



The Rev^d Dr Biequet,
With the author's kindest
Compliments;

THE
CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

OF THE
EUCCHARIST,

DEMONSTRATIVELY PROVED
FROM SCRIPTURE, FROM TRADITION,
AND FROM THE WRITINGS OF SOME OF THE MOST EMINENT
CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT AUTHORS WHO HAVE
TREATED ON THE SUBJECT;

IN SIXTEEN LETTERS,
WITH NOTES AND APPENDICES,

ADDRESSED TO
THE LORD BISHOP OF EXETER,

AND DEDICATED BY PERMISSION
TO HIS IMPERIAL AND ROYAL MAJESTY THE
EMPEROR OF AUSTRIA, KING OF HUNGARY,
BOHEMIA, ETC.

BY M. D. TALBOT.

“The Eucharist is that flesh of our Saviour, which suffered for our sins, and which the Father by his goodness raised from the Dead.”—(*St. Ignatius M. ad Smyrn. c. 7.*)

LONDON:

T. JONES, 63, PATERNOSTER ROW;

C. DOLMAN, BOND STREET; J. BROWN (LATE KEATING AND BROWN), DUKE
STREET, MANCHESTER SQUARE; AND ALL BOOKSELLERS.

1844.

THE NEW YORK

LIBRARY

W. Davy and Son, Printers, 8, Gilbert Street, Oxford Street.

TO THE EMPEROR.

SIRE,

Notwithstanding the sublimity and the solidity of the great cause, which I have undertaken to defend, I have not the smallest doubt, that being presented to the world under the protection of the great name and the famed Christian virtues of your Imperial and Royal Majesty, and of your Illustrious Ancestors, my feeble works will receive a double strength and a double splendor.

The real presence of Christ in the sacrament of the Eucharist, has no witnesses more illustrious, after the Apostles and holy Fathers, than those renowned Monarchs and Apostolical Emperors from whom, under God, you derive your being and your exalted eminence.

They ever regarded this most holy sacrament as the object of their particular veneration; and the perpetuity of the faith, touching this adorable mystery, is an invincible proof of the truth of the doctrine of the Catholic Church, it alone suffices .

DEDICATION.

to confound all heresies, and to put an end for ever to that imaginary change which separatists presume to accuse her of with so much rashness and temerity.

The kingdom of the Son of God is not of this world; but, nevertheless, he is in the world; it is for the salvation of the world, that he exercises in it his power, and that he reigns over men and angels. It is written, that Kings will render homage to him; and we behold this prediction fulfilled to the letter throughout the globe. The most powerful empires adore his footstool; the immaculate Lamb is to-day triumphant over the universe, and the sacrament of the altar is a victorious sacrament, which has subjugated the world. The Eagles of the Empire flutter around this mystery, and nourish themselves with the body and blood of Jesus Christ. The Roses of England, once upon a time, but alas! those happy days exist no more, drew from it their sweetest perfumes.

Almighty God has in his infinite wisdom, placed your Imperial and Royal Majesty in the most elevated position that mortal can be raised to, and well your conduct corresponds with his unbounded kindness towards you. Your august life is devoted to the happiness of your subjects; and your known profound veneration for this holy sacrament of the altar, which is the sacrament of unity, according to the holy Fathers, and the sacred bond of peace, is beyond all praise. Your profound respect and perfect obedience in all spiritual matters to the Universal Church, under the guidance of the illustrious Successor of St. Peter, the Bishop of Rome,

DEDICATION.

and the protection you always afford to her, will be more honorable than all the triumphs of the Cæsars; they will be sure to draw down on you the benediction of heaven, the applause of the angels, and the protection of God himself, who will watch over your great Empire as long as you take an interest in promoting his glory.

Accept, Sire, the assurance of the humble and continual supplications, which I will ever offer up in the presence of this adorable sacrament, that the Almighty may shower down on your Imperial and Royal Majesty, on your Illustrious Consort, and on the whole of the Imperial Family his choicest blessings.

I am,

SIRE,

With the most profound respect,

Your Imperial and Royal Majesty's most dutiful,
most humble, and most devoted Servant,

M. D. TALBOT.

TO THE
SINCERE ENQUIRER AFTER TRUTH.

Many persons in the present day will read a new book on any subject which engages their attention, who will not take the pains to seek for, or to study, older works, though these may possess greater merit. Alive to this feeling, and knowing how earnestly and anxiously the divine mystery of the holy Eucharist is now discussed and meditated upon by that numerous body of religious inquirers to whom the Almighty in His all-wise dispensations has not yet vouchsafed the full light of faith, the author of the following work has been induced to devote some of his leisure hours to collecting from the more elaborate writings of Catholic Theologians, some few of the many arguments and illustrations which irresistibly confirm the truth of this soul-comforting dogma of Catholic faith. May all his readers, with a lively humble confidence in God's truth and mercy, captivate the pride of reason to the mysteries of revealed knowledge, and "discerning the body of the Lord," partake "verily and indeed" of the "bread of eternal life."

PREFACE.

A long time ago the holy Fathers assured us, that the devil is the author of all heresies, and that separatists are the disciples of this bad master. The illustrious St. Augustine says: "Seeing that men had abandoned the temples which they had dedicated to him, and that they ran to the Mediator who truly delivers all those who place their confidence in his name, he raised up heretics who, under the name and appearance of Christians, combat the doctrine of Jesus Christ."— (*St. August. Lib. 18, de Civ. Dei. c. 51.*)

St. Cyprian had written the same before him; in speaking of the Novatian schismatics, he says: "The spirit of malice, seeing that the people in crowds embrace the religion of Jesus Christ, the idols and the temples which were before his dwellings were now abandoned, that he made use of a new stratagem to deceive, under the appearance of the name of Christians, those who were not sufficiently on their guard against his hypocritical machinations; he caused to rise up heresies and schisms to upset the faith, to corrupt the truth, and to destroy unity, and in this manner surprises and deceives,

by the errors of new doctrines, those whom he cannot retain in the darkness of their former course.”—(*St. Cypr. Tract 3, de Simp. prælat.*)

Even if the Fathers of the Church, the venerable witnesses of the faith, had not given us this information, the Gospel would have instructed us on this point, when it calls the devil the father of lies.—(*St. John viii. 44.*) It is easy therefore to conclude, that he is the father of all pernicious falsehoods, which corrupt the sacred doctrine of the Church, which extinguish the spirit of God (*Thess. v. 19*) in our souls, and destroy faith. But if common sense points out to Catholics the propriety of attributing all heretical doctrines to the devil, surely the same common sense ought to convince separatists of the mad folly of being guided by him. The design of heresy is to pass for the truth; the means which she takes to insure success are detestable, and equally as vile and infamous as her origin, springing as she does from the father of lies. Thus all separatists, far from declaring their opinions to proceed from the devil, endeavour by all means in their power to persuade the world that they were revealed by God; they wish it to be believed, that their doctrines proceed from the Holy Ghost, or that the Holy Spirit speaks through their mouths,—thus they consider it to be of vital importance to make God appear to be the author of the doctrine which they wish to have received. To accomplish their object, they therefore corrupt, with the most unblushing effrontery, the sacred Scriptures, and following as they do their own whims and fancies, they consequently never agree among themselves

upon the meaning of the texts of holy Scripture ; for on that passage alone, " This is my body," (St. Matthew xxvi. 26,) I remark no less than sixty different interpretations given to it.

Martin Luther and his adherents expound these words, " This is my body," literally, and therefore believe the real presence of Christ's body in the sacrament ; but being however resolved to incommode the Pope, as Luther says, (*Epist. ad Calvin,*) they add, that the substance of the bread and wine is likewise there ; and to extricate themselves from a difficulty which attends the real presence, they affirm moreover, that the body of Christ is everywhere. And thus they have brought forth two new points of faith never before heard of, namely, consubstantiation and ubiquity ; and this the writers of the Church of England call an absurd and monstrous doctrine. Zuinglius, in contradiction to Luther, asserts that these words must only be understood in reference to the simple figure of the body of Christ. Calvin endeavoured to reconcile these two interpretations, but I cannot discover what he really wishes to express when he says, " that the body of Jesus Christ is really present in the Eucharist, but only by faith." Zuinglius tells us, that he himself was the first that found out this exposition, by the help of a certain angel which appeared to him, but whether he was black or white, he says, he cannot tell ; so that, for aught he knew, it may be the doctrine of the devil. I am sure Luther at least thought so, (*See Epist. ad Calvin,*) for he calls Calvin a devil, for offering to obtrude his doctrine upon the world, and for wresting the plain words of our Saviour to such a sense.

The Church of England does not expound these words literally, nor yet figuratively; for she neither believes in transubstantiation nor in consubstantiation, neither real presence nor yet real absence, and to confess the truth, I repeat here what I said in one of my former works, I do not well know what she believes in that particular,—and what is worse, to the best of my understanding, she does not know herself. For the Catechism which is put into the hands of children and the common people (wherein surely the articles of faith must, if anywhere, be clearly and plainly expounded) teaches “that the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord’s supper;” which, I am sure, is the very same with the doctrine of the Council of Trent—her “verily and indeed” being the self-same thing with that Council’s “*verè et realiter*.” Yet if you should ask the majority of her divines of the present day, whether the body and blood of Christ be, verily and indeed, in the sacrament? they will answer you, No.* If you ask them further, how can you then, verily and indeed, take and receive the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament, if it be not there? Some will answer you, “That though his body and blood be not there, yet when you take the bread and wine,

* The learned Julius Vindex clearly proves that the doctrine of the real presence (if the most eminent Divines of the Church of England are to be believed) is no less the real doctrine of the Church of England than it is that of the Church of Rome. See Letter II. of this series.

you take at the same time the body and blood of Christ to all the intents and purposes of the sacrament;" but this is such a riddle, that it surpasses my skill to unfold. Others say, "That by an act of faith you do verily and indeed take and receive the body and blood of Christ when you receive the elements." But if you urge the difficulty further, and tell them, that "to receive the body and blood of Christ by faith, is no more to receive it verily and indeed, than to receive an idea or representation of a thing to which you give assent, is to receive the thing itself." But suppose it were, they must admit of Christ's body being in several places at once, which is the inconvenience they would wish to avoid, by rejecting the real presence in the sacrament; for if one in London, and another in York, or elsewhere, should at the same time (as is very possible) verily and indeed take the body and blood of Christ, then surely the body must be in two different places at once. If you urge, I say, the difficulty thus far, you are not likely to get any answer which either you or any one else can understand. So that though the Church of England has many advantages over the Lutherans and Calvinists, yet in this she is neither so reasonable as they, nor so consistent with herself, nor yet with common sense.

The faith of Protestants then is doubtful, wavering, without a knowledge of what to adhere to; nevertheless, their celebrated Reformers, Zuinglius, Calvin, Beza, Carlostadius, Œcolampadius, Muntzer, (the disciple of Luther, and chief of the Anabaptists,) Melancthon, and a great number more, when they apostatized from the Church in communion with

the See of Rome, every one of them boasted he possessed a perfect knowledge of the Scriptures, but soon afterwards they divided into different sects; the frightful diversity in their interpretations, frequently of the whole of a passage itself, is an evident demonstration that it was the spirit of erroneous novelty which actuated them, and not the spirit of God, which is always the same; and consequently that neither Protestants, nor any who do not submit to the inspired decisions of the Catholic Church, can be certain of anything, neither as regards the number of the books of Scripture, nor of the fidelity of the translations, nor of the true reading of the texts, and of necessity their faith is purely human, and insufficient to guide to eternal life. But the Apostles and the Councils of the Roman Catholic Church have invariably spoken the same language, because they were animated by the spirit of God, an evident proof that they were inspired by the Holy Ghost, and this is the reason why they invariably express the same sentiments upon the revealed articles in every age, and in every Council, although these Councils were composed of so many different nations, and of so many different dispositions and tempers; there never was held a Council but commenced by confirming and ratifying what the preceding Councils had decided on as articles of faith, and all that according to the infallible word of Jesus Christ, who promised to his Church that the gates of hell should never prevail against her.

I ask here now every upright Protestant, if he can seriously and sincerely persuade himself that God, in order to reform

his Church, had raised up in an extraordinary manner those men who contradict, blacken, and excommunicate each other? Can he persuade himself that God has spoken through the instrumentality of Luther, when he says, that Jesus Christ is really present with the bread? that God has spoken through Zuinglius, when he says, that the eucharist is nothing more than a mere sign or figure? that God has also spoken through Calvin, when he says, that Christ was really present in the sacrament, but by faith? In fine, can God have spoken by the instrumentality of so many other Reformers, who are quite opposed to each other in most essential points, and which they themselves look on as essential for their religion, and who mutually treat each other as heretics? It is as clear, as the sun at mid-day, that they were not inspired by God, for they speak according to their whims and fancies, according to their intents and purposes, and God permits this frightful diversity of opinions, that they may confound each other. But what is most astonishing is that these different sects, so animated, so inveterate against each other, unite as one body against the Church of Rome, and what is equally extraordinary, until within these last few years, they permitted the public service of every sect in England and in Holland, while proscribing the Catholic Church, which was forbidden and denounced, although many of their ministers had declared that they could be saved in that religion. Now whence sprung this great enmity to the Roman Church, unless from this, that Protestants in these countries did not wish to have before their eyes a religion from which they

themselves were deserters and apostates. This is the reason why they feared a religion which commands obedience to ecclesiastical rule, and submission to secular authority. They feared a religion which commands the mortification of the flesh, which ordains fasts and abstinences, which obliges us to keep our passions under, to confess our sins, and to do penance.

Truth is one of the glorious attributes of God, and consequently I here again ask, in the presence of an enlightened public,—and recollect this is a most material point, and requires a clear and satisfactory answer,—Could Christ have instructed the Lutheran that he was really present in the Eucharist, and at the same time have informed the Zuinglian that he was there but in figure? Oh surely not; for such conduct as this would make him the God of contradiction and not the God of truth—such a supposition, even for a moment, would be blasphemy. The more we reflect, the more we ponder on our duty to God, the more we shall see the absolute insanity of separating ourselves from the chair of unity, that is, from the chair of Peter. I cannot do better than to request the serious attention of my readers, whilst I lay before them a powerful and most satisfactory quotation from a most profound Catholic theologian, in which he shews, yes, and demonstratively shews, that the real presence was ever the doctrine of the Catholic Church, from the very era of the Apostles. He says:—

“The belief of the real presence of Christ in the sacrament, must have been the common belief of the Church; or, it must

have happened by some inconceivable miracle, that not one of all the Christians of the world, though they were unceasingly urged by the language which expressed the real presence to believe that doctrine, ever yielded to a temptation, that proved afterwards to be so alluring and so powerful, as to seduce in an instant all the faithful of the universe. Had the ancient Church believed the real presence, it would be much less extraordinary, that none of its members should have been ever tempted to believe that Jesus Christ was not present in the eucharist. Nevertheless, as the mystery of the real presence, like other mysteries of religion, has its peculiar difficulties, Catholics show that these difficulties have been followed by their natural consequences—that they have shaken the faith of some and thrown them into doubt and infidelity. The Capharnaïtes were the first who were scandalized at this mystery, and they abandoned Jesus Christ. St. Ignatius testifies, that some of the early heretics would not confess that the eucharist was the flesh, which Jesus Christ offered for us. Hesichius says, that we ought to consume by the fire of charity all the doubts that arise in the mind against this mystery. It is related in the Lives of the Fathers, that a solitary having fallen through ignorance in the error that the bread which we receive in the holy communion is not the natural body of Jesus Christ, but his body in figure only, two other ancient solitaries warned him not to adhere to his opinion, but to follow the doctrine of the Catholic Church, all the members of which believe, that the bread is the body of Jesus Christ, and the wine his blood, not in figure but in truth; they after-

wards convinced him by a miracle, which their prayers obtained from God, that their doctrine was true. In the life of St. Gregory, written by John the Deacon, we find that a woman who had fallen into a similar error was converted by a miracle, which St. Gregory performed in the presence of all the people.

“The narrative of this miracle was, the writer states, extracted from certain books that were read in the Churches in England. This last circumstance has made Albertin impugn the truth of the narrative; and yet it is a circumstance which greatly confirms its authority, for as the Churches of England were founded by missionaries sent here by St. Gregory, it is probable that the history of his life, which they read in the Churches here, was composed by these first Apostles of Britain, men of the most upright characters, and who were well acquainted with the actions of St. Gregory. But, although the historical narratives which I have adduced above do not conclusively establish the truth of the miracles they record, yet the vague reply, that these narratives are perhaps fabricated, will not warrant their rejection. Proofs are of different classes, and these historical proofs, which do not give entire certainty, are not therefore to be discarded as manifestly false; besides, these attest with certainty the faith both of the authors from whose works they are quoted, and of the age in which these histories were written. For it is improbable, for example, that John the Deacon would give the narrative contained in his history, had he and his contemporaries believed with the woman of whom he speaks, that

the bread was not the very body of Christ. And it is still more improbable, that this narrative would be inserted in the books which were read in the Churches in England, if it were opposed to the faith received in this country. It is then permitted to adduce narratives, such as have been just recited, if only that degree of authority be ascribed to them to which they are entitled—if they be referred to as clear and undoubted evidence of the faith of the historian, and of the age when he flourished, and as probable evidence of the fact which they record. The narrative which regards St. Gregory has peculiar claims to respect, because Guitmond testifies, that the life of St. Gregory from which it was taken, was approved by many Popes, and that its accuracy was never questioned: ‘This biography which so many learned and holy Pontiffs sanctioned, in the very presence of Rome, by an approbation from which no one dissented. This history which so many Churches continue to receive, with the concurrence of the whole Christian world, and under the guidance of these Pontiffs.’ Hence Guitmond justly makes this reflection on the history of St. Gregory, and on other similar histories: ‘If so many Saints and learned Popes, so many abbots eminent for learning and piety, so many religious, so many ecclesiastics, and, in fine, if all the people of God believed, that these histories were contrary to the true faith, why have they never condemned them? why have they not destroyed and annihilated them? why have they not prohibited the reading of them? why have they praised and recommended them? and why have they handed them down to us

as works capable of edifying and instructing us?' We have then a right to infer with Lanfranc, from such works as we now speak of, 'That they suffice to prove, that all the faithful who preceded us held from remote ages the same belief which we now hold.' We learn, moreover, from the letter of Paschasius to Frudegard, that some passages which Frudegard had met in the works of St. Augustine disturbed his peace of mind and led him to doubt, in some degree, of the doctrine which in common with the universal Church of his own time he had hitherto believed. We find also in St. Fulbert, (*Epist. ad Adeodatum*,) that many were tempted to disbelieve the mystery of the eucharist. It is observed by those (*Guiz. L. 3*) who wrote against Berengarius, that his error was occasioned by some difficult passages in the works of St. Augustine. In the life of St. Malachy, which was written by St. Bernard, it is related, that an Irish clergyman who had fallen into error on the eucharist, presumed to assert, that this mystery contained neither the grace nor the reality of the body of Jesus Christ, and was only the mere sign of both. For this error he was reprov'd and excommunicated by St. Malachy, and visited by God with a sickness of which he died, after having however abjur'd his heresy. Thus it is evident that the difficulties of the Eucharist were attended with their natural effects, though their force was crushed, as it were, by the constant uniform and distinct belief which the faithful had of the truth of this mystery. Now Protestants cannot shew on their parts, that similar effects really followed from the passages of the Fathers, and from the other arguments

which lead to the belief of the real presence. For as Protestants do not find that any person was reproved because he professed the belief of the real presence, they must admit that there was, in truth, no one who deserved to be reproved for that doctrine; that is, they must admit, that for eight hundred years there was not even one solitary individual who was tempted to believe the real presence by the same language which subsequently drew over to that belief the entire universe. Hence to defend themselves, Protestants are forced to uphold these so very conflicting hypotheses—that the language of the Fathers suddenly gained over the universe in the tenth century to the belief of the real presence—and that up to the ninth century, this same language never excited in the mind of a single individual a doubt favorable to that doctrine. For a doubt of this nature, had it ever occurred to any one, would have necessarily drawn from the Fathers a formal declaration against the doctrine which it favoured, yet no vestige remains to shew that any such declaration was ever made by them.”—*(The Perpetuity of the Faith of the Catholic Church upon the Eucharist, p. 233, translated from the French.)*

Permit me now to ask, after this lengthened quotation, could anything be made more clear than the manner that this most learned man, Monsr. Arnaud, step by step, has demonstratively shown, that the real presence of Christ in the sacrament was ever the doctrine of the universal Church? St. Paul says: “O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust, avoiding the profane novelties of words, and the opposition of a knowledge falsely so called.”—(1 Tim. vi. 20.)

As Protestants generally appear to set a great value on the opinion of St. Augustine on all subjects, I therefore lay before them a very powerful quotation on the point in question, and which I have extracted from the writings of this great saint and doctor of the Church, (*Lib. de Consecratione, Dist. 2, c. 72,*) as follows: "In the mystery of the body of Christ performed within the holy Church, there is nothing more done by a good priest, and nothing less by a wicked one; because what is wrought there is not by the merit of him who consecrates, but by the word of our Creator, and the power of the Holy Ghost; for if it were by the merits of the priest, it would not by any means belong to Christ," &c. Who will again ever venture, after perusing the above quotation, to assert that St. Augustine was not a firm believer in the real and substantial presence of Christ in the eucharist.

NOTE I, TO PREFACE.

It is always with delight that I appeal to an enlightened public, being ever sure to find justice at their hands; I therefore conjure them previous to their reading these letters, to peruse with attention this note, which will point out to them the disagreeing systems of Protestant writers concerning the origin and antiquity of transubstantiation, that this generous public may see how little they can depend upon the veracity of these Protestant witnesses, who all contradict one another.

Dr. Whitaker attributes the invention of transubstantiation to Innocent III., in the fourth Council of Lateran, in the beginning of

the thirteenth century.—(*Whitaker's Answer to the Jesuit Duræus*, p. 480.) Dr. Cousins, in his *History of Transubstantiation*, p. 150, will have it invented about the middle of the twelfth century. Mr. Fox, in his *Acts and Monuments*, (edition 1576,) p. 1121, tells us, that the denying of it began to be accounted heresy in the time of Berengarius, that is, in the middle of the eleventh century. Joachim Camerarius, in his *Historiæ Narratio, &c.* p. 161, goes a step higher, and tells us that transubstantiation had quiet possession of the Church from the middle of the ninth century. Dr. Tillotson, in his *Discourse against Transubstantiation*, p. 306, confesses it to have been defended (at least as far as it imports Christ's corporeal presence in the sacrament) by the second Council of Nice, which consisted of three hundred and sixty bishops, in the 8th century. Dr. Humphreys (*Jesuitism*, P. 2, p. 626) assures us, it was imported amongst other Popish wares into England by St. Gregory the Great, and by St. Augustine the Monk, in the end of the sixth century. The Centuriators of Magdeburg find it in the writings of the Fathers of the fourth and fifth centuries.—(See *Centur.* 4, *Col.* 295; *Cent.* 5, *Col.* 517.) In fine, Adamus Francisci, a learned Protestant, in his *Margarita Theologica*, p. 186, not being able to discover any beginning of this doctrine, contents himself with telling his reader, that the Popish transubstantiation crept early into the Church.

Such is the concord of these witnesses who pretend to charge the Church of Christ with innovations; like to those who were formerly suborned against her divine spouse, (Mark xiv. 56,) their witnesses agree not together. I entreat of my readers to bear in mind that the learned Protestant divine, Dr. Whitaker, one of the greatest and most determined enemies of the Catholic Church, was not ashamed to acknowledge, that no reliance can be placed on the veracity of Protestant writers.—(See *Vindication of Mary*, Vol. 3, p. 54.) That most profound Protestant theologian, Dr. Thorndyke, one of the greatest lights of the Anglican Church, is obliged, as an act of justice, to acknowledge, in speaking of the Church of Rome, "I must accept the Church of Rome for a true Church, as in the Church of England

I have always known it accepted; seeing there be no question made but that it continueth the same visible body, by the succession of bishops and laws that were first founded by the Apostles. There remaineth therefore in the Church of Rome the profession of all the faith necessary for the salvation of Christians to believe either in point of faith or morals." How glorious, how triumphant for Catholics to hear such language from the very mouths of their opponents. "But many Protestants will still not admit," says an eminent Catholic prelate, "that the doctrine of the primitive Catholic Church was the same with that which the Church in communion with the See of Rome professes at present, and would willingly have their followers to believe that the faithful in the first centuries were Protestants." But unfortunately for them the school-master is abroad, and he directs the public to ask, "If this be so? when and how did their posterity become Papists? In what year of the Lord did this pestilent heresy of Popery (as some Protestants call it) first creep into the Church? Who was the first author of it? In what place was it first broached? What opposition did it first meet with at its appearance from the zeal of the pastors of the Church? What disturbances did it cause? What Councils were held on this occasion, &c.? or was this the only change in religion, the only heresy which crept into the world, without author, without date, without disturbance, without resistance, so that the whole world by a strange revolution from Protestant became Papist, though no one knew how nor when? On the contrary, we can trace up Protestantism to the very year it was first broached, viz., 1517. We can name the day when their first preacher laid the foundation of their religion; when we could have truly said to them, your profession had no being yesterday. We can tell the author, the place, the first and chief abettors of their doctrine; the disturbances it caused, the resistance which it met with, the books written on both sides, &c. We can do the same with regard to Arianism, and all other heresies or innovations in religion. Let Protestants do as much, or not accuse us of innovations. Let them name the Pope or Bishop of Rome for these eighteen

hundred years that brought into the Church a religion different from that in which his immediate predecessor both lived and died ; which as they certainly cannot do, it is a plain demonstration that the faith of the Church of Rome was never changed."

Now the real and substantial presence of Christ in the sacrament, and transubstantiation, the immediate consequence of the real presence, have ever been the doctrine of the Catholic and Apostolic Church, "the pillar and ground of truth," as I have demonstratively proved in these letters; it is therefore for my readers to consider whether they will accept the literal sense of these words of the Saviour for their belief, "This is my body, this is my blood," which has ever been the explanation given to them by an infallible authority in matters of faith, namely, by the Church of all ages; or if they prefer the Protestant figurative sense given to these same words, "This is my body, this is my blood," by a Church but of yesterday, as I have shewn. Let my readers also bear in mind, that the different Protestant sects differ widely among themselves on the meaning of these words; for example, the Lutheran firmly believing in the real presence, the Calvinist as sternly denying it, and this recollect on one of the greatest dogmas of Christianity. Surely they both cannot be right; therefore, I maintain, that common sense tell us that there must be an infallible authority on earth to lead all into the right way, and to give us the true meaning of Scripture, which is and has been continually twisted and perverted by heretics for the very worst purposes. We are also commanded by the Saviour, under the most dreadful penalties, to hear the Church, that is, to obey the Church, and which the Apostle calls, "the ground and pillar of truth." Now surely the Church here meant, cannot be the Protestant Church, which, I repeat, dates her rise from the year 1517; it can refer to no other but to the Church in communion with the See of Rome, the Church of all ages.

I shall here briefly notice for the information of my readers, one of the great arguments that Protestants make use of against this great dogma of Catholic faith, on account of these words which our

Lord added to the institution, "Do this for a commemoration of me." (See Appendix, where I have treated at large on these words.) We do not make, say they, a commemoration of a thing that is present; for which reason, if the body of Christ had been present in the eucharist, he never would have proposed it as a memorial. To this I answer, that the Evangelists were so far from imagining that the explication of these others, "Do this for a commemoration of me," that the latter are not even 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 is my body," but to point out the disposition of mind in which we ought to perform the action which Jesus Christ had just ordained, that is, of receiving and eating his body. I maintain that Protestants are unable to prove from Scripture that one cannot, as they say, make a commemoration of an object that is present; neither does reason oppose it.—(See the Rev. J. Waterworth on the Penal Laws.)

NOTE 2, TO PREFACE.

It is certain that our Lord had delivered to the Apostles instructions of the greatest importance concerning the Eucharist before he instituted it. It is most probable that he had given others, which are not come down to us, to confirm them in the faith of this 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," even 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 hence we cannot doubt

but our Lord spoke of the holy eucharist in the blessing and in the canticle after supper.*

NOTE 3, TO PREFACE.

I honestly confess that in early life, from what some of my Protestant relatives had told me of the novelties of Romanism, particularly regarding transubstantiation, and in what I found in many eminent Protestant authors concerning the late innovations of those doctrines controverted between the two Churches, I began to have doubts of the verities taught by the present Roman Church; much more when enquiring how late these doctrines were introduced into the Church, I was generally told by my Protestant relatives that they were not imposed on the faithful before the Council of Trent, about two hundred and seventy years ago; but when I compared the date of the Protestant Reformation with that of this Council, I plainly perceived that the protesting against these errors was begun and very near perfected before these errors were (as Protestants assert) then imposed; which, though it seemed extraordinary, and which might have passed with others as a reasonable answer to the objection of novelty, yet I resolved to peruse the Councils themselves, and, *de point en point*, note the time when these doctrines were in Council established.

1. I began with the Pope's supremacy, which I found confirmed in the General Council of Chalcedon,† *Act.* 16, (one of the first four General Councils which are acknowledged by the Church of England,) above one thousand three hundred and ninety-three years ago, six hundred and thirty Fathers present, and about the year of our

* Grot. in St. Matt. xvi.; Gerhard. Buxtorf. Dissert. p. 310, 325; Camer. Myr. p. 114.

† It is evident that Councils were not called to create verities, but to declare which were the verities believed.

Lord 451; and relation had to the first Council of Nice, *Can.* 6, which was held two hundred and twenty-five years after the death of St. John the Evangelist. This supremacy was also allowed, professed, and taught by the most ancient Fathers after the Apostles, and acknowledged by Melancthon, Luther, Bucer, Bilson, Dr. Cooper, Bunny, Fulke, Middleton, Osiander, the Centurists, and many others too numerous here to mention.

2. Those books which Protestants call apocrypha, were taken into the canon of the Old Testament in the third Council of Carthage, signed by St. Augustine the Great, Baruch only was not named, because it was looked on as an appendix to Jeremiah, whose Secretary he was.—(*Can.* 47.)

3. The unbloody sacrifice of the mass in the sixth Council of Constantinople, about one thousand one hundred and fifty-seven years ago, (*Can.* 32,) and also in the ninth Council of the Apostles it was decreed, "That a bishop shall communicate when sacrifice is made.

4. Veneration and respect for holy Saints' relics, (according to Apostolical tradition,) as also of Martyrs and of holy images, in the second Council of Nice, three hundred and fifty fathers present, *Act* 3, Anno Dom. 780. See more in *Act* 7, with the general consent of ancient Fathers.

5. Communion in one kind sufficient.—See the Council of Constance, Sess. 13, and practised in the Church thirteen hundred and fifty-years since.

6. Purgatory, and many more too long to relate, in the Council of Florence, and believed in the primitive times.

7. And lastly, the doctrine of transubstantiation confirmed in the great Council of Lateran, in which there were near twelve hundred prelates present, (See Letter XV. on this Council,) and in seven or eight other Councils before that of Trent; and all the controverted points, particularly and by name declared by many eminent Protestants themselves to have been brought into England by Augustine the Monk above eleven hundred and fifty-seven years since.

Indeed when I had diligently examined this truth, and found it most evident, beyond all possibility of any just and reasonable contradiction, I was much scandalized at the disingenuity of Protestant writers, who, whilst they accuse others of fallacy, of imposture, and of impudence, presume to advance so great and demonstrable a falsehood, in a matter of fact, that nothing but the most complete ignorance can excuse them, and expose themselves to the greatest censures of rashness and of indiscretion, as uncharitable and unjust to those whom they call their enemies, as also unsafe, and abusing the credulity of their friends. It is with the deepest regret that I am obliged to use any language which can in the least wound the feelings of any one, but my duty to the public forces me to tell the truth.

I submit every word contained in this work to the supreme judgment of the Apostolic See, adhering with heart and soul to the solemn declaration made by St. Jerome, in his Epistle to St. Damasus Pope, "It is with your Holiness I hold it; that is to say, I live in communion with the Chair of Peter. Upon that Rock I know the Church has been built."—(*Epist. xiv. ad Damasum.*)

CONTENTS.

	Page
Letter I.—“This is my body.—This is my blood.”—St. Matt. xxvi. 26, 28.....	1
Testimony of the Fathers, &c.....	61
Letter II.—“Take, eat, this is my body which shall be delivered for you.” The real presence of Christ’s body and blood in the sacrament is the true doctrine of the Church of England, if her most eminent Divines are to be believed.....	71
Letter III.—That the Holy Eucharist is both a figure and the very body of Jesus Christ; that he is in several places at the same time; and that the sacrifice offered in many places is but one Christ.....	100
Letter IV.—How the words of Christ, “This is my body,” was under- stood by St. Irenæus, Tertullian, St. Augustine, and by Theophilact, viz., that it is both the true and real body of Christ, and also the figure of Christ’s body. Figures may be taken in two ways	118
Letter V.—The explanation given by St. Chrysostom, St. Augustine, St. Irenæus, and St. Ambrose, on that passage of St. Paul, “The chalice which we bless,” &c. Our sacrifice more excellent than that of the Old Testament. It is manifest that he spoke not of the sacri- fice of the cross, but of the sacrifice instituted at the last supper. Christ himself our oblation and sacrifice.....	136
Letter VI.—“It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing”	143
Letter VII.—“The words which I have spoken to you are spirit and life”	150
Letter VIII.—Three different kinds of bread mentioned by Christ in the 6th chapter of St. John	156
Letter IX.—Bread and wine are sanctified and become a great sacra- ment by the invisible work of God	163
Letter X.—All the Fathers agree that we receive the body and blood of of Christ in the Eucharist.....	170
Letter XI.—“The spiritual rock was Christ”	180

CONTENTS.

	Page
Letter XII.—Men are capable of distinguishing between literal and figurative expressions; and if they want this capacity, they want also the capacity of distinguishing between truth and error	184
Letter XIII.—The explanation of that famous passage of St. Augustine taken from the third book of Christian Doctrine, c. 16.....	192
Letter XIV.—The explanation of that passage from St. Athanasius, which Protestants ridiculously consider fatal to the Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation.....	204
Letter XV.—The great Council of Lateran	209
Letter XVI.—The verity of the Eucharist strengthened by the reality of the true Church of Christ in the See of Rome	215
APPENDIX.	
I.—“Do this in commemoration of me.”—The Mass	232
II.—The sacrifice of the Mass	257
III.—Whether Protestants acknowledging the Eucharist to be a bare sign, or figure only, be an article of their faith, or nothing more than one of their inferior supposed truths	279
NOTES	283

LETTER I.

“This is my Body. This is my Blood.”—St. Matt. xxvi. 26, 28.

TO THE LORD BISHOP OF EXETER.

MY LORD BISHOP,

If we ought to receive with becoming reverence every word which was spoken by the Saviour of the World, your Lordship cannot deny but it would be the very height of impiety to alter even one syllable of those which he uttered, when making his last Will and Testament, just before he suffered the ignominious death of the Cross for our Sins, and which contain the most convincing proofs, that he could give us of his affection and of his love; Cum dilexisset Suos, in finem dilexit eos. What attention is paid to the last words of a dying man, of one even who knows not but Hell may be his lot. “No one then,” says the great St. Augustine, “utters a falsehood,” and if an heir should ridicule them, he would be looked upon as a bad man; how then shall we avoid the anger of God, if we reject, by infidelity or by contempt, the last words of his only Son, our Lord and Redeemer, spoken shortly before returning to Heaven, whence he beholds all who neglect and all who observe them, and whence he will come to judge both the one class and the other.

Nevertheless, my Lord Bishop, it is really deplorable to behold the efforts which Sectarians have made, and are making, to alter and corrupt the last Will and Testament of the Son of God, comprised in the few words which declare so expressly his last bequest, "Take eat, this is my Body." I shall now only simply quote what Martin Luther, the Father of the pretended Reformation, says in his "Defence of the Words of the Supper against those Fanatical Spirits, the Sacramentarians," to shew the baneful and terrible effects of the heresies of the 16th Century. "Of these holy and sacred words, *Hoc est Corpus meum*," says Luther, "Carlostadius miserably twists this pronoun, *hoc*; Zuinglius mangles this substantive verb, *est*; Æcolampadius tortures this word, *Corpus*. Others destroy the whole text, taking this word, *hoc*, out of its original position, and placing it the very last, saying, *Accipite, comedite, corpus meum, quod pro vobis datur, est hoc*; others maim half this text, and place this word, *hoc*, in the middle, saying, *Accipite, comedite, quod pro vobis datur, hoc est Corpus meum*; others again alter it thus, *Hoc est Corpus meum ad mei commemorationem*, that is to say, my Body is not here truly present, but only the commemoration of my Body; besides these I have here mentioned, to make up the number seven, we find others who say, they are not articles of Faith, that each one is permitted to form his own judgment on them as he thinks best, and consequently shews the folly of so many discussions on this subject. These people trample under their feet, and destroy every thing sacred. Each one fancying that he carries with him the Holy Spirit,* and is therefore convinced he cannot err, although their interpreta-

* The Holy Spirit is promised (St. John, xiv. 26) to the Apostles and to their Successors, particularly to teach them all truth, and to preserve them from all error, but he is not promised to each individual, according to the fanatical idea of Sectarians.

tions and their proofs are completely at variance, in so much so, that not one of them can be true. The Devil thus grossly and visibly deceives mankind.”—(*Lutherus in Defensione verborum cæncæ contra Phanaticos Sacramentariorum Spiritus*, Tom. 7.) Thus, my Lord Bishop, this confusion of opinions is a manifest proof of the spirit of discord which governs them, and which prevents their authors from agreeing on any point excepting one, viz, to suppress the true and legal meaning of this text, and to turn and twist it into contrary and supposed senses quite repugnant to the intention of the Testator.

Every one knows that the Eucharist is an inestimable gift, which Jesus Christ when dying bequeathed by his last Will to his Church, as to the legitimate heir of all his property. He describes it in these words, “This is my Blood, the Blood of the New Testament;” and the Fathers so understanding it, explained his meaning by calling the Eucharist, “the Hereditary Gift of the New Testament,—Hereditarium munus Novi Testamenti.”—(*St. Gaudentius, tr. 2, in Exodum.*) His bequest is thus expressed in the Gospel: “And whilst they were at Supper Jesus took Bread, and blessed, and broke, and gave to his Disciples, and said, Take ye and eat, this is my Body; and taking the chalice he gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this, for this is my Blood of the New Testament, which shall be shed for many for the remission of sins; and I say to you, I will not drink from henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I shall drink it new with you in the kingdom of my Father.”—(*St. Matthew, xxvi. 26, 27, 28, 29.*)

The Catholic, taking these words in their proper and literal sense, believes that the Eucharist is the true Body of Jesus Christ under the form of Bread. The Sectarian laughs at his simplicity, and declares that it is nothing but Bread he has bequeathed to us, as a sign or a figure of his body.

Which therefore of the two, I may be asked, is the right explanation of the Sacred Text? I answer, that without a doubt it is the one which gives to the words of Jesus Christ the meaning the most natural and the most conformable to his intentions, which agrees best with his high and exalted character, and which is the most advantageous to his family and to his heirs. Let Protestants weigh without prejudice all those circumstances, and they will soon be convinced of their being in error. 1st. Because beyond all doubt, the words of a will ought to be taken and understood in their proper and natural sense. The law so prescribes it, and good sense is quite in accordance with this disposition of the law. Where, permit me to ask, is there to be found a man of sound judgment, who wishing to make his Will, does not endeavour to express it in the most clear and intelligible language, in order to take away every pretext from those who might be tempted to dispute it? Every one would wish that his last Will and Testament should be faithfully fulfilled, and fearing to be misunderstood or mistaken in the forms, he does not confide in his own judgment, but consults talented, able, and experienced persons on these subjects. But if after all his assiduity and care to express himself clearly, some obscurity unfortunately be found which was not foreseen, it cannot be said that he occasioned it purposely, but that he was mistaken in the proper manner of expressing himself, while he sincerely desired to take away every pretext of litigation from his heirs.

With what face then can Protestants advance, that Jesus Christ, who is wisdom itself, did on so important an occasion as his last Supper, use ambiguous terms and improper phrases, thus throwing an eternal apple of discord among his children. If he merely intended to give them by his last Will and Testament the figure of his Body, I ask in the name of common sense, what prevented his expressing himself

clearly, and saying in precise terms, "This is the figure of my Body?" What could be his reason, I ask again? was it to deceive us by such a surprising equivocation, or was it to curtail three or four words, which had he but added to those he spoke, he would have put an end to all doubts on this most important of all questions.

Was it the want of sincerity on his part? Hear St. Hilary: "Fortè qui verbum est, et qui veritas est, loqui vera nescivit? et qui sapientia est, in stultiloquio erravit? et qui virtus est, in ea fuit infirmitate, ne posset eloqui quæ vellet intelligi."—(*L. 8, de Trin. Sub. Init.*) "Perhaps," says St. Hilary, "that he who is the Word and the Truth itself, did not know how to express himself? That wisdom was blended with extravagance; that strength had this weakness, that it did not know how to articulate what it wished to be understood." Is it not therefore abusing the simplicity of mankind, to assert that the Son of God, who is the essence of all perfections, who can deceive no one, and who has assured us in terms the most clear and expressive, that that which he gave us was his body; is it not, I say, abusing the simplicity of mankind, for Protestants to presume thus to contradict the Son of God, by asserting that we are not obliged to believe it to be that which he has declared it? Is it permitted thus to joke, to trifle, with the Sacred Word?

St. Paul says, "Hominis confirmatum testamentum nemo spernit aut superordinat."—(*Gal. iii.*) "No one despises the will of a man if it be authentic, or permits himself to add, or to take away from it." But the Sectarian considers himself privileged to censure the last Will and Testament of our Beloved Saviour, to corrupt it by the addition of figures, and to explain his sacred words in a contrary sense. What should we say to a man, who to defraud a lawful heir of a diamond which his father had bequeathed to him by his will, should sustain that the word diamond ought to be taken in figurative

sense, that is to say, for the figure of a diamond, and not for the diamond itself? Such a person, I assert, would either be considered a madman or a fool. Yet such is the extravagant and ridiculous conduct of Protestants on this subject. The Catholic Church asserts that Jesus Christ has left us by his Will his own precious Body under the species of Bread and Wine. Protestants on the contrary assert, that this is impossible, that it is inconceivable, that there is nothing in the three Evangelists nor in St. Paul to warrant such a doctrine. Catholics produce the Gospel to convince them of their bad faith, and we tell them with St. Augustine, “Quare litigas? Fratres sumus, non intestatus mortuus est Pater. Fecit testamentum, et sic mortuus est. Mortuus est, et resurrexit,” &c. &c.—(*St. Aug. in Ps. 21.*) “Ubi inventa fuerit ipsa hereditas, ipsam teneamus, Apéri testamentum.”—(*Ibid.*) “Why do you cavil? We are Brothers; our Father has not died Intestate; he made his Will before he died; he has risen from the dead; he lives for ever; he hears our words, and he understands his own. Open the Will, let us read it, and then we shall find the inheritance which we hold from him.” We shew this Will of Jesus Christ to every one, we recite his very words: “Hoc est Corpus meum.—This is my Body.” “Hic est sanguis meus—This is my blood.” But in order to dispossess us of this rich treasure, Protestants declare, that this mode of expressing himself is improper; that Jesus Christ spoke in a figurative language, for that which he gave us to eat was not his Body, but only the figure of his Body. Consequently the Will of the Son of God is not properly speaking a Will, but a figurative Will; or we may say, that a Will may be true in substance, although all that it contains be nothing but figure.

Now, permit me here to ask your Lordship, is not this absolutely turning into ridicule all laws both divine and human. The law commands the words of a Will to be strictly

taken in the literal sense; and even when they (the words) be figurative, she commands that her judges should explain and keep as close as possible to the reality. "*Quibuscunque verbis aliquid sit relictum, liceat legatario id prosequi.*" In whatever way a thing may be left in a Will, the legatee is permitted to follow it up. Nevertheless, Protestants this day have the hardihood to contest with us, the Will of the Son of God, which is couched in terms clear and formal, in words simple and natural, yet they wish to make it speak a figurative language, or rather, to disfigure it, and to deprive us of our legal rights. What! while they maintain that it is infamous to conceal, to change, or to alter any thing in the Will of a dead man, yet Protestants do not in the least scruple thus to violate and to corrupt the Will of the living God; this manner of acting is quite insupportable. Secondly, it is certain that the words in a Will ought to be taken in the sense most conformable to the wishes of the testator. On this point Protestants agree with us; but they maintain, with the most blind obstinacy, that the intention of the Son of God was only to leave us in the Eucharist the figure of his body; we on the contrary assert, that his intention manifestly was to bequeath to us the very substance of his Body and of his Blood.

On whatever side truth may be, it is important to know it. The right use of the Eucharist depends upon it, and eternal salvation rests upon this proper usage; that is, whether we receive it in figure only, or in reality: and as we cannot make a bad use of it without becoming "guilty of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ," therefore, that we may form a sound judgment on this point, and not be mistaken on so vital a subject, let us consult the very author of the Will; and I shall accordingly now seek to find out his intentions in his words; I shall examine what he says, in order to discover what he wishes to be believed. Let us hear the Son

of God! He declares that the Eucharist is his Body and Blood. He says so in words most clear and expressive, "Hoc est corpus meum; Hic est sanguis meus.—This is my Body; This is my Blood." We find these words mentioned no less than four times by three of the Evangelists and by an Apostle. He does not even once say, this is the figure of my Body. That is an expression not to be found in any one part of the Gospel. We do not find it in the Gospel of St. Matthew, nor in that of St. Mark, nor in that of St. John, nor is it to be found, I repeat, in any part of the sacred volume.

Judge now, my Lord Bishop, of his intentions, and tell me as a theologian and as an honest man, which of these two modes does he wish to be believed, viz., his figurative, or his real presence in the Eucharist. Can it be supposed for a moment, that he wished us to believe what he never said? or that in saying one thing, he expected us to believe another. Without doubt, his object was that we should ground our faith upon his words, and such was the purport and the essential motive he had in view when speaking them, and it must consequently follow that we are bound to believe that the Eucharist contains his Body and Blood, since the Sacred Volume in so many places assures us of it, and it is not possible that he intended us to believe the contrary, as he does not, I repeat again, so explain it in any *one part of* Holy Scripture.

It is out of the power of man, I assert, to invent terms *more strong, more forcible than our blessed Saviour used.* What then prevents Protestants from believing that it is his true Body and Blood which he gives us in the Eucharist under the species of Bread and Wine? Do you wish that he had used other words in order to convince you of his real intentions, and to strengthen your mind in the belief of the real presence. You may perhaps say, "I wish he had pointed out clearly the change of the substances of bread and wine,

the subsistence of their accidents without the subject, the presence of the Body of Jesus Christ in many places, the distinction between his natural and sacramental being, and his existence after a spiritual manner." Perhaps you may wish that he had said, "I have given you here my *humanity*, not *humanity* only, but Divinity too, which is present under the species of Bread and Wine, why therefore do you make yourselves unhappy at my departure? I shall not abandon you, for you have me whenever you wish to possess me, in your hands and in your stomachs. Why therefore are you sorrowful?" Are expressions like these such as you would wish to have seen written in the Sacred Volume? Do not dissimulate, but speak out. For if such be your wishes, I tell you, that you will not find them there. If you sincerely desire to hear the voice of the Son of God, I inform you, that he says in four words what Protéstants would have wished him to have explained away in many more; but He does not speak as a *weak man*, but as a God-man; and as on another occasion he created the Heavens and the Earth by His word, in like manner in these few words, "This is my Body," he comprehends, he operates, he produces all those wonders which Protestants would fain to reject. For, when he speaks so clearly, saying, "Take eat, This is my Body, This is my Blood," it was necessary, in order to fulfil his word, that he should transubstantiate what was before nothing but Bread into his Body, and what was before nothing but Wine, in like manner, into his Blood. Behold then the change of these substances of Bread and Wine, and the existence of the accidents without their subject. Besides placing himself in lieu of the Bread and Wine, it must consequently follow, that he should be present in many places; in Heaven by a visible presence, on Earth by an invisible and sacramental presence. Here you see the distinction between his natural and sacramental being, and also his existence after a spiritual manner.

But Protestants continually assert, that if he meant to bequeath to us his Body and Blood, he would have added, that it was his real Body, and that it continued to be no more Bread and Wine, which we take in our hands and which enters into our mouths. But I ask you and them, what reason obliged him so to express himself? Is it according to usage to add comments or explanations when we express ourselves in plain and clear terms? When a messenger from Heaven revealed to the ever Blessed Virgin Mary the secret of the Incarnation, did he explain to her all the particulars of that mystery? Did he inform her that the Son of God would assume her own proper being; that he would have a true and real body, and not in appearance only; that she would carry him in her arms, and that she would nourish him with the milk of her own breast? But did he not, on the contrary, content himself by telling her, that the Holy Ghost would descend upon her, and that the virtue of the Most High would overshadow her, and that nothing was impossible with God? And when the Evangelist declared this great mystery to the rest of mankind, did he make use of long discourses? What he said, was it not comprised in four words, "*Verbum caro factum est.*—The word was made Flesh?" Now is not that enough to oblige us to believe it?

But, my Lord Bishop, you cannot surely fail to perceive how little solidity there is in this Protestant objection to Transubstantiation; an objection as weak and as nonsensical as could be invented by the depraved wanderings of a diseased imagination. I will here bring forward a most powerful argument to refute it, and to shew its absurdity. If the Son of God had intended, as Protestants assert, to have merely left us in the Sacrament the figure of his Body, when saying, "This is my Body," then he did not use natural and proper terms, as in such case the figurative interpretation required explanation; and it was absolutely necessary to have apprised

the Apostles in order that they might not be deceived, that they might not take the shadow for the body, nor the figure for the thing figured. Consequently our blessed Saviour not having done so, and the same Scripture so often making use of those plain, clear, and simple words, and which we might well suppose never could be misunderstood but by a fool or a knave, "This is my Body," without ever mentioning in any one part that it was but the figure of his Body; this is an evident proof, that when his blessed mouth uttered those words, he intended that they should be taken in their natural signification, which required no explanation, and, consequently, that his design was to give us his true Body.

In order to complete this proof, I shall compare the opinion of Protestants with the belief of the universal Church in regard to the Will of Jesus Christ, and we shall see which of the two is the more honorable to the testator, and the more advantageous to his lawful heirs. Is there any one, permit me to ask, blessed with common sense, but must perceive the difference which exists between the Body of Jesus Christ, and the morsel of bread which the Sectarian takes and receives merely as the figure of his body? If I am persuaded that it be the true Body of Jesus Christ which I receive in the Eucharist, as the Evangelist teaches, the very idea of his real presence fills me with love, with admiration, with happiness, and with wonder; when I dwell on his greatness, I am astounded at his goodness, and with astonishment I exclaim in the words of the great St. Chrysostom, "What Pastor has ever fed his Sheep with his own Blood? The generality of mothers give out their children to strange nurses to be suckled, after having given them birth with so much pain; but the love of Jesus Christ does not permit him so to treat his children, he nourishes them with his own blood, and unites them entirely to himself."—(*St. Chrysostom, Hom. 60, Ad Pop. Antioch.*)

I revere his power in this abyss of wonders, and I exclaim with another of the Fathers, "O Lord Christ, with what contrition of heart, with what a flood of tears, with what reverence and trembling, with what purity both of body and of soul ought we not to celebrate this divine and heavenly sacrifice, where truly (*ubi caro tua in veritate sumitur, ubi sanguis tuus in veritate bibitur*) they eat your Flesh, where truly they drink your Blood. Where things the most exalted are joined to things the most low, where the holy Angels are found present, and where you yourself are both the Priest and the Sacrifice, established after a wonderful and ineffable manner."—(*S. Ambrosius in Precatione 1, Præparationis ad Missam.*)

I admire his prodigious liberality, and not knowing how sufficiently to express my unbounded gratitude for the excess of the Divine magnificence, I repeat with the angel of the school, St. Thomas, (*Opus 57,*) "Oh precious, admirable, wholesome, and saving banquet, filled with all sorts of delicious things! For who can picture to himself any thing more precious than this feast, where we do not receive the flesh of animals, as in the ancient law, but Jesus Christ himself, who is true God, is given to us to eat? What can be more admirable than this Sacrament, where Bread and Wine are substantially changed into the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, and consequently Jesus Christ, God and man, whole and entire, is comprised under the appearance of a little Bread and Wine."

I am astounded with the honor which he confers upon us, and I ask with St. Chrysostom, "What purity ought we not to possess to partake of such a sacrifice? What ray of the Sun but must give way to the lustre of the hand which distributes this flesh, to the mouth which is filled with this spiritual fire, to the tongue which is purpled with this astonishing blood! Reflect on the honor which is paid you, and the banquet to which you are invited; which the Angels

behold with trembling, and dare not look steadfastly at, on account of the brilliant splendour which is spread around it; it is the very same which we receive, it is to that which we are united, it is by it we are made partakers of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ.”—(*St. Chrysost. Hom 60, ad Pop. Antioch.*)

But on the contrary, my Lord Bishop, if we are to take it in the false and heretical sense which Sectarians are pleased to give to these divine words, “This is my Body, This is my Blood;” and instead of receiving the true and real Body of Jesus Christ, we are to receive nothing but bread, I lose much of that profound respect which I had conceived for this great mystery. According to the belief of the Christian Church in all ages, I am receiving the Holy of the Holies; but according to the Protestant doctrine, I behold nothing but a shadow. According to the first, I receive his true and precious Body and Blood; but according to the second, I receive nothing but Bread and Wine. According to the first, I receive the Sovereign Good in reality and in substance; but according to the second, I possess nothing but the figure. I was rich, being possessed of an immense treasure, which Hugues De St. Victor calls, “The riches of God,” and which St. Chrysostom styles, “The whole treasure of the goodness of God;” whereas according to this Protestant doctrine, I find myself possessing but a mere figure. Say what you please, my Lord Bishop, there is as great a difference between our Sacrament and yours, as there is between the Day and the Night. In fine, what a splendid idea of the power, of the goodness, and of the magnificence of God, do not these sacred words fill us with, “Take, eat, this is my Body;” but if I interpret them after your manner, “Take,” that is to say, take nothing, and take great care of it, “Eat,” that is to say, believe, “This is my Body,” that is to say, it is not my Body; was nonsense ever equal to this? Permit me now to

tell you, it was not thus that the Fathers interpreted and explained the will of the Son of God; and if, as I shall clearly show, my Lord Bishop, Protestants would listen to them with a more humble heart, with a perfect humility, they would inspire them with more noble ideas of his love, and of the immense value of the gift which he bestowed on mankind before his death. They would teach them that their Heavenly Mediator has not left them by his Will, the figure only of his Body and Blood; no, but his Deified Body;* since he himself declares, "This is (not the figure of my Body, but) my Body; This is (not the figure of my Blood, but) my Blood." "Non est figura panis et vinum Corporis, et sanguinis Christi, absit enim hoc, sed est ipsum Corpus Domini Deificatum, ipso Domino dicente; Hoc est meum, non figura Corporis, sed corpus, et non figura sanguinis, sed sanguis."—(*St. Jn. Damasc. L. 4, de Orthod. fid. c. 14.*)

They would have assured them, "That not one of the Faithful doubts, that at the hour of the Sacrifice, the Heavens open at the voice of the Priest, and that the Angels are found present at this mystery of Jesus Christ, that things the most elevated are united to things the most low, that terrestrial are joined to celestial, and visible to invisible."—(*St. Gregory, L. 4, Dial. c. 43.*)

They would have taught Protestants also that it is not the faith of the receiver which makes the Sacrament, but the word of Jesus Christ. Faith believes, but the words of Jesus Christ transubstantiate it.

"Christ," says Walafrid Strabo, about the year 860, "in the Supper which, before his betrayal, he had celebrated with his Disciples, after the solemnization of the ancient passover, delivered to the same Disciples the Sacraments of his Body and Blood in the substance of Bread and Wine; and taught

* "Non assumptione humanitatis in Deum."—(*Athan. Creed.*)

them, that they ought to pass from things carnal to things spiritual, from things earthly to things heavenly, from images to truth."—(*Walaf. Strabo, de Reb. Eccles. c. xvi.*)

"The Lord in the Supper," says Venerable Bede, (*Com. in Ps. iii.*) about the year 720, "gave to his Disciples the figure of his holy Body and Blood." The learned Author of *Faberism Exposed*, truly says, "When Venerable Bede called the blessed Eucharist the figure of Christ's body and blood, he spoke only of those sensible appearances of bread and wine being a figure; but never did that learned and holy man teach that the Eucharist itself was a mere figure. If Mr. Faber had acted with common candour, he would have placed the following words of St. Bede by the side of his quotation, and then no doubt could have existed of the belief of that venerable Doctor, (p. 332,) 'Thus his Blood is not shed by the hands of unbelievers to their own destruction, but is received by the mouths of the faithful to their salvation.'"
 "Sicque sanguis illius non infidelium manibus ad perniciem ipsorum funditur, sed fidelium ore suam sumitur ad salutem."
 —(*S. Bedæ, Homil. hiem. de Sanct. in Epiph.*) "If Venerable Bede," continues this learned author, "believed the holy Eucharist to be only a figure, he must have said that the figure of Christ's blood was received by the faithful; but he makes no distinction between the blood shed by the Jews, and the blood received by the faithful; both he believed to be real, true, and substantial."—(p. 332.)

As to St. Augustine, will any one presume to say, after reading the following quotation from this great Doctor of the Church, that this illustrious Saint was not a firm believer in, and did not teach the real presence of Christ in the Sacrament, when he said, addressing himself to his young pupils, wishing of course to ground them in the true belief on this great point, "Hoc accipite in pane quod pependit in cruce, Hoc accipite in calice, quod effusum est de latere Christi. erit

enim illi mors, non vita, qui mendacem putaverit Christum.”
 —(*S. Aug. Serm. ad Neoph.*)—“Receive this in the bread,
 which hung on the Cross. Receive this in the chalice, which
 was shed out of the side of Christ; it will be death and not
 life to him who thinks that Christ is a liar.”

Hear again Venerable Bede, who says, “Dixerat superius,
 qui manducat meum carnem, et bibit meum sanguinem habet
 vitam æternam, et ut ostenderet quanta distantia sit inter
 corporalem cibum, et spirituale mysterium corporis et san-
 guinis sui, adiecit; caro mea verè est cibus, et sanguis meus
 verè est potus.”—(*In Joan.*)—“He had said before, he that
 eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath life everlasting,
 with the express design of shewing how great the distinction
 is between corporeal meats and the spiritual mystery of his
 body and blood; he added, my Flesh is meat indeed, and my
 Blood is drink indeed.”

That this author considered this text as referring to the
 Sacrament, is as clear as day, where he says, “When Christ
 to shew the difference between corporeal meat and the spiritual
 mystery of his Body and Blood, added, my Flesh is meat
 indeed,” &c. Will any Protestant presume to bring forward
 this passage, in order to maintain his errors, viz., where he
 calls the Sacrament, “The mystery of Christ’s Body and
 Blood?” For a mystery is that which contains a something
 which is concealed from the senses, and not to be perceived
 by the common knowledge of mankind. So this mystery
 (the Eucharist) contains the very Body of Christ; a thing
 concealed from the senses, as Eusebius says, “Non exteriori
 censenda visu, sed interiori affectu.”—(*Hom. 5 Pasch.*)—
 “Not to be judged by outward light, but by faith;” therefore
 it is very properly called a mystery, because it contains the
 very Body of Christ, which the senses do not perceive.

Calvin himself justifies the Catholic doctrine on this great
 point, he says, “I say then, that in the last Supper, that

Jesus Christ is given to us indeed under the signs of Bread and Wine, yea his Body and Blood.”—(*Inst. L. 4, c. 17, Sect. 11.*) Your Lordship sees here the confession of our faith out of the very mouth of one of our adversaries; but as these are in no manner precise in their expressions, frequently saying the very contrary to what they believe, I shall return to St. Augustine, in order to convince you that this great Saint believed as firmly the real presence of Christ’s Body and Blood in the Eucharist, under the species of Bread and Wine, as did and does the Catholic Apostolic and Roman Church of this day. He expresses himself as follows: “It is his proper flesh which we receive in the Sacrament veiled and concealed under the form and appearance of bread, and it is his proper blood that we drink under the species and taste of wine.”—(*L. Sentent. Prosper.*) Can any thing be said more clear to express his firm belief of Christ’s real presence in the holy Sacrament; but this is not yet all, the same Saint upon these words of the 98th Psalm, “Adorate scabellum pedum ejus,” says, “That no one eateth the flesh of Christ in the Eucharist without first adoring it, and that we should sin if we did not adore it.” He believed then that this flesh was really present in the Eucharist, otherwise it never could be lawful to adore it. He says again, “A man may be carried in the hands of another, but no one can be carried in his own hands; nor do we find it so in David, but we very well know that it was done in Jesus Christ, for our Lord was carried in his own hands, when giving his body he said, ‘This is my Body,’ for he carried his own body between his hands.”—(*In Explic. Psal. 33.*) Now I ask your Lordship, in the name of heaven, how could St. Augustine say this, if he had not believed that what our Lord held between his hands was really his body? for if it were only the figure of his body, any man, I say, might carry his picture in his hands as well as Jesus Christ; yet, notwithstanding, he said

that no one was ever seen to do so but Jesus Christ, because there was no one but he that could do it.

Theophilact writes: "Our Lord in saying, 'This is my Body,' declares that this bread which is sanctified on the altar, is the same body of the Lord, and not the figure corresponding to it, in so much as he did not say, this is the figure, but, this is my body; for by an unspeakable operation it is transformed, although it seems to be bread, because we are weak, and have an abhorrence of eating raw flesh, especially human flesh, and nevertheless, though outwardly it seems to be bread, it is notwithstanding flesh indeed."—(*Super 26, c. Sancti Mat.*)

Did these Latin and Greek Fathers believe as our separated brethren do on this great question? Surely not; for no one free from prejudice, and blessed with common sense, but must own that they had the same belief as we have. Moreover, the Fathers who have believed that we ought to adore the Lord in the Eucharist, as the Kings adored him in the crib, did believe that he was really, substantially, and truly there, as St. Chrysostom, (*Hom. 24, Super. 1, ad Cor.*), St. Gregory Nazianzen in his sister's epitaph; these authorities, and many others which I omit here, as I mean to devote one of these letters in giving quotations from the Fathers of the five first centuries of the Church on this great dogma of Catholic faith, and which will evidently shew, that the belief of Catholics as regards the reality of Jesus Christ's body in the Eucharist, is not only conformable to the word of God, but also to the belief of the holy Fathers of the primitive Church.

