



. 05,

From the Library of
Professor Samuel Miller
in Memory of
Judge Samuel Miller Breckinridge
Presented by
Samuel Miller Breckinridge Long
to the Library of
Princeton Theological Seminary

BX 1765 .F2 L4
Traevern, J. F. M. 1754-
1842.

An answer to the Rev. G. S.
Faber's Difficulties of

377
115762



A N S W E R

TO THE

DIFFICULTIES OF ROMANISM.

AN

ANSWER

TO THE

REV. G. S. FABER'S

DIFFICULTIES OF ROMANISM,

BY THE

RIGHT REV. J. F. M. TREVERN, D. D.

BISHOP OF STRASBOURG,

LATE BP. OF AIRE.

TRANSLATED BY THE

REV. F. C. HUSENBETH.

“Qui estis? Unde venistis? . . . Habeo origines firmas ab ipsis autoribus quorum res fuit: Ego sum hæres Apostolorum . . . vos exhæredaverunt semper et abdicaverunt ut extraneos, ut inimicos.”

Tertullian. L. de Præscript. c. 37.

Baltimore:

PUBLISHED BY F. LUCAS, JR. 138 MARKET STREET.

Tenenda nobis est Christiana religio, et ejus Ecclesiæ communicatio, quæ Catholica est, et Catholica nominatur, non solum a suis, verum etiam ab omnibus inimicis.

S. AUGUSTIN, *de vera Relig. Cap. VII.*

INTRODUCTORY NOTICE.

In presenting the following work to the public, it may be requisite to state the circumstances which have led to its composition. They are briefly these. Some years ago the Abbé Trevern, formerly Vicar-general of Langres, being an emigrant to England in consequence of the French Revolution, published in London a French work, in two volumes, entitled "*Discussion Amicale sur L'Eglise Anglicane, et en general sur la Reformation, dediée au clergé de toutes les Communions Protestantes.*" When the London edition of this work was exhausted, its learned and highly respected Author, being then in France, and raised to the episcopal see of Aire, published a second edition of it in Paris, in the year 1824. An English translation of this valuable work has not yet appeared, but one is on the point of being published by the Rev. Wm. Richmond, of Swinnerton Park.

It was not till the year 1826, that any attempt was made to refute the above masterly composition. In that year there appeared a work from the pen of a clergyman of the Church of England, of well known talent and erudition, the Rev. G. S. Faber, B. D. Rector of Long Newton, bearing for title "*The Difficulties of Romanism.*" No sooner did the worthy

prelate become acquainted with this work—which professes to adopt his Lordship's *Discussion Amicale* as a text-book, and to furnish a refutation of it, than he applied himself with indefatigable exertion to vindicate his own book, and answer the alleged *Difficulties* of Mr. Faber's—and this amid the confusion, anxiety, and pressure of affairs of every kind attendant upon his Lordship's being translated from the see of Aire to that of Strasbourg. The good bishop transmitted his work in M. S. as he wrote it, to the translator, who now confidently presents it to the public.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Introduction, - - - - -	5

PART FIRST.

On the first three Letters of the Discussion Amicale.

The first Letter, - - - - -	13
The second Letter, - - - - -	15
The third Letter, - - - - -	20

PART SECOND.

On the Holy Eucharist.

<i>Chapter the first,</i> - - - - -	65
<i>Chapter the second—Proofs from Scripture,</i> - - - - -	74
<i>Chapter the third—Proofs from Tradition,</i> - - - - -	84
First General Proof—the Discipline of the <i>Secret.</i> - - - - -	91
Second General Proof from the Liturgies, - - - - -	117
Extracts from the Liturgies, - - - - -	128

General Proof from the Catecheses.

<i>Chapter the fourth—Particular Proofs from the Fathers,</i> - - - - -	146
St. Clement of Alexandria, - - - - -	166
Theodoret, - - - - -	168
St. Chrysostom and St. Augustin, - - - - -	172

PART THIRD.

	PAGE
Succinct Review of the <i>Difficulties of Romanism</i> , - - -	193
Introductory Statement, - - - - -	199
Celibacy, - - - - -	202
Tradition, - - - - -	203
Real Presence, - - - - -	206
Characters of the first Reformers, - - - - -	216
Confession, - - - - -	225
Satisfaction, - - - - -	230
Indulgences, - - - - -	234
Prayers for the Dead—Purgatory, - - - - -	239
Invocation of the Saints, - - - - -	249
Relics, - - - - -	253
Sign of the Cross, - - - - -	254
Church of England, - - - - -	256
Supremacy, - - - - -	258
Re-union, - - - - -	261
Inquisition, - - - - -	266
Intolerance, - - - - -	271
Recapitulation, - - - - -	275
Conclusion, - - - - -	276

ANSWER
TO
FABER'S DIFFICULTIES
OF
ROMANISM.

MY DEAR SIR,

You have so earnestly requested me to reply to the work lately published by the Rev. G. S. Faber, B. D. against my *Discussion Amicale*, that I should be truly deserving of reproach if I refused to comply. The only difficulty attending your request arose from my finding it impossible to reconcile the labour required, with the occupations of governing a diocese. My necessary resolve was to interrupt the latter for a time, when I reflected, on the one hand, that the refutation had appeared to you peremptory and conclusive, and understood, on the other, that my silence would be interrupted by your countrymen as the tacit avowal of a defeat. You assure me that the attack directed in my person against the doctrine I profess, issued from a celebrated pen, from the first even of your controvertists. Well, sir, I rejoice with you for it: the reputation and talents of such an antagonist will only add greater splendour to the truth. I trust that ere long you will see the arguments of your renowned theologian fall before you, one after another, without force or effect; and the proofs developed in my work remain still unshaken after the appearance of his. And then I hope you will yourself conclude that the

Faith of the Catholic Church is impenetrable to the shafts of its enemies.

In the first letter you did me the honour to address to me, I was informed that your learned friend had engaged to refute my work; that he purposed following me step by step, and shewing on each point that I had uniformly built upon a vain illusion, by believing myself always supported by the Scriptures and the Primitive Church. This plan was certainly the only methodical one, and at the same time the fairest and best calculated to exhibit the truth with the strongest evidence. You assured me that such was the plan to be adopted by my antagonist. Imagine then my surprise, my dear sir, when as I looked over his refutation, I found that instead of proceeding step by step after me, instead of adhering to the arrangement, which I had adopted for the various questions, he had preferred abandoning it altogether, displacing the questions, and putting those in front, which ought only to have appeared in the rear. A writer of the penetration you profess to find in him, ought undoubtedly to have been sensible how much strength is acquired by proofs when properly connected with each other, and how much they lose by being separated.

Although Mr. Faber and myself are widely divided in opinion, the same motive has led each to take up the pen—that of convincing your countrymen: our great opposition is in our respective objects. Mine was to make them sensible of the reasons, which ought to lead them back to *unity*; his on the contrary, was to exhibit those, which might still farther remove them from it. I strive to persuade to re-union: he endeavours to perpetuate dissension. I consider that you would gain every thing by becoming again what you once were; he thinks on the contrary, that you have every thing to lose, if you do not remain what you are. Which of us has the more effectually pleaded his cause, or rather *your* cause? Our judges are those

for whom we have written. Our books are the cause to be tried. Let them not consider their authors, but weigh well their respective arguments.

In the comparison I solicit, I see at once that my antagonist has a powerful advantage over me; he expresses himself in the language of the interested party, while I write in a language to which the greater number are strangers. I entreat those nevertheless who understand both, to compare the *Discussion Amicale* with the *Difficulties of Romanism*, and impartially to weigh our proofs. This labour will no doubt cost them application and patience. I solicit them to bestow it for the honour of truth, in the name of their dearest interests, of their happiness in this world and the next.

Do not expect me, sir, to enter at length upon all the questions, which divide us; upon the motives, which establish the truth of the Catholic faith; its conformity, whether with the natural light of human reason, or with the text of Holy Scripture, or the doctrine and practice of the primitive Church: consequently the necessity of adopting it, namely, of renouncing a pretended reformation, equally null in its establishment, and erroneous in its doctrine. This would be a labour far exceeding the leisure allowed by my habitual occupations; and would be to recommence what I have already published, and transcribe the *Discussion Amicale* almost throughout. It is a more simple plan to refer you to that work, by pointing out the volume and page.* You will there find the proofs I have developed on the contested points; I make bold to assure you that they still remain in all their strength, and that the *Difficulties of Romanism*, however specious it may have appeared to you, has not made any real attack upon them.

*These will be cited from the more correct edition, published in Paris, by Potey, No. 46. Rue du Bac. 1824.

I shall confine myself, therefore, to placing again before your view some of the more important articles, with an analysis of the proofs and objections, which the Rev. Mr. Faber brings against them. To this I shall dedicate the first and second parts of his Reply: they will suffice, I trust, to justify my assertions, to rectify the judgment you have formed of them, and to confirm the triumph of the Catholic Creed. In the third part, I shall take a review of the false suppositions, wrong interpretations, mistakes, reproaches, disposition to ill-humour, and hostile indications, which I have unfortunately, but too frequently, met with in *The Difficulties of Romanism*.

PART THE FIRST.

ON THE FIRST THREE LETTERS OF THE DISCUSSION
AMICALE.

The *first Letter* places before the reader an historical summary of the establishment of the Church of England. It exhibits Elizabeth, authorized by her Parliament, driving out of their sees those Bishops who, with a single exception, opposed her assumptions; and replacing them with men servile and accommodating, chosen from the second order of the clergy. *Dux femina facti.* It is nevertheless incontestable that Jesus Christ confided the government of his Church, as well as the teaching of his doctrine, to the Apostles and their successors, and by no means to the potentates of the earth. It is true therefore that a radical defect of competent authority rendered null the work of Elizabeth, and her two houses of parliament, who formed, if you will, a parliamentary and royal church, but assuredly not one canonically Christian.*

Apply again with me, sir, to the unhappy schism of 1559, what your learned doctor wrote against that of 1689, and which ought, with much greater reason, to have disgusted him with the assumption of Elizabeth. Listen to this able theologian: "A decree was made by a senate of laymen, that the bishops who refused to take the new oaths should be ejected out of their places. The time for taking them being expired, and these fathers refusing them, they are deprived of their palaces, revenues, in short of all rights annexed to their

* *Humanam conati sunt facere Ecclesiam*, would be here repeated by St. Cyprian. (Ep. 52.)

episcopal office. Hitherto we complained not. Let the secular hand reassume, if it pleases, what it has bestowed upon the Church. This may hurt the temporal estates of the bishops, but can never affect the consciences of subjects: for Christ has laid no obligation upon us to assert the legal rights of bishops, in opposition to the magistrate; but certainly he has obliged us to assert those rights, which he himself bestowed upon the Church, in order to preserve it under persecution; and which no earthly power ever gave, or was able to give. And yet the violence of our adversaries proceeded so far! Our reverend fathers were driven at last from the very cure of souls; altars opposite to theirs erected, and bishops, of an adverse party, thrust into their places. Though they were alive, their seats were filled, and filled by colleagues, before they were vacant, before their predecessors were deprived of episcopal power by bishops, who had authority to do it. Upon this account we looked upon the obedience we owed them to be still valid, nor could we transfer it to *their successors, who had departed from Catholic unity, from Christ himself, and all his benefits, according to the doctrine of St. Cyprian's age.*"*

Such is, word for word, the history of the deplorable overthrow effected in 1559: and thus ought all those to have spoken respectfully, but firmly, whose misfortune it was to witness it. Such is the language of every man of enlightened understanding, who knows what are true canonical principles—the distinction of the two powers, and their boundaries—what belongs to the one and to the other. It will ever be the manifest condemnation of Elizabeth and her parliament. Mr. Faber appears to have been sensible of this, since he has not attempted to contradict it. He has done honour to his judgment and prudence, by keeping si-

*Dodwell on the late Schism. London, 1704, pp. 4, 5.

lence upon the conclusions at the end of my first letter. Those alone ought to suffice at this day to bring back England to unity. The establishment of her Church, once found to be null in its origin, will be null for ever. Two centuries and a half have already passed over the actual state of things: ten more might pass, but they would never render that valid and legitimate, which was not so the first day of its existence. There is no prescription against Heaven.

After having related the origin of your *Established Church*, and shewn its essential defect, I pass in my *second Letter* to the examination of its doctrine. The end of my whole *discussion* is to shew—1st. That an absolute necessity, stronger than every obstacle and repugnance, renders it obligatory to put an end to the schism, by returning to the mother Church. 2dly. To prove that all the pretexts and grievances alleged to justify separation from that church, or to retain people at a distance from it, far from being founded on scripture or primitive tradition, are most certainly in opposition to them. I begin then by demonstrating—and there is no exaggeration in the expression—that the Church is essentially *one*, that there can never be a motive for breaking unity with her, and that to depart from unity, is by the very act, departing from the Church of Jesus Christ. Here proofs of every kind combine to exalt to the highest degree of certainty, this fundamental truth, entirely decisive between our separated brethren and ourselves: both the natural light of the human mind, and the design and precepts of our Saviour, the Father and Creator of this light; the doctrine of all the apostles* and their disciples, doctors or bishops, as well in their particular writings, as in their decisions in council; the practice of the Church,

* *God is not the God of dissension, but of peace: as also I teach in all the churches.* 1 Corinth. xiv. 33. And all the Apostles like St. Paul, since their teaching was the same, and upon this point St. Jude testifies it expressly of all.

and the order of its government pursued from the beginning; and finally, the testimonies even of those, who broke unity in the 16th century, and of those, who in support of that particular reformed party in which they were born, never ceased to thunder against those, who dissented from them.*

I have collected in my *second Letter* a number of texts on this great question, which appear to me well calculated to make an indelible impression upon my readers. Yes, sir, if I do not deceive myself, whoever among your countrymen is faithfully in search of the truth, will there clearly see, as I venture to assure him, that truth can never be found in schism and separation. Shall I only recall to your remembrance those words twice repeated by our Divine Saviour in the admirable prayer which he made to his Father in the midst of his Apostles, the evening before his passion? "That they all may be one," said he, "*that* the world may believe that thou has sent me. That is to say,

*I have quoted these various authorities in my second letter from page 53 to 60. I will here add the following to the celebrated Theologians of your church: "The King" (says Casaubon of James the First) "plainly believes, without fallacy or deceit, that there is but *one* true church, called Catholic or Universal, out of which he holds that no salvation is to be expected. He detests those who in old times and afterwards either departed from the faith of the church, and so became heretics; or departing from her communion became schismatics." How was it possible to speak so well, and yet not apply his principles to the transactions of the preceding reign? How was it that James the First was not sensible of the strict obligation of honestly labouring to bind again the bond of unity? What did it profit him to wear so rich and noble a crown during a mortal life in the midst of the schism, if he knew it to be such? "The ark out of which all perished," says Mr. Perkins, "was an emblem of the church militant, out of which all are condemned: out of the militant church there being no means of salvation, no preaching, no sacraments; and by consequence no salvation." *On the Revelation*, p. 308.

"If the Church of Rome," says Tillotson (T. 6, p. 245) be the Catholic Church, it is necessary to be of that communion; because out of the Catholic Church there is no ordinary possibility of salvation."

that all those who may hereafter believe my word, and the preaching of my Apostles, may be *one among* themselves, as thou and I, Father! are one: in order that by the agreement of their faith, by their adherence to the same pastors, their perseverance in the same Church, they may prove to all the faithful that my mission came from thee. For thou alone, O Father! canst command the minds and hearts of men; thou alone canst bring them to uniformity of belief, and retain them in it. At this spectacle, hitherto unknown upon the earth, the infidels will feel thy power and thy sweet influence, and will come to adore thee at the feet of the same altars. Let them be *one*, that the world may know that thou hast truly sent me!"

Tell me, sir, can you ever be persuaded that any man can love our amiable and adorable Saviour, and remain insensible to this moving prayer? That any one can be zealous for his glory, and yet be pleased with divisions, and oppose the accomplishment of his wishes? That it is possible to desire the extension of his kingdom, and yet arrest its progress by word and example? To wish that his divine mission should be displayed in the intimate union of all his followers, and yet by laborious efforts to retain Christians at a distance from one another, and by rash and often calumnious accusations prevent them from religiously giving each other the hand, and becoming again among themselves what they were in the days of peace and confraternity?

I seriously invite my reverend antagonist to weigh in his heart and before God the considerations which arise from the sublime prayer of our Saviour. I entreat him moreover to dwell some moments on these words of the celebrated Protestant Claude, to Dr. Henchman, Bishop of London, in 1680, on occasion of the Dissenters in that extensive diocese: "Evidently," he wrote, "their conduct is equivalent to a positive schism, *a crime detestable in itself both to God and man.*

Those who are guilty of it, whether by first establishing it themselves, or *continuing to enforce it among others*, must expect to have a terrible account to render at the great day of judgment." Claude did not perceive that he himself was at the head of a party of Dissenters whose origin and schism came from Calvin! He was not sensible that he himself was continuing to maintain this schism among his partizans! and he did not apply to himself what he said with so much justice of his imitators present and future, that they must expect to have to render a terrible account! What astonishing blindness! How can we consider it but as a just visitation from above? But why should this unhappy Claude find imitators even in our days? Why must we even now have the pain of witnessing an able writer sharing his inconsistency; proclaiming like him the enormity of schism, and like him taking up his pen or raising his voice to attach the people to it more firmly? Let him prove then at the same time either that Elizabeth and her clergy did not break unity; or that out of unity, and in schism, we can secure our salvation. Neither he, nor any one in the world, will ever prove either.

I must however remark, to his praise,—and it is a consolation to me to make it public,—that he appears to have felt the force of the proofs, which filled my *second Letter*. Had he found them defective, he would not have hesitated to object to them. I take authority from his silence to say, that on the decisive question of unity we are both agreed. What I truly deplore is, that while he admits the principle with all the Protestant communions, he rejects with them its essential and immediate consequence, though he prides himself on logical exactness. This consequence ought long ago to have led him and them to that tribunal of Divine creation, which Jesus Christ has erected in his Church, to preserve the faithful in unity. The estab-

lishment of this tribunal, and the obligations of submitting to it, are the subjects of the *Letter* following.

When it is once demonstrated, and acknowledged on all sides that the precept of unity is indispensable, and of rigorous obligation upon all Christians, it must be believed that our Divine Legislator has given us the means of observing it. Now this means, since personal inspiration has ceased, can be no other for us all, than the establishment of a supreme tribunal, which has the right of declaring what is revealed, and what is not; and which, itself secured from error, will also preserve us from it while subject to its decisions. If such a means does not exist, then we have no means whatever of obeying Jesus Christ on this essential point. Without this tribunal, it is impossible for us ever to remain united; with it, we can never be otherwise. If the New Testament had never been written, we ought still to have believed in the institution of this ancient authority, and admitted it as the necessary effect of a known cause, and the evident consequence of an acknowledged principle. Both are inseparably bound by a chain, impalpable, but indestructible.

This method of reasoning is not at all to the taste of Mr. Faber. There was one way, and only one of refuting it: he should have proved that without acknowledging an infallible authority, Christians can always remain in unity of faith. But neither he, nor any other upon earth, will discover such a proof. The passions of men and the experience of ages will eternally appear in opposition to it. What then is his resource to furnish a refutation? At first he professes not to perceive the intimate relation and connexion between the precept of unity, and the necessary existence of an infallible tribunal. He takes *infallibility* separately, as if persuaded that by keeping it apart from *unity*, he can attack it with greater advantage. He therefore passes over my *second Letter* like the *first*, and enters at once into discussion with the *third*. We shall soon

see whether his attempt is crowned with success; but it is curious enough to observe how, after so often repeating that he would take my work for his text, he passes over in silence the first hundred pages!

It is true, however, that farther on he glances at the first argument of my *third Letter*—and at page 39 he has chosen to say a few words upon it without finding fault. Here however he appears to disapprove of the observation I made in these words, “God commands us to preserve unity in religion; therefore he has furnished us with the means of so doing.” This mode of concluding *a priori* appears to him too hazardous, too bold and venturesome. And yet no one more freely yields than himself to the dictates of his own reason. He very often delights in putting whole pages of my book *into form*, into syllogisms suitable to his purpose, and intentionally so turned as to introduce what he intends to object to me. Nay more; in the same chapter, page 38, he forgets what he has just blamed, and pleads himself in favour of theological reasoning: “we shall introduce,” says he, “an universal scepticism, if we deny the right of forming a private judgment upon perfectly unambiguous propositions. . . . In these matters, and in various others which might easily be specified, I hold private judgment to be strictly legitimate; and I feel persuaded that the Bishop of Aire will not disagree with me.” Well, sir, do you find any ambiguity in the propositions which I have advanced, on the absolute necessity of a supreme authority? Are they not on the contrary as clear as the light? I had a right then, according to Mr. Faber himself, to use them, and he was wrong in censuring me for it.

After declaring what reason suggests on the necessity of a supreme tribunal, I come to the authorities, which demonstrate its real existence. It is Jesus Christ who teaches it; his apostles and their successors; the conviction which ever animates the Church, and directs her dogmatical decisions in councils.

These proofs brought together demonstrate that in fact this tribunal, the propriety of which good sense alone had ascertained, was positively established by **JESUS CHRIST**. I beg those who have at hand the *Difficulties of Romanism*, to compare the 2d chapter of the first book with my *third Letter*. Mr. Faber saw very plainly the force and development of the proofs which I there adduced, and he does not even endeavour to destroy them! He contents himself with advancing that I do not reason according to the promises and expressions of our Lord, but from the interpretations, which I give to them. Judge, sir, between us; are not the following words clear and positive declarations—"Go ye therefore and teach all nations: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and behold I am with you *all days*, even to the consummation of the world?"* What need here of arbitrary interpretations? How can these words be susceptible of opposite expositions?† **JESUS CHRIST** promises his and their successors to the end of the world that he will assist them, when they shall teach the precepts, which he has given them. Can it enter any sensible head, that error can corrupt that teaching, which is directed by our Saviour himself? And when he says to them, "I will ask the Father, and he will give you another Paraclete: when he shall come, the spirit of truth, he shall teach you all truth." Can there be any fear of pernicious mixture in doctrine, where the Holy Spirit resides, and teaches all truth? What is wanting to the clearness of these magnificent promises? What need have they of any interpretation? And above all, how can they be interpreted in an opposite sense? Truly there are certain unfortunate minds, for which no human language is sufficiently plain. Tell them further with St. Paul that the Church

* St. Matt. xxviii. 19, 20.

† See Bossuet, *Corollaire de la Defense du Clerge Gall.* parag. 8, and *Dissertation Prelimin.* parag. 21.

of God is the pillar and ground of truth; they will reply that doubtless it was so in the time of the apostles, but that in our days we behold this pillar on the contrary surmounted by a group of errors. Have then the gates of hell prevailed against the Church? Has **JESUS CHRIST** ceased to be with her? Has he withdrawn his Holy Spirit, and failed to accomplish his word? No, no, my dear sir, far be such blasphemy from us; we know that the world will pass away, but that his word will not pass away. Let us hold fast his brilliant promises; and pity every communion, which rejects them, which prides itself on having no connexion with them, and by that alone cuts itself off from the body of Jesus Christ. Let us deplore the blindness of those who invent interpretations opposite to the promises given to the Church, only because they are determined, in spite of every proof, never to re-enter her bosom.

“That the privilege of infallibility resides in the Catholic Church,” says Mr. Faber at the beginning of his discussion, page 10, “is strenuously maintained: but as to the precise quarter where it is to be found, there is not the same unanimity.” He goes on to say, that some hold it to reside in the Pope and others in a general council: and adds, page 12, “Under such circumstances, *if the prerogative of infallibility belong to the church, we must seek its residence elsewhere than in the person of the Pope.*” A truth too striking for me to wish to dispute. But let him listen to one reproach which he very often deserves. He sets out with saying, and repeats again and again, that he chooses the *Discussion Amicale* for his text, and that it is his intention to comment upon it from beginning to end. And yet at page 224 of the 1st volume, I insert this objection at length, and give its solution: he takes no notice of this whatever. He forgets his engagement with the public and with myself. I can no longer discover his purpose. He must be satisfied with my re-

ferring both himself and his readers to my book. I will here only sum up my answer in a few words. "The general acceptance of the bishops dispersed over the world assures us that a council is really œcumenical or universal: by them also are we made certain that the Pope has pronounced *ex cathedrâ*. Thus we Catholics agree perfectly in the same principle; and in reality we on both sides attach the seal of infallibility to *universal consent*." This, I conceive, is all that needs be said in reply to this formidable objection.

