papal infallibility, expressed his approbation of it, as an accurate explanation of the articles of our faith, in two successive Briefs addressed to Bossuet. In 1682, it was unanimously approved of by the general assembly of the French clergy, held in that year at Paris. The sarcastic sneer of the sceptical Maimbourg is the only instance of disapprobation by a Catholic with which I am acquainted. But Maimbourg nowhere attests that Bossuet has "presented a false view of our doctrines." Dr. Lingard, Charles Butler, Dr. Fletcher, Dr. Milner, in a word, all our eminent polemic writers have appealed to this work. Therefore, if the approbation of so many theologians of different nations, the sanction of bishops, cardinals, and popes can stamp authority on the immortal work of the "Bishop of Meaux," it must be, then, received as a conclusive evidence of the real nature of our doctrines. Gibbon says, "Bossuet assumes, with consummate art, the tone of candour and simplicity; and the ten-horned monster is transformed, by his magic touch, into a milk-white hind, who must be loved as soon as seen." Dr. Marsh thus appeals to Bossuet's work:—"The inquiry, which we are about to institute, will be conducted in the most intelligible manner, by making Bossuet's chapter on Scripture and Tradition the

basis of that inquiry ; and no Romanist can object to it, as Bossuet is universally holden by them in the highest estimation." Finally, the learned Margaret Professor of Divinity at Cambridge insists strongly on the "necessity of abiding by Bossuet's explanation." It was in consequence of reading this work, that Turenne is said to have returned to the religion of his fathers.

Next to Bossuet I have placed Veron, who discriminates, with the most acute precision, between the articles of faith and the mere opinions of the schools ; whilst every statement is supported by accurate reference to our councils, creeds, and most approved theologians. It is a work of great research, and of profound judgment. The celebrated Brothers Wallenburgh use it as their text. De la Hogue, the late Maynooth professor, on most questions of difficulty, contents himself with quoting Veron's words. Hooke, the learned Sorbonne doctor, appends this treatise to his own work "on the Church." Liebermann, Bailly, Collet, in a word, theologians of all nations look upon Veron's "Rule" as a most accurate and just explanation of our tenets. The Catholics of this Kingdom are indebted to the learned Waterworth for the English translation of this treatise.

END OF THE LECTURES ON THE INVOCATION OF ANGELS
AND SAINTS.

END OF VOL. I.

Printed by J. L. COX & SONS, 75, Great Queen Street,
Lincoln's-Inn Fields.