But if your Lordship should ask me how is this done, I would make you a similar answer to that which the angel Gabriel made to the blessed Virgin Mary, regarding the mystery of the Incarnation. The Virgin asked, "How this was to be done?" And the Angel replied, "The Holy Ghost

shall come upon thee, and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee." Your Lordship may likewise ask me, how is Bread made the Body of Christ? I would answer thus, the Holy Ghost operates these things in a way far above what we can comprehend or express; and the Bread and Wine are changed into the Body and Blood of Christ. In fine, my Lord Bishop, though you may regret he did not say, that it is the true body of the Son of God, or any other words you please, yet remember he has said, "Take eat, this is my Body," and the Fathers have assured us of their belief on this point, "Discipulos docuit proprium se tradere Corpus." You may perhaps wish that he had said, it is the very substance of his body and of his blood which we take, and which enters our mouths, forgetting that he tells you so by his faithful interpreter St. Chrysostom, "Non vulgari honore os nostrum afficitur, cum Corpus Dominicum excipit."—(*St. Chrys. Hom. 30, in 2, ad Cor.*)—"Our mouth is honoured in an especial manner by receiving the Body of the Lord."

Hear now again St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, and St. Cyril of Alexandria on this point. St. Augustine says: "I did not know what God wished to express by his Prophet, when he commands us to adore his footstool, that is to say, the Earth; 'Adorate scabellum pedum ejus;' and I cannot comprehend how it can be done without impiety. But I have found the secret of it, and the mystery in the sacrament of Jesus Christ; it is what we daily perform when we eat his flesh, and before eating it we adore it, not only without superstition, but with all the merit of faith; for this flesh being the food of salvation, we must adore it, although it springs from earth, and even the footstool of God, and far from committing sin by so doing, we sin in not adoring it."—(*St. August. Ps. 98, T. viii. ed Froben. p. 1104.*)

St. Ambrose, the holy Bishop of Milan, says: "We daily adore the flesh of our Redeemer, and we adore him in the

mysteries which he himself has established, and which are celebrated daily on our altars. This flesh of Christ has been formed of earth as well as ours, and the Earth is called in Scripture the footstool of God. But this footstool, considered in the person of the Saviour, and in the Sacrament of his Flesh, is more venerable than all the thrones of Kings, and for this reason we adore it.”—(*St. Ambr. Lib. 3, de Spirit. Sanct. cap. 12, ed. Froben. p. 205.*)

St. Cyril of Alexandria, who was present at the third General Council held at Ephesus, says: “Lest we should have an horror of the flesh and blood placed on our altars, God condescending to our weakness, infuses into the things offered up, (that is to say, into the Bread and Wine) the virtue of life, converting them into his own real flesh.”—(*St. Cyril, Lib. 13, Super Lev. in med.*) Can anything be more clearly said?

I shall take this opportunity of refuting a calumny of an eminent Protestant Divine, who says, “Let the Papists go on with their dabitur, and effundetur—shall be given, shall be shed; and it fits their notion well enough who believe that the same Body and Blood was substantially offered in the Eucharist, and on the Cross; but let Protestants stick close—to the present, giving, shedding, &c.” This, my Lord Bishop, I beg leave to say, is a very ignorant or wilful misrepresentation. For Catholics are so fixed in their persuasion, that those words are to be taken in the present tense, and are therefore a proof of Christ’s actually offering, giving, or sacrificing his Body, that he might have been satisfied of their opinion from Commentators, Controvertists, School Divines, and Writers of Spiritual Books. I will be content to cite one only of each.

Maldonatus,* upon the words, “This is my Blood,” (St.

* “Maldonatus, John, a very learned Spanish Jesuit, was born at

Matt. xxvi.) expressly refutes Protestants for explicating the words so as to exclude the present signification. Bellarmin, on the Mass, (*Lib. 1, cap. 12,*) not only proves that sense, and refutes Kemnitius's objections to the contrary, but also adds, that all these senses, is shed now, shall be shed on the Cross, and shall be shed in the Sacrifice, hereafter to be repeated in the Church, are all true, and none of them to be denied, but especially not the first, as being the most literal. Among School-men, (*Coninck de Sacramentis, Tom. 1, p. 83, Dub. 2, Num. 38,*) having asserted Christ's sacrificing from the words, is given, is shed, adds, Heretics answer that the present tense is put for the future, and that in the Vulgata and in the Canon of the Mass, it is, shall be shed. To this he replies, that the words of Christ in their first and immediate signification (*primo et per se*) import the present actual immolating of his Body and Blood; though the actual immolating being intended by Christ as a representation of the future immolating on the Cross, the Church has thought fit to retain the reading of the Vulgata in the future tense, *effundetur*, as it is also read by St. Cyprian and others.

Richeome,* in a spiritual book, (for it is rather of that than of the controversial nature,) under the title of "Holy Pictures of the mystical Figures of the Eucharist," is so full

Fuente del Maestro, in Estremadura, 1534, died 1588. He wrote Commentaries on Jeremiah, Baruch, Ezekiel, and Daniel. Lyons, 1602—Cologne, 1611—*de Fide*, 1600. Treatise upon Angels and Demons.—Par. 1605. A Comment on the Four Gospels.—Par. 1617, fol. In this he very happily explains the literal sense of the four Gospels. Treatise of Grace, upon Providence, upon Original Sin, upon Justification, the Merit of Works, and upon Justice; with Prefaces, Harangues, and Letters."—(*Watt's Bibliotheca Britannica, Vol. 1, 2, p. 637, g.*)

* Lewis Richeome was Provincial of the Jesuits, and the author of several very learned works.

and clear upon this point, that I will cite at large the sixth section of the Fourteenth Picture, p. 271, of the English Translation, printed Anno 1619.

“When our Saviour,” he says, “made his Body present in uttering these words, this is my Body, in the same instant he offered it to his eternal Father in an unbloody sacrifice, after the form of Melchisedech, and forthwith he gave it to his Apostles in the Sacrament under the same form. This is the reason that having said, This is my Body, he addeth, given for you, now given and broken, and which shall be hereafter given and broken in the same manner, even to the end of the world, in remembrance of the unbloody sacrifice which tomorrow I will offer for you, once for all upon the Cross. So as our Saviour made not his Body only present, but present under the form of Bread, giving it a being of food, a dead being, albeit that it was in itself ever living; even as making himself man, his Divinity took a body, and a mortal being, and endured death in that body, albeit the Divinity being always immortal, and endured nothing, as we have before declared. He made himself by reason of the dead species, present as dead, and represented himself as a victim. And it imports not, as has been said before, that our Saviour uttereth no words of oblation, expressly saying, my Father, I offer thee this Body. The manner after which he makes himself present as a victim, expressed sufficiently that he offered himself.

“The same immolation was made in the consecration of the chalice, when our Saviour said, This is my Blood of the New Testament shed for many for the Remission of Sins. For by this consecration the Blood of our Saviour is represented apart, which also does evidently declare, that his Body was made a sacrifice, according to the likeness of those of the Jews, who coming to immolate the beast, did kill it, separating the blood from the body with a sword, as our Saviour

with his omnipotent word, instead of a piercing sword, made his Blood present in the cup, as separated from his Body, and so represents the immolation thereof. And albeit, the Body and Blood was not actually separated, and that the Body was in the cup, and the Blood was in the Body, under the accidents of Bread; yet notwithstanding by reason of the form of Bread, separated and set apart, they appear separated to represent this immolation; and the Blood was truly shed, not after the manner of Aaron's bloody sacrifice, in which blood was drawn from the veins in its proper form, but after the manner of Wine. Our Saviour used also the present tense, saying, This is my Blood shed; this is the chalice of my Blood shed for the remission of Sins; to signify that this which was in the chalice, to wit, his Blood (for the wine could not be shed for the remission of sins) was already poured into the chalice, by an unbloody effusion, as it was the next day by bloody effusion on the Cross. And when the holy Fathers did sometimes turn the words of consecration into the future tense, saying, shall be shed, instead of which is shed; they contraried not the sense we now give, for they all did affirm the real presence of our Saviour's Blood in the chalice, but they referred the words of our Saviour not only to the present pouring forth which was then made, but also to that which was to be made, as well upon the Cross by bloody sacrifice once, as in the Eucharist by unbloody sacrifice, even unto the end of the world."

I have the more willingly cited this place at large, because it explains at once the reason of consecrating the Blood apart, though it is with the Body, and no less clearly shews how unjustly Protestants charge us with taking the words of the institution only in the future sense, whereas both this, and other authors, as also the notes of the Rheims Testament, and our writers commonly use the very same arguments, and almost the same words, to prove the present signification as

Protestants do. It was really an unheard of ignorance or most unfair dealing on the part of this eminent Protestant Divine, to misrepresent the Catholic doctrine concerning the present point as regards the words of the institution, so it is a very great weakness in him to use the same argument, to prove that which Christ gave was bread. I shall touch on this subject again in a future letter. For it is no more than what young logicians, of a few days' schooling, are taught to laugh at. It runs thus: he says, "What he took, that he blessed; and what he blessed, that he brake; and what he brake, that he gave; what he gave, that they received; therefore what they received was bread, for that was what he took." "Now this is exactly," as a very learned Catholic Divine says, "the trifling argument of school boys, to prove that you eat a living lamb. As follows: what you bought, that you took; what you took, that you had for supper; what you had for supper, that you eat; therefore you eat a living lamb, for that was what you bought." But as in this induction there is omitted the preparing the lamb for supper, so in the former induction there is omitted the consecration imparted in the words, saying, This is my Body; it should run thus, what he took, what he brake, what he gave, saying, this is my Body, could not be bread. For then the words would not have been true, because Bread cannot be truly his Body, and yet remain truly Bread. This eminent Protestant Divine says again, "That it savours of impiety to suppose that our blessed Lord, in speaking on so extraordinary a subject, did not make use of the most apt, and adequate words, whereby to let his Disciples into his meaning." And can it be imagined that the words, this is my Body, are the most apt and adequate words to express that it was Bread he gave them, and not his Body. Yet turn the point as you please, my Lord Bishop, it will be certain in the end, that either it is not truly Bread, or not truly his Flesh; but if it be properly and

literally the one, it is improperly and metaphorically the other. Accordingly the great body of Christians throughout the world, judging it most unreasonable to take the words he spoke on so extraordinary a subject, in a most improper and uncommon metaphorical meaning, did for many ages, and do still, agree to understand them in the proper and literal sense of his true Body.

And I prove it thus. 1st. The orthodox Christians from the beginning, understood Christ's words in a literal sense, or, which is the same thing, believed the real presence of Christ's body in the sacrament. I produce St. Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, to bear witness. This great Patriarch in his Epistle to Nestorius, speaks thus of the Eucharist: "*Neque enim illam, ut carnem communem, suscipimus, absit hoc, neque rursum tanquam viri cujuspiam sanctificati, et dignitatis unitate verbo consociati; sed tanquam verè vivificam ipsiusq; verbi propriam.*"—"God forbid that we should receive it as common flesh, nor yet as the flesh of a man sanctified, and united to the word, by a conjunction of dignity; but we receive it as it truly is, the quickening and proper flesh of the Word himself." This letter was read and approved of in the Third General Council,* which, no doubt, it never would have been, had it contained anything contrary to the orthodox faith, so that having received authority and approbation from these Fathers, I shall no longer consider it as the doctrine of an individual, but as the faith of the whole General Council. Now can it be supposed, that this General Council should approve and place on record a letter which declares the real presence, in as clear and in as plain a manner as it is possible for words to express, unless it had been, at that time, the faith of the whole Catholic Church? And can it be supposed for one moment, that the Catholic Church in

* Concil. Ephes. puncto 7.

those fair days of her youth, as the Calvinists term it, should believe that Christ's proper flesh, as the said letter expresses it, was in the sacrament, unless they had understood Christ's words in a literal sense, and received the same doctrine from their immediate ancestors? Or can it be imagined that these ancestors should be of this belief, unless they had likewise received it from their ancestors, and so up to the very period of the Apostles? This is, surely, to any man of sense, but more especially to the Church of England, (which professes to receive the Acts and Decrees of this Council,) a demonstration that from the beginning of Christianity to the period of this Council, all the orthodox Christians did both believe the real presence, and understand Christ's words in a literal sense.

2nd. The orthodox Christians from the beginning understood these words of Christ, this is my Body, in a sense of transubstantiation? For this truth we have the unanimous consent of the ancient Fathers of the Church; many of whom, in their familiar discourses to the common people, illustrate this conversion by the change of the water into wine, of Aaron's rod into a serpent, of the river Nile into blood, &c. &c. And it is very observable in all their discourses on this subject; and whenever they speak of this change, they have recourse to the omnipotent power of God, to which alone they ascribe it, which surely would be useless had there been no real change in the case. St. Cyril of Jerusalem speaks thus concerning this change: "Therefore since Christ has said of the Bread, this is my Body, who dares any longer to doubt it? And since he himself so positively affirmed, saying, this is my Blood, who ever doubted, so as to say, that it was not his Blood? In times past, at the wedding in Cana of Galalea, he changed water into wine, which had a certain likeness to blood; and shall we not think him worthy to be believed, that he could change wine into his blood?"

Again, "For under the appearance of Bread, he gives us his Body; and under the appearance of Wine, he gives us his Blood." And a little after, "Though your senses seem in this to oppose you, yet faith must confirm you; do not judge the thing by the taste, but let faith assure you, beyond all doubt, that you partake of the Body and Blood of Christ."—(*Cate. Mystag.* 3.)

Here is a great Bishop, an eminent witness of antiquity, one who flourished upwards of 1430 years since, and who no doubt was very well acquainted with the faith of the Catholic Church of his time touching this point; here is a careful pastor expounding Christ's words, and catechizing his flock in the very language of the present Roman Catholics. He tells them, that since Christ said that the Bread and Wine were his Body and Blood, they must believe that the Bread and Wine were changed into his Body and Blood. He illustrates this change by a familiar comparison of the water which Christ changed into wine, and enforces the belief of the possibility of the other, by the actual existence of this change which they had both read and believed. He tells them, that under the appearance of Bread they receive the Body, and under the appearance of Wine they receive the Blood of Christ; and that though their senses may tell them that it is still bread, yet that faith must correct that mistake; that they must not judge what it is by the taste, but must believe that it is the Body and Blood of Christ, whatever their senses may suggest to the contrary. Did ever any Roman Catholic speak plainer concerning transubstantiation?

I ask you here, could any Roman Pontiff, or Pastor, from the time of St. Peter till now, have enforced the belief of this great mystery with more cogent arguments, than to tell his hearers, that since Christ said, this is my Body, we must believe it is so. Since he changed water into wine, we have no reason to doubt but his omnipotence is sufficient to change

wine into his Blood, though it appears to our eyes, to our taste, to our smell, that the thing is otherwise, yet we must not, in this important business, rely upon the relation of these senses, but upon the sense of hearing, because "Faith comes by hearing, and hearing by the word of God," which word we are here only required to believe? all which are the reasonings of St. Cyril. Now, my Lord Bishop, what Protestants may think of this great Prelate, I shall not determine; but this I am certain of, that had he written this since the Reformation, they would all have looked on him to be as great a Papist as ever put pen to paper.

St. Gregory of Nyssen, speaks thus to the same purpose: "Rectè Dei verbo sanctificatum panem, in Dei verbi corpus credo transmutari."—"I do believe, that the Bread sanctified by the word of God, is changed into the Body of God the Word."—(*Orat. Cate. cap. 37.*)

St. Ambrose takes the greatest pains to impress this truth on the ignorant people, he says: "That Bread, before the sacramental words, is Bread; but when the consecration comes to it, of the Bread is made the Flesh of Christ. Let us prove this. How can that which is Bread be the Body of Christ? By consecration. By what and by whose words is the consecration performed? By the words of the Lord Jesus. For all other things which are said, do give praise to God, there is a prayer premised for the people, for kings, and for others; but when the priest comes to make the venerable sacrament, he does no more use his own but Christ's words. Therefore the word of Christ maketh the sacrament. What word of Christ? Even that word, by which all things were made. The Lord commanded, and the Earth was made; the Lord commanded, and every creature was engendered. You see then how efficacious the word of Christ is. Seeing then there is so much power in the word of the Lord Jesus, as to cause things that were not, to have a being. How

much more efficacious is it, to make the things that are extant to be changed into another thing? Heaven was not, the Sea was not, the Earth was not; but hear him who says, He said, and they were made; He commanded, and they were created. That I may answer you then, it was not the Body of Christ before the consecration, but after the consecration; I say unto you, that it is then the Body of Christ; He said, and it was made; He commanded, and it was created.”—(*Lib. 4, de Sacra. cap. 4.*)* I shall not trouble your Lordship with any reflections of mine upon this passage, it being, in my opinion, so plain, and so much to the purpose, that it cannot possibly require any thing to strengthen it.

St. Chrysostom says: “That the sacrifice of the altar which we offer in many places, is every where the same sacrifice, because we always offer one Christ, and consequently it is the same sacrifice. And what (says he) are there many Christs, because he is offered in many places? No, surely; but it is everywhere the same Jesus Christ; here whole and entire, there whole and entire, one only body everywhere. As then it being offered in many places, it is always the one same body; it is always the same one sacrifice.”—(*Hom. 17, in Ep. ad Heb., see Hom. 41, in 1 Cor. Hom. 21, in Act. Apostol.*) Is not this manner of reasoning just? then the same body may be in two places, without its form, its matter, or its substance being multiplied.

Protestants always object to Transubstantiation, and declare that it ought not to be received, because reason is incapable

* Some Critics have doubted whether the books whence this quotation is taken belong to St. Ambrose, because the style is different from the rest of the works of this Father; but the best and ablest Critics agree that they are either St. Ambrose's, or of some other Bishop near his time, who dilates upon what St. Ambrose wrote concerning the Eucharist.

of comprehending it. If this principle be admitted, my Lord Bishop, the unity and trinity of God, the incarnation and death of our blessed Saviour, &c., cannot be believed—the truths of natural philosophy must be denied; in a word, according to this system of reason, the whole œconomy of God to man. Christianity must be rejected, and universal scepticism be the necessary consequence. Accordingly we find this deceitful doctrine of modern reason eagerly embraced by the unnatural enemies of Christianity. Hence in these our unhappy days, in spite of the blaze of worldly science, the negative creed of Rousseau, “That a man of reason ought not believe what he does not comprehend,” is the faith of many. Reason, I grant, is a gift of God; if not infected by passion or prejudice, it is a safe guide as far as it conducts; but being finite, it has its limits, beyond which it would not be reasonable to proceed. It may enquire, for example, whether God hath spoken; and the fact being ascertained, it is its duty to prostrate itself at the portals of revelation, and believe and adore. It is most fortunate for the humble believer who thinks it reasonable to submit to proper authority, that he lives in the midst of a glorious theatre, where the divine attributes of his God are continually displayed, and where the physical mysteries which daily meet his eye, gradually lead him on, and persuade him to believe those of a superior nature in the order of grace. On all sides he is surrounded with mysteries, which transcend the most penetrating faculties of the mind. He most firmly, however, believes them, and lives on them. They constitute his food, his raiment. The most illiterate must behold with admiration and gratitude the stupendous operation of the growth of plants; their stems full of veins, like so many engines thrown into motion by the heat of the Sun—their buds, their flowers, and their fruit. Where is that deep penetration to be found capable of explaining the production and reproduction of

vegetables? The opposers of the mysteries of religion know that animals left without food languish and die—that if, on the contrary, they are well nourished, they grow and fatten; hence it might be inferred, that the food consumed becomes, though it is unknown how, real animal substance, flesh, blood, and bone. Are these impugners of Transubstantiation still inclined to deny, because their reason does not comprehend it, that the bread which they had eaten in their childhood, was, by the divine power, wonderfully changed in the organs of digestion into their flesh and blood, and that they have thus grown to the full stature of men? Or will they obstinately insist that they are still children in size as well as in faith? No, for the sake of reason, for the sake of their own souls, it is hoped they will no longer be obstinate, but believe. Is it possible that they will persevere to assert, that the same Almighty power which increases the grain of corn one hundred fold in the hand of the husbandman for the nourishment of their corruptible bodies, is incapable of changing the Bread in the hand of the Priest into his Body for the food of their immortal souls; and that Divine Being, who changes the richness of the soil into the juice of the grape, is not able to change Wine into his Blood? The dogmas of the Catholic Church are fixed—there is no being on earth capable of making a new article of faith. It was the peculiar right of the loving Redeemer, who from mercy died for men, to establish the conditions of salvation. It is the duty of all who wish to be saved, to endeavour to know these conditions, and with the divine grace to comply with them. Surely there can be no mode of knowledge more certain than to consult antiquity—nor of ascertaining the purity of water than by examining up to the fountain. Now if the modern system of believing only what we understand be adopted, it will follow, that the number of articles of faith will be as various as the degrees of judgment each individual

possesses; and, consequently, the less a man knows, the greater right he has to become an infidel.

If nothing is to be admitted but what reason comprehends, boasted science herself must fall a blind victim. Who will attempt to explain the mysteries which present themselves in optics, magnetism, electricity, &c. How will the chemist demonstrate the transubstantiation or change of substance which takes place in every chemical union? He knows, as a matter of fact, that two highly corrosive substances by their union become mild and harmless—two harmless substances when united deadly poison—two colourless substances may present us with a brilliant complexion—and the union of two fluids a solid mass. By the atomic theory he has learned, that bodies unite in certain proportions, that there is a maximum and a minimum, above or below which there is no chemical union. But where is the philosopher capable of explaining a plan which could be conceived only by infinite wisdom and executed by unbounded power? Hence if the opposers of the infinite mercy and love of the Divine Redeemer be consistent, they must refuse to make use of the results of chemical operations—they cannot use glass, salt, porcelain, metals, spirits, wine, sugar, &c. If they be travelling by sea and experience a storm, they must throw the compass overboard, because they do not understand the polarity of the needle. If, finally, they be sick and at the point of death, they ought not to take medicine, because they cannot comprehend its nature, formation, or mode of operation. The contrary, however, is their practice, when there be question of the health and comforts of their bodies. Should they be less solicitous for the safety and happiness of their immortal souls? Can they be justified in rejecting the bread of Angels offered on our altars because their limited reason does not understand the operation of infinite power and infinite goodness? Should they not rather acknowledge with a

modern writer on chymistry, and rationally confess, "That this study enlarges the mind, and gives it a more exalted idea of the infinite wisdom, power, and goodness of God?"—Hence this material world becomes a more intelligent book, in every part of which the Divinity presents itself to our view. The mysterious operations performed by the chymist, and the wonderful changes produced in the essence of bodies, teach him to believe mysteries in the order of grace. If he be not determined, through passion or prejudice, to close his eyes to the light, his reason will convince him, that nothing is more rational than to submit his limited understanding to infinite power and infallible truth,—that it is sufficient to know that God hath spoken, that we may believe and obey; our Saviour having commanded us, under the most dreadful penalties, to hear the Church, the pillar and ground of truth.*

• A most learned Catholic Prelate, one of the greatest theologians of the last century, asks, "By what means, setting aside the authority and testimony of the Church, can Protestants be certain of several parts of Scripture, which before the decision of the Church were doubted by some of the greatest lights of antiquity?" For example, the Book of Esther, (in which, as it is read in the Protestant Bible, God is not once named,) which is omitted by St. Melito, one of the chief doctors of the second century, in his Catalogue of the Canonical Books of the Old Testament, (*apud Euseb. Lib. 4, c. 26,*) and by St. Gregory Nazianzen, in his Poem concerning the genuine Scriptures; was doubted of by St. Amphilochius, in his Iambicks to Seleucus; and rejected by St. Athanasius, in his 39th Paschal Letter; and by the Author of the Synopsis, or Short View of the Scriptures, published with the works of the same Athanasius, p. 128. In like manner, the Epistle of St. James, the 2nd of St. Peter, the 2nd and 3rd of St. John, and that of St. Jude, were all doubted of by several of the ancients, as appears from Eusebius, (*Lib. 2, Histor. c. 23, Lib. 3, c. 3*); St. Amphilochius, in his Poem to Seleucus; and Origen, quoted by Eusebius, (*Lib. 6, Histor. c. 25.*) Of the Epistle to the Hebrews, St. Jerome, writing upon the 8th chapter of Isaiah,

I shall now again call your Lordship's attention to the miracles which the Fathers (who are acknowledged by Protestants to be the witnesses of the truth) speak of when they compare the conversion of the Bread and of the Wine into the Body and into the Blood of Jesus Christ, to the Incar-

tells us, that the custom of the Latins did not receive it amongst the canonical books of Scripture. And the Apocalypse, or Revelations, by the testimony of the same St. Jerome, (*Epist.* 129, *Edit. Basil. Anno* 1565,) and St. Amphilochius writing to Seleucus, was rejected by the greatest part of the Eastern Church. Hence we infer, that if Protestants will set aside the authority of the Church, in judging which books are to be received for Scripture, and which not, they must consequently doubt of all the forementioned books. But if they allow of these books as undoubted canonical Scripture, upon the decision of the Church made some centuries after the Apostles' time, they ought, by parity of reason, to receive her decisions in all other controversies relating to faith. 2nd. We infer that the Sixth of the Thirty-nine Articles of the English Protestant Church, implies a visible contradiction; whilst on the one hand it professes to receive no other Books for canonical Scripture but those of whose authority there never was any doubt in the Church; yet, on the other hand, receives the above-mentioned books, and accounts them canonical, notwithstanding they were, as we have seen, doubted of for several ages, as they are at present by the Lutherans. But it is not only of these books that Protestants will have reason to doubt, setting aside the authority of the ever-flourishing Church of Christ, but of all the rest too. 1st. St. Matthew's Gospel, according to the ancients, was written in the vulgar Hebrew, or Syro-Chaldaick, which original is entirely lost, so that there is not any one copy of it extant in the whole world. Now by what means will your Lordship, or any of your brethren, without having recourse to the authority of the Church, prove that the Gospel of St. Matthew, which we have at present, is agreeable to the Hebrew original? And if not, how will Protestants be assured that it is the word of God? 2nd. As to all other parts of Holy Writ, how can you tell, setting aside the judgment of the Church, that they have them pure and uncorrupt? The authentic copies written by the Apostles and Evange-

nation, which is the greatest of all miracles. "Let us make use of examples, say they, as drawn from the thing itself. Let us establish the truth of this mystery by that of the Incarnation. Was the order of nature followed when our Saviour was born of Mary? It is clear that it was contrary

lists are no where extant, nor have there been any for many ages; and the transcribers, to whom we are indebted for the best manuscript copies that we have at present, have made so many slips, and have fallen into so many faults, either through negligence or malice, that there are not perhaps this day in the whole universe two manuscripts of the Holy Scriptures that agree throughout one with the other; and not so much as ONE that agrees with the Protestant Bible or Testament. And so numerous are the various readings and corruptions which are found in the different copies of Holy Writ, that the learned Mr. Mills, in his Edition of the New Testament in Greek, anno 1707, has made them amount to above thirty thousand in that part of Scripture alone, that is, to almost as many as there are words in the New Testament. And although some of these various readings may seem to be of no great moment, yet it is acknowledged that many of them are very considerable, and such as quite alter the sense of the text. Now by which of the miracles of the Apostles, or by what other means, without having recourse to the authority of the Church, will these gentlemen convince their parishioners, that the Bible which they put into their hands is the pure word of God, when there is scarce a word in it, for all that they know, which may not be corrupted? So far this most learned prelate.

It was well observed by Bishop Walmsley, (the celebrated author of *Pastorini*,) in a conversation with Edmund Burke, that a remarkable corroboration of the truth of the Catholic doctrine is furnished by the fact, that although there is not a single doctrine held by the Catholic Church which is not denied by one or other of the separatists from her communion, yet that taking them collectively, every doctrine she holds might be proved from the great majority of their various creeds, articles, or confessions,—a fact which proves irresistibly the infallibility of the Church, and stamps her adversaries with the brand of reprobation foretold by St. Paul: viz., they were condemned by their own judgment.

to the order of nature that a virgin should conceive, (præter naturæ ordinem,) and this body which we make is born of the Virgin, (et hoc quod conficimus corpus ex Virgine est.) Why do you seek the order of nature in the body of Christ, when the Lord himself was born of a Virgin contrary to the order of nature? * Most certainly it was the true flesh which was crucified and buried; it is truly the sacrament of this flesh. Our Lord Jesus Christ himself said, This is my Body. Before the benediction of the heavenly words it is named species, but after the consecration it is called the Body of Jesus Christ. He himself says it is his Blood. Before the consecration it is otherwise named, after the consecration it is called Blood; and thou answerest, Amen, that is to say, it is true; that which the mouth pronounces, the soul confesses; that which the words express, the heart believes."— (St. Ambros. *de Initia*nd. c. 9.)

In this passage, which is clear and decisive, St. Ambrose, from whom I have taken it, lays down four great points, which plainly declare the doctrine of the primitive Christians as regards the miracle of the Eucharist. 1st. He compares the conversion of bread into the body of Jesus Christ to his Incarnation, which is also frequently done by St. Justin, (2 *Apol.*) and by St. Cyprian, (*de Cæna Domini vel author illi ætate Suppar.*) in order to establish, as he says, the truth of this mystery upon that of the Incarnation, and to teach us in the same manner, that the Word is truly made Flesh, concealing his Divinity under his holy humanity, he converts the Bread truly into his Body, concealing his Flesh under the species of Bread. Consequently, who will presume

* St. Augustine one day while contemplating on the sea shore the mysteries of the Godhead, an angel appeared to him and said, "As well might you attempt to fathom the ocean as to understand the mysteries connected therewith."

to say now that Jesus Christ only gave us his figurative flesh, according to Marcion, who had, as Tertullian says, a pumpkin instead of a heart. 2nd. He declares that the change of the bread surpasses the laws of nature as well as that of the Incarnation. "Quid hic quæris naturæ ordinem in Christi corpore." It is not then an allegorical change, nor a mental change. It is a miraculous change; it is a miracle which changes nature; it is a substantial change. 3rd. He proves the verity of this wonderful change by the words of the Son of God, This is my Body, shewing us the cause of this miracle, and the power of him who operates it. For, as St. Chrysostom admirably says, "They are not the productions of a human power; for what Jesus Christ did then at the supper, even now he so operates and accomplishes it. We hold the rank of ministers, but it is himself who sanctifies these things and changes them. Jesus Christ who has made this table, is now again present; it is he himself who prepares it. Because it is not a mortal man who makes these gifts, the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, it is Jesus Christ himself who has been crucified for us. The priest who represents him, truly assists there, and pronounces the words; but the power and the grace comes entirely from Christ. This is my Body, says he; it is that word which changes the things which are present; because as that word increase, multiply, and fill the earth, was only once pronounced, but it operates always, giving to our nature the power of engendering. In like manner, that (word, This is my Body) once said accomplishes this sacrament, and brings it upon every altar since that period to the present, and even till the coming of Jesus Christ."—(*St. Chrysost. Homil. 83, in Matth. and Homil. 60, ad Popul. Antioch, Idem. Homil. de Prodit Judæ.*) In fine, he adds, as a last proof of the verity of this miraculous conversion, that it is the language and the opinion of the whole Church; that the priests and people speak after the following manner: Whence does it happen, that that which

before consecration they call Bread, after the consecration they call the Body of Jesus Christ, and the people answer, Amen, that is to say, it is true. Whence he concludes, that as they can say it, so they ought to believe it, it being necessary that the heart and mouth should accord.

After such clear, plain, and powerful quotations from the Fathers, which I have brought before the notice of an enlightened public, will Protestants, permit me to ask, presume to say that the Fathers did not believe, profess, and teach a true, real, and substantial change of Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, but only a figurative change? If they turn and twist the words of the holy Fathers in such a manner as to make them express what they never thought of, then I say, that they pretend not to see what they clearly perceive, and fear to act what they ought to do, viz., to yield to a manifest truth; "*Noluit intelligere, ut bene ageret.*" For surely no one can be found, possessed even with a little common sense, and free from prejudice, but must acknowledge the wonders which they (the Fathers) relate, in order to make us believe this admirable change. That the whole body of the holy Fathers recognised in this mystery something more holy, more excellent, more miraculous, and more august than a mere figure.

Hear now the words of the parent of your pretended Reformation, Martin Luther, who says, "That not one among the Fathers, numerous as they are, should have spoken of the Eucharist as these men do (the opposers of the real presence) is truly astonishing; not one of them speaks thus, there is only Bread and Wine; or, the Body and Blood of Christ are not present. And when we reflect how often the subject is treated of by them, it ceases to be credible. It is not even possible that not so much as once such words as these should not have dropped from some of them. Surely it was of moment that men should not be drawn into error, still they all speak with a precision which evinces that they entertained

no doubt of the presence of the Body and Blood of Christ. Had not this been their conviction, can it be imagined that among so many the negative opinion should not have been uttered upon one single occasion? On other points, this was not the case. But our Sacramentarians, on the other hand, can proclaim only the negative or contrary opinion; these men then, to say all in one word, have drawn their notions neither from Scriptures nor from the Fathers."—(*Defensio Verborum Cænæ. T. 7, p. 391. Ed. Witt. 1557.*)

Alas, my Lord Bishop, what miracle then is it that plain bread should be taken from the common food of mankind in order to be consecrated to God? Does not this happen to every thing which is offered to the supreme majesty of the Creator? Is there any thing in this change which a mortal man cannot effect? Jacob took a common stone and made an altar of it, which he consecrated to God. What miracle do we find in this change? The Jews offered their jewels to adorn the ark of the Testament. They performed a good act, I acknowledge, giving by this change a holy custom to common things; but what miracle, I ask, was there in it? I say further, the Fathers have acknowledged that the paschal lamb was a sacred sign, but did they consider it a miracle? They acknowledged the manna to have been miraculous, but did they ever place it on an equality with the Eucharist? Have they not declared, as your Lordship will see in the course of these Letters, that it was but a shadow of our mysteries; they have raised in an infinite higher degree, the sacraments of the law of grace over those of the ancient law. Can your Lordship produce even one single quotation from any one individual Father, to shew that he considered them above the Eucharist; on the contrary, do they not call it the sacrament of sacraments, the Sun of our mysteries, the abridgment of the wonders of God? Why? Because the author of these wonders being then present, everything re-

garding it becomes miraculous; the destruction of the substances, the preservation of the accidents, the absence of material bread, the presence of celestial bread in many places, and a hundred other wonders which follow this great and incomprehensible miracle of the substantial change, which is so solidly established by the all power of Jesus Christ, according to the doctrine of these great men. Is it not therefore the very essence of folly in Protestants to presume to measure the power of the Lord of heaven and of earth by human reason.

St. Cyril of Jerusalem fortifies our faith against our senses, and St. Gregory of Nyssen, shewing the great difficulties of the Eucharist, says, "Consider how it can happen, that this only Body, which is always divided among so many millions of the faithful throughout the world, should be whole and entire in each one of them by the part which they receive of it, and still remains whole and entire in itself."—(*Cat. Gregor. Nysse. Or. Cath.*)

Before the middle of the eighth century, St. John Damascene thus delivers the sense of the Church in his time, on the Eucharist: "If the word of God is quick and powerful; if God made all things which he would; if he said, let the light be made, and it was made; let the firmament be made, and it was made; if by his word the Heavens were made; and all the hosts of them by the breath of his mouth; if heaven and earth, water, fire, air, and all their perfections were the production of his sacred word; if man himself was made by it; if God the Son, when he pleased, was made man, and formed himself a body out of the immaculate blood of the holy and ever Virgin Mary; what can prevent him from being able to make his Body from Bread, and his Blood from Wine and Water.—(Quin ex pane corpus suum, ex vino et ex aqua sanguinem suum efficere queat?) Not, that his Body descends from heaven; but, that the Bread and Wine are changed into the Body and Blood of God. Neither are

Bread and Wine the figure of the Body and Blood of Christ, (God forbid,) but the very body of Christ incarnate. And if some of the Fathers have called Bread and Wine the figure of the Body and Blood of our Lord, as St. Basil did, they did not say this of what is offered after consecration, but only before it. Yet we call them figures of things to come; not that they are not truly the Body and Blood of Christ, but because by them we are partakers of Christ's divinity now, of which we expect hereafter a clear light in the beatific vision." —(*Lib. 4, de Fide Orthodoxà, cap. 14.*)

I think it right here to offer a few remarks on the belief of the Iconoclasts as regards the Eucharist; who, having assembled at Constantinople, under the Emperor Constantine Copronymus, anno 754, to abolish the use of images, in their definition of faith, said, 1st. There is only one true image of Christ to be worshipped, viz., the Eucharist. 2nd. That the bread which is to be consecrated, has not the shape of a man, (ne idololatria subintroducatur,) lest men should adore it before consecration, or other pictures. 3rd. That consecration is a sort of adoption. 4th. That Christ would have the Bread of the Eucharist, being sanctified by the coming of the Holy Ghost, be made his own divine Body after consecration. Similiter et Eucharistiæ panem, per sancti spiritûs adventum sanctificandum, divinum corpus fieri voluit, mediante sacerdote. This shews they did not err in regard to the Eucharist, though it seemed suspicious their calling it three times, in the short space of a few lines, the image of Christ's body; which, though it might be said in a Catholic sense, was not then the usual language of the Church according to the decision of the Church. Hence the Fathers of the Seventh General Council (which was the Second of Nice, anno 787, and consisted of 250 prelates,) in their refutation of the Decree of the Iconoclasts, read by Epiphanius, a deacon, (*Acts 6, T. 7, Conc. p. 447.*) Answer: "That never did any of the Apostles,

or of the holy Fathers, call the unbloody sacrifice (which is made in remembrance of Christ, and of all that he did or suffered) the image of his body. For they did not learn that from Christ, but heard him say in the Gospel, unless you eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, you shall not enter into the kingdom..... And—This is my Body, &c. He did not say, take and eat the image of my Body. And so St. Paul, deriving his doctrine from the same divine fountain, (1 Cor. xi. 23, 24.) Neither Christ, nor the Apostles, nor the holy Fathers call the unbloody sacrifice, offered by the priest, an image, but the very Body, and the very Blood. Some of the Fathers indeed call them types before the consecration, as St. Eustachius—and St. Basil. But the following words shew that he means they were types before they were consecrated, but ‘That after consecration they are properly called the Body and Blood of Christ; that they are properly so, and so are believed to be.’ They add, that the Iconoclasts, by a wicked sophism, say this divine oblation is made by adoption; and as it is madness to say this, so it is to call the Body and Blood of our Lord an image. At length, setting aside their false doctrine, they touch slightly upon the truth, saying, it is made the divine Body; but if it be an image of this divine Body, it cannot be the divine Body itself.”

The same doctrine is fully and elegantly urged by St. Nicephorus, Patriarch of Constantinople, (next after Terasius, who assisted at this Council,) in the second of his three books, called *Antirrhetici* (*Apud Leonem Allatium. Lib. 3, de Consensione Perpetuà, cap. 15, §. 21, p. 1223*); by Theodorus Graptus, his contemporary (*Lib. de inculpatâ Christianorum Fide*); and by Elias Cretensis, (*In Comment Orationis primæ St. Gregor. Naz.,*) one of the prelates who was present in the Seventh General Council.

Yet Dr. Cosin, Bishop of Durham, one of your most eminent Protestant divines, with an effrontery unheard of, had the face

to declare that Transubstantiation was "invented about the middle of the twelfth century, and confirmed by no ecclesiastical or Papal decree before the year 1215." This is as correct as what Protestants continually advance against us, "That the Scriptures, the primitive Church, and the Fathers are all against us; and that we have nothing on our side but an unintelligible jargon of metaphysics. How blessedly, my Lord Bishop, is your Reformation reformed. When that pious work of Protestants was first set on foot, the language was, what do we care for the Fathers? But since its completion, the Fathers, they say, are all found to be on their side, which has been demonstratively proved to be false by Cardinal De Perron, Bellarmin, Scheffmacher, &c.

Dr. Cosin did not consider the condemnation of Berengarius in the eleventh century as a convincing proof, that Transubstantiation was not invented in the twelfth century; and he positively asserts, "At last a new form of retractation was imposed on Berengarius, (in the Roman Council, under Gregory VII., anno 1078,) whereby he was henceforth to confess, under pain of the Pope's high displeasure, that the mystic bread is substantially turned into the true and proper flesh of Christ." He pretends that almost the entire population of France, Italy, and England at that period were of Berengarius's opinion, and that it was maintained by many famous nations. Heavenly God! I am astounded how a Protestant prelate with the least regard for truth, could stand up, in the face of antiquity, in the face of all history, and have uttered such an egregious falsehood; how true are not the words of that eminent Protestant theologian, Dr. Whitaker, who says, "I blush for the honor of Protestantism, for forgery seems peculiar to it, as a particular disease; in vain I look for such a cursed outrage among the disciples of Popery."—(*Vindication of Mary, Vol. 3, p. 64.*)

But 1st. Since Berengarius, according to Dr. Cosin, had

so many great nations on his side, how did it happen that there never was any one single Council which decreed in his favor? Permit me to ask, were there then no Bishops in Italy, France, or in England? How came both himself and his doctrine to have been condemned by four or five Councils in Italy; by as many in France; by one or two in Normandy; and some years after his death his heresy was condemned by a numerous Council held at Plaisance, its decision was as follows: "That Bread and Wine, when they are consecrated upon the altar, are truly and essentially changed into the Body and Blood of our Lord, and not in figure only."—"Quòd panis et vinum, cum in Altari consecrantur, non solum figuratè, sed etiam verè et essentialiter in corpus et sanguinem Domini convertantur."—(*T. 10, Conc. Lab. p. 502.*)

2nd. If Berengarius asserted the ancient doctrine, and had so many famous nations on his side, why did not the Greek schismatical Church espouse his doctrine? It was, in the eleventh century, most active in opposing the Catholic Church, even for permitting her clergy to shave their beards; but never did it express one word against the Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation. Why did none of the other Oriental sects, such as the Nestorians, Eutychians, &c., oppose her belief on this great point? Is not this a clear demonstration that the Catholic Church in communion with the See of Rome,* and the Greek schismatical Church, and all the ancient sects in Christendom agreed in this mystery.

3rd. Hugh, Bishop of Langres in France, writing to Beren-

* St. Jerome, who was called Magister Mundi, declares that it is absolutely necessary, in order to be a Catholic, to profess the Roman faith. Hear and believe. "If you profess the Roman faith," says St. Jerome, "you are Catholics; if you do not profess it, you are not in the communion of the Catholic Church."—(*St. Jerome in Apolog. 1 adv. Ruffin.*)

garius, says, "That he had scandalized the whole Church."—"Universalem Ecclesiam scandalizas." Durandus, Abbot of Troarn in Normandy, told him, "That he had impugned the doctrine of the whole Catholic Church."—"Quod Catholica per orbem universum prædicat Ecclesia." Guitmundus, Archbishop of Anvers, accused him of being the founder of his sect, "That he contradicted all the world; that there was not any little town or village that had received his doctrine."—(*Lib.* 3.)*

The same arguments, therefore, by which the celebrated Lanfrank, the thirty-third Bishop of Canterbury, who was in great esteem with William the Conqueror, and who was Regent of the Kingdom during his absence, and a man of great abilities, had used to oblige Berengarius to abjure his error regarding this great mystery, ought equally to convince sincere Protestants of the present day: "A doctrine," said the Archbishop, "which has always been received by the whole Church, must undoubtedly be derived from Jesus Christ and his Apostles: now it is certain that this dogma of the real presence has been, at all times, believed by the universal Church. Ask all the nations of the earth, who make profession of believing in Jesus Christ; inquire whether the Greeks and Latins do not speak the same language respecting this article. They certainly do; and therefore it is fair to conclude that the Church has never varied in this point. Had she varied, how could there be this general uniformity of doctrine? If," continued the learned prelate, "it had been a recent opinion, and but lately introduced in opposition to the ancient doctrine, surely some period might be assigned which gave birth to such a novelty. By what miracle could the commencement and progress of such an innovation, have escaped the notice and researches of all historians? How is it possible, that in all the Churches of the

* See Algerus on the same subject.

world, we find not a single trace of such an extraordinary change having taken place? Most assuredly, a change of this nature must have been noticed—a change so difficult, so surprising, and therefore so well calculated to leave in the minds of the people the most durable impressions.*”

* *Lanfrancus, Lib. de Corpore et Sanguine Christi Domini, cap. 22.* Erasmus, in his letter to Balthazar, highly commends these writers, who, in the eleventh century, had, both by argument and authority, solidly confuted the heresy of Berengarius. Against the Sacramentarians he opposes the same arguments, namely, the words of Christ—of St. Paul—the authority of the holy Fathers—the uniform decision of Councils—and the general consent of the Christian world. The same general principles here recognised by Erasmus in support of Transubstantiation, the intelligent reader will easily apply to other points of religious controversy. I give the following extract of this interesting letter of Erasmus, from the English translation of Du Pin’s Ecclesiastical History of the Sixteenth Century, p. 306.

“ It is said in the gospel, *This is my body, which is given for you*; and St. Paul says, *I have received of the Lord that which I have taught you: and he that shall eat and drink the body and blood of Jesus Christ unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of Jesus Christ.* This is our foundation, which cannot be shaken. Some of the ancient doctors of the church seem to have spoken, sometimes obscurely, and sometimes differently, of this sacrament. Their obscurity ought to be attributed either to the depth of the mystery, or to the precautions which they took; for as they were often speaking before a mixt assembly of Jews, Gentiles, and Christians, they would not give that which was *holy* unto dogs. The seeming differences that are found among them, proceed from this—that the sacramental species are sometimes called *symbols*, sometimes the *communion*;—besides, because the body of Jesus Christ is hidden under those signs, that which belongs to the signs is attributed to the body, as to be *broken* and *bruised*. The body, then, which is in the sacrament, is the same *in substance* with that which was nailed to the cross; but it is not the same as to its *qualities*, because it is *glorified* and *spiritual*.—In a word, by the

I appeal now, my Lord Bishop, to an enlightened and generous public, whether Dr. Cosin did not shew a total disrespect for truth, when he presumed to assert in the teeth of all antiquity, that "Transubstantiation was not held till the twelfth century, and that all the doctors of the primitive Church do clearly, constantly, and unanimously conspire in this, that the presence of the Body of Christ in the sacrament is only mystical." May I not on the contrary confidently

body of Christ is sometimes meant his natural body, which was born of the blessed Virgin, and sometimes his mystical body, which is the church; and which has made some readers, through inadvertency, believe that the fathers said some things which did not agree together. But having so positive a testimony from Jesus Christ and St. Paul, and being assured that the ancient fathers, to whom the church, with good reason, has ascribed so much authority, have unanimously acknowledged that the true substance of the body and blood of Jesus Christ is in the Eucharist; and the *constant authority of councils*, and the *unanimous* consent of Christians being joined to these, let us unanimously agree about this divine mystery, and let us here, under this veil, take the bread and cup of our Lord, till we eat and drink it in another manner in the kingdom of heaven. And would to God, that those who have followed the errors of Berengarius, would imitate his repentance, and that their obstinacy would happily yield to the truth which is taught in the gospel. There are an infinite number of questions concerning this sacrament, as how transubstantiation is wrought, &c. But it is sufficient for the ordinary sort of Christians to believe that the true body and blood of Christ are there; that they cannot be divided, nor subject to any accident, whatever may happen to the *species*.—In a word, we ought to satisfy all the difficulties that can arise in our minds, by having recourse to the infinite power of God, to whom nothing is impossible, and to whom every thing is easy. We ought likewise to consider the qualities of a *glorified* body, and especially those of the body of Jesus Christ, nor have we any thing to do, but worthily to celebrate this mystery according to our faith, and to make that faith appear by our actions."

assert, that Transubstantiation* was from the beginning the unanimous belief of the universal Church; that that which appears to be but Bread and Wine is after consecration the true Body and Blood of Jesus Christ, and which is firmly grounded on Scripture, on the doctrine of the ancient Fathers, and on the decisions of the sacred Councils.—“My Flesh is meat indeed, and my Blood is drink indeed.”—(John vi. 56.)

“Let his word be to us of more authority than our reason, or our sight. Since, therefore, the Word hath said, This is my Body, let us be persuaded of it; let us believe it truly; let us behold it with intellectual eyes,” &c.—(*St. Chrysostome, Hom. 82, in Matt. T. 2. Ed. Savil.*)

The first Nicene Council decrees, “By faith let us understand the Lamb of God, who taketh away the sins of the world, to be placed on the sacred table, to be sacrificed by the Priests unbloodily,” &c.—(*Lib. 3, Decret. de Divina Mensa. An. Dom. 325.*)

If a Protestant should ask me, why cannot the words of the institution, “This is my Body which is given for you,” (St. Luke xxii. 19,) “This is my Blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many, for the remission of sins,” (St. Matt. xxvi. 28,) be understood in a sacramental, as Protestants call it, that is, a figurative sense? I would answer, 1st, Because they were never so understood by the Catholic Church, “the pillar and ground of truth.”

2nd. Because they are words of the institution. After a sacrament or sign is instituted and known, it may sometimes borrow the name of the thing which it signifies. But no sacrament was ever instituted, by attributing abruptly to it

* *Transubstantiation.* This word was adopted by the fourth Council of Lateran, (An. 1215,) about 300 years before Luther and Calvin commenced reformers; but was in use before that Council, as appears from Peter of Blois, and Hildebert, who died in 1132.

the name of that which it is to signify. To institute a disparate and unexpected sign in this manner, is to speak contrary to the fundamental laws of speech, much less can the bare imposition of a foreign name be either the institution of an unknown sign, or import the real conveyance of a man's body by a morsel of bread.

3rd. This, to Luther appeared so excessively absurd, that he could never be sincerely reconciled to a figurative or symbolical presence. In his Lesser Confession, written but a little more than a year before his death, he calls the authors of it, "A damned sect, a pack of liars; cursed, proud, and arrogant spirits; bread eaters, wine drinkers, soul murderers."* He says: "He believes the Body of Christ is in the sacrament, as the School-men express it, not by commensuration to place, but yet determinately, that is to say," says he, "certainly, corporally, and truly."—"Quod corpus Christi non sit localiter in sacramento, sed definitive; id est, certò est ibi, corporaliter et verè." And in his Theses, a little before his death, he says: "We seriously think the Zuinglians and all the Sacramentarians heretics, and separated from God's Church, who deny the Body and Blood of Christ are taken into the mouth of our body in the blessed Sacrament."—(*Thesi*, 28, *Contra Lovanienses*.)

4th. Luther with his Consubstantiation, setting aside tradition, would certainly have been in the right, if our blessed Saviour when he took Bread and Wine into his hands, which was to be the communion of his Body and Blood, (1 Cor. x. 16,) had only said, here is my Body, here is my Blood. But nothing, my Lord Bishop, but a substantial change can

* In Parvâ Confess., Anno 1544, "Blasphemos in Deum et Christum, damnatam sectam, mendaces homines, maledictos, et arrogantes spiritus, sacramentorum hostes, &c., Panivoros, vinibibones, Animarum Lationes."

make it be said of Bread and Wine, truly and literally, this is my Body, this is my Blood. As nothing but a substantial change could have made the words of Moses true, if, when he threw down his rod, he had said, this is a serpent; or of Christ, if he had said at Cana of Galilee, when the servants brought in water, this is wine.

5th. It is not then philosophy, as some Protestants affirm, but the plain texts of Scripture and universal tradition which force us to acknowledge Transubstantiation. I mean an entire change of one substance into another, as of Water into Wine, (St. John ii. 9,) of Water into Blood, (Exod. vii. 20,) of Moses's rod into a serpent, (Exod. iv. 3.) And if when he cast his rod upon the ground, he had said, this is a serpent, his words would have been true in the same literal sense, in which the words of Christ are verified, This is my Body, this is my Blood, (St. Matt. xxvi. 26, 28.)

Luther in his Great Confession, (*de Cæna Domini*,) against Zuinglius and Œcolampadius, says, "Bread and the Body of Christ are so strictly joined together, (Per prædicationem identicam, panis est realiter et propriè Corpus Christi,) that they become one and the same thing." But this is evidently impossible. For, though iron be red hot, and penetrated as it were with fire, yet nothing could be more false than to say, this iron is fire. So that Luther in the same book is forced to confess that Transubstantiation may be allowed. His words are: "Hactenus docui, et adhuc doceo, parum referre, nec magni momenti quæstionem esse, sive quis panem in Eucharistiâ manere, sive non manere, et transubstantiari credat."

Œcumenius commenting on 1 Cor. 10, says: "They have eaten manna as we the Body of Christ; they have drank a spiritual drink, that is, water running out of a spiritual rock or stone, as we the blood of Christ."—(*Œcumen. 1 Cor. 10*.)

St. Chrysostome when expounding this same text of St.

Paul, uses no other words in his exposition but the following: "Ille illis Manna et aquam, et tibi Corpus et sanguinem dedit."—"He (meaning God) gave to them manna and water, and to thee his Body and Blood." And St. Jerome, in expounding the Scriptures, says: "Et Potum accipimus de latere Christi manantem."—"And we receive drink flowing from the side of Christ."

These great Saints therefore give us clearly to understand that Catholics do not receive a figure only in the sacrament, but the very Body and the very Blood of Christ Jesus, the only begotten Son of the Eternal Father.

Protestantism, on the contrary, which has rejected this magnificent gift, is the absence of Christ, as Deism is in a more general order of ideas, the absence of the Divinity. With the Bible in his hand, the Protestant fancies that he communicates with the living truth; but is it on the material form of the words, or on their real sense, that this communication depends? And whereas it is the reason of each Protestant that determines for him the sense of the Bible, how can this ever varying reason be a transmission of the reason eternally unchangeable? How can so many interpretations that destroy one another be an emanation of the substantial word, which, like God himself, bears the character of unity? There is between them that vast space which separates illusion from immutable reality. You imagine that you enjoy the immediate presence of the Sun of Intelligences, and nothing is present to you save the shadows of your own mind. Deifying your thoughts, you believe that you converse freely with the word, whilst you are separated from it by the profound abyss which pride has interposed. The Protestants resemble an unhappy wanderer on the deep, who mistakes for the paternal shore those hills of mist, which are capriciously raised and destroyed by the winds. But the illusion soon vanishes. The fantastical horizon which surrounds

them changes every instant; their inconstant opinions come into collision, separate, scatter, and suddenly reveal to them the waves of boundless scepticism. Hence the anguish of those who desirous of faith, but weak in will, are bound to Protestantism by temporal ties;* they behold with terror the agitations of an unlimited scepticism which assail it on every side. This spectacle, so afflicting to every Christian heart, hurries them into the opposite extreme. The propensity to illuminism, which has been found at every period among this class of Protestants, augments and strengthens in proportion as rationalism destroys the little faith which the Reformation has preserved.† In this exaltation they seek an asylum against doubt. In effect, every Protestant is placed in this dilemma: if he do not believe himself infallible, he has no certainty for his faith; if he believes himself infallible, each of his judgments must appear to him a ray of increased intelligence. He ought, according to the remark of Bossuet, to “deem all his thoughts to be emanations of the Deity; an intellectual pantheism which directly leads to the other.

I shall now conclude, my Lord Bishop, this lengthened letter with a quotation from the writings of a most holy, learned, and highly gifted prelate of the Catholic Church, the late Bishop of Siga,‡ who is now, I sincerely hope and trust, reaping the benefits of a well spent life.

“All Protestants admit, (for it is impossible to deny it,) that the scriptures, as literally explained, are clearly in our

* *Cunctæque profundum pontum adspectabant flentes.*”

† In a work published on the state of the Protestant Religion in Germany, Mr. Hugh James Rose, a Minister of the English Church, has forcibly pointed out this result of rationalism: “The Doctrines of the innovators must have shocked and afflicted all who as yet were sincerely attached to Christianity.”—(*See the Catholic Memorial of January 1829.*)

‡ Dr. Baines, Vicar Apostolic of the Western District.

favour, and clearly against themselves. Our Saviour says in the scripture, '*This is my body.*' The Catholic Church assents, and says '*It is his body.*' Most of the Protestant sects dissent, and say '*It is not his body; it is only a figure of it.*' Our Saviour says in St. John, '*My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.*' We say the same; but the Protestant says, '*His flesh is not meat indeed, except inasmuch as he is the object of our faith.*' St. Paul says, that '*Whoever eateth and drinketh unworthily eateth and drinketh judgment to himself, not discerning the body of the Lord.*' We say the same; but Protestants say, '*It is impossible to discern what is not there.*' St. Paul says, '*We have an altar,*' (Heb. xiii.) (and consequently a sacrifice; for one implies the other,) and that '*the chalice of benediction which we bless is the communion of the blood of Christ, and the bread which we break the partaking of the body of the Lord.*'—(1 Cor. xi.) We say the same;—but most Protestants deny both the sacrifice and the victim.

It is for modern innovators to show that the literal sense of scripture is to be abandoned, and a figurative one preferred. In their favour they have their own private judgment, at the end of eighteen centuries; but against them they have the apostolical liturgies and the universal belief and practice of the Christian world from the very days of the Apostles. If their explanation is right, all Christendom was wrong from the beginning. But if their explanation is erroneous, the true worship of God is abolished amongst them, the channel, by which the merits of Christ were to be conveyed to their souls, is cut off;—they can '*have no life in them,*' because they cannot '*eat the flesh of the son of man and drink his blood;*' or if, eating and drinking, they believe erroneously concerning this mystery, they '*eat and drink judgment to themselves, not discerning the body of the Lord.*' Oh, that God would, in his tender mercy, open the eyes of his erring

children, and, seating them once more as guests at his heavenly table, prepare them for future thrones of glory in His Eternal Kingdom. AMEN.

I am,

My Lord Bishop,

Your obedient Servant,

VERAX,

A CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

POSTSCRIPT.

It is most false in the enemies of the Catholic Church to assert as they constantly do, that by means of explication, any substantial addition was ever made to the doctrine of the Church in communion with the See of Rome on the Eucharist. The Roman Church always believed that Jesus Christ was present in the Eucharist, and "that the Eucharist was the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ;" and these words suggest the very same ideas upon the Eucharist that are suggested by the language which the Roman Church now uses. To be present, to be really present, to be substantially present, these phrases all express absolutely the same thing; because a metaphorical presence is not presence, but rather real absence. And hence the idea of presence is not included in the simple idea which the terms metaphorical presence suggest. On the contrary, in order to represent to oneself a presence merely metaphorical, we must exclude the simple idea of presence, and substitute the idea of presence in sign, in operation, or in some other manner that involves the idea of absence, rather than of presence. The difference between the language of the primitive Church, "the Eucharist is the Body of Jesus Christ," and the language of the Church in communion with the See of Rome, "the Eucharist is really

and substantially the Body of Jesus Christ," does not arise precisely from these last recited words being more explicit than those used by the ancient Church; but simply from this, that they are more assertive than are the words which the ancient Church employed. For when we say, that the Body of Jesus Christ is really and substantially present in the Eucharist, we annex to the ideas of simple presence a reflection, which affirms more positively the truth of what we assert; and our words mean,—It is true that Jesus Christ is in the Eucharist. For as the words, "it is true," do not change the idea of the proposition to which they are added, and as they denote merely that the mind considers more expressly the truth of that proposition; in like manner, the terms, "Real presence, substantial presence," only more positively assert that which both now and at all times the simple and natural idea of presence includes. Thus the additions and the pretended explications of the primitive faith which Protestants suppose to have been made, are vain, groundless imaginations, unsupported by proof or by reason. In a word, the Catholic Church has ever been most watchful when the capital truths which the faithful distinctly believe were impugned. But it is impossible to assail popular truths without causing alarms among the people, and without occasioning scandals and tumults. Now the doctrine of the Eucharist was always familiar to the people, and was, so to speak, the most popular of all the mysteries, for with this mystery none of the faithful could have been unacquainted. It was therefore even more impossible to make any change in the common faith upon it, than the received faith of any other mystery.

NOTE TO LETTER I.

Faith in the Eucharist, which at every moment powerfully excites confidence, love, and the spirit of sacrifice, constantly upholds prayer in the degree of perfection to which it has been raised by Christianity; whilst wherever this faith has been altered or rejected, prayer necessarily retrogrades towards its primitive imperfection, a thing no longer tolerable, for under the empire of religion fully developed, it is a grating discord, which disturbs the harmony of the whole. A striking comparison will tend to illustrate these observations. The Lutheran belief in the Eucharist, is that which differs least from the Catholic, which latter has been entirely rejected by the Calvinists. The English system, notwithstanding the strong quotations from her most talented divines, which I have extracted from the works of the learned Julius Vindex, and which will appear in the Second Letter of the series; yet I most positively maintain, that her foundation is Calvinistic, oscilating between Wittenberg and Geneva, in as much as, according to Bishop Burnet, it considers as indifferent the dogma of the real presence, so strenuously maintained, for the moment of communion, by the primitive Lutherans, but rejected with such horror as an impious tenet by the fanaticism of the ancient Calvinists. A celebrated Catholic theologian has well remarked, that Lutheranism, notwithstanding the ferocious temper of its founder, presented from its very origin a milder character in point of piety, when contrasted with the repulsive harshness of Calvinism, though established by a man less violent. The character of the English system is intermediate; the Calvinists think it too devout, the Lutherans not sufficiently so. Hence the three principal fractions of Protestantism are distinguished by a corresponding relation to piety as they recede from or approximate to the generative dogma of Catholic piety. I am far from supposing that the peculiar character of each of these sects has been determined by this cause alone; but in order to account for the phenomenon, it should not be forgotten that the moral as well as the physical world has its affinities and combinations. This law, which may be demonstrated by the history of many ancient sects, showed itself in Jansenism, the last of modern heresies. One of the first effects of its anti-social doctrine was to estrange from communion the stern controvertist, who contended to the last for the rarity of grace, was naturally impelled by his sombre logic to publish the manifesto of

his sect against frequent communion. Impervious to the mysteries of love, Jansetical devotion is cold and heartless. It stands self-convicted of wanting the grace of prayer.