The opinion of those who place infallibility in a general council, appears best to suit the taste of Mr. Faber. But unluckily, says he, "from faithful history we learn, that general councils, upon points both of doctrine and practice; have decided in plain and avowed opposition to each other." He is not the first, who has made this assertion: but certainly if he had been able to prove it, he would have been the first, who had succeeded in so doing. It is curious to observe how he proceeds in his demonstration. He takes two councils, one of which was from the beginning rejected by the whole of the West, and soon after by the universal Church: and the other immediately approved by it. He wonders to find them teaching opposite doctrines, as if he had honestly expected to find them unanimous. Truly I lament that this pitiful objection should be revived in these days. There is not a student in our seminaries who does not know that the *Conciliabulum* of Constantinople in 754 was never acknowledged.* Every difficulty, once solved, should

*"How could it be a general council, when it was neither received, nor approved, but on the contrary, anathematized by the bishops of other churches—when neither concurred in by the Pope, nor by the bishops about him, nor by legates, nor by a circular letter according to the usage of councils? Which had not the consent of the patriarchs of the East, of Alexandria, Antioch, or Jerusalem, nor of the bishops dependent upon them?" *Extracted from the Refutation of this Conciliabulum, read in the 6th session of the 2d Council of Nice.* See Fleury's Church Hist. vol. 6th, book 44, § 36, of the quarto edition, printed at Caen.

be consigned to oblivion: it is unworthy of a man of learning to mention it again. It may deceive the illiterate; but in the end it will disgrace that man in the eyes of both parties, who flattered himself that he could still turn it to the credit of his own.

In support of the pretended opposition between general councils, of which he has selected such an unlucky example, I find him inserting long historical notes, which, I am sorry to say, are complete in every thing except applicability and truth. Mr. Faber discovers in the South of Spain, in the small town of Elvira, a council of nineteen bishops, who forbid painting the Godhead on the walls of their churches; and by a very illogical way of arguing, concluding twice from *particulars* to *universals*, he deduces from this prohibition two false conclusions. The first, that it was forbidden to paint on the walls any kind of pictures: the second, that in the first ages of Christianity not only was the veneration of images and pictures *unknown*, but even that their introduction into the churches was *forbidden*. Mr. Faber would have reasoned otherwise if he had taken St. John Damascen for his guide, who was so famous in the grand dispute about images: "We know," says he, "what can, and what cannot be represented by images. How can an image be made of Him who has no body? But since he became man, you may make a representation of his human form, of his nativity, of his baptism, his transfiguration, his cross, his burial, his resurrection, or ascension. Express all these by colours as well as by words; be not afraid." The first consequence deduced by Mr. Faber from the council of Elvira is therefore false. Must we say the same of the second? Let us refer it to the decision of St. Basil. "I receive the apostles," he wrote to Julian, "the prophets and the martyrs. I *invoke* them to *pray for me*, and that by their intercession, God may be merciful to me, and forgive my transgressions. For this reason I *revere and honour their*

images; especially since we are taught to do so (this is addressed at once to Mr. Faber) "by the tradition of the holy apostles; and so far from these being forbidden us, they appear in our churches."* Mr. Faber read this passage, with many others, in the *Discussion Amicale*, vol. 2. page 364; but he passes them all over in silence, and is unwilling to make them known to those whom he undertakes to instruct.

The following is of the highest antiquity; and I wish to retrace it before my readers, first, because he has considered it prudent to withhold it from his; and secondly, because when we undertake to enlighten mankind, there is no need of concealing from them the truth. Tertullian, when driven to the excess of rigour by the inflexibility of his character, reproached the Catholics with having absolved adulterers, and defended such indulgence by the words of the good Shepherd *represented in painting, or in relief upon the chalices*. "Let us now," he resumes, "produce the pictures upon the chalices."† It was at the close of the second century that he spoke thus of this figure painted or engraved, as of a common ornament. Would it be an unwarrantable presumption to attribute its origin to the days of the apostles? In the stormy centuries of reviving persecutions, the Church possessing neither temples, nor oratories, had not been able to fix pictures or images on the walls or altars, in the same manner as she did later. But she had portable ones on the chalices, such as alone were suitable to her uncertain and fluctuating situation. This sentence of Tertullian, let

*In 814 Leo, the Armenian, at that time the disguised patron of the Iconoclasts, assembled several bishops in order to induce them to break pious images. Euthymius, metropolitan of Sardes, thus addressed him: "Know, sire, that for 800 years and more since Jesus Christ came into the world, he has been painted and adored in his image. Who will be bold enough to abolish so ancient a tradition?"—Who? the Rector of Long Newton.—*See Fleury*, vol. 7. b. 46. § 13. *Quarto edit. of Caen*.

†Le de Pudic. ch. 7.

fall by the way, and without any regular design, appeared to me in 1812, a ray of light for our cause. I have since had the satisfaction to see the same view of it taken by Leibnitz, the most penetrating and universal genius of the reformation.*

I again feel compelled against my inclination to re-establish a fact mutilated by the faithful and modest pen of my antagonist, who thinks himself justified in praising a Bishop of Marseilles for what St. Gregory the Great found worthy of censure, and in blaming with contempt the decision of one of the greatest lights, who have governed the Church. Such a forgetfulness of all that is becoming would cause disgust, if it were not still more calculated to excite pity. Read what follows, sir, I beseech you, and say if you think me too severe:—"I have learnt," writes this great Pope to Serenus, "that seeing some persons adore the images in the Church, you have broken them: I commend your zeal for preventing the adoration of things made by the hand of man. But I am of opinion that you ought not to have broken these images; for pictures are placed in the churches (observe the general custom) in order that those, who cannot read, may see upon the walls what they cannot learn in books. You ought therefore to have preserved them, and deterred the people from *sinning by adoring the painting.*" And in a second letter; "Shew the people by the Holy Scripture, that it is not lawful to adore what has been made by the hand of man; and add, that seeing the *lawful use* of images turned into adoration, you became indignant and broke them. If you will, you can further say—I willingly allow you to have images in

*Et quanquam sub initio Christianismi, aut nullas aut perraras fuisse imagines, probabilius videatur, (unius enim imaginis Christi, sub habitu boni pastoris ovem errantem requirentis, sacris calicibus iusculpti mentio reperitur apud Tertullianum) paulatim tamen fuisse receptas negari non potest.—*Syst. Theolog. p. 132. Édil. Paris. 1819.*

the church for your instruction, for which purpose they were made *in former days*. . . . If any one wishes to make images, do not hinder him: only forbid the adoration of them. The sight of the historical representations ought to move them to compunction; but they ought only to bow down to adore the Holy Trinity. I say all this to you out of the love I have for the Church; not to weaken your zeal, but to encourage you in your duty.*” Could any one convey a more sensible admonition, or one at the same time more paternal? And yet the Rector of Long Newton does not blush to call this a decision *wretchedly injudicious!*

I am happy to be able to present to him a judge whom doubtless he will not refuse. Leibnitz himself shall speak: I regret that I cannot give at length the judgment of this great man on the subject of images.† “As to the veneration of images, it cannot be denied that the Christians abstained from it a long time through fear of superstition, while they were mixed with the Pagans. But at length when the worship of demons was destroyed in the greater part of the known and civilized world, even grave men found no longer any reason for excluding images from being used in the worship of the true God, since they are the alphabet of the unlearned, and a powerful motive to excite the common people to devotion. It must be observed that a double honour is paid to images: one kind which belongs to the image, as when it is placed in a remarkable and honourable situation, set off with ornaments, surrounded with lighted tapers, or carried in procession; and in this I see no great difficulty. The other kind of honour is that which is referred to the original. When for example, it is kissed, when people uncover their heads before it, or bend their knees, or prostrate, or offer prayers, or vows, or praises or thanksgivings:

* The first letter of St. Gregory the Great to Serenus, Bishop of Marseilles, in the year 599. The second in 600.

† See his *Syst. Theol.* p. 121.

but in reality, although they are accustomed to talk of paying homage to the image; it is not the lifeless thing incapable of honour, but the original which they honour before the image.* No one with sound sense will say and think, 'grant me, O image, what I ask; and to thee, O marble or wood, I return thanks;' but 'it is thou O Lord, whom I adore, and whose praises I publish.' I see no evil in prostrating before a crucifix, and when looking upon it, honouring him, whom it represents. But the advantage of it is evident; since it is incontestable that this action wonderfully excites the affections; and we have seen that it was customary with St. Gregory the Great." (We have seen it too with St. Basil.) "Those who follow the confession of Augsbourg are not entirely opposed to this custom: and certainly if we did not know that there were formerly great abuses in the veneration of images, which have rendered suspicious a thing good in itself; if we did not know the animated disputes which have arisen on this point, and even in our own days; no one perhaps would have thought of suspecting any concealed evil in the veneration paid before an image, or any danger, or cause of scruple; so innocent is the thing considered in itself, I will say even so reasonable and praiseworthy." O that the Protestant communions, who will not own a supreme tribunal created by our Divine Legislator, would at least submit to the authority of superior men of disinterested minds! O that they would be persuaded by a Grotius or a Leibnitz! Their schisms at length would cease to divide the kingdom of JESUS CHRIST. Will they ever find safer guides, or judges

*"If it were possible in human language to express ourselves with rigorous precision, instead of the *veneration of images*, we should say *veneration of Saints* before their images." See *Discussion Amicale*, vol. 2, p. 348. Let any one be at the pains of comparing my 16th letter with Leibnitz, and they will see that I have had the happiness of falling in exactly with that profound thinker.

more unexceptionable than these two geniuses; both nurtured and rendered illustrious in the bosom of the reformation, both surmounting by profound research the prejudices of birth, and the habits of life, and consigning, in their immortal testaments, the triumph of Catholicity?*

I was far from expecting, from the opinion you had given me of the author, that I should see figuring in the *Difficulties of Romanism*, the apparent contradiction between the Fathers of the second council of Nice, and those of Frankfort and Paris. It is painful to have to explain again what has been explained so often. O that this at least may be for the last time! No doubt you have seen in the commerce of life, friends or families who lived in union, disagreeing all at once through a mere misunderstanding. Complaints are made on both sides; they avoid each other and condemn each other. The separation and dissension last as long as the error from which they arose. At last comes an explanation: the mistake is discovered, and the falsity of the reports, which had circulated: they regret that they ever believed them, acknowledge their faults, and on both sides return with pleasure to their former sentiments of esteem and concord. Now this is precisely the history of the *temporary misunderstanding on the subject of images*, between the East and the Gauls, at the time of which we are speaking. Alarming reports of the sentiments and decisions of Nice give occasion to the convocation of the council of Frankfort. An unfaithful translation of the Greek acts unluckily comes to confirm these reports, and leaves no room to doubt that absolute adoration has been impiously given to images. "The question proposed," say the fathers at Frankfort, "is that of the recent council of the Greeks for the ado-

* *Votum pro pace*, and *Systema Theolog.* productions of the two first heads of the reformation. •

ration of images; in which it is written, that whoever will not render to the images of the saints service and adoration *as to the Divine Trinity*, shall be considered anathema." Thirty years afterwards the council of Paris still attributed the same sentiments to the fathers of Nice, and pronounced their condemnation, after the example of Frankfort and the Caroline books, and under the same erroneous impression. In course of time the truth came to light. Correct versions were spread about, the mistake was acknowledged, and justice was done to the Fathers of Nice.

How indeed could such justice have been refused, since in the second session the patriarch Tarasius was found approving of Pope Adrian's letter, and adding, "I am of the same belief, that images are to be adored with a relative affection, *reserving to God alone the faith and worship of LATRIA*:" and all the council loudly proclaiming itself of the same opinion. When also in the fifth session this passage came from the Bishop of Thessalonica in reply to a Pagan: "We do not adore the images, but what they represent; and even then we do not adore them as gods; God forbid! but as the servants and friends of God, who pray to Him in our behalf." And this passage of a dialogue where the Christian replies to a Jew, who is converted, but scandalized at images: "The scripture forbids us to adore a strange God, and to adore an image as God. The images, which you see among us serve to remind us of the incarnation of JESUS CHRIST, by representing his face; those of the saints represent to us their combats and their victories. When we venerate them, we invoke God. "Blessed be thou O God of this saint, and of all the saints." Finally, when at the last session, these words were read in the decision of the council: "To images are to be rendered the respect and *adoration of honour; but not true LATRIA*, which our faith requires, and which *belongs solely to the Divine nature*. But incense and lights

are to be used before these images, as is customary with regard to the cross, and the gospels, all after the pious customs of the ancients: for the honour paid to the image is referred to the original; and he who adores the image, adores the "subject which it represents." These latter expressions are cited by Mr. Faber, while he suppresses the preceding ones, and takes care not to give the passages mentioned above, nor the following pronounced by the Bishop of Ancyra in the first session: "I receive the venerable images of JESUS CHRIST inasmuch as he became man for our salvation; those of his holy mother, the angels, the apostles, the martyrs, and all the saints. I kiss them, and give them *the adoration of honour*. I reject with all my heart the false council called the seventh, as *contrary to the whole tradition of the Church*." He himself has subscribed for fear of persecution: but remorse brought him with many others to a solemn retraction.

It is well known that the word *adoration* was in use in the East to signify a simple testimony of submission and respect; whilst in Gaul it was used solely to express the homage rendered to the Supreme Being. Is it not an absurd injustice to give it only the latter signification in the mouth of the Orientals? Is it to no purpose then that they themselves distinguish two kinds of adoration, that of *honour*, and that of **LATRIA**? To no purpose that they proclaim that the former is for the images of the saints, and the latter for God alone? It is in vain for them to declare that the honour and adoration pass from the image to the original: they cannot persuade certain obstinate and prejudiced minds. These will maintain, in spite of their declarations, that the word *adore* is only susceptible of one signification, and that consequently they cannot attach to it any other: these will maintain that when they pray before an image or picture, (for they must know better than the others) they only pray to the

marble, the wood, or the canvass, that they have no thought beyond these, and consequently that they have been, are, and will be forever idolaters, both they and their adherents! What then is to be done? What course must we take? Pity these peevish and contentious spirits, and leave them to themselves.

To sum up—the Fathers of Nice, those of Paris, and those of Frankfort, agreed without being aware of it, in the self-same doctrine. The opinion of the Orientals, falsely interpreted for some years, but better understood afterwards, was found conformable to that of Gaul, Germany, Italy, and ancient tradition: and in the end it reigned exclusively in the East, under the rule of the Empress Theodora. Here is precisely what should be thought of the vicissitudes, occasioned by the Iconoclast Emperors. I am sorry for Mr. Faber's sake, after all the pleasure he has felt in enumerating the pretended *variations* of a Church, which believes itself, with reason, unchangeable in faith, and which even by its Divine constitution, cannot be otherwise.

After attempting to shake our infallible tribunal by exhibiting councils opposed to each other, and completely failing in this first attempt; is it likely that Mr. Faber will be more successful in opposing them by turns to the primitive Church, and the sacred scriptures? He has persuaded himself that he should triumph over the fourth council of Lateran, held in 1215, under Innocent III. He takes offence at the word *transubstantiation*, employed in the first chapter, to express the change of substance, in the Eucharist. He pronounces that the word and the thing are in manifest opposition to the belief and doctrine of the first five centuries. He expresses himself in a decisive and dogmatical tone, like a man sure of what he asserts; and he little suspects that he is all the while completely in error. He will see positive proof of his being in error in the next chapter. I shall there

establish the proposition precisely contrary to his; that is to say, the exact conformity of the doctrine of the first five centuries with that of the fourth council of Lateran. You will, I flatter myself, agree with me, that Mr. Faber has not discovered the spirit and doctrine of the Fathers upon the Eucharist, that he takes their doctrine in an inverted sense; as do Tillotson and all the sacramentarians—whence it follows that he thinks them contradictory to each other and even to themselves. I will throw new light on this subject; and the result will necessarily be, that what he calls my “shrewd arguments,” furnished in rigorous truth, the only key, which can lay open the opinion of the fathers, and acquit them of the charge of being at variance with themselves and one another.

At present I pass on to the pretended opposition of our general councils to the sacred scriptures. But previous to replying to the examples of it which he produces, it will be necessary to shew him again, since he does not know it, or pretends not to know, by what marks the *œcumenicity*, or universality of councils becomes acknowledged, as well as their decisions of doctrine, or other regulations. It is strange that professing to refute my work step by step, he leaves it continually, and flies off, no one knows where, to find something to sift and dispute. I have undoubtedly a right, when he professes to attack me, to require him to do so upon my own principles, and not upon those of others. Now I have laid down as a fundamental principle, with all our able theologians, that the general acceptance of the bishops dispersed over the world, the judges of faith, could alone make known to us whether such a council was really œcumenical, or such a decree of a Pope pronounced *ex cathedrâ*; and consequently whether the decision of the council or Pope appertained to faith. Upon this principle, it is easy for you, sir, to judge, that the whole of what Mr. Faber adduces from his second chapter to the end

of page 17, is entirely foreign, and inapplicable to the Catholic doctrine. He would have done very wisely, if he had spared himself the trouble of swelling out his book with it, and us the labour of reading articles which do not in any way interest us.

We should be grievously mistaken, if like Mr. Faber, we were to take for decisions and articles of faith, all that we found in the decrees, chapters, or canons of general councils. We often find in them sentences introduced to serve for explanation, or to prevent a difficulty; others hardly touched upon, and merely given *en passant*, which therefore do not belong to the main subject of the decision. These incidental sentences do not in any way concern faith, and impose no obligation of belief or assent.* If you please, we will take, as an example, one of the canons brought as an objection by Mr. Faber, page 23—the sixth canon of the second council of Lateran, in the year 1139, that we may discuss the second council before the third with the Rector's permission, though he takes them the other way. "Decernimus ut ii qui in ordine subdiaconatus et supra uxores duxerint, aut concubinas habuerint, officio atque ecclesiastico beneficio careant." This is the whole decree of discipline. Let us observe what follows: "Cum enim ipsi templum Dei, vasa Domini, sacrarium Spiritus Sancti debeant esse et dici, indignum est eos cubilibus et imunditiis deservire." This passage follows the decision, and does not belong to it: it is added in the way of explanation to justify the prohibition and obviate objections. In a word, it is a reflection, and not a decree. This, I imagine, should be enough to pacify the mind of Mr. Faber, which has taken fire at the reflection of the fathers of Lateran. Let him then cool down, and not imagine that if he became a Ca-

*See *Melchior Canus de locis Theol.* a celebrated theologian of the council of Trent.

tholic, he would be obliged to admit as an article of faith, what appears to have given him so much offence.

I do not see, however, that he ought to feel any great difficulty in adopting it, if he reflected ever so little. If in the law of Moses, the man who had carnally cohabited with his wife was considered unclean, and could not on the same day even enter the sanctuary, is it not very congruous that the priest of the new law, obliged as he is every day to administer the sacraments or celebrate the sacred mysteries, should absolutely refrain from conjugal obligations? Let the Rector only take a review of the distractions, disquietudes, and other consequences, entailed by the nuptial union; let him reflect on the first bower of mankind, and I cannot think he will find any exaggeration in the words employed by the council to justify the prohibition of marriage for ecclesiastics. Nevertheless, however rigorous and general it appears, there might be circumstances in which, with the hope of promoting greater good, the Church might judge it right, as at Nice, to leave to priests both the condition and use of marriage. For the rest, Mr. Faber is wrong in imputing to us the prohibition of marriage in general. He ought to know that it is more honoured by the Catholic Church, than by his own. With him and every other Protestant, matrimony is merely a civil ceremony; with us, this civil ceremony is exalted by the Sacrament of matrimony.

It is ridiculous to behold, at pp. 27—28, the imaginary triumph of the Rector, and to pursue the pompous chain of syllogisms and dilemmas, which he unrolls in order to place the council in *evident* contradiction with the scripture. When Luther formerly sought to prove that good works availed little to salvation, he advanced on the authority of St. Paul, that man was justified by faith alone. People cried out on all sides, that the word *alone* was not in the apos-

tle's text. In reality it never was there; but it remains in Luther's quotation to lead astray the simple and ignorant who may read it. After the example of the veracious patriarch of the reformation, Mr. Faber will also quote St. Paul, (Heb. xiii. 4) with equal fidelity. "Scripture declares," says he, "that *marriage is* HONOURABLE in ALL men, whether they be clerks or laics." Would you not suppose, sir, that this text, distinguished by italics and capitals, was really St. Paul's? Divide it in two, however, and be so kind as to return the larger half to our good Rector. Of the twelve words in italics, the seven concluding ones are his own; St. Paul only says, "*marriage honourable in all:*" *Τίμιος ὁ Γάμος ἐν πᾶσι.*

I understand the text to mean, "*let marriage be honourable;*" and not "*marriage is honourable,*" as Mr. Faber translates it. He will say that his English bible translates as he does: let it be so; but then I find two in fault instead of one: they are both wrong. In that chapter the apostle is giving precepts of morality, and all in the imperative mood; as verse 1st, *Let fraternal charity, &c.*—v. 5, *Let your manners, &c.*—ver. 7, *Remember, &c.*—v. 9, *Be not led away, &c.* and so on in verses 13, 15, 17, 18, 21, 22, 23, 24; and in the last verse, we have *Grace be with you*, even in your bible, where the Latin is merely, *Gratia Dei vobiscum.* Therefore the text in question ought to be understood, *Let marriage be honourable in all.* What completes the proof is, that by translating, *Marriage is honourable in all men*, the proposition thus put forth in the affirmative and general sense, would be untrue: for certainly marriage is neither honourable nor honoured in those spouses who break their mutual engagement. I have dwelt a long time on the monosyllable *is*; but I considered it necessary to furnish you with the means of judging if Mr. Faber had any right to conclude as he does; "Hence it is evident,"—"and hence also it is evident . . . by the indisputable fact, &c." Lan-

guage has nothing stronger, and yet more foolishly paraded than the word *evident*. Now judge, if you please, where is the double evidence of Mr. Faber, in his critique upon the second council of Lateran. I flatter myself that, at least in your opinion, certitude is on my side.

It appears that my antagonist has a particular dislike to all that was formerly transacted in the ancient basilic of Lateran. We shall have hereafter to defend the fourth council from his attacks. Here he falls upon the third; and in what manner do you think? You will soon admire with me the most generous and magnanimous exertions of good faith and zeal for the truth. In fact, he lights upon the 16th chapter, chooses out and places by itself the following passage: "for those are not oaths, but perjuries, which are made against the utility of the Church, and the institutions of the holy fathers." It is easy to see how this passage, thus insulated, will provoke a zealous comment from the indignation of the Rector. His tact is chiefly conspicuous in his having detached it from what preceded and followed it; and thus given it a general and indefinite sense, which is far from the intention of the council. I must give you the whole of the 16th chapter, entitled, "Of the regulations of Churches." "Since in all churches, what has been approved by a majority of the ancient brethren should be observed without delay; those deserve to be reprimanded, who, few in number, and less influenced by reason than caprice, oppose what has been decided by the majority, and thus disturb the course of ecclesiastical government. Wherefore we decree by these presents, that except in cases where reason and truth are on the side of the minority, the determination of the more numerous and wise portion of the chapter shall be put in execution, notwithstanding any appeal. And let not this our decision be evaded, even if any one of the members should maintain that he is obliged

by oath to support such or such a custom of his church. *For those are not oaths, but perjuries, which are made against the utility of the Church, and the institutions of the holy Fathers.* And if the member persists in despising decisions conformable to reason and holy institutions, let him be subjected to a suitable penance, and so long deprived of the participation of the body of our Lord." It is plain that this regulation regards the canons of cathedrals, where the capitular statutes are made by the majority; and it supposes a case where the wish of the majority is to abolish a custom become prejudicial. One of the members chooses to oppose the measure, under the pretext that he has sworn to observe the usage or custom which the majority wish to abolish. "You swore to keep it," they tell him, "when it was in full force; but now the authority which established it, is resolved upon its abolition.—This at once annuls the obligation of your former oath. To persist in defending it, would be going against the statutes of our fathers, and against the utility of the church: your oath would become a perjury." Nothing can be more simple and true than this.

But how does Mr. Faber proceed? He picks out a sentence to his liking; he presents it in an insulated form; for cathedral churches he substitutes the Catholic church, and puts its rulers in place of the canons of chapters. From this he sets off heroically to declaim against the political and ambitious views of Rome! You will allow, sir, that his favoured hands do not change lead into gold.

His violent sally against the policy and projects of aggrandizement used by the court of Rome, is led on by a pompous display upon the sacred inviolability of an oath, of whatever kind it may be: for he makes no exceptions, not even of one made against the interests of an individual, of a family, or against the rules of a society. If he does not go thus far, he argues away

from the question, and says nothing that will avail; since the council only declares those oaths to be perjuries, which are made against the utility of the churches and the statutes of the holy fathers.