The Eucharist is in Catholicism the centre of those pious communities known under the name of congregations. They have existed at all times and places under ever-variable forms, for they are precisely destined to correspond to the moral wants of times and places. The outcry against these institutions, considered in themselves, argues at least a profound ignorance of human nature. As besides the tenets common to all, there are various modes of conceiving them—every individual, country, and period, having its peculiar intelligence; in the same manner, and for the same reason, besides that fund of piety which is common to all Christians, there are modes equally diversified of feeling religion. When a certain number of individuals agree in their ideas and feelings, these analogous dispositions necessarily tend to associate, and for that purpose seek an exterior and appropriate form. This tendency produces in the intellectual order schools of Christian philosophy; and in the sentimental, congregations of piety. Their suppression would reduce piety to a geometrical equality, to a state of inactivity opposed to the law of nature; which so far from impeding, stimulate the free and varied developement of individual power and energy. But those particular societies, by the very fact of having each its mode of life, would soon form as many different modes of worship, were they not based on those of general worship. This is what the Church does, in giving them the altar of sacrifice for a centre, and frequent communion as their first law. The Eucharistic devotion, which is of general obligation, is to the particular forms of devotion which every individual may adopt, what the symbol is to their different systems; it is both the foundation and the rule. Catholicism maintains in point of piety as of government, something fixed and common, for such is, in every possible order of things, the necessary support of all individual activity and existence; variety in the midst of unity, such is Catholicism—such is nature. Frequent communion continually leads back the soul to itself. This sort of action, sensible at every period of the Church, is more perceptible in the middle ages. The interior of monasteries exhibited a vision of the angelic life amid the ferocity of a barbarous age. The religious orders which cultivated the soil of Europe, still accomplished more, they

reclaimed the moral waste of the soul. The Cenobites were obliged by their rule often to approach the sacred table. The divine word which alone resounded in the depths of their solitude, and which was prolonged in the silence of their meditations, daily reminded them of the perfection which a familiarity with the Holy of Holies demanded from them. This thought continually excited them to acquire the knowledge of their own hearts; they cultivated those with exceeding care, that they might carry to the most august as well as to the sweetest of all mysteries, the purest and most delicate flower of human affection. The ascetic works of that period are marked by an exquisite refinement of feeling. From the cloister it gradually made its way into the world, and directing itself to other objects, inspired chivalry with that mysticism of love and honor which has exercised such powerful influence on the manners and literature of the Christian world. The asceticism of the middle ages has handed down an inimitable work, to which Catholics, Protestants, and Philosophers have agreed to pay the best tribute of admiration, viz., that of the Heart. How wonderful, my Lord Bishop, that a small book of mysticism, the production of such an age, should have imparted a deeper tone of reflection to the meditative genius of Leibnitz, and kindled almost to enthusiasm the cold temperament of Fontenelle! No person has ever read a page of the Imitation, particularly in the hour of affliction, who did not say in concluding, this reading has done me good. Next to the Bible, this work is the sovereign friend of the soul; but where did the poor solitary who wrote it find that inexhaustible love? For never would he have written with so much power and sweetness had he not loved much. He solves the question for us himself; every line in his book on the Sacrament is a commentary of the preceding one; all the relations which I have now considered, present but imperfectly the influence of this principle of love; to understand it fully, we should feel it. Are the wonders of the heart to be despised as valueless; and if marks of the divinity exist any where, where shall they be sought for if not in the inspirations of virtue? As for my part I bow with deeper reverence to the accents that sanctify the soul, than to the voice of genius. Let us then listen to them in respectful silence. The Eucharist, they tell us, is an integral part of the two worlds, a temple placed on the boundaries of Earth and Heaven. There is effected an union between the types of the one, and the realities of the other, and the communion is

accomplished as if beneath the half-opened vestibule of the invisible sanctuary where the eternal union is consummated. Whilst the senses are detained in the visible order, the soul feels the pressure of the invisible; it enters into it—it partakes of its substance, like a man placed at the limits of this present material system, who, stretching forth his hand, grasps the boundaries of a higher world. There then passes within the soul what human language would fear to profane by expressing. To that confused murmur of the passions, which as yet agitates the faithful soul, like the last struggle of life, succeeds a profound peace. Shortly after, a commotion sweet as it is powerful, announces the presence of the Deity, and immediately holy desires, prayer, patience, and the spirit of sacrifice, often languid, are again revived. All that is divine within her kindles at the moment; the mental eye becomes purified, and receives some rays of that light which is reflected from a brighter world. Emotions which combine all that is touching in sentiment with all that is calm in reflection, attest the renewed harmony of the spirit and of the senses. We may frequently feel on other occasions the joys of virtue; here alone we are inebriated with all its delights. You would fondly wish to retain these exquisite sensations, but your efforts are vain; they have been shed on the soul, but to imbue her with the sense of that word of happiness, the name of which belongs to a lost language, whose idiom spoken by the children of Adam, contains but the wreck. But the more clearly the soul comprehends that word, the more deeply does she feel that it is not of this world. Until she shall have deposited at the portals of heaven the burthen of terrestrial virtues, until the moment shall have arrived when she shall be freed for ever from hope; the joys of the captive soul will be marked by suffering, the pleasures of this world becomes insipid, its happiness a burthen; and whoever is deeply versed in life must acknowledge, that the great miracle of communion is to render it tolerable. These raptures of love mingled with sorrow impart at that solemn moment a sublime expression to the countenance. That of joy is rarely so; because joy is so fugitive and false, that it appears to give to the human figure a senseless and undignified expression. Sorrow, on the contrary, almost always ennoble the countenance. But the instinct of our primeval destiny, alarmed by the contrast, seeks another dignity than that of sorrow. The true condition of man is the reparation of his misery, and his countenance never

exhibits a nobler terrestrial aspect than when he embodies the expression of that mystery of sorrow and grace, on receiving the impress of a divine joy in the abyss of his sufferings. Mark that Christian who adores his Saviour within his soul; would you not say, that if that mouth, closed by recollection, were to open, a voice would come forth, attempting, though in a plaintive tone, the canticles of heaven? It would blend the sighs of man with the rapture of an angelic spirit.

TESTIMONY OF THE FATHERS, &c.,

For the Five first Centuries, during which period Protestants generally allow the Church to have been pure and undefiled. "And the Bread which I will give is my flesh for the life of the world."—(John vi. 52.) Real Presence of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist.

CENTURY I.

ST. IGNATIUS, MARTYR.—Speaking of some heretics in his time, he says: "These abstain from the Eucharist, and from prayer, because they do not acknowledge the Eucharist to be the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins, and which the Father by his goodness resuscitated. Rejecting therefore this gift of God, they die in their disputes."—(*Ep. ad Smyrn. p. 36, T. 2, P.P. Apost.*)

CENTURY II.

ST. JUSTIN, MARTYR.—"Then to him who presides over the brethren, is presented bread and wine, tempered with water: having received which, he gives glory to the Father of all things in the name of the Son and the Holy Ghost, and returns thanks in many prayers, that has been deemed worthy of these gifts. These offices being duly performed, the whole assembly in acclamation answers, Amen; when the ministers, whom we call deacons, distribute to each one a portion of the blessed bread, and the wine and water. Some is also taken to the absent. This food we call the Eucharist.—Nor do we take these gifts as common bread and common drink; but as

Jesus Christ, our Saviour, made man by the word of God, took flesh and blood for our salvation, in the same manner we have been taught, that the food which has been blessed with the prayer of the words which he spoke, and by which our blood and flesh in the change are nourished, is the flesh and blood of that Jesus incarnate.”—(*Apol. 1, p. 95.*)

ST. IRENÆUS.—Against the heretics of his time, says : “This pure oblation, the Church alone makes. The Jews make it not, for their hands are stained with blood ; and they received not the word that is offered to God. Nor do the assemblies of heretics make it.—For how can these prove, that the bread over which the words of thanksgiving have been pronounced, is the body of their Lord, and the cup his blood, while they do not admit that he is the Son, that is, the word of the Creator of the world.”—(*Adv. Hæc. Lib. 4, c. 34, p. 326.*)

CENTURY III.

ORIGEN.—“You that have been accustomed to be present at the divine mysteries, know when you receive the body of the Lord, with what care and veneration you preserve it, lest any particle of it fall to the ground, or be lost.”—(*Hom. 13, in Exod. T. 2, p. 176.*)

ST. CYPRIAN.—Speaking of some who had the weakness to deny their faith, he says: “Returning from the altar of the devil, regardless of the menaces of God, they dare to offer violence to the body and blood of the Lord, thus sinning more against him, than when they denied him.”—(*De Lapsis, p. 132.*) “Christ is the bread of life.—He said: I am the bread of life who came down from heaven. If any one eat

of my bread, he shall live for ever. But the bread which I shall give is my flesh for the life of the world. Hence it is manifest, that they have this life, who approach his body, and receive the Eucharist.”—(*De Orat. Dom. p. 146.*)

CENTURY IV.

COUNCIL OF NICE.—Condemning an abuse which had crept in, that deacons in some places administered the Eucharist to priests, the Council says: “That neither canon nor custom has taught, that they (deacons) who have themselves no power to offer, should give the body of Christ to them that possess that power.”—(*Can. 18, conc. Gen. T. 2, p. 38.*)

ST. ATHANASIUS.—“Take care then, O deacon, not to give to the unworthy the blood of the immaculate body, lest you incur the guilt of giving holy things to dogs.”—(*Serm. de incontam. Myst. T. 2, p. 35.*)

ST. HILARY.—“If the word truly was made flesh, and we, truly, receive this word for our food: how can he be thought not to dwell naturally in us, who assumed the nature of our flesh inseparably united to him, and communicates, in the sacrament, that nature to us.”—(*De Trin. L. 8, p. 954.*)

ST. EPHREM OF EDESSA.—“When the eye of faith is clearly open, it contemplates in a light, the Lamb of God, who was immolated for us, and who gave us his body for our food to the remission of sins. This same eye of faith manifestly beholds the Lord, eating his body and drinking his blood, and indulges no curious enquiry. You believe that Christ is the Son of God, for you were born in the flesh.

Then why do you search into what is inscrutable? Doing this you prove your curiosity, not your faith. Believe then, and with a firm faith receive the body and blood of our Lord. Abraham placed earthly food before celestial spirits, (Gen. xviii.) of which they all ate. This is wonderful. But what Christ has done for us greatly exceeds this, and transcends all speech, and all conception. To us, that are in the flesh, he has given to eat his body and blood. Myself, incapable of comprehending the mysteries of God, I dare not proceed; and should I attempt it, I should shew only my own rashness."—(*De Nat. Dei. T. 3, p. 182.*)

ST. CYRIL OF JERUSALEM.—In his instructions addressed to those who had been newly baptized, he says: "The bread and wine which before the invocation of the adorable Trinity, were nothing but bread and wine, become after this invocation, the body and blood of Christ."—(*Catech. Mystag. 1, n. 4, p. 281.*) "The Eucharistic bread, after the invocation of the Holy Spirit, is no longer bread, but the body of Christ."—(*Catech. 3, n. 3, p. 289.*) "The doctrine of the blessed Paul alone is sufficient to give certain proofs of the truth of the divine mysteries; and you, being deemed worthy of them, are become one body and one blood with Christ. For this great Apostle says: That our Lord, in the same night that he was delivered, having taken bread and given thanks, broke it and gave it to his disciples, saying to them, Take and eat, this is my body. Afterwards he took the cup and said, Take and drink, this is my blood. As then Christ, speaking of the bread, declared, and said, this is my body, who shall dare to doubt it? And as speaking of the wine, he positively assured us, and said, this is my blood, who shall doubt it, and say, that it is not his blood?"—(*Catech. 4, n. 1, p. 292.*)

ST. OPTATUS OF MILEVIS.—Speaking of the sacrileges of the Donatists, he says: “For what is the altar but the seat of the body and blood of Christ? What offence had Christ given, whose body and blood, at certain times, do there dwell?—This glaring impiety is doubled, whilst you broke also the chalices, the bearers of the blood of Christ.”—(*Contra. Parmen. L. 6, p. 91.*)

ST. BASIL.—“About the things which God has spoken, there should be no hesitation, nor doubt, but a firm persuasion, that all is true and possible, though nature be against it. Herein lies the struggle of faith. The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying: How can this man give us his flesh to eat? Then Jesus said to them: Amen, amen, I say to you; except you eat of the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you. John vi. 53, 54.”—(*Regula 8, Moral, T. 2, p. 240.*) “With what fear, with what conviction, with what affection of mind should we receive the body and blood of Christ. The apostle teaches us to fear, when he says: He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh judgment to himself (1 Cor. xi. 29); while the words of the Lord: This is my body which shall be delivered for you, (*Ibid. 24,*) create a firm conviction.”—(*Ibid. in Reg. brev. quæst. 172, p. 472.*) “The Christian must be without spot or stain, and thus prepared to eat the body of Christ, and drink his blood.”—(*Ibid. in Moral, reg. 80, c. 22, p. 318.*) “It is the duty of him who approaches to the body and blood of Christ, and to the memory of his passion, not only to be pure from defilement, but likewise to shew forth and express the remembrance of the death of Christ, lest he eat and drink to his own judgment.”—(*L. 1, de Bapt. c. 3, T. 2, p. 651.*) “If they who were unclean, under the old law, might not touch what was holy, how much more criminal is he who, in the impurity of

his soul, rashly approaches to the body of our Lord. Let us therefore cleanse ourselves from all defilement.”—(*Ibid. L. 2, c. 3, p. 654.*)

Some are of opinion, the last quoted work on baptism ought to be ascribed to Eustathius of Sebaste. The evidence however is of equal weight, as to what the faith of the Church was at that period; as Eustathius was the contemporary of St. Basil.

ST. GREGORY OF NYSSA.—“Now we must consider how it can be that one body, which so constantly through the whole world is distributed to so many thousands of the faithful, can be whole in each receiver, and itself remain whole. The body of Christ, by the inhabitation of the word of God, was transmuted into a divine dignity: and I now believe, that the bread, sanctified by the word of God, is transmuted into the body of Christ, agreeably to what he said, This is my body.”—(*Orat. Catech. c. 37, T. 2, p. 534.*)
 “The bread also is at first common bread; but when it has been sanctified, it is called and is made the body of Christ.”—(*Orat. in Bapt. Christi. T. 2, p. 802.*)

ST. AMBROSE.—“The manna in the desert was given in figure. You have known things more excellent. For light is preferable to the shadow; truth to figure; the body of Christ to the manna of heaven. But you may say: I see somewhat else; how do you assert that I shall receive the body of Christ? This remains to be proved. How many examples may we not make use of to shew that we have not here what nature formed, but what the divine blessing has consecrated, and that the virtue of this blessing is more powerful than that of nature. Moses held the rod; he cast it to the ground and it became a serpent. Again he took it by the tail, and again it became a rod. See you not that by the

prophetic power, the nature of the rod and the serpent was twice changed? If now the blessing of men was powerful enough to change nature, what must we not say of the divine consecration when the words of our Lord operate—the word of Christ which could draw out of nothing what was not, shall it not be able to change the things that are, into that which they were not. For it is not a less effect of power, to give new existence to things, than to change the natures that were. Was the order of nature followed, when Jesus was born of a virgin? Plainly not. Then why is that order to be looked for here? Our Lord himself proclaims: This is my body.”—(*De Initiandis*, c. 9, T. 4, p. 350.)

ST. JOHN CHRYSOSTOM —“Elias left his garment to his disciples; but the Son of God left us his own flesh. The prophet indeed threw off his covering, but Christ ascending took with him his body and left it also for us.”—(*Homil. 2, ad Pop. Antioch*, T. 1, p. 37.) “Let us then touch the hem of his garment, rather let us, if we be so disposed, possess him entire. For his body now lies before us, not to be touched only, but to be eaten, and to satiate us.”—(*Homil. 51, in cap. xiv. Mat. T. 7, p. 553.*) “Let us believe God in every thing, and not gainsay him, although what is said may seem contrary to our reason and our sight. Let his word overpower both. Holding fast his words; for his words cannot deceive; but our sense is very easily deceived. That never failed; this often. Since then his word says: This is my body; let us assent and believe, and view it with the eyes of our understanding.”—(*Homil. 83, in Mat. T. 7, p. 868.*) “This body lying in the manger, the wise men revered. Thou dost not see him in the manger, but on the altar—nor dost thou only see him, but moreover thou touchest him, nay, thou eatest him, and returnest home with him in thy breast.—Cleanse then thy soul from all defilement, and pre-

pare thyself to receive these mysteries.”—(*Hom. 24, in 1 Cor. T. 10, p. 261.*)

CENTURY V.

ST. AUGUSTINE.—“Our Lord was willing that our salvation should be in his body and blood. And this was an effect of his humility. For had he not been humble, he would not have been to us meat and drink.”—(*In Psalm xxxiii. T. 8, p. 92.*) “When committing to us his body, he said: This is my body; Christ was held in his own hands. He bore that body in his hands.”—(*Ibid. p. 94.*) “The bread that you behold on the altar, sanctified by the word of God, is the body of Christ. That cup—that which the cup contains, is the blood of Christ.”—(*Serm. 227, al. 83, in die. Pasch. ad Infantes. T. 10, p. 555.*) “We receive with a faithful heart and mouth the mediator of God and man, the man Christ Jesus; who has given us his body to eat, and his blood to drink.”—(*Contra. Advers. Legis. L. 2, c. 9, T. 6, p. 264.*) “But some say this is hard, who can hear it? (John vi.) It is hard to the hard, that is, it is incredible to the incredulous.”—(*De verbis Apostoli. Serm. 2, T. 10, p. 94.*)

ST. NILUS.—“Before the prayer of the priest, and the coming of the holy spirit, the things laid on the table are common bread and wine; but, after the solemn invocation, and the descent of the adorable spirit, it is no longer bread, and no longer wine, but is the body, and pure and precious blood of Christ, the God of all.”—(*Ep. 44, L. p. 21.*) “Let us not approach to the mystic bread, as to mere bread; for it is the flesh of God, the venerable, adorable, and life-giving flesh.”—(*Ep. 39, L. 3, p. 322.*)

ST. ISAAC.—Speaking of what passed in his mind, in the presence of the blessed sacrament, he says: “Faith whispered to me: eat, and be silent; drink, child, and inquire not. She shewed me the body slain, of which, placing a portion on my lips, she said gently: Reflect what thou eatest. She held out to me a reed, directing me to write. I took the reed; I wrote; I pronounced, This is the body of my God. Taking then the cup, I drank. And what I had said of the body, that I now say of the cup: This is the blood of my Saviour.”—(*Serm. de Fide. Bibl. Orient, T. 1, p. 220.*)

ST. PETER CHRYSOLOGUS.—“Let Christians understand, who every day touch the body of Christ, what helps they may draw from that body, when the woman was perfectly cured by only touching the hem of his garment.”—(*Serm. 34, p. 872.*) “I am the bread which came down from heaven: He is the bread, which, sown in the womb of the Virgin, and finally brought on our altar, affords daily celestial food to the faithful.”—(*Serm. 67, p. 899.*)

ST. PROCLUS, PATRIARCH OF CONSTANTINOPLE.—“By these prayers, (of the liturgy,) the descent of the Holy Spirit was expected, that by his sacred presence he would make the bread, that is presented for the offering, the body of Christ, and the wine mingled with water, his blood.”—(*In Bibl. P. P. Max. T. 6, p. 618.*)

THEODORET.—Who wrote four books against the Eutychian heresy, introduces a dialogue between an orthodox believer and an Eutychian, under the names of Orthodoxus and Eranistes. The subject being that of the Eucharist, the answers of Orthodoxus will clearly demonstrate what the belief of the Catholic Church was at that period, as to the reality of Christ's presence in the Eucharist. “*Eran.*—Tell

me what you call the gift that is offered before the priest's invocation? *Orth.*—We call it an aliment made of certain grains. *Eran.*—And how do you call the other symbol? *Orth.*—We give it a name that denotes a certain beverage. *Eran.*—And after consecration, what are they called? *Orth.*—The body of Christ, and the blood of Christ. They are understood to be what they have been made; this they are believed to be; and as such they are adored.”—(*Dial. 2, T. 4.*)

LETTER II.

“Take, eat, this is my Body which shall be delivered for you.” The real presence of Christ’s Body and Blood in the Sacrament is the true doctrine of the Church of England, if her most eminent Divines are to be believed.

TO THE LORD BISHOP OF EXETER.

MY LORD BISHOP,

St. Anselm* says: “We read in the Gospel that Jesus took bread,† he blessed, and brake, and gave to his Disciples, and said: ‘Take ye, and eat, this is my body which shall be delivered for you.’ When he took it into his hands it was bread. For so the Evangelist says, ‘He took bread,’ and by that blessing, the bread is made the body of Christ, not only significatively, but also substantially. Neither do we exclude from the Sacrament altogether the figure; neither do we

* Anselm, was Archbishop of Canterbury in the reigns of William Rufus and Henry the 1st, was a native of Italy, born in 1033, at Aost or Augusta, a town at the foot of the Alps, he died at Canterbury, A.D. 1109. His works have been often reprinted.

† The Protestant Bibles put, he blessed *it*, he brake *it*, and gave *it*, a word not to be found in the Greek or Latin. See Dr. Saunders’ great work on the Lord’s Supper, chap. I. Protestants do this, Dr. Saunders says, in order to make it appear that it still remains bread.

admit the figure only. It is the verity, because it is the body of Christ; it is a figure, because it is offered in sacrifice. Let us consider the words of our Lord; he says, 'Take and eat, this is my body;' and in order that they might be convinced that in very deed it was the true body of Christ, he declared certain signs by which they should perceive it. 'This is,' says he, 'my body, that shall be delivered for you.' If this body should be made the body of Christ figuratively and not substantially, it should be only the figure of Christ; that which follows does not appertain to a figure, which is this, 'that shall be delivered for you.' Neither did he name it bread after he had sanctified the bread, but his body; neither did he, after he had blessed the wine, name it wine, but his blood. Therefore as the Catholic faith does believe that the bread which is offered to the priest to be consecrated, by the priestly consecration is made the body of Christ, not significantly, but substantially; &c."—(*Anselm. lib. de Offic. Divi.*)

Œcumenius, a member of the Greek Church, who lived about 800 years ago, writes thus upon these words of Christ: "Erant quoque in veteri testamento pocula in quibus libabant; ubi etiam, postquam victimas immolassent, sanguinem irrationabilium excipientes poculis libabant. Pro sanguine igitur irrationabilium, Dominus proprium sanguinem dat, et bene in poculo, ut ostendat vetus Testamentum antea hoc delineasse."—(*Œcum. in 2 Prim. Corr.*)—"There were also in the Old Testament cups in which they sacrificed; wherein likewise after they had offered sacrifices, receiving the blood of brute beasts they sacrificed in cups. Therefore instead of the blood of brute beasts, our Lord giveth his own blood, and properly in a cup, that he might shew the Old Testament to have described this before." Moreover, applying the thing figured to the figure, this author means, that as truly as the blood of brute beasts was received in cups, so also have we the blood of Christ in cups. Besides this, I assert,

that his speech and manner of delivering himself are to be weighed. The figure of Christ's blood is not his own blood. Wherefore when he says, that Christ gives us his own blood, he at once removes the figure. For the one means the thing itself; the other a figure or token of the same. Now let us proceed further, and consider the very words of this author, upon Christ giving us his own blood. He says, "In poculo.—In the cup." If then it be given to us in the cup, it is not the blood of Christ spiritually, for that is not received in cups, but in the soul of man. It being then Christ's own blood, and received in a cup, it must consequently be the true and real blood of Christ, to which it well appertains, inasmuch as Christ has so ordained it to be received in a real cup, for it is in itself a real thing. Besides this, the author says, that it corresponds extremely well with the figure that the blood of Christ should be in a cup, because it was so prefigured, inasmuch as the blood of beasts was offered in cups. Then Christ giving his own blood in the cup to his Disciples, and saying, "Drink ye all of this, this is my blood," did assuredly speak these words in their proper sense, and he undoubtedly did the same when he said, "This is my body."

You cannot, my Lord Bishop, but perceive the perfect agreement among the Fathers on this great verity; and you cannot help also perceiving in this exposition, that which should be always found among the children of God, an uniformity, a consent, and a godly agreement as regards this great truth, one of the most weighty articles of our Faith. You do not behold this harmony, this concord, among our brethren who have unfortunately for themselves separated from the Church of God, such as the Lutherans, the Calvinists, Methodists, &c., as well as members of the Church of England as by law established.

Hear the words of the very learned Julius Vindex on the subject, (*Goliath Beheaded*, &c.) he says, "Though it be a very difficult matter at present to fathom the real sentiments

of the Church of England * respecting the Eucharist, I do most positively insist on it, that the doctrine of the real presence, (if her most learned divines are to be believed,) is no less her real and true doctrine, than it is that of the Church of Rome. I shall begin first with Doctors Nowell and Ford; the first in his famous Catechism, the other in his Commentary on the Thirty-nine Articles."

"What is the heavenly or spiritual part of the Lord's supper, which no sense can discover?" says the former.

Answer.—"The body and blood of Christ, which are given to the faithful, and are taken, eaten, and drank by them, which though it be only in an heavenly manner, yet they are received by them truly, really, and in very deed.—Vère, tamen, et reipsa."

Ford seems merely to have copied his words: "The body and blood of Christ which are given to the faithful in the Lord's supper, and are by them received, eaten, and drank only in a heavenly and spiritual manner, yet truly and in reality."

No objection can be drawn from the words heavenly and spiritual, used by these two authors. Catholics admit the use of them also. Hear the learned Veron: "Not only can the body of Christ, under the symbols be called spiritual, and Christ himself spirit, but also under the symbols can be said to be in a spiritual manner, or spiritually, and not in a corporeal manner, or a carnal one." † By these words Veron most certainly understood a real presence under the elements; we must suppose that Nowell and Ford, as honest and plain dealing men, did the same.

* See the Articles and Liturgy as they stood in 1548, clearly expressing the real presence; in 1552, as clearly denying it; in 1562, leaving it doubtful; and in 1662, apparently rejecting it altogether. Surely divine faith must of its own nature be immutable and unchangeable, as the God from whom it emanates; it cannot be subject to the arbitrary and capricious devices of men.

† Rule of Faith, chap. 2, sect. 2.

Now for other unequivocal British Protestant authorities. Observe! I speak not of transubstantiation for the present, but of the real presence only.

Dr. Andrews of Winchester is allowed to have been one of the brightest lights of the Church of England, his words alone would decide the point: "Christ," says he, addressing Cardinal Bellarmine, "said, this is my body; he said not in this, or that way, that it was so; we agree as to the object, the whole, the only difference respects the *modus* or manner of the presence.—*Præsentiam, inquam, credimus, nec minus quam vos veram.*—We believe the true presence no less than you do."* "And the king too believes Christ to be not only really present, but truly adorable in the Eucharist; and as for my part, I do with St. Ambrose 'adore the flesh of Christ in the mysteries.'"† Reader, is not this sufficient for my purpose? However, I will add a few more authorities.

"As I like not those who say, he is bodily there, so I like not such as say, his body is not there. Because Christ says, it is there; St. Paul says, it is there; and our Church says, it is there; really, truly, and essentially, and not only by way of representation or commemoration; for," says he, "why would our Saviour bid us take what he would not have us receive. We must believe it is there. We must know what is there. Our faith may see it, our senses cannot."‡ Could Gregory the 16th himself say more?

"The altar," says Archbishop Laud, "is the greatest place of God's residence on earth; yea, greater than the pulpit; for there it is, *hoc est corpus meum*. In the pulpit it is at most, *hoc est verbum meum*! And a greater reverence is due to the body than to the word of the Lord; and to the throne

* Andrews's Answer to Bellarmine's Apology, chap. 1, p. 11.

† Ibid. chap. 8, p. 104.

‡ Lawrence's Sermon, p.p. 17, 18.

where his body is present, than to the seat where his word is preached." *

Words so clear against the Calvinian doctrine of a few years later, that Mr. Prynne asks with indignation, "Whether any other Protestant did ever hold the doctrine of Christ's body being upon the altar? No," says he, "never Protestant wrote so before himself." †

Thus the Archbishop, who having quoted this passage of Bellarmine, viz., "*Conversionem panis esse substantialem, sed arcanam et ineffabilem*," owns that had he left out the word, *conversionem*, no man had spoken better.

Having sufficiently proved the true and real presence of our Saviour in the sacrament to be the true and real doctrine of the Church of England, I might certainly end here, but the reader will, I trust, pardon a short digression, for the purpose of my giving a most remarkable passage from the works of Luther in favour of transubstantiation, unquoted till recently by any Catholic author. And it is not only singular on that account, but important, as containing an answer to the silly cavil founded on the words, "do this in remembrance of me."

"Every act of our Saviour was intended for our advantage and instruction. 'This do,' said he, 'in remembrance of me.' What doth this mean? Is is not, what I now do, do ye? What did Christ do? '*Panem accepit, et verbo quo dicit hoc est corpus meum, mutat in corpus suum, et dat manducandum discipulis*,' viz., He took the bread, and by the words, this is my body, he changes it into his body, and gives it to his disciples." It is one hundred chances to one that these words of Luther have never as yet arrested the attention of your Lordship, but you may see them by consulting the second Tome of his works, p. 253, Wittenberg edition, A.D. 1562.

* Laud's Speech in the Star Chamber, p. 47.

† Prynne's Breviat of Laud's Trial, p. 520.

So much for the true and original belief of the Church of England in regard of the real presence in the Eucharist. "And thus," says Bossuet, "a good English Protestant, without blemish to his religion or conscience, may believe that the body and blood of Christ are really and substantially present in the bread and wine immediately after consecration." —(*History of the variations of the Protestant Churches, Book 14, sec. 122.*)

I omitted to mention, that Dr. Heylin in his treatise, entitled "Respondet Petrus," openly reproaches Archbishop Usher with having, in his answer to a Jesuit's challenge, deviated in toto from the doctrine of the Church of England concerning the real presence, and quotes many passages to prove that she holds it as firmly as the Catholics. It is well known that Usher, like some other prelates, was more a Calvinist than a true member of the established Church on the doctrine of the Eucharist, and hence this reproach.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

"I can find but few amongst English Protestant divines going so far," continues the learned Julius Vindex, "as to deny the absolute possibility of transubstantiation. Their main objections are, first, that it cannot be evinced from the words of holy writ; secondly, that it stands in direct contradiction to the testimony of the senses. See La Placette, Taylor, Tillotson, &c."

"Let it appear," says Dr. Taylor,* one of its most violent opponents, "that God hath affirmed transubstantiation, and I for my part will burn all my arguments, viz., of apparent contradictions and impossibilities against it, and make public amends." Then to the objection, that Protestants as believing themselves the doctrines of the Trinity, the Incarnation, the

* Taylor on the Real Presence, pp. 240, 237.

Resurrection of the same body at the latter day, &c., should not object to transubstantiation from any seeming absurdity, or impossibility whatsoever, he answers, "That if there were as plain revelation of transubstantiation as of the others, then this argument were good; and if it were possible for a thousand times more arguments to be brought against transubstantiation, yet (saith he) we are to believe the revelation in despite of them all." Now no man can believe that to be true, in any way, which he knew before to be absolutely false and impossible, therefore, neither he nor other Protestant divines who are of the same sentiments, can believe any absolute impossibility in the doctrine of transubstantiation. Again, "Those who believe the Trinity in all those niceties of explications which are in the school, and which now pass for the doctrine of the Church, believe them with as much violence to the principles of natural philosophy, as can be in the point of transubstantiation."*

The possibility then of transubstantiation being thus conceded, let us see whether the words of the institution taken in the plain and obvious sense, do not (even according to its greatest opponents) prove that stupendous doctrine.

"The sense of the words of the institution, this is my body," says Calvin, "taken literally, cannot stand without a change of the bread into the body of Christ; so that the visible bread may become the invisible body."†

"Either our figure or their transubstantiation must follow," says Beza, writing against the Lutherans, "for you cannot insist on the literal sense of the words, 'this is my body,' without plainly establishing transubstantiation."

"If you take," says Zuinglius himself, "the word est, without a figure, the substance of the bread must be changed

* Liberty of Prophecy, sec. 20.

† Calvin's Second Defence against Whesphalius, p. 664.

into that of the body of Christ, so that what had been bread, is no longer so.—*Fieri nequit, quin panis substantia in ipsam carnis substantiam convertatur panis ergo amplius non est, qui antea panis erat.*” * And in his reply to Luther, he presses him thus: “If the pronoun ‘this,’ points to the bread, and that you reject a figure in the words, it will inevitably follow, that the bread doth become the body of Christ; *jam panis transit in corpus Christi, et est corpus subitò, quod jam panis erat.* So that,” he says, “if you reject the figure, the Pope has every reason to insist on transubstantiation.” † Transubstantiation once admitted, adoration of our Saviour, as present in the Eucharist, inevitably follows.

“Heshusius,” says Calvin, “cannot deny that adoration is due to Christ either in or under the elements; as to my part, I have ever reasoned thus: If Christ be under the bread, he is to be adored therein.” ‡

“I am astonished,” says Beza, writing against the same Lutheran, “how you can possibly leave adoration free, to be paid or not, confessing, as you do, a real presence in the Eucharist; for my part, did I believe him really present, I would not only consider adoration proper, but indispensable.” §

“If the true body of Christ be present on the altar, as the Church of Rome asserts, he should there receive the most profound adoration possible.” ||

“I am decidedly of the opinion of both Calvin and Beza,” says Dr. Drelincourt, “did I believe the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, I would unquestionably adore him

* Zuinglius in *Exegesi contra Lutherum*, p. 336.

† Zuinglius de *Cœna Domini*, folio 275.

‡ Participatio Christi in *Cœnà*, p. 727.

|| Beza contra Westphalum, p. 245.

§ Jurieu, *Voice of Elias*, p. 32.

therein.”* And lest the reader might consider these foreign writers as singular in their opinions, let him recollect the words already cited from Bishop Andrews, viz., “The king adores Christ truly present in the Eucharist, and I do with St. Ambrose ‘adore the flesh of Christ in the mysteries.’”

“The corporal presence once established, both the popish mass and the adoration of Christ therein follow of course.”†

“Adoration of the Eucharist is a natural consequence of the Roman doctrine *jurè et facto*, because if the Eucharist be in substance not bread, as we say, but the body of Christ, as they affirm, it is evident that it not only may be, but should be adored, as Christ’s body is in every place an object of adoration.”‡ Your Lordship, I presume, need not be told that Mr. Daillé was one of the most learned Protestant ministers of France.

“The sounder Protestants, *Protestantes saniores*, have no doubt,” says Bishop Forbes, “of the propriety of adoring Christ in the reception of the Eucharist with true sovereign worship.”§

In fine, says the noted Jurieu, addressing his Catholic brethren, “In order to express the manner in which you understand the presence of Christ in the Eucharist, you tell us that he is not there according to a natural manner of existence, viz., in a corporal one, but in a mysterious or sacramental way, though still truly, really, and substantially an object of faith, and the food of our souls. Now this is precisely what we believe ourselves. We all adopt the very same expressions, for which reason, many of our divines, on

* False Shepherd discovered.

† Ursinus, *Catechismus de Liberatione hominis*.

‡ Daillé’s *Apology for the Reformation*, chap. 9.

§ Forbes’ on the Eucharist, book 2, chap. 2, sec. 9.

perusing our writings suspect that, though you accuse us of departing from the real doctrine of the Church, yours is in reality the same as ours." *

Should your Lordship, or any of your friends, resort to the old cavil of Christ's presence on earth being incompatible with his presence in heaven, I reply in the words of a most learned Protestant minister: "The corporal presence in the Eucharist, is not against any article of faith. It destroys not the ascension of our Lord, nor is his rendering himself present on this earth whenever he pleases, any way incompatible with it. The contrary is merely a consequence of our own; the essence of his body remains the same." †

As to the primitive fathers and their doctrine in respect of transubstantiation, so much misrepresented by Protestants, particularly by Tillotson, in his bombastic and blasphemous 26th discourse, they are fairly and totally given up to us by the learned Dr. Parker, Bishop of Oxford; the great Scaliger acknowledging also the impossibility of proving the Calvinian doctrine, now so prevalent in England, from their writings.

"It is evident," says the above mentioned prelate, "to all ordinarily conversant in ecclesiastical history, that the ancient Fathers did, from age to age, assert the true and real presence of Christ in very high and expressive terms: the Greeks called it *metabole*, &c., and the Latins agreeably with them, conversion, transmutation, transformation, transelementation, and at length transubstantiation; by all which expressions they meant neither more nor less than the real and substantial presence of Christ in the Eucharist." ‡ Thus this candid and learned man.

"I have often wondered," says the great Scaliger, "that

* Jurieu's Voice of Elias, p. 27.

† Commare's Letter to Vigier, p. 39.

‡ Parker's Reasons for abrogating the Test, p. 13.

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, as Mr. Marnix observed to me, speaking of M. Plessis Mornay and others, who had rashly undertaken to do so." *

Ponder well, my Lord Bishop, as a prelate of the Church of England,† on the following awful words of the learned Protestant Claude to Mr. Arnauld:‡ "Let Mr. Arnauld recollect, that our present dispute of the real presence is such, that either heaven or hell must be the lot of whichever of us makes a wrong choice. Let him remember it, for we cannot forget it." §

I shall here notice among the numerous inconsistencies of Protestants, one in particular, which must astonish not a little any sober and reflecting man. They cry up Scripture as an easy rule of faith, they appeal to it while they refuse to listen to this positive testimony of Christ's own words. They cry

* Scaligerana, p. 78.

† "It is affirmed by Bishop Ridley, (says Heylin, one of the principal compilers of the Liturgies,) 'that in the sacrament of the altar, is the natural body and blood of Christ; and if there be the natural body, there must be a real presence in his opinion.' The question between us and the Papists is not concerning a real presence, which the Protestants do also profess, it is agreed on both sides that there is a true and real presence, the difference being only in the *modus presentiæ*."—(*Heylin's Introduction to Cyprianus Anglicus*, p. 15.)

‡ Claude's Second Reply to Arnauld, p. 627.

§ In the last few pages I have availed myself largely of the before named work of the learned Julius Vindex, omitting or changing a few words applicable to Archbishop Magee, to whom his argument was addressed.

up, I say, the Scripture as a very easy rule of faith, and yet at the same time, they pretend that it says one thing and means another. Surely if Christ ever expressed himself clearly, it would be on this solemn occasion, when settling a treaty, an alliance, and making his last will and testament, which should ever be couched in the most simple and plain language.* Does a wise man on such occasions make use of unusual figures of speech? Does he say, as I remarked in my former letter, for instance, that he bequeaths a diamond when he intends only to bequeath the figure or a representation of a diamond. Such a manner of arguing is downright nonsense; the fact being, your Church is built on pride, error, and inconsistency. Hear Dr. Lingard, whose very name carries with it such weight, and who most justly remarks: "The new doctors, the pride of evangelical liberty, believed one day one thing, and another day another; and as men and circumstances changed, the creed of the English Church was improved or corrupted by successive alterations. The first book of Common Prayer was a book of godly travail. The Commons, Lords, and infant head of the Church, pronounced it to have been composed with the aid of the Holy Ghost. (2 and 3 Ed. VI. c. 1.)†

* It is a received maxim with lawyers, that all testaments are to be interpreted in the obvious and literal sense of the testator's words. How absurd is it not therefore in Protestants to wrest the clear words of Christ, in making his last will, to bear a figurative sense in opposition to the constant testimony of the Greek and Latin Church in all ages?

† On this subject I will refer my readers to Bishop Beveridge's Explanation of the Catechism, p. 14. It is amusing enough to observe with what ingenuity the Right Rev. Prelate gradually slides through three pages, from the body and blood of Christ, till he at last rests on a secure standing place, the graces of the body and blood of Christ.

“In the second Gospel the communion was ordered to be delivered with the following words, ‘The body of our Lord Jesus Christ, which was given for thee, preserve thy body and soul to everlasting life.’ But it was soon discovered that this form savoured of the corruption of Popery; within a few years, though it had been adopted by the aid of the Holy Ghost, it was expunged, and a new form substituted by the aid of the said divine spirit. The Eucharist was no longer the body of Christ; by the magic touch of an Act of Parliament, it was converted in a bare resemblance of his death, ‘Take and eat this in remembrance that Christ died for thee; and feed on him in thy heart by faith and thanksgiving.’ This new form, with the declaration in the articles, gave offence to many whose minds could not keep pace with the principal Reformers in the godly career of innovation; and in the third of Elizabeth it was determined to quiet their alarms, and to allure them to the Established Church, by adopting a language more conformable to their feeling and belief. Hence in the delivery of the communion, both the forms of Edward the 6th were ordered to be united, that the objections of the Catholic might be removed, without offending the scruples of the orthodox believer; and in the article, the denial of the real presence was obliterated, and in its stead an explication introduced, which according to the prejudices or judgment of the reader might, from the manner in which it was worded, denote either the real existence or the real non-existence of Christ’s body and blood in the Lord’s supper. This, I believe, will prove to be the true history of the obscurity which prevails in every official document on the nature of the sacrament; the best interpretation of the unknown tongue, under which the established Church has chosen to veil her real sentiments.”—*(See Gilbert, Bishop of Sarum, on the Thirty-nine Articles, art. 28.)*

In conclusion now, my Lord Bishop, I assert, that every

religion is to be avoided which contains heresies that have been condemned by the Catholic and Apostolic Church, the ground and pillar of truth, and which have always been considered as such by her; but all these new religions contain such heresies; they are, I maintain, nothing more or less than a heap of different heresies propagated and taught in past ages by several heretics, and all of which, I repeat, have been uniformly anathematized by the universal Church, therefore they are to be avoided.

I am now to prove my minor, and therefore I have to consider the principal points of doctrine which these religions teach.

1st. Luther and Calvin, the fathers of your pretended Reformation, declare that there is no free will; and Luther in his 26th Article affirms, "That it is the principal foundation of his religion." See also Calvin, L. 1, Recognit. But this was long ago the heresy of Simon Magus, and of Valentinus, as is testified by St. Augustine, (*Hær.* 11,) and of the Manicheans, as is proved also from St. Augustine, (*In Prolog. Contra Pelag.*) and of Wickliffe, &c. (*In Conc. Constant. Sess.* 8.)

2nd. Luther and Calvin teach, "That God is the instigator or mover of all wickedness, and that every sort of evil springs from God's decree." And this again in former ages was the heresy of Simon Magus, (*See Vincent Lirin.*) and of Florinus, (*Eusebius, L.* 5, *c.* 20.)

3rd. Both teach, "That good works are not necessary to salvation, and that faith alone is sufficient for salvation." This was an heresy of the same Simon Magus, as is stated by St. Irenæus, (*L.* 1, *c.* 20,) and of the Eunomians, about the year of Christ 360, as is proved by St. Augustine, (*Hær.* 54.)

4th. Both teach, that sins though they be ever so great and numerous, cannot injure him who has faith, for that the malice of them is not to be imputed to him who believes.

This was the heresy of the Eunomians, as related by St. Augustine, (*Hær.* 54,) of Basilides, and of Carpocrates, as mentioned by St. Irenæus, (*L.* 1, *c.* 23, 24.)

5th. Calvin denies the real presence of Christ's body in the Eucharist. But this was the heresy of Berengarius, about the year of our Lord 1051, where it is to be remarked, first, that though some persons privately had doubts on that great dogma of Catholic faith, the real presence, yet it was never publicly broached till Berengarius was hardy enough to have moved the question, as is related by Hugh of Langres, and Adelman of Bressia, in their Epistles to Berengarius, and by Paschasius in his book on the words of the institution of this sacrament; the fact being, that the real presence was ever the uniform doctrine of the Catholic Church, and was never opposed by any heretic until the time of Berengarius. Secondly, that this heresy of Berengarius was condemned by many Councils, as I have stated in my first letter; likewise Berengarius had three times abjured his error, and ended his life by dying very penitent in the bosom of the Catholic Church. After his death his heresy lay buried in oblivion for two hundred years, that is, till the time of the Lollards, who revived it, and which is proved by Trithemius's Chronicle about the year 1315. After them, Wickliffe broached the same heretical opinion, as appears from his third article. After his death this heresy again slumbered in silence for the space of one hundred years, till Zuinglius renewed it; and after him Calvin and others; whereby it appears certain that the rejecting the real presence was always considered by the Church as an egregious heresy. Therefore, my Lord Bishop, that the Church has either always erred in a principal article of divine faith, and consequently was never Christ's true Church on earth, or that opinion which abrogates and inveighs against the real presence of Christ's body in the sacrament, is a damnable heresy.

6th. Both Luther and Calvin reject tradition, and declare that every thing necessary for salvation is to be found in Scripture alone. This was the heresy of the Arians, as is recorded by St. Augustine, (*L. 1, Contra. Maxim. c. 2, et ult.*); also of Nestorius, Dioscorus, and Eutyches, as is declared in the Seventh Synod, Act 1.

7th. Both deny the sacraments of penance and confirmation. The Novations taught the same opinions centuries ago, as is proved by St. Cyprian and by St. Theodoret, (*L. 4, Epist. 2, L. 3, Fabularum.*)

8th. Luther and Calvin declare, that the Church consists of good alone; that the Church in former times was visible, but perished notwithstanding for many ages, and that at the present moment the elect alone remain in their congregations. Now, my Lord Bishop, this was the very heresy of the Donatists, as is recorded by St. Augustine, (*L. de Unit. Eccl. c. 12.*)

9th. Luther and Calvin teach, that prayers are not to be offered for the dead; and that the fast of Lent, or even any fasts, as commanded by the Church, are not to be kept, but that every one is to fast whenever it appears good to him. The Arians taught the very same in former ages, if we may believe St. Epiphanius, (*Hær. 75,*) and St. Augustine, (*L. de Hær. c. 33.*)

10th. Luther and Calvin condemn that any veneration should be paid to holy relics, to the images of Christ and of his Saints, and call it idolatry. Vigilantius did precisely the same thing in past ages, as is mentioned by St. Jerome. The same has been done by the image breakers, as is related by Zonaras, Cedrenus, and Nicephorus, regarding those who made war against images.

By all these powerful testimonies which I have produced, it is manifest, that the chief opinions of Lutheranism, of Calvinism, and of the established Church, are all borrowed and, in fact,

grounded on heresies long since condemned by the ancient Church, and which were always regarded by her as heresies.— (*See Bellarman, de Notis Eccl. c. 9; and Coccius, de Signis Eccl. L. 8, Art. 3.*) In a word, I feel sure on reflection, that your Lordship must agree with me, that the great malady of Protestants is the pride of reason, which never consents to believe that it could be deceived.

I am,

My Lord Bishop,

Your obedient Servant,

VERAX,

A CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

POSTSCRIPT.

Protestants should acknowledge with a holy fear, to what a degree they are inexcusable if they do not submit to 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 incomprehensible eating of the flesh of our Lord, because the word of God represents those who were 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. The consolation of the Catholic is, that if on one side 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 in conduct they resemble the first deserters from the communion of Jesus Christ, Catholics have the comfort to see themselves here 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 the words of eternal life, and that he has the power to do more than man can conceive, and that how incomprehensible soever his words may be, they are the only way by which we can come to life everlasting. Thus the Disciples who here abandoned 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 I will venture here to entreat my readers to meditate well on the following quotations from two of the most illustrious doctors of God's church, viz., from St. Cyprian and from St. Augustine, who is, according to Calvin, the most faithful witness of antiquity. St. Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage in Africa, who lived in the third century, says: "The priest in consecrating imitates what Jesus Christ did, and indeed is our Lord's lieutenant, and offers then a true, perfect, and accomplished sacrifice in the faithful Church to God the Father, endeavouring to do as Jesus Christ himself did at his last supper."—(*L. 2, Ep. 3.*) St. Augustine says: "Oh most beautiful Jesus Christ, I beseech thee by that sacred effusion of thy precious blood, whereby we are redeemed, grant me contrition of heart, and a fountain of tears, especially, whilst I, although unworthy, am assisting at the sacred altar, desiring to offer up to thee that admirable and celestial sacrifice, worthy of all reverence and devotion, which thou, oh Lord my God, immaculate priest, didst institute and command to be offered up in commemoration of thy charity, that is, of thy passion."—(*Manual, c. 11.*)

NOTE I, TO LETTER II.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

The doctrine of Transubstantiation is a natural consequence of the real presence—so natural, that many of the leading ministers of the Calvinistic body, assembled in Council, have expressed their surprise that the Lutherans do not adopt it. “For,” say they, “as the rod of Moses was not changed into a serpent but by transubstantiation; as water did not become blood in Egypt, or wine in Cana, without a change—so, in the Eucharist, bread cannot become the body of Christ, if it be not changed into his flesh by losing the substance of bread.”—(*Synod of Czenger. See Bossuet’s History of the Variations of the Protestant Religion, Book 2, chap. 33.*) Thus do we see, that the Catholic doctrine on this important subject is, in a manner, admitted and taught by our greatest opponents—the Lutherans admitting the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, the Calvinists teaching that if the real presence be admitted, Transubstantiation cannot be rejected.

Three hundred years and upwards have elapsed since the Sacramentarians attacked the doctrine of Transubstantiation; they ransacked the Scripture and Fathers to prove their novel opinions; but a host of Catholic divines have triumphantly demonstrated, from the same authorities, from Councils, ancient liturgies, and the united evidences of the Greek and Latin Churches, that Transubstantiation has been the invariable doctrine of the Catholic Church from the days of Christ down to their own times. On this article, as on all other points, Protestants have made but a feeble defence; driven from position to position, they changed their mode of attack, and scarcely employ any argument now against the doctrine in question, but that of reason and the evidence of the senses, excluding all scriptural mysteries, according to the Socinian system. “If Protestants be not orthodox in this particular,” says D’Alambert, “they are, at least, consistent with their own principles,” namely, that the “Scripture is the rule of faith, as understood by every man of sound judgment;” if he read the Scripture with a pure intention, and judge by it that there is no mystery of the Trinity, Incarnation, &c., he may, no doubt, deny those mysteries, as not being grounded, according to his judgment, on the evidence of the senses. There are, however,

some mysteries in nature, and our senses are as liable to deception, with regard to them, as they are in these of religion, as appears from the following examples.

Square towers appear circular when viewed from a distance, and seem smaller than they are in reality. What becomes of the evidence of our senses in this case, in opposition to reason? The organ of vision is also deceived with regard to motion, as when we set sail with a fresh breeze from port, the shores seem in motion, and the villas and cities retreating. Should we be remote from a long chain of mountains, the convex as well as the concave parts of them appear to the view like a plain level surface. The Sun appears sometimes only two feet, at most, in diameter; though according to astronomers, it is about one million three hundred and ninety-three thousand times bigger than the earth. Who could imagine the square of the hypotenuse to be equal to the sum of the squares of the two sides, though the sum of the sides is larger than the hypotenuse?

It is demonstrated, that the diagonal is incommensurable with the sides of the square; yet it is impossible to account for this incommensurability. The senses tell such as view from the base one of the largest pyramids of Egypt, (it is, according to Herodotus, 800 feet high, and its base covers eight acres of ground,) that its summit resembles almost a spire; were all mankind assembled in the same place, they would say, that the top of that pyramid terminates in a point; yet reason, which judges of the altitude and proportions of the object, assisted by art and experience, correct that mistake, and tells us, notwithstanding the general voice of the senses of mankind, that the top of a pyramid is a platform, capable of containing fifty persons. Are we not, therefore, justified in asserting, that were all mankind to deny, that God revealed the doctrine of Transubstantiation, (for it is foolish to reject a fact revealed to us by God, because we do not think it possible,) would not faith have a right to correct that general error, as we see reason has a right to correct the error of the senses and imagination with regard to the pyramid? The evidence of our senses, no doubt, is often of very great use, but they are not so on many occasions; our senses do not even distinguish between poison and a wholesome remedy; the sight as well as taste are deceived in the common beverage of adulterated tea and coffee; we know their bad qualities only from their effects.

Locke says, he cannot assent to a proposition, which affirms "the same body to be in two distinct places at once;" it seems this philosopher forgot, that the human soul, which though an immaterial substance, "is a body in its peculiar manner of existence," says Tertullian, (2 *Advers. Prax.* c. 7,) "The human soul is a body in a certain sense," says St. Augustine, (*Cont. Ep. Fund.* c. 16,) and exists in every part of the human frame at one and the same time; the voice of the orator is heard by the whole and every part of the assembly, and although but only one, is heard in many places at once. There is no parallelogram, how small soever, which may not be extended from the earth to the heavens in infinitum, without becoming at the same time of greater capacity; hence had an angel the power to reduce himself to a point, and of course to a line, he might occupy any given extension or length whatever, and he would at the same time be present in heaven and on earth. Had Locke reflected, that a burning torch or stick twirled with rapidity, appears to be at the same time coexistent with every part of a circle, he would then have perhaps admitted that a body could be, by Almighty power, in two places at once, and that what is possible in appearance to the creature, is possible in reality to the Creator, with whom all things are possible.

But let us examine Locke's opinion upon Protestant principles: Protestants profess to believe, that in eating the bread and drinking the wine, they receive spiritually by faith the body and blood of Christ; a Protestant therefore animated with faith, may receive the body and blood of Christ as often as he uses bread and wine at his ordinary meals, or on other occasions, though he be neither priest nor minister; for it is not the consecration made by the minister, but the faith of the receiver, according to Protestants, which renders the body and blood of Christ spiritually present. Let us now suppose, that the Protestant population of the British empire amounts to ten millions of persons, and that twenty thousand of that number receive the sacrament on the same day and moment, and render Christ's body and blood spiritually present, by their faith, at the same instant. Here, then, are the body and blood of Christ not only in two places, but in twenty thousand places at one and the same instant. It is strange, that a solution so simple escaped the penetration of this philosopher.

But the great objection against Transubstantiation, is that of

Tillotson, which has been employed by Hume and other Protestant writers. They say, that "this doctrine is contrary to the reason and sense of mankind." Yet, it is not more contrary to sense and reason than the doctrine of the Trinity. Trinity and unity, in one and the same respect, is a contradiction; but in different respects, there is not even the shadow of a contradiction; for the unity is in respect of the nature, the Trinity in respect of the persons. Transubstantiation is not more contrary to sense and reason, than that the Sun and every fixed star should be greater than the earth; that he who appeared to Joshua, (v. 13, 14,) and to the holy women, should be an angel. But if God revealed it to them, that he who appeared to be a man, was not a man but an angel, must they have believed God or their senses? If they said, they would believe their senses rather than God, they would be guilty of downright blasphemy. "Our senses," says Tillotson, "afford us a physical certainty, that the substance of bread exists wherever we see its appearances." It is astonishing that Protestants, who are so well informed in other respects, have not well considered that the same objection may be proposed against the Incarnation; and that they themselves are obliged, as professing that mystery, to give the solution; for we take it for granted, that they admit revelation. Had not they who perceived all the visible characters of human nature in Christ, an apparent physical certainty, that he was a human person? How then could they believe his divinity, or the mystery of the incarnation? What became in this case of the evidence of sense? The same as in the Eucharist; we see the appearances of bread, but not the body of Christ, except by faith. Sense could not discover the divine nature in him "in whom dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead corporally. The Jews could not perceive the divine nature in him, when he said: "I and the Father are one," (St. Mark xvi. 5, and Matt. xxviii. 5,) for which they were going to stone him, "because," said they, "thou being a man, makest thyself God." According to this fine Protestant principle, we should believe no miracles, not even those of Christ himself, unless we had seen him perform them.

But to show the weakness of Tillotson's objection, let us suppose, that a man who was blind from his birth recovers his sight for a moment, that he sees another man placed between two mirrors. He sees three men exactly alike, and whose movements are precisely

the same. It is impossible for him, according to those who have written on the theory of vision, to discern which of the three figures is the real man, unless he ascertain it by the touch. (*Locke, B. 2, c. 9.**) Let us also suppose, that this man loses his sight immediately after. Let us next consider, if possible, the mysteries and wonders the blind man must believe, and the proofs which we may deduce from them against all kinds of certainty. He is told, that the three persons or visible figures which he saw in the mirrors are but one single man. Is it easier for him to comprehend that, than the mystery of the Trinity? Here is the miracle of a human body existing in many places at once, notwithstanding Mr. Locke's assertion. He must admit, that the visible qualities of the human substance exist in two plates of glass, without the human substance itself, and of course, all the wonders of transubstantiation. He must persuade himself, that matter is penetrable, as he saw distinctly a human body moving in a solid plate of glass which resists the touch. He may be told, it is true, that the organ of vision has been entirely deceived; but he will hence conclude, that the faculty of seeing is only a constant illusion, calculated to make us doubt of the most evident axioms of metaphysics and natural philosophy. What then is this blind man to do? Must he doubt and distrust the testimony of mankind, and oppose to the moral certainty of their attestation the metaphysical certainty of the principles of reasoning and the physical certainty of the course of nature? It would follow, in short, from Tillotson's objection, that a blind man is an idiot, should he credit the assertion of a number of men, who assure him of a fact which is contrary to the testimony of his senses. He is physically certain by the touch, that a flat, smooth surface does not produce a sensation of cavities or protuberances; he should not believe, therefore, what he is told of a looking glass, a portrait, or a piece of perspective. Unbelievers have been often invited to reply to the above comparisons, and to show in what their reasonings are different from those of the blind man, yet nothing has hitherto appeared in their writings to solve that difficulty. Some of them have candidly acknowledged † that they could give no answer whatever.

The principal answer to the objection, arising from the evidence

* See also Berkley's Theory of Vision, N. 102.

† Diderot's Letter on the Blind, pp. 12, 13, 44, 45.

of the senses, may be comprised in the following words: its principle militates against the mysteries of the Trinity and the Incarnation, which are admitted by Protestants. The holy Fathers were well acquainted with that objection, but never thought it worthy of disquisition. Many fallacies, as we have shown, result from the testimony of the senses.

The rule which Christ handed down to correct the error of the senses, is contained in these words: This is my body; this is my blood; as all the holy Fathers acknowledge. But were it maintained that this rule, transmitted by the Holy Ghost, is not quite sufficient, because it cometh only by the sense of hearing, and not by that of seeing, the assertion would go to deny the omnipotence of Christ, and subvert the whole fabric of divine revelation.

Blessed, then, are Catholics; thrice blessed, indeed, provided their deeds correspond with their faith! In them are verified the words of our Lord to St. Thomas: "Blessed are they, who have not seen, and have believed." Let us humble ourselves and confess, that it is not for a créature, how excellent soever, to comprehend the truths which the Creator has thought fit to conceal; "for if the works and ways of God could be conceived by human reason, they would cease to be wonderful, and could not be called unsearchable."

I shall now conclude, my Lord Bishop, with a very just quotation from the Annual Review of 1806, as follows: "The declaration against Transubstantiation is yet extorted from the members of the House of Commons, although the Church of England consecrates that doctrine by maintaining that the body and blood of Christ are verily and indeed received by the faithful at the Lord's supper. This may be called consubstantiation by Lutheran sophistry; but it only removes the transubstantiation of the sacramental elements from the chalice of the priest to the mouth of the communicant. We comprehend not, how any Evangelical Christian, or sincere member of the Church of England, can assent to this declaration without feeling the remorse of perjury."—(*pp.* 565, 566.)

NOTE 2, TO LETTER II.

Mankind believed that God was present by grace; but what is grace? It is an aid given to man, enabling him to regain the state

in which he was created; renovating, because it relates to fallen man, and consequently purely gratuitous. It is, in another point of view, a continuation of the creative action. Since the incarnation of the word, the Church has believed in the real presence of Christ; but what is the real presence, but the incarnation perpetuated? The dogma of the Eucharist is as naturally and as intimately connected with the order of ideas which is based on the incarnation, as is the dogma of grace with the more general order of ideas, though fundamentally the same, which has for its basis, the restoration of rational beings according to the primitive plan of the Creation. It is uniformly a belief in the actual presence of the Deity, but under two different modes, having the same mutual relation as the two fundamental facts by which they are determined; for the real presence is to the mere divine action or grace, precisely what the incarnation is to the will of assisting fallen man. The generative term of the union of God with man having changed, the fruits are different; but in both cases the proportion is preserved. Thus all the mysteries of love are interwoven with each other, or rather, they are the progressive accomplishment of the same merciful design, of which the Eucharistic union is the last terrestrial compliment; how beautiful the harmony which presents, under so magnificent an aspect, to the reason of man, this mystery, which is also the tenet of his heart, being the purest and sweetest of his consolations.

The error of those who reject the real presence is, in relation to Christianity fully developed, what the system of the ancient philosophers, who denied the dogma of grace, was to primitive Christianity: an error which the Pelagians sought to combine with Christian ideas. By creation, said the former, we receive from God all that constitutes man, what necessity for a new divine action? By the union of the Word with human nature, said the latter, we received all that constitutes the Christian, what necessity for a new union with God? The first did not understand that man stood in need of a communion in divine grace to maintain the life of the soul, or to practice the primeval law. The second are still ignorant that a communion in the divine substance of the incarnate Word, is necessary to possess the plenitude of life, and to attain the high perfection of the evangelical law, which is the end and consummation of the former. But when they suppose that, in recognising the necessity whether of grace, or of the eucharistic communion, injury is done

the Creator or Redeemer, they forget that the eucharistic communion is the means by which the permanent incarnation is individualized in every Christian, as grace is the means by which the divine permanent power operates in a particular manner in every man, and thus, so far from detracting from the creative power, or from the renovating influence of the incarnation, nothing is better fitted to give a more exalted notion of them, than this continual want of participating in them, as nothing is more capable to inspire us with a lively sentiment of the infinite love they reveal, than this inexhaustible communication of both one and the other. Hence the beautiful expression of Bourdaloue, rigorously true with respect to grace, but supereminently so with respect to the Eucharist, or grace by excellence: "God exalts himself by this infinite condescension."

The analogies which I have just noticed show how Protestantism, in setting out with the denial of the Catholic dogma of the Eucharist, has proceeded step by step to reject the dogma of grace, the foundation of all religion; and this progress of Protestantism confirms in turn the accuracy of these analogies. For the history of doctrines is by no means a vain phenomenon. Their external connection shadows forth the internal association of ideas, and gives a palpable form to their logic. The three leaders of the Reformation combined against Catholic mysticism, assail each from his ground, the belief in the sacrament of love. Luther mutilates and denaturalizes it. Calvin, by veiling under equivocal expressions the substance of his doctrine, annihilates it. Less cunning, but more enterprising, Zuinglius lifts the veil. The first effect of their common doctrine was, that the Reformation exhibited a worship divested of sacrifice, and was thus placed without the pale of religion, such as it has been conceived in all ages. Shortly, by a natural consequence, Socinianism, following up the work of destruction, assailed the dogma of the real presence in the incarnation itself, as well as the fundamental idea of sacrifice by attacking the Redemption. Though ancient Protestantism had struggled some time against the ascendancy of Socinian doctrines, the latter have however prevailed, save in the old liturgies, they are to be met with in all the writings of the Reformers. Faith in prayer and in grace, the last link that binds man to God, still survived amid the wreck of

these crumbling doctrines; but the Rationalists of Germany * betray a marked tendency to hold up this belief as a ridiculous superstition, irreconcilable with the laws of nature. Thus as the Reformation advances, the living worship retires, a desert expands around it, and in this moral waste, where all the sources of love are dried up, prayer, even prayer which springs up wherever a particle of faith remains, withers and dies beneath the blighting influence of Rationalism. One of the most celebrated Doctors of ancient Protestantism demanded what connection could exist between faith in the real presence and faith in prayer? He took credit to himself that he could not understand it; and indeed what is it these men have understood? The history of their own doctrine fully developed, confounds their presumptuous ignorance; it shews that the germ of Catholic mysticism exists in faith in prayer. In truth, whoever admits that a simple act of the human will effects a change in the spiritual or material order of the universe, and that God obeys the voice of man, he makes a most profoundly mystical act of faith, as it bears a relation to an order of things entirely beyond the sphere of his reasoning and sensation; and hence he is inconstant, if in retaining a belief on this subject, he refuses it on another, under the pretext that it transcends the sphere of his reason, or the conception of his reason. Here then we have one of the causes which will make Protestantism disappear as a religion, at a period which cannot be very remote. Its destiny impels it with an irresistible force to resolve itself into pure rationalism; for if the reason of each individual be absolute, it ought to admit nothing but what it clearly conceives. Rationalism, in turn, will abolish faith in prayer, because it is essentially indemonstrable. Now, prayer once destroyed, form if you can, my Lord Bishop, the notion of a religion? Catholicism, on the contrary, maintains its belief in the real presence, and communion in the substance of the word made flesh, by an act of faith essentially similar to that by which the presence of God, through his action and communion in grace, by means of prayer, have been at all times believed. Catholicism also maintains, in virtue of the same principle, the faith of all ages in divine communications, rendered more perfect by the

* Among others, Eberhard, Tunkeim, Spalding, Veigscheider, &c. Larrogeu, *Hist. of the Euch.* p. 41.

effects of the incarnation. To reject the Catholic doctrine, either we must discard the faith of antiquity, by denying that God was present to man in a particular manner, conformable to his nature, that is to say, in a human manner, or we must suppose that this union of God with man, which has ever been the foundation of religion, was not designed to be perfected; in other words, that the ancient worship was not designed to give place to a more excellent one; which inference would be directly opposed to the primitive traditions, that were the very vehicles of this faith in a future development.*

* I acknowledge that this note is purely metaphysical, consequently only adapted for those who are well instructed.

LETTER III.

That the Holy Eucharist is both a figure and the very body of Jesus Christ; that he is in several places at the same time; and that the sacrifice offered in many places is but one Christ.

TO THE LORD BISHOP OF EXETER.

MY LORD BISHOP,

The illustrious St. Augustine gives a plain and excellent testimony that the Eucharist is both the figure and the very body of Christ, when he says: “Corpus Christi et veritas et figura est; veritas dum corpus Christi et sanguis in virtute Spiritûs Sancti ex panis et vini substantiâ efficitur; figura verò est, quod exterius sentitur.”—(*De Consec. dist. 2, car. ver.*)—“The body of Christ is both the verity and the figure; it is the verity when the body and blood of Christ, by the power of the Holy Ghost, is made of the substance of bread and wine; but that is the figure which is outwardly perceived.” St. Hilary, Bishop of Rome, who succeeded Leo the First, speaks exactly in the same manner: “Corpus Christi quod sumitur de altare figura est, dum panis et vinum videntur extrâ, veritas autem, dum corpus et sanguis Christi interius creditur.”—“The body of Christ which is received at the altar is a figure, since bread and wine are outwardly seen; but it is the truth, since the body and blood of Christ are

inwardly believed *to be contained*." Now here we find both these learned men declaring that the sacrament is not a figure of the body of Christ, but the body itself; they understand and declare it not to be a figure only. A figure it is, but it is the body also, which St. Anselm very well expresses when he says: "Neque ab hoc sacramento figuram omninò excludimus, neque figuram solam admittimus."—(*Anselm. li. de offic. divi.*)—"We do not exclude altogether a figure from the sacrament, neither do we admit it to be only a figure."

This, my Lord Bishop, is the Catholic faith, that the holy sacrament is both a figure and also the very body of Jesus Christ. By this author also, who expounds Christ's words, is solved that flimsy, trifling, and sophistical argument, which Mr. Pilkington brought forward against Christ's presence in the sacrament, in the open discussion which took place at Cambridge against the sacrament. The argument was as follows: Christ took bread, he blessed bread, he brake bread. Wherefore he gave to his Disciples bread. If he gave them bread, then he gave them not his body.

In this argument, Mr. Pilkington uses the words as though by the acts, which the verbs express, nothing had been done. He says: Christ took bread, and blessed bread. By that act, Christ took bread, is declared one act; and when he blessed the bread, he performed another act; which Mr. Pilkington passes over, as if Christ in blessing the bread and wine had done nothing. By which sophism he really might just as well attempt to prove that Christ had given us no sacrament, as that he had not bequeathed to us his body and blood. For as Protestants say, he delivered that which he took; but he took bread, which is no sacrament; therefore he delivered bread, which is no sacrament. But permit me here to ask your Lordship, what did Christ do when he blessed the bread? Though Mr. Pilkington would have wished to have passed it over, yet St. Anselm (*Lib. de offic. divi.*) tells us what he

did. He says: "Accepit panem, et per illam benedictionem panis fit corpus Christi."—"He took bread, and by that benediction the bread is made the body of Christ." Now then where Mr. Pilkington reasons and says, "Christ took bread, and blessed bread, and therefore gave bread," he conceals the very act which Christ did when he blessed the bread. For by that blessing the bread was made the body of Christ, so that he might and did truly say, *Take and eat, this is my body*. He gave no bread, but his body, according to the truth of his words.

But your Lordship may here perhaps ask me, what does faith require of us to believe in regard to the great mystery of the Eucharist? I answer, three most wonderful things, and which are the divine effects of consecration. 1st. That the real body of our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and true man, is really, substantially, and truly present in the sacrament. 2nd. That in this sacrament after consecration no substance remains of what was there before. 3rd. That the accidents which prior to the consecration had for their subject and support the substance of bread and wine, remain in this sacrament, through a great miracle, without any support or subject. For that which we see, taste, and feel, are the same accidents which were before in the bread and wine; and yet, my Lord Bishop, there is neither bread nor wine, but only the substance of the body and blood of Jesus Christ; which in no respect are the support of the accidents.

You may probably ask me, if the body of our Lord has the same properties in the Eucharist, as it had on the Cross? To which I answer, No; for on the Cross his body was mortal and passible, and in the Eucharist it is impassible and immortal. 2nd. On the Cross the body of our Lord was visible and perceptible to the senses of the body, but in the sacrament it is concealed under the species after the way and with the properties of a spirit; for though we believe that his

true body is really present in this divine sacrament, notwithstanding it is after a spiritual manner; viz., we believe that the body of Jesus Christ is there a spiritual body, and not a terrestrial one. *There are bodies celestial and bodies terrestrial*, says St. Paul, (1 Cor. xv. 40 and 44,) *Our body is sown a natural* (or as our adversaries render it, a sensual) *body, it shall rise a spiritual body; if there be a natural* (or sensual) *body, there is also a spiritual*. We are taught by these words of this great Apostle, that one and the same body may be considered in two ways; 1st. As a natural or sensual body, that is to say, having the properties of other natural things that are sensual, and liable to be perceived by the senses of the body, which may be seen, divided, and felt. 2nd. As a spiritual body, viz., which has the properties of spirits; which are 1st, not to be perceptible to any of the senses; 2nd, to be in every part of the place where they are, and altogether in the whole place; 3rd, not to be divisible, because they have no parts; as God, the angels, and our souls, which are spirits. Now this being acknowledged, we believe that the body of our Lord is really, substantially, and truly present in the blessed sacrament of the Eucharist, but spiritually, that is, after a spiritual manner. We believe that the body of Jesus Christ is there a spiritual body, and not a sensual body. He is in the Eucharist as the soul is in our body, and as the word of God was in the humanity of Jesus Christ. When I say as, I mean *as really*, and not *in the manner*; so that this body can neither be perceived nor known by any of the senses, neither by seeing, smelling, tasting, nor yet by feeling. When the priest divides the host, he therefore does not divide the body of Jesus Christ, because he is there a spiritual body; and when the host is broken, the body of Jesus Christ remains whole in all its parts, without being either broken or divided.

Perhaps your Lordship would wish me to make a com-

parison, in order that you may conceive exactly what I mean. It is as follows: when our Lord died on the Cross, and his soul was separated from his body, the word which was within him was not therefore separated either from the soul or from the body, but remained entirely united to the soul which descended into Limbo, and also wholly united to the body which remained on the Cross; and nevertheless there was but one word. This is St. Cyprian's comparison to express the mystery of the Eucharist: "In our Lord," says he, "was seen the humanity; but the divinity was hidden; even so in the sacrament which is visible, the divine substance takes place."

Your Lordship may ask me, is it not wonderful that in the sacrament Jesus Christ has taken the properties of a spirit? To which I answer,—Not at all; because he had done so already during his life, as when he came from his blessed mother's womb, leaving her a virgin; he then took the qualities of a spirit, which passes through a wall without making any break therein. So likewise when the Jews designed to take him, his hour being not yet come, he made himself invisible, and passed through the midst of them without their perceiving him, either by sight or by feeling: he had taken the qualities of a spirit, and of a terrestrial body he had become a spiritual body. Your Lordship may likewise ask me, when the priest consecrates and pronounces these words, *This is my body*, must every Catholic believe that the body of our Lord, which ascended into heaven, descends upon our altars? I answer, No. It must remain there in its form, until he visibly comes at the general day of Judgment; but we believe that through an Almighty virtue, which exceeds the order of nature, this same body remaining always in heaven, is reproduced under the species of bread. I know well that Protestants assert, that Christ ascended into heaven and sits at the right hand of God the Father, *ergo*, he is not in the sacrament; to which the Catholic Christian

replies, though it be quite true that Christ sits at the right hand of God the Father, yet it by no means prevents his presence in the sacrament. For the Catholic confesses both: 1st. That Christ is present in heaven with his Father, according to the article of Catholic faith; and 2nd. That he is present in the sacrament, according to his word, when he said, *This is my body; do this for a commemoration of me.* So that his presence in heaven by no means prevents his being present in the sacrament, he being present in both, and in a manner agreeable to both.

Against this, Protestants reply, that every natural body can be but in one place. Christ had a natural body; *ergo*, it can be but in one place. But it is in heaven, exclaim they, as in a place; *ergo*, it is there and no where else. Remark well, my Lord Bishop, how Protestants fly to natural philosophy as to their great strength, in order to maintain their faith? Is it, let me ask, a sure and an immutable belief which is built on such a structure, (natural philosophy,) instead of being built upon the Scriptures, the ancient Fathers, or the universally received faith? Perhaps it may be said, that I argue thus in order to deface the validity of their matter. In order therefore to prevent this idea, I will mention the very argument which Œcolampadius, the great founder of this school, brings forward, he says as follows: "Si dicas, panis continet corpus, vide quid sequitur. Ergo panis locus erit, et unum corpus erit in multis locis, et multa corpora in uno loco, et corpus in corpore, &c."—(*Œcolampadius, de Verbis Cænæ Domini.*)—"If you say the bread contains the body, remark what must follow, then the bread shall be a place, and one body shall be in many places, and many bodies in one place, and one body in another."

Œcolampadius resorts to natural philosophy to prove his heresy, and endeavours to impugn the Catholic faith; although his argument proceeds directly against Luther, who taught

that the bread in the sacrament remains with the body of Christ.* Yet it is also against the Catholic faith, for it impugns the presence of Christ in the sacrament. But how, as is said, by natural reason? I will tell your Lordship why they pretend to prove this (their doctrine) by natural reason. Because it is quite unknown to Scripture; and I feel certain they never did, nor never can be able to bring forward any one text of Scripture to prove it, and which would at once diminish the Almighty power of God. But I shall answer Œcolampadius as regards his great argument, viz., natural reason, out of the writings of St. Ambrose, and which I have quoted in my first letter, who says, “Quid hic queris naturæ ordinem in Christi corpore, cum præter naturam sit ipse Dominus Jesus partus ex Virgine.”—(*De Initi. Myst. cap. 9.*)—“Why do you seek,” says St. Ambrose, “the order of nature here in regard to Christ’s body, seeing that the same Lord Jesus Christ was born of a Virgin out of the order of nature.” And I beg leave further to add, that besides his birth, many other of his acts were out of the order of nature; such as the great learning and wisdom displayed by him in his disputations with the Doctors, when he was but twelve years old; his walking upon the sea; his voluntary death, in giving up his blessed soul at his own pleasure, without force or violence; his resurrection and his ascension. All these, my Lord Bishop, were as much out of the order of nature, as that his blessed body be in several places; and Œcolampadius and his sect may find just as good and as solid arguments against them as against this; which if he do, or may do, shall we therefore follow his bad example, and deny Christ’s walking on the sea, his death, his resurrection,

* Such is the agreement between the Father and the Son, between master and the scholar, between Luther and Œcolampadius, and so of one of them with another.

and his ascension, as he and they (Protestants) did and do his real presence in the sacrament? If we did so, we should have a mingled faith, like the Turks. For they retain a part of the law of Moses, and a part of the inventions of Mahomet; consequently after this Mahometan manner, we should have a faith partly grounded upon Scripture, and partly on natural reason. But, my Lord Bishop, we Catholics will stick firm to the anchor of our faith, viz., to the Catholic Church, which we are commanded by the Saviour to hear and to obey under the most dreadful penalties. Wherefore, to conclude with St. Ambrose, "let us not seek the order of nature in Christ's body," but let us seek the order of faith, and let us cleave to it.

Now I here assert and declare, that I will demonstratively prove this point from clear scripture, viz., Christ our blessed Saviour taking the bread, and blessing it, made it his body, saying, "*Hoc est corpus meum.—This is my body.*"—(Matt. xxvi., Mark xiv., Luke xxii.) ; which being done, his body was at that time present in several places, as in his own hands, also in the hands of every one of his Apostles. Thus he carried himself in his own hands, as has been well remarked by St. Augustine, who says: "*Et ferebatur manibus suis. Hoc verò fratres, quomodò possit fieri in homine quis intelligat? Quis enim portatur in manibus suis? Manibus aliorum potest portari homo, manibus suis nemo portatur. Quomodò intelligatur in ipso David secundum litteram non invenimus, in Christo autem invenimus. Ferebatur enim Christus in manibus suis, quando commendans ipsum corpus, ait: Hoc est corpus meum.*"—(*St. August. in Psalm 33.*)—"And he was borne in his own hands. But brethren how can this be done in man, who can understand? A man may be carried in the hands of other men, in his own hands no man is carried. How it may be understood in regard to David himself according to the letter, we do not find; but that it may be

understood in Christ, we can easily conceive. For Christ was carried in his own hands when he, giving the self-same body, said, This is my body."

You have just heard St. Augustine affirming, that Christ carried himself in his own hands. Consequently this must follow, that the self-same body did bear or carry, and the self-same body that was borne or carried, being but the very one body of Christ, was then at one time in several places. And the same one body of Christ was at one time in twelve different places. And as it was then in so many, so it may now be in fewer or in more, according to the omnipotent pleasure of him who is the Lord of nature, and of natural order, and is subject to neither of them, but rules and alters them as seems best to accord with his wisdom to shew his honor and glory. This was so well known and so firmly believed by St Basil, that he prays thus in his mass: "Look, O Lord Jesus Christ our God, from thy holy tabernacle, and come to sanctify us; who sittest above with thy Father, and art with us here invisibly, vouchsafe with thy mighty hand to give us thy holy undefiled body and precious blood, and by us sinners to thy people."—(*Basil, in suâ Liturgiâ.*)

St. Chrysostom says: "O Lord Jesus Christ our God, look from thy holy tabernacle, and from the seat of the glory of thy kingdom, and come and sanctify us; who sittest above with the Father, and standest by us invisibly, vouchsafe with thy mighty hand to give us thy undefiled body and precious blood, and by us to all people."—(*Chrys. in suâ Liturgiâ.*) This great Saint says again: "This sacrifice is a counterpart (*Hoc autem sacrificium exemplar est illius*) of that which Christ offered. Even the self-same do we always offer, (*id ipsum semper offerimus.*) Neither do we now offer one Lamb, and to-morrow another, but always even the self-same. Therefore this is one sacrifice, for this reason, otherwise as it is offered in many places there would be many Christs. Not

so. But there is one Christ everywhere, being whole and entire both here and there, (et hic plenus existens, et illic plenus, unum corpus,) even one body. And as he, that is everywhere offered, is one body, and not many bodies; even so also is the sacrifice one, (Sicut enim qui ubique offertur unum corpus est, et non multa corpora; ita etiam et unum sacrificium.)"—*St. Chrys. in 10 ad He. Hom. 17.*) Weigh well, my Lord Bishop, this testimony of the great St. Chrysostom, and above all what he so fearlessly asserts, "That the sacrifice of Christ is but one. For otherwise as it is offered in many places, there would be many Christs.—Alioquin quoniam in multis locis offertur, multi Christi essent."—(*Chrysost. in 10, He. Hom. 17.*) In which words he plainly declares, that though Christ is offered in many places, yet there are not many Christs, but one Christ. This great Father teaches, not like a natural philosopher, but as a divine philosopher, a lover of the wisdom of Christ's faith, according to which, and contrary to philosophy, he confesses Christ's body to be in many places at once, and that with the most profound reverence, and not with doubtful admiration.

St. Ambrose says: "Therefore this sacrifice is one, and for this reason, that as it is offered in many places there would otherwise be many Christs. Not so; but everywhere one Christ, being complete both here and there, even one body. For as he who is offered everywhere is one body, and not many bodies, even so also is the sacrifice one."—(*St. Ambr. in 10 Heb.*) Therefore, my Lord Bishop, Christ who is offered everywhere is but one body, and one sacrifice. St. Ambrose says again: "We have seen the High Priest coming to us. We have seen and heard him offering for us his blood. Let us Priests, as we may, follow, that we may offer sacrifice for the people, although (etsi infirmi merito) by merit we are weak; yet are we by the sacrifice honorable,

(honorabiles tamen sacrificio.) For although Christ is not now seen to offer, yet he is offered on earth, when the body of Christ is offered."—(*St. Ambrose, in Psalm 38.*) No one can deny but that St. Ambrose says: "That Christ is offered on earth." But when is he offered? When his body is offered. Consequently it is evident, that as we may confess Christ to be truly in glory, so we may also confess that he is truly on earth, inasmuch as he is offered in sacrifice; and so his being truly both in heaven and on earth, is a truth which I labour here to prove.

I shall now proceed to give your Lordship the opinion of St Bernard, who says: "Oh most merciful Lord; that we little worms creeping upon the face of the earth, may have thee present, before our hands, before our eyes, who whole and entire sittest at the right hand of the Father; who also in a moment (*qui etiam unius horæ momento, ab ortu solis usque ad occasum*) from the East to the West, from the North to the South, is present to all. Thōu being one, art in many; and being the self-same, art in several places. Whence comes this, I say? Truly not from any obligation, (*Certè non ex debito,*) neither from any merit of ours, but of thy will, (*Et dulcedinus tuæ bene placito,*) and the pleasure of thy kindness."—(*St. Bernard, in Sermone de Cæna Dom.*) Therefore Christ being one, is at one time in many places. Behold here the great St. Bernard, not with scoffs and doubts, but with godly simplicity and reverence, confessing the verity of Christ's presence, both at the right hand of God the Father, and also in the sacrament before our hands, before our eyes, doubting of nothing, but wondering at the great goodness and mercy of our Lord and Saviour Christ to us poor miserable mortals.

Such was the simplicity of faith and the humbleness of mind of these holy Fathers, that believing the fact, they

acknowledged the great benefits of God. Whereas Æcolampadius and Sectarians in general, puffed up with pride, reject the simplicity of faith, and condemn the benefits of God. St. Bernard again says: "Give thanks, O spouse, rejoice incomparably. In the warfare of this present banishment, thou hast thy husband president, and ruler; thou hast the pledge, thou hast the earnest money by which thou mayest as a glorious and beloved spouse be united and joined to thy spouse in heaven with felicity; on earth thou hast thy spouse in the sacrament (in terra sponsum habes sacramento); in heaven thou shalt have him without any cover. Both here and there it is the verity. (In cœlis habitura es sine velamento, et hic et ibi; veritas; sed hic palliata, ibi manifestata.) - But here covered, there openly manifest."—(*St. Bernard, Serm. eod.*) Remark with attention, my Lord Bishop, this godly passage, and particularly as regards my present subject, to shew that the Church has her spouse Christ on earth in the sacrament, whom in heaven she shall behold in full vision surrounded with all majesty and glory. Here truly is Christ, there he is also truly; the only difference is, that here he is under a cover, there to be seen surrounded with all splendour.

Listen now to St. Chrysostom on this same subject, and see how perfectly St. Bernard coincides in opinion with him: "O miraculum, O Dei benignitatem, qui cum patre sursum sedet, in illo ipso temporis articulo omnium manibus pertractatur, ac se ipsum tradit volentibus ipsum accipere ac complecti."—"O miracle, O the goodness of God, he that sitteth above with God the Father, even in the same moment of time is handled by all, and he delivers himself to those who will receive him, and embrace him."—(*St. Chrysost. Lib. 3, de Sacer.*) Your Lordship perceives here, agreeable to the quotation which I have just given you, that this great Saint acknowledges and declares the great goodness of God, that Christ who sits at the right hand of the Father is at that

time* (meaning after the consecration) in the hands of men. At that period, he says, he is in the hands of men, it argues a real and substantial presence; for the spiritual presence cannot be in hands, but in hearts; and as a further invincible proof of this, St. Chrysostom exclaims with reverential wonder, "O miracle!" by this exclamation he acknowledges it to be a miracle, he declares that the bread is more than the figure of Christ's body. For that is no miracle to be astounded at. But he acknowledges the miracle to be, that Christ sitting above with the Father, should also be in the sacrament in the hands of men; this is the miracle. For this is above nature, and only done by the power of God, and therefore is a miracle. Thus then, my Lord Bishop, it is evident to the humble Christian, agreeable to the confession of these holy Fathers, that Christ's body is miraculously both in heaven and on earth in the sacrament, and so in like manner in many places at once, notwithstanding the contemptuous exclamation of Æcolampadius, limiting the power of God, by the impossibility, as it appeared to his unbelieving understanding, that the body of Christ should be in a thousand places. This exclamation of this arch-heretic was his best argument, and by which he seduced the people from their faith. But if this vile man had, and if sectarians would now but acknowledge the miracle with St. Chrysostom, they would soon perceive how foolish this line of argument is.

St. Gregory of Nyssen, who has been styled the Father of the Fathers, in his book on the Life of Moses, takes occasion from the manna to speak of the holy Eucharist, of which Christ himself has taught us to consider it an illustrious figure. These are his words: "And thus he is to receive within himself with a purified soul the food which descends

* St. Basil, Lib. 2, de Bapt. c. 2; St. Cyprian, Lib. 1, Ep. 5; St. Leo, Sermon de Jejunio; St. Chrysost. Hom. de prodict. Judæ.

from above; which no sowing has produced for us by the arts of agriculture, but which is bread prepared for us without sowing and ploughing, descending from above, and found upon the earth. But you know well, this true food according to the figure of the history, that the bread which comes down from heaven is not any incorporeal thing. For how should a thing incorporeal become nourishment to the body? But assuredly what is not incorporeal, is a body, . But the body of this bread is neither by ploughing nor sowing produced by agriculture; but the earth remaining as it is, is found full of this divine food, with which the hungry are filled, who have learned the mystery of the Virgin through this miracle. Therefore this bread not produced by agriculture, is also the word." Here, my Lord Bishop, is plain evidence of Transubstantiation; for the holy Father calls the Eucharist a body and bread not produced by agriculture, and declares it to be the word, our divine Saviour himself. No believer in a mere moral change could have spoken thus. For bread, even when morally changed as to its character, as says a most eminent Catholic theologian, and made holy, is still bread produced by previous tillage; nor can it be truly called the word, as St. Gregory calls the holy Eucharist.

I am,

My Lord Bishop,

Your obedient Servant,

VERAX,

A CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

POSTSCRIPT.

For the information of several of my Protestant relatives and friends, I here positively assert in answer to their questions, and without the least fear of contradiction, that such

places calling the Eucharist by the name of type, figure, memorial, mystery, &c., are granted by many eminent Protestant divines not to exclude the verity and reality; and the Fathers in these same places not only affirm it to be truly Christ's body, but add many other expressions as cannot mean anything but his personal body. And so little have Catholics ever apprehended the words sign, sacramental, memorial, and mystery, to be objectionable to their faith, that in the short prayer of the office and mass of the blessed sacrament they are all used at once. The prayer is: "Deus qui nobis sub sacramento mirabili passionis tuæ memoriam reliquisti; tribue quæsimus, ita nos corporis, et sanguinis tui sacra mysteria venerari, ut redemptionis tuæ fructum in nobis jugiter sentiamus." And when they deny the Eucharist to be a figure, it is only when there is reason to apprehend that word is used to exclude reality and substance. The words of Origen are: "Christ did not say, this is a symbol, but, this is my body, clearly or expressly, lest any one should think it a type."—(*Lit. g. Ap.*) Magnes says: "The Eucharist is not a type of the body and blood, as some men defective in their understanding have asserted, but rather the body and blood." St. Augustine, Protestants assert, affirms that "The ancient sacrifices of holy men were manifold, and various signs of this true sacrifice;"—(*Lit. a. Ap.*) but if Protestants had but mentioned here those words of the Saint in the same place, viz., "Christ is the priest who offers, and the thing which is offered," every one would have been persuaded that St. Augustine believed the body of Christ in the Eucharist to be his personal body, especially if the Protestants had added what follows, being what the Saint says, viz., "That the body sacrificed in the Eucharist is that body whereof the psalm says, 'Corpus autem aptasti mihi.'"—(*Vide Lit. e. Ap.*) which was certainly said of his personal body. Theodoret says: "Our Saviour taking the symbol, said not, this is my

divinity; but, this is my body."—(*Lit. k. Ap.*) I now put this syllogism, and I defy your Lordship to answer it, as follows: The Fathers teach it is the very body, whereof it is the image; but it is the image of his natural body; therefore it is his very natural body.

NOTE I, TO LETTER III.

Never was the belief concerning the Eucharist more powerfully established and justified than that of the Armenians; the Patriarch of Cis, who has the other Churches under his jurisdiction, gave attestations with the signatures of many Bishops and Vartabiets or Doctors, which were inserted at the end of the third volume, "*De la Perpétuité*," with those of the Armenians of Ispahan, Cairo, and of Constantinople. At last the Protestants themselves, who conversed with the Armenians, were forced to confess, that there could be no doubt but their belief in the Eucharist was precisely the same with that of Roman Catholics. Sir Paul Ricaut, in his "*Present State of the Armenian Churches*," how desirous soever he might have been to find some conformity between the belief of the Oriental and Protestant Churches, was obliged, after conferring with a great number of Armenians, to give the following testimony: "They believe Transubstantiation in the same manner as the Church of Rome. Our Lord said, This is my body, this is my blood. And the good people finding those words so clear, prefer taking them according to their plain and literal acceptation, than to perplex themselves with school quibbles, or the interpretation of the figurative sense." Sir Paul's observation amounts to this, that the Armenians are disposed, (like the disciples who did not separate from Christ, like the Capharnaïtes when he told them he would give them his flesh and blood,) and are always ready (as every good Christian ought to be) to say with St. Peter, "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life." The Armenians so firmly believe in the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, and feel so indignant against such as presume to deny it, that the Archbishop Stephen, the greatest enemy to the Latin missionaries, ever zealous to maintain the schism, and at the same time to defend the Christian religion against the infidels,

made the following reply, as related in the account of the mission of the Archbishop of Ancyra to Ispahan: "A Calvinist having asked him if it were true, that he believed a mouse could eat the body of Christ? * He answered boldly, Yes, I believe it could; and that adorable body would be, in such case, less dishonoured than if it were eaten by a wretch like thee, who darest contradict him, notwithstanding the many proofs of that truth contained in his gospel." Such separatists as desire less animated replies to their questions, may find them in a work entitled "*Thesaurus Linguae Armeniæ*," in which Mr. Schroeder, a learned Protestant of Hesse, gives in Armenian and in Latin † a dialogue between an Armenian Priest and an European Protestant.

NOTE 2, TO LETTER III.

The Church of England clings with desperation to that parent stock upon which alone her vitality depends, but from which she can never more receive sap or nutriment, by means of that moral separation which originated with her. We find Cerinthus, Arius, Montanus, Apollinaris, Manicheus, Eutyches, Pelagius, Socinus,

* "The divinity is everywhere present;" says Vernon, "but it does not hence follow, that when any substance is burnt or trampled under foot, that the divinity is burnt, &c. The case would be precisely the same if animals gnawed or eat the host or symbols; for it would not follow, that they eat the body of Christ. The body of Christ is eaten by man, because it is received as a sign, or a cause of grace, and it would not be such in the stomach of an animal, though it eat the symbols. Therefore it cannot be said, that an animal eat it, properly speaking, as it is eaten by man. If a dog eat a morsel of the consecrated bread which is used by Protestants at the Lord's supper, it would not, on that account, eat the sacrament, considered as a sign." The body of Christ is now, my Lord Bishop, immortal and incorruptible, and consequently not liable to corruption; the eucharistic species, under which the body is concealed, may indeed be corrupted, but not the body of Christ. But although the sacrament should be profaned, cast into the mire, &c., this is not more unworthy of Christ than to be spit upon, scourged, and crucified, between two thieves.

† For this Dialogue and the Armenian Liturgy, see Père J.e Brun, vol. 5.

Huss, Wickliffe, Waldo, Luther, Cranmer, all struggling to connect themselves with the Catholic Church, and claiming, upon some occasions, a sympathetic relationship with each other. Now I here call on your Lordship to show me how you will ever be able to stitch your inconstant Church of England to these various heretics. Were they, I demand, or were they not more different from the principles of the present Reformers than they were from the Catholic Church? and would not the ancient heretics anathematize your Lordship and your doctrines as zealously as the Catholic Church herself? and I here call on you, according to your principles, to shew an enlightened public how a Protestant can make an article of faith.

LETTER IV.

How the words of Christ, "This is my body," was understood by St. Irenæus, Tertullian, St. Augustine, and by Theophilact, viz., that it is both the true and real body of Christ, and also the figure of Christ's body. Figures may be taken in two ways.

TO THE LORD BISHOP OF EXETER.

MY LORD BISHOP,

St. Irenæus says: "Giving also instruction to his Disciples (he speaks of Christ) to offer to God the first fruits of his creatures, not like one having need, (non quasi indigenti, sed ut nec ipsi infructuosi,) but that they should be neither unfruitful nor unthankful, he took that bread, which is a creature, (eum qui ex creatura panis est accepit,) and gave thanks, saying, This is my body; and the cup likewise, which is a creature as we are, (qui est ex ea creatura quæ est secundum nos,) he confessed to be his blood; and of the new testament taught a new oblation, (et novi testamenti novam docuit oblationem, quam ecclesia ab Apostolis accipiens in universo mundo offert Deo,) which the Church receiving from the Apostles, offers to God throughout the whole world"—(*St. Irenæus, Lib. 4, cap. 32, Contra Heres.*) And when he had declared how Almighty God had instituted and appointed

sacrifices and oblations as things to be offered to him, not as to one who stands in need of them, but for the exercise of their obedience and of their faith, by which God is delighted, God receiving no benefit or advantage from them, but they who perform such acts derive much benefit from them, and for whose advantage God instituted them. So he likewise declares, that in the new testament people may exercise their faith and obedience, and thereby purchase much gain and profit, and for benefits received be found thankful. Christ also taught his Apostles to offer sacrifice. And what the sacrifice is he teaches, saying, that it is his body made out of the creature bread, and his blood made out of the creature wine. How this thing is accomplished he shows us: that Christ took the bread which is a creature, and gave thanks, saying, this is my body; and likewise the cup, which also is a creature, and confessed it to be his blood; and the same is meant of the bread to be his body. What words more plain can we require, or what stronger authority can we insist on? If Christ confessed it to be his body, his declarations being always true, in what light do our dissenting brethren stand, who deny it to be his body? Shall we doubt the truth of Christ's words, as St. Ambrose says, "Ipse Dominus Jesus testificatur nobis, quod corpus suum accipiamus et sanguinem; nunquid debemus de ejus fide, et testificatione dubitare?"—"Our Lord Jesus makes known to us, that we receive his body and blood; ought we then to doubt of his truth and of his testimony."—(*Lib. 4, de Sacrament, c. 6.*)

We find that beyond all doubt the sacrifice of the new testament was instituted and taught by Christ himself. This St. Irenæus declares, "that Christ confessed his body and blood to be present, and that by these words, this is my body; this is my blood." It is as clear as day, that this illustrious Saint understood them in their literal sense without type or figure, and consequently acknowledged the very real presence

of Christ's body and blood in the sacrament. For further proof of this, remark the force of the words which immediately follow, when he says, "*Et novi testamenti novam docuit oblationem.*"—"And of the new testament he taught a new oblation." This new oblation of the new testament is the body and blood of Christ. And permit me here to add, that if the sacrifice which Christ instituted to be the new oblation of the new testament were but sacramental bread, it consequently could be no new oblation; for then it would be the same that Melchisadech offered, who presented bread and wine in sacrifice as a figure; consequently, if this sacrifice be but bread and wine, a bare figure, then it is no oblation. In the Levitical law we find bread and wine also offered in the sacrifice; the shew bread was also offered in sacrifice; wherefore it must necessarily be understood as regarding an oblation and a sacrifice not heretofore accustomed to be offered, which for that reason may be called a new oblation, which is no other but the very body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ; which although it was figuratively offered before by Melchisadech in material bread and wine, yet now in the new testament it is offered as it never had been before, not in figure, but in very deed, the very body and blood of Christ himself; the heavenly bread and celestial wine, in lieu of the bread and wine of Melchisadech, as the thing figured, consequently it is a new oblation instituted and to be offered in the new testament. Wherefore Christ to shew the resemblance of the figure to the thing, and the figure therein to be fulfilled, took bread and wine, and consecrating them into his body and blood, acknowledged them, as Irenæus says, to be his body and blood, that the figure might be there manifestly shewn to be terminated in that heavenly bread and wine, the very thing figured by that figure.

Now hear Tertullian who flourished very near the time of St. Irenæus, he says: "When Christ therefore had said, that

with desire he wished to eat the passover as his own * (body), the bread that was taken and distributed to his disciples, he made it his body, saying, this is my body; that is to say, a figure of my body. But it had not been a figure, except it were a true body"—“Hoc est corpus meum id est, figura corporis mei, figura autem non fuisset, nisi veritatis esset corpus.”—(*Tertullian, Lib. 4, Cont. Marc.*)

See Irenæus against Valentinus, and Tertullian against Marcion the disciple of Cerdon, who wickedly taught like his master, that Christ had not a real body when he was conversing on earth, but a fantastical body. Remark here, that Tertullian to prove that he had a true and real body immediately refers to the institution of the sacrament, saying, “That Christ made the bread which he took and distributed to his Disciples his body, saying, this is my body.” Whereby as he demonstratively shews by Christ’s own act, who made the bread his body, and by his own word (who said of the same that he had so made) that Christ had a true body; which could not well have proved the object Tertullian had in view, if that which he made his body, and which was declared by him to be his body, had not been a true body. Even when Christ made the bread his body, when he said, This is my body, proves against our dissenting brethren both the presence of Christ’s true body in the sacrament, and also that the words of Christ are to be taken in their proper and literal sense. But here perhaps your Lordship may say, that Tertullian adds and declares that it is a figure of his body? My reply would be, that I earnestly would request that your Lordship would take the whole quotation from Tertullian which is here alleged into consideration, and you will at once see his true meaning. It is in two parts; the first, where he

* Indignum quippe ut quid alienum concupisceret Deus. It is improper to suppose that God should desire any thing strange.

says, that Christ made the bread which he took in his hands his body; the second, where he says, this is my body, that is to say, a figure of my body. I consequently would require of your Lordship to inform me, whether you would receive the first part of this quotation from Tertullian, which states that Christ made the bread his body? But I am strongly inclined to think, that neither your Lordship nor any of my dissenting brethren would concede any such thing. For if Christ made the bread his body, (and it is most certain by the testimony of this author that he did so,) then truly and really is his very body in the sacrament; which is flatly denied by the declarations of some of the great leaders of your pretended Reformation.

Zuinglius says: "Forasmuch as bread and wine be the token of the friendship by which God and his Son were reconciled to mankind, we weigh not these things for the worthiness of their matter, but according to the greatness of the thing signified; that now it be not common bread, but holy, neither that it has only the name of bread, but also of the body of Christ, but by name only, and by signification which the younger men call sacramental."—*Zuinglius, ad Illustris. Germ. Principes.*)

Œcolampadius says: "It is more than scythical or diomedical barbarousness in the covering of bread to seek the flesh of Christ, (*Rusticitas est non observare nec cognoscere, in quo hospes benevolentiam suam doceat, et pro spirituali carnalem requirere cœnam,*) it is gross impropriety not to observe and to know in what Christ teaches his benevolence, and for a spiritual to require a carnal supper."—(*In Exposit. Verborum Cœnæ. Dom.*)

Now here we find, my Lord Bishop, Œcolampadius denying what Tertullian affirms. For he says, "it is barbarousness to seek the flesh of Christ in the sacrament;" whereas Tertullian positively asserts, that Christ made the bread his

body, and gives us not a barbarous, but a godly doctrine to seek the flesh of Christ in the sacrament. Bullinger likewise says: "Commemoratio ac symbolum est corporis veri, non ipsum corpus."—"It is a remembrance and a token of the very body, not the very body itself."—(*Bullingerus, in 2 Act.*)

I shall not trouble your Lordship with any further quotations from the great leaders of your pretended Reformation, it being certain that the entire body of them deny what Tertullian affirms, and would abhor to say what he said, viz., that the bread is made the body of Christ. Now remember well, that Tertullian does not say that it is named or called the body of Christ, but in plain, clear, and express words, declares that "it is made the body of Christ." No one can help perceiving that they (the leaders of the pretended Reformation) do not receive what Tertullian declares to be the fact, that Christ made the bread his body. But my Lord Bishop, the whole Catholic Church with one accord, which is ever guided by the spirit of truth, has and ever will receive it, confessing with Tertullian and with St. Cyprian, who immediately followed him, "Panis quem Dominus Discipulis edendum prorigebat non effigiei, sed naturâ mutatus omnipotentiâ verbi factus est caro."—(*St. Cyprian, de Cæna Dom.*)—"The bread which our Lord gave to his Disciples, changed not in outward form, but in nature, by the omnipotency of the word is made flesh." St. Ambrose, after the same manner, says: "Panis iste, Panis est ante verba sacramentorum, ubi accesserit consecratio de pane fit caro Christi."—(*St. Amb. Lib. 4, de Sacr. c. 4.*)—"This bread is bread before the sacramental words, but when the consecration has taken place, of the bread is made the flesh of Christ." Therefore, according to all these great Fathers of the Church, bread is made the flesh or body of Christ, which manner of expressing themselves excludes the figure only and includes the very substantial presence of Christ's body. Thus much regarding the first part of the quotation from Tertullian.

I shall now say a few words in reference to the second part

of my quotation from Tertullian, where he calls it a figure of Christ's body. This part of my citation, my dissenting brethren will of course receive with the greatest pleasure and delight, though they receive it by no means agreeably to the mind of the author. The Catholic also receives it, and receives it well; for he receives it in the manner meant by the author. I prove it thus. He that wishes clearly to understand a Catholic author, must not make him speak contrary and repugnant to himself or to those of his fellow Catholic writers; when he does not act after this manner, he will understand him well, and will do him justice. But if he interprets a Catholic writer so as to make him inconsistent with himself and other learned writers of his creed, he will both understand him badly, and act in a manner unworthy of an honest man. The Catholic receives also this second part of the quotation from Tertullian, where he says, it is a figure of Christ's body; and also following Tertullian, teaches that it is a figure, but so that the presence of Christ be not denied, which the first part (as I have shewn) teaches. And therefore, though it be a figure, yet not only is it a figure, but likewise the very body of Christ, that is, the figure and the body joined together. My dissenting brethren receive this second part of my quotation from Tertullian, understanding it after the same manner as Œcolampadius did, "*Quod panis assumitur in signum tantum*," that the bread is merely taken as a sign, denying thereby the presence of the body, and consequently makes the author not only repugnant to himself, but also to other holy Catholic writers; for where Tertullian said, that Christ made the bread his body, Œcolampadius, understanding by the figure the sacrament to be only a figure or a sign of Christ's body, and not the body itself, the bread not being made his body. Therefore Œcolampadius makes Tertullian deny in the second part of the quotation what he taught in the first part, which may not be allowed; therefore he receives and understands the author badly, and places him

in opposition to other Catholic authors as ancient as Tertulian, such as St. Ambrose, St. Cyprian, St. Irenæus, St. Justin, and Alexander, all of whom teach that the sacrament of Christ's body and blood contains the very body of Christ, and is not a bare figure or sign only.

For the better understanding what I have asserted, I extract the following from the writings of an eminent Catholic divine, who says, "That a figure may be taken in two ways. First, as a sign or token of a thing really absent, but present in figure or sign; as a ring given by a man to his beloved wife, is a sign or token of remembrance of him who is absent. Another way that a figure may be taken as of a thing absent in manner and in condition, such as sometimes happens, but really present in very deed and substance, as when a wife beholding her husband, and seeing the scars and marks of wounds which he had suffered for her and for their children's protection and safeguard, his loving kindness and affection for his dear wife, and all the dangers he underwent for her and their children, are immediately brought to her remembrance. In which case, though the substance of the man be present, yet to his wife he is a figure and token of remembrance of himself. Absent in condition of a man now in fight, and covered with dangerous and deep wounds. For now he is not the man he was, yet a whole and perfect man." Now, my Lord Bishop, where Tertullian says that the sacrament is a figure of Christ's body, it is true after the second manner of acception or allowing of a figure. For Christ's body now present in the sacrament, and there by faith most certainly seen and beheld, is a figure and a token of remembrance to his spouse the Church, of his afflictions, passion, and wounds which he suffered upon the cross for her safeguard and delivery, which body, though it be substantially present, yet after the manner of a passible and suffering body it is not now present.

St. Augustine says: "*Caro carnis, et sanguis sacramentum*

est sanguinis. Utroque invisibiliter spirituali et intelligibili signatur Domini Jesu Christi corpus visibile et palpabile, plenum gratiâ omnium virtutum, et divinâ majestate.”—(*St. August. Lib. Senté. Pros.*)—“The flesh is a sacrament of the flesh, and the blood is the sacrament of the blood. By both of which being invisible, spiritual, and intelligible, is signified the visible and palpable body of our Lord Jesus Christ, full of grace and of all virtues, and of divine majesty.” Here St. Augustine informs us, that the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament being under the species of bread and wine invisible, spiritual, and intelligible, are figures of the same body visible and palpable. Now, my Lord Bishop, seeing that St. Augustine in such plain terms, and that the Scriptures also assure us, that Christ was made in the likeness of men; and nevertheless he was a natural and substantial man, and that he is the very image of the Father, and yet also of the very substance of the Father. So in like manner we are taught that the sacrament is a figure, and also that it is the very thing itself. For we say that the body of Christ under the species of bread, and his blood under the species of wine, are figures of that body which suffered upon the cross, and of the blood which issued from the same body, and separated from it; and yet nevertheless it is the very same body in substance which hung upon the cross, and the very same blood in substance which ran from that blessed body. Therefore Tertullian might very well call it the body of Christ, and the figure of the body, for it is both.

I shall make this appear stronger by two quotations from St. Augustine, in which, speaking of the same thing, he calls the sacrament in one place the figure of the body of Christ, in the other he calls it the price or redemption, which is as much as to say, the body of Christ. Thus he says, speaking of Judas the traitor, “Cùm Christus ejus cogitationes non ignoraret, eum tamen adhibuit ad convivium, in quo sui corporis et sanguinis figuram Discipulis commendavit.”—(*St.*

August. in Psalm 3.)—"When Christ was not ignorant of the thoughts of Judas; yet he had him present at the feast, at which he commended to his Disciples the figure of his body and blood," In another place he says: "Tollerat ipse Dominus Judam, diabolum, furem, et venditorem suum. Sinit accipere inter innocentes Discipulos, quod norunt fideles, precium nostrum."—(*St. August. Epist.* 162.)—"Our Lord himself suffers Judas, a devil, a thief, and who sold him, he permits him to take among his innocent Disciples that which the faithful know to be our price or redemption." Now remark, my Lord Bishop, that what he called in the first of these two quotations the figure of Christ's body, here he calls it the price or redemption, which is Christ himself, as St. Paul declares, "Qui factus est nobis sapientia, et justitia, et sanctificatio et redemptio.—Who is made to us wisdom and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption." If it be but bread and wine, it is not then our price, it is not then our redemption, which St. Augustine says it is. By this then it is manifest, that the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament are the figures of the same body and blood of Christ crucified for our redemption, consequently it may properly be called the body of Christ, and the figure of the body of Christ. Agreeably to this, Theophilact says: "Attende quòd panis qui à nobis in mysteriis manducatur, non est tantum figuratio quædam carnis Domini, sed ipsa caro Domini."—(*Theophilact, in 6 Joan.*)—"Remark that the bread, which is eaten by us in the mysteries, is not only a certain figure of the flesh of our Lord, but the flesh itself of our Lord."

Therefore this manner of understanding Tertullian is just and upright. For after this way he is in perfect accordance with himself both in the one place and in the other, as when he says: "Caro corpore et sanguine Christi vescitur, ut anima de Deo saginetur."—(*Lib. de Resur. Carnis.*)—"The flesh eateth the body and blood of Christ, that the soul may be

made fat with God." Where in plain words he says, that man, not by spirit, but by his flesh, eateth not a piece of bread, a sign or figure only of Christ's body, but it eateth Christ's very body and blood. After this manner of understanding he is in perfect agreement with St. Augustine and Theophilaet, and other holy Fathers. He also is in perfect agreement with the whole Catholic Church, which always did and does teach, that the body of Christ is both a figure and truly the thing signified itself. Wherefore neither Tertullian nor St. Augustine, in the places alleged, either refused or denied, but accepted and embraced this doctrine of the Catholic Church; for the Church always acknowledges as much as they herein say, and they with the Church acknowledged the sacrament to be both. And I here challenge the adversaries of the Catholic Church to produce but one ancient author who says as Protestants do, that it is *figura tantum*, only a figure, and who asserts as they do, that the true and real body of Christ is not in the sacrament, and then I will own that they have done something. Hitherto they (Protestant ministers) have not advanced one step to prove what they have so improperly asserted, viz., that Christ is not truly and really present in the sacrament; all they have done is by sophisms and by every sort of stratagem to deceive the people, and to draw them away from the true faith, for wherever they read this word (*figura*) figure in Tertullian, in St. Augustine, or in any other author, they run away with it, violently wresting it so as to make their auditory believe that the author says as they say, and which is most false; for not one of the Fathers (the venerable witnesses of the faith) assert as these men (Protestant ministers) continually do, that it is only a mere figure, which is the point our adversaries must prove, and that they never can do. Wherefore, my Lord Bishop, look to yourself in time and be not deceived. Mark well what Tertullian declares, that the bread is made

the body of Christ, so likewise say Catholics, in accordance with the holy Church, but this Protestants deny. Tertullian says it is a figure of the body of Christ; so say Catholics, again agreeing with the holy universal Church; and so, after a manner, say Protestants, but the manner is such, that though in the word (figure) it seems so to speak and to agree with Tertullian, yet in meaning it denies the whole. For neither do our adversaries agree upon the thing which is the figure, nor do they say with Tertullian, that it is a figure and also the very true and real body of Christ; they assert, on the contrary, that it is a mere empty figure, which is totally different from what Tertullian teaches. An enlightened public will now be able to perceive whether it be Catholics or Protestants who agree with this ancient Father of the Church.

I shall now conclude this letter, my Lord Bishop, by a quotation from St. Augustine, wherein he says, "And it is a rule among all learned divines, that in the disputations on matters of faith, all Scriptures must be explained in their literal sense; forasmuch then as this Scripture is brought forward regarding a most important article of faith, (as you have heard,) it must be taken and understood in the literal sense. The words are taken to prove that Christ had a true body. Wherefore in the literal sense they are spoken and understood of his true body." Thus you may perceive, that according to this great doctor of the Church, figures, signs, tokens, and tropes, are not admitted to give us the true sense and meaning of these words, This is my body.

I am,

My Lord Bishop,

Your obedient Servant,

VERAX,

A CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

POSTSCRIPT.

By these words, "This is my body," our Saviour instituted a sacrament, and what is more, with a commandment thereto annexed, saying, Take eat, &c.; do this, &c. He hereby, as I have mentioned in my first letter, made his last will and testament, and which he never would have done in words so figurative and so obscure, as that the most learned could not understand them; for he must have consequently perceived, that instead of bestowing great blessings, which doubtless he intended, he would, on the contrary, only have given and left us the most dangerous occasions of errors, scandals, ruin, mischief, and contentions. Permit me here to ask your Lordship, in the name of common sense, if you were making your last will and testament, and should by express words and writing have declared your son the heir to all your gold, plate, diamonds, &c., what opinion would you entertain of the judge who should expound your words to have no reference whatever to gold, to plate, or to diamonds, but merely to counters, figures, &c. of gold, of plate, and of diamonds, &c.? You would consider his sentence to be most unjust, most false, and most malicious. But now for a moment let us suppose that this decision was agreeable to your intentions when you made your will, would not your son loudly complain that you, his own father, had most grossly deceived him. None of which without blasphemy can be applied to Christ.

This is so true, that Melancthon says: "I do not find any strong reason, why by the name of body in the words of the supper, only the sign of a body absent should be understood, for although in the sacred Scriptures there are words full of figures of all sorts, yet there is a very great difference between the narratives of things done, and divine ordinations or decrees of the nature or will of God, &c.; for

it is necessary that the meaning of these places be certain, whence decrees and articles be taken; if it were lawful to interpret these in any way, all things might be depraved," &c. —(*In L. Epist. Ecolamp. and Zuing. Ep. ad Fridericum*, p. 645.) Musculus acknowledges that, (*Loc. Com. de Cæna*, p. 332,) "Christ at his last supper made his testament, which argues that he did it in words plain to be understood." For as the Apostle says, (Gal. iii. 15,) "A man's testament being confirmed no man despiseth or disposeth;" according to Beza's translation, "If it be but a man's testament, &c., no man addeth thereto;" much less then to our Saviour's testament, to which many Protestants add so many of their own most contradictory and most absurd glosses. To this purpose, says Andræas, "The words of Christ are the words of a testament, in which he speaks expressly and perspicuously, that his will may be understood by all."—(*Collat. Cath. et Orth. fidei*, &c. p. 321, n. 39.) But what Scripture can be so plain, or reason so convincing, for the recalling of a heretic, than when Zuinglius declares, that "Although God with all his blessed Angels should descend from heaven, and should swear in the supper of the Lord the body and blood of Christ to be given to all who receive it, yet I neither could, nor would believe (says he) unless with my own eyes and hands I should see and feel the same."—(*Apud Schusselb. Lib. 4, Theol. Calv. Art. 9*, p. 344.) (See the same in *Resp. ad Biblicanum*, Tom. 2, fol. 163.) Yes, my Lord Bishop, so plain are the words of Scripture in our favour, that Zuinglius says: "What can be spoken more clearly than, this is my body."—(*In Explan. Art. 18*.) Calvin says: "I do not deny, but that Christ would speak most clearly."—(*In Admon. ult. ad Westph. p. 812*.) Beza says: "Christ could not have spoken more expressly and more significantly of the sacraments."—(*Ad Repetit. Santis. p. 8*.) And again he says: "We have often truly said, that which now also I will

repeat, that there cannot be preserved the proper meaning of the words, in these words, this is my body, but the papistical transubstantiation must be established." Chameirus repeats and allows this last saying of Beza to be most true: "I acknowledge," says he, "what my master says to be most true."—(*Epist. Jesuit. part 1, p. 49.*) The divines of Geneva profess to believe, that "If the words of Christ be taken simply, it is necessary that the dotage (so these wicked men were pleased to call it) of transubstantiation must infallibly follow."—(*Apol. Modest, &c., p. 18.*) Dr. Reynolds is forced to say: "I will grant that the words of Christ, this is my body, shew rather to favour your real presence, than that sacramental which we defend."—(*In his Confer. c. 2, sect 1, p. 23.*) So confessedly clear are the sacred Scriptures taken in their literal sense for the real presence and transubstantiation.

NOTE 1, TO LETTER IV.

The Protestant scheme, and indeed all others but the Catholic Doctrine of the Eucharist, is very dangerous, upon this very reason, that they cannot be maintained but with such explanations of the strongest expressions we meet with in the primitive writers, as would, if permitted, destroy the very fundamental principles of the Christian religion. For it is as clear as day, that if these words, "The Eucharist is that body which Christ took of the blessed Virgin, and in which he suffered and rose again," do not express it to be his substantial body, then these and the like expressions, "born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate," &c., do not import a human body. Protestant writers are continually bringing forward a quotation from Hesychius, on Levit. viii., which they call a peremptory declaration against Transubstantiation, where the Scripture says: "Moses and his sons are commanded to eat the bread with the flesh." "This," says Hesychius, "was done (ut intellegeremus nos, illud ab eo mysterium dici, quod simul panis et

caro est,) that we might understand that mystery to be here meant by him, (Moses,) which is at the same time both bread and flesh." Now is it not evident that however this may sound well from a Lutheran, it must appear weak indeed as coming from gentlemen of the Church of England. But I recollect having read in the works of a very learned divine of the Church of England, where he adds, that he (Hesychius) means bread in substance, flesh in mystery? And is it not most extraordinary he does not see that we can also say, he means bread in appearance, flesh in substance? Where is the equity of framing such language against us? I perfectly recollect also having read in this same author, these words of St Chrysostom: "We should understand all this mystically, and spiritually—they are spirit, and they are life; that is, they are divine and spiritual things; what then, is not his flesh, flesh? Yes, assuredly?"—(*Lit. y. Ap.*) And as we have seen that he means his substantial natural flesh, so I will only add, that this Saint (*Lit. o. Ap.*) expressly says, "That we must not think it is bread, but that the substance of bread ceases; as the substance of wax ceases by being consumed by the fire, so the substance of bread ceases, and is consumed by the substance of the body."

NOTE 2, TO LETTER IV.

There are two wants in human nature which religion alone can satisfy; the one, that of the practical,* the other, that of the interior life; these two wants must be satisfied, that whatever is good and beautiful in human nature may have its free expansion. Suppress every trace of the mystical life, and you arrive at the brutal activity of the London populace; suppress the esteem and taste of the practical life, and there remains but the senseless quietism of the Indian priest. Every religious system which alters in a single point one of these essential modes of our being, approximates in a greater or less degree to one or other of these two species of degradation. The perfection of man depends on their simultaneous developement; the

* By the name of practical life, I do not mean the activity which is limited to the world of the senses, but that course of conduct which is connected with the moral order, as presented to us here below in the visible creation.

one restrains the soul within the present, the other impels it towards the future order ; and as this star of the moral order belongs to both worlds, it cannot accomplish its career but by the harmonious combination of this two-fold attraction.

It has been frequently remarked, that when Protestant mysticism does not present itself under the form of fanaticism, it for the most part sinks into a religious melancholy. Besides the injury it inflicts on the intellectual faculties, this malady, weakening by its effects the activity of the soul, proceeds to attack the generative principle of good works, and consequently the moral fecundity of man ; whilst among the sects contrary to mysticism, this moral decay is replaced, as may be seen in the metropolis of Calvinism, by a fever for gold, and all the sensual enjoyments of life. Protestantism is opposed to the alliance of the interior and social life ; for individualism, in breaking the ties by which spirits are bound together, produces isolated forms of belief, which in turn engender a solitary mysticism. The human mind under such circumstances seeks life within itself, for there also it seeks truth. The heart feeds with complacency on itself, as reason idolizes itself ; and though rationalism and madness have each their distinctive traits, if you examine more closely you will find in both but the Proteus of egotism.

I invite every reflecting and philosophic mind, capable of applying the test of experience to the influence of doctrines, to contrast in this respect, the spirit of Protestantism with the genius of the Catholic religion, which has unceasingly produced a parallel development of the interior and social life, so harmoniously combined, that the action and reaction is uniform and continual. This is not the place to sound the depths of a subject, which in order to be fully treated, should embrace the moral history of humanity. Not to depart from the limits of my present subject, I shall simply remark how, among the causes that concur in establishing the peculiar character of Catholicism, the Eucharistic faith holds the first rank. It is not only a principle eminently active in each of these two orders ; but as they tend to separate, because the wants to which they correspond crave to be satisfied at the cost of each other, this tenet is the powerful link which inseparably unites them. For if this mystery, which is itself an initiation to the mysteries of a future life, impel the soul beyond the present order, on the other hand, the disposition strictly necessary to approach it, is the accomplishment

of all the obligations of ordinary life, and particularly of those which one might be more inclined to despise and to consider most repulsive. Extending its vivifying influence to two extremities of the moral world, it reaches at the same time the most humble duties and the loftiest of the soul. This bread of angels, which has become the bread of man, imparts to the faithful a two-fold existence. Like Raphael, they may say to those indigent souls who can only beg at the banquet of time the gross food of voluptuousness and pride, "I seemed indeed to eat and drink with you, but I use an invisible meat and drink which cannot be seen by man."* But the same action which associates him with angels, reconducts him by the road of virtue into human society. For all is social in Catholicism, interwoven as it is with common tradition. It is for this reason that the most magnificent gift of divine love is confided not to an individual, but to the Church. She alone is the depositary of eternal truth. Before the Holy of Holies can be approached, the individual conscience is submitted to the power of religious society, in the person of one of its ministers, who pronounces the sentence of grace. The sanctuary is thrown open, and penitence freed from remorse, and innocence assured of its purity by the judgment of authority, going hand in hand amid the public prayers to seat themselves at the universal banquet of the just. Thus the faithful are not admitted to this intimate union with Christ but by drawing more closely the links which bind them to the Church, the common parent of all Christians; and the greatest act of the mystical life is itself a great social action.

* "Sed ego cibo invisibili, et potu qui ab hominibus videri non potest, utor."—(Tob. xii. 19.)

LETTER V.

The explanation given by St. Chrysostom, St. Augustine, St. Irenæus, and St. Ambrose, on that passage of St. Paul, "The chalice which we bless," &c. Our Sacrifice more excellent than that of the Old Testament. It is manifest that he spoke not of the sacrifice of the cross, but of the sacrifice instituted at the last supper. Christ himself our oblation and sacrifice.

TO THE LORD BISHOP OF EXETER.

MY LORD BISHOP,

St. Paul says: "Is not the cup of blessing, which we bless, a partaking of the blood of Christ." St. Chrysostom declares the meaning of these words to be, "Quod est in calice, id est, quod à latere fluxit, et illius sumus participes." "That which is in the cup is that which flowed out of the side, and of it we are partakers."—(*In. 10, 1 Cor.*) If this be the meaning of St. Paul, why then, in the name of heaven, do we wander in mists and in the dark clouds of tropes, of figures, and of significations. Where Chrysostom expounding the Scriptures, and wishing to explain to us the true and plain meaning of it, teaches that there is in the cup no trope, figure, or sign, but the blood which flowed out of his side. In which exposition we behold at one view the clear and true doctrine of the Catholic Church on this great point; so clear,

I say, that Protestants cannot conceal their heresy beneath it. Protestants require one plain sentence, to prove the real presence of Christ in the sacrament; permit me here to ask, can you or they require one more plain, clear, and expressive than the one which I have just given, when this great Saint and illustrious doctor of the Church declares that the meaning of this great Apostle is, "That that which is in the chalice is the same which flowed out of the side, and that we are partakers of it?" If Protestants should ascribe a different meaning to St. Chrysostom's interpretation of this passage than that which he has given us, they will act most unfairly towards him; but this unfortunately is but too much their practice. Now what is the meaning, but in a simple and plain manner to explain and clear away any difficulty in regard to words or sentences of a man's conception or speech doubtfully or darkly conceived or spoken before? Wherefore Chrysostom seeing that this was the meaning of St. Paul's words, however doubtful they might appear to some, accordingly in plain precise words declared the same. This then being the true meaning of St. Paul's words, was it not most improper of Cranmer to give it quite a contrary interpretation. Thus he says: "Neither that wine made of grapes is his very blood, nor that his blood is wine made out of grapes, but signifies to us, as St. Paul saith, that the cup is the communion of Christ's blood." How shamefully false this part of Scripture is expounded by Cranmer, as this explanation of St. Chrysostom plainly proves, and others also which I shall produce.

Hear again St. Chrysostom: "Reputate salutarem sanguinem quasi è divino, et impolluto latere effluere, et ita approximantes labiis puris accipite."—(*St. Chrysost. Ser. de Euch. in Enceniis.*)—"Regard or esteem the wholesome blood, as to flow out of the divine and undefiled side, and so approaching it receive it with pure lips." Now recollect, my

Lord Bishop, that these words were contained in a sermon which he preached to the people, wherein his meaning would be declared in plain and simple language, and put in that form which could not be misunderstood by the people, and this was done, that they should consider the cup of our Lord to be his blood, and that they should come and drink it even as out of his side, also he wishes to take it with pure lips, therefore in this he teaches the real presence; for the spiritual manner of receiving Christ's blood is not by lips, but with the heart and soul; whereby it is plain he meant his words to be no otherwise understood than as they were spoken. Let these words of this holy prelate be deeply impressed on your mind, viz., "That that which is in the cup is that which flowed out of the side, and of that we are partakers."

St. Chrysostom again says: "He prepared this wonderful sacrifice when he changed the sacrifice of the old law, and when he commanded himself to be offered." Now when did he perform these two acts? My Lord Bishop, remark well, here are two things; the one is that Christ changed the sacrifice; the other, that he commanded himself to be offered. When were these two things done? At his last supper, when, as St. Cyprian says: "Obviarunt sibi instituta nova et antiqua, et consumpto agno, quem antiqua traditio proponebat, inconsumptibilem cibum magister apponit Discipulis."—(*St. Cypr. de Cæn.*)—"The new and old ordinances met together, and for the lamb, which the old tradition had set forth as being consumed, the master gave to his disciples meat that could not be consumed." So that for the lamb of the old law, he gave them an incorruptible meat, his body and blood, which was the verity of that shadow, as St. Chrysostom says; that lamb was the figure of the lamb to come, and that blood showed the coming of the blood of our Lord, and that sheep was an example of the spiritual sheep; that lamb was the shadow, this the verity. But after the Son of Righteousness

had shone with beams, the shadow was taken away with the light. And therefore on that table both the passovers of the figure and of the truth were celebrated; by all which he declares, that the lamb of the old law was a figure of our lamb Christ, which were together on the table as two passovers, the old and the new. But when the new passover, which was the body of Christ there consecrated, was set forth as the new passover, which he calls the Son of Righteousness, then the old passover was taken away, and this substituted in lieu of it. Then was the old sacrifice laid aside, and this placed in its stead; then was the old sacrifice changed, and a new sacrifice appointed.

How true what St. Augustine says: “Aliud est Pascha, quod Judæi celebrant de ove, aliud autem quod nos in corpore et sanguine Domini celebramus.”—(*St. August. Cent. literas Petiliâ.*)—“It is another passover which the Jews celebrate with a sheep, and another which we celebrate in the body and blood of Christ.” In that great and wonderful institution, Christ did three things, that is, he consecrated his blessed body and blood, he offered it in sacrifice after the order of Melchisadech, and received it with his Apostles, desiring and commanding that his priests should do that which he then did, and thus he commanded that he himself should be offered. Therefore, my Lord Bishop, it is clear, that this passage fully justified St. Chrysostom when he said, “That Christ commanded himself to be offered.” A vast number of the holy Fathers are of the same opinion.

St. Irenæus says: “Eum qui ex creaturâ panis est, accepit, et gratias egit, dicens; hoc est corpus meum; et calicem similiter, qui est ex eâ creaturâ, quæ est secundum nos, suum sanguinem confessus est. Et novi testamenti novam docuit, oblationem.”—(*Lib. 4, Ca. 32.*)—“He took the bread (speaking of Christ) which is a creature, and gave thanks, saying, this is my body; and the cup likewise, which is a creature

like us, he confessed to be his blood. And of the new testament, he taught a new oblation."