Little would the reader here expect to see poor John Huss brought on the stage. The Rector, after his ingenious comment on the 16th chapter, brings forth the faggot of this unfortunate man, as a consequence of the doctrine, which he pretends to have there discovered. According to his account, the Emperor had sworn to preserve the life of John Huss; but this oath being considered contrary to the interests of the Church, was annulled, he says, by the fathers of Constance. Well, sir, would you wish to know the truth of this affair? Sigismund had taken no oath at all; and consequently the council did not annul any. The Emperor had directed a safe-conduct to be given to John Huss, who wished to defend his doctrine at Constance. There his doctrine was condemned; and the man declared a heretic for his obstinacy in not renouncing his errors. The law, unhappily in force on the Continent at that time, as well as in England, was put in execution against him. Sigismund was so far from having sworn to preserve his life, that he declared in the council itself, that if Huss did not retract, he himself would be the first to set fire to his pile.* I must say, that if it be disgraceful in a controvertist to repeat an objection, a hundred times solidly refuted, it is fatiguing to me to have again to write its refutation, as if it were for the first time.

How unpleasant and painful indeed is the task, to have again to expose the false exhibition, which Mr. Faber makes of the 27th chapter of the same council. Where are we henceforth to look for equity and good

* The Protestant historian of the council of Constance informs us that John Huss, and Jerome of Prague, were delivered up to the flames by order of Sigismund himself.—*L'Enfant*, book 3, § 48.

faith, if they are no longer in the mouth, and under the pen of a clergyman? The Rector has the effrontery to advance, that by this 27th canon, the obligation of destroying heretics, was imposed upon the faithful, who are bound, as he would have it, even in these days, either to fulfil this obligation, or to reject the infallibility of the Church. And yet he cannot be ignorant of the difference, which we make between *dogmatical decisions*, which command the faith of Christians for ever, and *ordinances of discipline*, which change with the circumstances, which gave them birth. The Rector could not have been ignorant, that at the period of which he speaks, the two powers acted in concert; and that the council did no more than support the temporal authorities, by pressing the people at their recommendation, to march against certain barbarous and formidable sects. He must have known that the council, so far from ordering the destruction of heretics in general, marks out most distinctly those of whom it has been informed, and distinguishes by name the Albigenses, Bulgarians, Cathari, Publicani, sprung from the Eastern Manicheans, and the excesses and ravages committed by them in Italy, throughout the South of France, and even in Spain. "They exercise," says the council, in the same 27th canon, "such cruelty upon the Christians, that without regard to churches or monasteries, they spare neither widows, orphans, old men or children, age or sex; but destroy and lay waste all before them, like the Pagans." In fine, Mr. Faber must have been aware, that against every other kind of heretics, the Church has never known, and never will know, any other arms than persuasion and prayer.

In truth, sir, I cannot forget the assurance with which Mr. Faber takes to himself the praise of having supported, upon facts, his arguments against the infallibility of the Church. Unquestionably his "naked facts," as he calls them, have all their merit intrinsical-

ly in themselves; they have nothing to do with extraneous ornaments. Nevertheless, their nudity has need of some covering, and this indispensable covering is *truth*. You have seen that truth is essentially wanting, to what he has, with a semblance of candour, presented you as "naked facts." You have seen the arguments which he has professed to deduce from them, disappear along with them, upon the slightest examination. Really, if I were a member of your church, I am sorry to say that I should feel obliged to petition for an injunction, to forbid any apologist to undertake her defence with such weapons: for it is manifesting to the world, that there are no solid arms to be found for your cause.

Reading, at page 31, these words of Mr. Faber: "The Bishop lastly argues, &c." I expected that the Rector was about to mention and refute my final proofs of the infallibility. Not at all: he says nothing about them; he conceals them from his readers, and gives instead of them, arguments drawn from I know not where. This leads me to make an observation, which is but too applicable elsewhere. When he chooses to sum up in a few lines, whole pages of my work,—my ideas, words, and proofs are completely metamorphosed beneath his pen:—I no longer recognise myself; it is not me, but some other, whom he appears to attack. This obliges me to beg of my readers to do me the justice to confront my text with what he imputes to me. I particularly request them in this place, to compare my third letter with his second chapter. They will then be convinced that instead of producing my proofs, he suppresses the most striking among them, and imputes to me what are not mine. I can solemnly declare, that if the reader only knows my work by the *Difficulties of Romanism*, he will have

but an incomplete and often false idea of the *Discussion Amicale*.

In every question treated in that work, the plan, which I have constantly followed, has been to prove our doctrine by the holy scriptures, and by the traditions of the primitive Church; as these two principles are generally admitted and acknowledged by Protestant theologians. I cannot answer for their being so by Mr. Faber; for, on the subject of tradition, he appears hardly to know what to hold. Sometimes, he seems sufficiently disposed to admit it, and sometimes to reject it altogether. At page viii. of his preface, he requires us to produce, from period to period, an uninterrupted chain of witnesses, up to the apostles themselves: in other places he persuades himself that he can shew us to be in opposition to the primitive Church, by some detached passages from the third or the second century. At page 33, he tells us, that if the Christians of the second century, could easily join with those of the first; *we* can no longer do the same, separated as we are from the apostles' time, by too great a distance, to pass safely over the space of eighteen centuries, and join the last link of the chain to the first. But from page 17 to 18, he quotes against us several passages from Fathers, of whom St. Clement of Alexandria, is the most ancient. At page 35, he will admit no doctrine which is not *clearly founded* on the holy scripture; and at page 49, he maintains that the precept of St. Paul, "Hold the traditions which you have learned, whether by word, or by our epistle,"* was not binding, except about the period when he inculcated it to the Thessalonians. But at page 18, he labours hard to prove, that the first five centuries are against transubstantiation. At page 32, he approves of the argument of prescription of Tertullian and St. Irenæus, which we still use to shew the apostolicity of any dogma or custom.

* *Thess. ii. v. 14.*

Among the doubts and variations of Mr. Faber, he will not object to my adopting, that as his opinion, which is the most favourable to tradition. I am the more inclined to do this, as it will be the means of reconciling his sentiments, with those of the most celebrated theologians of his church, who profess an entire deference for the fathers and councils of the first five centuries,* and with the great lights, the learned personages of that admirable and pious epoch. I have quoted many testimonies from them in the fourth letter of the *Discussion Amicale*. There, you may see, my dear sir, several passages to which it

* "Let us stand to the judgment and decision of antiquity, and embrace that saying of the Nicene Fathers, as if it came from an oracle, let the ancient customs be observed."—*Bp. Montague Pref. to App. ad orig. Eccles.*

"Whilst men do labour to bring into discredit the ancient Fathers and primitive Churches, they derogate from themselves such credit as they hunt after, and as much as in them lieth, bring many parts of religion into wonderful uncertainty.—*Bp. Overal's Convocation Book, p. 191.*

"Although scripture is the most certain and safe rule of belief, yet there being no less veracity in the tongues than in the hands, in the preachings than the writings of the apostles; nay *prior sermo quàm liber, prior sensus quàm stylus*, saith Tertullian, the apostles preached before they writ, planted Churches before they addressed epistles to them; on these grounds I make no scruple to grant that apostolical traditions, such as are truly so, as well as apostolical writings, are equally the matter of that Christian's belief, who is equally secured by the fidelity of the conveyance, that as one is apostolical writing, so the other is apostolical tradition."—*Dr. Hammond's Disc. of Heresy.*

"If any other matters not yet received or practised in our Church, should be found to be of equal antiquity and universality, I declare it to be my hearty desire that they also may be restored: for I am well assured, that from the beginning of the gospel of Christ, to the time of the council of Nice, and long after, during the fourth century, the Catholic Church all over the world was united in one holy doctrine, discipline, and manner of worship."—*Dr. Brett's Introduction to his Independency of the Church, p. 7.*

"During the first five centuries, the Church then pure and flourishing, taught unmixed the faith which the apostles had preached."—*Whitaker on Antichrist, p. 51.*

would have been easy to add a hundred more, from St. Augustine, St. Vincent of Lerins, the 318 bishops of the great council of Nice, St. Chrysostom, St. Epiphanius, St. Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, St. Irenæus, all decisive upon the authority of tradition.

Let us stop at the second century; and shew by contemporary writers, that the doctrine and practice of the Church at that period, were the same as those of the first century.* St. Clement of Alexandria, testifies that "Some of those who had immediately succeeded the apostles, and preserved the tradition of their doctrine, had lived even to this time, in order to

"This general consent of our so profoundly judicious Protestants, in appealing unto the primitive Church for the space of the first four hundred and forty years after Christ, thus acknowledged by our adversaries, may well serve for a just reproof of their slander, who usually upbraid Protestants with contempt of all antiquity: for here even old Rome is commended. Protestants are so far from suffering the limitation of the first 440 years, that they give the Romanists the scope of the first 500 or 600 years, as our adversaries themselves do acknowledge."—*Morton's Catholic Appeal for Protestants*. Edit. London, 1610, book 4, chap. 30, page 573.

"It cannot be doubted," says the learned Usher, "that St. Patrick had a peculiar veneration for the church of Rome, whence he had been sent to labour in the conversion of our island; and I myself had I lived at that time, should have submitted as willingly to the judgment of that church, as to that of any other in the world: so sacred is the esteem which I cherish for the integrity of that church in those happy days." (At the end of *Usher's Religion of the Irish*, p. 87, of the 5th century—epoch of St. Patrick.

These will suffice: but you may find thirty other authorities in *Wix's Reflections*, 2d edition, London, 1819.

*It would be easy to prove, from your best divines, that the doctrine of the apostles was taught in its integrity, down to the 5th century inclusively. Besides the passages of Usher, Morton, and Whitaker just quoted, I could cite many others produced by Mr. Wix. The common opinion of your able theologians is, that the first four general councils ought to be received, and the doctrine of the same space of time considered as apostolical. This observation overturns the first principle laid down by Mr. Faber in his preface, where he requires in proof of apostolicity, a chain of witnesses uninterrupted up to the apostles themselves. I could

scatter and cultivate the seed of the true faith." What St. Clement testified with regard to Egypt, analogy allows us to suppose for several other churches; such for instance, as that of Smyrna, whose bishop, St. Polycarp, martyred at the age of a hundred, in 166, had actually been a disciple of St. John. "God," as I observed in the *Discussion Amicale*, v. I. p. 194, in his designs of protection for his Church, permitted that in the midst of persecutions and dangers, some few of these primitive and holy bishops, should have their career protracted to a very advanced age; and as heretofore in the beginning of the world, the patriarchs by means of their long lives, transmitted more easily to posterity what they had learned from their fathers of the creation of the world, the dogmas of religion, and the principal traits of the antediluvian history, so in the Christian dispensation, these venerable old men served to bear witness that their faith was exactly the same, which they had received from the apostles or their immediate disciples." Tertullian informs us by what means the doctrine of the apostles was preserved in the various churches. I cannot help placing before you a very curious passage on this subject. "*According to the order prescribed for all the churches, councils are assembled in certain parts of Greece, where the most important affairs are discus-*

oblige him, by the superior authority of his own masters in theology, from the first apologist of your reformation Jewel, down to the doctors of our own times, to admit as apostolical the doctrine of the 3d, 4th, and 5th centuries. But I will not rigorously assert my rights, and he ought to thank me for my forbearance. I attach myself to one of his opinions, page 32, where he acknowledges that the doctrine of the second century was truly that of the apostles: let us be satisfied with this, and endeavour to make him also satisfied. Among the witnesses of the 2d century, I reckon St. Cyprian, born about the year 190, converted by the aged Cecilius—Origen, born about 165—Tertullian, born about 160—St. Clement of Alexandria, about 151—St. Irenæus, about 120—Theophilus of Antioch, about 115—St. Justin in the year 103.

sed in common; and this representation of the whole Christian name obtains among us the greater veneration.”* From this institution resulted that kind of *consanguinity* in doctrine, which existed, as he says in his usual energetic manner, among all the churches, of the Christian world. Does he not likewise refer those, who wished to know the tradition of the apostles, to the churches founded by them, such as Corinth, Ephesus, &c. See, he adds, what Rome has learned, “what she teaches, and the perfect harmony between her doctrine, and that of the churches of Africa.” “It is asked,” says he in another place, whether no tradition is to be admitted but what is written”—this is precisely the idea sometimes affected by Mr. Faber; and here follows its refutation—“To begin with baptism; when we go down into the water, we protest in the Church and under the hand of the bishop, that we renounce Satan, his pomps and his angels: then we are plunged three times, answering something more than our Saviour prescribed in the gospel. When we come out of the water, we taste a mixture of milk and honey; and from that time we abstain for a week from our daily bath. The Sacrament of the Eucharist, ordained by our Saviour at supper, and for all, we take in our assemblies before daylight, and only from the hand of him who officiates; we offer for the dead; we celebrate annually the natiivities of the martyrs. You ask me some law of the scriptures for these usages and others like them; you will find no such law. But we produce you tradition which adds them, custom which confirms them, and faith which practices them.”†

No doubt Tertullian extolled with reason the faith of the churches founded by the apostles, when he

*Treatise on Fasting, ch. 13. To these councils here spoken of by Tertullian, our learned Usher refers with equal sagacity and justice the most ancient apostolic canons. See what he says of them in Cotelier, No. 8, T. 1, p. 430.

† Lib. de Corona, n. 3, 4.

directed persons desirous of knowing what doctrine had been revealed, to such of the churches as were nearest to him. But St. Irenæus, before him, had rendered the most glorious homage to the see of St. Peter; eminent above all others, when he declared* “that all the churches in the world should be in good understanding and accordance with that of Rome, where the tradition derived from the apostles is preserved in its integrity.” Thus the particular councils which, according to the first quotation from Tertullian, were held in Greece, *according to the rule established from the time of the apostles*, and the teaching of the Roman Church, the centre of all churches, according to St. Irenæus, were the powerful motives which preserved all the faithful in unity of faith and episcopal government.

I will conclude this digression on the second century by Hegesippus, who in his old age wrote at Rome, in 176, under Pope Eleutherius. That Pope succeeded Soter, and Hegesippus had seen him the deacon of Anicetus. Hegesippus had travelled from Jerusalem into Greece and the islands, had conversed with a great number of bishops, and testifies in a fragment preserved by Eusebius, (*Hist. Eccl. lib. 4.*) “that in every Church was held the self-same doctrine, which is contained in the law, in the prophets, and in the preaching of our Saviour.

Although Mr. Faber, p. 32, acknowledges the doctrine of the second century to be apostolical, I have thought myself bound to place again before you, decisive proofs and undeniable testimonials of it. I have thought it the more necessary to fix your ideas, and confirm them upon this important point, as those of the Rector are wavering; and if he appears, at p. 32, to admit the authority of the second century, he seems elsewhere to reject altogether the tradition of the

*Lib. 3, contra Hæres, ch. 3.

primitive Church. Without looking farther than page 35, he will hear nothing of decisions, either of Rome or of any other councils. He will have the Holy Scriptures to be the sole judge of controversies.—“As no one pretends,” says he, “that we possess any other written, and therefore any other certain revelation; we must evidently begin with rejecting every doctrine and every practice built upon such doctrine, which have clearly no foundation in Holy Scripture.” Thus apostolical tradition in this place goes for nothing: but to whom does it belong to interpret the Holy Scripture? Is it to be delivered up to private judgment, to the insulated opinion of each individual? This was Luther’s resolution: he proclaimed for all, the liberty which he had claimed for himself. Without such liberty indeed his reformation would never have advanced a step. But he was not long without tasting the bitter fruits, which it brought him. He thundered and blushed at the divisions among his followers; but did not put a stop to them. They have never ceased to succeed one another, and tear Protestantism to pieces. All have sprung from the same principle, and keep continually issuing from it, like mushrooms from the earth, as Mr. Faber himself expresses it. In a word, this principle, which gave life and increase to the reformation, has progressively brought on its decline; and will infallibly cause its death. Mr. Faber sees it, and curses its fatal and inevitable effects: let us mark well this acknowledgment. Would Heaven, that his brethren and superiors would lift up their voices with him to sound the same warning throughout England! But when a principle is acknowledged to be thus monstrously abusive, it is not enough to deplore it; they should have courage enough to renounce its consequences. The first of these, not to mention others in this place, was *schism*. Let then the Established Church return without delay

to unity. This must be; or the sects she has produced will soon be the death of their mother.

Mr. Faber assures us that the principle of private judgment was not that of Parker and his colleagues. How then did they raise themselves to the head of the ecclesiastical government? Was it not in opposition to the discipline universally established; in opposition to their spiritual superiors, and in open revolt against them, and the canons of the Church? It was then by exalting their private opinions above the doctrine universally received. The Rector calls those reformers wise and venerable, whom he beholds nevertheless enthroned in sees, which were not vacant, but occupied by a right, which violence could neither give nor take away, by bishops who sacrificed their temporal interests to the duties of conscience, and the divine and ecclesiastical laws of episcopal government. Mr. Faber is in admiration at the conduct of these intruders, p. 40—he proposes it as a model in preference to the decrees of general councils.* A miserable and anticanonical convocation of certain minds groveling before the temporal power, and in rebellion against the Church constitutes an authority with him; and all the bishops of the Catholic Church in his eyes possess none! Can you conceive, sir, a blindness, a delirium equal to this? Can the perversion of reason go farther? How strong then must be the power of early education, of self-love, party spirit and prejudice, even in minds of superior cultivation! But O God! what will those ministers answer at thy tribunal on a future day, who have led their people astray by such instructions!

However, let us see what these “wise and venerable reformers,” these great models of Mr. Faber’s, did at their convocation in 1562. According to him,

*“Nothing ought to be more venerable upon earth than the decision of a true œcumenical council.”—*Leibnitz, Letter to the Dutchess of Brunswick, July 2, 1694.*

when the Holy Scriptures did not give them sufficient light, they had recourse to the primitive Church. I know perfectly well that they did no such thing; but let the Rector's assertion pass: and since he recommends the imitation of this pretended example, here we are once more led back by himself to the primitive Church. Now at least let us endeavour to keep him to it. After the repugnance he has but too often manifested towards it, he seems now to return to it in good earnest, against his will it would appear, but carried on by a force which is irresistible. At page 42, he mentions among the doctors of the primitive Church, Justin, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen and Cyprian; and adds as follows: "The several writers here enumerated, though but few out of many, form a chain, which reaches up to St. John and the apostles. Hence, if we can be morally certain of any thing, we may be sure, that, in their exposition of scripture, so far as the great leading doctrines of Christianity are concerned, they would proceed, either on direct apostolic authority, or at least according to the then universally known analogy of apostolic faith." And further on, he says, "Where in her yet existing documents, the primitive Church is explicit, we must, so far as I can judge, on the principles of right reason, submit ourselves to her decision."

Then it is proved, agreed, and decided between us that the doctrine of the second century was conformable to that of the first, and is known to us by the writings of St. Cyprian, Origen, Tertullian, St. Clement of Alexandria, St. Irenæus and St. Justin. This is amply sufficient, sir, to enable you to pronounce with safety upon the questions between us. For if you will be at the pains of looking once more into my *Discussion Amicale*, you will see that the traditionary proofs of dogmas and practices, which I defend, reach up at least to the second century, by means of one or other of the very writers whom the Rector has just

selected, and whom I regard as well as himself as undeniable witnesses of all that was believed and practised in their times. From this you will conclude, that if he had reasoned consistently with himself, he would have found himself obliged to agree with my book; since he acknowledges that every doctrine or practice which ascends to the second century, without any known origin posterior to that period, must be apostolical.

But pray explain to me, my dear sir, what Mr. Faber means, for I cannot understand him, when he pretends that the proof of tradition, "as employed by the Bishop of Aire is a mere fallacy, the detection of which is not very difficult"—page 33—and when he supposes that "I would carry the chain down to the present time," through a space of nineteen centuries: page 45. I confess that he is here quite incomprehensible. Nothing can be more simple than my reasoning, which is absolutely the same as his own, and that of every man of sense. In fact what have I to prove? The conformity of any given doctrine with that of the primitive Church; for instance, praying for the dead, confession, satisfaction, or the sign of the cross. Well, sir, am I to lose my time in extracting and accumulating testimony upon testimony, from age to age, from our own up to the apostles? Certainly I shall do no such thing; and for two reasons: 1st, because the belief of the last fourteen and fifteen centuries is not disputed, but rather accused of novelty and corruption. 2dly, because my proofs do not derive force from the intermediate generations, but powerfully from the primitive ages. My belief ought to be founded upon that of the apostolic times; and the certainty that they could not have been deceived is also my security. Leaving therefore what is not disputed, I proceed straight to the fifth century, and by the fathers who attest the doctrine of their time, I prove that such an article was then taught and believed. In

the same manner I pass to the fourth century, which abounds like the fifth with ecclesiastical documents. Following the same method, I arrive at the third century, and take advantage of similar authorities which I find there, and which, though less numerous, are sufficiently so for my purpose. Thus I come to St. Cyprian, Origen, Tertullian, St. Clement of Alexandria, St. Irenæus, St. Theophilus of Antioch and St. Justin; and supported by these eminent personages, I enter triumphantly the second century, and repose at length with the Rector at the fountain of pure and apostolic doctrine. What can he discover in such a progress, which is unfair and fallacious?* If in my *Discussion Amicale* I have often quoted testimonies from the fifth, fourth, and third centuries, it was because I was reasoning at the time with able theologians of your communion, who comprise the first five centuries in the primitive Church. The Rector of Long Newton has chosen to mutilate and confine it by his own private authority to the second century. I now accommodate myself with as good grace as possible to this new fancy of the Rector's, though I see what has led him to it very clearly. He was no doubt sharp-sighted enough to perceive, and I confess such perception was just—that he would be more violently overthrown by the whelming force of the authorities which would crowd upon him from the centuries he has lopped off, in favour of the Catholic faith and in opposition to his own opinions.

This brings us to the third chapter; in which Mr. Faber proposes to answer two of my letters; and after all, answers neither. He gives a summary of certain arguments, which he supposes to be mine, but which

*“In this manner we can reason even at this day; and can thereby make Irenæus' and Tertullian's argument our own, provided we have first proved that the faith we contend for is the very same that obtained in the churches of that age.” *Waterland on Holy Trin.* p. 380.

are foreign to my meaning. If I sought to exhibit all his deficiencies in this chapter, it would be necessary to consume a hundred pages, to expose the five of which it consists. I will confine myself to the defence of what I wrote upon the sixth article of the convocation of 1562. He takes up its cause; and forgetting once more that he has just acknowledged the authority of apostolical tradition, at least to the end of the second century, he maintains here, with those whom he styles his profound and wise reformers, that the Holy Scripture contains all that is essential to salvation. If this be so—since I am compelled to use repetitions—what becomes of the necessity of baptism for infants, and the sanctification of Sunday? The Scripture says nothing about either; and yet the Rector admits both, equally with ourselves. What becomes even of the authenticity of Scripture? For this can only be proved by the testimony of the primitive Church; and you will soon see the Rector compelled, in spite of himself, to own it; thus, in the same page, he admits tradition; and rejects it, in favour of the sixth article of his profound and wise reformers.

It is the misfortune of those who take up a false position, to find themselves unavoidably assailed on all sides by difficulties. Tradition presented inextricable difficulties to the chief reformers; they exclaim, "Away with tradition! The Bible! the Bible alone!" and drew up their sixth article. They did not see, and the Rector who defends them does not see, that new and insoluble objections are the only result. In fact, they there lay down as a fundamental principle, that the scriptures contain all that is necessary for salvation. This principle, unless they drew it gratuitously from their own heads, ought to have been derived from the Scripture. If so, let the Rector prove it to us: let him produce one single text, where any one of the inspired writers teaches that we may confine ourselves, both for faith and practice, to what is writ-

ten; one solitary place, where he declares that the Scripture delivers all that the apostles taught; or if you will, all that is essential to salvation. But where will he meet with such a passage, since we find one absolutely contrary, word for word. "Stand fast; and hold the traditions which you have learned, whether by word, or by our epistle." 2 *Thess.* ii. v. 14. You see the apostle distinguishes his verbal, from his epistolary instructions: he prescribes to the Thessalonians, to keep both equally; to observe the doctrines which he had given them in words, and those which he had delivered in writing.

The Rector replies that this held good at the time; for, "when that epistle was written, most certainly *not all* the four gospels had been published. . . . It is no very chimerical supposition, that the matters, verbally delivered by St. Paul, were afterward, in the course of God's providence, committed to faithful writing. Whence it would follow, that the position contained in the sixth article of the angelican Church, though not strictly true when the apostle wrote his second letter to the Thessalonians, may yet, in the sixteenth century, have been an incontrovertible verity." This subterfuge is not without subtility, and even address, if you would so have it.* It is only a pity that it wants solidity: it betrays the Rector's embarrassment, and but helps him a little out of it, to throw him into contradiction with the Fathers, with the best theologians of his own Church, and even with himself.

The holy Fathers had the New Testament in their hands, as well as ourselves; and yet they did not cease to insist on the necessity of admitting the apostolical traditions, and to establish the obligation of so doing,

* It is borrowed from Stillingfleet's *Scripture and Tradition Compared*; from Dr. Patrick, Bishop of Ely, *Discourse on Tradition*; and from Dr. Williams, Bishop of Chichester, *Exam. of Texts, &c.*—See *Preservative against Popery*, vol. I. Edit. London, in folio—1738.

upon this very passage of St. Paul to the Thessalonians. St. Chrysostom comments upon it thus: "We see by this that the apostles did not write every thing; but taught many things by word of mouth only. But whatever way they come to us from them, we are equally obliged to believe them. Let us believe the tradition of the Church; it ought to be enough to move us to believe—to know that it is a tradition."* "I should consume the whole day," says St. Basil, "were I to recount to you all the mysteries transmitted to the Church, without the Scripture. . . . Among the dogmas of the Church, there are some contained in the Scriptures, and others come from tradition; and both *have equal force*, with regard to our pious veneration. For it would be mortally wounding the gospel, to regard traditions as things of little authority."† Yet, this Mr. Faber does; according to St. Basil, he mortally wounds the gospel, by rejecting all that is not written. "We do not find all in the Scripture," says St. Epiphanius, "because the apostles, who have left us many things in writing, have also left us others by tradition."‡ St. Epiphanius, then, was far from teaching that all verbal instructions were finally recorded in the New Testament; and among others, those which were to be observed, according to the precept of St. Paul. Call to mind in this place, sir, the most illustrious example of antiquity, that of the council of Nice. Eusebius, who had been a member of it, testifies, "that the bishops opposed the false subtilities of the Arians, by the grand truths of the Scriptures, and *the ancient belief of the Church, from the Apostles to that time.*" And Gelasius informs us, that after having a long time, maturely and fully considered this adorable

* St. Chrysost. *Serm. on the 2d Ep. to the Thess. ch. 2.*

† *On the Holy Spirit, ch. 27*, on the same passage of St. Paul.

‡ *Heres. 75*, where you see *verbal* traditions distinguished from *written* traditions, long after the publication of the New Testament.

subject—the divinity of Christ—it appeared to all ours at once, that the consubstantiality of the Word ought to be defined as of faith, in the same manner as this faith *had been transmitted to us by our holy Fathers after the Apostles.*

The Rector and his sixth article, are no better in accord with your learned theologians, than with the 318 bishops of the council of Nice. He that will not submit to the current evidence of the ancient liturgies, Fathers and councils, may bring into controversy, not to mention other things received by the Church in all ages, the divine authority of the inspired writings, infant baptism, episcopacy, the Lord's day, and even the divinity of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ; and so, at once blow up the Catholic faith and Church.”*

In ecclesiastical history, and there only, I may say, is the decision of all controverted points in divinity, either as to doctrine or discipline. For every one of them must be determined by matters of fact. It is not refining, and criticisms, and our notions of things, but what that faith was, which at the first was delivered to the saints. This is matter of fact, and must be determined by evidence. And where any text of the New Testament is disputed, the best evidence is from those Fathers of the Church, who lived in the apostolic age, and learned the faith from the mouths of the apostles themselves, such as St. Clement, Ignatius, Polycarp, &c. These must best know the sense and meaning of the words delivered by the apostles. And next to them, they to whom they did deliver the same, and so on through the several ages of the Church, to this day. And those doctrines, and that government of the Church, which has this evidence, must be the truth. And they who refuse to be determined by this rule, are justly to be suspected; nay, they give evidence against themselves, that they are departed from

* *Dr. Hicks on the Christian Priesthood, vol. I, p. 145.*

the truth.”* Those who admit the canon of Scripture, upon the testimony of the Fathers, will find themselves hard put to it for a reason why they reject the very same testimony in the case of church government. For, to admit their testimony in one case, and to reject it in another, equally clear and universal, is to play fast and loose, and to act upon no principles at all.”† “As to the matter in hand, the defender’s persuasion is this: 1. Where there is any plain opposition between Scripture and tradition—there, the Scripture must be followed. 2. That no such plain contradiction is to be found, where tradition appears early and general. 3. That tradition is *necessary to explain some passages of Scripture, where the sense is not clear and indisputable*, (and what is there that men will not dispute?) and that without this supplemental assistance, neither the necessity of infant baptism, nor the obligation to keep Sunday, can be made out. 4. That without tradition, we cannot prove the Old and New Testament to be the word of God,” &c.‡ “The admitting such a secondary proof, (tradition,) in this case, is not derogating from Scripture authority, but is confirming and strengthening it in more views than one.”§ “There would scarcely be the smallest doubt that this doctrine of the Scripture, on the sacrifice, came down from the apostles, and that, consequently, it was necessary to hold to it, even though we should find not a word for it in the writings of the prophets and apostles; for the precept of St. Paul is universal—My brethren, stand firm, and hold fast the traditions which you have learned, whether by word of mouth, or by our epistles.”||

I am happy in being able to quote to the Rector of

* *Mr. Leslie Dis. concern. Eccl. Hist.* p. 2 and 3.

† *Mr. Reeve’s Pref. concerning the right use of the Fathers*, vol. 1, p. 16.

‡ *Collier’s Vindication*, part 1, p. 2 and 3.

§ *Waterland on the H. Trinity*, p. 401.

|| *Dr. Grabe on a passage of St. Irenæus*.

Long Newton, the very doctor from whom he has borrowed what I have called a subterfuge. You shall hear, then, Dr. Patrick, Bishop of Ely. The following is from his discourse on tradition: "For in all this Christians are agreed, that whatsoever was delivered by Christ from God the Father, or by the apostles from Christ, is to be embraced and firmly retained, whether it be written or not written; that makes no difference at all, if we can be certain it came from him or them. For what is contained in the Holy Scripture hath not its authority because it is written, but because it came from God. If Christ said a thing, it is enough; we ought to submit to it: but we must first know that he said it; and let the means of knowing it be what they will, if we can certainly know he said it, we yield to it."* And at the end of the first part of his discourse:

"Whatever is delivered to us by our Lord Jesus Christ and his apostles, we receive as the word of God, which we think is sufficiently declared in the Holy Scriptures. But if any one can certainly prove by any authority equal to that which brings the Scriptures to us, that there is any thing else delivered by them, we receive that also. The controversy will soon be at an end: we are ready to embrace it, when any such thing can be produced.

"Nay we have that reverence for those who succeeded the apostles, that what they have unanimously delivered to us as the sense of any doubtful place, we receive it and seek no farther.

"In short, *traditions* we do receive, but not all that are called by that name. Those, which have sufficient authority; but not those, which are imposed upon us by the sole authority of one particular church, assuming a power over all the rest.†"

* Introduction, parag. iv. p. 8

† End of 1st part, parag. viii. p. 26 and 27.

It is easy to see that this last stroke is directed against the particular Church of Rome, "with which, nevertheless, St. Irenæus declares, that all others ought to agree, on account of its acknowledged preeminence and authority." But Rome is not concerned here alone; and Dr. Patrick might well have abstained from wrongfully shewing hostility and injustice towards her. He requires, before he considers himself obliged to admit any tradition, the proof of its being apostolical; here he is right. And the proof which Tertullian, St. Basil, St. Augustin, and St. Vincent of Lerins, gave to the heretics of their times, we also give to our separated brethren in England and elsewhere. When they saw an article of faith, of discipline, or practice generally established in the Church, they attributed its origin to the teaching of the apostles; provided, however, that no more recent beginning of it was known. In fact, it is impossible to assign any other cause to such unanimity.

Mr. Faber is so good as to make me the following "large concession," as he terms it: "Let his Lordship prove that the traditions of the modern Latin Church, are the identical verbal traditions of St. Paul, and the Anglican Church, I feel assured, will forthwith receive them." He must allow me to tell him, that such a sentence leads me to wish that he possessed a fund of sounder theology. First, because the present Latin Church does not, and even cannot, admit of any other apostolical traditions, than those, which were admitted in the age of St. Augustin. Secondly, because it is not according to right notions of theology, to distinguish in the preaching of the apostles, the teaching of St. Peter, of St. Paul, of St. Matthew, or of any others in particular. Let him consult his ancient masters; and he will learn from Dr. Stillingfleet, among others, that "We have all the reason in the world to believe that the apostles delivered one and the same faith to all the churches, having the same

infallible spirit to direct them.”* This sameness of teaching, is the source of oral and apostolical traditions; to that must be attributed, all that is uniformly found in all the Christian liturgies of the fifth century, prayer for the dead, confession, satisfaction, &c. I have developed the proofs of this, in my *Discussion Amicale*.

Allow me to present you one more quotation at the end of those already drawn from your own theologians. It may perhaps be a little bitter to you to hear the first of your apologists, the celebrated Jewel, thus express himself on the subject of tradition. “Although we have departed from that Church, which they call Catholic; . . . it is sufficient for us that we have departed from that Church, . . . which with our own eyes we plainly saw *had deviated from the holy Fathers*, and from the primitive and Catholic Church.—But we have approached, as near as possible, to the Church of the apostles of the ancient Catholic Bishops and Fathers, which we know was sound, and, as Tertullian says, a spotless virgin.”†

From this passage it follows that your Established Church separated from ours; that it made a schism between us; and why? Because according to Jewel, our Church had visibly departed from the Holy Fathers and the primitive Church. Then according to him, as well as in my belief, we must attach ourselves not to the Scriptures alone, but also, and according to the precept of St. Paul, to the oral traditions known by the teaching of the Holy Fathers; we must separate from those who separate from the faith and practice of the primitive Church. This is precisely what I maintain against Mr. Faber; whilst he holds against Bishop Jewel and myself, that it is sufficient to be guided exclusively by the Scripture.

* *Stillingfleet's Sermon on Tradition.*

† *Jewel's Apology, section x.—Campbell's Translation.*

In his celebrated sermon at St. Paul's Cross in 1550, three years before the publication of his Apology, Jewel exclaimed thus: "O Gregory! O Augustin! O Jerome! O Chrysostom! O Leo! O Dionysius! O Anacletus! &c. . . . If we be deceived herein, ye are they that have deceived us. You have taught us these schisms and divisions, you have taught us these heresies." After this, enumerating at length the controverted points on the Eucharist, he denies that in the first six centuries, the real presence, the change of substance, the adoration of Jesus Christ present under the species of bread and wine were ever taught; and continues in these words: "If any man alive were able to prove any of these articles, by any one clear or plain clause or sentence, either of the Scriptures, or of the old doctors, or of any old general council, or by any example of the primitive Church. . . . I speak not this in vehemency of spirit, or heat of talk, but even as before God, by the way of simplicity and truth; . . . if any one of all our adversaries be able to avouch any one of all these articles, by any such sufficient authority of Scriptures, doctors or councils, as I have required, as I said before, so say I now again, I am content to yield unto him, and to subscribe." Is this, I beseech you, the language of a man who believes that the Scriptures contain all that is necessary to salvation? Will Mr. Faber hold such language? Will he who has read in the *Discussion Amicale* texts so clear and numerous on the real presence, the change of substance and the adoration, engage with me to subscribe upon one single testimony of the Fathers, to all the rest of the Catholic doctrine? In the place of Bishop Jewel would not he have expressed himself rather as follows:—
 "Leave all your troublesome quotations from the Fathers: shew me your Eucharistic mysteries in the Bible. You will not find a syllable about them in the whole New Testament. This utter silence proves

two things; first, that you are wrong in your ideas of the real presence, since these immediate consequences of it are no where to be found; secondly, that they cannot in any case claim our assent, since all articles of faith ought to be found in the Scriptures, and there they are not." But Jewel holds quite another language. A Catholic Doctor could not express himself more energetically on a subject of pure oral tradition, or with more veneration on the authority of the Holy Fathers. He was not therefore of the opinion of those, who two years later drew up the sixth article. Jewel, it is true, had a seat in their assembly: he ought even to have been the soul of them, as he was the ablest of them all. How then came he to permit such an article to be composed? How came he still further to subscribe it? It is no business of mine to make him appear consistent with himself,* but I flat-

*Mr. Faber is much dissatisfied with the anecdote I have related of Bishop Jewel in the *Discussion Amicale*, vol. 2, p. 135. He does not consider it worthy of credit. I will remark, that it is related by Dr. Smith, Bishop of Chalcedon, who printed it in 1654, at the age of 87 years, and who therefore was born in 1567, three years at least before the death of Jewel, which took place September 22d, 1571. This Dr. Smith venerated by all who knew him, after a long and saintly career, left behind him a singular reputation for virtue and piety. Such a character could not be suspected of falsehood. He had printed the anecdote first in 1614, when the two Catholic Lords were still living from whom he had received it, and also the physician, Dr. Twin, who had told it to these two Lords, as he had heard it from Genebrand, the chaplain of Jewel, to whom the Bishop when dying had confided it.

In 1614 it would have been easy and natural to contradict this narration. But Mr. Faber comes too late at this time of day to call it in question. He has no proofs whatever to weigh against the authority of the pious and venerable Dr. Smith, and justify him in accusing the good Bishop either of imposture or credulity in believing or publishing such a calumny. For the rest, Jewel, brought up a Catholic, became a concealed Protestant under Henry VIII. a declared friend of the Zwinglian Peter Martyr, under Edward VI. a Catholic under Mary for a short time, a Zwinglian during his stay in Germany, and Episcopalian in fine under Elizabeth, from whom he did not scruple to accept the see of Salisbury.—

ter myself that neither Mr. Faber nor any other will henceforth attempt to defend the sixth article, and support its doctrine.

What appears particularly to embarrass and chagrin Mr. Faber, is that he finds himself compelled to have recourse to tradition at the very time when he has just pronounced it of no use. For being soon obliged to express himself upon the canon of the Scriptures, he speaks thus; page 51—"In the judgment of the Bishop, tradition is of such vital importance, that the very canon of Scripture itself depends upon it. By renouncing, therefore, the tradition of the Latin Church, we effectively invalidate the authority of the canon of Scripture." Admire the candour of the Rector. Without appearing so to do, he dexterously makes me substitute the tradition of the *Latin Church*, which I never once mentioned, for the *universal tradition*, which is the sole subject of the present question. "One might almost imagine," he adds, "that our Latin brethren deemed us altogether ignorant of the very existence of the early ecclesiastical writers." No, sir, we imagine no such thing; they are in your hands: we only lament that you after all abandon them. Is not primitive tradition composed in fact from their writings and testimonies? Did you not receive from their hands the canon of the Scriptures? You are ready yourselves to assure us that you did so: "we resort not to the naked dogmatical authority of the see of Rome"—you tell us with a tone of harshness, and a want of politeness more in character with the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries than with our own—"but to the sufficient evidence borne to that effect in the yet existing docu-

He was possessed of much information considering the age in which he lived, and the shortness of his life. It has been said of him, from his writings and conduct, that he had a good memory, but little judgment.

ments of the primitive Church." Undoubtedly; and this is what I have often represented to you. You ought then in prudence to have given up your sixth article: you ought not to have set out with declaring the Scripture alone sufficient for salvation; and that the instructions verbally given by the apostles had been afterwards inserted in the writings subsequently published by them. You ought not to have said, at the very time when you were forced to observe yourself the precept of St. Paul, that it did not apply to us, and was even inapplicable very soon after it was given. In fine, you ought not to have maintained with so much assurance that the Scripture was all-sufficient, at the moment when you were seeking for apostolical instructions in the Fathers, and apart from the Scripture, to prove even its authenticity. Save yourself, if you can, from the charge of self-contradiction; and look out, if you please, some other than me to make you consistent with yourself.

PART THE SECOND.

ON THE HOLY EUCHARIST.

CHAPTER THE FIRST.

When I received a letter addressed to me by the Rev. G. S. Faber, Dec. 20, 1825, I imagined that I should find him a man of learning well versed in theological science, in the reading and doctrine of the Fathers of the Church; an ecclesiastic the friend of peace, deploring like myself the fatal separation effected in the sixteenth century, by a policy as blind as it was interested; a pastor disposed to unite his efforts with mine to re-unite Christians but too long separated, and to bring back to the bosom of unity, hearts formed for a mutual good understanding, for loving each other, and conjointly strengthening upon earth the kingdom of our divine Saviour. O flattering hopes and charitable anticipations, why did you so quickly vanish? Why at the very first reading did my antagonist's work present only a mass of imaginary *Difficulties*, laid to the charge of what he chooses to call *Romanism*? Why so much gall discharged upon the *Discussion Amicale*, and mixed with so many unmerited praises of its author, whom he does not know? That Mr. Faber is an able writer, I am quite disposed to think; that he is much followed as a preacher, I can readily believe; but that he is a judicious and pacific controvertist I can boldly deny; and, sir, you will soon be of my conviction by pursuing with me his discussion on the Holy Eucharist.

I. He begins by laying down the question as he understands it; page 52.—“The disagreement between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, in regard to the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, chiefly respects the supposed process denominat- ed *transubstantiation*. . . . Here, if I mistake not, is the main disagreement between the two churches. With respect to the doctrine of the real presence, they both hold it.” If the Rector were speaking of the doctrine taught in England for one hundred years, or thereabouts, from the reformation of Elizabeth down to 1662, I should be entirely of his opinion; for during that time the real presence was the most pre- valent doctrine. “The King,” as Bishop Andrews testifies in his answer to Card. Bellarmine’s Apology, “the King (James 1st) acknowledges Jesus to be truly present, and truly *to be adored* in the Eucharist.” I also with St. Ambrose “adore the flesh of Christ in the mysteries.” (Bishop Andrews, ch. 8, p. 194.) Would Mr. Faber hold such language? “The most sensible Protestants,” says Bishop Forbes, (*de Eucha- ristia* I. 2, c. 2, § 9,) “do not doubt that Christ is to be adored in the Eucharist. For in the reception of the Eucharist, Christ is to be adored with the true worship of *latria*. ’Tis a monstrous error of the rigid Protes- tants, who deny that Christ is to be adored in the Eu- charist, except only with an inward adoration of the mind, but not with any outward act of adoration; as kneeling or other like posture of the body.” Yet is not Mr. Faber obliged by the existing rubric, to teach *this monstrous error*?

“I suppose,” says the learned Mr. Thorndike, (Epil. I. 3, c. 30, p. 350.) “the body and blood of Christ may be adored, wheresoever they are; and must be adored by a good Christian, where the cus- tom of the Church, which a Christian is obliged to communicate with, requires it. And is not the pre- sence thereof in the Sacrament of the Eucharist a

just occasion presently to express, by that bodily act of adoration, that inward honour which we always carry towards our Lord Christ, as God? Mr. Faber would exclaim, take care how you hold such an opinion."

I might here also quote Ridley, Hooker, Casaubon, Montague, Taylor, and Cosin.* Such was at that time the doctrine of the most celebrated theologians of the Church of England: they adored Jesus Christ in the Eucharist, because they believed him there present.

II. With the year 1662 we are introduced to a new epoch. We find your church solemnly proscribing the adoration of the Eucharist.† By a necessary consequence of this sacrilegious proscription, the Calvinistic opinion is introduced into the kingdom, it reaches through the schools, and is heard in the pulpits of the established Church. And in fact, if the adoration necessarily supposes the presence; explain it as you will, the presence obliges also the adoration.‡

*See the *Discussion Amicale*, T. 1. pp. 314, 315, 316, and *Essay towards a proposal for Catholic Communion*, chap. 5.

†See the concluding notice of the Communion Service in the Book of Common Prayer.

‡Christum in actione cœnæ vere et substantialiter præsentem, in spiritu et veritate adorandum, nemo negat nisi qui cum sacramentariis vel negat, vel dubitat de presentia Christi in cœna. *Kemnitius* T. 2, Edit. Francofurt. p. 150, No. 4 Exam. Cone. Trid.

In 1670 the ministers of Strasbourg presented in a body to the magistrates a request by which they demanded, among other articles, that all who approached to the Lord's Supper should be required to receive it kneeling; they instanced the example of the Church in Saxony, and gave as a motive the faith of the real presence, adding that if, according to the expression of St. Paul, "every knee should bow at the name of Jesus," much more should it be done before his sacred person.

Zwinglius could not comprehend how those who believe Jesus Christ to be present, can escape the guilt of sin in not adoring him (*In Exer. Euch. ad Luther.*) Calvin declares loudly, and Beza after him, that it always appeared to him most conclusive to say, that if Jesus Christ be present in the bread, he is there to be adored. *Nos*

From the moment it is forbidden to adore, it is equally unlawful to believe Jesus Christ present in the Eucharist. We must then pass with Mr. Faber to that kind of change, which he presents us with so much self-complacency, that *moral change*, which consecrates the bread and wine, it is true, for a religious ceremony, but leaves them untouched in their substance. Thus the Sacrament will exhibit nothing but empty and material symbols, and we must only speak of it as an inanimate figure without any reality; for, I beseech you, what is a figurative presence, but a *real absence*?

You who have rejected with your Church, the adoration of Jesus Christ in his Sacrament; you, who with her, condemn it as a shameful idolatry, how can you come forth and tell us, that you are agreed with us on the real presence? Ah! sir, if you were convinced of this holy presence, you would be seized with awe and trembling on approaching the holy table; you would annihilate yourself before your God, veiled under the sacramental species, but revealed to your faith; you would receive him with every testimony of profound and lively adoration; and after the humble centurion of the gospel, you would say with your forefathers, with ours, and with us, "O Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldst enter under my roof; but say only the word, and my soul shall be healed." This was the language of your country, for eleven hundred years. You can no longer hold and pronounce it with the sentiment and attitude of adoration! Alas! for you it exists no longer—I do not say upon the altar, since you proscribe the very name and idea, but upon the table of

semper sic rationati sumus: si Christus est in pane, esse sub pane adorandum. (con. Luther.) But neither Calvin and his disciples, nor Mr. Faber and the modern Church of England men, adore Christ in the Sacrament: therefore they do not believe him there present, however strong, and as it were, Catholic, may be the expressions, which they often affect to use.

the Lord's Supper;—you have nothing but bread and wine. The body of Jesus Christ, you say, is become a stranger to earth and her forsaken inhabitants, since it has been in heaven. Adoration, therefore, in you, would be real idolatry. Thus, Mr. Faber is mistaken when he assigns transubstantiation as the fundamental point of opposition between his Church and ours. He ought to have assigned the doctrine of the *real presence*, by reducing the first and principal question between Catholics and modern members of the Church of England, to the following terms: *Is the body of Christ really present in the Eucharist, or is it not?* This question, moreover, holds the first rank, from its very high importance. In fact, the conviction of the real presence, gives to the faith of the true Catholic, an impulse perfectly sublime; and then it calls him back to the acknowledgment of his own lowliness, of his profound unworthiness, and concentrates all his powers in silent adoration. To him, it is a source of the most delightful emotions, and at the same time a principle of spiritual strength, of love, joy, consolation and hope: in fine, it transports him above all terrestrial things; and in some measure, deifies him upon earth. Tell, me, candidly, sir, has the cold and lifeless opinion of the figure ever produced, or can it ever produce any thing like this?

It is sufficiently strange that a man persuaded of the real absence of the body of Jesus Christ from the sacrament, should take any great interest in the transubstantiation. Does any one torment himself to discover the mode of a thing's existence, which he does not believe to exist at all? To what purpose would a man dispute of the manner in which the prodigy of the real presence is effected, if all the while he disavowed the belief of a real presence? Even if the Rector should successfully demonstrate to Catholics, that the change of substance in the Eucharist is inadmissible, he would not thereby prove that the reality of the presence is

also inadmissible. He would still have to combat and overturn the Lutheran opinion. For the real presence is understood in two ways; either by the change of the substance of bread, into the substance of Christ's body, as the Catholics hold; or by the junction or union of the two substances, as the Lutherans contend. On the other hand, the same proofs which establish the doctrine of transubstantiation, demonstrate that of the real presence. As soon as the substance of the sacred body has taken place of the substance of bread, we must necessarily believe and adore Jesus Christ, under the figure and form of bread, under the sensible qualities of a substance which no longer exists. You perceive, sir, that the principal difference, and the greatest opposition between our Church and yours, is in the *real presence*. Transubstantiation is but secondary. It springs from the doctrine of the *reality*, but it follows, and never precedes it. By placing it in the foremost rank, the Rector has made a mistake very surprising in a theologian. He has badly stated the question, because he has erroneously conceived concerning the Holy Eucharist. He appears to have but confused ideas of our mysteries: and hence he has not perceived the principal opposition of the two churches, where it really exists; but has placed it where it is not.