St. Ambrose says in his prayer, "I, Lord, mindful of thy worshipful passion, approach thy altar, (*Accedo ad altare tuum licet peccator, ut offeram tibi sacrificium, quod tu instituisti et offerri præcepisti in commemorationem tui pro salute nostrâ,*) although a sinner, to offer unto thee the sacrifice which thou hast instituted and commanded to be offered in remembrance of thee for our health."—(*In Prima Oration, præpar.*)

You behold here, my Lord Bishop, two most ancient and venerable witnesses testifying with St. Chrysostom, that Christ commanded the sacrifice which he instituted to be offered. What the thing is which we offer, St. Chrysostom clearly teaches when he says, that Christ commanded himself to be offered. So that Christ himself is our oblation and sacrifice, which we offer not by our own invention, but by his holy and loving commandment. For, by that, Christ has ordered us to offer himself in our sacrifice, it is most clear, that our sacrifice is more excellent than that of the old testament. It is manifest also, that he spoke not of his sacrifice upon the cross, but of that instituted at his last supper, when and where the old sacrifices were taken away, and all of them replaced by this one, which St. Chrysostom well taught when he said, "For the slaughter of beasts he ordered himself to be offered." So that he commanded himself to be offered when the sacrifices were changed; but the sacrifices were changed at the last supper, wherefore in the last supper he commanded himself to be offered.

I am,

My Lord Bishop,

Your obedient Servant,

VERAX,

A CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

POSTSCRIPT.

St. Thomas of Aquin, one of the great lights of the Catholic Church, says on this subject: "And the bread which we break, that is to say, the receiving of the bread broken on the altar, is it not a partaking of the body of our Lord making us one with Christ? for under the form of bread is received the body of Christ. Then when he says: For we are one bread, &c., he shews that we are all one in his mystical body, and he touches a double unity. The first is the unity of incorporation, by which we are transformed into Christ; the other is of life and of feeling, which we receive of Christ, who is our head. As one might truly say, that by this it is manifest, that we are one with Christ; for we being many are one bread, by the union of faith, of hope, and of charity; and one body by the subministration of charity, that is to say, the body of that head, which is Christ. I say many, that is to say, all we that participate of one bread, that is to say, of the body of Christ, and of one cup, that is to say, of the blood of Christ, with a worthy participation, not only sacramental, but also spiritual."—(*S. Thomas Aquin, in deci. 1 Cor.*) In this explanation of St. Thomas, we find a most perfect agreement between him and all the early Fathers on this great point. For they all have expounded the bread and the wine which we partake of, to be the body and blood of Christ. So does St. Thomas. They have taught us from St. Paul, that by that participation we are made one body with Christ, and he teaches the same. Thus as God is the God of peace and of concord, so in his house is agreement and consent in all the great points of our faith and of our religion, and this is a truth hitherto constantly, as it were, with one mouth taught that the bread broken on the altar or table of Christ, is his body, and that all we who worthily receive it are by the same incorporated in Christ, and made one body with him.

NOTE TO LETTER V.

Morton's acknowledgment that the old Jewish Rabbins *before* Christ foretold the doctrine of Transubstantiation. Theodore Ribbendorf admits it also.

"These testimonies," says he, "of Rabbi Cahana, Rabbi Juda, and Rabbi Simeon are such, and make so directly for Transubstantiation, that the most Romish Doctors for a thousand years after Christ, did not in so express terms publish this mystery to the world. Nay, they are more plain, and pregnant for transubstantiation, than the transubstantiations themselves."—(*Morton's Appeal*, pp. 395, 396.) And to prove that Morton was right I give their own words.

"The sacrifice which shall be offered of wine, shall not only be changed into the substance of the blood of the Messias, but also into the substance of his body. The sacrifice which shall be made of bread, though it shall be as *white as milk*, will be converted into the substance of the body of the Messias."—(*Rabbi Cahana*, ad c. 49, *Gen. v. 11.*)

"The bread shall be changed when it shall be *sacrificed*, from the substance of bread into the *substance* of the body of the Messias, which shall descend from heaven, and he himself shall be the sacrifice."—(*Rabbi Judas*, in 25 *Exodus*.)

"The sacrifice which after the time of the Messias priests will make, shall be of bread and wine, and that sacrifice on every altar shall be *changed* into the *body* of the Messias."—(*Rabbi Simeon*, *filius Johai*, *libro qui inscribitur Revelatio secretorum*.)

"Ille est Messias de quo loquitur totus Psalmus. Cum ergo ait, et erit placenta frumenti in terra in capite montium, vult dicere, quod, placenta panis fiet sacrificium in capitibus sacerdotum, qui sunt Ecclesia."—(*Rabbi Jonothas*, in *Libro Collectio num. in Psal. 72.*)

LETTER VI.

"It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing."

TO THE LORD BISHOP OF EXETER.

MY LORD, BISHOP,

"It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing." This is one of the texts which our adversaries glory in, and by which they think completely to overturn the Catholic doctrine on this great point. Yes, they have even made it so familiar to their children, that they bring it forward on all occasions against the presence of Christ in the sacrament. I shall say little from myself on this subject, but I shall lay before your Lordship the exposition of two of the most eminent Fathers on this great dogma of Catholic faith, the public will then behold how these Protestants have unhappily instructed their pupils to blaspheme Christ's blessed flesh, saying, that it profits nothing. The public will see how these men "wrest the scriptures to their own destruction," and turn and twist them from their natural and obvious meaning.

I shall commence with St. Augustine, who says: "What is it then that he adjoins, 'It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profits nothing.' Let us say to him, (*dicamus ei patitur enim nos non contradicentes sed nosce cupientes*), he

suffers us, not against saying, but desiring to know. O Lord, good master, how does the flesh profit nothing? You having said, Except a man eats my flesh, and drinks my blood, he shall have no life in him. Does life profit nothing? And for what be we, that we be, but that we may have eternal life, (An vita non prodest quicquam? et propter quid sumus, quod sumus, nisi ut habeamus, vitam æternam, quam tua carne promittis?) which you promise by thy flesh? What is it then that the flesh profits nothing? The flesh profits nothing as they understood it. They so understood the flesh, as being torn from the dead carcase, or as it is sold in the shambles, not as it is quickened by the spirit. Therefore it is said, the flesh profits nothing; in the same manner it is declared, that science puffs up or makes proud. Shall we then hate science? God forbid. And what is it science puffs up? because charity is wanting.—(Et quid est, scientia inflat? sola sine charitate.) Add therefore charity to science, and science shall be profitable, not by itself, but by charity. So now also as the flesh profits nothing, that is the flesh only, let the spirit come to the flesh, as charity comes to science, and it profits very much. For if the flesh profits nothing, the word should not have been made flesh, that he might dwell among us. If Christ by the flesh profits us much, how then does it happen that the flesh profits nothing? But the spirit by means of the flesh has done somewhat (Sed per carnem spiritus aliquid pro salute nostrâ egit) for our health. The flesh was the vessel what it had to attend, not what it was.—(Caro vas fuit, &c.) The Apostles were sent, did not their flesh profit? If the flesh of the Apostles profited us, could the flesh of our Lord be of no service to us? Whence the style? whence the writing? All these works appertain to the flesh, but the spirit moving it as his organ, therefore, it is the spirit which quickeneth, the flesh profits nothing. As they understand the flesh, so do not I give my

flesh to be eaten.—(Sicut illi intellexerunt carnem; non sic ego do ad manducandum carnem meam.)"—(*St. August. Tract 27, in Joan.*)

Let us now, my Lord Bishop, ponder well on the above quotation from this great Saint, and see if the flesh profits nothing. Let us also consider well, and ascertain if the Scriptures in any one place teaches that Christ's blessed flesh is not present in the Eucharist. Let us always recollect that the Catholic faith no where teaches that Christ is given in the sacrament "as a lump of flesh torn from a dead carcase; neither, that the flesh of Christ is there as it is in the shambles," nor that it is a pure natural flesh without the spirit, nor the flesh of a mere man; for so they understood it, says St. Augustine, and after this manner the flesh profits nothing. But the true doctrine of the universal Church on this great dogma of Catholic faith is, that we must believe the flesh of Christ to be in the sacrament, not as the flesh of a pure man, but as the flesh of God; not divided from the God-head, but inseparably and for ever joined together; not in a gross manner as in the shambles, but spiritually, and yet verily and really, as a divine mysterious flesh, not torn from a dead carcase by pieces to be given to the people, but as Petrus Cluniacensis says, it is parted, yet every one receiving a whole Christ; neither is it eaten and thereby consumed, but it is eaten and ever remains, as the Church says, *nec sumptus, assumitur*, neither being received, is consumed. This is the Catholic faith against which the Scriptures say not one word.

St. Augustine says: "The flesh of Christ taken as it is quickened by the spirit, that is, by the Godhead, and as the flesh of God, it profits much, which flesh is so received by the faithful." And consequently the Sacramentarians ought to be ashamed, and sincerely to repent of their wicked blasphemy, having in so infamous a manner calumniated the Catholic faith of Christ, calling it "the gross and vain

imagination of the Capharnaïtes," with the like impieties; seeing that the faith is pure, perfect, and in every way agreeable to God's word, and in no one respect in accordance with the Sacramentarians, according to whose gross ideas, the flesh profits nothing; so after that manner Christ most certainly did not give his flesh to be eaten, as St. Augustine, in the person of Christ, concludes his exposition, saying: "Sicut illi intellexerunt carnem, non sic ego do ad manducandum carnem meam.—As they understood the flesh, so do not I give my flesh to be eaten." In which words St. Augustine clearly points out, that Christ gives us his very flesh to eat, but not after that manner, for the substance is not denied here of the thing that is given, but the manner, which he plainly shews when he says, "As they understood flesh, so do I not give my flesh, but not as they understand it."

St. Chrysostom says: "What then, does the flesh profit nothing? He does not speak of that flesh, (God forbid,) but of those who carnally take those things that are spoken. But what is it to understand carnally? plainly as things are spoken, neither to think anything else.—(Quid autem est carnaliter intelligere? simpliciter ut res dicuntur neque aliud quippiam excogitare.) Not after this manner are things which are seen to be judged. But all mysteries are to be judged with the inward eyes, that is, spiritually. He that eateth not my flesh, and drinketh not my blood, hath not life in him. How does the flesh profit nothing, without which no man can live? See, that that particle (the flesh profits nothing) is not spoken of that flesh, but of the carnal hearing.—Vide quòd ea particula, caro non prodest quicquam, non de ipsâ carne, sed de carnali auditione dictum est."—(*Chrysost. Hom. 46, in Joannem.*)

This illustrious Saint clearly shews that this expression of Christ, "the flesh profits nothing," is not to be understood of the flesh of Christ. "Non de ipsâ carne dictum est.—It is

not spoken," says he, "of that flesh of Christ." And at the end he says again, "Vide quòd ipsa particula, caro non prodest quicquam, non de ipsâ carne dictum est.—See, that that particle (the flesh profits nothing) is not spoken of that flesh, alluding to the flesh of Christ." How shameful is it not in these ungodly teachers to propagate their blasphemous interpretation of this text of holy Scripture, in opposition to the exposition of it by those two renowned Fathers of God's Church. These teachers say, that the flesh of Christ is not in the sacrament, for the flesh profits nothing. But that the flesh of Christ is in the sacrament, and when received profits much, is taught by both these illustrious Fathers, and by the Catholic and Apostolic Church, "the ground and pillar of truth."

I shall now give you, my Lord Bishop, two powerful quotations from St. Hilary, who lived about 360 years after Christ. He says: "Quæ Scripta sunt legamus, et quæ legerimus intelligamus, et tunc perfectæ fidei fungemur officio, de naturali in nobis Christi veritate quæ discimus, nisi ab eo discimus, stultè utque impiè discimus ipse enim ait; caro mea verè est esca, et sanguis meus verè est potus, qui edit carnem meam, et bibit sanguinem meum, in me manet, et ego in eo, de veritate carnis, et sanguinis non est relictus ambigendi locus. Nunc enim et ipsius Domini professione, et fide nostrâ verè caro est, et verè sanguis est. Et hæc accepta atque hausta id efficiunt, ut et nos in Christo, et Christus in nobis sit."—(*Lib. 8, de Trinitate.*)—"Let us read these things that are written, and such things as we read let us understand, and then we shall perform in a perfect manner the duty attached to faith. Whatever we learn of the natural verity of Christ in us, except we learn of him, we learn it foolishly and in an ungodly manner. For he says, 'My flesh is truly meat, and my blood is truly drink. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood dwelleth in me, and I in him.' Of the verity of the flesh and blood of Christ there

is no reason to doubt. For now by the plain words of our Lord himself, and by our faith, it is truly flesh and truly blood. And these taken and drank cause it to happen, that we are in Christ, and Christ in us." Remark well, my Lord Bishop, that it is understood of the sacrament, but not of the sacrament as a bare figure, but as containing the thing which it signifies, which thing is the body and blood of Christ; and this appears so plain, so evident to this learned and holy man, that by the illumination which faith gave him in order to understand this text of Scripture, he said, "That of the verity of Christ's flesh there can be no doubt; and that there was no cause whatever to refuse belief to it." And he gives you accordingly the reason: "For now," says he, "by the words of our Lord, and our faith, it is verily flesh and verily blood."

St. Hilary says again: "If the word were truly made flesh, and we receive the very word made flesh in our Lord's flesh, how can it be thought, that he does not naturally abide in us, who being born man has both taken, now inseparably, on him the nature of our flesh, and also under the sacrament of his flesh to be communicated to us, has joined the nature of his flesh to the nature of eternity?"—(*S. Hilar. Ibid.*) You cannot wish, my Lord Bishop, for words more plain, more clear, than those I have just quoted. 1st. To shew that the Son of God was made flesh, and that the same Son of God being made flesh, we receive him in the Eucharist, not as Protestants say, "that we receive him verily," but spiritually; and I prove it thus: When he says, "How is he to be thought not naturally to abide in us?" Remark well these words, for how can Christ naturally abide in us, but by the receiving his natural flesh and body. 2nd. The spiritual receiving does not operate a natural abiding, but each of them joined together, and the corporeally receiving his natural body, causes the natural abiding of Christ in us; wherefore, if he be naturally abiding in us by the receiving his flesh in the sacrament, that

receiving of his natural and real flesh into our natural bodies must cause us to receive Christ's body really in the sacrament. 3rd. Christ being thus received, operates in us this effect, that we are in Christ, and Christ in us.

I am,

My Lord Bishop,

Your obedient Servant,

VERAX,

A CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

POSTSCRIPT.

An eminent Protestant divine quoting these words of St. Ambrose, "In illo sacramento Christus est, quia corpus est Christi. Non ergo corporalis esca, sed spiritualis est—corpus enim Dei, corpus spirituale est. Corpus Christi corpus est divini spiritus, quia spiritus est Christus,"—(*Lit. k. Ap.*) says, "St. Ambrose's argument proceeds thus: the sacramental body of Christ must be a spiritual body, because his natural body is so." Hence it follows, that his sacramental body is at the same time his natural body; or in other terms, that his natural body is in the sacrament. The Saint's argument runs thus: where Christ's body is, there Christ is; and, therefore, since Christ is a spirit, his body wherever it truly is, is not a mere body, or a dead corporeal thing, but animated by Christ's personal spirit; and consequently is not a mere dead and corporeal food, but a spiritual food, as animated by the soul, and united to the person of Christ, who is a spirit, as to his divine person. This not only shews Protestants their mistake as regards this point, but is also a proper reply to sacramentarians, who would infer from such places of the Fathers, as call the Eucharist spiritual food, that it is not Christ's true body.

LETTER VII.

“The words which I have spoken to you are spirit and life.”

TO THE LORD BISHOP OF EXETER.

MY LORD BISHOP,

I purpose devoting this letter to the explanation given by St. Augustine, St. Cyril, and Algerus, in regard to that text of St. John's Gospel, 6th chapter, “Verba quæ ego locutus sum vobis, spiritus et vita sunt.—The words which I have spoken to you are spirit and life.” I shall not detain your Lordship, but will at once proceed to give you the comments of the holy Fathers on this text, which are so clear, so forcible, and so convincing, that no unprejudiced person can resist them.

St. Augustine writes thus: “Quid est spiritus et vita sunt? Spiritualliter intelligenda sunt. Intellexisti spiritualliter? Spiritus et vita sunt. Intellexisti carnaliter? etiam sic illa spiritus et vita sunt, sed tibi non sunt.”—“What is it, ‘The words which I have spoken to you are spirit and life.’ They are spiritually to be understood. Hast thou understood them spiritually? they are spirit and life. Hast thou understood them carnally? so likewise they are spirit and life, but to thee they are not.” What St. Augustine means by carnal

understanding, you may have heard more than once from his own words, that is, that he should eat the flesh of Christ after the very same manner that flesh is cut out to us in morsels or pieces, as flesh is cut up and sold in the shambles. And not only so, but to take it merely as the flesh of the natural man, and not as the flesh of the Son of God, and to be of that low and base degree, that it should be mortal and consumable, not able to give life everlasting to those who should worthily eat it, nor to endure for ever, nor to continue without end. This, if you have studied the words of St. Augustine and St. Cyril, is to understand Christ's words after a carnal manner, the folly of which manner of interpreting them no good Christian ever yet doubted. But these words are understood spiritually. And what is meant by "spiritual understanding" of this process of Christ? for the eating of his flesh has been in many places explained and declared in the writings of St. Augustine (*Sup. Ca. 22*); but to be as concise as possible, these words declare it, "Caro ejus est, &c.—It is his flesh which we receive concealed under the appearance of bread, and his blood which we drink under the appearance and taste of wine." This is the spiritual understanding meant by St. Augustine, as regards the substance of the sacrament, although there is another manner of understanding them spiritually, which both he and all the holy Fathers and all good Catholics believe, receive, and approve, but both must be joined and united by every good Christian.

Now let us see how exactly St. Cyril agrees with St. Augustine, he says: "Verba quæ ego locutus sum vobis, spiritus et vita sunt. Totum corpus suum vivificâ spiritûs virtute plenum esse ostendit. Spiritum enim hic ipsam carnem suam nuncupavit, non quia carnis naturam amiserit, et in spiritum mutata sit. Sed quia summè cum eo conjuncta, totam vivificandi vim hausit. Nec indecenter hoc dictum quisquam existimet. Nam qui Domino conglutinetur, unus

cum eo spiritus est. Quomodo igitur caro sua una cum eo non applabatur? Hujusmodi ergo est, quod dicitur; putatis me dixisse vivificum naturâ sùî esse terrestre, et mortale hoc corpus, ego vero de spiritu et vitâ locutus sum. Non enim natura carnis secundum se vivificare potest, sed virtus ipsius spiritûs, vivificantem carnem reddidit. Verba ergo quæ locutus sum, id est, ea quæ locutus sum vobis, sunt spiritus et vita, qua ipsa etiam caro mea vivit et vivifica est.”—(*Ca. 24, in 6 Joan.*)—“The words which I have spoken to you are spirit and life. He shews his entire body to be full of the quickening power of the spirit. For he here calls the spirit his very flesh, not that it has left off the nature of flesh, and is changed into a spirit, but because being excellently joined with him, it has taken the whole power to quicken. Nor should any one suppose this to be said improperly. For he who is truly united to our Lord, is one spirit with him, why then shall not his flesh be called our Lord’s flesh? It is therefore after this manner said, you suppose me to have asserted that this mortal and earthly body of the human nature to be quickening or giving life. But I have spoken of spirit and of life. For the nature of flesh cannot give life, but the power of the spirit gives animation to the flesh. The words therefore which I have spoken, that is, the things that I have spoken to you, are spirit and life, by which my very flesh doth exist, and is quickening.” So far St. Cyril.

In these words it is easy to be perceived, that when St. Augustine in expounding the words of Christ, said that they are to be understood spiritually, St. Cyril, as if expounding his words as well as those of Christ, declares that they are so to be explained, spiritually, not by any fancied spiritual manner of understanding them that shall be so spiritual as that it shall utterly deny Christ’s flesh, but in reference to the spiritualized though very real and natural flesh of Christ, which is so entirely joined to the divinity, which St. Cyril calls “the

spirit." It is such a spiritual flesh, that it may also be called the spirit; and as St. Jerome, (for the like consideration of its being so exalted,) calls it the "divine flesh," so St. Cyril understood the words of Christ, "The words which I have spoken to you are spirit and life," as meaning that the flesh of Christ is spirit and life; and therefore, my Lord Bishop, the adversaries of the universal Church on this point are carnal and gross in their ideas; the holy Fathers themselves understanding the very flesh of Christ to be a spiritual flesh, though these Sectarians maliciously and infamously call us Capharnaïtes for believing as they did, as if we received nothing but carnal flesh, the flesh of a mortal man, and not the flesh of Christ, which being inseparably joined to the divinity, and consequently endued with the power of the God-head to give life, is called both spirit and life, and is therefore both the very true and real, and likewise the spiritual flesh of Christ. Ergo, we Catholics receive Christ's real spiritual flesh, because it is a spiritual flesh, and likewise because it is known by a spiritual knowledge, not by the knowledge of natural reason, nor by the knowledge of the carnal senses, but by the spiritual knowledge of faith, which believes that to be in the sacrament which reason cannot comprehend, nor the senses perceive.

Hear now Algerus, who says: "Et si sciri non potest; credi potest, quia quod videtur non materiale corpus panis est, sed species corporalis. Quod autem intelligitur Christus est, qui omnia quæcunque vult in cælo et in terra potest. Sicquæ dum exteriorum sensuum testimonio non acquiescit, nec interiori inquisitione comprehendens, de veritate tamen non latebat, fit per Dei gratiam ut in tali suo agone fides nostra exerceatur, exercendo augeatur, augendo perficiatur, perfecta coronetur."—(*Algerus, Lib. 2, cap. 3.*)—"Although it cannot be known, yet it may be believed; for that which is seen is not the material body of bread, but the form of bread,

but that which is meant is Christ, who can do whatever he will both in heaven and on earth; and so while man does not agree to the witness of the outward senses, neither by the inward inquisition comprehending, yet does not doubt that it is done by the grace of God, that faith in such her conflicts is exercised, in exercising is increased, in increasing is perfected, and being perfected is crowned." Thus Algerus; and so far wide then is the Catholic doctrine from carnality, in believing and receiving Christ's very body in the sacrament under the form of bread, that our faith, as this author says, has a great battle and conflict to sustain, both with reason and the knowledge derived from the senses; in which conflict, if we proceed to advance, our faith being so exercised and perfected, that in the end on account of this trial, through the mercy of God, it will be crowned with everlasting happiness.

I am,

My Lord Bishop,

Your obedient Servant,

VERAX,

A CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

POSTSCRIPT.

This flesh of Christ is not seen by us, and consequently it is not perceived by any sense, but as faith comes by hearing, in this respect it may be called spiritual. St. Augustine says: "What you see on the altar is bread, and the cup, (*Quod videtis in altari panis et calix est, quod etiam oculi vestri renuntiant. Quod autem fides postulat instruenda, panis est corpus, calix est sanguis,*) your eyes tell you so, but that faith requires to be instructed. The bread is the body, and the cup is the blood; but in the minds of some the following

idea may occur: We know whence our Lord Jesus Christ has taken flesh, that is, of the Virgin Mary, he was nourished, he grew, he was buried, he rose, he ascended into heaven, whence he will come to judge the living and the dead. He is now sitting there at the right hand of the Father. How then is bread his body, or how does the chalice contain his blood? (Quomodò ergo panis corpus ejus? Vel quod habet calix, quomodò est sanguis ejus.) Brethren, these things therefore are called sacraments, because there is one thing seen in them, and another understood; that which is seen has a corporeal form, that which is understood has a spiritual fruit or profit."—(*Serm. ad Infances.*) In which words St. Augustine plainly shews what is considered to be in the sacrament by the judgment of the senses, and what by the judgment of faith. The eyes judge it to be bread and wine, but faith judges that which the eyes have judged bread to be the body of Christ, and that which is judged by the senses to be wine is the blood of Christ. Thus, my Lord Bishop, it is not known to be the body of Christ in the sacrament but by the knowledge of faith, consequently it is not a carnal but a spiritual knowledge. If so, then we understand Christ's words spiritually, and not as the Capharnaïtes did, after a carnal manner, which some Protestants falsely accuse us of doing. See Algerus, Lib. 2, Ca. 3. St. Bernard, *Serm.* 33, *in Cant.*, on this chapter, when shewing the great difference between this present life and the blessed life to come, explaining the meaning of the one and the happiness of the other, the perfection of the one and the imperfection of the other, accordingly says, "That paradise is a safe habitation, there the Son of God is the sweet food." Comparing it with this life, he says, "I also have the word of the Son of God, but in the flesh; the truth is set forth before me, but in the sacrament."

LETTER VIII.

Three different kinds of bread mentioned by Christ in the 6th chapter of St. John.

TO THE LORD BISHOP OF EXETER.

MY LORD BISHOP,

Our blessed Saviour entered into an argument with the Jews, which is contained in the 6th chapter of St. John, in which he mentions three sorts of bread. That is, the bread manna, the bread of the Son of God, and the bread of the flesh of Christ. Which three breads, as they are distinct in their nature, so the Evangelist marks them also as distinct in the time of their appearance, by shewing the different periods in which they were given to man. Thus in speaking of manna, which was given long before, he distinctly points out the time as being passed, saying, "Patres vestri manducaverunt manna in deserto.—Your fathers did eat manna in the desert," by which is declared not only a distinction and a difference of the thing itself, as being manna, but also of the time when, and the place where it was eaten by their fathers. The second bread is the Godhead of Christ, which as it is quite distinct from the first bread in substance, so it is distinct by the difference in giving it. And therefore our Saviour uses the present tense, as then presently given, say-

ing, "Non Moyses dedit vobis panem de cœlo, sed pater meus dat vobis panem de cœlo verum.—Moses gave you not that bread from heaven, but my Father giveth you the true bread from heaven." Where remark that Christ says, that his Father giveth the true bread; he did not say, that he did give, or will give, but presently giveth. And who and what this bread is he declareth, saying, "Ego sum panis vitæ.—I am the bread of life." And without specifying whether this be spoken of his manhood, or of his Godhead, he immediately declares, "Qui venit ad me non esuriet, et qui credit in me non sitiet in eternum.—He that cometh to me shall not hunger, and he that believeth in me shall never thirst" Belief is directed to none, so as to believe in them, but to God alone. We believe in Jesus Christ both as God and as man, not on account of his manhood only do we believe in him, but in that of his Godhead and manhood joined together in the unity of person in our Saviour, so that God and man are one Christ. Wherefore in this place it must be necessarily understood to speak of his Godhead. The third bread he commences to speak of when he said, "Et panis quem ego dabo, caro mea est, quam dabo pro mundi vita.—And the bread which I will give, is my flesh for the life of the world." In which words he teaches a manifest distinction between the bread here spoken of and the other before mentioned. For in this place by express words he names the bread his flesh. Which yet even in more explicit terms he plainly teaches to be his very real and substantial flesh, which he will give for the life of the world. He did not give his flesh spiritually to suffer for the life of the world, but the very real flesh of his very body.

Remark here, that there were (besides the bread which our Saviour had then miraculously fed the people with) three breads spoken of by Christ; these three breads being distinct, not only as regards time, as I have before mentioned, but

also as regards the difference of substance, as being three several and diverse substances. As for manna, that it was of a different substance from the other two, every one must acknowledge. That the other two differ in substance with each other is likewise very evident; one of the same being the Godhead of Christ, the proof of which is, that he exhorted the Jews to believe in it; the other being his flesh which he gave for the world. Christ moved the Jews *to believe in his Godhead*, and *to eat the flesh of his manhood*. And here remark, that speaking of the bread of his Godhead he exhorted the Jews more than once to believe in him, but speaking of this other bread he never told the Jews to believe in it, but always to eat it. There he said, “Egosum panis vitæ.—I am the bread of life.” Here (as it were dissevering his flesh, as being one of the substantial parts of his person, from the whole) he says, “Panis, &c.—The bread which I will give is my flesh;” which is a different substance from that of the Godhead of Christ, although both these substances be in Christ, and he but one person.

In reference to the different periods in the giving of these two breads; the first is given presently, and therefore Christ said, “Panis enim Dei est, qui cœlo descendit, et dat vitam mundo.—For the bread of God is that which cometh down from heaven, and giveth life to the world.” Where he always speaks of the present time, saying, that he cometh and giveth life to the world. Now speaking of the third bread, he speaks of the time not present, but of the time to come, saying, the bread which I will give. So that as there are two plain distinctions as regards time, that is, the time present, and time to come, so are the two breads two different substances, the one being expressed as the principal part to be believed in, the other as the inferior part by the name of flesh to be eaten. Now I assert that this is the true and natural meaning of this part of Scripture; and further, that the sacred volume itself

forces us to take this interpretation according to the letter. How lamentable it is then in our adversaries to declare, that Christ in the 6th chapter of St. John, speaks not one word of his body and blood in the sacrament.

For the confirmation of what I have alleged, and in order to refute that which Satan has moved our adversaries to utter against this sacred truth, I shall refer to the holy Fathers, to shew whether there be these distinctions of bread as mentioned in the 6th chapter of St. John or not; but to be as concise as possible, I shall give here but three quotations, two of them from those renowned Fathers of the Church, St. Chrysostom and St. Augustine, both of whom mention the bread of God's flesh in the sacrament, as of the bread of his Godhead. As for the bread which our Saviour multiplied, and the bread manna, which according to every one are perfectly distinct, and regarding which there is therefore no controversy, I shall say no more in reference to them.

When our blessed Saviour began to treat of the other two breads, and said, "Ego sum panis vitæ." St. Chrysostom thus expounds this text: "Jam in mysteriorum traditionem deventurus est, et primùm de divinitate suâ sic disputat; ego sum panis vitæ; neque enim de corpore, hoc dictum est, de quo circa finem inquit, panis quem ego dabo, caro mea est; sed adhuc de divinitate; etenim ille propter Deum verbum panis est, quemadmodum hic panis, propter advenientem ei spiritum, panis, cœlestis efficitur."—(*Chrysost. Homil. 44, in Joan.*) Do we not see here a clear distinction of breads? "This, (says he,) 'I am the bread of life,' is spoken as referring to the Godhead;" and continues the explanation of it till he comes to this text, "The bread that I will give is my flesh," and "this (he likewise says) is spoken of his body." Now, permit me here to ask, can it be denied but that St. Chrysostom held that the 6th chapter of St. John speaks of the body of Christ in the sacrament.

St. Augustine in expounding the same text agrees with St. Chrysostom that Christ spoke of his body; “Determinat consequenter non tantum secundum divinitatem, quæ pascit omnia, sed etiam secundum humanam naturam, quæ est assumpta à verbo dei, cum subdit; et panis quem ego dabo caro mea est.”—“Our Lord,” says St. Augustine, “shews how he calls himself bread, not only after his Godhead, which nourishes all things, but also after his human nature, which was assumed by the Son of God, when he afterwards said, and the bread which I will give is my flesh, &c.” Does not St. Augustine here agree with St. Chrysostom, and teach a palpable difference between the bread of the divinity and the bread of the humanity? Does he not say, that Christ in this text, “The bread which I will give is my flesh,” speaks of his human nature? Here you have the authority and the opinions of two of the most ancient and most learned doctors of the Church on this great point; will you not take their judgments before those of these new fangled inventors in the expounding of the Scriptures.

Again, Theophilact says: “Manifeste autem nobis hoc loco, de communione corporis dicit. Nam panis (inquit) quem ego dabo, caro mea est, quam ego dabo pro mundi vita. Porro potestatem suam indicans, quod non ut servus, et minor patre crucifigendus, sed voluntariè, inquit, ego dabo carnem meam pro mundi vita.”—(*Theophilact, in 6 Joan.*)—“Christ here manifestly speaks of the mystical communion of his body. ‘For the bread,’ says he, ‘which I will give you is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.’ And shewing his power, that he should be crucified, not as a servant, and inferior to the Father, but willingly, declares, ‘I will give my flesh for the life of the world.’” Remark here that Theophilact does not only follow, but agrees with St. Chrysostom, and also that his words signify that it was a clear plain matter of fact, a matter of fact received by all

men in Christ's Church in his time without controversy, when he says, that Christ in that text speaks manifestly of the communion of his body.

I shall merely refer my readers to St. Thomas of Aquin, St. Bonaventura, Petrus Lombardus, Dionysius Carthusianus, Hugo di Cardinalis, Holcot, N. Lyra, and to a great number of others in the middle ages, who, though they are not esteemed nor regarded by our adversaries, who likewise affect to treat with disdain all who have written within the period of the last thousand years, have yet written so plainly in defence of this truth, that their arguments and reasonings cannot be controverted.

I am,

My Lord Bishop,

Your obedient Servant,

VERAX,

A CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

POSTSCRIPT.

Can we for a moment suppose, that St. John, the most profound of all the Evangelists, and who has endeavoured to enter into the most ample explanations when he treats of impenetrable mysteries, would have passed over in silence the mystery of the Eucharist, unless the 6th chapter of his gospel had a reference to it, that is from the 50th or 52nd verse to the end of the chapter. Your Lordship must acknowledge that in no other part of this gospel is the Eucharist spoken of; and to prove what I assert, hear St. Augustine, who very properly remarks, "That if St. John dispensed speaking of it, as the other Evangelists had done, at the time of the institution, the reason is because he already had said much in regard to it in another place in reference to this article."—

(*L. 3, de Consensu Evang. c. 1, t. 4, Ed. Froben. p. 472.*)

Permit me further to add, that if the divine penmen have instructed us with such exactitude as regards the excellence and the effects of baptism, is it to be supposed for one moment, that they would have learnt nothing of the excellence and the virtue of the Eucharist? Because it is in this chapter which I have cited, that we find these instructions, and if Protestants do not wish to acknowledge them as appertaining to this mystery, it is in vain to seek them elsewhere.

It is for these reasons, and for many others too long here to enumerate, that all the ancient Fathers with one accord understand as we do the 6th chapter of St. John, from which we draw such strong proofs in favor of our doctrine. I shall content myself now by citing those who have written upon the gospel of this Apostle.—As St. Chrysostom, in Joan. Hom. 44, T. 3, apud Hugonem. p. 46; St. Augustine, in Joan. T. 9, Ed. Froben. p. 230; St. Cyril of Alexandria, in Joan. T. 4, Ed. Paris, p. 364; Theophilact, in Joan. Ed. Colon. p. 170; Euthymius, in Joan. T. 19, Bibl. Patr. apud Anisson. p. 686. If your Lordship should wish me to cite others who have incidentally spoken of it.—See Origen, Hom. 7, in Num. T. 1, Ed. Froben. p. 215; St. Cyprian, de Orat. Domin. Ed. Froben. p. 236; S. Hilar. Lib. 8, de Trinit. Ed. Paris, p. 955; St. Basil, in Regul. Mor. cap. 21, Ed. Par. 1638, p. 531; St. Cyril, Hieros. Cat. 4, Myst. Ed. Par. 1631, p. 237; St. Epiphan. Hœr. 55, T. 2, Ed. Petavii. p. 472; St. Ambros. de iis qui Myst. c. 8, T. 2, Ed. Paris, p. 337; St. Hieron. ad Hedibiam, T. 4, Ed. Martianai, p. 174; St. Leo, Sermon. 6, de Jejun. 7 Mensis. Ed. Quesnel, p. 175; Sedul. in c. 40, Cor. Biblioth. Patr. Tom. 8, apud Aniss. p. 544; Primas. in Cap. 11, Cor. Bibl. Patr. T. 11, p. 189; Hescych. Lib. 6, in vit. 22, Bibl. p. 147; St. Greg. Lib. 7, Moral. cap. 4, T. 1, Ed. Paris, p. 195.

LETTER IX.

Bread and wine are sanctified and become a great sacrament by the invisible work of God.

TO THE LORD BISHOP OF EXETER.

MY LORD BISHOP,

Although the Apostles by their words and by their Epistles did shew forth Christ, yet neither the one nor the other is called the body of Christ, but only that which is consecrated by the words of Christ on the altar, as St. Augustine says: "Paul might by signifying (*significando prædicare Dominum Jesum Christum*) to preach our Lord Jesus Christ, either by his tongue, by his epistle, or by the sacrament of his body and blood, yet he no where calls his tongue, his paper, his ink, nor the signifying sounds sent forth by the tongue, nor the marks of the letters written on skins, (*pellis,*) the body of Christ, but only that which being taken from the fruits of the earth, and by the mystical prayer consecrated, we receive for our spiritual health in the remembrance of the passion which our Lord suffered for us, which thing, (*quod cum per manus hominum,*) when it is brought by the hands of men to that visible form, it is not sanctified that it may become so great a sacrament, (*non sanctificatur ut sit tam magnum sacramentum,*) but by the spirit of God

working invisibly.”—(*St. August. de Trin. L. 1, 3, cap. 4.*) By whom you see we are taught, that though Christ by different means is set forth and preached, as by Scripture, by preaching, and by the sacrament, yet all these are not of the same nature. For none of these are called the body of Christ, that is, by the words of Christ, this is my body; that only is called the body of Christ.

Now Æcolampadius wished to shew, that because St. Augustine says that Christ is preached by Scripture, by word, and by sacrament, that these three are of one sort, there being no more in the sacrament than in the other two. But I request of your Lordship to remark, how he falsifies the words of this great Saint, in order to prove what he has so wickedly advanced, for he gives only a part of what St. Augustine says, and holds back the rest; he gives this much: “Paul might by signifying preach our Lord Jesus Christ, otherwise by his tongue, otherwise by epistle, otherwise by the sacrament of his body and blood.” And upon this he grounds his argument, and would wish to let it appear so to have confirmed his doctrine. But all the words of St. Augustine which follow are left out, and these completely destroy the foundation which he endeavoured so craftily to raise. The words which he left out are as follows: “Yet we do not call his tongue, his epistle, nor his writings, the body of Christ; but we call that only the body of Christ, that is taken from the fruits of the earth, and is by the mystical prayer consecrated; that is what we call the body of Christ.” All these words this Reformer thinks proper to pass over. Such was the sincerity of this man in quoting the holy Fathers; so good is the cause which he defended, that the Fathers must be mutilated and brought out in piecemeal to answer his purpose.

Remark these two points, that St. Augustine says, “That the bread is sanctified and made so great a sacrament.” And

again he says, "It is so sanctified and made by the invisible work of the Holy Ghost." There is a great difference between the sanctification of the sacrament itself, and the soul of man that receives the sacrament. Œcolampadius and Cranmer stoutly maintain, that the sacraments being dumb things receive no sanctification, but only the souls of men; they maintain also, that the Holy Ghost does not operate in the things that are sacraments, but in the persons who receive the sacraments. Thus they speak because they wish to avoid the presence of Christ in the sacrament, which is there made present by the sanctification of the bread. But in opposition to these heretical opinions of these two Reformers, this great Saint (Augustine) says: "That the same bread which is made by the hands of men is sanctified, is made so great a Sacrament." Against them also he says: "That the Holy Ghost works invisibly in the bread." Pray therefore, my Lord Bishop, inform me what St. Augustine means by calling the sacrament so great a sacrament? and what work that is, which the Holy Ghost operates invisibly in the bread? The works of the Holy Ghost are not trifles; they are great and wonderful things which he performs. And what he works, St. James in his mass, and St. Basil, as also St. Chrysostom, in their masses, declare. St. James says: "*Spiritum tuum sanctissimum demitte nunc Domine in nos, et in hæc sancta dona proposita, ut superveniens sancta, et bona, et gloriosa sua præsentia sanctificet, et efficiat hunc panem corpus sanctum Christi tui, et calicem hunc preciosum sanguinem Christi tui.*"—"Send down now, oh Lord, thy holy Spirit upon us, and upon these holy gifts set forth, that he coming down upon them, may by his holy, good, and glorious presence sanctify and make this bread the holy body of thy Christ, and this cup the precious blood of thy Christ." Thus speaks St. James; and those great Saints, Basil and Chrysostom, make use of exactly the same expressions.

It is as clear as day, that St. Chrysostom so understood "Hoc est corpus meum," as is proved in several places in his works, when treating of these words, "This is my body;" he never once adds this meaning, this is a figure of my body, but always leaves them in the sense in which they were spoken; and in some places by express words, in others by plain circumstances, he declares the very presence of Christ's body in the sacrament. By express words when he says: "Qui dixit hoc est corpus meum, et rem simul cum verbo confecit."—"He that said, 'This is my body,' he by his word made also the thing."—(*In 14 Marc. Hom. 51.*) I hope sincerely that your Lordship will ponder well on these words of St. Chrysostom, that they may be always preserved in your memory, and may be always retained as a rule to understand him in all places where he speaks of the sacrament of Christ's body and blood. For if Christ by his words made the thing also that he spoke of, and the thing which he spoke of was his body, accordingly by the words which he spoke he made his body. This then being true, as St. Chrysostom here teaches, it cannot be denied but that by express words he teaches the very presence of Christ's body in the sacrament. See St. Chrysostom, (26 *in Matt. Hom. 83.*) where he says, "For inasmuch then as he has said, 'this is my body,' let us hold it with no ambiguity or doubt, but let us believe, and with the eyes of our understanding let us verily see it." Now in the name of heaven, if the words of Christ had another meaning than the one which the universal Church gives to them, suppose, for example, that this is but a figure of Christ's body, and not the body itself, would the illustrious St. Chrysostom have taken such pains in a public sermon to impress on the people's minds the necessity of believing and of not doubting the truth of the words as they were spoken? would he not first have given the true sense and meaning of them, if there were any other, and then exhorted the people

not to doubt? but it is as clear as words can express, that Chrysostom firmly believed and taught the real and substantial presence of Christ in the sacrament. It is a bad and a cruel manner to teach the people that the Scriptures can deceive, and are not to be understood but in a sense altogether different from its plain meaning. This is not the manner of St. Chrysostom, consequently, as he wishes them not to doubt but to believe the words as they were spoken, (which he does in that instance, and never teaches any other mode elsewhere,) it is manifest that these words are to be understood in their proper literal sense, and without the figure, which our adversaries wish to give them.

You cannot help perceiving now, how this bread is sanctified. Do you not see that it is the Holy Ghost who operates the change of the bread and wine after the words of consecration have been pronounced? You cannot help likewise perceiving the great reason St. Augustine had when he called this sacrament so great a sacrament. And is it not a wonderful sacrament, when by the power of the Holy Ghost, Christ's body is made present? In order to conceal this verity, Œcolampadius quotes St. Augustine by piecemeal. But you have seen the true Catholic faith well testified, the falsehood of its adversaries detected, and, I trust, that help has been hereby given to you to perceive that this sacrament is consecrated by mystical prayer, that is, by Christ's own words, the effects of which consecration being the body of Christ really present, the words must consequently be taken without the figurative sense.

I am,

My Lord Bishop,

Your obedient Servant,

VERAX,

A CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

POSTSCRIPT.

Some Protestants boast that they are ever guided by antiquity; but to prove to your Lordship how false their assertions are, I have only to give a quotation from the great St. Augustine, wherein he plainly shews the necessity of receiving the sacrament fasting, whereas according to Protestant practice, a person may eat a good breakfast, *à la fourchette*, and then approach the sacrament. St. Augustine says: "Placuit enim Spiritui Sancto, ut in honorem tanti sacramenti in os Christiani prius Domini corpus intraret, quam exteri cibi."—(*Ad Jan. Epist.* 118.)—"It hath pleased the Holy Ghost, that in honor of so great a sacrament the body of our Lord should enter the mouth of a Christian before worldly meats." But your Lordship may say, that this honor is not paid to the sacrament but to God, and to his grace received when the sacrament is taken? To which I answer, that the very words of St. Paul, speaking of the sacrament, overthrows this assertion, for he expressly says, "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup." He does not say: let him examine himself, and so he shall receive the grace of God, and the virtue of the merit of Christ's passion and death; which doctrine is generally taught throughout the entire gospel. For what is more clearly and strongly taught than the remission of sins to those penitents by the virtue of Christ's passion? But here St. Paul speaks of the sacrament in an especial manner, and therefore says: "And so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup." For a still more manifest proof of this, remark that St. Paul refers the honor or dishonor that is done by worthily or unworthily receiving, not immediately to the grace of God, or to the merit of Christ's passion, but to the sacrament, and therefore says: "Itaque quicumque manducaverit panem et biberit calicem Domini indigné, reus erit corporis et sanguinis

Domini."—(1 Cor. 11.)—"Whosoever therefore shall eat the bread and drink the cup of our Lord unworthily, he shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." So that the worthily receiving is referred to the bread and to the cup of our Lord; wherefore it is evident, that as the worthily or unworthily receiving is referred to the sacrament, so the honor or dishonor that is done by the same is also referred to the Eucharist. Therefore when St. Paul taught Christians to examine and to prepare themselves for worthily receiving so great a sacrament, he taught them to honor the sacrament. I may also add, that as St. Paul taught the Corinthians, and by them all Christians, the presence of Christ in the sacrament, he might well teach them to honor him in the sacrament; for where Christ is really present, there is no danger, but every Christian should there honor him.

"No man," says St. Augustine, "ascends up to heaven, but he who came down from heaven, even the son of man who is in heaven. He did not say, who was, but the son (says he) of man who is in heaven. He spoke on earth, and he said, he was in heaven. For what purpose was it, but that we may understand, which I have already declared to your charity, that Christ, God, and man, is one person, not two, lest our faith be not a trinity, but a quaternity. Christ therefore is one; the Son of God, the soul, and the flesh, one Christ; the Son of God, and the Son of Man, one Christ. Christ ever the Son of God; the Son of Man in the order of time; nevertheless one Christ after the unity of person in heaven. When he spoke on earth, the Son of Man was in heaven, in the same manner as the Son of God was on earth; the Son of God was on earth in the received flesh, the son of man was in heaven in the unity of person."—(*St. August. Tract 27, in Joan.*)

LETTER X.

All the Fathers agree that we receive the body and blood of Christ in the Eucharist.

TO THE LORD BISHOP OF EXETER.

MY LORD BISHOP,

All the Fathers with one accord agree that we receive the body of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist. It appears clear that they believed that Jesus Christ really enters into us; although some of the Fathers may not, I admit, have expressed themselves so clearly as others have done on this subject, yet their meaning was exactly the same. What! because an author takes a particular view, and in seeking proofs from every quarter to justify an expression, employs terms in such a manner as to bear a signification a little out of the ordinary sense in which they are used, is it therefore less true, "That the Saviour," as St. Irenæus says, (*Lib. 5, c. 2,*) "has declared that the chalice, which is a creature, is his true blood?" It will be no longer true, "That the Holy Ghost," as says St. Isidore, (*L. 1, Ep. 109,*) "makes the bread of the Eucharist the true body which Jesus Christ assumed at his incarnation." It is no longer true, "That the Creator of natures," as says St. Gaudentius, (*Tract 2, in Exod.*) "makes of bread his true

body, because he can do it, and that he has promised it." It is no longer true, as says St. Cyril, (*L. 4, Cont. Nestor. p. 113,*) that "Jesus Christ enters our bodies by his own flesh." It is no longer true, that "Although what they offer neither resembles nor is equal, it is nevertheless the true divine body," as says the author of the dialogues attributed to Cæsarius, (*Dialog. 3, inter. 169.*) It is no longer true, "That what we receive in the Eucharist is the true body and blood of Jesus Christ, that it is truly his body;" as all the Churches of the world make a public profession of faith to believe it. (See *Per. 2, 1, 4, c. 8, cidessus.*) It is no longer true, that "It is his real flesh which we receive, and his true blood which is our beverage," as says the author of the work on the Sacraments, (*L. 6, c. 1.*) It is no longer true, that "The Holy Ghost makes of bread the body of Jesus Christ," as Procleus assures us in his Treatise upon the Liturgy. It will be no longer true, "That we behold in the Eucharist," as St. Chrysostom says, (*Hom. 24, in Epist. 1 ad Cor.*) this same body which Magi had adored." It will be no longer true, "That we can eat," as says Severus, "the word itself, because it has no body, but that we eat it in eating the flesh which the word gives life to."—(*Dans la Chaine sur S. Jean, imprimée à Anvers.*) It will be no longer true, that "Jesus Christ," as says St. Cyril, (*In Joan, p. 999,*) "blesses all the faithful by one only body, which is his own real one, and that we receive this only indivisible body into our bodies." It will be no longer true, as says St. Augustine, (*Lib. 2, Cont. Adver. leg. et proph. c. 9,*) "That we receive with a faithful heart and mouth the mediator of God and of men, the man Jesus Christ, who gives us his body to eat and his blood to drink, although it appears more horrible to eat the flesh of a man than to kill it, and to drink his blood than to shed it." It will be no longer true to say with St. Cyril, (*In Joan. p. 861,*) "That a corruptible being as ours, cannot in

any other way exist, but in being united corporally to the body of him who is the very essence of life." We must then no longer make the profession of faith of St. Gregory of Nyssa, (*Orat. Cat. cap. 37*), "I believe that the bread is sanctified by the word, is transmuted into the body of God the word." Nor to say with the author of the Homilies attributed to Eusebius of Emesus, (*Hom. 5, de Pasc.*) "That the sacrificer converts invisibly by his word full of secret power, visible creatures into the substance of his body and blood."

Now if we were to follow this Protestant reasoning, we must give up all those passages, and a number of others which I could produce, merely and simply because some Fathers have expressed themselves in a manner not so clear as others have done, although their meaning was exactly the same. This clearly proves to us the folly of individuals presuming to set up their own weak opinions in opposition to the infallible authority of God's Church—she alone being guided by the spirit of truth: "And behold I am with you all days even to the consummation of the world."—(St. Matthew.) She is also as the Apostle declares, "The pillar and ground of truth." I will further advance that if it were permitted to follow this Protestant method in the examination of the Fathers, no dogma could be preserved uncontaminated, since there is not one article of faith but has been attacked, by means of some difficult passage taken out of the writings of the Fathers, in the same manner as texts of Scripture have been perverted from their true meaning. This is the reason why Facundus (and it would be well if Protestants would adopt the rule which he recommends to every one in studying the Fathers, and which he shews Catholics invariably follow) says: "It belongs but to heretics possessed of the spirit of calumny, to wish to turn from their proper meaning clear and manifest passages, by passages obscure and ambiguous ;

Catholic piety and prudence, on the contrary, endeavour to clear up what is obscure in some passages, by the clearness of those which are evident.”—“*Quemadmodum calumniantium hæreticorum est ex dubiis et obscuris quæ certa et manifesta sunt malè interpretari, ita solitum prudentiæ ac veritatis Catholicæ, ex indubitatis atque evidentibus ambigua et latentia declarare.*” It is he himself who has given us this excellent caution, that as authors treat upon different subjects, so they have likewise different views in their words;—“*Pro diversitate causarum diversa semper est dicentis intentio;*” by which he points out to us not to insist upon the meaning of an expression, with the particular view to bring it forward to serve as a proof to a thing which he had advanced. In fine, my Lord Bishop, this same Facundus, who teaches us by his example to practise towards him, what he invariably practises towards the other Fathers, and who loudly condemns the rashness of those who have had the presumption to make use of his name to combat the doctrines of the Church. “It is,” says he, “in these different ways that a pious and intelligent reader ought to understand the words of the ancient Fathers, and lay aside all the calumnies of heretics; but when ignorant and presumptuous persons, who condemn everything which they do not understand, commence to read them, it is certain that this sort of persons find in them (the writings of the Fathers) subjects not only to torment themselves with, but likewise their neighbours, for not having themselves a sufficiency of knowledge to understand them, they have presumption enough to wish to prevent others from explaining them properly.”—“*Non hæc ingeniosum lectorem, sed potius lectorem non fastidiosum requirunt. Aperta res ac manifesta interpretatione ullâ non indiget. Tantum est ut videre jam velint qui clausis oculis veritati resistunt.*”

It is thus that Tertullian declares in one part of his book on the Resurrection, (c. 8,) “That the flesh is nourished by

the body and blood of Jesus Christ, in order that the soul should fatten in God.”—“Caro corpore et sanguine Christi vescitur, ut anima de Deo saginetur.” And in the very same book, in speaking of the Capharnaïtes, and taking the word to eat in the same sense which they did, he says, (*c.* 37,) “That they believed that Jesus Christ would give them his flesh to eat.”—“Nam quia durum et intolerabilem existima-verunt sermonem ejus, quasi verè carnem suam illis edendam determinâsset.” Aubertin concluded from this, that according to Tertullian, that Jesus Christ has not given us truly and really his flesh to eat. And he had reason so to suppose; but he was wrong to believe that there was anything contradictory in this proposition, in the sense which Jesus Christ gives us his flesh to eat. Both in fact are true, and both are authorised by the Fathers.

Tertullian advances the first, as we have seen, though he does not refrain from saying with all the Fathers, that the flesh is nourished by the body of Jesus Christ; and he would say accordingly without difficulty, that we truly eat it, and that Jesus Christ truly gives us his body to eat. For Gelasius Cizicenus made no difficulty whatever to declare at the Council of Nice, “That we truly receive the precious body and blood of Jesus Christ.” And St. Augustine explains after the same manner, the idea which the Jews had of what Jesus Christ taught on this subject, he says: “They conceived what Jesus Christ said in a foolish and in a wrong sense; they thought that he spoke of his carnal flesh, and that our Saviour would cut it up into small pieces to give it to us to eat; this is why they said, This speech is hard.”—(*In Psal.* 98.) “They do not believe,” says he, in another place, “that there was anything great in what Jesus Christ said to them, nor that these words covered some particular grace which he wished to bestow on them. They understood him as they wished to understand him, according to the

fashion of men; they thought that Jesus Christ might have had the intention to distribute his flesh cut up into small parts to those who believed in him." "They believed," he says again in the same place, "that he should cut up his flesh to be distributed in small parts, as they cut up dead bodies, and in the same manner as they expose meat in the shambles; but they did not believe that he said to them that it should be living and animated by the spirit."—"Sic intellexerunt quomodo in cadavere dilaniatur aut in macello venditur, non quomodo spiritu vegetatur." "You believe," says he again in another place, (*Serm. 2, de Verb. Apost.*) "that I am going to cut up my body into morsels in order to give it to you."

Now here we find St. Augustine speaking exactly in the same terms as Tertullian, but he did not refrain from saying that Jesus Christ truly gives us his flesh to eat: "Verè qui nobis dedit manducare corpus suum." The illusion then of Aubertin was, that he did not wish to comprehend, that it could be said without a contradiction that Jesus Christ did not give us his body to eat; that is, that he did not give it to us to beat, to cut, to taste, and to digest, as the Capharnaïtes imagined, and that he gives us truly his body to eat, because we truly receive it into our bodies. "But," exclaims Aubertin, "would they say, that a man who would eat flesh which would have the shape of fish would not eat flesh? Do they not say, that they eat pills? Que des brochets mangent des autres brochets, quoiqu'ils les avalent tout entiers? Why then should these Fathers say, that we do not eat the flesh of Jesus Christ, if it were true that he really enters into our bodies?" Aubertin is full of those low and base comparisons; and it is most extraordinary that he who has so often applied and used them, should not at last have found out his fault, for it is very true to say that a pike may eat a pike, and we could not say that he does not eat it, and the reason

is because he touches it, he tastes it, he digests it; but when a thing does not act on all the senses, and that of all the actions in which consist the eating, it meets with that only of the entry into the mouth of food, and to descend into the stomach, it is much more common to say, that we do not eat it. Thus, for example, we do not say that we eat the air; we do not say that we eat pills. Protestants themselves do not say that they eat the Holy Ghost, although he be present in the food which they receive. Theologians deny that we eat the soul of Jesus Christ, although we receive it with his body. The scholastic philosophers do not say that they eat the substantial forms, although they appear as material beings, which are joined to all bodies, and consequently to food. Therefore in attaching itself to the literal signification of the word to eat, it is more difficult to explain those passages where the Fathers tell us that we eat the body of Jesus Christ, and those where they tell us that we do not eat him; because, in fact, there is not exercised on the body of Jesus Christ scarce any of the actions which are comprised in the idea which we have of this word. * Who therefore will be astonished when Origen tells us, (*Hom. 7, in Levit.*) as regards the meaning of the Capharnaïtes, that there are in these words, If you do not eat the flesh of the son of man and drink his blood, a letter which kills. Now why would he not say, as the sense which the Capharnaïtes give them is the literal meaning of the words to eat and to drink, and that this signification is a letter which kills?

Who would be astonished that Eusebius of Cesarea should say, as speaking for Jesus Christ, (*De Eccles. Theolog. Contr. Marcel. Ancyr. L. 5, c. 12,*) "Do not suppose that I speak of the flesh which I carry as if it were to be eaten, and do not think that I command you to drink a corporal and visible blood." On this passage an eminent French Catholic theologian makes such just remarks, that I think it best to

give his words: "Que conclut tout cela, sinon que l'on ne mange pas le corps de Jesus Christ, et que l'on ne boit pas son sang de la manière et selon le sens le plus commun de ces terms? Il faut seulement remarquer qu'Eusèbe n'explique en ce lieu le sixième chapitre de S. Jean, ni de la manducation sacramentale ni de la manducation spirituelle de la chair de Jesus Christ, mais de la parole de Dieu, ce qui est un sens très-rare dans les Pères; et qu'ainsi, en supposant que cette chair dont parlait Jesus Christ était sa parole, et non son corps, il avait encore plus d'occasion de faire dire à Jesus Christ qu'il ne fallait pas manger sa chair, mais cela ne conclut nullement que le même Eusèbe n'ait cru que l'on recevait réellement la chair de Jesus Christ en recevant l'Euchariste, quoique d'une manière qui n'est pas sensible; puisque il croyait que les symboles Eucharistiques, n'étaient pas des figures vides, comme ceux de l'ancienne loi, mais qu'ils contenaient la vérité même."

Now 1st, if the Fathers had considered that the Eucharist was nothing else but bread and wine, they ought never to have taken the pains they did to clear up those expressions which they used when they called it bread and wine, nor to prevent us from believing that it is bread and wine. 2nd, They ought never to tell us, in calling it bread and wine, that it was not bread and wine. 3rd, They ought not only not to have used these terms in the places in which they did, but they ought in no place to have made use of them. 4th, They ought to have taken away the difficulty of these terms which might lead us to believe that it was not bread and wine; but that we ought, on the contrary, to believe that they called the Eucharist bread and wine merely to designate what it appeared to be, when they sometimes called it bread and wine. They give us many powerful reasons for believing that it is not bread and wine; if they did not do it in these places, they did it in others; if they never made difficulties on the ex-

pressions which mark that they are not bread and wine, nor understood them to be taken in the literal sense; it is by these different circumstances that we come to distinguish the meaning which the Fathers gave to these terms which they used. For example: St. Gregory Nazianzen calls the elements, "Antitypes of the mysteries." But then, a few lines before, he said, "That in the Eucharist we partake of the divinity of Christ."—(*Lib. 6. Ap.*) St. Epiphanius tells us, "That the bread and wine offered by Melchisadech, did typify the antitypes of Christ's blood;" he adds, "that blood which flowed from his side, for the cleansing and redeeming our souls," which certainly was his natural blood. As upon these two places in particular, so in general I may farther observe, that when types are compared with their antitypes, the word antitype naturally means the thing signified by the type. And, therefore, since the ancient sacrifices were types of Christ's personal sacrifice, the antitypes of his blood mean his personal blood, as the original of those types, and answering to, and taking the place of the types; and much in this way, Baptism in the first Epistle of St. Peter, iii. 21, in the Greek is called the antitype of the Ark, and of the saving of those who by it escaped the deluge. Baptism is the reality of that saving remedy against perishing in sin, which was prefigured by ancient types. And thus the Eucharist is the reality of that saving blood which was prefigured by the blood of ancient sacrifices, and the antitype of those types; though at the same time that it is the reality of that substantial blood of Christ, it is also typically in the Eucharist, that is, not in its own shape, but under the type or appearance of bread. In fine, it is as clear as day to any one accustomed to read the Fathers with proper dispositions and with unprejudiced minds, that they (the Fathers) believed it to be, not a figure only of Christ's body, but his very real and personal body. St. Chrysostom is brought forward by Protestants as a witness

against the doctrine of the universal Church on this great point, when he says: "We have received greater symbols than were contained in the Holy of Holies."—(*Lit. e. Ap.*) But then he adds in the same place: "We have not the cherubim, but the Lord of the cherubim dwelling in us;" which cannot be true, unless the Eucharist be Christ himself. How now, in the name of heaven, can Protestants assert that St. Chrysostom plainly makes the body and blood to be but symbols? No, he does not make them but symbols, or only symbols, but he plainly makes them such symbols as contain the very person of him whose symbols they are.

I am,

My Lord Bishop,

Your obedient Servant,

VERAX,

A CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

POSTSCRIPT.

In the Council of Trent is defined the conversion of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, which conversion is there and in the Lateran Council termed by a proper name, "Transubstantiation."—(See page 48.) To these Councils and to the ancient Fathers whom I have quoted in these letters, some Protestants have ridiculously opposed a few obscure sentences to endeavour to prove the Lutheran doctrine on this subject, rather than their own, and this recollect, my Lord Bishop, is decidedly in opposition, if your most learned divines are to be believed, to the doctrine of the English Church as regards the sacrament. An Almighty has said, "This is my body," and man, vain man, has presumed to question it! but "who art thou that repliest against God? shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, why hast thou made me thus?"—(Rom. ix. 20.)

LETTER XI.

"The spiritual rock was Christ."

TO THE LORD BISHOP OF EXETER.

MY LORD BISHOP,

When Œcolampadius commented on that text of Scripture, "Petra erat Christus," he declared it was figurative, whereas it is proved to be quite the reverse, viz., no figure whatever, but a certain truth, for the spiritual rock was Christ; therefore it is properly applied to the Catholic verity, that as the rock was not figuratively, but truly Christ; so in like manner the sacrament of the altar is not figuratively, but verily the body of Christ. And as the Holy Ghost was verily under the corporeal form of a dove, and truly present with the fiery tongues, and also verily given to the Apostles by the breathing of Christ, so is the body of Christ verily and truly under the corporeal forms of bread and wine. As the Holy Ghost was under the appearance of a dove; and verily also given to the faithful, as the Holy Ghost was given to the multitude. And under that corporeal form as truly received by Christians, as the Holy Ghost was, by the breathing of Christ, received by the Apostles. So there is a conformity and a great resemblance between these parts of sacred

Scripture, and which move the Christian very strongly to believe in the presence of Christ's body in the sacrament. For as we are taught to believe that the Holy Ghost descended under a corporeal form, because the Scripture says so; in like manner we are taught to believe that Christ's body is under the form of bread, because the Scripture informs us to that effect, Christ having blessed the bread, said, "This is my body," and so of the rest; and as the Scripture no where says, that the dove or the tongues were the Holy Ghost, so it no where declares that the form of bread is the body of Christ. But as the sacred Scripture informs us, that with these forms the very things themselves are given, and not the bare signs only; so we are taught that with the form of bread is given the very thing consecrated, which is the very body of Christ himself, saying, "Take, eat, this is my body."