III. At last, I arrive at two consoling pages, full of wise and judicious reflections.* I have read them, and read them again with great satisfaction; and I feel much pleasure in thus openly making the acknowledgment. Why are such pages so rarely found in the work to which I am replying? If it be truly painful, when we are labouring to reconcile two parties at variance, to find in one, hostile dispositions and difficulties raised in an arbitrary manner, it is delightful to hear both express the same sentiments on any question. Here Mr. Faber unites with us in censuring the temerity of those theologians, who inflated with vain

* pp. 54, 54.

science, and imposed upon by presumptuous suggestions of reason, imagine consequences absurd and contradictory in the doctrines of the real presence and transubstantiation.* He appears to address such vain and restless minds in these words of Ditton—"They must leave off this quibbling and disputing, and take whatever they find revealed in the gospel; remembering that the infinite wisdom and goodness can never possibly oblige them to believe any thing that is really absurd and contradictory, . . . yet they may be obliged to believe many things which unconquered prejudice may tell them are absurd and unreasonable, and which they may think to be so, by using themselves to judge of the ways of God too much by human rules and measures."†

With Cosin, Bishop of Durham, Mr. Faber acknowledges the possibility of the presence in several places, and with Forbes that of a change of substance. The first expresses himself as follows: "We confess with the Holy Fathers, that the manner is ineffable and unsearchable, that is, not to be enquired and searched into by reason, but to be believed by faith alone. For although it seems incredible, that in so great a distance of place, Christ's flesh should come to us to become our food; yet we must remember, how much the power of the Holy Spirit is above our understanding, and how foolish it is to measure his immensity by our capacity. But what our understanding comprehends not, let faith conceive."‡

Now you shall hear the second: "Many Protestants too boldly and dangerously deny that God has power to transubstantiate the bread into the body of Christ.

* It is plain that he alludes to several writers well known in England, among others to Tillotson.

† *Discourse concerning the Resurrect. of Jesus Christ.*—London, 1714, 2d Edition, Part I. sec. 4, p. 15.

‡ *Cosin Hist. Transub.* p. 36, sect. 5, n. 4.

'Tis true all own that what implies a contradiction cannot be done. But because, in particular, nobody certainly knows what is the essence of every thing, and consequently what implies a contradiction, and what not; 'tis, without question, a rashness in any to put limits to God's power. I approve the opinion of the divines of Wittenberg, who assert the power of God to be so great, that he can change the substance of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ.* These principles, which are equally those of the Rector, and Bishops Forbes and Cosin, are also quite conformable to those of Grotius, Leibnitz, Molanus, and your most learned countrymen, who would all have repeated that beautiful invocation of one of your bishops: "O God incarnate, how thou canst give us thy flesh to eat, and thy blood to drink! How thy flesh is meat indeed! How thou who art in heaven, art present on the altar! I can by no means explain. But I firmly believe it all, because thou hast said it; and I firmly rely on thy love; and on thy omnipotence to make good thy word, though the manner of doing it I cannot comprehend."†

Since the time of this religious and truly philosophical invocation, theology has sustained a terrible shock in your Church. Bishop Ken and Mr. Faber were brought up in quite opposite doctrines on the subject of the Eucharist; the former in the principle of *reality*, the latter in that of *figure*, which so far from inspiring its cold partisans with the sublime faith of the Bishop, would not even allow the Rector to admire it. Still let us congratulate him on his having rejected as rash and presumptuous the consequences, which many of his brethren have imputed to the Catholic doctrine, and censured the declamations with which their pulpits have been made to resound in that positive and deci-

* Bp. Forbes *De Euch.* l. 1, c. 2.

† Dr. Ken, *Bishop of Bath and Wells.*—*Exposition*, 1685.

sive tone, which imposes on minds incapable of fathoming metaphysical questions.

Mr. Faber, as I feel happy again to acknowledge, beheld the difficulty with a great deal of just discrimination when he reduced it to this simple question of fact: "Was transubstantiation revealed by Jesus Christ or not?" But he soon after without being aware of it, substitutes the dogma of the *real presence* for that of transubstantiation; for the greater part of his arguments are directed against the *reality*. I am induced to remark this, not so much to reproach him with it as to exhibit the want of accuracy in his ideas. For after all it is evident, that if there be no real presence, there can be no transubstantiation in the Eucharist. Let us now examine his proofs against the real presence. Hitherto it has been the usual course of divines to examine the promise made by Jesus Christ, before its accomplishment. Such is not the plan of the Rector: he returns to his usual method of inverting the order of his ideas. He enters upon the discussion of the scripture proofs by the words of institution; taking care however to discourse later of the promise which our Saviour had made long before hand. He must allow us to bring back things to their natural order: we will follow him afterwards in the inverted march, which he has chosen to adopt.

CHAPTER THE SECOND.

PROOFS FROM SCRIPTURE OF OUR DOCTRINES ON THE
HOLY EUCHARIST.

1. I think you will not require me to repeat to you at length the arguments developed in my first volume, from p. 250 to 279. Be so kind as to read again this portion of the *Discussion Amicale*. I content myself with presenting you a summary sketch of the arguments which prove that Jesus Christ had promised to give us, not the *figure*, but the *reality* of his sacred body.

1 He begins by reminding the Jews of the great miracle of the multiplication of the loaves, which had taken place before their eyes the preceding day, and which alone ought to have gained him their entire confidence. He reproaches them with their backwardness in confiding in him, and establishes his claim to their confidence. What is the meaning of this exordium, and this manner of opening himself to them imperfectly and by degrees? Whence comes it that he reminds them at every turn of the necessity of faith due to his character, his miracles, his heavenly origin and divinity? What is the object of these recommendations, precautions and preliminaries? What end has he in view, and what does he intend to propose to them? Certainly something extraordinary, and extremely difficult to receive. Let us attend to his words: "I am the living bread . . . if any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever: and the bread that I will give, is my flesh for the life of the world."* A

**St. John* vi. v. 51, 52.

declaration so strange, so far removed from human ideas, could not relate to a figurative eating, which is simple enough. The natural sense of the words as the Jews have just heard them, astonishes and confounds their minds. They judge it impossible for them to eat the flesh of Jesus. The carnal manner, which they conceive inseparable from this manducation, evidently supposes the *reality*; and no less evidently excludes the *figure*. It was the reality, therefore, which they understood.

2. So far from undeceiving them, or explaining his words in the figurative sense, our Lord subsequently repeats no less than six times his first declaration with expressions every time stronger. The energetic words in which he expressed himself even shocked several of his disciples; they declared that they were too hard for them to bear. They must then have conveyed the sense of the *reality*, incomprehensible to the human mind; and not the figurative sense, which is so conformable to our ideas.

3. Jesus adds, that if they are scandalized at what he has now told them, they will be much more so when they see him ascend where he was before: that is, that the accomplishment of his promise will appear to them much more incredible, when he shall no longer be present before their eyes. But a figurative manducation becomes still more easy after his ascension, that splendid proof of his divinity; whereas the real manducation is far more incredible, for you gentlemen especially who are forever repeating to us, that his body is as far from our altars as heaven is from earth. Therefore it was not a figurative, but a *real* manducation which our Saviour had announced.

4. Nevertheless, in order to remove from their imagination the crudity of a carnal manducation, Jesus adds, that his words are not to be estimated according to human reason, but according to the enlightening grace of the Holy Spirit. For "it is the spirit that

quickeneth: the flesh" (or human intelligence) "profiteth nothing."* But no, exclaims Mr. Faber: "our Lord teaches us, that his language is to be interpreted *figuratively*, not *literally*." And I rejoin that it is not so; and cannot be so. For if by this sentence, our Lord had given them to understand that his discourse was to be interpreted in a figurative sense, those Jews who had revolted at the gross idea of a real manducation, and those of his disciples who had found his words a hard saying beyond bearing, would immediately have been pacified; they would have been reconciled to the discourse of their master, and more

* *Spiritus est qui vivificat, caro non prodest quidquam: quod indicat ista Spiritus Sancti auxilio intelligi oportere. Carnem enim, hoc est rationem humanam in hisce divinis rebus nihil prodesse, hoc est, caligare et ineptire.—Centur. Lutheran. Cent 1, c. 4.* Mr. Faber would have it that the ancient fathers understood this 64th verse, as he does. He says at p. 87, "that it may be more distinctly seen how widely the ancients differed from the Bishop of Aire, I subjoin, as a specimen, the gloss of Athanasius:" and then he gives a translation worse than incorrect, as will be readily seen by the Latin version of the Learned Benedictines, as follows: "*De seipso dixit Christus, filius hominis et Spiritus, ut ex illo, quæ corpus suum spectarent; ex Spiritu vero, spiritualem suam et intelligibilem, verissimamque divinitatem declararet, (and after quoting verses 62, 63, and 64) nam hic etiam utrumque de se dixit, carnem et spiritum: et spiritum a carne distinxit, ut non solum quod apparet, sed etiam quod invisibile est credentes discerent ea quæ ipse loqueretur non esse carnalia sed spiritualia. Quot enim hominibus corpus satis esset ad esum, ut illud totius mundi fieret alimentum? Sed ideo meminet ascensionis Filii hominis in cælum, ut a corporali cogitatione ipsos retraheret, atque hinc ediscerent carnem, de quâ locutus fuerat, cibum ē supernis, cælestem et spiritualem alimoniam ab ipso dari: nam quæ locutus sum vobis, inquit, spiritus et vita sunt: quod perinde est ac si diceret: quod ostenditur et datur pro mundi salute caro est, quam ego gesto: sed hæc vobis cum ejus sanguine a me spiritualitèr esca dabitur: ita ut hæc spiritualiter unicuique tribuatur, et fiat singulis tutamen in resurrectionem vitæ æternæ.*" Ep. 4, ad Serap. Episc. Thmuitanum.

Observe these words; *but this flesh with its blood shall be given to you by me in a spiritual manner*; this is precisely our doctrine.—There is a wide difference between saying that the flesh and blood are given in a spiritual manner, and saying that they are given in figure only. A body in figure is not a body; but a spiritualized body is a real body still. It is such as the bodies of the elect will

attached to him than ever. And yet it was immediately after this last sentence that they withdrew, abandoned their master, and walked no more with him! Therefore this last declaration did not indicate the figurative sense.

5. Jesus reproaches the disciples with not believing his word: "there are some of you that believe not." But if he had explained himself in the figurative sense, these would have believed; none would have merited the reproach of incredulity. He adds, that no one can believe in what he has said, unless it be given him by the Father. But to believe in a figurative manducation, there is no need of any particular grace.

6. The doctrine of Jesus on the promised manducation prevented many Jews from believing in him; and induced many disciples to forsake him. Now our doctrine on this point prevents many Christians from adopting our creed, and causes some to abandon it; whereas the present doctrine of your Church in general attaches its members to it, and withholds those who would otherwise come over to us. Our

be in heaven. *Semintur corpus animale, surget corpus spirituale.* The Rector has taken the passage of St. Athanasius in a wrong sense from beginning to end.

In the *Discussion Amicale*, pp. 263, 264, vol. 1, I said, Christ when he announced his ascension, insinuated to his disciples, and gave them sufficiently to comprehend, that in the manducation of his flesh, the senses would have no share, as they had imagined, and that his presence would be neither palpable nor visible; since according to this natural presence, they would see him disappear and ascend into heaven. He further instructed them that they ought not to judge of his body as of other human bodies, incapable of themselves of a similar ascension: that his would prove to be divinely constituted; his flesh, that of the Son of God, upon which he could stamp an almighty power, and which he could easily change and give in a supernatural state." I thank Mr. Faber for having shewn me that without being aware of this passage of St. Athanasius, I had been so fortunate as to light in part upon the ideas of that great Prelate.

doctrine therefore, and not yours, is conformable to that of Jesus Christ.

7. Lastly; and I beg you to attend well to this final observation. Several disciples chose to withdraw from their master, even after the declaration he had just made, rather than rely on his word for the manner of accomplishing what he promised:—but the apostles remain attached to him; and building on his divinity, depend upon his power for the execution of his promise. But the former would not have abandoned such a master through unwillingness to believe so simple a thing as a manducation explained in Mr. Faber's way, in a figurative sense: nor would the latter have needed to rely for their belief, upon his divinity and omnipotence. Therefore neither party could have understood this manducation in the figurative sense of the Rector: and therefore I conclude that the true sense is that of the real presence; that being the only sense which can explain the opposite conduct of the disciples who departed, and the apostles who remained.

II. I now ask you, sir, if the long and memorable scene at Capharnaum must not have made a deep and indelible impression upon the apostles? In how great expectation must they have been held by a promise so extraordinary and wonderful, that it could have been conceived and proclaimed by none but God himself! It must have required no less than the miracles which they witnessed every day, and the full conviction of the divinity of their master, to keep them in the assurance that he would one day realize his promise, however unintelligible to them was the manner in which he would execute it. This unheard-of scene must have frequently returned to their minds; but especially at the memorable time, when, after the paschal supper, and the washing of their feet, being again seated at table by his order, and seeing him take bread in his venerable hands, bless it, and lift up

his eyes to heaven in prayer—they heard him solemnly pronounce those words, *take and eat, this is my body*. These words dart light at once into their minds; their expectation is accomplished, their hope and faith are crowned: and even we ourselves, sir, though at so great a distance from this grand event, assist at it in imagination, and partake of the banquet of our Saviour. We can imagine that we have just heard him, as we heard him before in the synagogue of Capernaum. Here as on the former occasion, we enter into the sentiments of the apostles: with them we perceive in a moment the manifest connexion between the promise of this great favour, and its accomplishment; between the food promised, and the food bestowed; the flesh which the Lord was to give them to eat, and that which he actually gives them to eat. We compare the narrative of St. John with those of the other evangelists: these words of the former, “the bread which I will give is my flesh for the life of the world,” with the words of St. Luke: “This is my body which is given for you.” In both, the subject is the same; there, as here, the same meaning, the same mystery, the same truth. We further remark that this great miracle, designated beforehand in terms precise and expressive, is now announced in the most clear and simple terms which language can furnish; and we say, Jesus Christ pronounced the words of institution in the same sense as those of the promise; but we have just seen that he certainly pronounced the words of promise in the sense of the real presence. Moreover, the apostles must have given to the words of institution the same sense in which they had taken the words of promise: but that sense was assuredly that of the real presence: therefore in the same sense they understood the words of institution.

III. If notwithstanding, it will afford you satisfaction for me to resume the retrograde movement of Mr. Faber, and go back from the institution to the promise;

be it so, I am quite willing. But what advantage will the Rector gain for his opinion of a figurative presence? This we shall soon see. Whether the words of promise are placed first, or introduced after those of institution, I see no difference, except in the subversion of natural order. The intimate relation between them renders them inseparable. They admit not of being insulted, they demand comparison and juxtaposition: so close is their natural union. This Mr. Faber ought to admit; for he himself makes use of the 64th verse of the vi. ch. of St. John, to endeavour, if possible, to explain the words, "*This is my body,*" in a figurative sense. He cannot therefore dispute my right to employ the same chapter, to shew that the words of institution import the real presence.

It is indeed the indispensable duty of every commentator to bring together the ideas, which must at that time have occupied together the minds of the apostles. Who can doubt that the astonishing scene at Capharnaum was at this moment present to their memory? Certainly we have sound reason to believe that so extraordinary a discourse as the one held by our Saviour on that occasion, followed up and inculcated by him with equal force and perseverance, addressed first to the Jews, then to the disciples, and always with particular energy, must have left a deep impression on the minds of the apostles. Judge of this, sir, by St. John. About seventy years had rolled by, when he retraced this scene with so animated a pen, so much circumstantial precision and such confident recollection, that when you read it, you seem to see it passing before your eyes. How much more strongly then must it have been remembered by the apostles at the end of a few months; and especially when being prepared for something extraordinary, and all their attention fixed, and rivetted upon their master, they heard these words from his mouth: *Take, eat: this is my body which shall be delivered for you!* We

may well suppose them exclaiming at that moment; "Behold now the accomplishment of what he had promised us! This is the bread of which he spoke to us; the bread, which came down from heaven to give life to the world: this is the reality of that mysterious declaration; *Amen, amen, I say unto you: except you eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life: My flesh is meat INDEED; and my blood is drink INDEED He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, abideth in me, and I in him.* These words must then have loudly echoed in the ears of the apostles: and I beg you, sir, to tell me honestly, whether such language as this, and affirmations thus repeated can be reconciled with a metaphorical sense; or if they do not necessarily exclude a figurative acceptation? Is it not true that the words *my flesh is meat indeed*, rigorously express the reality? For after all, *flesh in figure* would be at most but figurative nourishment; it never could be *meat indeed*. It is therefore manifest, that the words of promise import the *reality*; and since the words of institution cannot be susceptible of a different signification, we must acknowledge in them also the *real presence*.

Need I go farther? I am willing certainly, if it be required, to separate the words, *this is my body*; and to consider them by themselves. I maintain that they must always exhibit to us the real presence. Otherwise instead of interpreting the words of Jesus Christ, we must change them; we must make him say the very reverse of what he did say. For if he only left us the figure, it follows that what he declared to be his body, is not his body; inasmuch as the sign of a thing is not the thing itself, but only a representation of it. Then instead of these positive words, *this is my body*, we must make him say, at least in equivalent words, *this is not my body, but only the figure of it.*

Moreover, would he not himself have led us astray, if the words we read in his Testament, *the living bread, the bread, which came down from heaven—the flesh, meat indeed—the body, which shall be delivered*, express only a wrong idea; while the words *sign* and *figure*, which we do not find at all, are the only ones which will open to us the true meaning of the Scriptures?*

IV. Mr. Faber with a good grace, surely, represents me as an enemy to metaphors, ready to “make short work with the whole family of them!” No, sir, I am no

*I observed at page 293 of my first volume, “that before the institution of the Eucharist, bread had never been taken *in the ordinary usage of language*, as a sign of any thing whatever.” Mr. Faber replies, that in the Old Testament bread is sometimes mentioned as a sign of the body of Jesus Christ. I know it is: and the Rector must also know that a sign exhibited in some parts of the Old Testament is not therefore proved to have been employed *in common use*, in the language of conversation and the ordinary intercourse of life. This was what I said, and all that it was necessary to say; particularly when we reflect that before the descent of the Holy Ghost, poor Galileans as the apostles were, could not have been familiar with the books of the Old Testament.

The Rector observes in a note, p. 92, that according to the ancient fathers, bread and wine in the Old Testament are signs and figures of our Lord’s body and blood. And he thence concludes that they must be so in the New Testament. But any one else would have inferred that they could not be so in the New Testament. For the figures of the Old Testament were not repeated, but fulfilled by our blessed Saviour. If bread and wine are still only figures in the New Testament, the Rector with such an opinion, ought to have said, that in the Old Testament they were figures *of the figure* of the body and blood of Jesus Christ.

I say the same of the loaves of proposition, figurative of the bread consecrated upon our alters. If ours is no more than it was heretofore, there is nothing but figure in both Testaments, and reality in neither. I conclude then, that on the one hand, the passages of the Old Testament where bread is given as a figure of Christ’s body, do not prove that it was so considered *in the ordinary use of language*, which was all that I advanced: but on the other hand, they prove that the bread, which prefigured the body of Jesus Christ in the Old Testament, was to become and did become his real body in the New Testament. And thus, sir, you behold the pretended objections of the Rector become, in reality, fresh proofs of the truth of the Catholic faith: *sagittæ parvulorum factæ sunt plagæ eorum!*

enemy to them; I know too well their value in writing or speaking, to wish to banish them. But because they are to be welcomed when they appear in features, which are readily acknowledged, does it follow that we must admit them, when no such features appear? I can see metaphors in the words, *I am a door*, or *I am the vine*. The explanations, which immediately follow them unfold the metaphors, which otherwise were not altogether new. But the words, *this is my body*, are not followed by any explanation: so that to find their interpretation we must recur to the sixth chapter of St. John; and we have seen that so far from giving any idea of a figure, that chapter visibly imports the reality.

This I think will suffice upon the arguments for, and against the real presence, drawn from the New Testament; particularly if taken in conjunction with those, which I have developed in the sixth and seventh letters of the *Discussion Amicale*. To me every difficulty appears cleared up on this subject, the question decided, and the real presence solidly established by the Sacred Scriptures,

CHAPTER THE THIRD.

PROOFS OF OUR DOCTRINE ON THE EUCHARIST FROM
TRADITION.

I. A divine, a philosopher—every man accustomed to order in his ideas, will never fail to arrange them on paper with the same attention to method and perspicuity. Mr. Faber however disdains to follow servilely in the train of the learned writers who have preceded him. He departs from the beaten track, and opens for himself a new one, just as his ideas bear him along from one subject to another. After trying in his fourth chapter to explain in a figurative sense the words of our Saviour, which with sublime simplicity express his real presence; he leaves the Gospel all at once; passes unceremoniously to the writings of the Holy Fathers, which he abandons in the chapter following to resume the Holy Scripture, leaving this again altogether at chapter sixth, where he returns to the examination of the Fathers, which he had begun without being able to finish. I cannot admire such disorder; I shall pursue the regular course which I have prescribed to myself. I have said enough to establish the truth of our doctrines by the Holy Scripture; I now enter upon tradition, and the proofs, I shall deduce from it will fill this third chapter. In the third part of this work, I purpose to collect the mistakes, contradictions, studied suppressions, infidelities and false imputations, which are scattered through the whole of the Rector's production. I shall pass over these various matters as cursorily as possi-

ble, as being of minor importance, and for the most part regarding me personally.

I must own, sir, I had flattered myself that my three letters on the general and particular proofs from tradition would have found some favour with Mr. Faber. But he professes to discover nothing in them but an ingenious and subtile argumentation, and certain captious approximations, capable of deceiving none but the most unenlightened. They have not been elsewhere so esteemed, by able divines of various communions, and even of his own. It shall be my object to compel him to the same avowal as his brethren, or at least to silence. And I am sure of success, if I can present these proofs to his view, with the force and clearness which are so peculiarly their own. I begin by exhibiting to him and to you an analysis of the three letters, such as it appeared in a French paper at the time when the *Discussion Amicale* was brought over from London to Paris.

II. "The secrecy universally observed during the first five centuries on the mysteries of the altar, is the principal point on which the labours of the author turn, on the subject of the Eucharist; and may be called the pivot of his demonstration. He beheld the command of this carried so far, that the Fathers did not hesitate to declare that it was better to shed their blood than to publish the mysteries; and that in fact several did shed their blood, rather than reveal them. He saw that this discipline must of necessity be traced up to the apostles; and after establishing this point of history beyond a doubt, he asks himself this question: What then was concealed beneath this secrecy relative to the mysteries of the altar? It must have been either the figure of the Sacramentarian, or the real presence of the Catholic. In the first supposition, there could be no reason for keeping silence; because with a figure there is no mystery; and the law of secrecy would in that case have been established not

only without any substantial motive, but even in opposition to the most cogent reasons for speaking freely. The assemblies of the Christians were calumniated; they were charged with unheard-of crimes; the faithful were put to the torture to force from them the avowal of what passed clandestinely among them.—Why not then throw open every door? Why not expose to the light the innocence of their religious rites? And why did they not invite the Pagans to come and be convinced with their own eyes, that they took nothing but a little bread and wine, as a sign of mutual fellowship, and a memorial of their Saviour? Reason, charity, and self-interest, would have obliged them to do this. The secrecy then which they persisted in keeping is absolutely incompatible with the belief of the Sacramentarian.

—In the belief of the Catholic, on the contrary, who does not see the propriety and even necessity of this discipline? The exalted dogmas of our faith are so far above human understanding, that at the first mention of them, the Pagans would have derided them as foolish and extravagant, and uttered against them a thousand insults and blasphemies. Their prejudices would have been strengthened against that religion, to which nevertheless, they were by degrees to be enticed. Thus on the one hand, the respect due to the mysteries of our Lord, and on the other, the regard, which charity would suggest for the weakness of the Pagans, sufficed to command in the Catholic belief, a careful silence on such doctrines, and not to make them known till after a lengthened course of instructions preparatory to baptism. After this, read the Fathers; read the motives which they assign for the law of secrecy; and you will confess that they are precisely such as I have just mentioned. Conformity of reasons demonstrates conformity of belief. We earnestly exhort our readers to follow up in the eighth letter this first general proof assigned by the author.

In the development of this interesting discussion, they will at once be convinced of the connexion and evident agreement between the discipline of the *secret*, and the Catholic doctrine of the real presence; and no less evidently will they see its incompatibility with the figure of the Sacramentarians.

For the rest, what to certain prejudiced minds might appear in the eighth letter no more than an inference, drawn with more dexterity than certainty, becomes, in the letter following, a positive fact, and thus acquires a force that is irresistible. What indeed was concealed *in part* by the secrecy of the Christians? That which was practised in their religious assemblies, and performed at the altar. And what was this? Interrogate the liturgies; they are ready to answer you. About the time of the council of Ephesus they are for the first time produced in open light; previous to that time they had been confined to the memory of the bishops and priests; for the danger of the secrets' being betrayed had forbidden their being committed to writing. But at that period, Christianity having taken the lead, and having nothing more to fear from Paganism, every church committed its liturgy to writing. And what is the information they give you? All, without exception, present to us the altar, the oblation of sacrifice, the real presence by the change of substance, and the adoration.

Nestorians, Eutychians, Jacobites, are here agreed both among themselves and with Catholics, all, notwithstanding schism and heresy; in spite of distance and separation, in spite of the difference of rites, prayers and solemnities; all in Italy, Africa, Spain, Gaul and Great Britain, as well as in Greece and its islands, in Asia Minor, the Indies, Egypt and Abyssinia; all describe to us the same mysteries, the same dogmas; all profess the same faith, and proclaim the same doctrine. An agreement so wonderful, an uni-

formity so admirable could only proceed from one and the same cause; and that cause would be sought for in vain elsewhere but in the teaching of the apostles. Such is the substance of the second general proof drawn out before us in the ninth letter.

Its connexion with the preceding proof is this. The secrecy of the Christians concealed the mysteries of the altar. The written liturgies disclose them; they display to us the real presence, transubstantiation and the adoration. Therefore these mysteries were really enveloped in the *secret*. The facts speak for themselves, and the primitive liturgies demonstrate by their mutual agreement, the correctness of our views and argumentation. But the *secret* is traced back to the apostles; the essential part of the liturgy comes equally from them, and both were common to all the churches in the world. Here, then, are two general and certain proofs of the apostolicity of our doctrine on the Holy Eucharist.

This is not all: the particular proofs are admirably connected with those which are general. For in fact, what the faithful celebrated at the altar, what they so carefully concealed from the non-initiated, was made known for the first time to the neophytes just after their baptism, and before they approached to the Holy Communion. They were detained, that what till then had been withheld, and what they were soon to receive, might be explained to them. And what was then explained? What dogmas, what doctrine did they then hear? Was it the *figure* of the Sacramentarian, or the *reality* of the Catholic? Let us open the *catecheses*; they will point out the instructions, which were then given. All these so plainly exhibit our mysteries, that it would be impossible at the present day to express in terms more clear, precise, and energetic, the oblation of sacrifice, transubstantiation, and the real presence, with the adoration, which it demands. Thus then we are assured a second time by

the *catecheses*, that it was this sublime belief, which was concealed beneath the discipline of the *secret*.

Whoever searches for it, and wishes to see it in the ancient Fathers, must always bear in mind that they spoke or wrote uniformly under the law of the *secret*; that in discourses pronounced before the uninitiated, in writings destined for the public, always in fine when there was danger of betraying the discipline, they were under the necessity of using obscure and ambiguous expressions: that consequently whoever is desirous of forming clear and certain ideas of what they believed and taught on the Eucharist, should not depend on writings of this kind; because good sense would dictate that clearness is not to be sought, where obscurity was commanded. This observation suffices to put to silence every objection drawn from various passages of the Fathers. But when they addressed the faithful only, or wrote for them alone, then freed from restraint, they could speak of the mysteries without disguise; they were obliged by their ministry, to speak so, whenever they had to instruct the newly baptized. These are the discourses and writings, which we ought in these days to consult, in order to become acquainted with their real sentiments, and their inward belief on the mysteries; and in these we find openly, and at every word, our genuine doctrine on the Holy Eucharist."

III. Thus all is explained and understood, all is connected in these three dissertations. From the triple alliance of the *secret*, the liturgies and the *catecheses*, results a complete harmony, and an irrefragable proof of the apostolicity of our doctrine on the Eucharist. The Rector, who appears to have felt and dreaded the force of this triple alliance, attempts to weaken, and, if possible, to break it. He separates the three parts, and attacks them in succession. It becomes then my business to strengthen them one by one, and

draw closer the cords, which unite them: *funiculus triplex difficile rumpitur*.*

IV. He begins by condemning, as I did, the extravagant opinion of those, who date the origin of the *secret* discipline from the fourth century. How in fact could it be imagined, that the Church would undertake to deprive, in one day, all who were not Christians of the knowledge of mysteries universally diffused the day before? How are we to suppose that such an undertaking could be carried into effect? Mr. Faber acknowledges with me the folly of such a supposition: but soon after, by some unaccountable caprice, while he owns that the *secret*, as regarded the Pagans, was to be traced up to the apostles, he confines its establishment with respect to the catechumens, to the middle of the second century. What fact, what decree, or what monument does he produce in proof? None at all. In what place, by what order was the knowledge previously communicated to the catechumens, withheld from them? The Rector says not a word. He gives us in the outset his own conjecture, without supporting it by a single testimonial. He imagines that St. Paul, full of admiration for the secret mysteries of the Pagans, had some idea of placing under a similar safeguard, those of Christianity; and that a hundred years afterwards, the Church prescribed such a law of secrecy with regard to the catechumens. He refers to certain passages of St. Paul's Epistles, without quoting them, which appear to him to prepare the way for this discipline. I have verified these passages; and there is not one among them which can justify his conjecture.

But it must be further observed that the catechumens before baptism, were only either Jewish or Pagan unbelievers, who came of their own accord to submit to probation, and demand the instructions

**Ecclesiastes* iv. v. 12.

which they were required to go through, before they could be judged worthy of baptism. If there had been no secret with regard to them, before this period, it must follow, that in the primitive days, the Church, forgetful of the precept received from her divine legislator, cast the precious pearls of her doctrine before swine. For according to the language of tradition, the pearls are the mysteries, and the swine designate the unbelievers. In fine, those who in this glorious century became Christians, had commenced by being catechumens; and the number of these latter from the days of the apostles to the middle of the second century is incalculable. Among so great a multitude, it is morally impossible that several attracted at first by curiosity, and even by better dispositions, should not have been disgusted, and abandoned the austere and fatiguing course of probation and instructions, to return to the religion of their Fathers. They would then have carried away with them into the world the knowledge of the mysteries; they would have communicated it to their relations and friends, and to all who cared to be informed of it. There would in such a case have been no longer any secret for the catechumens, or even for the Pagans. So far, sir, are we led by the arbitrary and ill-digested supposition of Mr. Faber. Let us leave it then for what it is worth; and consider it as never proposed: for what settles the question against the Rector in one word, is, that all the ancient liturgies exclude the catechumens before the celebration of the mysteries. This rule is general: therefore apostolical.

FIRST GENERAL PROOF—THE DISCIPLINE OF THE SECRET.

I. I now pass on to the general proof, which I extracted from the discipline of the *secret*; not however that I ever insisted that the Eucharist was its *sole, exclusive*, or even principal object. The Rector makes

me assert this in his book, though he knows that I never said it in mine; he repeats it to satiety, as if to shew me up to his readers as in error, and enjoy a victory as easy as it is imaginary. Let him exult; I offer no interruption: I shall not disturb his triumph; I am ambitious of one more real and substantial; I will establish it upon incontestable monuments. Without producing them all, I will present you with several; and if I fatigue you with their number, you must blame the man who compels me to it. You shall see the discipline of the *secret* in vigour, from the epoch of the council of Ephesus in 431, up to the days of the apostles.

II. Century 5th. I begin with the celebrated president of the above mentioned council: these are the words of St. Cyril of Alexandria in his seventh book against Julian. He does not notice the objections of that emperor against baptism, but contents himself with saying, that "these mysteries are so profound, and so exalted, that they are intelligible to those only, who have faith; that therefore he shall not undertake to speak on what is most admirable in them, lest by discovering the mysteries to the uninitiated, he should offend Jesus Christ, who forbids us to give what is holy to dogs, and to cast pearls before swine." Observe, sir, that according to this learned Patriarch, the precept of the *secret* discipline comes from Jesus Christ himself: and pray bear in mind this important testimony, which will furnish later the solution of a difficulty, which the Rector imagines to be insoluble. After saying some little of baptism, he adds: "I should say much more, if I were not afraid of being heard by the uninitiated: because men generally deride what they do not understand; and the ignorant, not even knowing the weakness of their minds, despise what they ought most to venerate."

"It is requisite," says St. Isidore, of Pelusium, to have in the heart zeal, and the love of virtue, in order

to eat worthily the *true and divine* passover. They fully comprehend my meaning, who following *the sanction of the Legislator*, have been initiated in the mysteries." It was therefore by order of the divine Legislator that they spoke clearly of the mysteries only to the initiated; and the mysteries of the Eucharist were comprehended in the number.

Innocent first wrote thus to the Bishop Decentius: "I cannot transcribe the words (the form of confirmation) for fear of appearing rather to betray, than reply to your consultation". . . . and farther on; . . . "as to those things which it is not lawful to write, I can tell you them when you arrive."

In the first of his three dialogues, Theodoret introduces *Orthodoxus* speaking thus: "Answer me, if you please, in mystical and obscure words; for perhaps there are persons present who are not initiated in the mysteries. *Eranistes*—I shall understand you, and answer you with the same precaution;" and farther on, "You have clearly proved what you intended, though under mystical terms." In the second dialogue, *Eranistes* asks: "How do you call the gift which is offered before the invocation of the priest? We must not mention it openly," replies *Orthodoxus*, "because we may be overheard by persons, who are not initiated. Therefore speak in disguised and enigmatical terms; a food made of such a seed." The same Theodoret in his preface to Ezechiel traces up the *secret* discipline to the precept of Jesus Christ. "The divine mysteries are so august, that we are bound to keep them with the greatest caution: and to use the words of our Lord, these pearls ought never to be cast before swine. For indeed men finish with despising what they have obtained without difficulty."

St. Augustin in his discourses before catechumens, or in such writings as might fall into their hands, never failed to conceal from them the mystery of the Eucharist. His ordinary expression was, "*the faithful know*

it." In his fourth sermon on Jacob and Esau, speaking of this mystery, he does not venture to call it the sacrament of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, but only "the sacrament known to the faithful, made from corn and wine." In his epistle to the catechumen Honoratus, he says, "We render thanksgiving to the Lord our God in the great Sacrament, in the sacrifice of the new law: when once you have been baptized, you will know where, when, and how it is offered." Speaking of the manna in the 12th treatise on St. John: "We know what the Jews received; and the catechumens do not know what the Christians receive." And in the preceding treatise: "Ask a catechumen if he eats the flesh of the Son of man, and drinks his blood; he does not know what you mean; . . . the catechumens do not know what the Christians receive . . . the manner in which the flesh of our Lord is received, is a thing concealed from them." "What is there hidden from the public in the Church?" he says in his first discourse on the 103d psalm. "The sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist. The Pagans see our good works, but not the sacraments. But it is precisely from those things, which are concealed from their sight, that those spring, which cause their admiration." And in the 10th sermon on St. John, "Those who know the scriptures, understand perfectly what Melchisedech offered to Abraham; we must not here make mention of it, because of the catechumens: nevertheless the faithful are acquainted with it."

III. *Fourth century.*—St. Chrysostom takes occasion from baptism to express himself as follows, on the secrecy of the mysteries in general: Homil. 40 on I Corinth. "I wish to speak openly, but I dare not, on account of those who are not initiated. These persons render explanation more difficult for us; by obliging us either to speak in obscure terms, or to unveil the things which are secret: yet I shall endeavour as far as possible to explain myself in disguised terms." "Take care

not to give that which is holy to dogs, and to cast pearl before swine," says he in his first book on compunction of heart. He takes occasion from this divine precept to declaim against the abuses of granting baptism to catechumens not properly disposed, and admitting to the holy table impure and corrupt Christians. In the letter in which he informs the Sovereign Pontiff, Innocent the First, of the tumult excited against him in his Church, he relates that the seditious persons, *among whom were many of the uninitiated*, forced a passage to the place where *the sacred things were deposited: that they saw every thing there, and that the most holy blood of Jesus Christ was spilt upon their garments*. Palladius giving an account of the same sedition in his life of St. Chrysostom, says only that the *symbols were spilt*. You see here the difference of expression: the Patriarch uses no circumlocution in a confidential letter to the head of the Church; but Palladius speaks with reserve, and in disguised terms in a history intended for the public. For the sake of brevity, I will repeat to you the words of your learned Casaubon. "Is there any one so much a stranger to the reading of the Fathers, as to be ignorant of the usual form of expression, which they adopt when speaking of the sacraments, *the initiated know what I mean?*" It occurs at least fifty times in the writings of Chrysostom alone, and as often in those of Augustin."

"I am ashamed," said St. Gregory of Nyssa, to an aged catechumen, "to see that after having grown old in probation, you still suffer yourself to be sent out with the catechumens, like a little weak boy who does not know how to take care of what is entrusted to him; join yourself to the mystic people, and become at length acquainted with our secret dogmas."

St. Gregory Nazianzen says that the greater part of our mysteries ought not to be exposed to strangers; and further, that "we ought rather to shed our blood than publish them." Orat. 42, et 35.

“We receive,” said St. Basil, “the dogmas transmitted to us by writing, and those which have descended to us from the apostles, beneath the veil and mystery of oral tradition—the words of invocation in the consecration of the bread, and of the Eucharistic chalice; which of the saints have left us them in writing? The apostles and fathers, who prescribed from the beginning certain *rites to the Church*, knew how to preserve the dignity of the mysteries by the secrecy and silence in which they enveloped them. For what is open to the ear and the eye can no longer be mysterious. For this reason several things have been handed down to us without writing, lest the vulgar, too familiar with *our dogmas*, should pass from being accustomed to them, to the contempt of them. A dogma is very different from a sermon. . . . Beautiful and admirable discipline! For how could it be proper to write or circulate among the public, what the uninitiated are forbidden to contemplate?” (On the Holy Ghost, c. 27.)

Listen to the synod of Alexandria, speaking of the Eusebians, enemies of St. Athanasius, in 340. “They are not ashamed *to celebrate* the mysteries before the catechumens, and perhaps even before the Pagans, *forgetting that it is written*, that we should hide the mystery of the King; and in contempt of the precept of our Lord, that we must not place holy things before dogs, nor pearls before swine. For it is not lawful to *shew* the mysteries *openly* to the uninitiated; lest through ignorance they scoff at them, and the catechumens be scandalized through indiscreet curiosity.”*

St. Epiphanius (Anchor. No. 37) wishing to prove that the allegories of Origen were to be rejected, and that we must believe things without always seeing the

* These motives were no less strong in the first century, in which the Rector gratuitously conjectures that the mysteries were open to the catechumens. The synod was accountable to all the Bishops for the catholicity of its condemnation of the Eusebians.

reason for them, quotes the Eucharist as an example. "We see that our Lord took a thing into his hands, as we read in the gospel, that he rose from table, that he resumed the things, and having given thanks, he said, *this is this of mine. Hoc meum est hoc.*" This singular turn of expression and reservation conveyed no meaning to those who are uninitiated. But ought it not to speak very loudly to Mr. Faber? What think you, Sir? Does it favour the opinion of a figurative presence? And do you not at first sight penetrate the meaning of the enigma?

St. Jerome replying to Evagrius, who had consulted him on an obscure passage of the apostle, touching the sacrifice of Melchisedech, says: "You are not to suppose that St. Paul could not easily have explained himself; but the time was not come for such explanation: he sought to persuade the Jews, and not the faithful, to whom the mystery might have been delivered without reserve."

St. Cyril of Jerusalem, expresses himself as follows, (Catech. 6, No. 29)—"We do not speak clearly before the catechumens on the mysteries, but are obliged often to use obscure expressions, in order that while we are understood by the faithful who are instructed, those who are not so may suffer injury." And in Catech. 18, No. 32, 33, "at the approach of the holy festival of Easter; . . . you shall be instructed, with God's grace, in all that it is proper for you to know; with what devotion, and in what order you are to enter the laver of regeneration, . . . with what reverence you must proceed from baptism to the holy altar of God, to taste the spiritual and heavenly mysteries which are there dispensed . . . after the holy and salutary day of Easter, . . . you shall hear, if it please God, other catechetical instructions . . . and on the mysteries of the New Testament which are celebrated upon the altar, and had their beginning in this city: all that is taught of them by the Divine

Scriptures, as also what is their force and power; in fine, how you are to approach to them; and when, and how they are to be celebrated." Nothing marks more forcibly the importance of the *secret*, than the notice placed by St. Cyril at the end of the preface at the head of his catecheses; the last five of which disclose the mysteries of Baptism, Confirmation, and the Eucharist. It is as follows: "Give these catecheses, made for their instruction, to be read by those who approach to baptism, and by the faithful who have already received it. But as for the catechumens, and those who are not Christians, take care not to communicate them to such. Otherwise take notice, you will be accountable to God. If you transcribe a copy of them, do it I conjure you, as in the presence of the Lord."

St. Gaudentius, Bishop of Brescia, contemporary with St. Cyril, speaking to the neophytes on their return from baptism, said to them; "In the lesson which you have just heard from Exodus, I shall choose such parts as cannot be explained in presence of catechumens, but which it is necessary to disclose to neophytes." In another place he proclaims; "that the splendid night of Easter requires him to confess less to the order of the text, than to the wants of the occasion; so that the neophytes may learn the established rule for eating the paschal sacrifice, and the faithful who are instructed may recognize it." (Treatise 5 on Exodus.)

St. Ambrose, in his book on the mysteries, c. 1, n. 2, says—"The time admonishes us to treat of the mysteries, and to explain the meaning of the sacraments. If before your baptism and initiation we had thought of speaking to you on these subjects, we should have appeared rather to betray than explain them."

"It is not given to all to contemplate the depth of our mysteries. Our Levites exclude from them at first, that they may not be seen by those who ought

not to behold them, nor received by those who cannot preserve them." In his book, *De Officiis*, "Every mystery should remain concealed, and covered by faithful silence, lest it should be rashly divulged to profane ears." And upon this verse of psalm 113, *I have hidden thy words in my soul, that I may not sin against thee*: "he sins against God, who divulges to the unworthy, the mysteries confided to him. The danger is not only of telling falsehoods, but also truths, if persons allow themselves to give hints of them to those, from whom they ought to be concealed." And he opposes such indiscretion by the words of our Saviour: "Beware of casting pearls before unclean animals."

IV. *Third century*.—Zeno, Bishop of Verona, in a discourse on continence, exhorts the Christian woman not to marry an infidel, for fear she might betray to him the law of secrecy, *ne sis proditrix legis*. And he adds, "Know you not that the sacrifice of the unbeliever is public, but yours secret? That any one may freely approach to his, while even for Christians, if they are not consecrated, it would be a sacrilege to contemplate yours?" In a discourse on the 126th psalm, we read these words.—"Custom has given the name of the house of God, or temple, to the place of our assemblies, which are surrounded with walls, in order to secure the secret celebration of our sacraments."

St. Cyprian thus begins his book against the proconsul of Africa: "Till now I had despised the impieties and sacrileges which thy mouth discharged incessantly against the only true God;" he adds, that if he had been silent, it was not without the command of his Divine Master, "who forbids us to give that which is holy to dogs, and to cast pearls before swine." He contents himself with establishing the unity of God, without saying a word on the Trinity, or the sacraments of the Church.

Origen, in his 13th homily on Exodus, preparing to treat of the mystery of the Eucharist, says: "I am afraid and doubt much if I shall find suitable hearers, and that I shall be demanded an account of the pearls of the Lord; where, how, and before whom I have produced them." And in a homily on Leviticus, "Do not stop at flesh and blood, (the lambs and goats spoken of by Moses) but learn rather to discern the blood of the world; hear what he himself says: *This is my blood which shall be shed for you.* Whoever is instructed in the mysteries knows the flesh and the blood of the Word of God. Let us not dwell on the subject, which is known to the initiated, and which the uninitiated ought not to know."

The very ancient author of the Apostolic Constitutions, book 3, ch. 5, admonishes, "that in speaking of mystic things, care must be taken not to be indiscreet, and to express one's self prudently, bearing in mind the words of our Saviour, 'do not cast pearls before swine, lest they trample them under foot.'"

St. Clement of Alexandria, in the first book of his Stromata, says—"I pass over intentionally several things, fearing to commit to writing what I took great care not to say, lest those who read these writings should take my words in an improper sense, and we should be accused, as the proverb says, of putting a sword into the hands of a child. There are certain things which the Scripture will show me, though they are not there openly expressed . . . there are some which it will only touch upon; but it will endeavour to say them under a veil, to disclose them while it conceals them, and to shew them while it is one's self."

Tertullian seeking to deter his wife from marrying an infidel if she should survive him, says to her among other reasons: "You would thereby fall into this fault, that the Pagans would come to the knowledge of our mysteries. . . . Will not your husband know what you taste in secret, before any other food;

and if he perceives bread, will he not imagine that it is that so much spoken of?" Therefore secrecy covered the mysteries of the Eucharist.

In the liturgy called that of the apostles, and later of St. John Chrysostom, the priest and deacon bowing down, and each holding a part of the sacred host, make together an admirable confession, which begins thus: "I believe O Lord, and confess that thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God, who didst come into the world to save sinners, of whom I am the chief; let me partake of thy mystical supper. I will not reveal the mystery to thine enemies." Therefore the Eucharistic mysteries were covered by secrecy.*

The author of the *Recognitions*, which are very ancient, since they were translated by Rufinus in the fourth century, proves as follows, the difficulty of preaching before a multitude: "For what is, cannot be said to all as it is,† on account of those who give a captious and malignant ear. *What then will he do who imparts the word to a crowd of people unknown? Will he conceal the truth? But how then can he instruct those who are deserving? If however he exhibits the clear truth before those who are indifferent about salvation, he is wanting to him, by whom he is sent, and from whom he has received orders not to cast the pearls of doctrine before swine and dogs, who would be furious against it by arguments and sophisms, envelope it in the mire of their sordid and carnal understanding, and by their barking and disgusting replies would tear and fatigue the preachers of God.*"

*This liturgy is still followed by all the Greeks, who are in the West, at Rome, in Calabria and Apulia, by the Georgians, the Bulgarians, the Russians, and Muscovites; by all the Christians, the modern Melchites under the patriarch of Alexandria, resident at Cairo, under the patriarchs of Jerusalem and of Antioch, resident at Damascus.—See *P. le Brun Ceremonies of the Mass, T. 4, in 8vo.*

†Book 30.

V. *Second and first centuries.*—The secrecy of the first Christians on the Eucharistic dogmas is demonstrated from the unworthy calumnies spread and believed in the pagan world against their assemblies; by the punishments employed to extort from the Christians an avowal of what they practised, and by the origin of these calumnies and cruelties which dates from the first century.

Tertullian, in his *Apology*, exclaims when repelling the accusations of infanticide and impurities; “Who are those who have made known to the world these pretended crimes? are they those who are accused? But how could it be so, since *it is the common law of all mysteries to keep them secret?* If they themselves made no discovery, it must have been made by strangers. But how could they have had any knowledge of them, since *the profane are excluded from the sight of the most holy mysteries*, and those are carefully selected who are permitted to be spectators?” The Pagans then were ignorant of what passed in the assemblies of the Christians; and this ignorance evidently pre-supposes the secrecy preserved by the faithful. The object of this secrecy was the Eucharistic bread; the mysteries of the altar. For these alone could have given rise to the calumnies, while at the same time the sight of them was forbidden to the profane, and permitted solely to chosen spectators. These reports indicate manifestly the Sacrament of the body and blood of Jesus Christ.