Thus, my Lord Bishop, you may perceive how wisely God has set forth his mysteries, that one may be conferred with another, so that the faith of the weak may be much strengthened, the faith of the strong comforted and delighted, and the more so that they may behold how God turns the swords of the enemy upon themselves, and with their own very weapons defends us. St. Chrysostom, (x. 1 *Cor.*) to prove that St. Paul meant Christ to be that spiritual rock, says, "Ideo dixit, consequente Petrà." Therefore said St. Paul, as follows: that the Jews drank of a spiritual rock, which spiritual rock was one that followed them. But no other rock followed them but Christ, therefore Christ was the spiritual rock; so that we may conclude that this proposition is to be understood grammatically, and not tropically or figuratively. If therefore Œcolampadius laid the foundation of his building to prove the words of the Lord's supper to be figurative, and that upon a false understanding of scripture, will he not erect his building upon the same false foundation, that is, that these words of Christ shall be likewise understood in a wrong

sense? Your Lordship cannot help to perceive how your Reformers twist and turn the Scriptures to every sense but to the right one, in order to gratify their own whims and fancies; and I here most positively assert, and common sense teaches it, that no one on earth has a right to interpret the sacred Scriptures but the Catholic Church, because she alone is the ground and pillar of truth, to her alone the Saviour has promised his blessed assistance to be with her for ever, "and behold I am with you all days, even unto the end of the world."

I am,

My Lord Bishop,

Your obedient Servant,

VERAX,

A CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

POSTSCRIPT.

I take this opportunity of replying to a question lately put to me regarding the two natures in Christ, as follows: Eutyches, a monk of Constantinople, pretended that there was but one nature in Christ, which error is followed by the Armenian and Ethiopic schismatics. This heresy was condemned in 451, at the Council of Chalcedon; and is thus refuted from the Gospel: "The word was God.....the word was made flesh and dwelt among us."—(St. John i.) This passage most clearly expressed two distinct natures; the divine nature of the word called God, and the human nature designated by the name of flesh, which the word assumed in order to dwell among men. "I and the Father are one. The Father is greater than I," says Christ.—(St. John x. and xiv.) These two assertions cannot be true unless there be two natures in Christ; the one divine, by which he is one with the Father,

and the other human, by which he is less than the Father. The Evangelists relate, that he fasted, was hungry, fatigued, that he suffered on the cross and died. His whole life and sufferings most evidently prove, that the properties of human nature remained whole, perfect, and without confusion in him after the union of the human nature with the divine word.

NOTE TO LETTER XI.

It is impossible to establish virtue, justice, and morality on any solid foundation without the tribunal of penance, because that tribunal, the most formidable of all, takes cognizance of the conscience of man, and directs it in a manner more efficacious than any other. Now that tribunal belongs exclusively to the Catholic Church. It is impossible to establish the tribunal of penance without a belief in the real presence, that principal basis of Catholic faith, because without that belief, the sacrament of communion loses its dignity and value. Protestants approach the holy table without fear, for they receive only a sign commemorative of the body of Jesus Christ. On the other hand, Catholics approach it with dread, because they receive the very body of their Redeemer. Thus wherever this belief was destroyed, the tribunal of penance ceased with it; confession became useless, as wherever this belief exists, confession is essential. And this tribunal, which is necessarily established with it, renders imperative the exercise of virtue, justice, and morality. In fine, the Eucharist is to the moral what the Sun is to the physical world, illuminans omnes homines.—(St. John.)

LETTER XII.

Men are capable of distinguishing between literal and figurative expressions; and if they want this capacity, they want also the capacity of distinguishing between truth and error.

TO THE LORD BISHOP OF EXETER.

MY LORD BISHOP,

The entire controversy between the Catholics and the Protestants is clearly reducible to this one point, whether the ordinary expressions of the Scriptures and the Fathers ought to be understood in the sense which first occurs to the mind, that is, in their simple and natural sense; or whether they ought to be taken in a far fetched and figurative signification. Catholics adopt the literal signification, Protestants the figurative. The Catholics say, that when the Fathers affirm that the bread is changed, and made the body of Jesus Christ, they mean that the bread is really and truly changed into the very body of Jesus Christ. The Protestants, on the contrary, assert, that the Fathers wished to express not a real, but a merely figurative change in the bread.

To this one point the present important question is limited—a question, the decision of which depends solely on the principles and rules adopted by men in order to distinguish

between simple and figurative expressions. To ascertain and define these principles and rules is very difficult. But that there are such must be admitted. To deny this would subvert the belief not of one mystery alone, but of all the mysteries without exception; because the proofs of any one of the mysteries may be subverted by interpreting figuratively whatever is affirmed upon it in the Scriptures and in the Fathers. If it be said, for example, in the Scripture, that Jesus Christ is God; the Arians and the Socinians will reply, that in a figurative sense he is God; that he is God by grace, and not by nature; that he is God, but subject to another God greater than himself. If the Scripture speaks of the Holy Spirit as a person, these heretics will also reply, that it speaks thus by the figure *prosopopeia*. If it be said of Jesus Christ that he was born of a Virgin, they will tell you, that in a figurative sense the assertion is true; because as some Eutychians taught, he passed through the womb of Mary, as water through a very pure canal. If it be said that he suffered and died, it will be answered with the Manichians and Mahometans, that he suffered and died apparently and figuratively, because he appeared to suffer. If it be said, that he redeemed men by his blood, this will be interpreted, agreeably to the Socinian doctrine, to mean, not that the blood of Jesus Christ was offered as the price of man's redemption, but merely that as Jesus Christ died to confirm the truth which he announced, we should attribute to his death the deliverance of men, whom God receives into grace, when they submit to the truths which Jesus Christ taught, and follow the rules which he gave them. In short, all religion, and all the proofs derived from the Scripture and from the Fathers in support of religion, are based on this principle, that men are capable of distinguishing between simple and figurative expressions; and if they want this capacity, they want also the capacity to distinguish between truth and error.

This is then the only question to be considered: what are the rules for discriminating simple from figurative language, and how are we to make so important a distinction? Now if this inquiry be entered on sincerely, I think it impossible for any one not to be convinced, that the faithful never could have understood figuratively the ordinary expressions of the Fathers upon the Eucharist, and that they must have interpreted them literally. I will here subjoin some of the rules that serve to distinguish between simple and figurative language.

1. When what is to be expressed may with as much facility be declared naturally as figuratively, natural and simple language is in general infinitely more often employed than figurative; hence it is, that as simple expressions present the idea of the truth distinctly to the mind, they are used to reduce to accuracy expressions that are metaphorical. This rule applies when, with equal facility, we can convey our meaning by simple as by figurative language. For some things so far transcend the grasp of the human mind, that they can hardly be made intelligible except by means of metaphors borrowed from objects more lowly and more proportioned to the limits of the human understanding. The fundamental reason of this rule is, that men ordinarily, and when not prevented by any particular cause, incline to what is most conformable to truth and nature. Now metaphorical expressions are, in some manner, contrary to nature; because if rigorously taken they are false, and cannot therefore be ordinarily used, and if they were ordinarily used they would be deceitful and unintelligible. It is not, for example, difficult to understand St. Gaudentius, when he speaks thus of the water of the baptism which the Apostles administered to those whom they had converted by their preaching: "The Lord Jesus," says he, "converted this water into wine by an invisible power, so that they who were baptized made known

by the gift of tongues, which they all at once received, that they had tasted of the Holy Spirit."* For this metaphor is so seldom employed, and the baptism which the Apostles administered is so often spoken of without it, that every one, from the clear and distinct idea conveyed to his mind by the language ordinarily used on baptism, must perceive that the extraordinary language of St. Gaudentius is figurative and metaphorical. But if the baptism of the Apostles were ordinarily spoken of as St. Gaudentius speaks of it, and if the Fathers constantly announced that in it Jesus Christ changed water into wine by an invisible power, every one should then understand these expressions literally, and believe that at the baptism of the first Christians, as at the marriage of Cana in Galilee, Jesus Christ changed water into wine. In like manner, were there only one or two passages in the ancient writers in which it was affirmed that what we receive in the Eucharist is the body of Jesus Christ; that the bread is made the body of Jesus Christ, that it is changed, converted, and transelemented into the body of Jesus Christ; if while this was affirmed in one or two places only, it was clearly stated in all other passages upon the Eucharist, that the bread is

* What St. Gaudentius says in the passage here quoted is not properly a metaphor, but an allegorical exposition of the miracle of Cana. The entire passage is as follows: "Therefore the most blessed Apostles, after having discharged the duty of faithful ministers, filled the vases of the believing nations with the water of sacred baptism, and the Lord Jesus by an invisible power converted this water into wine, so that those whom the Apostles baptized gave instant testimony, by the gift of tongues, which they had suddenly received, of the Holy Spirit operating within them." It is hence clear, that when St. Gaudentius says that God converted water into wine in the baptism conferred by the Apostles, he means that God accomplished what was prefigured by the conversion of water into wine at the marriage of Cana in Galilee.

not really changed into the body of Jesus Christ, that it becomes only the sign and the figure of his body, these reiterated plain expressions, presenting a distinct idea of the real absence, might explain the other unusual passages, and make the figurative expressions intelligible. Now the fact is precisely the reverse. For the passages which the Calvinists adduce to elucidate and define those others that express the real presence, are rare, unnoted, obscure, unknown, and by no means popular; while the passages that lead to the belief of the real presence, are of frequent and ordinary occurrence, and were always in the mouths of the pastors and the people. Hence it was impossible that these should have been viewed as figurative passages.

2. As metaphors always include a certain degree of falsity, it would be doing violence to our nature, to use for a long time and continually metaphorical language; and rhetoricians teach, that metaphor when thus used, instead of being ornamental, occasions enigmas in discourse, a fault so named because it renders language obscure and hard to be understood. Let the expressions in the Fathers, which naturally denote the real presence, be examined by this rule, and we shall find that the faithful could not attribute a figurative meaning to them. For whenever the Fathers make use of them, they adhere to them, continue throughout their discourse to employ them, and often strengthen them by the addition of other similar expressions. In short, to speak of this mystery as the Fathers speak of it, they must have formally intended to deceive those whom they addressed. From the numerous examples before me, sufficiently numerous, as those informed on the subject know, to fill a pretty large volume, I will quote but one from the Twenty-fourth Homily of St. Chrysostom, on the first Epistle to the Corinthians, and I will leave every reasonable person to decide, whether anything not only more enigmatical, but even more non-

sensical that this Saint's discourse ever appeared, if, as the Protestants pretend, his words are to be figuratively interpreted? "These words of the Apostle," says the Saint, "the chalice of benediction which we bless, is it not the communion of the body of Jesus Christ? ought to excite not less terror than faith in our minds. For they teach us, that what is in the chalice is the same blood which flowed from the side of the Saviour, who was pierced on the cross." Here, according to Protestants, St. John commences to speak metaphorically, and his metaphors are strange indeed. For, in order to say that wine is the figure of the blood of Jesus Christ, it would be very strange to affirm that what is in the chalice is the same blood which flowed from the side of the Saviour. But let us observe how St. Chrysostom keeps up the metaphorical language. In a passage almost immediately after that just quoted, the Saint says: "That Jesus Christ was not content with having delivered his body to death for us; but as the first flesh which he had formed from the earth had been deprived of life, and was subjected to death by sin, Jesus Christ formed, so to speak, another substance, and as it were a leaven, that is, his own flesh, which although of the same nature as ours, was nevertheless exempt from sin, and full of life. This he gave to all, that all should be nourished by it, and that, divesting themselves of the old flesh, they might be renewed by this new flesh. We must observe, that the Apostle, speaking of the Jews, does not say that they are participators of God, but only that they are participators of the altar; because what was formerly offered on the ancient altar was to be consumed by fire. This is not the case with the body of Jesus Christ. And in what does the difference consist? In this, that Jesus Christ communicates the same body to all the faithful, and thus we are not partakers of the altar, but of the very body of Jesus Christ." The metaphor begins here to be somewhat tedious, and I am sure to be also

troublesome to a Calvinist. But St. Chrysostom does not intend to desist so soon. He grounds on the truth which he has here laid down, an important instruction to the faithful, in which he warns them not to approach this terrible and dreadful sacrifice, as he calls it, except in the spirit of peace and with an ardent charity, so that they might be worthy to appear in the air before Jesus Christ, when at the consummation of ages he will descend from heaven. Then resuming this pretended metaphor, the Saint proceeds: "If it be true, that there is no one so rash as to receive with discourtesy and indifference a king who might visit him; but what do I say? if so far from receiving a king thus, no one would presume to touch the king's robes too familiarly, and in a manner not sufficiently respectful to the sovereign: if no one would use such familiarity with the king, even though the monarch were in a desert unaccompanied by any of his retinue—if, I say, no one would have the effrontery thus to touch merely a man's vesture, how can we do so daring an act as to receive within us the body of God himself with dishonour and injury—of God who is infinitely exalted above all kings; this body which is so pure, and in which there is not the least stain; this body which is united and dwells with the Divinity; this body by which we receive being and life, by which the gates of hell were burst and the portals of heaven thrown open."

I am,

My Lord Bishop,

Your obedient Servant,

VERAX,

A CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

POSTSCRIPT.

Christ is the truth personally residing among men. Contemporary with Christ, the Church which received from his blessed lips the eternal word, but clothed in human language, unceasingly communicates, under the same relative and limited form, the infinite word to mortal intelligences, until passing from this region they become united to him in a more perfect world. How could this tradition of the word have been even for a single instant suspended? Could the Church in some day-dream have imagined that word to be eternal which was but of yesterday? Is it not notorious that the Church has always cast from her bosom every innovator, who substituting for common tradition his own ideas, sought instead of transmitting truth to create it? In hearing the Church, the faithful then hear Christ himself, who speaks to them as really as he did to his Disciples seated around him on the mount of beatitudes. Now, my Lord Bishop, the Catholic and Apostolic Church, "the pillar and ground of truth," tells us, that the word is eternal; and she likewise informs us, that when our Saviour pronounced these words, "This is my body," he meant them in the literal sense. Can we therefore have the audacity to set up our weak opinions in opposition to Christ's words, and to the decision of his holy Church? Thus the Church, in receiving from Christ the word which enlightens, received also from him the divine remedy, which she distributes to her children as she imparts to them the light of his word. The word made flesh resides in the midst of them, always full of truth and of grace. As formerly crowds of infirm pressed on his steps to be healed by the virtue that emanated from him, so do the faithful at present labouring under the same malady hidden within them, approach with an humble faith to a participation of this divine remedy, and which is the Eucharist.

LETTER XIII.

The explanation of that famous passage of St. Augustine taken from the third book of Christian Doctrine, c. 16.

TO THE LORD BISHOP OF EXETER.

MY LORD BISHOP,

I can truly say, that this passage taken from St. Augustine's third book of Christian Doctrine, c. 16, is the most celebrated quotation from the Fathers which Protestants make use of in opposition to the doctrine of the Catholic Church. For it does not appear that Berengarius had any knowledge of that passage of Tertullian's which appears in his fourth book against Marcion, nor of those which Protestants draw from the dialogues of Theodoret, from Gelasius, from St. Ephrem, and from St. Chrysostom, while that from Facundus has been made use of comparatively only very recently. But as regards this passage of St. Augustine's, of which I speak, it has always been known to those who combatted this mystery; they have brought it forward in support of their own doctrines, and they have generally made use of it to insinuate their poisonous errors into the minds of their hearers. It is this passage which caused Frudigard to entertain strong doubts of the real presence, and originated the

explanations which were asked by him on this subject of Paschasius. It is therefore right that I should here examine this passage with great care, but at the same time in as concise a manner as I possibly can.

The difficulties of this passage are of two sorts—the one grounded on the rule established by St. Augustine for the understanding of the Scriptures, the other upon the application which is made of them. The rule or principle of St. Augustine, from which Protestants would wish to draw advantage is, that of an expression which bears a command, which appears to order a horrible and a criminal action, or to prevent us from doing good to mankind, we must take it in a figurative sense. Protestants consequently assert, that from this passage they are justified in concluding that these expressions of Jesus Christ, where he exhorts us to eat his body and drink his blood, are of this number, and refers to something horrible, and that therefore they must take them in a figurative meaning. But we may truly say, that considering only this principle, there never was a more futile objection to the doctrine of the real presence; for if this principle be taken in a general manner, or with wrong restrictions, it will be found to be one of the most dangerous maxims which could be advanced, whilst if it be joined with the restrictions, which even Protestant ministers themselves judge requisite, it proves nothing whatever. I should recommend your Lordship to look into Cardinal Perron on the point in question. Let me here ask, is not this pretended maxim contradicted by several passages of the sacred Scripture? And I fearlessly ask you, in the name of heaven, what appearance of crime can be attached to this commandment which can possibly be brought against the Catholic interpretation. Protestants cannot make use of this maxim to exclude the Catholic sense, as such sense cannot be comprised in the principle advanced by St. Augustine. Protestants could only avail themselves of this principle by

referring it to the words, "unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, you have not life in you," and therefrom conclude, that this expression must be figurative, as taken literally it implies wickedness. This, in fact, is the only reasonable difficulty which they can bring forward on this subject.

But to make this as clear as I possibly can, I shall give the entire passage in St. Augustine's own words, he says: "If the expressions of the Scriptures seem to command any shameful or criminal act, forbids anything useful, or to do good to our neighbours, that is figurative. As for example, these words of Jesus Christ, 'if you eat not the flesh of the Son of Man, or drink not his blood, there is no life in you,' it seems to command a shameful and a criminal action. It is then a figure, which commands us to participate in the passion of Jesus Christ, and to preserve in memory the remembrance which is sweet and useful, that his flesh has been crucified for us"

This is the famous passage, my Lord Bishop, by means of which Protestants fancy they establish that they receive the body of Christ in the sacrament only in a figurative manner, and that the manducation commanded by this text, consists only in the participation of the sufferings of Christ. But it is most easy to shew the rashness of this conclusion by a few examples. 1st. It is certain that they can establish nothing precise from this explanation of St. Augustine's in reference to this text, for they cannot deny but many authors have explained it in exactly the same manner as this great Saint has here done, and yet they have ever firmly believed in transubstantiation.* 2nd. These words of Christ, as he meant

* St. Bernard, among many others whose belief cannot be doubted upon this point, gives this meaning to it in his third Sermon upon the Psalm, *Qui habitat*. "These people," says he, "having heard

them, "Except you eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood," were most innocent, whether he spoke them of faith, or of the sacrament; but they seemed to import that the faithful were to kill him, to eat his flesh like that of other animals, and to drink his blood in the same manner as some have done formerly the blood of their horses. Thus the false disciples understood them, who knew but one way of eating and drinking. And I repeat here, that it is a rule laid down by St. Augustine, (*Lib. 3, de Doctrinâ Christi, c. 12,*) that the words or facts of Scripture, either of God or of holy men, which to the ignorant seem as it were to be vicious, must be

these words of Jesus Christ, 'If you do not eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and do not drink his blood,' &c., found this discourse hard and withdrew. For what is it to eat his flesh and to drink his blood, if we do not participate in his passion, and imitate the life he led upon earth." It is plain that St. Bernard explains this passage exactly in the same manner as St. Augustine did, in order to shew that the scandal of the Jews was unfounded. Nevertheless, whoever would conclude from this, that St. Bernard did not believe in Transubstantiation, would draw a very false and a very rash conclusion, even by the avowal of Protestant ministers. I refer your Lordship to the following works of St. Augustine, in which you cannot fail to perceive that when St. Augustine explains in so many places the sense of the sacramental eating, it is not a simple allegorical and uncertain interpretation on which it is not proper to ground a dogma, but that he regards it as the true sense of the words of Jesus Christ, as a solid foundation, on which can be established against heretics the necessity of receiving this sacrament in order to have eternal life. They are as follows: C. 10, L. against the Adversaries of the Law and the Prophets; in the Question 57 on Leviticus; in the first Book of the Merit and the Remission of Sins; in the Treatise 11 and 26 on St. John; in the 11th and 46th Sermons on the words of the Saviour; in the first book against Cresconius, Ps. 25; in the Sermon on the words of the Gospel, as mentioned by Venerable Bede, on the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians; in the Sermon on the Psalms, 33 and 98.

understood mystically, or, as he expresses it, they are all figurative; not that he would have us to deny the historical and literal sense, but that we should believe there is a mystery in that which to the ignorant has an appearance of vice. As in the woman's anointing Christ's feet, says he, (St. Luke vii. 38,) and the Prophet marrying a harlot, (Hosea i. 2.) The first looking like effeminacy in Christ, the other as intemperance in the Prophet. Thus St. Paul did not deny the history of Genesis when he said, (Gal. iv. 24,) that Abraham having two sons is an allegory, for these are two covenants or rather testaments.

Guitmundus who lived in the year of our Lord 1060, solved this difficulty thus: "St. Augustine says, that our Lord seems to order an evil deed, or a great offence, not that commanding his flesh to be eaten he did therefore command an evil deed or a great offence, nor that commanding his flesh to be eaten he did uphold an evil deed or a great offence, but that he seemed to order, that is to say, to those who thought that he commanded this, did necessarily enjoin his flesh to be slain, and to be cut one member from another, and so at last his flesh either to be eaten raw or sodden; therefore (says he) there is a figure in this expression. (Here now Guitmundus answers the difficulty.) Perhaps the shadow man (alluding to the heretic) does here rejoice with great clamour; but rejoice thou not, shadow teacher, out of order; rejoice not too hastily. Of what thing is it said to be a figure? with patience and diligence listen. It is a figure (says St. Augustine) commanding. What commanding? or what figuring? *Figura ergo est (ait August.) præcipiens, quid præcipiens? Quid figurans? hoc enim figurat quod præcipit. Passioni Domini (inquit) communicandum et suaviter atque; utiliter in memoria recondendum quod pro nobis caro ejus crucifixa et vulnerata sit. Deo gratias.* (For it is the figure of that which it commands.) That we, says he,

should partake of the passion of our Lord, and sweetly and profitably bear in memory, that his flesh was crucified and wounded for us. God be praised. Whatsoever then it be which St. Augustine here calls a figure, (for what in these words he calls a figure, it is not difficult to find out,) it is not the figure of the body of our Lord, but of his being crucified and being wounded; (Non utique corporis Domini, sed crucifixionis ejus, et vulnerationis hoc est occisionis, nostræ que communicationis. Cum ea, id est, ut imitemur Christum et communicemus passioni ejus compatiendo, manifestissime figuram esse demonstrat;) that is, of his death, and of our communicating with the same, that is to say, that we should follow Christ, and partaking of his passion, suffering with him, that is what he manifestly shews to be a figure. Paul the Apostle also agreeing with him, who says, ‘As often as you shall eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye shall shew forth the death of the Lord until he comes.’—*Guitmundus, Lib. 2.*)

Although this be a lengthened explanation of this famous passage of St. Augustine’s, yet I thought it best, long as it is, to lay it entire before your Lordship, in order that you may perceive that this most learned author manifestly proves that St. Augustine does not say that it is a figure of the body of Christ (which Protestants pretend it to be) in the sacrament, but St. Augustine declares that these words of Christ, “Except ye eat of the flesh of the Son of Man,” &c., is a figurative manner of speaking, for the eating and drinking Christ’s flesh and blood in the sacrament is a figure of Christ’s passion and of the blood which he shed for us, and a sign in order that we should preserve the thing in our memory, and for the moving us to take up our cross and to suffer with Christ. In what follows, this same author expresses himself in a still more plain and clear manner, he says: “If we ask what St. Augustine here calls the figure, there is nothing

perceived here so agreeable to occur, (*Nihil hic utique tam congruè videtur occurrere,*) as that which a little before the same Doctor had now said, that is the celebration of the body and blood of our Lord. For which cause the Berengarians foolishly and most unwisely object to us the book of the Christian doctrine, seeing that the meat of the altar of our Lord is no where in it called a sign (*nusquam ibi figura, nusquam ibi signum dicatur*); and whatever there is called a figure or sign, it is most certainly made evident not to be a figure of the body and blood of our Lord, but of the passion of our Lord, and of our communicating with the same." This answer of this learned man, my Lord Bishop, is so satisfactory, that it must crumble to dust all your Protestant quibbles and sophisms as regards this text of St. Augustine.

I shall now give you another quotation from this same great Saint (Augustine) which alludes to the same subject, he says: "Although it may seem to be more horrible to eat the flesh of a man than to kill a man, and to drink the blood of a man than to shed it, yet nevertheless we do receive the mediator of God and men, Jesus Christ, giving his flesh to be eaten with a faithful heart and mouth, and his blood to be drank."—(*St. August. Cont. Adversarium legis et Prophetarum, cap. 9.*) Remember, my Lord Bishop, the rule laid down by St. Augustine for the understanding of the Scriptures, and confer this passage with that other, and you shall soon perceive that the figurative speech is not meant or intended to deprive us of the sacred and blessed presence of Christ in the sacrament of the Eucharist, and to leave us nothing but the bare figure, sign, or token of that body and blood, as Protestants declare it to be. I refer your Lordship to St. Cyril, (15 *Joan.*) who understands the words exactly as St. Augustine does, viz., that the receiving of Christ's body makes our bodies immortal. And I here positively assert, that what St. Augustine expressed of the blessed Eucharist is

as follows: 1st. That Christ's immortal body is really present upon the altar under the sacramental signs. 2nd. That we receive it not only with our heart, but also with our mouth. 3rd. That it is actually received even by the unworthy communicant. 4th. That the sacramental signs or outward appearances (which he calls the sacrament) are not properly the body of our blessed Saviour, but only in a metaphorical sense; which is very true, and asserted not only by St. Anselm, (*Lib. de Corpore et Sanguine Domini*,) who undoubtedly held transubstantiation, but, I may say, by every Catholic in the world; whether those signs or species be physical accidents of bread, or modifications of the object, or such impressions made upon our outward senses by the body and blood of Christ, as bread and wine, if they had been present, would have caused, according to the different opinions of schoolmen; but being known by the faithful to be sacramental signs, (for signs, according to St. Augustine, are not only of things absent, but also of things latent, as blood is a sign of a soul, and breathing is a sign of life,) they may, as St. Anselm says, (*Lib. de Corpore et sanguine Domini*,) be called his body and blood in a metaphorical sense; as blood is the soul, and as the building, which is supposed to contain the faithful, that is, a particular Church, is called the Church; which are both St. Augustine's examples. The first of these we have in his Confessions, where he writes thus of his mother, St. Monica: "She desired to be remembered at thy altar; whereas she had been constantly present, without missing any day whatsoever; and whence she knew was dispensed the holy victim, by which the hand-writing that was against us was blotted out, and by which the enemy was conquered that numbered our sins."—(*Lib. 9, Conf. cap. 13.*) The second, which I have quoted a little before, "We receive with a faithful heart and mouth," &c. The third, "Those who, as the Apostle says, eat and drink damnation to them-

selves, yet eat the very flesh of Christ, and drink his very blood.”—(*Serm. 11, de verbis Domini, cap. 11.*) All these are the necessary consequences of transubstantiation, and shew sufficiently that the Protestant figurative and symbolical presence is quite contrary to St. Augustine.

To these, this great Saint adds, “That no one eats his flesh without first adoring it.”—(*In Psalm 98, v. 5.*) “And that Christ upon the altar is offered in sacrifice.”—(*Lib. 17, de Civitate Dei, cap. 20, et Lib. 22, cap. 10, Serm. 113, de Diversis. Lib. 20, Contra Faustum, cap. 21.*) “There was, as you know,” says he, speaking upon the 33rd Psalm, “formerly a sacrifice of the Jews, according to the order of Aaron, in victims of cattle, and this in a mystery. There was not then the sacrifice of the body and blood of our Lord, which the faithful knew, and those who have read the gospel, which sacrifice is now spread over all the world.—*Nondum erat sacrificium corporis et sanguinis Domini, quod fideles nôrunt, et qui Evangelium legerunt; quod sacrificium nunc diffusum est toto orbe terrarum.*” And in his 57th Letter to Dardanus. “You know,” says he, “in what sacrifice it is said, *Gratias agamus Domino Deo nostro.*”

I shall now proceed to answer a question which has lately been put to me by a distinguished and by a most learned Protestant prelate, although I have, in fact, treated this same subject in another part of this work. The question is as follows: “If transubstantiation be an article of faith, are we not obliged to understand it?” To which I reply, by asking your Lordship, as a prelate of the established Church, are we obliged to understand the Incarnation, the Trinity, the Creation, the liberty of God, his attributes, the propagation of original sin, the real presence? I never yet could meet with a philosopher who could understand either the composition of quantity, or the possibility of motion. And St. Basil, in his 166th Epistle, said extremely well, when he

desired Eunomius to study first the structure of a fly before he pretended to fathom any of our Creator's unsearchable attributes. And I now, in my turn, recommend this learned Protestant prelate, and Protestants in general, to study the structure of that insect before they start such a nonsensical objection to this great mystery, viz., "that they must understand transubstantiation before they believe it." I tell them here, that it is mystery, and consequently above their comprehension. Can they not believe that there are three persons in God, and that the second is both God and man, without knowing whether subsistence be negative or positive;—whether it be an entity, a mode, a modality, or a termination;—how it differs from personality, and both from a person;—from substance, from essence, and from existence;—and how far the powers of all these reach? These are the schoolmens' tiring-irons, but they have nothing to do with the creed. And I have every reason to believe, that if it had not been for vain philosophy, and the opposition of science, vainly and foolishly so called, neither transubstantiation nor consubstantiality had ever been doubted of among Christians. The arguments against both are solved in exactly the same manner.

I am,

My Lord Bishop,

Your obedient Servant,

VERAX,

A CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

POSTSCRIPT.

Protestants pretend that Christ made no mention of the sacrament in the 6th chapter of St. John. If this be true, then I defy your Lordship to prove the Eucharist to be a sacrament, and much more, that it conveys to us all the

benefits of Christ's passion; out of St. John, neither heaven nor grace is promised to the worthy receiver. We allow the manner of Christ's presence must be taken in a spiritual sense, *id est*, that his existence is not natural, but miraculous, after the manner of a spirit, not of a natural body; yet it is real, though not carnal, that is, though not vested with the visible qualities of flesh and blood:

NOTE TO LETTER XIII.

Wherever sacrifice ceases, the man remains and the priest disappears. Look at the Jews; no where did the priesthood strike deeper root than among that people; no where was it surrounded with more veneration. What are at the present day the Rabbins, who have superseded the priests of that people, now disinherited of all sacrifices? The anathema which pursues their degraded ministry, has been proclaimed by the mouths of Israelites. "Their power, exclaim their own followers, can effect nothing for the salvation of our souls."* The same observation applies to Protestantism. The ancient idea of the priesthood is one of the human ideas which it lost with sacrifice. The day on which the fire of the eternal holocaust was extinguished, beheld the divine mark effaced from the brow of its ministers. The opinion of the Protestant public refuses them that pious respect which all the people of the earth have attached to the sacerdotal character. It does not exact from them these superior virtues which Catholicism imposes on its priesthood, and with great justice, for it would be unfair to expect a consequence when the principle had been destroyed. This equitable indulgence sometimes shews itself with great naiveté. I shall select an example out of many, and that within the pale of the English Church, which however has preserved, better than the other sects, some resemblance of the priesthood. Dr. Burnet, relating the legal assassination of Charles the First, admits that Bishop Juxon, who assisted him in his last moments, "performed his duty so drily and

* Jewish Consisteries of France, by M. Siuger, p. 32.—Paris, 1820.

coldly, as to make little or no effort to infuse any lofty sentiments into the mind of his royal master;" yet the mitred historian asserts that he did his duty as an honest man.* Suppose that Abbé Edgworth had acted like Bishop Juxon, could you conceive how a French prelate, writing the history of the Revolution, would tell you that the confessor of the son of St. Lewis did his duty as an honest man before that scaffold, the foot of which was bathed with the blood of martyrs, and above which the heavens opened. Such a supposition would be revolting to the feelings of Catholics, and in their eyes every priest who, in descending from the altar, possessed no other recommendation than that of being an honest man, would be a monster. Now if we consider on the one hand, that the Catholic priesthood tends, by its constant and universal action, to the practice of duty, and on the other, that the influence of the priesthood is proportioned to the veneration it inspires, we shall easily conceive how the Eucharist, of which the sacerdotal character as conducted in Catholicism is the sublime emanation, now already exercises in this respect a prodigious power in establishing the reign of virtue on the earth. Catholicism moves the world in order to elevate it to heaven, the priesthood is its instrument, the real presence its support.

* History of the last Revolutions of England, Tom. 1, Liv. 1.

LETTER XIV.

The explanation of that passage from St. Athanasius, which Protestants ridiculously consider fatal to the Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation.

TO THE LORD BISHOP OF EXETER.

MY LORD BISHOP,

This is a passage from St. Athanasius, and which Protestants call an unanswerable argument against transubstantiation; for, say they, it proves that Christ never intended to give his visible body to be eaten. But, my Lord Bishop, men's judgments differ extremely, so it is to me an unanswerable evidence to the contrary, and that he designed to give his visible body, though not in a visible manner. The words, as an eminent Protestant divine translates them, are as follows: "Christ predicates of himself both flesh and spirit; and distinguishes one from the other, that believers may learn what of him is visible, and what invisible; for what he says is not carnal but spiritual. For how many, or rather how few, would his body have satisfied, if it had been to be eaten, that this should be an entertainment for the whole world? Therefore he reminds them of the Son of man's ascent into heaven, that he might draw them off from corporeal notions,

and that they might learn, that the flesh spoken of was heavenly spiritual food given by him ; for what I have spoken, says he, is spirit and life ; as if he had said, the body which is shewn, and given for the world, shall be given for food, so as to be spiritually distributed to, or in every one, as a preservative to the resurrection of eternal life."—(*Lit. a. Ap.*)

This had been long since proposed by Peter Martyr, as an unanswerable argument, but clearly answered by Bellarmine and others. And I here must observe, that Protestant writers scarce ever take notice of our answers, as fair adversaries ought to have done. I now reply, 1st. That it is quite true that the eating of Christ's body must not be taken carnally, as the Capharnaïtes did, that is, as divided into morsels like common dead flesh. For thus without another miracle, it could not have sufficed for the whole world. But what is this against those who hold that it is indivisibly taken, and entire in every part of the Eucharist? 2nd. I grant that the body of Christ is spiritual food, not only because it feeds the soul, but also because it is animated with life, soul, and divinity of Christ. Thus Catholics frequently call it spiritual. Thus St. Bernard, who most certainly was a Catholic, says, that Christ's body was eaten spiritually. And a very eminent Protestant divine frequently observes, that calling the sacrifice spiritual, does not prevent it from being a real material sacrifice ; and so calling it spiritual, does not exclude the real substantial body. And it is spiritually distributed, because entire in each part, and not like morsels of common flesh ; spiritually as to the manner, though truly in substance. Thus St. Hilary calls the conception of Christ spiritual, not excluding the reality, but to signify the supernatural manner. Thus St. Epiphanius says, Enoch was spiritually translated ; that is miraculously, and after a manner more resembling that of a spirit than that of a body, &c. 3rd. Christ's reminding them of his ascension, was to with-

draw them from the carnal notion of eating his body by morsels; and the sense is, that he will give the same body which shall ascend in glory, and by that same power which shall make his body ascend, as if it were a spirit, free from the lumpish weight of common flesh; so I will give it in a spiritual manner, not by morsels, in the gross way you apprehend, but entire. The body I will give is that in which I shall ascend, and which was (says St. Athanasius here) shewn and given for the world. And what body was that but his natural body? 4th. In fine, we have further proof that this was St. Athanasius's sentiment, from the words translated by this eminent Protestant divine himself, as follows: "It is the body to which God says, sit thou on my right hand; to which the devil with his wicked powers was an enemy; as also the Jews and Gentiles; by which (body) he is called the high priest, and Apostle, by means of the mystery which he delivered to us, when he said, This is my body."—(*Lit. d. Ap.*)

Upon citing these words, this learned Protestant theologian says, "He makes the body in the sacrament the same, in some sense, with that which sits at God's right hand." But why must he add, "in some sense?" The Saint affirms absolutely it is that body. And lest that one expression might not be sufficient, to shew he means the natural body, and that it only signifies, that the Eucharist is the body of Christ in an invisible manner, and does by no means exclude the invisible things from being a real substance.

I am,

My Lord Bishop,

Your obedient Servant,

VERAX,

A CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

POSTSCRIPT.

I take this opportunity of asserting, that there never was the least difference of opinion between the Latin and the Greek Church concerning transubstantiation. That when Cyrillius Lucaris denied it among the Greeks, he was immediately anathematised by two different Councils held at Constantinople, anno 1639, 1642. And when Berengarius opposed it among the Latins in the eleventh century, his doctrine was immediately crushed by eleven different Councils in the Western Church, viz., at Rome, Brionne, Verceil, Paris, Tours, Rohen, Poitiers, Bourdeaux, &c., long before Innocent the Third, the period in which Protestants assert that transubstantiation was first fostered on the world.

NOTE I, TO LETTER XIV.

How cold and comfortless is not Protestant doctrine? yes, so cold, that it absolutely freezes one. They have pastors that talk, but teach nothing with certainty; they have infallible verities locked up in Scripture, but none can open that book, or convey them with confidence into men's hearts; they hear God speak, but none of them knows what he says; they know well the promises which Christ left to his Church, and of the spirit of truth abiding with some Christian teachers (find them where they can) for ever, to the end of the world; but now they are obliged to declare, because all pastors are fallible, that Christ breaks his word, if all may deceive, and teach both fallible and false doctrine. Finally, they must acknowledge that such believers belong to them, as St. Paul mentions, who receives the word of God, as it truly is the word of God; but have not one pastor or doctor who can presume to declare that he teaches this word infallibly. Yet infallible believers and infallible teachers appear to be very near relatives; the one, if faith comes by hearing, totters without the other; and methinks when the Apostle says, (Rom. x. 14,) "And how shall they hear without a preacher?" he supposes as well the preacher (instructing) infallible, as the

hearers infallibly instructed. Had I no other just objection against the Protestant religion than the following, it would be quite sufficient to prevent me from ever becoming a Protestant, viz., that Protestants do not know how they are placed in their Reformation, because being fallible, can never know if their religion be true or false, and whether they themselves be only novices, proficient, or masters in the trade of reformation.

NOTE 2, TO LETTER XIV.

I will tell your Lordship in a word, that Protestants never can nor never will be able to answer anything that has the appearance of a rational proof, or a received principle. No; their own sole proofless word, on which sandy foundation the entire of Protestantism is built, it alone upholds what they teach. They say, it is true, they left the Church of Rome because she left herself, but that they stick close to the primitive doctrine. Observe it; they are here both accusers of us, and judges in their own cause. Their proofless word does all, without reducing it to any known or certain principle. Not one Council, my Lord Bishop, not one canon, not one ancient tradition, not one consent of Fathers can they produce, whereby particular men are privileged to rise up against an ancient mother Church, and condemn her of false doctrine. They will tell you that they stood alone when Luther rose up, yet taught, forsooth, the true gospel of Jesus Christ, and we must believe them. Here is the last *propositio quiescens*, they say so; to what we charge against their uncommissioned authority to preach as they did, you have the like uncommissioned answer, the Lord sent them abroad, and the truth they taught secures them. But I have exposed the weakness of their flimsy answers in my Further Reply to the Rev. Dr. Hook of Leeds, and this Rev. gentlemen, I beg your Lordship to recollect, has never ventured to offer one word in reply to me in vindication of those gross calumnies which he has so falsely advanced against the Catholic Church, "the pillar and ground of truth."

LETTER XV.

The great Council of Lateran.

TO THE LORD BISHOP OF EXETER.

MY LORD BISHOP,

It is evident to every man of common sense, that the Fathers, those great pillars of the Church, would never have believed in transubstantiation, nor have taken such pains to inculcate it to the people, had it not been the universal belief of the Catholic Church. I shall now only add some words of the decree of the great Council of Lateran on this subject. The words which relate to my purpose are these: "Transubstantiatis pane et vino in Corpus et sanguinem Christi.—The bread and wine being transubstantiated into the body and blood of Christ."—(*Concil. Later. 4, sub Inno. 3.*) Your Lordship may tell me that it was but a conventicle of heretics; but I will inform your Lordship on the contrary, that it was a great General Council, representing the whole Catholic Church, and that all the individual members of the Catholic Church at that time received and acquiesced in its decree.

Now, after having examined the authentic acts of this Council, and consulted all the (at least) famous historians

and ecclesiastical writers of those times, and even the writings of some of our learned adversaries, I find that it has all the marks and characters which even the most Œcumenical Council ever yet had. I find that this Council was called by common *consent of both Emperors*, and of all the kings and free states in Europe; that it was held in Rome in the year of our Lord 1215, Pope Innocent the Third presiding in it. The best historians of those times tell us, that there were near twelve hundred prelates in this Council; that the Patriarchs of Constantinople and Jerusalem were there in person; that the Patriarchs of Alexandria and Antioch, being under the yoke of the Saracen and Turkish tyranny, because they could not come in person, sent their deputies instructed with full powers to represent their persons and Churches. As to Europe, the great number of prelates there assembled shew, even to a demonstration, that there were more than sufficient representatives of the Western Churches. And what more can be desired to complete a General Council?

Now can any man imagine, that so august an assembly as this, so many grave and learned men of different humours, interests, and manners, should all conspire together to impose upon themselves and on all mankind besides, a new doctrine in one of the most essential points of Christian faith, contrary to what they had received from their ancestors, and that not even one honest man should be found among them to discover the imposture? Or that all mankind should acquiesce in such a doctrine, and no one to have the courage to say, this is contrary to what we have been hitherto taught? Can it be imagined, I say, that the bishops who met here on purpose to hear every individual prelate relate his own story, and to declare what faith he had received from his ancestors on this subject, who aimed at nothing else but to find out the truth, to see wherein they all agreed, and to reckon that only as an article of their faith which should be found to be the same in

every man's mouth; and yet, that contrary to the main end and design of their meeting, and, what is much worse, to the eternal damnation of their own souls, they should unanimously agree to declare as an article of their faith, what they neither received, nor knew, nor believed before? In a word, is it possible that any man of sense could imagine, that in any age of the Church, the Pope, Patriarchs, Bishops, Kings, Princes, and People should all agree to receive as an article of faith, that which the Apostles never delivered to their ancestors, nor their ancestors to them? And if this be absurd, and not to be supposed, as most certainly it is, with what colour of reason can any man refuse the evidence of this Council? What shall we believe, if we do not believe so great and so grave an assembly? Here are from all parts of the Christian world, so many hundreds of learned prelates, attesting on no less a penalty than their eternal damnation, if false, that this is the faith which the Apostles delivered to the Church, that this is the doctrine which they received from their forefathers. Also all the rest of the prelates and people of the whole Catholic Church, likewise declaring, by their ready acceptance and submission to this doctrine, that it is the same they received from their predecessors. And after all this, will men be so blind to their own salvation as to believe that the whole Catholic Church, both in its representatives and in the diffusive body of Christians, could be induced to conspire together to deceive their posterity, against their own plain and true interest, against the trust and confidence reposed in them, the duty and piety of parents to their children, the tender care they ought to have for their welfare, and contrary to the main end and design of the divine goodness, who put his word into their mouths to the end they might faithfully deliver it to succeeding generations; and all this, notwithstanding the terrors of the Lord, and the wrath of God revealed from heaven against all impious liars; not-

withstanding the dreadful woes and curses pronounced in Scripture against false seducers, and the horrible aggravation of their own guilt, for having led so many millions into error and perdition. Add to this the promise of the Holy Ghost's guiding the Church into all truth, the assistance of the divine spirit with it to the end and consummation of the world, the dear and tender love of the great shepherd of our souls for his flock, and the great care and concern he has for the preservation of his Church, for which he shed his most precious blood; if after all this, I say, men will be so far deluded as to believe such dreams, I shall only say to them as Joshua (xxiv.) did to the children of Israel, "If it seem evil to you to serve the Lord, choose you this day whom you will serve—but for me and my house, we will serve the Lord, and believe his holy word." Thus much concerning the proof of this mystery.

I am,

My Lord Bishop,

Your obedient Servant,

VERAX,

A CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

POSTSCRIPT.

It may be advisable for me here to declare what Catholics mean by the infallibility of the Church, it is as follows: that the Holy Ghost, the spirit of truth, by the promise of Christ, in all ages resides in the Catholic Church; infallibly declares and explains by the pastors of the Church, assembled in a General Council, and united to their head, all Christian verities. In this great principle of faith, all Catholics in communion with the See of Rome with assurance and concord agree. And herein consists the whole notion of what Catho-

lies in communion with the See of Rome mean by infallibility. The illustrious St. Jerome, who was called "Magister Mundi," declares that it was absolutely necessary in order to be a Catholic to profess the Roman faith—hear and believe: "If you profess the Roman faith," says St. Jerome, "you are Catholics; if you do not profess it, you are not in the communion of the Catholic Church."—(*St. Jerome in Apolog. 1, Adv. Ruffin.*)

NOTE TO LETTER XV.

The Catholic Church cannot err in matters of faith, because Christ has promised, that the gates of hell shall not prevail against his Church, and that the Holy Ghost shall teach her all truth.—(St. Matthew xvi. 28; St. John xvi.) These promises are most certainly very clear, and demonstratively shew that the Church is under divine protection, and that we are secure of being in the right way whilst we continue obedient to her decisions. This being a subject highly interesting, it may tend to strengthen the faith of a Catholic to compare the declaration of the founder of the Christian Church, with the declarations of one who styles himself her Reformer. Christ declares, that the gates of hell shall not prevail against the Church; Luther, the Father of the Reformation, declares, that the gates of hell have prevailed against the Church. Christ makes a most solemn promise, that the Holy Ghost shall teach her all truth, and shall abide with her for ever; Luther asserts most positively, that the Holy Ghost has not taught the Church all truth, and that having ceased to be her director, the Church is become erroneous. Christ assures us, that he himself will continue with the Church in aiding her pastors to teach all nations, even till the end of the world; Luther tells us, that Christ has long since withdrawn his aid from the Church, and that her pastors are become unfit to be the teachers of nations. The question then is, are we to give credit to Christ, or are we to give credit to Luther? Now not Luther alone, my Lord Bishop, but the leaders of all sects say the same. Nor is this notion confined to sect-makers, for the same, in substance, is daily repeated

by their followers. Yet on being asked if they believe the promises of Christ, they will answer that they do. If then they really do believe the promises of Christ, they must, with St. Paul, believe the Church to be the pillar and ground of truth.—(1 Tim. 3.) And if they do believe this, and continue separated from her communion, what apology can we make for their conduct. They appear not unlike certain men of whom this Apostle speaks, who, for some temporal advantage, changed the truth of God into a lie—serving the creature rather than the Creator.—(Rom. 1.)

St. Athanasius says: "The Church is invincible; though the gates of hell and all the powers conspire against it."—(*Orat. quod unus sit Christus*, T. 2, p. 51.) "Truly all heresies are the gates of hell, which cannot prevail against the rock."—(*St. Ambrose, in Ancorat. T. 2, p. 13.*) "Though the Church be often agitated by storms, it can never suffer shipwreck."—(*St. Ambrose, Lib. de Salomone, C. 4, T. 2, p. 1093.*) "Hence we plainly understand," says St. Jerome, "that the Church may be agitated to the end of the world, but not to be overturned; may be tried, but not conquered; and thus, because the Almighty, the Lord of this Church, has so promised, whose promise is a law."—(*In c. 9, Amos. T. 3, p. 208.*)

LETTER XVI.

The verity of the Eucharist strengthened by the reality of the true Church of Christ in the See of Rome.

TO THE LORD BISHOP OF EXETER.

MY LORD BISHOP,

The Catholic and Apostolic Church, "the pillar and ground of truth," commands us under the dreadful penalty of heresy, to believe in the real presence of Christ in the sacrament, and in transubstantiation. Therefore I purpose in this letter to state some most strong and most powerful reasons for inducing us to believe, with the most perfect humility, whatever our holy mother the Catholic Church teaches us to be of faith.

1st. A Church or religion which manifests itself, and proves the doctrine it professes by the same signs, marks, and characters of truth, whereby the apostolical and primitive Church was known and evidenced, is undoubtedly true; or if this proof be not valid, we may easily deny truth to that apostolical and primitive Church. Now, my Lord Bishop, the only Church in the entire world thus known and evidenced, is no other, I maintain without fear of contradiction, but the Church in communion with the See of Rome throughout all

ages. This principle is undeniable. Deny these signs and marks to the Church in communion with the See of Rome, and you at once deny what is evident; grant them, and you admit of Popery.

2nd. A Church or religion which in every age after Christ, has had a most clear, assured, and indubitable evidence of truth, which is the glory of miracles, (Christ's own marks and cognizances,) shews the absolute power of God co-operating with us, and therefore cannot but be true, unless we can basely suppose, that his power alone separated as it were from his goodness, had wrought these wonders to deceive the world. But the Catholic Church in communion with the See of Rome, and she only, clearly demonstrates unparalleled miracles, not in one, but in every age, as is without controversy proved in every century by undoubted records, which truth I promise to shew if any doubts are entertained of it. Therefore, either this Church, or no other, is Christ's true Church. I call miracles the most forcible and persuasive arguments of truth that can be proposed; all other proofs, though clear and convincing to disinterested persons, yet are liable to cavils. For, cite Scripture against Sectarians, wilful misrepresentations are brought against it; produce Fathers and Councils they are either rejected by these men as fallible, or drawn to a sinister sense, as fancy will have it; speak to them of the sanctity of our Church, they answer, much of it may be hypocrisy; insist upon that great work of conversions, some reply, "Policy and human industry," as a Protestant author expresses it, "had a strong hand in them;" but when we come to the proof of proofs, and plead our cause by known and most evident miracles, all mouths are stopped, envy itself is silenced and cannot utter a probable word against us, unless perhaps some require, most unreasonably, that every one within this moral body should work miracles, which is merely said to cavil; for even in the primitive times, that privilege

did not extend to every one. It is therefore sufficient that there be some chosen and holy persons united in faith with this Church, to whom God communicates the grace and the power to perform these wonders.

3rd. A Church which has converted entire kingdoms and nations from infidelity to Christ, and drawn innumerable souls from a bad life to penance and austerity, from the pleasures of the world to a contempt of it, from self-love to a perfect self-abnegation, must either be properly and deservedly named the true Church of Christ, or the Apostolical Church did not prove her truth by such admirable and miraculous conversions. The Church alone in communion with the See of Rome, has, by the assistance of God, performed these wonders, therefore, she is the true Church, or there never was any true Church upon earth. But if your Lordship should deny these conversions made by the Catholic Church, then you would deny what is evident; grant them, and you subscribe to Popery.

4th. A Church which opposed all Sectarians since the commencement of Christianity, and was never opposed by any author of credit, or orthodox society of Christians, but only by condemned heretics, such as Arius, Luther, Calvin, Zuinglius, &c., this Church, I say, most certainly professes true religion. The Church alone in communion with the See of Rome, has age after age thundered forth her anathemas against all Sectarians, and never was opposed by any but by known heretics; this is an undeniable proof for the truth she maintains.

5th. A Church which has had in all ages most indubitably more illustrious marks and signs of truth accompanying it, than all the other sects in the whole world put together, either ought to be acknowledged as Christ's only pure and holy Church, or we must declare that God can make a false heretical sect more credible, clear, and evident to reason, by signs

of truth and of sanctity, than is his true orthodox Church. Reflect seriously, my Lord Bishop, and tell me, in the name of the Saviour, can we suppose for a moment that miracles, conversion of souls, casting out devils, great austerity of life, efficacy of doctrine, &c., once the convincing arguments of truth in the first ages, are now to be pointed out to us in the Church in communion with the See of Rome, to favor such errors as Sectarians presume to impute to her, or to countenance any thing like anti-christian doctrine? So to judge, my Lord Bishop, is an improbable paradox; and here you have another most clear proof and principle for the truth of the Catholic religion as taught by the universal Church.

6th. A Church which has manifestly performed services for God, by defeating his enemies, and gaining him friends, and yet daily labours to do him more service; a Church, a Church, I say, which never, no never, had stain or mark of dishonor placed upon her, nor censure, public or private, affixed to her, or issuing from any universal Church, is blameless, pure, holy, and uncorrupt in doctrine. In all these, the Church in communion with the See of Rome justly glories, which no other Christian sect can pretend to do; and this is an undeniable proof of her integrity.

7th. A Catholic Church established by Almighty God, and therefore once true, must consequently, upon the exact same grounds which then proved her orthodox, ever after be acknowledged as true. Hear my reasons; 1st. That infinite wisdom which founded this once true Church, made it a school not to teach a few of the first Christians, or for a time only, but to instruct all and for ever. The word of our Lord remains eternally, and this is the word that is evangelized among you.—(1 Peter i. 25.) That word then, which these primitive Christians learned, yet remains, and is now taught by the same true and infallible Church founded by Christ. 2nd. The gifts of God, (Rom. xi. 29,) are without repentance,

that is, unchangeable; whatever therefore moved an infinite wisdom to make a Church once true, or for a time, evidently shews that his mercy was to be extended farther, and to be continued till the end of the world. 3rd. The absolute necessity of having Christians instructed in truth, for souls are now just as precious to God, and as well provided with means to attain salvation as were the primitive Christians, requires the continuance of truth in that Church which Christ first founded. He wishes all to be saved, and come to the knowledge of the truth.—(1 Tim. ii. 4.) If all, then none at this day are excluded from the means of learning Christ's verities, taught only in that Church which he has established. 4th. The gift of grace Sectarians acknowledge permanently resides in God's Church for ever; therefore, truth is also permanent and inseparable from it, truth being as necessary to a Church as grace is. 5th. The rock, which is Christ, stands immovable and unshaken; therefore, the true Church being built upon this rock and corner stone, (1 Cor. x. 4,) can no more fail or separate herself from truth, than that Christ can cease to be an infallible verity. To say then that God once founded his true Church upon the rock Jesus Christ, and grant that afterwards he permitted either men or devils to pull her down, to defile her with error and false doctrine, is so desperate a paradox, that I think no Christian dare to avow it in such terms.

8th. Now mark, my Lord Bishop, the inferences which I draw from these premised considerations. The Church in communion with the the See of Rome was once the true Church, Protestants confess it, once it was built on Christ, once it taught Christian verities without error, once it was acknowledged by Christians as Christ's school, once it evangelized the word of God with perfect purity; therefore, if God be as favorable and as benificent to souls as he was for-

merly, if he does not withdraw from us the means necessary for salvation, if his gifts be unchangeable, if his intention of placing truth permanently, that is, for ever, among Christians be not altered, if he bless his own Church as well with truth as with divine grace, this Catholic and Roman Church, and no other, once true, was, is, and shall ever be so for the future. *Ecclesia invicta res est*; (they are the words of a great doctor of the Church,) *et si infernus ipse commoveatur*.—The Church is invincible, and continues the same although hell itself be moved and struggle against her. We never can be too thankful to our Heavenly Father for that great verity which is registered in the gospel, “*Portæ inferni non prævalerunt adversus eam*.”—“The gates of hell shall never prevail against her.” Upon this we ground our faith, and therefore your Lordship has here unquestionable principles. It would be the very essence of blasphemy to suppose for a moment that Almighty God could send such men as Luther,* Calvin,†

* Luther was a man of an infamous character, he not only broke the three vows which he made to God, viz., poverty, chastity, and obedience, but he married a nun, and thereby caused her to break her vows. “If a man vow a vow to the Lord, or swear an oath to bind his soul with a bond, he shall not break his word, he shall do according to all that proceedeth out of his mouth.”—(Numbers, xxx. 2.)

† See Bolsecus in *Vita Calvi. ni cap. 5*, Jul. Brigerus. p. 59. The infamy of Calvin is also made manifest from the judicial acts which took place at his trial in the City of Noyon in France, where he was convicted of the abominable crime, the sin of S—y, (the very idea of which makes a man’s blood run cold,) he was sentenced and condemned to be publicly burnt, but the bishop of that city interceded for this wretch, and the consequence was, that the punishment was changed into whipping and to be burnt on the shoulder with a hot iron; whereby it appears manifest to every honorable mind, that this bad man was both by act and deed infamous.”—(*L. 1. ff. de his*

Zuinglius, Cranmer, Henry the 8th, &c., men of the most infamous lives, to reform that Church to which he promised ever to be with her, "Teaching them (the pastors of the Church) to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and, lo, I am with you always even unto the end of the world."—(St. Matthew xxviii. 20.)

9th. I assert here three things. 1. No cavils, no sophisms, can overturn an evident verity; but it is an evident verity, that God, who is the essence of goodness, could not permit so learned, so excellent, so numerous and precious a portion of Christians, as the Roman Pontiffs and doctors were, from the fifth century to Luther, to be all defiled with false doctrine, nor could he suffer those innumerable Christians, who were taught by such wise, holy, and learned pastors for a thousand years, to be all misled in consequence of their false doctrine, or to be seduced into error. This is impossible, unless we grant, which would be a blasphemy, that Christ utterly deserted his Church, and preserved none true on earth for so long a period, contrary to his sacred promises.—(St. Matt. xxviii. 20.)

10th. 2. This is an undeniable verity, that if the Catholic Roman Church had erred, as Protestants assert, those men cannot by their own discerning spirit, much less by a confessed principle, probably say, how far or wherein she erred. For example, and I urge them to answer the difficulty, why do they declare that the Catholic Church erred more in believing the real presence of Christ in the sacrament, than believing a trinity of persons in one God? They cannot by any proof but by their own fancy point out a greater error in

qui notantur infamia, and L. Quid ergo, § Ex compromisso. ff. de his qui notantur infamia.) Can any man in his senses suppose that our gracious God would send such men as these to reform his Church.

the one than in the other. Therefore, whilst they believe a trinity, and other doctrines in common with this supposed erring Church, for truly they can hold them solely on this Church's authority, or else they cannot believe them, they may be just in the same manner plunged into error by confessing a trinity, as they suppose this Church is deceived, as they would be, in holding the real presence of Christ in the sacrament.

11th. 3. It is an undeniable verity, that Christ once promised to be with the Church he founded to the end of the world, which was the Catholic and Roman Church. Now Protestants must acknowledge that Christ broke his word, for most certainly when he made this promise, he well foresaw that the Catholic Roman Church, at least if Protestants speak the truth, about the fifth or sixth century would become erroneous, and consequently would forsake their good master who had founded her. This Church then which had abandoned truth, Christ, who is truth, forsook; nor did he continue with any other society of Christians for ten entire centuries, because all these were professed heretics, and Christ never taught heresy, or assisted heretics in their doctrine; therefore he did not only promise what he never intended to perform, but more. Even now, my Lord Bishop, glorious as he is in heaven, he winks at these hideous supposed errors of his once own Catholic Church, and which he himself founded, and remedies none of these errors, poor souls are consequently beguiled to this day with the false doctrine of that Church which he established in truth, and promised to assist for ever. Are those, permit me to ask your Lordship, probabilities? No, they are the most pernicious doctrines that ever entered into the heart of a Christian, or tongue expressed.

Now, my Lord Bishop, I beg to state, that among many other evidences of the Catholic Roman Church which I could produce, the following is not one of the least: That God, by a special providence, has preserved her both in being and in

honor for eighteen centuries. This wonderful Church, my Lord Bishop, has stood so long invincible and glorious in the heat of all persecutions; she resisted the violence of Jews and heathen princes; she encountered all professed heretics and defeated them. No counsel or wit of man, no devil or devils with all their power have hitherto been able to destroy her; whilst whole immense kingdoms, and the most powerful empires on earth, have all lost their ancient glory and were subverted. Whence I argue, as the learned Gamaliel once did, (Acts v. 39,) if this counsel and work be of men it will be dissolved; but if it be of God, Protestants and Sectarians in general, who so violently oppose her, cannot destroy her. Now here, my Lord Bishop, is my dilemma, my convincing argument. Either this Church subsisted for so vast a time by mere chicanery and human policy, or was and is protected by God's special providence? If your Lordship grants the first, it must have perished long ago, and have come to nothing; but if God by his special providence has preserved her in being, she is therefore, without a doubt, the orthodox Church of Christ, and cannot be accused of error or of disloyalty to her Creator. To confirm this truth, I ask, whether the reasons now alleged prove the truth of the Christian religion, taken under that general idea, to have been so wonderfully preserved amidst so many storms and persecutions by God's special assistance? If Protestants answer, yes, then I assert, that the very same arguments applied to the Catholic Roman Church, prove also that God has graciously protected and preserved her. The reason is, because, as I have demonstratively proved in my Reply and Further Reply to the Rev. Dr. Hook of Leeds, that the true Christian religion and the Catholic Roman religion are synonymous terms, and the very same, there being no difference between them. Now if Protestants should assert, that the Christian religion, as well as the Roman Catholic religion, have subsisted so

long without special assistance by man's mere industry and human policy, they not only enervate Gamaliel's argument, but invent a paradox which can never be proved, or brought to any known principle, but to fancy only.

I am,

My Lord Bishop,

Your obedient Servant,

VERAX,

A CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

POSTSCRIPT.

As for myself, my Lord Bishop, I find that the Church of England by law established, admits really but of the sacrament of baptism; for what is that of the supper, with their Calvinistic doctrine regarding the Eucharist? Faith alone renders Jesus Christ present in their hearts, say they; but I say that faith is nothing but faith, and I find it most ridiculously absurd to suppose that faith only can produce a sacrament. What benefit can you consequently receive from a sup of wine and a morsel of bread? You have in your Church no priests taken from among men, that they may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins.—(Heb. v.)* You have

* See Hebrews v. 4, "And no man taketh this honor unto himself but he that is called of God, as was Aaron." Now permit me here, in the name of heaven, to ask, who has called the ministers of the Protestant Church of England to the sacred ministry? I will tell your Lordship, Henry the 8th, Queen Elizabeth, and their successors; and I will tell you also, without fear of contradiction, that none of these are authorised to preach the word of God, and to administer the sacraments, according to the ordinary course appointed by God, unless they be lawfully (Heb. xi. 6) ordained, (Rom. x. 15,) sent, and called thereunto by the Catholic Church; therefore, the true

no sacrifice, and I again assert, you have no sacrament but baptism. See Bellarmin, (*Lib. 1, de Euchar. c. 10, secundo, and cap. 11, per totum.*) where he most learnedly explains many propositions continually brought forward by Protestants, and most admirably refutes their sophisms and quibbles.