Let us hear the Pagan Cecilius, in the curious and interesting dialogue of Minutius Felix, which I recommend you to read: “Shall we allow men of an infamous and desperate faction to attack the Gods with impunity; and gathering together an ignorant rabble and credulous women, instruct them for a profane society, not to say a conspiracy, which is not done by any holy ceremony, but by sacrileges, nocturnal assemblies, solemn fasts and horrible meats: people who love

darkness and fly from the light; who say nothing in public, and talk incessantly when assembled together —this evil sect increases every day; wherefore we must endeavour to extirpate this execrable society. They know one another by certain secret signs, and love one another almost before they are acquainted. Lust forms a part of their religion: they commonly call themselves brothers and sisters, to make simple fornication become incest by this sacred name; so much do these wretched people indulge in crimes. Certainly if there were not such crimes among them, there would not be so loud a cry against them. The ceremony which they observe, when they admit any one to their mysteries, is not less horrible because it is public. They place before the new comer an infant covered with paste, in order to conceal the murder which they will have him commit. At their bidding he gives it several stabs with a knife. The blood runs on all sides; they eagerly suck it up; and the common crime is the common pledge of silence and secrecy. Their banquets are also known; and our Cirtensis makes mention of them in his harrangue. They all assemble on a solemn day, men, women, children, brothers and sisters of all ages and both sexes; and after having well eaten and drunk, as the heat of the wine and the meat begins to provoke them to lust, they throw something to a dog who is tied to a chandelier, and throw it so far that he cannot reach it, on purpose that in springing forward he may overturn the lights. Thus having got rid of the sole witness of their crimes, they are guilty of promiscuous intercourse; and by this means are all incestuous in will, if not in effect, since the sin of each one is the wish of the whole company. I pass over many things designedly; and indeed here are already too many. And truly the darkness, which they seek for their mysteries, are sufficiently evident proof of all we say, or at least the greater part of it. For why conceal all that

they adore? We are not afraid to publish what is proper: crimes only demand secrecy and silence."

Mr. Faber could have no motive to make him afraid of communicating openly to Cecilius his opinion of a figurative manducation, of a moral change in the substance of the bread, of the real absence of Jesus Christ. The Christian Octavius has no such replies to make. He does not disclose what is believed, nor what is done: he contents himself with repelling the infamous calumnies. "I would now," he replies, "address myself to those who say, or who believe that the murder of an infant is the ceremony of introduction to our mysteries. Do you then think it possible that a poor infant, a little body so tender is destined to die beneath our violence; and that we shed the blood of a being newly born, as yet of imperfect form, and scarcely a human being? Let those believe it, who could be cruel enough to perpetrate it. You indeed expose your children to savage beasts, and birds, as soon as they are born, you strangle and suffocate them: there are even some who by cruel potions murder them in their wombs, and kill them before they see light. This you have learned from your Gods. . . . Nor are those far removed from such a crime, who feed on savage beasts just come out of the amphitheatre, all bloody and full of those whom they have just devoured. As for us, we are not allowed to see murders, nor to hear them; and blood so fills us with horror, that we do not even eat that of animals. As to the incestuous banquet, it is a calumny invented by the devils to sully the glory of our chastity, and deter men from our religion by the horror of so great a crime. What your orator Cirtensis has said is rather an injurious accusation than a testimony. And truly you are far more guilty of incest than we . . . and thus you accuse us of false incestuous actions, while you have little remorse in committing real ones. But the Christians do not place

chastity only in the exterior; they place it in the mind, and do not so much study to appear chaste, as to be so in reality: . . . and if we are chaste in our assemblies, we are no less so in all other places. Many preserve the holiness of celibacy even until death, without any boasting: and so far are we from incest, that some are ashamed even of lawful pleasures.”

“If our accusers are asked,” said Athenagoras, “if they have seen what they assert, there will none be found impudent enough to say that they have. How can they accuse those of killing and eating human beings, who, it is well known, cannot bear the sight of a man put to death even justly? Men like us, who have renounced the spectacles of gladiators and wild beasts, believing that there is little difference between seeing a murder and committing one?”

“Those,” said St. Justin,* “who accuse us of these crimes, commit them themselves, and attribute them to their Gods. For our part, as we have no share in them, we do not distress ourselves, having God for the witness of our actions, and thoughts. . . . We entreat you that this request may be made public . . . that it may be known what we are, and we may be delivered from these false suspicions, which expose us to punishment. It is not known that we condemn these infamous deeds which they proclaim against us, and that for this very reason we have renounced those Gods who have committed such crimes, and require such. If you command it, we will expose our maxims to the world, that, if possible, it may be converted.” Observe, he does not say, we will expose *our mysteries* to the world.

VI. *Punishments employed to extort from the Christians the secret of what passed in their assemblies.* Eusebius has preserved for us the admirable letter which the Churches of Lyons and Vienne wrote to

*Second apology addressed to M. Aurelius in 166.

those of Asia and Phrygia, on the persecution, which they had just suffered in Gaul. We find in it the following passages. "They took some of our servants, who were Pagans, and being filled with the spirit of the devil, and apprehensive of the torments, which they had seen the faithful suffer, deposed falsely, through the violence of the soldiers, that we made feasts like Thyestes, that we indulged in the pleasures of Œdipus, that we committed abominations, which it is not lawful to think or speak of; and of which we cannot believe that any one ever would have been guilty. When these black calumnies were spread among the public, every one rose up with such fury against us, that our neighbours, who had previously treated us with some moderation; became the most enraged. . . . The number and cruelty of torments, which the holy martyrs suffered are beyond all that we can express. . . . This happy woman (the heroic servant Blandina) felt new strength as often as she renewed her profession of faith, and found relief and pleasure in repeating—"I am a Christian and no evil is committed among us." Sanctus also supported the torments with a constancy more than human; and when in the midst of the most cruel punishments, the impious wretches interrogated him *in the hope of extorting from him by the violence of pain some word unworthy of him*, instead of replying to their questions . . . he answered nothing else, but 'I am a Christian' The devil, who thought he had overcome Bibliada, because she had renounced the faith like certain others, was desirous of crowning her condemnation by calumny; and caused her to be tormented afresh, in order that, weakened as she was by her fall, she might depose against us. But this violence served only to rouse her from her profound lethargy. The punishments which the executioners exercised upon her, made her remember the fire of hell, and she said to them—*'How should the Christians devour infants, when they*

are not even permitted to eat the blood of beasts? She then confessed that she was a Christian, and was numbered with the martyrs . . . Those who had renounced the faith were shut up in prisons, as well as those who had confessed it: so far from deriving any benefit from their apostacy, they were arrested as criminals and *murderers*, and tormented more cruelly than the others. . . They were moreover despised by the Pagans as cowards who had renounced the glorious character of Christians to become their own accusers of *murder*. . . Attalus having been placed upon the iron chair and burnt, said to the people in Latin, pointing to the intolerable smoke which rose from his body, 'it is truly eating men to do as you do: but for our part, we do not eat them, nor commit any other crime.'"*

*Besides this letter written by witnesses, who had still before their eyes the bloody but glorious tragedy, I had quoted a short fragment from St. Irenæus, preserved by Ecumenius, an author of the tenth century. Mr. Faber attaches himself exclusively to this fragment, and for reasons best known to himself, says not a word on the original letter of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne. I here subjoin the ancient Latin version of the fragment, that by comparing it with that of the Rector; a judgment may be formed of his rare talent for translation, and his extreme exactness even in the smallest things. It is as follows: "Cum Græci servos horum Christianorum in divinis mysteriis edoctorum apprehendissent, deinde vim inferrent, ut videlicet areanum quidpiam ab his de Christianis discerent; cum hi servi non haberent quomodo vim inferentibus ad delectationem et gratiam loquerentur, præterquam quod a dominis audierant divinam participationem esse sanguinem et corpus Christi; existimantes ipsi quod vere sanguis et caro esset, hoc responderunt inquirentibus. Illi vero id sumentes tanquam reipsa hoc perageretur a Christianis, id aliis quoque manifestabant Græcis; et martyres Sanctum et Blandinam tormentis id fateri cgebant. Quibus libere et scite Blandina locuta est, dicens: quomodo hoc ferrent, qui ob divinum studium et meditationem ne concessis quidem carnibus vescuntur?"

The fragment and letter both speak of the same persecution; the letter names in detail several martyrs; the fragment only Sanctus and Blandina. The information in both comes from servants; the inculpatations are for a similar crime; here it is human blood, human flesh; and there, feasts like that of Thyestes.

In the second apology which St. Justin addressed in 166 to Marcus Aurelius, I read as follows: "But kill yourselves then, all of you, you will say; and you will thus find God, without troubling us with your persons any longer." St. Justin tells them in reply, that the faith which the Christians have in Providence does not permit them so to do; and he adds that to justify the calumnies propagated against the Christians, they put to the torture slaves, children, and women; they made them suffer horrible torments to extort from them a confession of the incests and banquets of human flesh, of which the Christians were accused. They who accuse us of these crimes, commit them themselves, and attribute them to their Gods. For our part, as we have no share in such horrid crimes, we do not give way to uneasiness, having God to witness all our thoughts and actions."

The answers breathe the same sentiments, and the like horror. "How should they do what you say," says Blandina, "who through piety and having God before their eyes, abstain even from lawful meats?" "How," exclaimed Bibliada, "how should the Christians devour infants, when they are not even permitted to eat the blood of beasts? And Attalus: "for our part, we do not eat men, nor commit any other crime."

Now let us come to the translation: *Existimantes ipsi* (not the Greeks, but the servants,) *quod vere sanguis et caro esset*, says the Latin Version. *The tormentors*, says Mr. Faber, *fancying that it was literal blood and flesh*, (*literal blood, literal flesh, literal body* occur incessantly in his book: we can say with propriety that any word is taken to the letter, or literally; we speak of a literal explication; but who ever heard of a *literal* foot, a *literal* hand, heart of *literal* blood or flesh? I know of no language which admits of such an expression. But let us pass on to the other words,) *quibus libere ac scite Blandina locuta est; Blandina readily and boldly answered—boldly* is not the meaning of *scite*. What St. Irenæus admires in the answer is not the boldness, but the prudence, the wisdom which while it repels the accusation, takes care not to disclose the *secret*. Ask your Rector what *scite* means; press him to give you its real sense: he will not be able to give it; for, to adopt his style, if the Christians at that time eat only *literal* bread and drank only *literal* wine, Blandina ought to have so declared without disguise; and in not doing so, she would have replied, *non scite, sed stolidè*.

Pliny the younger, governor of Bithynia, giving an account of the Christians to Trajan, occasioned by the reports which had gone abroad against them, says that he had determined to take proper measures for ascertaining the truth. "This made me consider it the more necessary to extort the truth by the force of torments from the female slaves, who were said to belong to the ministry of their worship: but I discovered nothing except a bad superstition carried to excess."

VII. These calumnies and cruelties take their origin from the first century. Celsus, who writing *with grey hairs* in the first years of Adrian, must have been born between the years of seventy and eighty at the latest; begins with the reproach of clandestine practices, which he often repeats against the assemblies of the Christians. Origen replies that the doctrine of the Christians was better known than that of the philosophers. "It is true nevertheless," he adds, "that there are certain points not communicated to every one: but this is so far from being peculiar to the Christians, that it was observed among the philosophers, as well as ourselves. . . . Celsus therefore attempts in vain to decry the *secret* kept by the Christians, since he does not even know in what it consists.* One would think that Celsus sought to imitate the Jews, who *when the gospel began to be preached*, disseminated false reports against those who had embraced it: that the Christians sacrificed a little child, and eat its flesh together; that to do works of darkness, they extinguished the lights, and then abandoned themselves to impurity indiscriminately."†

"For my part," says St. Justin, "when I, who am a disciple of Plato, heard the Christians denounced in so unworthy a manner, and saw them walking with such

**Orig.* Book 1, No. 7—Edit. Bened. T. 1.

†*Ibid.*, Book 6, No. 28.

intrepidity to death, and to all that was terrible; no, said I to myself, it is impossible that such men should live in the depravity of vice, and the pursuit of infamous pleasures. Is there in fact a man so enslaved to voluptuous gratifications, or of such outrageous intemperance as to find supreme luxury in a banquet of human flesh; and who at the same time will run gaily to punishments, and throw himself into the arms of death, to deprive himself voluntarily of what he loves?"

From the testimony of Eusebius, Saturninus and Basilides sprung from Menander, who himself sprung from Simon; "The devil," he adds, who has no pleasure but in evil, made use of these monsters . . . to give occasion to the infidels to cry down our religion. . . . Thence came those black calumnies that the Christians committed incests with their mothers and sisters, and eat abominable meats."*

"We are traduced," exclaimed Tertullian,† as the most wicked of men; bound to each other by an oath of infanticide; guilty of regaling ourselves upon the flesh of the infant which we have just slain; and afterwards abandoning ourselves to incest, after the dogs who are accomplices in our debauchery have procured for us, by overturning the lamps, the protection of darkness, and the effrontery of crime. . . . The imputation of these works is dated, as I have said, from the reign of Tiberius. Hatred of the truth began with it; it was detested as soon as produced to the world."

Finally, we learn from Tacitus, speaking of the burning of Rome, that Nero accused people of it who were odious by their crimes, and called Christians. . . . "They first apprehended those who confessed; afterwards a great multitude were convicted upon their

**Eus. Hist. Eccl.* Book 4, chap. 7.

†*Apol.* ch. 7.

information, not so much of the burning of Rome, as of hatred of the human race.”* He afterwards speaks of them as criminals deserving of death. Could we conceive that a society of men so pure and perfect could have been devoted to the hatred of mankind, if we were not informed by Eusebius and Tertullian of the abominable calumnies which the emissaries of the Jews had spread abroad against them as early as the reign of Tiberius?

VIII. If, sir, you have paid attention to the passages from the Fathers, which I have now laid before you relative to the affecting and admirable discipline of the *secret*, you can no longer entertain a doubt on either of the following points—1st. That the origin of this discipline is to be dated as early as the preaching of the gospel, and that it was in vigour in all the Churches during the first four centuries—2dly, that the Eucharistic dogmas were concealed beneath the secrecy observed during this long period.

1. In fact, either we must attribute the discipline of secrecy to apostolic institution, or say that the Church, after having delivered the mysteries to the public during a century, more or less, decided all at once upon depriving them of the knowledge of these mysteries. To impute to her such a decision, would be to charge her with a conduct most absurd and extravagant; or rather to accuse ourselves of absurdity, and lie open to just reproach. The *secret* so religiously observed in the fourth century, demonstrates, by the very fact, that it must necessarily have been so observed up to the days of the apostles.† Positive proof of this is furnished by the testimonies which have just passed in review before us. You must have remarked that the greater number of the Fathers, whose words I have

* *Annal*, Book 15.

† You will find the proof of this fully developed in the 1st vol. of the *Discussion Amicale*, p. 350, *et seq.*

cited, many more of which I could have produced, trace the discipline of secrecy up to the precept of Jesus Christ: "take care not to cast pearls before swine." We have seen, moreover, that the atrocious calumnies spread abroad against the Christians, arose from the privacy of their assemblies, and the inviolable secrecy as to what was done in them; and we learned at the same time that these calumnies began even in the reign of Tiberius. In fine, it is here that the solidly true axiom of St. Augustin becomes applicable: "*Whatever the universal Church holds, and has always held, without its having been established by any council, is to be justly considered to have come down from apostolical tradition.*" We know of no council which established the discipline of secrecy; and we are sure that it was observed in all the churches in Christendom. Our witnesses are—for Rome and the whole of Italy, Julius the First and Innocent the First—for the Milanese, Ambrose—for Aquileia, Rufinus—for Dalmatia, Jerom—for Brescia, Gaudentius—for Verona, Zeno—for Carthage, Tertullian and Cyprian—for Hippo and all Africa, the great Augustin—for Alexandria, Clement and his disciple Origen, and the patriarchs Athanasius and Cyril, and the synod of that famous metropolis in its encyclical letter to all the bishops of the world—for Jerusalem and Palestine, the celebrated catechist Cyril—for Cyprus and the islands of the Archipelago Epiphanius—for the country about the Euphrates, Theodoret—for Antioch, the queen of oriental cities, Chrysostom—for the towns of Nyssa and Nazianzum, the two Gregories—for Capadocia and Pontus, Basil—for Helenopolis, Palladius and Sozomen—for Constantinople, Isidore of Pelusium.

In a word, if the discipline of secrecy had been disregarded in one single church of consequence, it soon must have ceased every where else. Suppose that at the end of the first century, some one of the churches founded by the apostles had not conformed to this dis-

cipline: what would have been the result? The mysteries would have been divulged from one to another by persons travelling from that diocese in the neighbouring countries, and in a short time the *secret* would have been published every where. Put these various considerations together, and you will agree with me that the apostolicity and universality of the discipline of secrecy are of the number of facts the best attested in history.

2. It is no less certain that the dogmas of the Eucharist were concealed beneath the *secret*. Mr. Faber would maintain the contrary. He must forgive me if I prefer the testimonies of contemporary Fathers to his views and opinions. You have read them; almost all declare it in terms so positive, that it is impossible to be mistaken. They even go so far as to name among the mysteries concealed from the profane, the Eucharist, the Christian Passover, the sacrifice of bread and wine, prefigured by that of Melchisedech. And in fact, what could be the object of the infamous calumnies spread against our brethren from the birth of Christianity, but the Eucharistic mysteries? To what could they allude by their tales of infants murdered, their flesh served up as meat, and their blood as drink—of banquets of Thyestes, &c. if not to the dogma of the real presence, to the manducation of the body of Jesus Christ? And is it not clear that these abominable imputations were grafted on the communion of the faithful, and ridiculed in the most revolting manner by the Jews, in order to excite the hatred and horror of mankind against the rising Church?

IX. And now, sir, that you see these two points solidly established; and the apostolicity of this discipline followed in all the churches during the first four centuries; and the Eucharistic dogmas concealed beneath the *secret*; address yourself, I pray you, to the Rector of Long Newton. Ask the teacher of a moral change, of a figurative presence, of a real absence,

the champion of *literal* bread and *literal* wine, and the adversary in consequence of the adoration of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist—ask him how an opinion so simple as his own, so conformable to our natural ideas, could have been ranked by antiquity among the mysteries? how the Fathers could have taught the faithful of their time that they must rather shed every drop of their blood than divulge it? how the numerous martyrs of Lyons could suffer themselves to be tormented and torn in pieces, rather than loudly declare it? and how the reply of the magnanimous Blandina has excited, and will excite the admiration of every age?

What, sir! are we to imagine that while the most horrid calumnies were disseminated on all sides against the primitive Christians; while they were accused of murdering new-born infants in their secret assemblies, of feeding upon their palpitating flesh, and intoxicating themselves with their blood—and of abandoning themselves like blind furies to excesses unheard of upon the earth; while they were devoted as a race accursed to the execration of mankind, and to atrocious tortures; that they would not open their mouths to declare their innocence? At least for the purpose of charitably saving the magistrates and the multitude from the horror of commanding or contemplating so many barbarous and protracted massacres? From what motive could they have forbidden themselves an innocent and natural defence? Why at least did they not say to their fellow citizens: “Come then to our assemblies; see what passes there amongst us; we take a little bread and wine in memory of our good Master, who delivered us from sin and opened for us the way to virtue. He himself commanded us to use this simple and affecting ceremony: come, and you will learn to know us better, and understand what we really are?”

X. Nay more; if the faith and practice of the first Christians had corresponded with the belief of Mr.

Faber; if the Eucharist had been viewed in the same light by them, as it is by him; not only would it never have formed a part of the discipline of secrecy, but it never would have occasioned the malignity of their cruel enemies, who so far from believing their unworthy calumnies, would never even have thought of inventing and propagating them.*

I assert, sir, with full and entire conviction, that in this ancient discipline of secrecy, there is a certain mute, but perpetual and decisive evidence in favour of the real presence. It is in vain for the Rector to contend; he will always find himself borne down by its irresistible force; and struggle as he may, he will never rise from his overthrow. I say the same of your whole Church; let her assemble all her champions; let her put forth through them every resource of wit and learning—and undoubtedly she possesses much of both—she can never account for the establishment of secrecy with regard to the Eucharist. It will ever be to her a problem, whose existence will be as incontestable, as its solution will remain impossible. To discover it, recourse must of necessity be had to Catholic principles; and she must behold with us, in the primitive Church, the belief of the real presence of our Saviour in his Sacrament, the heavenly, the ravishing object of our faith and adoration. Then it will be readily conceived that by divulging the mystery so exalted and inaccessible to reason, scandal would have been given to the pagans and catechumens; and raileries provoked, which would infallibly have been poured forth by men, who were not Christians, since you hear them incessantly even now from the mouths of your theologians and preachers. Then we can conceive that by speaking openly of the real

*See page 363, vol. 1, of the *Discussion Amicale*—the fine theory of the two Anglican Bishops, Pearce and Hoadley, and of Prebendary Sturges, on the manner of presenting the Eucharist.

presence, and of the change of substance, they would have shocked the imagination of the Pagans, and kept those at a distance from the religion, whom it was their duty to attract to it. Then we can understand the precept of Jesus Christ, and the prohibition of the primitive Church, "to cast pearls before swine." Then also we can well conceive, that through obedience to the law of their divine Legislator, and the command of his Church, the faithful would rather shed their blood than betray the secret. Then are we in admiration at the faith and heroism of those martyrs, who without revealing the secret, were contented modestly to reply in the midst of torments, "there is no evil committed among us." Then in fine every thing is understood and explained in those illustrious ages; the rule of the Church—the exact conduct of the faithful—the self-devotion of her martyrs—and the frightful calumnies and atrocious torments, of which they were the glorious victims.

I finish with one final conclusion. The discipline of secrecy in the first four centuries is evidently incompatible with the actual doctrine of your Church; but perfectly conformable with that of ours. I had reason therefore to say, that it was a general proof that in the first four centuries, the Christians believed what the Catholics have believed, still believe, and will ever believe, the reality of the presence of our divine Saviour in the most holy and most adorable Sacrament of the Eucharist.*

* On the subject of the atrocious crimes attributed to the first Christians, the Rector furnishes us with a striking proof of the candour of his soul, and the rectitude of his mind. He knows perfectly well that when we approach to the Holy Table, we are persuaded, as the persuasion generally was among you, up to the reign of Charles II. that we receive, under the sensible appearance of bread, the body of Jesus Christ present in a supernatural manner, a body spiritualized, invisible, *inaccessible to all the senses*. Such is the mystery which we believe on the word of our God-Saviour. Now listen to the reasoning of Mr. Faber: "the pagans

SECOND GENERAL PROOF OF THE CATHOLIC DOCTRINE
ON THE EUCHARIST, TAKEN FROM THE ANCIENT
LITURGIES.

1. When I perceived at my second reading of *The Difficulties of Romanism*, the title of the seventh chapter, I laid down the book upon my table, and asked myself these questions: "What will the Rector say here? What part will he take with regard to our ancient liturgies?" They all speak uniformly, and in expressions the most energetic of our doctrines. All proclaim with one voice the altar, the oblation, the unbloody sacrifice of the new covenant, the real presence of the victim, the change of substance, and in fine, the adoration. We see by them that all the Christians in the world, at the moment of communion

fancied that the early Christians *literally* devoured human flesh and *literally* drank human blood. . . . Now they could not *with truth* have *denied* the existence of such abomination, if they had *held* the doctrine of the real presence: for in *that* case, they must have been conscious, that according to their full knowledge and belief, they were in the constant habit of *literally* devouring human flesh and of *literally* drinking human blood. Yet under the most severe torments, they invariably and totally *denied* the fact. Therefore by denying the fact, they of necessity, denied also the doctrine of the real presence." Is it possible thus to keep those in the dark whom it is a duty to enlighten? Where is the Catholic in the whole world who can recognise his sentiments in those attributed to him by Mr. Faber? Which among us would not feel horror-struck at the idea of them? His language answers to the notion of the men of Capharnaum; and one might imagine him to have just arrived among us from their synagogue.

In quoting Mr. Faber's words, I have purposely substituted the *real presence* for the word *transubstantiation*, which he employs; and my object was to shew you and make you sensible that his reasoning bears in the most direct manner, and in the first instance, against the doctrine of the real presence. He generally affects to reason only against the change of substance; because having set out with assuring us that our respective churches are agreed as to the real presence, he is afraid of appearing to contradict himself. But I beseech you only to pay attention, and you will see that he combats the real presence almost wherever he names *transubstantiation*.

heard from the mouth of the deacon these words, *the body of Jesus Christ*, and they replied, *it is true*. This *Amen* repeated by innumerable lips during a succession of generations and centuries, is an admirable confession of faith, which will resound from the primitive Church even to the end of the world, in proof of the real presence.*

Would the Rector in those days have been daring enough to oppose his voice to that powerful and universal testimony; and instead of *Amen*, replied, "I see nothing but a figure?" The liturgies agree in presenting us with lively invocations to beg of God to send his Holy Spirit upon the gifts offered, in order that the bread *may become* the body of Jesus Christ, and what is in the chalice *may become* his blood, by his changing them through the virtue of his Holy Spirit†. Would Mr. Faber have raised his discordant voice to explain these invocations in his favourite language of a moral change? and will he still maintain before us now, that in imploring the Divine Omnipotence to descend upon the gifts, it was merely to change them from common and domestic use, to a service symbolical and religious? The liturgies represent to us the clergy and people by turns in fear and trembling, in the attitude of profound adoration, when they partake of the Eucharist; and put into their mouths at that time the most lively confessions of faith in a presence, which commands the sovereign worship of the *latría*. What then would have been the expression of the Rector's countenance in the midst of these fervent assemblies? Would he have shared the ardent devotion, the religious awe of those humble adorers of Jesus Christ? or rather will

* *Habet enim magnam vocem Christi sanguis in terrâ, cum eo accepto, ab omnibus gentibus respondetur Amen. August. contra Faustum. Lib. 12.*

† The liturgy, called that of the apostles—*transmutet et perficiat*—Lit. Syri. translated by Renaudot.—*Transmutante in te.* Lit. Nest. translated by Renaudot.

he not be ready to involve them with us in the guilt of idolatry? Will he not accuse them together with us of rendering sacrilegious worship to material things, and to speak in his own language, to a morsel of *literal* bread?