Church must first be known, and by the Church their lawful calling to that ministry; for faith cometh by hearing, (Rom. x. 17,) hearing by the word of God, and this from the pastors lawfully ordained, sent, or called by God's Church. To the Catholic Church, therefore, we must first repair, to know whom we ought to hear, that so hearing we may believe, and believing unto salvation. "How shall they hear without a preacher?"—"How shall they preach unless they be sent?" &c. Consequently we must first find out the true Church, and she will point out to us the true ministry. God is the God of truth, not the God of error. Now Protestant ministers do not preach the word truly, seeing that they grossly differ among themselves in fundamental points of religion, as about the books of Scripture, the law and gospel, faith and works, articles of the creed and sacraments. Now God, I repeat, being the God of truth, cannot dwell with ministers like these, whose faith and doctrine are as unsteady and as changeable as the wind that blows. "The dissensions which are amongst us," says Gallus, a Protestant, "are not light, nor trifling, but of the chief articles of Christian doctrine, as of the law and of the gospel, of justification and of good works, of the sacraments," &c.—(*Nich. Gallus. in Thes. et Hypoth.*) He might have added, my Lord Bishop, with Selucer upon the 103rd Psalm, part 3, their dissensions about the humanity of Christ, his ascension into heaven, and sitting at the right hand of God, &c.; and in England, about his descent into hell, predestination, and the necessity of bishops in the Church. "We," says Martin Luther, "censure in good earnest the Zuinglians, and all Sacramentarians, (that is, all who deny the real presence of Christ in the sacrament,) and consider them as heretics and aliens from the Church of God."—(*Luth. Contra. Articul. Lovan. Thess. 27, Tom. 2, fol. 53.*) I conclude, therefore, that the true Church of God, or the prelates belonging to her, assisted by his word and spirit, (Isa. lix. 21,) and perpetually by succession of bishops and of pastors, ever present to the faithful in all times and

Upon the absurd charge of innovation of doctrine by the Council of Trent. "A strange notion," says the learned Mr. Hallam, in his *History of Literature*, "has been started of late years in England, that the Council of Trent made important innovations in the previously established doctrines of the Western Church; an hypothesis so paradoxical in respect to public opinion, and it may be added, so prodigiously at variance with the known facts of ecclesiastical history, that we cannot but admire the facility with which it has been taken up. It will appear by reading the accounts of the sessions of the Council, either in Father Paul, or in any more favourable historian, that even in certain points, such as justification, which had not been clearly laid down before, the tridentine decrees were most conformable with the sense of the majority of those doctors who had obtained the highest reputation, and that upon what are usually styled the distinctive characteristics of the Church of Rome, namely, transubstantiation, purgatory, and invocation of saints, and the Virgin, they assert nothing but what has been so engrafted into the faith of this part of Europe, as to have been rejected by no one without suspicion or imputation of heresy. . . . No General Council ever contained so many persons of eminent learning and ability as that of Trent; nor is there ground for believing that any other ever investigated the questions before it with so much patience, acuteness, temper, and desire of truth; the early Councils, unless they be greatly belied, would not bear comparison in these characteristics. Impartiality and freedom from prejudice, no Protestant will

ages, is the sole external propounder and expounder of the law, or a general Council, which is an infallible judge of all controversies in religion, otherwise how can we be undoubtedly assured that former heresies were rightly and justly condemned.—See Irenæus, *Lib. 3, Advers. Hæres. cap. 4*; Tertullian, *de Præscript. cap. 21*; and St. August. *Tom. 7, Contra Crescon. Lib. 1, cap. 33*.

attribute to the Fathers of Trent; but where will he produce these qualities in an ecclesiastical synod? But it may be said, that they had only one leading prejudice, that of determining theological faith according to the tradition of the Catholic Church, as handed down to their own age. The one point of authority conceded, I am not aware that they can be proved to have decided wrong, or at least against all reasonable evidence. Let those who have imbibed a different opinion, ask themselves whether they have read Sarpi through with any attention, especially as to those sessions of the Tridentine Council which preceded its suspension in 1547?"

NOTE 1, TO LETTER XVI.

I am continually told by Protestants, that they acknowledge with much pleasure that there can be but one Church, and that they are well convinced that the Church of Rome is that true Church, but they assert at the same time that the Church of England forms also a part of this same true Christian Church. Now this Catholics deny, and their reason is as follows, which I extract from the writings of an eminent Catholic theologian: "Christ," says he, "cannot teach the Roman Catholics that there are seven sacraments, and afterwards teach the Protestants that there are but two. Again, with regard to the blessed Eucharist, or the Lord's supper, he cannot tell the Catholic that it really and truly is his sacred body and blood, and afterwards tell the Protestant that it is nothing but bread and wine taken in memory of his body and blood. Therefore if Christ taught the Protestant doctrine, the Catholic doctrine is false; if, on the other hand, he has taught the Catholic, the Protestant doctrine is false—they cannot both be true."

NOTE 2, TO LETTER XVI.

Christ for the sanctification of mankind, either instituted seven visible signs of invisible graces, or else he did not; if he did, then

there are seven sacraments; if not, then let our adversaries satisfy us to the following propositions, viz., baptism is either a sacrament or it is not; if not, why then hath it the visible signs, viz., the words and water of an invisible grace, according to St. John iii. 5, "Unless a man be born of water and of the spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God"? And again, Gal. iii. 27, "As many of you as are baptized in Christ have put on Christ"?

Confirmation either is a sacrament or it is not; if it be, then we agree; if not, why hath it the visible sign, viz., the oil and balm of an invisible grace, according to Acts xix. 5, 6, "Hearing these things they, &c. And when Paul had imposed his hands upon them, the Holy Ghost came upon them"? And again, Acts viii. 14, 15, 16, St. Peter and St. John did impose their hands upon them, and they received the Holy Ghost?

The Eucharist either is a sacrament or it is not; if it be, the controversy is ended; if not, why hath it visible signs, viz., the accidents of bread and wine, of an invisible grace, according to that of the Corinthians, xvii. 26, 27, "This is my blood of the new testament, which shall be shed for many in the remission of sins"? and St. John vi. 53, "Unless ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you"?

Penance either is a sacrament or it is not; if it be, then we agree; if not, why hath it the visible sign, viz., the penitent's confession and the priest's absolution of an invisible grace, which is the remission of sins, according to St. John, xx. 23, "Whose sins ye shall retain, they are retained; whose sins ye shall forgive, they are forgiven"?

Extreme Unction either is a sacrament or it is not; if it be, then there is more than two sacraments; if not, why then hath it the visible sign, viz., the priest's prayer, and the anointing with oil of an invisible grace, whereof St. James speaks, v. 13, 14, 15, "If any man be sick among you, let him bring in the priests of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil, in the name of the Lord, and the prayer of faith shall save the sick man, and our Lord shall lift him up; and if he be in sins, his sins shall be forgiven him"?

Holy Orders is either a sacrament or it is not; if it be, then it is no vacant ceremony; if not, why then hath it the visible sign, viz., the words of the bishop, and the things given to him that is ordained,

of an invisible grace, according to 1 Tim. iv. 14, "Neglect not the grace which is in thee by prophecy with imposition of hands of the priesthood"?

Matrimony either is a sacrament or it is not; if it be, then it is not a mere ceremony of the Popish Church; if not, why then hath it a visible sign, viz., the mutual consent of both parties of an invisible grace, and supernatural conjunction made by Almighty God, St. Matthew xix. 6, "That therefore what God hath joined, let no man separate"?* and again, Ephes. v. 31, 32, "They shall be two in one flesh; this is a great sacrament, but I speak concerning Christ and the Church."

A visible sign of an invisible grace, divinely instituted by Christ, either is a true definition of a sacrament or it is not; if not, then you deny the definition which you yourselves attribute to a sacrament; if it be, how can you deny the above mentioned seven visible signs of invisible grace divinely instituted by Christ to be sacraments? Baptism and the Lord's Supper are either more evidently mentioned in Scripture (according to Protestant doctrine) than any of the other five to be sacraments, or they are not; if not, why then do Protestants hold these two only, and none of the other five, to be sacraments? If they be, then shew us in what book, chapter, or verse, is Baptism and the Lord's Supper said to be sacraments, and none of the other five, which Protestants so obstinately deny.

NOTE 3, TO LETTER XVI.

A very learned dignitary of the Church of England has lately mentioned to me, "That the distinguishing the oblation of the Eucharist from that of the cross, is really a confounding or obscuring the whole mystery, and rendering it perplexed and intricate. We ought no more to reckon them two several oblations, than we should say an animal was three several sacrifices, because it was first immolated, then slain, afterwards burnt, and the blood of it ritually sprinkled." To which I reply, that Catholics may very justly answer to the objection made, from such places of the ancients as

* Do not Protestants, by granting divorces, act in complete opposition to the Lord's command as contained in this text?

seem to speak of the Eucharist being a different sacrifice from that on the cross, and that consequently they did not think it Christ himself personally. For however the sacrifice may be called different in other respects, yet according to the Catholic doctrine it is plainly and clearly the same in substance; on the other hand, according to the principles of this Protestant dignitary, bread is the only substance offered, therefore it cannot be the same sacrifice in substance. As all the actions of Christ tended to make one sacrifice of atonement for our sins, so all the oblations of the Eucharist may thus be called one sacrifice. But they cannot be properly one and the same in substance, unless one and the same thing and substance be offered. Thus the same animal immolated, burnt, &c., was the same sacrifice; but where different substances were offered, the sacrifices were essentially different. It is this then which makes the mystery intricate and perplexed. Our adversaries presuming to make bread and Christ's body the same sacrifice; whereas according to Catholic principles this point is most clear, since the Catholic Church declares with St. Ignatius, and in the common language of the Fathers, "That the Eucharist is the very same body which Christ offered on the cross." And it is most evident it was in this sense that St. Chrysostom, in his Homilies upon the Epistle to the Hebrews, calls the Eucharist one and the same sacrifice; because, says he, "Not different lambs, but the same lamb, the same Christ is offered; whereas the Jewish priest offered to day one lamb, tomorrow another."—(*Vide Hom. 17.*) And if it were commemoratively and not substantially the same, then the Jews also did no less offer the same; for theirs were prefiguratively the same. The learned dignitary also acknowledged that "few truths of Christianity can be more copiously or plainly proved from the Fathers than the doctrine of sacrifice."* Consequently it is evident, that the Church of England by law established, in which this verity is so shamefully neglected and defaced, cannot be the Church of the ancient Fathers. Hear now the words of another eminent theologian of the Protestant established Church, in which he acknowledged "That the common appellation which was given to heresy and to schism in primitive times, was erecting altar against altar, or new altars, or making sacrifices apart, or out of the Church." To which I reply, no body of men

* See Scandret on Sacrifice.—Oxford reprint.

in those times thought they could have even the appearance or shadow of a church without an altar and a sacrifice. What appearance then can the Protestant Church of England have of a Church, which did not oppose only, but destroy altars, and do not pretend to any, and still disavows a sacrifice? And although a few Protestants lay claim to it, yet manifestly make their sacrifices apart, and consequently are out of the pale of the true Church. This learned dignitary acknowledged likewise, "That in his opinion the Christian sacrifice has sufficient proof from Scripture to determine an impartial enquirer, and it rests with us on the same foundation in this respect as it does with the assertors of the doctrine of the trinity, of the baptism of infants, of episcopacy, and of liturgies. Our proofs from Scripture, though we believe them to be just and true, and know they are such as our adversaries cannot answer, yet when we are told that they are not satisfactory, and the question is simply this, whether they or we understand the Scriptures right? we take the same course that the adversaries of our communion do in the cases before mentioned, we appeal to the ancient monuments of the Church." Now, my Lord Bishop, as this way of appealing to tradition is extremely reasonable, so I am equally sure it is quite inconsistent with the general principle of Protestants, and with several particular doctrines of the Church of England. As to what Protestant writers generally say of oral tradition, in reference to Catholics, I take this opportunity of asserting, without the least fear of contradiction, that Catholics do not ground their doctrine in great controversies on that alone. And surely, my Lord Bishop, you who hold the most distinguished place on the bench of bishops for great talents, must acknowledge that an universal oral tradition carries with it immense force in matters of universal practice and moment. If the ancient writers are, as this learned dignitary of the established Church of England allows, the best expounders of Scripture, then Scripture alone, as interpreted by particular men at the time of the pretended Reformation and since, is not the sole decisive rule of controversy. And then there is an end, or rather there never could be a just beginning of a pretended Reformation of faith upon that principle, of particular men deciding by Scripture alone.

APPENDIX I.

"Do this in commemoration of me."—The Mass.

TO THE LORD BISHOP OF EXETER.

MY LORD BISHOP,

Protestants insist that these words, "Do this in remembrance of me," are against the real presence of Christ in the sacrament. This consequence is so ridiculous and nonsensical, that Calvin himself (*Super. 1, Cor. 5, 11*) is forced to acknowledge it as such, and to confess that those of his creed reason very ill; as is most true. For if an Emperor at his death should say, I desire to be interred in such a place, and I command a stately tomb to be erected on that spot in remembrance of me, would not that man be considered a downright fool that should say, the Emperor's body is not in that tomb, because he desired it to be erected in memory of him? Now really our adversaries follow this fool's example; our Lord said clearly, when he gave the communion to his Apostles, that he gave them his body; Take ye, (saith he,) this is my body; and after they had communicated, he said, "Do this in remembrance of me," that is, as St. Paul expounds it, as often as you communicate, remember me, my death and passion. Ergo, say our adversaries, his body is not present in the blessed sacrament. Can anything equal the absurdity of this reasoning? Nay, can there be anything more false or more opposed to the words of the Saviour, who declares and affirms that he is there really present; and I most positively here assert, that the commemoration of a thing in no possible manner excludes the presence thereof. Certainly not; for

a king, my Lord Bishop, may himself well represent a battle which he shall previously have gained; and when according to this counsel of the wise man, "Memento Creatoris tui,—Remember thy Creator," we remind ourselves of God and of his benefits, where is the man to be found who would be so silly to infer thence, that God is not present with us? For God is everywhere, and St. Paul says, in him we live, move, and have our being. Thus you must perceive, my Lord Bishop, that the remembrance of a thing by no means excludes the presence thereof; and when communicating we remember Jesus Christ and his most dolorous passion, agreeable to what he has commanded us by these words, "Do this in remembrance of me." It does not therefore follow, that he is not really present in the blessed sacrament, since he has in clear and express terms assured us that he is there present. Remark further, that the remembrance which is made in the communion is not properly of Jesus Christ, but rather of his death and passion, according to the testimony of St. Paul, "As often as ye shall eat of this bread and drink of this chalice, ye shall announce the death of our Lord."—(1 Cor. xi. 26.)

The Church teaches that the Eucharist is a true sacrifice, as it is a true sacrament; because in the Eucharist, besides the act of Jesus Christ giving us his flesh to eat, and his blood to drink, he likewise offered up and gave this same body and this same blood to God his Father, for the remission of all men's sins; and consequently the Eucharist is not only a true sacrament, but also a true and propitiatory sacrifice. The doctrine and belief of the Church on this great point is grounded on the word of God, on the doctrine of the ancient Fathers, and on the decision of the sacred Councils. In the first place, this decision of the Catholic Church is founded on God's words; for our Lord, giving his body to be eaten, says, (St. Luke xxii.,) This is my body which is given for you; also, which is broken for you; and giving the chalice, This is my blood shed for you unto the remission of sins. These words declare that when Jesus Christ gave his body to his Apostles, it was already given up and offered to some one, and his blood shed and consecrated to some one; now this could be to no other but to God his Father; it follows then, that he did sacrifice his body, for to give to God something consecrated with such like ceremony of thanksgiving, of breaking, and of effusing, is to sacrifice and to immolate. And for a further proof of this verity, our Lord made use of the word to shed, when he

spoke of his blood, which is a word belonging to the sacrifice, as your Lordship may read in Exodus xxiv., where it is said, that Moses confirming God's league with the people of Israel, shed the blood upon the altar. The second authority from Scripture which shews that Jesus Christ in instituting the Eucharist offered up a true sacrifice to God his Father, is taken out of the first chapter of Malachy, where God says by the mouth of his Prophet, "That he will reject the sacrifices of the ancient law, and that in the new law he will have a pure oblation which shall be offered to the Lord in all places, and in all nations." But this sacrifice and oblation can be no other than the sacrifice of the altar, which alone is pure, new, offered up in all places, and in all nations." It cannot be the sacrifice of the cross, for that was offered up in one place only, viz., on Mount Calvary, and our good works are neither pure nor worthy enough. The meaning of that text in the 109th Psalm, "Thou art a priest for ever," &c., is to shew us, that it further ratifies what I have just now said, and clearly shews that Jesus Christ truly sacrificed when he instituted the Eucharist; for St. Paul, (Heb. v. 6,) attributes this prophecy to Jesus Christ, meaning that as Melchisadech, the great priest of the high God, truly offered up in sacrifice bread and wine, so Jesus Christ on the eve of his passion offered up to God his Father the sacrifice of his body and blood under the species of bread and wine, in order to accomplish what Melchisadech had offered up in figure, therefore he is called a priest according to the order of Melchisadech, and the Scripture adds, for ever, because, says Theophilacte expounding these words, "this divine oblation is made without intermission by God's officers and servants," that is to say, by the priests; by whose means, says St. Chrysostom, "the faithful eat the flesh of our Lord, and drink his blood, when they perform the redoubtable sacrifice." St. Cyprian, Bishop of Carthage in Africa, and who lived in the third century, says, (*Lib. 2, Ep. 3*.) "The priest in consecrating imitates what Jesus Christ did, and indeed is our Lord's lieutenant, and offers then a true, perfect, and accomplished sacrifice in the faithful Church to God the Father, striving to do as Jesus Christ himself did at his last supper." St. Gregory of Nyssen, who lived in the fourth century, and who was present at the second General Council, or 14 de Resurrect. J. C. says, in confirmation of what I have stated, "Our Lord preventing the violent assault of the Jews, offered himself as a victim, being

himself both high priest and lamb. You will ask me when that was? (Observe this, my Lord.) It was when he gave to his Disciples his body to eat and his blood to drink." Thus indeed these holy Fathers believed that Jesus Christ did truly sacrifice in instituting the holy Eucharist.*

But I will now give your Lordship a more convincing proof, and which is from the first General Council of Nice, consisting of three hundred and eighteen bishops, assembled there from all parts of the world. Complaints being made that in some particular Churches the deacons gave the holy communion to priests, the holy Council came to the following determination: "That neither rule nor custom have ever established, that those who do not offer should give Christ's body to those who do offer."—(*Can. 18.*) The same Fathers also decreed as follows, and which words are quoted by Gelasius, (*Par. 32, c. 31*): "Let us not submit our spirits to the bread and wine, which are proposed to us on this divine table; but raising up our spirits let us believe with faith, that on this sacred table, that

* In the book of Common Prayer of the inconsistent Church of England, will be found the following prayer, inserted in these words: "Grant us, gracious Lord, so to eat the flesh of thy dear Son Jesus Christ, and to drink his blood, that our sinful bodies may be made clean." To express a real presence, my Lord Bishop, more clearly, no form of words could be found. In the Articles of Religion, many are the objections which have been made to the mystery of the Eucharist by the opponents of the Catholic Church; and many are the objections which are made to every mystery. But all those objections would fall of themselves, were men to cultivate the virtue of humility, by bringing down the pride of reason, when soaring in regions above its natural reach. Whoever forms a true notion of the power of God, must feel convinced that with him nothing is hard or impossible, and that he can do much more than man can comprehend. Every true Christian feels it his duty to submit his reason to the obedience of faith; he never hesitates to assent to every point of doctrine, which he knows to be taught by that Church, which, all who claim a share in the merits of redemption, Christ has commanded us to hear,—that Church which Christ hath most solemnly promised, that he himself and the Holy Ghost, the spirit of truth, will abide for ever.—(St. Luke x.; St. Matt. xxviii.; St. John xvi.) And as the spirit of truth abides with this Church expressly to teach her all truth, as Christ himself has declared, it cannot reasonably be called in question, but that in all points of faith and morals her doctrine must be free from error.

Lamb which takes away the sins of the world, is immolated by the priests in an unbloody manner, and that in truly receiving his precious body and blood, they are the symbols of our resurrection." These words make it evident, that the Fathers of this great Council * believed that the Eucharist was not only a true sacrament really containing the true body and blood of Jesus Christ, but likewise a true and proper sacrifice, and consequently they believed that Jesus Christ truly sacrificed in communicating his Apostles.

I may here be asked, if our Lord said mass? I answer, most assuredly he did; for to celebrate mass is neither more nor less than to sacrifice and to offer to God Jesus Christ's body and blood for the remission of sins. Thus the word of God, the testimony of the ancient Fathers, and the authority of the Councils, give us to understand that Jesus Christ said mass. The Apostles likewise, my Lord Bishop, offered up this sacred oblation and said mass, and I prove it thus: whatever Jesus Christ commanded the Apostles to do, the same was faithfully fulfilled by them; but our Lord commanded the Apostles to do what he did in the Eucharist, saying to them, Do this, that is to say, sacrifice; they did therefore what Jesus Christ had done. But Jesus Christ in celebrating the Eucharist, offered up the sacrifice of his body and blood; the Apostles then offered up in sacrifice to God the Father the body and blood of Jesus Christ, and consequently said mass. I prove it from Scripture as follows, (Acts xiii. 2,) where St. Luke, speaking of the Apostles, says: "As they were sacrificing to our Lord, and fasting, the Holy Ghost said, separate me Saul and Barnabas unto the work whereunto I have taken them." By which words it is manifestly seen, that the Apostles sacrificed, and consequently said mass; for to say mass, to offer the blood of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist, and to sacrifice the body of Jesus Christ in the new law, are one and the same thing.

Your Lordship may remark, that the Protestant Bible printed at the Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1796, instead of these words, "As they were sacrificing," has the words, "As they ministered to the Lord." But the Greek has, *Leitourgountoon*, which is as much as to say, sacrificing or saying mass; "Which is justified," as an eminent Catholic theologian says, "by Erasmus, who translated the aforesaid

* The Church of England receives the first four General Councils.

text by, *sacrificantibus illis Domino*, as they, viz., the Apostles, were sacrificing to our Lord; whence it happens among the Greeks, that the celebration of the mass is called *Litourgia*, liturgy, that is to say, sacrifice." You may ask me here, my Lord Bishop, do these words of Christ, as recorded by St. Paul, (1 Cor. xi. 24,) "This do in remembrance of me," were the words "to do," ever used in Scripture, or even elsewhere, for to sacrifice? I reply, that the words "to do," are used for to sacrifice, not only in Scripture, in the Hebrew, and in the Greek Septuagint, but also in several of the very best classical writers, as Cicero, Varro, Virgil, &c. I can furnish you with several instances from the Hebrew, but not to be too copious, take these two, (Leviticus xxiii. 19): "Then ye shall do one kid of the goat for a sin offering, and two lambs for the first year for a sacrifice of peace offering." Here the Hebrew word for "then ye shall do," is, "*Vaasithem*," and the Protestant bible translates it, "Then ye shall sacrifice." See also the same word in the same sense, (Numbers vi. 11,) "And the priest shall offer the one for a sin offering, and the other for a burnt offering." The Hebrew word here again, shall do, "*Veasa*," and it is translated into the Greek Septuagint, "*Poiesei*," shall do. It is also used in good Latin. Cicero says: "*Juno cui omnes consules facere necesse est.*—Juno to whom it is required that all consuls should do;" that is, should offer sacrifice; and Virgil says, "*Cum facies vitula.*—When you shall do with a calf;" that is, when you shall sacrifice with a calf. My second authority from Scripture which proves that the Apostles sacrificed and said mass, is St. Paul, (Heb. xiii. 10,) who affirms, that "We have an altar, whereof they have no power to eat who serve the tabernacle." Now there never was an altar without a sacrifice, for the one naturally supposes the other, they being so closely united; there was then a sacrifice in the Christian Church in St. Paul's time, and since this sacrifice could be no other than the sacrifice of the mass, it follows, that mass was said in St. Paul's time, and consequently that the Apostles said it. These words cannot be understood of the sacrifice of prayers, because those who serve the tabernacle, viz., the Jews, and those who are not Christians, cannot eat that which is offered upon this altar; and notwithstanding those who served the tabernacle, or who were not Christians, might offer prayers that might be pleasing to God, as were the prayers of Cornelius the Centurion, while even yet a pagan. More-

over, we cannot eat prayers, and St. Paul says, that which was offered upon this altar was eaten. There was then in St. Paul's time a sacrifice in the Christian Church distinct from the sacrifice of prayers and of praises, of which the primitive Christians had partaken of. Now this sacrifice could be no other than the sacrifice of the mass, wherein Jesus Christ is offered up and immolated, by this then it is clear that the Apostles said mass. It is evident, my Lord Bishop, there was an altar in St. Paul's time in God's Church, are not our adversaries consequently acting a most truly ridiculous part, and much to be blamed for asserting that they are of St. Paul's religion? You cannot but acknowledge the truth of what I state, for since in the pretended Reformed religions there is no altar in any of their temples, but the very contrary, for they have used their best endeavours to level them to the ground in our Churches, following herein the rage of the ancient Donatists, therefore they cannot be of the religion of St. Paul, and the primitive Christians; and we have every right to reprove them in the same exact manner as St. Optatus did their predecessors, viz., the Donatists, he says, "What is more sacrilegious than to break down the altars whereon you yourselves have heretofore offered up Jesus Christ? what is the altar, but the seat of Christ's body and blood? in what has Christ's offended you, whose body and blood is there resident at certain times? you have redoubled the injury by breaking into pieces the chalices wherein is carried the blood of Christ."—(*L. 6, Cont. Parmen.*) These are the words of St. Optatus, a most holy bishop, who assisted at the first Council of Nice; and in his name I here ask the cause of the impiety and the infernal fury which hurried on Protestants to demolish so many altars, whereon the adorable sacrifice of the precious body and blood of Christ was continually offered up to glorify the most holy Trinity, and to render thereunto the holiest, greatest, and worthiest homage we possibly can.

Besides the proofs from Scripture which I have produced to shew that the Apostles said mass, I have the authority of the ancient Fathers, who confirm this truth. St. Epiphanius, (*Hær.* 79,) and Hesychius, a companion of St. Jerome, (*Super. 9, c. Levit.*) affirm that the Apostles first accomplished Jesus Christ's precept concerning the celebration of the mass on Whit-Sunday; the great St. Basil, Proclus, and the Council of Constance, confirm the same, saying, that St. James, Bishop of Jerusalem, was the first who began

to say mass in that city, upon Whit-Sunday, by the consent of all the Apostles; St. Matthew, as is related by Anonymous Eusebianus, celebrated mass in Æthiopia, and suffered martyrdom whilst he was at the altar performing the sacred mysteries; Abdias, Bishop of Babylon, and a disciple of St. Simon and of St. Jude, mentions that St. Peter said mass in Antioch, and that he first composed a missal; lastly, St. Irenæus, who lived about seventeen hundred years ago, demonstratively shews that Jesus Christ and the Apostles sacrificed and said mass, he expresses himself as follows, (*L. 4, c. 32*): “Christus novi testamenti novam docuit oblationem, quam Ecclesia ab Apostolis accipiens in universo mundo offert Deo.”—“Jesus Christ,” says he, “taught us a new oblation of the new Testament, (viz., the mass,) which the Church offers to God throughout the whole world, having received the instruction of the Apostles.” Now all these authorities, from Scripture and the ancient Fathers, manifestly shew the antiquity of the mass, and prove against its enemies that it is no invention of men, since it has Jesus Christ for its author, of which Luther gives a striking testimony: “It was never our intention,” says he, “to abolish the mass, for we cannot deny but that it was divinely instituted by the Son of God, and celebrated in an holy manner by the Apostles.”—(*Tom. 3, p. 383.*)

St. Jerome informs us, that in his time “the bishop of Rome offered to God the holy sacrifice upon the relics of St. Peter and of St. Paul,” that the tombs of these illustrious Apostles might serve him as altars, and that it was the custom of all bishops, not only of one city, but of the whole universe. There were then altars, my Lord Bishop, throughout the entire world in the time of St. Jerome, and upon these altars they already offered everywhere the Christian sacrifice, the pure oblation according to the Prophet Malachy, the singular sacrifice which distinguishes Israel according to the spirit, from Israel according to the flesh, as says St. Augustine,* “The Church which this day extends from East to West, is Israel according to the spirit, being different from Israel according to the flesh,” which served under the shadows of sacrifices, (*qui serviebat in umbris sacrificiorum,*) by which the singular sacrifice which Israel according to the spirit now offers was meant, (*sacrificium singulare,*

* St. August. *L. Contra Advers. legis et Proph. c. 13.*

quod nunc offert.) These words are decisive, I repeat. It is not the sacrifice of prayer, for surely the Synagogue had its prayers, its psalms, its hymns. It is not the sacrifice of an humble heart, for the synagogue had its penitents. It is not the sacrifice of the cross, for that never can be renewed. It is the singular sacrifice, the true sacrifice, which Israel now offers according to the spirit.—Quod nunc offert Israel secundum spiritum. But what is Israel according to the spirit? It is the Church which existed from the time of the Apostles to the present, and will always continue till the end of the world by a true succession of bishops,* and who offers up to God a sacrifice of praise through the body of Jesus Christ. Since when does she offer this Eucharistic sacrifice? † Since the period when the God of Gods has spoken, and has called the earth to his service, from the East even unto the West. But your Lordship may tell me, that it is a superstitious practice to erect altars upon the relics of the martyrs? “Lay aside your error,” says St. Augustine, “it is to God we erect our altars, and not to the martyrs; it is to God we offer sacrifice, and not to men.—*Eriginus altaria ad memorias martyrum, ubi sacrificamus, non martyribus, sed soli Deo.*—In those places where we celebrate the memory of the martyrs, we erect altars, there we sacrifice, not to the martyrs, but to God only.”—(*St. August. Lib. 2, Contra Faustum. c. 21.*) And in his twenty-second book of the City of God, he says, “We do not build temples to the martyrs as if they were Gods, but we erect holy places to their memory, to render homage to them as men; and if we in them dress up altars, it is not to offer sacrifice to the martyrs. We offer the sacrifice to God alone, who is the God of martyrs and of us.” I may be asked, what is the utility of this sacrifice and of

* “Et immolat Deo in corpore Christi sacrificium laudis, ex quo Deus Deorum locutus vocavit terram à solis ortu usque ad occasum.”—(Ibid.)

† Consequently Protestants have left and abandoned the continuation of the true and substantial sacrifice of our Lord Jesus Christ upon the cross (the mass); they have likewise lost by degrees one of the greatest benefits and the greatest lessons of this admirable sacrifice, I mean, the spirit of sacrifice in one's self in our private life and daily; therefore, it is easy to be remarked, that each Protestant, really believing that he is serving God with fidelity, does not less remain attached to the love of himself, even to excess, fearing and avoiding everything which might be a subject of sacrifice to him.

these altars? has not the Saviour made clean all those who are sanctified by one only oblation? has he not effaced all the sins of the world by the one only sacrifice of the cross? and if he has obtained the pardon of all sins by his death, which he has, for St. Paul declares that there is no longer any oblation or sacrifice? All this is true, but there are no longer sacrifices of sheep and of goats. The Church which has erected altars from the days of the Apostles till now, has perfectly well understood it, and accordingly has never immolated the flesh of animals, nor has she for one moment ever considered that she was in any manner acting contrary to the doctrine of the Apostle, in offering to God the sacrifice of the mass, because we declare that this sacrifice is the same in substance with that which was offered on the cross, although it be different in the manner, the same victim which was immolated by the criminal hands of the Jews in a bloody manner, is to day offered up to God by the innocent hands of the priests in an unbloody manner for the living and for the dead. This is the reason why the Council of Trent most justly has pronounced anathemas against all those who presume to say, that the sacrifice of the mass does injury to the sacrifice of the cross, by diminishing its value. It is grounded upon the constant belief and general practice of the Church.

Does your Lordship wish to hear her belief on this great question? It is as follows: "That victim," says St. Gregory, speaking of the sacrifice of the mass, "in an especial manner preserves the soul from eternal death, which renews amongst us, by a mystery, the death of his only Son, who never dies again; having risen, death has no longer empire over him, nevertheless, ever living in himself, by an immortal and incorruptible life, he is again immolated in this mystery of the sacred oblation;* for his body is there taken, his flesh is there divided for the salvation of the people, his blood is shed and flows no longer by the hands of infidels, but into the mouths of the faithful. Let us now judge what this sacrifice is, which, in order to free us from sin, imitates (Jews in an unbloody manner) for ever the passion of the only Son. For who is there among the faithful who doubts but that at the hour of the immolation the heavens open at the word of the priest, that the choirs of angels arrive to be present at this sacred mystery of Jesus Christ, that things the most elevated

*. Pro nobis iterum in hoc mysterio sacræ oblationis immolatur.

are joined to things the most low, the terrestrial to the celestial, and the visible united to the invisible.”—(*St. Greg. L. 4, dial. c. 58.*)

Do you wish to behold her practice? It is after this manner: “When,” says St. Cyril, “they have finished the spiritual sacrifice and the unbloody worship of the host of propitiation, we pray to God for the peace of all the Churches, for the peace of the world, for kings, for soldiers, for our allies, for the sick and for the afflicted, in fine, for all those who stand in need of assistance, because we all require it. When we offer this sacrifice, we immediately make a commemoration of those who have died before us.”—(*St. Cyril, Hierosolim Cathe. 5.*) St. Basil, in his Liturgy, says: “Receive—we approach your holy altar according to your unbounded mercy, that we may be worthy to offer this reasonable and unbloody sacrifice for our sins and for the sins of all the people.” St. Augustine says: “We cannot deny but that departed souls are comforted by the piety of their living parents, when they offer for them the sacrifice of the mediator, or when they bestow alms in the Church.”—(*St. August. in Enchir.*)

I shall again return to St. Paul, and fearlessly assert, that if there be altars in the evangelical law, on which reposes the body of Jesus Christ, agreeable to the testimony of the Apostle as explained by the Fathers, so there is likewise a priesthood in order to immolate the victim and to offer that sacrifice, which St. Augustine calls, “The perpetual sacrifice of the Church, the daily sacrifice.—*Quotidianum Ecclesiæ sacrificium.*”—(*St. August. Liv. de Civit. Dei, c. 20.*) For who is not acquainted with what St. Paul declares in the Epistle to the Hebrews, that the priesthood of the old testament is transferred to the new? Hence it follows, that the law is likewise transferred, “*Translatio enim sacerdotio, necesse est ut et legis translatio fiat.*”—(*Ad Hebr. c. 7.*) For the sacrifice is not less connected with the priesthood than with the law, we must necessarily conclude that the change of the sacrifice has been followed by the change both of the one and the other; this is evident—no one can deny it. It is likewise true, that the sovereign Pontiff, who has made this change, and who has established the sacrifice and the priesthood in the evangelical law, is Jesus Christ who has substituted his body and his blood in place of the victims and sacrifices of the Jews. “*Ut umbræ cederent corpori, et imagines sub præsentia veritatis, antiqua observantia novo tollitur sacramento, hostia in hostiam transit, san-*

guinem sanguis excludit, et legalis festivitas, dum mutatur, impletur.”—“In fine,” says St. Leo, “that shadows should give place to reality, and images to the presence of truth, the ancient observance is taken away by a new sacrament, one host passes into another host, the blood excludes blood, and the change of the legal festival is its accomplishment.”—(*St. Leo. Serm. de Passione.*) But is it not requisite to know whether that sovereign, that eternal sacrificer, who is unique in his primacy, because no one succeeds him, has *not* ordained priests to serve under him at the altars? and whether he has not instituted a sacrifice which is to be daily offered by the ministry of the priesthood? Protestants are forced to deny all this, in order not to acknowledge either the sacerdotal character, or the sacrifice of the mass, but in so doing they are acting quite in opposition to the doctrine of the Fathers, of the Councils, and even of Holy Scripture, they must first efface the word mass from the writings of St. Ambrose,* of St. Augustine, of St. Jerome, of Victor Uticus, of Sulpicius Severus, of the Councils of Rome, of Carthage, of Melevis, of Arles, of Agda, of Valence in Spain, of Orleans, of Tours, of Mascon, of Narbonne, and of Valence in France, the most recent of which was upwards of twelve hundred years from the present period; they must reject the counsel of St. Paul to Timothy, “to stir up the grace which is in him by the imposition of hands,” and in another place where the Apostle says, “not to neglect it,” and again, “that to impose hands lightly on any one,” for St. Ambrose † and St. Jerome assure us, that he speaks of the ordination of priests, and of the power which they receive to offer to God the sacrifice through the person of Jesus Christ; they must treat as nought entire volumes which the holy Fathers have written on the dignity of the priesthood. Protestants also must reject all the honor which the holy Fathers declare to be due to the priesthood; they must likewise deny the power which the priests of the Catholic Church have received from God to consecrate bread and wine into the body and blood of Jesus Christ, and to offer daily to God the immaculate

* St. Ambr. L. 5, Ep. 33; St. Hierom. in c. 11, Proverb.; St. August. Serm. 137, 251, de temp. victor uticen, L. 2, de persecu; Vandalor. Sulp. Sever. in vita S. Martini. Cæsar Arel. Ep. 12, Concil. Valent. in Gallia, anno 584.

† St. Ambr. in c. 4, Ep. 1, ad Timoth.; St. Hierom. in c. 58, Isaiaæ.

victim for the sins of the people.* They must ridicule the simplicity of St. John Chrysostom, who says, "That the priesthood is made on earth, but that it holds rank among celestial things, because this order is not established by a created mortal, nor by an angel, nor by an archangel, nor by any created power, but is established by the Holy Ghost himself."—(*St. John Chrysostom, L. 3, de Sacerdotio.*) They must criticise those verses of Tertullian which teach, "That Jesus Christ being priest by the excellence of his supreme Father, has associated men to his office, and has made them priests of his body."—

"Namque suo socios homines sibi sanguine fecit,
Atque sacerdotes voluit sui corporis esse,
Ipse Patris summi perfectus jure sacerdos."

(*Tertullian, L. 4, Contra Marcionem.*)

They must consider as fabulous what St. Augustine mentions in the twenty-second book of the City of God, when one of his priests was called to chase away some evil spirits which haunted a house in his diocese, and who freed it from these infernal inmates, "as soon as he had offered the sacrifice of the body of Jesus Christ."—(*St. August. L. 22, de Civit. Dei, c. 8.*) They must condemn St. Ambrose of superstition and of error, when he wrote with such powerful effect on the graces attached to the priesthood; this great Saint says: "Man imposes hands, and God confers the grace; the priest extends his right hand supplicating, and God blesses with his right all-powerful hand; the bishop consecrates and confers orders, and God grants the dignity which is attached to orders."† They (Protestants must protest against the Councils‡ and the writings of the illustrious Saints §

* Theodo. in c. 5, primæ ad Timoth. idem sentit.; St. Hierom. Ep. ad Heliado. et L. 1, advers.; Jovini, c. 19, et L. 1, advers.; Pelagium, c. 9, et in Epist. ad Titum.

† Homo imponit manus, Deus largitur gratiam; sacerdos imponit supplicem dexteram, et Deus benedicit potenti dextera; episcopus initiat ordinem, et Deus tribuit dignitatem.

‡ Concilium Nicææ, Can. 14.

§ St. Dionys. de Eccl. Hierar. c. 1 et 5; St. Ignat. Martyr, Ep. ad Tralian; St. Justin, in Dialog. cum Tryph.; Hesychius, L. 2, in Levit.; St. Gaudent. tr. 2, in Exod.; St. Bern. Serm. de Cæna; Vide St. Cyprian, Ep. 2 et 9; St. Basil, L. 2, de Bapt. c. 8; St. Epiphan. Hæresi 79; St. Chrysost.

who declare, that the Priests have been established by Jesus Christ, in order that they may offer the sacrifice of his body, by a prerogative which distinguishes them from all others, and which has never even been granted to the angels. In fine, Protestants after having effaced from the writings of the Fathers the recollection of priests, of altars, and of the eternal priesthood of Christ; they must suppress all that these holy Fathers have ever said of that dear victim which is every day immolated by the hands of priests, viz., "That Jesus Christ in the Eucharist is both the priest and the sacrifice; that this mystery is performed only by the hands of priests; that it is the only, true, and singular sacrifice, which comprehends all other sacrifices which were but figures; that the same victim which was once immolated upon the cross, is daily immolated upon the altar."—"That he is found in the hands of the faithful, that he enters into their mouths, and that they drink truly the blood which flowed from his wounds."—"That the Eucharist is the flesh of the Saviour, which has suffered for our sins, and that the Simonians and Saturnians reject the Eucharist and the oblations, because they do not believe in them."—"That the oblation which we make is the same which Jesus Christ made at the pascal feast, that his sacrifice was in no manner more holy than ours, and that ours is in nothing inferior to his, but that, in fact, it is but the same redoutable and salutary sacrifice."—"That we offer always the same, that it is not another we now offer, but always the self-same, and for this reason, because it is always the same sacrifice; that there are not many Christs, although he is offered in many places; that he is the same Christ, who is whole and entire here and there, consequently that it is but the one same sacrifice, as it is but one and the same body which is offered in many places; that it is he himself who is our supreme Pontiff, who has offered this victim which purifies us, and we offer now the same which he offered there, and which cannot be consumed."

L. 3, de Sacerdotio, Concilium Lateranense; St. Chrysos. in Ps. 95; St. August. L. 1, Cont. ad Leg. c. 18; St. Gregor. L. 4, Dial. c. 58, Placuit Spiritui Sancto ut Corpus dominicum pruis intraret in os quam cæteri cibi; St. Aug. Ep. 118, c. 6, vid. L. 12, Contra Faustum, c. 10 et 20; St. Ignat. Ep. ad Smyrnens citatur à Theodoret, Dialogo 5; St. Chrysos. Hom. de Jejunio. prim. Pasch. idem Hom. 17, in Ep. ad Hebr.

I have given you now, my Lord Bishop, sufficient clear proofs of this victim, which is every day immolated by the hands of men, and of which St. Andrew * speaks so divinely before the Proconsul Ægeas, which is most faithfully written in the Acts of his Martyrdom, "the fidelity of which," as says a most eminent and distinguished Catholic divine, "cannot be suspected on account of their antiquity." This great Apostle says: "I daily sacrifice to Almighty God the immaculate lamb; who notwithstanding that he is truly sacrificed, and his flesh truly eaten by the people, yet doth he still remain whole and living."

If Protestants will not open their eyes to behold the bright rays of the Sun of this great day, I lament deeply their blindness; if they

* The genuineness of this passage I know has been called in question by several eminent critics. If I should be asked, what reason I have for supposing that this history came from the disciples of St. Andrew? I reply, in the words of a most learned Catholic divine, that we have many. 1st. That it has always passed under the name of the Disciples of St. Andrew, who were the priests and deacons of Achaia; and it is not probable that it was written by others under their name. It is simple, and there appears no mark whatever of falsity or novelty on it, it being written in the style of primitive Christian simplicity, the same simple style being clearly perceived in the writings of the Apostles and of their disciples. The second is, that it has never been called in question up to the period of 1617; for if it had been suspected of falsity, so many ancient and modern heretics, against whom it has been continually quoted, would have declared against it, and would not have failed to have expressed strong doubts of its authenticity, and would have denounced it to be a forgery; its authenticity not having been called in question nor rejected for so many centuries, it is evident that they believed it to be true. 3rd. That it was received from the earliest ages throughout the universal Church; for the passion of St. Andrew, and the remarkable words so celebrated in the Church, have been drawn from this work; and St. Bernard, in the Sermons which he made on this Apostle, quotes the authority of this book, in citing these words in confirmation of what he stated, and which he would not have done had he considered them apocryphal. I might bring other proofs, but these three are the most solid which Catholics can produce against separatists to force them to receive and to admit this book, having done all in their power of late years to undervalue and to depreciate its authority.—See *Histoire Chronologique du combat Eucharistique, entre l'heresie et la foy*. Par M. Andre Dusaussy, P. Predicateur, P.

could think to darken such shining truths by their captious reasonings, I would truly deplore their presumption. Notwithstanding all the effects which they make to combat them, they will never be able to suppress them. They may place themselves under the banners of Luther and of Calvin, against the authority of the holy doctors of God's Church, saying with them, "That he cares not if the Papists exclaim the Church, the Church, the Fathers, the Fathers, that in affairs of such vast importance he is indifferent as to what men do or say, that he is not ignorant that the Prophets and Apostles themselves were fallible, that he judges the Church, the Apostles, and even the Angels by the word of Jesus Christ."—(*Luther. de Missa Privata.*) "And remembering that it is the supper of the Lord, it is not just that we should withdraw ourselves from it even in the smallest degree, neither by the authority of men, or by the prescription of years."—(*Calvin, L. 4, Instit. c. 18, § 10, 11, and 12.*)

I shall now leave it to your Lordship and to my readers to judge if it be better on the one hand to follow the example of these apostles of the Reformation, in blaspheming the mass, and branding it with the foul stain of idolatry, or on the other, to believe with the East and the West, with the Greek and Latin Church, in every century, past and present, and in fine, with the entire Christian world, that it is the true, the only, the sovereign sacrifice of the evangelical law, which has banished from the face of the earth all false sacrifices, as St. Augustine says, "Huic summo veróque sacrificio cuncta sacrificia falsa cesserunt."—(*St. August. L. 10, de Civit Dei, c. 20.*)

I am,

My Lord Bishop,

Your obedient Servant,

VERA X,

A CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

POSTSCRIPT.

I may here be asked, if the word mass be of long standing in the Church? I would answer most assuredly; and a man would be considered as very ignorant who could be brought to deny it; for St. Clement, whom St. Paul calls his coadjutor, (Phil. iv. 3,) made use of the word mass in several parts of his writings, faithfully quoted

in the first volume of the Councils, and in Ep. 3, where he forbids priests to celebrate mass without the bishop's permission, "Because," says he, "no one is permitted to sacrifice and celebrate mass in any place, unless it be by order from the bishop." It was this great Pontiff (he was the fourth Pope) who wrote to the Corinthians a most excellent and salutary epistle, by means of which they laid aside all their disputes, he restored peace and harmony among them, and instructed them in the traditions of the Apostles; he was put to death on the 23rd of November, A.D. 100; he sat in the pontifical chair nine years, six months, and six days. St. Telesphorus, Pope and Martyr, who flourished in the beginning of the second century, and is the ninth Pope, (*Ep. Decret.*) commands three masses to be said on Christmas-day: "Let them," says he, "that are employed in the divine mysteries, celebrate three masses upon the day of the nativity;" the first at midnight, at the time our Saviour was born, the second at day break, when the shepherds came to adore him, and the third about the hour when the light of our redemption began to dispel the darkness of ignorance and of sin, which was the time when our Saviour offered up the sacrifice of his body on the cross. St. Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, bestows the greatest praise on this illustrious Pontiff, in his celebrated work against Heretics, where he says, he suffered a glorious martyrdom in the 15th year of the reign of Antoninus Debonnaire, the 5th of June, A.D. 152, having sat in the chair of St. Peter twelve years, eight months, and twenty-nine days. St. Ambrose (*L. 5, Ep. 33*) likewise uses the word mass, when he says, "I have persevered in my duty, I have begun to say mass." St. Augustine, (*Serm. 151, de Temp.*) having made it appear evident that the Lord's-day was to be kept instead of the Sabbath, says: "Now on these days let no one absent himself from the celebration of mass, and when all people come to Church, let no one betake himself to hunting." The Fathers who were assembled at the Council of Ayda, (*Can. 47*), made this decree: "We command all that are in the world to hear a whole mass upon the Lord's-day, and that no one be so rash as to depart before the priest's blessing. If any one be so temerarious as to do this, let him be publicly rebuked by the bishop." Finally, the Fathers who assisted at the great Council of Chalcedon, which our adversaries consider to have been one of the most orthodox, say, (*Act 11*), "The next day we celebrated mass altogether."

I now leave your Lordship to judge whether or no after all these authorities, and many others which I omit, fearing I might be too tedious, a man must not indeed be ignorant who could for a moment call in question the antiquity of the use of this word, mass, in the Church. Let our adversaries honestly confess, whether all these authorities do not at once condemn them; for it is as clear as day to all those who have eyes to read, that the Fathers of the first ages, who did not err in faith, (as our adversaries themselves confess,) did say and celebrate mass, as it is to this day said in the Church in communion with the See of Rome. I may be asked, has the sacrifice of the mass continued ever since in the Church? Yes; so that neither the ages of idolatry nor the rage of heresies could ever prevent this wonderful sacrifice from being followed and adored by all people, by princes, kings, by the most pious emperors that ever existed, and by the most learned men, and such as were the most eminent for sanctity. Now the mass being so solidly established, and proved from Scripture, confirmed by the Apostles, authorized by the sacred Councils, and by all the ancient Fathers, in fine, having been followed and revered by all people, and by the greatest men who have ever existed, must not that man, I say, be insane, and totally indifferent to his salvation, to renounce this wonderful sacrifice, deserting the Church in communion with the See of Rome, where it is continually offered up to God in satisfaction for sins? How painful to the feelings of an honorable mind, when he reflects that all these unhappy changes in religion were brought about by men of the most infamous and despicable characters, such as Luther and Calvin, who were the fathers of this pretended Reformation, followed by four or five renegade priests, criminals to their bishops, and by as many monks, who had cast off their habits, being dissatisfied with the cloister, and who have been so rash as to endeavour to annihilate and to abolish a mystery so adorable.

NOTE 1, TO APPENDIX I.

Mass, in Latin missa, is, as says the Roman Catechism, "*Quasi oblatio à fidelebus ad Deum missa per sacerdotem, tanquam per communem legatum.*" This word mass, according to some, comes from the Latin *missa*; according to others, it takes its origin from the Hebrew word *missach*, (*Tolet.* 1, 11, *Instruc.* c. 4,) which signifies a voluntary oblation, in which it agrees per-

fectly to Jesus Christ, this precious victim, of whom it is written, Oblatus est, quia ipse voluit.—(Isa. liii. 7.) The angel of the school writing upon this subject says, "That in Latin it is called missa, quia sacerdos per angelum preces ad Deum mittit et populus per sacerdotem; vel quia Christus, est hostia a nobis ad Deum missa; undè et in fine missæ diaconus dimittit populum dicens; ite, missa est."—(*St. Thom. 3, p. q. 83, a. 4, ad. 9.*) Thus since the propitiatory host, the victim, par excellence, is presented by the hands of the priest to the Lord; the mass is then exactly the same thing as the oblation, the offering of this holy victim. If in the mean time you wish to know what sort of oblation is the mass, and for what end it is offered, you will find it explained in the definition which the holy doctors give of the mass, as follows: "Missa est oblatio corporis et sanguinis Domini sub alienis speciebus facta, sacrificii ab ipso semel exhibiti expressiva."—(*Tolet. 1, 11, c. 4.*)

The dignity and the excellence of this divine sacrifice will appear to the greatest advantage if we but consider the person who instituted it, this person being no other than Jesus Christ at the last supper, as we learn from the mouth of the holy Council of Trent.—(*Sess. 22, c. 1.*) It was on this solemn occasion that taking bread and wine, and having consecrated them separately, in commanding his Apostles to do the same in memory of him, he instituted the holy mass, as regards the substance of it.—(*See Council of Trent, Conc. Trid. Sess. 22, c. 5.*) An eminent French writer says on this subject: "Car pour ce qui est de certaines circonstances accidentelles des rites, des Prières et des cérémonies qu'on observe en la Sainte Messe, elles nous sont venues en partie de la tradition Apostolique et en partie instituées par des différents Pontifes, afin d'augmenter la vénération et le respect pour un fonction si auguste."

NOTE 2, TO APPENDIX I.

"The first mass," says that profound theologian, Dr. Lingard, "was celebrated by our blessed Lord on the night before his passion, when he gave to his Apostles to eat of his body, and drink of his blood. He was a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec: and on that occasion, according to the consentient language of all Christian antiquity, by the separate consecration of the bread and wine, he instituted the Christian sacrifice, offering to his Eternal Father his body, which on the morrow would be given for us, and his blood, which on the same morrow would be shed for the remission of sins. Nor was this all; after the institution of the sacrifice, he instituted also the Christian priesthood, commanding his Apostles, and through them their successors in the ministry, to do what they had seen him do, as a perpetual

memorial and representation of his death upon the cross, 'Christ,' says St. Cyprian, 'was the high priest of God the Father; having first offered himself a sacrifice to the Father, and ordered the same to be done in memory of himself. The priest stands, therefore, in the place of Christ: and, if he does what Christ did, he offers in the Church a full and perfect sacrifice to God the Father.'—(*Ep. lxiii. p. 149.*) Similar language perpetually occurs in all the old Christian writers, even so far back as the first century. With all of them the mass is a sacrifice, and Jesus Christ the victim.

"Perhaps it may be asked, how then it happens that this sacred rite is not called a sacrifice in the tracts of the New Testament. It should be remembered, as has been noticed before, that those tracts are not records of Christian doctrine or worship. If they ever mention such matters, it is incidentally, and in covered language; for the writers had learned from their master *not to cast their pearls before swine*, (*Matt. vii. 6.*) and practised the lessons which they taught to their disciples, to conceal the mysteries of their worship from the knowledge and the derision of the profane. Yet they occasionally make allusions to the sacrifice, which were perfectly intelligible to those for whose use they wrote. Thus St. Paul, having remarked that the eating of the Jewish sacrifices profited nothing, adds, *we have an altar, whereof they are not at liberty to eat, who serve the tabernacle* (*Heb. xiii. 10.*); evidently intimating, that Christians had a right to eat of the victim sacrificed on the Christian altar, as the Jews eat of the victims sacrificed on their altars.—(See also *1 Cor. x. 18, 21*; *Phil. ii. 17.*)

"Another question is, what may be the meaning of the ceremonies with which the mass is accompanied; a question which would never be asked, if men were to reflect that the mass is not, like the many forms of worship which we see around us, of modern date and domestic origin—otherwise like them, it would betray by its language and the paucity of its ceremonies, the land, and the time of its birth. It is the worship of the Christians of old; it is therefore redolent of antiquity; it reminds us at each step of the habits and manners of nations which have long ceased to exist. We therefore revere and cherish it, as the form after which our fathers worshipped when they first embraced our holy faith; and which they received from men who had derived it from the Apostles of Christ. A worship fabricated of late years may be any thing else, but it cannot be the worship of the primitive Church.

"Christ is that pure and holy victim, who was offered once in a bloody manner on Mount Calvary, and is offered daily in an unbloody manner on the altar, *in every place from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same.*

"Among the charges against the Catholic Church, *the vain and profane babblings of men who speak evil of that which they do not understand*, (*1 Tim. vi.*

20; 2 Pet. ii. 12,) there is none more offensive to pious ears, none more disgraceful to its authors, than that which attributes idolatry to the practice of this most holy worship.

"Protestants, like Catholics, kneel to receive the sacrament. Why then if as is pretended, the outward demonstration of respect be idolatry, is the charge confined to Catholics? It attaches more strongly to Protestants, for they kneel before that which they believe to be bread and wine, Catholics before that which they believe to be the body and blood of Christ.

"Perhaps it may be said that this very difference will acquit the one and convict the other: because the Protestant can have no intention of paying divine worship to bread and wine.

"Now the Catholic will make the same reply. He can have no intention of paying divine worship to bread and wine, because he does not believe that bread and wine are there. The body and blood of Christ are the objects present to his mind: and to these only can his worship be directed.

"Nor let it be objected that the body and blood of Christ are not there. That cannot be: they must be there, or the words of our blessed Lord are not true. But even supposing that they were not there, the only legitimate inference would be that the Catholic is in error, not that he is an idolater. For it is a contradiction in terms to call that man an idolater, who hath no other intention, no other object, but to worship the *word made flesh*, who dwelt amongst us, and who suffered for us."

But your religion, my Lord Bishop, is the religion of man; and in proof of what I assert, I shall here bring under your Lordship's notice the same words of Dr. Lingard, which I have already quoted in another part of this work, but being so very apropos to my present purpose, I think it right to repeat them, as they clearly and truly shew that the Church of England is nothing more or less, I repeat, than the mere creature of human invention: "The new doctors, the pride of evangelical liberty, believed one day one thing and another day another, and as men and circumstances changed, the creed of the English Church was improved or corrupted by successive alterations."—(*Lingard*.) Your Church likewise has no antiquity, my Lord Bishop, you are but of yesterday, no universality, no succession of Protestant bishops and pastors, you have no lawful mission, no miracles to recommend you, you have no prudential signs of truth; yet from these and the like motives, previous rational proofs shewing the credibility of religion must be drawn, or the religion which is asserted to be true or credible, will appear naked and unevincenced, if I may be allowed to use that expression, having nothing to uphold it but the bare word of him who says it is true, and therefore is no religion. I need not urge this point further, because Protestants tacitly suppose the credibility of their religion not to be demonstrable by outward signs and marks of truth. For inquire of them why they prefer

embracing Protestantism rather than the Roman religion, or any other doctrine of heretics, you never hear a word of the long continuation of their Church, of their lawful missions, of the succession of their Protestant bishops from the time of Christ, no undoubted miracles, &c. No; but they immediately run to Scripture and tell you, that both their faith and the motives of it (internal to the book) stand there sufficiently evidenced. Now I here call on Protestants to shew, before the bar of public opinion, that the Bible declares the Protestant religion. The Bible, I know, teaches that Jesus is the Christ, the eternal Son of God, the Redeemer of the world, and thus much Protestantism teaches also; ergo, Scripture proves Protestantism. I answer, the argument *à genere ad speciem*, proves just nothing; for these doctrines are common both to Catholics and to other Sectarians, and are no specific articles of Protestantism as it is reformed. Now these must be shewn to be contained in Scripture. For example, that there is no sacrifice offered upon the altar, that there is no purgatory, that there is no transubstantiation, &c.; but Protestants warrant these negatives believed articles by Scripture proof. Protestants reply, that they do not find any mention made in Scripture of a sacrifice upon an altar, of transubstantiation, and the like. I answer, that others as learned as they find them, and prove all by Scripture; here, therefore, is no confessed principle to ground his denial on, all this clearly proves that every heresy which has ever sprung up in the Church from the time of Christ to the present period, has been grounded on Scripture badly interpreted, scarce two Protestants believing alike. Protestantism, consequently, whether we consider it in a general point of view, or descend to its particular tenets, is mere fancy, for Scripture alone without an infallible interpreter can make no one sure of his belief, for both Arians and Pelagians read it, yet they erred most grossly in points most essential, as Protestants do now, by presuming to interpret the sacred Scriptures according to their own whims and fancies, as the Arians and Pelagians did in former ages. We are, on the contrary, told by St. Peter, (2 Pet. i. 20,) "That no prophecy of Scripture is of private interpretation."—(See 2 Pet. iii. 16; St. Paul, Eph. iv.) We are everywhere admonished to hear the Church and her pastors, (St. Matt. xviii. 17; St. Luke x. 16; Heb. xiii. 17,) and to stick to apostolical traditions.—(2 Thess. ii. 15.) Consequently no power on earth has a right to interpret the Scriptures but the Catholic and Apostolic Church, which the Apostle declares to be "the pillar and ground of truth."

NOTE 3, TO APPENDIX I.

Some Protestants assert, that in the Hebrew it is not said, "for he was a priest," but, "and he was a priest," &c., so referring the said words not to the

bringing forth wine and bread, but to the blessing of Abraham. But even this, my Lord Bishop, will avail Protestants nothing, for every one who is well acquainted with the Hebrew language knows, as an eminent Hebrew master informed me, that this conjunctive particle *and*, is often taken for the causal, and the Hebrew particle is better expressed in such places by *enim* or *quia*, *for* or *because*, than by *and*; and so also it must be translated if the sentence be expressed elegantly in the Latin language, which St. Jerome was accustomed to do. Besides in the Hebrew, after these words, "And he was a priest of the Most High," there is an accent, which shews that the period there is ended, which is a convincing proof that the said words are to be joined to the preceding, "he brought forth wine and bread," not with the subsequent, "he blessed;" which distinction is likewise found in the Chaldee, Greek, and Latin texts, likewise in an English Bible printed in the year 1552, in which we read as follows: "Melchisadech, king of Salem, brought forth bread and wine, for he was a priest of the most high God;" which translation Beza proves to be correct by Theophilact, and many examples from Scripture.—(See *Beza, Annot. in Luc. i. 42.*) The Latin editions also in like places have not all of them the copulative *and*, but some other word as the sense requires, and consequently elsewhere they (English Bibles of 1578, in Gen. xx. 3) translate, "Thou art but dead, because of the woman which thou hast taken; for she is a man's wife;" the Hebrew expression I find is, "And she is married to a husband;" and the (Gen. xxx. 27) same may be observed in many other places. I must here request of your Lordship to recollect, that whenever Protestants suppose that it can serve their cause, they willingly consent to change the particle *and*, into *because*, as where it is said, (St. Luke i. 41,) "Blessed art thou among women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb," they (Protestants) translate it, (to be found in English Bibles of 1578,) "Blessed art thou among women, because the fruit of thy womb is blessed," and in the margin it is said, "It sheweth the cause why Mary was blessed;" thereby to insinuate, that the blessed Virgin was blessed not for any intrinsic virtue or goodness in herself, but only because her divine Son was blessed—so kind are Protestants to the blessed Virgin.

NOTE 4, TO APPENDIX I.

Luther, (*Ap. pro Cæna Domini*), Calvin, (*L. 4, Chron. in Henric. c. 4.*) Kemnitius, (*Cen. 4.*) Dr. Reynolds, (*in his Conference, &c., Altars and Sacrifice are linked by nature, &c.*) and almost all the other great Reformers freely grant that the mass was in use and was generally held to be a sacrifice in the time of St. Gregory and before, that is, upwards of twelve hundred years

since, a most convincing argument for the verity of the Catholic doctrine as regards all those whose understandings are not darkened by their own pride and self-conceit; for if the whole Church for upwards of twelve hundred years together has publicly practised idolatry, as it must necessarily have done if the Catholic doctrine of the mass be false, then the following consequences must have happened: 1st. False were all the predictions of the Prophets, that foretold the ceasing of idolatry, by the arrival of Christ on the earth. 2nd. False was Christ's promise, that the gates of hell should not prevail against his Church. 3rd. False is the expression of the Apostle, that the Church is the pillar and ground of truth. 4th. All those bishops and priests of the Catholic Church most esteemed and respected for virtue and for wisdom, who during this long period made it their daily office, and considered it a sacred duty to say mass, were idolaters, fools, and sacrilegious men, and in like manner were all the most renowned emperors, kings, and princes; all our ancestors held it a sacred duty to assist daily, at least as often as they could, at the sacrifice of the mass. So, my Lord Bishop, if we are to believe Protestants, the God of armies, the God of all that is great and good, has thought proper to reveal his truth, even in one of his highest and most exalted mysteries, to Martin Luther and to Calvin, men infamous for their pride and léchery, rather than to his saints who spent their whole lives in loving, serving, and worshipping him, and who were renowned for their humility and chastity. Who in his senses, permit me to ask, can believe this Protestant doctrine? Not I, for one, my Lord Bishop, I have read too much to be duped by such infamous men; and I freely declare, were I not a Catholic in communion with the See of Rome, never would I be a Christian. For Protestants, my Lord Bishop, remark well, are neither one in doctrine, nor one in worship. This I will prove. Hear what Dudith, a learned Protestant, writes on this subject: "Our people (the Protestants) are carried away by every wind of doctrine. If you know what their belief is to day, you cannot tell what it will be to-morrow. If you run over all the Articles, from the first to the last, you will find not one which is not held by some of them to be an article of faith and rejected by others as an impiety."—(*Epist. ad Caption, inter Epist. Bezæ.*) Dr. Blackburn, Archdeacon of Cleaveland, says: "He has very good reason to believe, that of one hundred Protestant parsons, who every year swear to believe and teach the Thirty-nine Articles which are in the book of Common Prayer, that not above twenty of them do believe these articles in the same sense."—(*Black. 3rd Edit.*) Dr. Clayton, the Protestant Bishop of Clogher, writes, that "no thinking man ever agreed exactly in their opinion, even in regard to any one article of it, viz., the book of Common Prayer."—(*Confess. 3rd Ed. p. 45.*) It is clear that Protestants do not continue in the same rule, (Phil. iii. 16,) nor all speak the same thing, (1 Cor. i. 10,) they have not got unity of doctrine

among them; consequently, I am under the necessity of concluding, that their society is not the Church of Jesus Christ. It is a body formed on human motives only; it is therefore manifest that God did not intend to make it his Church, and to forsake the ancient body which had been in possession of that title from the remote days of the Apostles.

NOTE 5, TO APPENDIX I.

In the oblation we see the symbols of life; in the sacrifice, the living being is condemned, and its death is the figure of another death; the flesh separated from the blood is the awful emblem of the idea concealed in this mysterious action. What relation could exist between the immolation of an animal and the remission of sins—this was a mystery to man. Did the vile blood of the victims, my Lord Bishop, that fell beneath the sacred knife, possess the virtue of purifying the conscience? Never did such an absurdity prevail in the world. But mankind firmly believed in what was represented by these sacrifices; all they knew was, that they were the types of a divine mystery of justice and of grace, and the voice of hope arose, during four thousand years, from the depths of that mystery which futurity was to unveil. The Deists in demonstrating that the efficacy of prayer and of sacrifice cannot be established by mere reasoning, prove what is attested by tradition, namely, that this faith has not originated in human conception. The more clearly they establish that the principle of these dogmas cannot be found either in the sphere of experience or in that of reasoning, the more evident it becomes that a belief in dogmas as ancient and as widely diffused as mankind, could not have existed if they had not been primitively revealed; so that the insoluble difficulties against the purely rational theory of these dogmas have infinite force in establishing the divine origin of that faith. If worship, the expression of these general tenets, be only a vain phantasmagoria, these tenets themselves must be an eternal chimera, and in the midst of this universal dream, I should like to know how those who reject belief in sacrifice, could prove to a consistent mind that it ought to believe in God.

NOTE 6, TO APPENDIX I.

Martin Luther candidly acknowledged that it was the devil who first instigated him to abolish the mass, he says: "He (the devil) and I are so intimate that I have eaten above a bushel of salt with him."—(*Concioni Dom. Reminiscere, fol. 19.*)

APPENDIX II.

THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS.

Our Saviour, in leaving to us his body and blood, under two distinct species or kinds, instituted not only a sacrament, but also a sacrifice; a commemorative sacrifice, distinctly shewing his passion and death until he come. For as the sacrifice of the cross was performed by a distinct effusion of his blood, so is that sacrifice commemorated in this of the altar by a distinction of the symbols. Jesus, therefore, is here given not only to us, but for us; and the Church is thereby enriched with a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice, usually termed the Mass: propitiatory we say, because representing, in a lively manner, the passion and death of our Lord, it is peculiarly pleasing to our eternal Father, and thus more effectually applies to us the all-sufficient merits of the sacrifice of the cross.

SCRIPTURE.

As the bloody sacrifices, ordained by the Jewish law, are understood to have prefigured the sacrifice, which the Redeemer of mankind was once to offer on the cross, by the effusion of his blood; so do we believe, that the unbloody offerings of the same law, but much more than these, the bread and wine, which Melchisedec, "the priest of the most high God," presented to Abraham, (Gen. xiv.) were a type or figure of that unbloody sacrifice, which Christ, "the priest for ever according to the order of Melchisedec," (Ps. cix.)

would continue to offer, through all ages, under the symbols or species of bread and wine.

Malach. i. 10, 11.—I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord of hosts, neither will I accept an offering at your hand.—For from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles, and in every place incense shall be offered to my name, and a clean offering. Matt. xxvi. 28.—This is my blood of the new Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins. Mark xiv. 24.—This is my blood of the new Testament, which is shed for many. Luke xxii. 19.—This is my body that is given for you: Do this for a commemoration of me. 20.—This is the chalice, the new Testament in my blood, which is shed for you. I Cor. xi. 24.—This is my body which is broken for you: this do for the commemoration of me: 25.—This chalice is the new Testament in my blood: do ye this, as often as you shall drink it, for the commemoration of me. 26.—For as often as you shall eat this bread, and drink this chalice, you shall shew the death of the Lord until he come.

According to the translation of these passages, which is conformable to the Greek, our Saviour speaks in the present tense, (or time,) of the actual immolation of his body, and the actual effusion of his blood, for the remission of sins; because, at that moment, he really, but mystically, offered up his body and blood for the salvation of the Apostles and of all men: while the words, do this for a commemoration or in remembrance of me, plainly denote the institution of a sacrifice, to be celebrated to the end of time. Thus Christ seems to say: As I now immolate my body, and shed my blood, for the remission of sins; so do you offer up this same body, and this same blood, in remembrance of me. What I now do, do you and your successors. In this sense, as we have seen, and shall see, have the words of Christ been always understood in the Catholic Church.

Ibid. x. 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21.—Wherefore, my dearly beloved, fly from the service of idols.—I speak as to wise men: judge ye yourselves what I say.—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?—For we being many are one bread, one body all that partake of one bread.—Behold Israel according to the flesh: are not they,

that eat of the sacrifice, partakers of the altar?—What then? Do I say, that what is offered in sacrifice to idols, is any thing? Or, that the idol is any thing?—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.—You cannot drink the chalice of the Lord, and the chalice of devils: you cannot be partakers of the table of the Lord, and of the table of devils.

As the Apostle speaks of the participation of the victims, among the Jews, which were offered on their altars, and of a similar participation among the Gentiles; so, instituting a comparison, he plainly speaks of Christians partaking of the body and blood of our Lord from the Eucharistic altar.

Heb. xiii. 10, 11, 12.—We have an altar, whereof they have no power to eat who serve the tabernacle.—For the bodies of those beasts, whose blood is brought into the sanctuary by the high priest for sin, are burned without the camp.—Wherefore Jesus also, that he might sanctify the people with his own blood, suffered without the gate.

The meaning of the passage is not plain, but it seems to intimate the superiority of the Christian worshippers. The Jews—not even their priests, were not allowed to taste of the victims which were solemnly offered for sin: but we have an altar and a victim, typified by those of the Jews, of which we may, at all times, partake; a victim once offered for sin, and represented by the daily oblation of his body and blood.

Acts xiii. 2.—And as they were ministering to the Lord, and fasting, the Holy Ghost said to them. The breaking of bread is often mentioned in the same Acts; and in the two quotations just given from St. Paul, the altar and table are mentioned, which must refer to sacrifice. Rev. v. 6.—And I saw: and behold in the midst of the throne, and of the four living creatures, and in the midst of the ancients, a lamb standing as it were slain.—8.—And when he had opened the book, the four living creatures, and the four and twenty ancients, fell down before the lamb.—9.—And they sung a new canticle, saying: Thou art worthy, O Lord, to take the book, and to open the seals thereof: because thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God, in thy blood, out of every tribe, and tongue, and people, and nation:—10.—And hast made us to our God, a kingdom and priests, and we shall reign on the earth.

FATHERS.

CENTURY I.

S. Clement of Rome, L. C.—"Whatever God has commanded to be done at stated times, that we must perform in regular order: thus must our offerings be made, and other public functions exercised; not inconsiderately, and without order, but, as it was ordained, at stated times and hours.—They, therefore, who in this manner, present their offerings, are acceptable to the Lord, and blessed; for, following his commandments, they do not go astray."—(*Ep. 1, ad Cor. n. 40, T. 1, PP. Apost. p. 170.*)

CENTURY II.

S. Justin, L. C.—"Inflamed by the word of his calling, as it were, by fire, truly we are the sacerdotal offspring of God; as he himself attests, saying, that, in every place among the nations, we offer to him well pleasing and clean victims. These victims he accepts from his own priests alone. Wherefore, shewing preference to all those, who, through his name offer the sacrifices, which Christ ordained to be offered, that is, in the Eucharist of bread and the chalice, which in all places of the earth are celebrated by the Christian people, God declares, that they are well-pleasing to him. But the sacrifices of you Jews and of your priests he rejects, saying; 'I will accept no offering from your hands; because from the rising of the sun, to the going down of the same, my name is great among the Gentiles: but ye have profaned it.'—(*Malach. 1.*) But I myself say, that those prayers and thanksgivings are alone perfect, and the victims pleasing to God, which are offered by good men. These, Christians alone have learned to offer in the commemoration of their dry and liquid food, (bread and wine,) in which commemoration they are reminded of the passion which Christ suffered."—(*Dial cum Tryphon Judæo, p. 386.*)

S. Irenæus, L. C.—"Giving advice to his disciples to offer their first fruits to God, not as if he stood in need of them, but that they

might not seem ungrateful, he took bread into his hands, and giving thanks, said: This is my body. Likewise he declared the cup to be his blood, and taught the new oblation of the new Testament, which oblation the Church receiving from the Apostles, offers it to God over all the earth *—to him who grants us food—the first fruits of his gifts in the new Testament, of which the prophet Malachias spoke: ‘I will not accept offerings from your hands. For from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, my name is great among the Gentiles, and in every place incense is offered to my name, a clean sacrifice.’—(1.) Manifestly hereby signifying, that the first people (the Jews) will cease to offer to God; and that in every place, a sacrifice, and that clean, will be offered to him,† and that his name is glorified among the Gentiles.” ‡—(*Adver. Hær. L. iv. c. xxxii. p. 323, 324.*) “Therefore the offering of the Church, which the Lord directed to be made over all the world, was deemed a pure sacrifice before God,§ and received by him; not that he stands in need of a sacrifice from us, but because he that makes the offering, if his gift be accepted, is thereby rendered worthy of praise.—As then in simplicity the Church offers, her offering is accepted by God as a pure sacrifice.”—(*Ibid. c. xxxiv. p. 324, 326.*)

Tertullian, L. C.—“It was ordained in the old law, that no sacrifices should be offered to God, but in the land of promise, which the

* Calicem—suum sanguinem confessus est, et novi Testamenti novam docuit oblationem, quam Ecclesia ab apostolis accipiens, in universo mundo offert Deo.

† Omni autem loco sacrificium offeretur ei, et hoc parum.

‡ On this passage, the learned Editor of Irenæus, the Protestant Dr. Grabe, observes: “It is certain that Irenæus and all the Fathers—either contemporary with the Apostles, or their immediate successors, whose writings are still extant—considered the blessed Eucharist to be the sacrifice of the new law, and offered bread and wine on the altar, as sacred oblations to God the Father; and that this was not the private opinion of any particular Church or teacher, but the public doctrine and practice of the universal Church, which she received from the Apostles, and they from Christ, is expressly shewn in this place, by Irenæus, and before him by Justin M. and Clement of Rome.”—(*Nota in Irenæum, p. 323.*)

§ Ecclesiæ oblatio, quam Dominus docuit offerri—purum sacrificium reputatum est apud Deum.

Lord was to give to the children of Israel; and that, when they entered, sacrifices and holocausts should there be celebrated. Why then does the spirit declare by his prophets, that, in all the earth, and in every place, sacrifices shall be offered? 'In every place incense shall be offered to my name, and a clean offering.'—(Malach. i.) As then it is plain, that a temporary Sabbath was appointed, and an eternal Sabbath predicted; a carnal and spiritual circumcision; a law that would pass away, and a law to endure for ever; carnal sacrifices likewise, and spiritual sacrifices promised—from this it follows, that, all these things being commanded to the Jewish people, the time would come, when they would cease, and the promise of a new law, with spiritual sacrifices, and a new Testament would take their place."—(*Adversus Judæos*, c. v. vi. p. 139.) The same he repeats against Marcion, (*L.* iii. p. 679.)—But it seems rather, that he alludes principally to the pure sacrifices of the heart, and not the establishment of a real sacrificial offering. In other parts of his works, however, I meet with expressions which evidently pertain to a sacrifice—such as altars, offerings for the dead, the duty of priests to offer, and annual oblation of husbands and wives for their departed consorts.

CENTURY III.

S. Cyprian, L. C.—Writing to the clergy and people of a certain district in Africa, he laments that, contrary to an established rule, a brother clergyman had been appointed, by will, an executor or guardian, when it was the sole duty of the ministers of the gospel "to attend to the altar and sacrifices,* and to prayers and supplications." Such likewise he observes, was the view of the Almighty in the establishment by Moses of the Levitical order, and then adds: "The same disposition holds good now, that they who are promoted by clerical ordination, be not called away from the service of God, nor perplexed by worldly business; but, receiving aliment from their brethren, they withdraw not from the altar and from sacrifices,† day

* Altari et sacrificiis deservire—debeant.

† Ab altari et sacrificiis non recedant.

and night intent on heavenly things." He next remarks that, in a case like this, it had been decreed, that for no brother, who by will had made such a disposition, "any offering should be made, or sacrifice celebrated for his repose: * because he merits not to be named at the altar in the prayer of the priests, whose wish it was to withdraw them from the altar." He, therefore, forbids prayers and oblations to be made for him. *Ep. 1, p. 1, 2, 3.*—"Although I am sensible, that most bishops, set over the Churches of God, hold to the maxims of evangelical truth and divine tradition, and depart not, by any human and innovating discovery, from that which Christ our master taught and did; yet as some, through ignorance or simplicity, in the sanctification of the cup of the Lord, and in delivering it to the people, do not that, which Jesus Christ, our Lord and God, the teacher and founder of this sacrifice, † himself did and taught; therefore, I judge it necessary to write to you, in order that, if there be any one still in that error, when he sees the light of truth, he may return to the root and fountain of Christian tradition." Then proceeding to the point, he says: "Be then advised, that, in offering the cup, the rule, ordained by Christ, be followed, that is, that the cup, which is offered in commemoration of him, be wine mixed with water. For as he said: 'I am the true vine;' not water, but wine, is the blood of Christ. And what is in the chalice cannot be thought the blood, by which we obtained redemption and life, if wine be wanting, whereby that blood is shewn, which, as all the Scriptures attest, was shed." *Ep. lxxiii. p. 148.*—"In the priest Melchisedec we see prefigured the sacrament of the Christian sacrifice, ‡ the holy Scriptures declaring: 'Melchisedec king of Salem brought forth bread and wine; and he was the priest of the most high God, and he blessed Abraham.'—(Gen. xiv.) And that he bore the resemblance of Christ, the Psalmist announces: 'Thou art a priest for ever according to the order of Melchisedec.'—(Ps. cix.) This order thus comes and descends from that sacrifice; that Melchisedec was the priest of the Most High; that he offered bread and wine, and that he blessed Abraham. And who was so much a priest of the most high God, as our Lord Jesus Christ? He offered sacrifice to

* Nec sacrificium pro dormitione ejus celebraretur.

† Sacrificii hujus auctor et doctor.

‡ Sacrificii Dominici sacramentum.

God the Father; he offered the same as did Melchisedec, that is, bread and wine, his own body and blood: and the blessing given to Abraham, now applies to our people." "But, in the book of Genesis, that the blessing given to Abraham might be properly celebrated, the representation of the sacrifice of Christ, appointed in bread and wine, precedes it; which our Lord, perfecting and fulfilling it, himself offered in bread and wine; and thus he who is the plenitude, fulfilled the truth of the prefigured image."—(*Ibid.* p. 149.) He afterwards adds: "If Jesus Christ, our Lord and God, be himself the high priest of his Father; and if he first offered himself a sacrifice to him, and commanded the same to be done in remembrance of him; then that priest truly stands in the place of Christ, who imitates that which Christ did, and then offers in the Church a true and complete sacrifice to God the Father,* doing what he ordained. For the whole discipline of religion and of truth is subverted, if that which was commanded be not faithfully complied with."—(*Ibid.* p. 155.)

I could quote many other passages from the Letters of S. Cyprian and from his other Tracts, in which he speaks of the Christian sacrifice of the new law, in terms the most plain and obvious, such as: "We are mindful of you day and night, and when we offer up prayer in the sacrifices."—(*Ep.* xxxvii. p. 72.) "As often as we celebrate the anniversary days of the martyrs, we offer sacrifices for them."—(*Ep.* xxxix. p. 77.) "To God and his Christ, whom I serve, and to whom, with a pure and undefiled countenance, in persecution and in peace, I unceasingly offer sacrifices." †—(*Ep.* lxvi. p. 169.) "Whilst we were offering sacrifice, ‡ the girl was brought in by her mother."—(*De Lapsis*, p. 132.)

CENTURY IV.

Eusebius of Cæsarea, G. C.—"And as he (speaking of Melchisedec) who was the priest of the Gentiles, seems never to have offered animal sacrifices, but wine alone and bread, while he blessed

* Ille sacerdos vice Christi vere fungitur, qui id quod Christus fecit, imitatur et sacrificium verum et plenum tunc offert in ecclesia Deo Patri.

† Sacrificia indesinenter offero.

‡ Sacrificantibus nobis.

Abraham; so our Saviour and Lord first, and then the priests who are descended from him, performing, in all nations, according to ecclesiastical ordinances, the sacerdotal function, represent, in bread and wine, the mysteries of his body and salutary blood, which mysteries Melchisedec had so long before by the divine spirit fore-known, and used in figure. The Scripture of Moses says; 'And Melchisedec king of Salem brought forth bread and wine: and he was the priest of the most high God: and he blessed Abraham.'—(Gen. xiv.)"—*Demonst. Evang. L. v. c. iii. p. 223. Coloniae, 1688.*)

S. Cyril of Jerusalem, G. C.—He mentions the various prayers and ceremonies which accompany our sacrifice of the altar, and adds: "When this spiritual sacrifice is ended, and this unbloody worship over the victim of propitiation, we supplicate God, for the common peace of the Churches, for the tranquillity of the world, for kings, for their armies, and their allies, for the sick and the afflicted, and in a word, for all who want assistance. Again, when we offer this sacrifice, we commemorate those who have departed this world before us.—We offer up that Christ who was slain for our sins, that he, who is most kind, may be propitious to us and them." He proceeds to the Lord's prayer which is recited in the Mass, and dwells on its several clauses; and then prescribes the reverential manner in which the body and blood of Christ are to be taken.—(*Catech. Mystag. v. n. 6, 7, p. 297, 298.*)

S. Gregory of Nazianzum, G. C.—"And where, and by whom could God be worshipped in those mystic and elevating sacred rites, than which nothing, among us, is greater nor more excellent, if there were no priesthood, nor sacrifice?—Knowing this, and knowing besides, that no one was worthy of this great God, this sacrifice, and this priesthood, who had not first offered himself a victim to the Lord—how should I dare to offer to him that external sacrifice, that antitype of great mysteries, or to take up the name and habit of a priest?"—(*Orat. I, T. I, p. 3, 38.*) "Julian, in impure and wicked blood, washes away his baptismal rite, opposing initiation to initiation—he defiles his hands, in order to purify them from that unbloody sacrifice, through which we communicate with Christ, with his divine nature, and his sufferings."—(*Orat. iii. in Julian. T. I, p. 70.*)

S. Optatus of Milevis, L. C.—"What is so sacrilegious as to break, to erase, and to remove the altars of God, on which you yourselves made offerings? On them the vows of the people, and the members of Christ were borne.—For what is the altar, but the seat of the body and blood of Christ? * What offence had Christ given, whose body and blood, at certain times, do there dwell? †—This huge impiety is doubled, whilst you broke also the chalices, the bearers of the blood of Christ." ‡—(*Contra Parmen. L. vi. p. 91, 92, 93.*) Among other excesses with which he charges the Donatists, he had before mentioned, that they ordered the consecrated elements to be poured out to dogs; which, seized with madness, turned against their masters, as against strangers, "guilty of the body of the Lord." §—(*Ibid. L. ii. p. 39.*)

S. Ambrose, L. C.—Commenting on the appearance of the angel to Zacharias (Luke 1) he says: "It were to be wished that, while we burn incense on our altars, and offer sacrifice, the angel would assist, and become visible to us. That he does assist, cannot be doubted, while Christ is there, while Christ is immolated; || 'For Christ, our pasch, is sacrificed.'—(1 Cor. v.)"—(*L. 1, in Evang. Luc. c. 1, T. iii. p. 12.*) "We have beheld the Prince of priests coming to us; we have beheld and heard him offering his blood for us: Let us priests then follow him, as we can, and offer sacrifice for the people, weak as we are in merit, but rendered honourable by this sacrifice: for although Christ is not now seen to offer, yet is he offered on earth, when his body is the victim. ¶ Indeed, he manifestly offers in us, since it is his word that sanctifies the sacrifice that is offered."—(*Enarr. in Psal. xxxviii. T. ii. p. 740.*)

In a letter to his sister Marcellina, giving an account of some disturbances at Milan, when an attempt was made to seize the Church, he relates: "The next day, which was Sunday, after the reading and sermon, when I was explaining the creed, word was brought, that officers were sent to seize the Portian-church, and that

* Sedes et corporis et sanguinis Christi.

† Cujus illic per certa momenta corpus et sanguis habitabat.

‡ Calices, Christi sanguinis portatores.

§ Sancti corporis reos,

|| Quando Christus assistit, quando Christus immolatur.

¶ Ipse offertur in terris, quando Christi corpus offertur.

part of the people were flocking thither. I continued to discharge my duty, and began mass: * but as I was offering, I was informed, that the people had laid hands on an Arian priest. This made me weep, and I prayed to God in the midst of the offering,† that no blood might be shed in this quarrel.”—(*Ep. xiv. T. v. p. 205.*) Having heard from the emperor Theodosius of the victory which he had gained over the tyrant Eugenius, Ambrose writes to him. “I took your letter with me to the Church: I laid it on the altar, and, whilst I offered sacrifice,‡ I held it in my hand, that by my voice you might speak, and your august letter perform with me the sacerdotal office.”—(*Ep. lviii. T. v. p. 322.*)

As the Mass has just been mentioned in a quotation from S. Ambrose, I will here subjoin a passage, on the subject, from the learned and pious Cardinal Bona, who flourished at Rome in the seventeenth century: “There is an epistle of Pius I., acknowledged to be genuine, written about the year 166 to the Bishop of Vienne, in the opening of which he thus speaks: ‘Our sister Euprepia, as you well recollect, made over her house to the poor, where we dwell and celebrate mass.’”—(*Conc. Gen. T. 1, p. 576.*) A letter also from Pope Cornelius to another bishop of the same city, written about the year 254, remarks that, on account of the persecutions, the Christians could not publicly “celebrate mass.”—(*Ibid. p. 681.*) In the fourth century, S. Ambrose writing to his sister mentions the mass, as likewise in his thirty-fourth Discourse: “I exhort you, you that are near the Church, and can do it without great inconvenience, to hear mass daily.”—(*T. v. p. 48.*) In his preparatory prayer before mass, he says: “Grant me thy grace, on this day and on every other, with a pure mind and clean heart, to celebrate the solemn service of mass.”§—(*Ibid. p. 335.*) “S. Augustin and other ancient Fathers use the same expression, and they use it as if it were common and generally received at the time.”—(*L. 1, Rerum Liturg. c. iii. p. 17. Edit. Paris, 1678.*)

In this fourth century various Councils were held which in plain terms speak of the Christian sacrifice.

* Missam facere cæpi.

† Et orare in ipsa oblatione.

‡ Cum offerrem sacrificium.

§ The two works quoted by Cardinal Bona, as the works of S. Ambrose, are not allowed, by the learned, to be his, though of some ancient author.

Council of Ancyra, G. C.*—Against such priests who, in the times of persecution, had shown great weakness, it enacts; “That they be not deprived of their stations; but that they be not allowed to offer, nor to address the people, nor to perform any priestly function.”—(*Can. 1, Conc. Gen. T. 1, p. 1455.*)

Council of Neocæsarea,† G. C.—“Country priests, in the presence of the bishop or the priests of the city, cannot offer, nor give the sanctified bread, nor present the chalice.”—(*Ibid. Can. xiii. p. 1483.*)

Council of Nice, G. C.—“The holy Synod has been informed, that, in some places and cities, the deacons present the Eucharist to the priests; a thing which no canon nor custom has taught—that they, who have themselves no power to offer, should present the body of Christ to those, who possess that power.”—(*Can. xviii. Conc. Gen. T. ii. p. 38.*)

Council of Laodicea,‡ G. C.—Having established certain rules to be observed in the service of the Church, it adds: “And after the priests have given the kiss of peace to the bishop, the laity must do the same one to the other, and thus the holy offering be completed: but the ministers alone may approach the altar, and there communicate.”—(*Ibid. Can. xix. p. 1499.*)

Second Council of Carthage,§ L. C.—It enacts, that, if any priest, having been reprimanded by his bishop, withdraw from his communion, and “offer sacrifice privately,”|| erecting altar against altar,

* This Council, held about the year 314, consisted of bishops from all the principal sees of the East, to the number of at least 118.—They enacted twenty-five canons for the establishment of discipline.

† This Council was called soon after that of Ancyra, and consisted of nearly the same bishops.

‡ This Council met about the middle of the fourth century, and has left us sixty canons, which have ever been held in the greatest estimation.

§ This Council was called by Genethlius, bishop of Carthage, who presided at it, in 390.—It enacted thirteen canons, respecting the celibacy of bishops, priests, and deacons, and other points of discipline.

|| Separatim—sacrificium Dei obtulerit.

contrary to established discipline—he be deprived of his office.”—(*Ibid.* *Can.* viii. *T.* ii. *p.* 1161.)

Theophilus of Alexandria,* *G. C.*—Let the priests, after certain portions have been consumed in the use of the mysteries, divide the remainder of what was offered in the way of sacrifice; but of them the catechumen may not eat nor drink, but clerks only and the believing brethren with them.’—(*In Commonit. Can.* vii. *Apud Bevereg.* *p.* 172. *Edit. Oxonii*, 1672.)

S. John Chrysostom, *G. C.*—On the words of the Prophet Malachy: “And in every place incense shall be offered to God and a clean offering;” he says, addressing the Jews: “When did this happen? When was incense thus offered? When this clean sacrifice? You can produce no other time than this, after the coming of Christ. And if of this time the prophet had not spoken; had he prophesied not of our sacrifice, but of that of the Jews, his prophecy would have been contrary to the law: for Moses forbids sacrifices to be offered in any other place than that, which God had chosen; to this he confines them. But Malachy declares, that, in every place incense shall be offered, and a clean sacrifice. In truth, however, there is no discordance between them. They speak of different sacrifices.—In the first place, the prophet fortels that, not in one city, as among the Jews, but from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, offerings shall be made. Then, by calling the sacrifice clean, he plainly denotes of what victim he spoke. And finally, the offerings will be made, not in Israel, but in all nations. In every place he says, evidently shewing, that wherever the sun sheds its light, there the gospel shall be preached. He speaks of a clean offering, not as if, by its own nature, that of the Jews had been unclean, unless through the will of the offerers. Wherefore God said: their incense is an abomination to me. Nevertheless, if our present sacrifice be compared with the former, so vast will the difference be found, that ours alone can merit the name of clean.”—(*Adv. Judæos Orat.* iii. *T.* 1, *p.* 437.) “The office of priesthood is, indeed, per-

* He succeeded Timotheus, and sat on the patriarchal chair of Alexandria from 385 to 412.—Some letters remain among those of S. Jerom, and in Beveredge's canons of the Greek Church.

formed on earth, but it should itself be referred to the class and order of things celestial.—Wherefore it is necessary, that the priest be pure, as if, placed in heaven, he stood among the celestial spirits.—For when you behold the Lord immolated, and the priest at the altar offering sacrifice, and pouring out prayers, and then the surrounding multitude partaking of the sacred blood, can you, at that moment, fancy you are among mortals, and dwelling on the earth? Rather, are you not transported to the heavens?”—(*De Sacerd. L. iii. c. iv. T. iv. p. 27.*) “But when the priest shall have invoked the holy spirit, and shall have completed this tremendous and awful sacrifice, the common Lord of all being handled by him; I ask you, in what rank shall we place him? And what integrity of life, and what sense of religion shall we not demand from him? Reflect, what those hands should be; what the tongue that utters those words; how pure and holy the soul that has been so honoured. Meanwhile, the angels stand by the priest, the army of heavenly powers cry out, and the space around the altar is filled by them in honour of him who lies there.”—(*Ibid. L. vi. c. iv. p. 82.*) These sentiments he often repeats. “He has ordained a sacred rite, changing the victim, and, in the place of animals, commanding himself to be immolated.”—(*Hom. xxiv. in 1 Cor. T. x. p. 256.*) “It was not in vain that the Apostles ordained, that, in the celebration of the tremendous mysteries, mention should be made of the dead. They knew, that great advantage would thence be derived to them. For all the people being present, and raising their hands to heaven, and the sacred victim lying there, shall not God be rendered propitious to them?”—(*Hom. iii. in c. 1, Ep. ad Philip. T. xi. p. 32.*) “But do we not (it may be asked) offer sacrifice daily? We do; but in remembrance of his death. And the victim is one, not many. But how is this? Because it was once offered, and brought into the sanctuary. This sacrifice is a copy of that; the offering is the same. Not one on one day, and on the next another; but always the same. Thus then the sacrifice is one. But are there many Christs, as the offering is made in many places? By no means: it is the same Christ every where; here entire, and there entire; one body. As then, though offered in many places, there is one body, and not many bodies; so is there one sacrifice. He is our high priest, who offered the victim of our expiation: that same victim we now offer that was then offered; which cannot be consumed. This is done in

remembrance of what was done. Do this, he said, in remembrance of me.”—(*Hom. xvii. in c. x. Ep. ad Hebr. T. xi. p. 856.*)

S. Innocent I., L. C.—He writes to the bishop of Eugubium: “You say, that the kiss of peace is sometimes given before the sacred mysteries are completed, which should not be done till after those parts which I must not reveal; for that kiss denotes, that the faithful present have assented to all that was performed.” He gives other directions, speaking of “the sacred mysteries and the victim that is offered.”—(*Ep. ad Decentium: Cons. Gen. T. ii. p. 1246.*)

S. Jerome, L. C.—“‘I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord, neither will I accept an offering at your hand. For from the rising of the sun,’ &c.—(*Malach. i.*) It is a fixed rule, when a prophecy manifestly refers to future events, not to weaken it by uncertain allegories. The present prophecy regards the Jewish priests, who brought improper victims to be offered, to signify to them, that spiritual victims would succeed to carnal, and that not the blood of bulls and goats, but perfumes, that is, the prayers of the saints, should be offered to God; and that, not in one province, nor in one city; but a clean oblation in every place, such as is offered in the Christian ceremonies: ‘For from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, great is my name among the Gentiles.’”—(*In cap. 1, Malach. T. iii. p. 544.*)

Having stated what were the opinions of many learned men on the character and offering of Melchisedec, (*Gen. xiv.*) he says: “The Apostle affirms, that the priesthood of Aaron, that is, the Jewish priesthood, had a beginning and an end (*Heb. vii.*); but that the priesthood of Melchisedec, that is, of Christ and his Church, should be eternal, and had no author; and that the priesthood being translated, it is necessary that a translation also be made of the law.”—(*Ep. cxxvi. ad Evagrium, T. 1, p. 1060.*) I find him, on many occasions, expressing the same sentiment, that the offering of bread and wine by Melchisedec, was a type of the sacrifice of the body and blood of Christ in the elements of bread and wine. “In the figure of Christ he offered bread and wine, and thus dedicated the Christian mystery in the blood and body of our Saviour.”—(*Ep.*

* This letter of Paula and Eustochium to Marcella, written to induce her to repair to Bethlem, is generally supposed to have been penned by S. Jerome.

ad Marcel. T. iii. p. 151.) "According to thee, the Roman bishop does wrong, who offers sacrifices to the Lord, over the bodies of Peter and Paul, which bodies we call venerable remains, but you vile dust. To him their tombs are altars."—(*Adv. Vigilantium, T. 1, p. 591.*) Having treated, at great length, of the superior virtues of the state of celibacy, he says: "And if the layman, or any one of the faithful, is not able to pray, unless he be continent; it is the duty of the priest, who is constantly to offer sacrifices for the people, always to pray: but if always to pray, then to be continent."*—(*L. 1, Adv. Jovinianum, T. 1, p. 487.*) He gives the same advice to bishops: "What must be our opinion concerning the bishop, who daily, for his own and the sins of the people, is to offer to God pure sacrifices?"—(*In c. 1, Ep. ad Titum, T. iii. p. 1045.*)

CENTURY V.

S. Augustine, L. C.—"Then Abraham (Gen. xiv.) was blessed by Melchisedec, the priest of the most high God, of whom many and great things are said in the Epistle to the Hebrews, (vii.) which epistle most people ascribe to the Apostle Paul, and some deny it. Then first appeared that sacrifice, which now is offered to God by Christians in all the earth;† and that is fulfilled which, long after the fact of Melchisedec, was said by the prophet of Christ: 'Thou art a priest for ever according to the order of Melchisedec.'—(*Psal. cix.*) Not according to the order of Aaron; for this order was to be annulled, when the things, which those shadows prefigured, should come to pass."—(*De Civ. Dei. L. xvi. c. xxii. p. 1019.*) "This eating and drinking, of which the wise man speaks, (*Eccles. iii.*) relate to the participation of this table, which the mediator of the new covenant, the priest according to the order of Melchisedec, offers of his body and blood. This sacrifice has succeeded to all those of the ancient covenant, which were offered, as the shadows of this that was to come."—(*Ibid. L. xvii. c. xx. p. 1138.*) "The prophet Malachy foretelling the Church, which we now behold

* Si semper orandum, ergo semper carendum matrimonio.

† Quod nunc a Christianis offertur Deo toto orbe terrarum.

propagated by Christ, in the person of God thus manifestly speaks to the Jews: 'I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord, neither will I accept an offering at your hand.—For from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense shall be offered to my name, and a clean offering.'—(Malach. 1.) Since then we behold this sacrifice, in every place, offered to God by the priesthood of Christ * according to the order of Melchisedec; and the Jews cannot deny, that their sacrifices have ceased, why do they still look for another Christ?"—(*Ibid. L. xviii. c. xxxv. p. 1210.*)

Speaking afterwards in reply to those who asked, why miracles were not then wrought? he recounts many, to most of which he was himself a witness, and among them relates, that the property of a great man, whom he names, having been much troubled by wicked spirits, he requested that, "in my absence, some of my priests would go, and, by their prayers, remove the evil. One of them went; offered there the sacrifice of the body of Christ,† praying that the mischief might cease: and, by the mercy of God, it instantly ceased."—(*Ibid. L. xxii. c. viii. p. 1485.*) "The Hebrews, in the victims which they offered to God, in many and various ways, as became so great a subject, prefigured the future victim, which Christ has offered. Hence Christians, by the holy oblation and participation of the body and blood of Christ,‡ celebrate the remembrance of that sacrifice. But the Manicheans understand not what they should believe, or what observe, in this sacrifice of the Christians."—(*Contra Faustum, Lib. xx. c. xviii. T. vi. p. 155.*) Then, to the objection of his adversary, that the Catholics had substituted the martyrs in the place of the idols of the Gentiles, he replies: "The Christian people celebrate the memories of the martyrs with a religious solemnity, in order to excite themselves to an imitation of their constancy, to be united to their merits, and to be aided by their prayers: but to no martyr, to the God alone of martyrs,§ in memory of them, do we raise altars. For what prelate, assisting at the altar

* Hoc sacrificium per sacerdotium Christi, cum in omni loco videamus offerri.

† Obtulit ibi sacrificium corporis Christi.

‡ Sacrosancta oblatione et participatione corporis et sanguinis Christi.

§ Ut nulli martyrum, sed ipsi Deo martyrum sacrificemus.

where the bodies of the martyrs lie, was ever heard to say: To thee Peter; to thee Paul; or to thee Cyprian, do we make this offering? To God alone, who crowned these martyrs, is sacrifice offered.—We frequently sacrifice to God in the Churches of the martyrs, by that rite, according to which, as the Scriptures of the new Testament declare, he commanded sacrifice to be offered to him. This pertains to that worship, which the Greeks call *Latria*, and which can be offered to God alone.”—(*Ibid.* p. 156.) “It cannot be doubted, that, by the prayers of the holy Church, and by the salutary sacrifice,* and by alms which are given for the repose of their souls, the dead are helped; so that God may treat them more mercifully, than their sins deserved. This the whole Church observes, which it received from the tradition of the Fathers, to pray for those who died in the communion of the body and blood of Christ, when, in their turn, they are commemorated at the sacrifice, and it is then announced, that the sacrifice is offered for them.” †—(*De verbis Apostoli, Serm.* xxxii. *T.* x. p. 154.)

S. Isidore of Pelusium, G. C.—“I exhort you to desist from doing these things, or not to approach the venerable altar.”—(*Ep.* xii. *L.* v. p. 556.) “Crimes acquire a deeper guilt from the place and time. For example: murder is always detestable; but it is more so, when committed in a sacred place; and still more wicked, if in the time of sacrifice.”—(*Ep.* cccxcii. p. 705.) “Either cease to be guilty of such crimes, or withdraw from the sacred table, that the children of the Church may safely approach to the sacred mysteries, without which they cannot be saved.”—(*Ep.* dlix. p. 723.)

S. Cyril of Alexandria, G. C.—“We offer in the Church a holy, vivifying, and unbloody sacrifice; not believing it to be the common body and blood of man, but the real body and the real blood of the life-giving word. For common flesh cannot give life, which our Saviour himself attested, saying: ‘It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing.’—(John vi. 64.)”—(*Declar. Anathem.* xi. *T.* vi. p. 156.) “God said plainly to the Jews, that they were

* Orationibus sanctæ Ecclesiæ, et sacrificio salutari, et eleemosynis.

† Hoc a patribus traditum, universa observat ecclesia, ut pro eis, qui—defuncti sunt, cum ad ipsum sacrificium commemorantur, oretur, ac pro illis quoque id offerri commemoretur.

not pleasing to him, or rather, that he would not accept their sacrifices in shadows and figures: but foretels, that his name shall be great among all nations, and that, in every place and nation, pure and unbloody sacrifices shall be offered.”—(*Comm. in c. 1, Malach. T. iii. p. 830.*)

Council of Chalcedon, G. C.—In this Council the following complaint was read against Dioscorus, the bishop of Alexandria: “So great was his audacity against all—not as became a bishop, and a bishop of so great a city and of this evangelical see—as not to permit the corn to be received, which our kind emperors had granted to the Churches of Lybia, on account of the sterility of the province, and because no corn is grown in it. It was granted, in the first place, that, of it the unbloody sacrifice might be offered; and then that travellers and the poor inhabitants might be aided.—From this oppressive act it has happened, that the tremendous and unbloody sacrifice has not been celebrated.”—(*Libellus Ischyriensis, &c. Conc. Gen. T. iv. p. 400.*)

Theodoret, G. C.—“Melchisedec was the priest, not of the Jews, but of the Gentiles: and so Christ offered himself to God, not for the Jews only, but for all men. He opens his priesthood in the night, when ‘he took bread; and blessing, broke, and gave it to them, and said: Take ye, this is my body,’ &c.—(*Matt. xxvi.*) We read, that Melchisedec was a priest and a king—the figure of the true priest and king—and that he offered to God, not animals, but bread and wine. For these he presented to Abraham, whilst in spirit he contemplated in the loins of the patriarch the true image of his priesthood.—Christ is now the priest, according to the flesh born of Judah, not himself offering, but being the head of those that offer. For he calls the Church his body, and by this Church, as man, he exercises the priestly office, while, as God, he accepts the offerings that are made. These offerings are the symbols of his body and blood.”—(*In Psal. cix. v. 4, T. 1, p. 852.*)

S. Leo, L. C.—He remarks, speaking of the passion of our Saviour, that “the variety of carnal sacrifices ceasing, the single oblation of the body and blood takes place of all other victims.”* But this pro-

* Una corporis et sanguinis tui implet oblatio.

perly is referred to the bloody sacrifice on the cross. (*Serm. viii. de Pass. Dom. p. 265.*) Afterwards he thus writes to Dioscorus, the same bishop of Alexandria, whose reprehensible conduct we have just seen: "That the discipline of our Churches may in all things agree, this should be observed: That, when a more solemn feast calls the people together, and more meet than the Church can contain, the offering of the sacrifice be repeated,* lest any be deprived of it; for religion and reason demand, that the sacrifice should be as often offered,† as there are people to partake. Otherwise, if the custom of one mass be followed, they, who cannot find place, must be deprived of the sacrifice.‡ We therefore anxiously exhort you, that you do not neglect, but join with us, as in faith so in practice, to observe a rule that by tradition is come down to us."—(*Eph. xi. al. lxxxii. ad Diosc. p. 437.*)

S. Eucherius, § L. C.—"Let all unbelief be gone, since he is the witness of the truth, who is the author of the gift; for the invisible priest does, by his word and secret power, change the visible creatures into the substance of his body and blood,|| saying thus: 'Take, and eat, this is my body,' &c. And therefore, as, at the command of the Lord, the highest heavens, the deep waves, and the vast earth, suddenly rose out of nothing; so by the like power in the spiritual sacraments, the virtue of the word commands, and the effect obeys.¶ Let no one doubt, that these creatures, by the nod of his power, by the presence of his majesty, pass into the substance of the Lord's

* Sacrificii oblatio indubitanter iteretur.

† Toties sacrificium subsequens offeratur.

‡ Si unius tantum Missæ, more servato, sacrificium offerre non possint.

§ He was bishop of Lyons, and had been a monk in the convent of Lerins. Some works, very elegantly written, are ascribed to him; but I would not say, that the Sermon, from which I quote this passage, is from him, though I find it under his name. It is admitted, however, to be ancient; and as it delivers explicitly the doctrine, which, in this and in the preceding centuries had been taught, its authority may fairly be added to the general mass of evidence. He probably was contemporary with Vincent of Lerins, of whom we have made great use; and died about the year 454.—See *Dupin and Cave*.

|| In substantia corporis et sanguinis sui, verbo suo, secreta potestate convertit.

¶ Verbi præcipit virtus, et rei servit effectus.

body.* When the creatures to be blessed by the heavenly words are placed on the altar, before they are consecrated by the invocation of the name of the Most High, the substance of bread and wine is there; but after the words of Christ, it is the body and blood of Christ.† And what wonder is it, that he who could create these things by his word, should change them when created?‡ Nay, it seems matter of less wonder, if that which is acknowledged to have been created of nothing, be now changed into better.§ Search what is hard for him to do, to whom it was easy to raise things visible and invisible, by the power of his will; to whom it was easy, to clothe man made of the matter of clay, with the image of his own divinity," &c.—(*Hom. v. de Pasch. sub nomine Eusebii. Bibl. PP. T. vi. p. 636, 637.*)

COUNCIL OF TRENT.

"Because under the former testament, as the Apostle Paul witnesses, (Heb. vii. ix. x.) on account of the weakness of the Levitical priesthood, there was no consummation, it became necessary—God so ordaining it—that another priest according to the order of Melchisedec should arise, our Lord Jesus Christ, who might be able to consummate all that were to be sanctified, and perfect them. Wherefore, this our Lord and God, although he was about to offer himself once, on the altar of the cross, to his Father, that on it he might operate our eternal redemption; yet, because, by death, his priesthood was not to cease, he, at his last supper, the same night in which he was betrayed, (1 Cor. xi.) that he might leave to his Church a visible sacrifice, such as the nature of man requires, by which the bloody sacrifice, once to be completed on the cross, might be represented; and its memory might continue to the end of time; and its salutary virtue be applied to the remission of those sins, which we daily commit—declaring himself to be the appointed priest

* Novum et impossibile non debet videri, quod in Christi substantiam terrena et mortalia committuntur.

† Post verba Christi, corpus et sanguis est Christi.

‡ Verbo possit creata convertere.

§ In melius valcat commutare.

for ever according to the order of Melchisedec; he offered to his Father his body and blood under the appearances of bread and wine; and, under those appearances, delivered the same to his Apostles, whom, at the time, he appointed the priests of the New Testament. To them, and to their successors in the priesthood, he gave command to offer the same, saying: 'Do this for a commemoration of me.'—(Luke xxii.) So the Catholic Church has always understood, and taught.—This is the clean offering, which the prophet Malachy foretold, should be offered in every place.—This the offering, which was prefigured by the various typical sacrifices of the law and of nature, comprising whatever good things they signified, consummating and perfecting all."—(*Sess. xxii. c. 1, p. 189.*) "And because in this divine sacrifice, which is performed in the mass, the same Christ is contained, and offered in an unbloody manner, who, on the altar of the cross, offered himself in a bloody manner—the holy Synod teaches, that this sacrifice is truly propitiatory, and that by it, to the sincerely penitent, the sins we commit, however enormous they be, are remitted. For it is one and the same victim; the same Christ now offering himself by the ministry of the priest, who offered himself on the cross; the difference being only in the manner of offering. By this offering then the fruits of that bloody offering are most plentifully received; so far is it from truth, that hereby the least part is derogated from it.* Wherefore, according to apostolical tradition, the mass is duly offered not only for the benefit of the living, but also for those, who, though dead in Christ, are not fully cleansed from all defilement."—(*Ibid. c. ii. p. 191.*)

* I subjoin, on this important point, the *Exposition* of our great Bossuet: "The Church is so far from believing, that any thing is wanting to the sacrifice of the cross; that she deems it, on the contrary, so perfectly and so fully sufficient, that whatever is afterwards added, has been instituted to celebrate its memory, and to apply its virtue. We acknowledge, that all the merit of the redemption of mankind is derived from the death of the Son of God: when, therefore, in the celebration of the divine mysteries, we say: 'We offer to thee this holy victim;' we pretend not by this oblation, to make or to present to God a new payment of the price of our salvation; but to offer to him, in our behalf, the merits of Jesus Christ present, and that infinite price which he once paid for us upon the cross."—(*Exposition de la Doctrine Cathol. Sect. xiv. p. 168. Edit. Bruxelles, 1751.*)

APPENDIX III.

Whether Protestants acknowledging the Eucharist to be a bare sign, or figure only, be an article of their faith, or nothing more than one of their inferior supposed truths.

TO THE LORD BISHOP OF EXETER.

MY LORD BISHOP,

When Protestants teach, as they generally do, that that which our Saviour gave to his Apostles at the last supper, and which priests every day consecrate, was and is no more than a sign, a figure only, of Christ's body, my question, I say, is, whether their positively acknowledging it to be a bare sign, or figure only, be an article of their faith, or nothing more than one of their inferior supposed truths? If it be this latter, then they never had nor can have any determinate faith in regard to this sacred mystery, which God has most certainly revealed to us in holy Scripture; and consequently they believe nothing as regards the blessed sacrament with divine faith, for inferior truths are no articles of belief * with them; on the contrary, if they say the belief of a sign, or figure only, is one of their articles of faith, and the thing believed an object of faith, they most certainly eat their own words, and confess that the Church of England makes new articles of faith, and such as never had the approbation of the whole Christian world, much less of Rome itself. For the entire Christian world of all ages never so believed. Some perhaps will answer,† they know not what he meant when he said, This is my body. I reply, if they know not what he spoke, why

* Inferior truths are not articles of faith.

† Some sectarians know not what they believe.

then do they accuse Catholics of idolatry, by the force of their inferior supposed truths, for adoring Christ in the sacrament. I am convinced that Arius was an heretic for denying the divinity of the Son of God, upon the uncertainty of his supposed superior truths. I am equally convinced that Sectarians are now in a much worse predicament, for they contradict all orthodox Churches in the belief of this sacrament, and declare Catholics to be idolaters, merely upon the uncertainty of their imagined inferior truths. Protestants say again, they have three evident principles on which they ground their new faith. 1st. What God spoke is true. 2nd. God's pure and uncorrupted word is in their hands. 3rd. They know well what God spoke in this word. I answer, the first principle is certain; the second more than doubtful; the third, on which all relies, and touches more upon their faith than on any rational antecedent motive evidencing it, is demonstratively improbable; for upon no proof, upon no received principle, by the light of no rational motive, can these men so much as even shew that they are better acquainted with what God spoke in Scripture than the whole Catholic Church, extended over the surface of the entire world, or than their own ancestors both knew of old and believed for a thousand years together. These men, long since deceased, held (and upon Scripture well understood) as firmly the real presence of Christ's sacred body in the eucharist, as a trinity of persons in one divine essence. The first, Protestants now generally reject,* the other they admit; and why? upon what conviction, upon what rational motive do they take and leave, assert and deny as they please? Press this and similar particulars home to them, and you will find that instead of reason or rational proofs, they will give you nothing more than their own real and individual sentiments for an answer. And thus they read the Scriptures, declaring that it verily appears to them that the sacred volume should be interpreted so and so,† that is, as appears best to their weak and fallible judgments. I press them to shew

* I may here be told, that the present Anglo-Catholic Church (as they call themselves) professes her belief in a real presence in the Lord's supper. I would reply, I am firmly convinced that she herself does not know what she believes, her faith being as changeable as the wind that blows.

† An old woman assured me the other day, that she could interpret and explain the meaning of Scripture as well as the Archbishop of Canterbury.

why they give new invented interpretations to several texts of the sacred volume, in preference to the old received sense; and I am answered by giving me only these new interpretations without any sort of proof on earth, but merely that they appear to them to be the best. Observe well what I say here, and you will find Protestancy reduced to fancy only.

I am,

My Lord Bishop,

Your obedient Servant,

VERA X,

A CATHOLIC LAYMAN.

POSTSCRIPT.

The work of Mr. Charles Butler on the Roman Catholic Church, can hardly fail to be read without interest and advantage. In this work the reader will be reminded that the Protestant Leibnitz, one of the most learned and profound philosophers whom the world has produced, has, in his *Systema Theologica*, discussed article by article the whole creed of the Roman Catholic Church, and yet discerns in none of its tenets superstition or idolatry. (P. 339.) Here you will be led to pray, in the words of Fenelon, "May the kingdom of truth, where there is no error, no scandal, no division, where God will communicate to it universal peace, soon come." St. Augustine in his *Confessions*, declares, (*Tom. 4, Præfat. in noviss Sinica*), that he was kept for a long time in the error of the Manichees, from having been taught to regard the Catholic Church with horror; "When I came to discover the truth, the spiritual sense of the Church," he says, (*Gaudens erubui non me tot annos adversus Catholicam fidem, sed contra carnalium cogitationum figmenta latrasse*),* "for so bold and impious was I, that these things which I ought first to have learned from her by inquiry, I charged upon

* That great work of the Benedictines, "L'histoire Littéraire," will alone convince any impartial reader that the debt of gratitude has never been discharged to the Ecclesiastical Scholars of the middle age. It will certainly justify the following testimony: "Ecclesia Gallicana, post Apostolicam sedem, est quoddam totius Christianitatis speculum et immotum fidei firmentum."—(*Regesta Gregor. IX., year 303.*)

her by accusation, being more anxious to impose falsehood than to be informed of the truth; and thus I so blindly accused the Catholic Church, now so sufficiently exonerated from all guilt in my eyes, being convinced that she taught not the opinions I so vehemently persecuted her for." It was a very remarkable appeal which Fenelon made to his readers in these words: "*Cherchez tant qu'il vous plaira hors de cette sainte unité, (I would understand this as alluding to the unity of affections and faith,) vous n'y trouverez que des docteurs secs et éblouis de leur science, qui languissent sur des questions sans fin, et qui s'évaporent dans leurs propres pensées.*"

NOTE TO APPENDIX III.

I may truly say, if the belief of the real presence of Christ in the sacrament, which has ever been the doctrine of the Catholic Church, as I have demonstratively proved in this work, were false, it would follow consequently that it was possible that the whole Church was always engaged in a criminal error and in an idolatrous worship; for if Jesus Christ were not present in the blessed eucharist, all Catholics would be true idolaters, all the blessed martyrs would have sacrificed their lives as a testimony of idolatry, the holy Fathers of the Church would be nothing more or less than a conventicle of idolaters, who had levelled pagan idolatry in order to raise up another, that is to say, bread and wine instead of the adoration of statues of gold, of silver, of wood, or of stone. But this is impossible, because it is repugnant to the wisdom of God, who, after he had formed the Christian Church, after having rendered testimony to his own work by so many miracles, and splendid acts, which display the power of the author of her existence, he had permitted all these which his grace had called to the faith of this religion; in a word, that his whole Church being engaged in error, it would at once destroy the promises which Christ the Saviour of the world had made to his Church, viz., "*And behold I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.*"—(St. Matthew xxviii. 20.)

NOTES.

NOTE I.

St. Matthew xxvi. 26.—“This is my body;” he does not say, this is the figure of my body, but this is my body.—(*Second Council of Nice, Act 6.*) Neither does he say in this, or with this is my body, but absolutely this is my body, which plainly implies transubstantiation.

NOTE II.

Verse 27.—“Drink ye all of this.” This was spoken to the twelve Apostles, who were the all then present; and they all drank of it, says St. Mark (xi. 23). But it no ways follows from these words spoken to the Apostles, that all the faithful are to drink of the chalice, any more than all the faithful are commanded to consecrate, to offer, and administer this sacrament, because Christ upon this same occasion, and, as I may say, with the same breath bid the Apostles do so, in these words, (St. Luke xxii.) Do this in commemoration of me.

NOTE III.

Verse 29.—“Fruit of the vine.” These words by the account of St. Luke, (xxii. 18,) were not spoken of the sacramental cup, but of the wine that was drank with the paschal lamb. Though the sacramental cup might also be called the fruit of the vine, because it was consecrated from wine, and retains the likeness and all the accidents or qualities of wine; but the true solution is, there were two cups on the table that night before our Saviour suffered, the legal and the eucharistical, or sacramental cup; the first was called the fruit of the vine, the second not.

NOTE IV.

Remark how this adverb *verily*, is as well added to the presence of Christ in the sacrament, as it is to the mystery of his incarnation, and to it, that he

was verily Christ. Whereby we are taught, that as verily as Christ was incarnated, and as verily as the incarnated was Christ, so verily is he present in the sacrament, and so verily do we therein receive him. See St. Hilary, Lib. 8, de Trinit., and St. Augustine, Tract 26, in Joan. "To be brief," says St. Augustine, "many who either with a feigned heart, do eat that flesh and drink that blood, or when they have eaten and drank they become apostates, and forsakers of Christ's religion; do they abide in Christ, or Christ in them?" Now I have to request of the Bishop of Exeter diligently to remark that St. Augustine says that evil men eat the flesh of Christ, which invincibly proves the real and substantial flesh of Christ in the sacrament; for otherwise the evil man cannot eat the flesh of Christ, therefore the abiding and dwelling of Christ in us are not only spiritually by faith and charity, but also natural by receiving Christ's very flesh in the sacrament.

NOTE V.

I reply to Sir Henry D——'s polite letter as follows: that neither the virginity of the Mother of God, the descent of Jesus Christ to Limbo, nor the sanctification of the Sunday, can be proved Scripture; nevertheless these are fundamental articles, as being contained in the symbol of the Apostles, thus you cannot deny but that there are articles necessary to be believed, which are not contained in Scripture; in fine, we have the same exact authority for them as we have for the inspiration of the sacred volume, for not one line in it declares it to be inspired, and, I fearlessly assert, take away the authority of the Church, and the very Scriptures have not a leg to rest on. This appeared so clear to the great St. Augustine, that he declared that he would not believe the very Scriptures if the authority of the Catholic Church did not move him so to do.

NOTE VI.

Thomas Moore, Esq. says with peculiar shrewdness: "We find a similar style of mystification still resorted to by those few Protestant controvertists, who, in order to maintain some little consistency with the Church of England Catechism, affect to uphold a real presence. Thus the theologians of the British Critic insist that 'a real presence is the doctrine of the Church of England;' while Mr. Faber talks of a 'change in the elements—a moral change.' All this, however, is but a mere stale repetition of the old trick of heresy, speaking the same things, but meaning them differently. In such manner was it, as Irenæus tells us, that the first Gnostics proceeded—using the same language with the orthodox Church, but thinking differently.

NOTE VII.

Protestant Calumnies against the Sacrament of the Eucharist.

Luther affirms, (*Lib. de Captivit. Babyl.* c. 1, *quod est de Euchar.*) that St. Thomas of Aquin was the author of that opinion which all Catholics teach, viz., that in the sacrament of the altar there is not the substance of bread and wine, but only accidents. But to omit more ancient testimonies, this doctrine was defined in the Council of Lateran (c. 1) before St. Thomas of Aquin was born.

Calvin teaches, (*Instit. L.* 4, c. 17, § 43,) that Pope Alexander was the first who made use of unleavened bread; but it is evident that Christ (Matthew xxvi., Mark xiv., Luc. xxii.) used it before on the first day of the Azimes.

Luther (*de Captivit. Babyl.* c. 1) and others avow, that transubstantiation was first invented by the Council of Lateran. But to omit all other proofs, the Centurists affirm that St. Chrysostom (*Cent.* 5, *Col.* 517) seems to teach transubstantiation; and that Eusebius Emissenus (*Cent.* 4, c. 10, *Col.* 985, 295) had spoken unprofitably of transubstantiation; and that St. Ambrose (*Cent.* 4, c. 4, *Col.* 295) had not written well of transubstantiation.

Ursinus confesses, that (*Commonefactio Cujusdam Theol. de S. Cæna*, §c. p. 211, 218) in Cyprian are many sayings which seem to affirm transubstantiation; and Adamus Francisci does not deny but that (*Margarita Theol.* p. 256) transubstantiation entered early into the Church.

Peter Martyr and Chemnitius assert, that the Greeks reject transubstantiation; but this is proved most evidently to be false by the condemnation passed by the Greeks themselves upon the confession of Augusta.—(*Censura Orientalium ad August. Confess.* c. 10.)

Chemnitius accuses Andræus of teaching that transubstantiation is one of those points which cannot be proved from Scripture; but he corrupts him, his words being, (*Lib. de Cæna Dom.*)—although transubstantiation could not be proved by clear Scripture, as you think, &c.; but Chemnitius to serve his own wicked purpose, easily changed a conditional speech into an absolute one.

Permit me here to ask my readers, what reliance can any man who venerates the truth place on false witnesses like these. It is with deep regret that I am obliged to use harsh and disagreeable remarks, but my duty to the public forces me so to act, viz., to tell the truth.

NOTE VIII.

If the answers which Protestants give to the proofs taken out of the 6th 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 clear proofs that can be taken from 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 force every one to acknowledge, that one may produce as specious answers to the proofs taken from holy Scripture concerning the divinity of Jesus Christ, as any that can be opposed to the proofs taken from the 6th chapter of St. John concerning the real presence. Thus whenever Catholics prove any contested articles by passages of the word of God, which appear very clear on their side, Protestants ought to be equally scandalized at, and own a defect in their religion, whether they be unable to answer those passages, or think it is in their power to give a favorable 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 this 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 holy Scriptures, on all the particular articles of faith, are clear and demonstrative, if considered independently 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 opposed to their cause. The true and best use which can be made of the versatile subtlety and dexterity which appear in their answers, is, to take occasion thence of acknowledging, that human language alone was little adapted to preserve all the truths of faith, and that it was necessary to join authority to the holy Scriptures, in order to determine the sense of them.

FINIS.

ERRATA.

- Page 16, line 7 from top, *for* meum *read* meam.
16, line 10 from top, *for* adiecit *read* adiecit.
23, line 4 from top, *for* was *read* were.
27, line 12 from top, *for* catechizing *read* catechising.
42, line 13 from top, *for* Eustachius *read* Eustathius.
42, line 10 from bot. *for* Terasius *read* Tarasius.
49, line 16 from top, *for* Quod *read* Quodd.
49, line 17 from top, *for* definitive *read* definitivè.
80, line 3 from bot. *for* hominus *read* homonis.
107, line 7 from bot. *for* sius *read* suis.
117, line 11 from top, *for* article *read* act.
158, line 13 from top, *for* Egosum *read* Ego sum.
189, top line, *for* that *read* than.
202, bottom line, *for* Consisteries *read* Consistories.

WORKS BY VERAX.

VERAX'S REPLY TO DR. HOOK'S FRIENDLY ADVICE TO CATHOLICS.

A SERIES OF LETTERS addressed to the Rev. WALTER FARQUHAR HOOK, M.A., proving the impossibility of placing any belief in Scripture except upon the Authority of the Church. With Appendix and Notes.

FURTHER REPLY addressed to the Rev. Dr. HOOK of Leeds, being in answer to his Letter dated September 21, 1837, demonstratively proving the Infallibility, the Catholicity, and Apostolicity of the Roman Catholic Church: together with Letters to the Archbishop of York, to the Bishops of Lincoln and Exeter, &c., &c. With numerous Notes.

A SHORT VINDICATION of the CHURCH OF ROME; consisting of Letters addressed to the Rev. Dr. Hook, on the Catholic Church and on the Church of England; together with Letters to the Lord BISHOP OF EXETER, on the Eucharist, and on the Holy Fathers. With Notes, &c. &c.

LETTERS addressed to the REV. WALTER FARQUHAR HOOK, D.D., on the Eucharist, Mass, and Communion under one Species; together with a full Reply to each one of the gross Calumnies (against the Catholic Church) contained in Dr. Hook's Sermon, preached at Manchester, entitled "The Novelties of Romanism." Also a concluding Letter; with Notes.

A LETTER to the REV. WILLIAM PALMER, M.A., of Worcester College, Oxford.—On the blessed Virgin Mary.

SECOND LETTER to the REV. WILLIAM PALMER, M.A., of Worcester College, Oxford, demonstratively proving the Church of England to be an Heretical and Schismatical Church, the mere creature of human invention.

THIRD LETTER to the REV. WILLIAM PALMER, M.A., of Worcester College, Oxford; on Auricular Confession, and the absolute necessity thereof; also the nullity of the Church of England's Ordinations, Notes, &c.

FOURTH LETTER to the REV. WILLIAM PALMER, M.A., of Worcester College, Oxford; on the way to find out the true Church of Christ on Earth, on Satisfaction, on Indulgences, on the Supremacy of the See of Rome, Infallibility, Eucharist, &c. &c.

FIFTH LETTER to the REV. WILLIAM PALMER, M.A., of Worcester College, Oxford.—God has confided the sacred deposit of the revelation of Christianity to an infallible authority.

THE TRIUMPH OF TRUTH, being a Reply to "A Short Inquiry into the Doctrines of the Churches of England and Rome."

THE DIVINITY OF OUR LORD AND SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST, demonstratively proved from Scripture, from Tradition, and from some of the writings of the most eminent Catholic and Protestant Authors who have treated on this subject; in Twenty-seven Letters, with Notes and Appendix, addressed to the Rev. CHARLES LE BLANC.

THE SUPREMACY AND JURISDICTION OF THE ROMAN PONTIFFS, demonstratively proved from Scripture, from Tradition, and from the writings of some of the most eminent Catholic and Protestant Authors who have treated on this subject; in a Series of Letters, addressed to the LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.



69 Prof.

19.7

20 h

22 h

24 h

27

92-3-4

116

118 his incorrect working - given 146

120 82

125

For 5 in page 142

My dear Dr. Pequest

I am glad to hear that
you have finished with H. & Co.
We pleased to accept my many
thanks. — I have given your
commission to Miss Fallowers,
she begs me to present her
best respects, & she promises
to attend to it. I sincerely
hope that you have been quite
comfortable during your stay

at Gloucester. I will remain
I attend to the sick &c for you
till Friday next, leaving
Spanish Place on that day
at or about 12 o'clock. I hope
you may have an agreeable
excursion & a safe & pleasant
return home.

With most sincere respect.

Yours faithfully
H. A. H.

Spanish Place
Friday Morning, Aug. 5th