After revolving these reflections in my mind for some time, I resumed the book, and read with avidity the chapter on the liturgies. What reply then does the Rector make to their decisive authority? None whatever, sir—to my utter astonishment, none. He would have done better therefore if he had not mentioned the liturgies in the title, since he says not a word of them in the chapter. Doubtless it is wise to keep silence about proofs, which we are not prepared to combat; but it would have been wiser, more candid, and more courageous to surrender to their victorious power. I will endeavour again to confront the Rector with the liturgies. When he looks them a second time full in the face, perhaps he will receive a more favourable impression. I even augur it from his silence. For if he could have pounced upon them in any part, he would certainly have done it, with the laudable zeal that animates him. Being unwilling however to interrupt the reflections, which I am compelled to submit to you, I shall place my extracts from the liturgies at the end of them. I regret that I am obliged to revert to them, and to swell out my reply to his book by a long addition, which he might have spared me the trouble of doing, if he had pleased.

II. It must have been proved to a demonstration to you, sir, that the discipline of secrecy covered with a mysterious and impenetrable shade the assemblies of the Christians, the dogmas therein professed, the prayers there made to God, and the rites there practised. These rites, prayers and dogmas, so long unknown to the profane, the liturgies revealed to the world, as soon as they were committed to writing. We have the good fortune to possess a great number

of them, and from almost every country where Christianity reigned in the fifth century. They do not leave a shadow of doubt of the consequences, which we have deduced from the discipline of the *secret*, by the aid of simple reasoning: they confirm their justice and truth, and establish our first assertions. They introduce us to the interior of the oratories, where the early faithful assembled. We see them placed there in perfect order; the men on one side, the women on the other; the children nearest to the sanctuary. There we behold the catechumens, here the penitent; and the bishop advancing to the altar preceded by his clergy. With them we assist at the divine worship, the same in every country, at least as to every thing essential. With them we partake in the prayers, and lectures from the Old and New Testaments. Shortly after we hear the officiating deacon raise his voice and say, "depart in peace," addressing the catechumens.*

Then it was that the divine office began, the celebration of the holy mysteries. They disposed themselves for the sacrifice by preparatory prayers: the bread and wine were removed from the credence table to the altar. The graces and blessings of God were invoked upon the assembly of the faithful, upon the Catholic Church, the sovereigns, and magistrates, upon the army, the bishops and clergy, upon every class of the faithful, enemies and persecutors, the Christians who were in prison or condemned to the mines, for the conversion of the gentiles, the return of schismatics and heretics, for the salubrity of the air, and the preservation of the fruits of the earth. They commemorated the patriarchs, prophets, apostles, martyrs and confes-

* *Litur. of the Apost. Constit.*—“Catechumens, retire; let no one remain here.” *Lit. of Constantinop.* “Let there be no catechumens any longer, nor any of those who are not initiated in the mysteries.” “Let each one be known, and the doors carefully kept.” *Lit. of St. James.*

sors; and prayed for all who had departed this life in the faith.* Then came the preface, the beginning and end of which are the same at this day. It was the introduction to the principal action of the sacrifice, which we call now, as formerly, the canon; in which they never failed to repeat the words of the institution of the Eucharist in the same terms as those of the evangelists. To these were added, particularly in the East, admirable invocations to beg of God to send upon the gifts his Holy Spirit, the witnesses of the sufferings of our Lord Jesus, that by his presence and power the bread and wine might be changed into the body and blood of Jesus Christ. The Lord's Prayer and the Apostle's Creed were commonly recited after the canon. The fervour excited by the approach of the consecration was kept alive after it: it even increased and became profound adoration, when the deacons distributing to the faithful both species, said to each one, "*This is the body, this is the blood of Jesus Christ.*" The receiver answered "*Amen.*" This affecting spectacle of love and devotion, worthy of the regard of heaven and the admiration of earth, concluded with lively acts of thanksgiving.

III. Such, in the primitive church, was the order of the divine service, which the Christians celebrated with the doors shut, and which they kept secret every where else with a fidelity which nothing could overcome. We have seen them suffering torments and death, rather than divulge what passed in their pious assemblies.

* From the birth of the Church to the sixteenth century no liturgy was ever known without a commemoration of the saints, and prayers for the dead. "We make memory of the patriarchs, prophets, apostles and martyrs, that by the merit of their prayers, God may favourably receive ours: we pray afterwards for the holy fathers and bishops, and in fine for all departed in our communion, believing that their souls receive great relief from the prayers which we offer for them at the moment when the holy and awful victim lies upon our altars."—*S. Cyril of Jerusalem Cat. Myst.* 5.—*Ab uno disce omnes.*

The liturgy was the faithful representation in detail of their worship. You will therefore readily imagine that it was not committed to writing. The secret would have been exposed to too many risks, if each Church had written its own. From the beginning they had adopted the only means of avoiding accidents, and concealing the knowledge of the mysteries from the profane. It had been determined that the prayers of the liturgy and consecration should be confided to the memory of the priests and bishops, as also the creed to the memory of the faithful.* This salutary precaution continued as long as the apprehensions which had rendered it necessary. But at length Christianity having gained the ascendancy, there was no longer any hesitation in publishing the mysteries. This happy period was about the time of the general council of Ephesus, in 431. It is even fair to presume that this determination was taken by the fathers of that council; for then the liturgies began to be written every where all at once. The Nestorians and Eutychians soon imitated the example of the Catholic Church; and in a short time, every Church in the East had its liturgy written.†

IV. But here, sir, you will be inclined to ask, how are we sure that liturgies written three centuries and a half after the apostles' time, came originally from them? In this manner: it cannot be reasonably doubted,

* "The symbol of our faith and hope comes to us from the apostles, and is not written.—*St. Jerom. Ep. ad Pam.* No one writes the creed; it cannot be read; repeat it to yourselves every day, when you lie down and when you rise. Let your memory be your book."—*Sit vobis codex vestra memoria.*—*S. Aug. ad Catech. T. 6,* p. 548.

† We only know of two liturgies written previous to the council of Ephesus; that which I have quoted of St. Cyril, and that of the anonymous author of the Apostolic Constitutions; and both contained a strong prohibition to communicate them to the uninitiated, because of the sacred things they contain. Hence at the time when they were written, the discipline of secrecy was still in vigour.

that the earliest liturgy was drawn up by the apostles, conformably with the instructions of their Master, and celebrated by them in those daily assemblies which they held at Jerusalem before they separated. Of this indeed we have positive evidence. St. Irenæus, a disciple of St. Polycarp, assures us of it in these words: "Our Lord taught the new oblation of his New Testament: the Church has received it from the apostles, and presents it to God in every part of the world.* This declaration establishes the fact decisively: and we naturally conceive that the apostles departing singly from Jerusalem would give the same liturgy, which they had there composed together, to the churches founded by them in the course of their preaching the gospel.

St. Epiphanius, though born in 310, two hundred and ten years after St. John, is nevertheless a valuable witness in this matter, because he united with the virtues of a great prelate, the science of a consummate theologian. Observe what he says after repeating the names of the twelve. "They were all elected apostles, to preach the holy gospel over the world, with Paul, Barnabas, and the rest; and they were the institutors of the mysteries, with James the brother of our Lord, and first bishop of Jerusalem."† We discover in Pliny some confused traces of the liturgy, which the Christians celebrated under his government.‡ St. Justin represents it to us more distinctly in the account which he thought it a duty to give to the Emperor Antoninus, of what the Christians did in their secret assemblies. The description which he gives corresponds precisely with the liturgies.|| I have adduced other authorities in my ninth letter and its appendix at the end of the 1st vol. of the *Discussion Amicale*; I beg to refer you to it.

**Adv. Hæres.* Lib, 4, cap. 32.

† *Hæres.* 79, No. 3.

‡ Letter to Trajan.

|| 1st Apol.

V. I see plainly enough you will reply, that the apostles composed a liturgy together; I conceive too, that they would communicate it to the churches, which they founded: but where are we to find this apostolic liturgy in these days? We have a great number which differ from each other considerably. If we suppose that these were traced upon the model of the primitive liturgy drawn up at Jerusalem, by what mark are we to distinguish what comes from the apostles, from what does not? I have laid down the certain and indubitable mark of distinction in my ninth letter, where you may see it solidly proved. The finger of the apostles is manifest wherever the various liturgies all unanimously agree. This apostolic mark has been acknowledged and described by eminent men in your Church: and persuaded as I must be, that their judgment will have more weight with you than mine, I will here present you with it. "It was highly unreasonable to suppose," says Dr. Waterland, "that those several churches, very distant from each other in place, and of different languages, . . . should all unite in the same errors, and deviate uniformly from their rule at once. But that they should all agree in the same common faith, might easily be accounted for, as arising from the same common cause, which could be no other but the common delivery of the same uniform faith and doctrine to all the churches by the apostles themselves. Such unanimity could never come by chance, but must be derived from one common source; and therefore the harmony of their doctrine was in itself a pregnant argument of the truth of it."*

Archbishop Wake says; "As for the liturgies ascribed to St. Peter, St. Mark, and St. James, there is not I suppose any learned man, who believes them written by those holy men, and set forth in the manner

* *Importance of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity*, pp. 372, 373.

they are now published. They were indeed the ancient liturgies of the three, if not of the four patriarchal churches—viz. the Roman (perhaps that of Antioch too) the Alexandrian, and Jerusalem Churches, first founded, or at least governed by St. Peter, St. Mark, and St. James. However, since it can hardly be doubted, but that these holy apostles and evangelists did give some directions for the administration of the blessed Eucharist in those churches, it may reasonably be presumed, that some of those orders are still remaining in those liturgies, which have been brought down to us under their names; and that those prayers wherein they all agree (in sense at least, if not in words) were first prescribed in the same or like terms by those apostles and evangelists; nor would it be difficult to make a further proof of this conjecture from the writings of the ancient fathers, if it were needful in this place to insist upon it.”*

“I add to what hath been already observed,” says Bishop Bull,† “the consent of all the Christian Church-

* *Discourse before his translation of the apostolical fathers*, p. 102.

† *Sermons on Common Prayer*. Sermon 13, vol. 1, new edit. I had remarked that if Bishop Bull had with just reason concluded from the liturgies the necessity of acknowledging the unbloody sacrifice of the new law, a man so well informed ought equally to have inferred the necessity of believing the real presence of the divine victim, the change of substance and adoration; since the liturgies are no less unanimous on these dogmas than on the sacrifice. I had quoted previously the following truly orthodox words of the same bishop: “If it be imagined that all the pastors could have fallen into error and deceived all the faithful, how can the word of Jesus Christ be defended, who promised his apostles, and their successors in their persons, to be always with them? A promise which would not be true, since the apostles were not to live so long a time, if their successors were not here comprehended in the persons of the apostles themselves.” I had added, that with such accurate reasoning, he ought to have come over to the Catholic Church. What does Mr. Faber say in reply to my reflections? He observes that Bishop Bull, notwithstanding died in the bosom of the Church of England. This I well knew, and deplored his inconsistency. Let the Rector explain it as he pleases; I can

es in the world, however distant from each other, in the prayer of the oblation of the Christian sacrifice in the Holy Eucharist, or sacrament of the Lord's Supper; which consent is indeed wonderful. All the ancient liturgies agree in this form of prayer, almost in the same words, but fully and exactly in the same sense, order and method; which whosoever attentively considers, must be convinced, that this order of prayer was delivered to the several churches in the very first plantation and settlement of them."

I conclude with Grotius, who is honoured by all parties as he deserves: "I find," says he in his *Votum pro pace*, "in all the liturgies, Greek, Latin, Arabic, Syriac, and others, prayers to God, that he would consecrate by his Holy Spirit the gifts offered, and *make them* the body and blood of his Son. I was right therefore in saying that a custom so ancient and universal that it must be considered to have come down from the primitive times, ought not to have been changed."

"In the matter of worship," say the ministers of Neuchatel, in the preface prefixed to their liturgy, dedicated to the King of Prussia in 1713, "great regard must be had to what was the practice of the first ages of the Church; and it must be acknowledged that we find in the prayers of the ancients a very peculiar simplicity and unction. Besides, who can doubt that what was done in those times, and established by the successors of the apostles, was most conformable to the spirit of the gospel, and deserving of respect from all Christians? It is true that the usages of churches varied considerably afterwards . . . but *it is certain*

only lament over it, and leave the judgment to Him who searches the reins and the consciences of men.

For the rest, I find, on the subject of the liturgies, men of your Church equally clever and more consistent than Bishop Bull. Whiston, Stephens, and Grabe, composed liturgies in which they included the *unbloody and rational sacrifice, the real presence, change of substance and adoration*.—See *Discussion Amicale*, vol. I, p. 426.

that the foundation and essence of the ancient worship has been preserved in almost all the liturgies; and that if, without regard to what is peculiar to each liturgy, and what was added in proportion as ignorance, error and superstition found their way into the Church, we retained what was of ancient and general use, and what all liturgies agree in within a very little, we should have the true form of worship among the primitive Christians. Such also would be one of the best means of arriving at that uniformity, so necessary for the peace and edification of the Church."*

VI. If then it should happen that in the midst of variations unavoidable in the lapse of so many centuries, so many events, idioms and Churches of different kinds, nevertheless all the liturgies agreed in the sense of those prayers which precede, accompany and follow the consecration; and if those prayers clearly expressed the real presence, transubstantiation, adoration and sacrifice, we must conclude that such uniformity, while it designated the essence of the liturgy, denoted also its apostolic origin. For it were impossible to suppose any other cause of such uniformity. We can find no other sufficiently preponderating and universal to unite in this manner all the Churches in the world in one spirit, one perfect adherence to these same dogmas, and one attention alike scrupulous to

*It is impossible to think on this subject more sensibly than Messrs. Waterland, Wake, Bull, and those ministers of Neuchâtel. They agree in theory, as your doctors do, that all that ought to be retained, *in which all the liturgies agree!* You say this, you teach it, and still you do not practise it! All the liturgies have exhibited and will here exhibit to you the altar, the unbloody sacrifice, the real presence of the divine victim, the change of substance, the adoration, and prayers for the dead; and you do not retain these sublime doctrines, but trample them under foot! You have pronounced your own condemnation. And your contradictions do not open your eyes! Nor the eyes of those who hear you! What? so many lights to distinguish what is good, and so much obstinacy in rejecting it! Great God! will they never recover from such blindness?

profess them in the same circumstances. There is no council to which this singular unanimity could be attached; and indeed the most œcumenical council would not have sufficed; because the heretics would never have followed its decisions, and the schismatical communions of the fourth and fifth centuries, being as inimical to each other, as to the mother Church, would never have agreed together to adopt the forms of prayer and professions of faith drawn up by the council. Nothing then but the institution and authority of the apostles, held by all equally sacred, can adequately account for such uniformity, if it really exists in the Christian liturgies written in the fourth and fifth centuries. Now I pledge myself to convince you in the most palpable manner, that all the liturgies of those times, in use not only in the Catholic Church, but even among the schismatics and heretics, unanimously agree in the prayers, which precede, accompany and follow the consecration; and that they express in the clearest and most energetic manner the belief of sacrifice, of the real presence, of transubstantiation and adoration. The fact in question is most easy to demonstrate, and established by authentic quotations extracted from all these liturgies. I will collect them for you, and let them pass in review before your eyes.

EXTRACTS FROM THE VARIOUS LITURGIES.

“We offer to thee who art King and God, this bread and this chalice, according to the order of our Saviour; returning thee thanks through Him, for having vouchsafed to permit us to exercise the priesthood in thy presence. We beseech thee to look down favourably upon these gifts in honour of Jesus Christ, and to send down upon this sacrifice thy Holy Spirit, the witness of the sufferings of our Lord, Jesus Christ, *that he may make this bread become the body of thy Christ, and this chalice his blood; we offer to thee,*

&c.* The prayers are long and very beautiful. At the moment of communion, the people exclaim; "Hosanna to the son of David, blessed be the Lord God, who cometh in the name of the Lord, and has shewn himself to us." The rubric adds: "The Bishop gives the Eucharist with these words: *It is the body of Jesus Christ.* The receiver answers; *Amen.* The Deacon gives the chalice, saying: *It is the blood of Jesus Christ, the cup of life.* The receiver answers; *Amen.* And after the communion, the Deacon begins the thanksgiving, saying: *after having received the precious body, and the precious blood of Jesus Christ,* let us give thanks to Him, who has made us partake of his mysteries." The Bishop concludes it by a noble prayer.

In the liturgy, rather alluded to than reported in the second book, we read simply as follows: "The benediction is followed by the sacrifice, during which all the people should remain standing and pray in silence; and after it is offered, each one, in order, should receive the *body and blood of the Lord,* and approach to it with the *fear and reverence due to the body of the King.*"

"We beseech thee, O God, to cause that this oblation may be in all things blessed, admitted, ratified, *reasonable* and acceptable, that it may *become* for us the *body and blood of thy well beloved Son, our Lord, Jesus Christ. . .*" And after the consecration: "We offer to thy supreme majesty, of thy gifts and benefits, *a pure host, a holy host, an unspotted host,* the holy bread of eternal life, and the chalice of everlasting salvation." And at the moment of communion, the Priest bowing down in sentiments of profound *adoration* and humility, addresses himself to Jesus Christ present in his hands, and says to him three times: "Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldst enter under my roof; but say only the word, and my soul shall be

*Liturgy taken from the 8th Book of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, written in the 4th century.

healed." And giving the communion, as in receiving it himself, he declares again that it is the *body of our Lord, Jesus Christ*.*

Such were the expressions of the liturgy introduced into the British isles in the year 595, and which was universally celebrated till the sixteenth century in the three kingdoms of England, Ireland, and Scotland, as it has been for many centuries in France, Germany, Spain, and every country in the world, where there are Latin priests. It would be superfluous to produce in this place the ancient liturgy of Spain, since we know from the learned St. Isidore among others, who succeeded his brother St. Leander in the see of Seville in 600, that it was conformable to the Roman liturgy, of which we have just given an extract, in the canon and essential parts of the mass.

Unfortunately we have no manuscript or monument to inform us of the ancient liturgy of Gaul, in its full extent and without any mixture of others. There remains an abridged exposition of the mass, composed by St. Germanus of Paris, in the middle of the sixth century. By the help of this small treatise, and of what we find in the works of St. Gregory of Tours, a few years after St. Germanus, we learn however accurately enough the ancient order of the Gallican mass, and the learned discover in it more analogy with the oriental liturgies, than with the Roman.

St. Germanus, speaking of the gifts placed upon the altar, says; "*The bread is transformed into the body, and the wine into the blood.* The Lord having said of the bread, this is my body, and of the wine, this is my blood. The oblation is consecrated upon the paten. The angel of God descends upon the altar as upon the monument, and blesses the host. When the fraction takes place, the clergy, in a suppliant posture, will sing the anthem: Vouchsafe, we humbly beseech thee, to

* *The Roman Liturgy*, according to the sacramentary of Gelasius.

receive this *sacrifice*, to bless it, and sanctify it, *that it may become* for us a lawful Eucharist in thy name, and that of thy Son, and of the Holy Spirit, *being transformed into the body and blood of our Lord, Jesus Christ.*"*

"May the spirit, the comforter of thy blessing, thy co-eternal co-operator descend, O my God, upon these sacrifices, that . . . this aliment being *transformed* into flesh, this chalice into blood, what we have offered for our sins, may save us by his merits. *Ut translata fruge in corpore, calice in cruore, proficiat meritis quod obtulimus pro delictis.*"†

"Beseeching by our fervent supplications, that he who changed water into wine would *change* into blood the wine which we offer."‡

The Gothico-Gallican Missal of the end of the seventh century contains a prayer to God in form of an invocation. "That thou wouldst vouchsafe to look down with an eye of mercy upon these gifts brought to thy altar, and that the Holy Spirit of thy Son would cover them with his shadow." As also this prayer after the consecration: "Being mindful of the passion and resurrection of our most glorious Lord, we offer to thee, O God, this spotless host, this *reasonable* host, this unbloody host." Again the following prayer before the communion: "Accomplishing the sacred solemnities, which we have offered to thee according to the rite of the high-priest Melchisedech, we devoutly beseech thee, O eternal Majesty, for grace to receive this bread, *changed into flesh* by the operation of thy power; this drink, *changed into blood*, and *to drink from the chalice the same blood, which ran from thy side upon the cross.*"

The priest takes the bread, and says of Jesus Christ:| "Taking the bread in his holy, spotless,

* Gallican Liturgy—Mass of the Circumcision.

† Mass of the Assumption.

‡ On the Epiphany.

|| Liturgy of St. John, or of Jerusalem.

and immortal hands, lifting up his eyes to heaven, shewing it to thee, O God, his Father, giving thanks to thee, sanctifying it, and breaking it, he gave it to us, his disciples and his apostles, saying: take and eat, this is my body, which is broken for you, and for the remission of sins." (They answer amen.) "In like manner after he had supped, taking the chalice and mixing water with the wine, looking up to heaven, shewing it to thee, O God, the Father, and giving thanks, sanctifying it, blessing it, filling it with the Holy Spirit, he gave it to us his disciples, saying: Drink ye all of it; it is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for you and for many, and which is given for the remission of sins:" and afterwards; "We offer to thee, O Lord, this awful and unbloody sacrifice." And again; "His vivifying spirit, who reigns with thee, O God, the Father, and with thy only Son, who spoke in the law and in the prophets, and in thy New Testament, who appeared and rested in the form of a dove upon Jesus Christ, our Lord in the river of Jordan, who descended in the form of fiery tongues in the supper-room of the holy and glorious Sion; send down now this Holy Spirit upon us, and upon these gifts, that by his holy, beneficent, and glorious presence, *he may make this bread the sacred body of Jesus Christ, Amen; and this chalice the precious blood of Jesus Christ, Amen.*" Before communion, the priest thus addresses himself to Jesus Christ upon the altar: "O Lord, my God! who art the bread of heaven, and life of the world, I have sinned against heaven, and against thee: and I am not worthy to partake of thy most pure mysteries: but through thy divine mercy, grant that, without incurring condemnation, thy grace may make me worthy to receive thy sacred body and thy precious blood, for the remission of my sins, and life eternal." At the communion of the people, the deacon says: "Approach with fear, with faith, and with

love." The people answer: "Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord."

"Receive us at thy holy altar," says the priest making the oblation, "according to thy great mercy; grant that we may be worthy to offer thee this *rational*, unbloody sacrifice, for our sins, and for all the ignorances of the people."* Then after the words of institution, which are not omitted in any liturgy with which I am acquainted, the priest bowing down says in secret: "We offer to thee this *rational* and unbloody worship; and we beseech, we pray and entreat thee, to send down thy Holy Spirit upon us, and upon these offerings: . . . *make indeed this bread the precious body of thy Christ;*" The deacon, answers "Amen;" And what is in this chalice, "*the precious blood of thy Christ;*" The deacon, Amen;" "*Changing them by thy Holy Spirit.*" The deacon, "*Amen, Amen, Amen.*" After several prayers, addressing himself to Jesus Christ, the priest says: "Look down on us, O Lord Jesus Christ, our God, from thy holy dwelling, and from the throne of the glory of thy kingdom, and come to sanctify us, thou, who sittest together with the Father in the highest heavens, and *art here invisibly present with us;* and vouchsafe, with thy powerful hand, to impart to us *thy immaculate body and thy precious blood,* and by us to all the people." The priest and deacon in *adoration* say each three times: "Have mercy on me a poor sinner." The people *adore* in like manner. Before the communion, the priest says to the deacon: "Draw near." The deacon bows reverently before the priest, who holds a part of the sacred host. The deacon says: "Give me, O Lord, the *precious and holy body of our Lord, God and Saviour, Jesus Christ.*" The priest gives it into his hand saying: "I give to thee the *precious, and holy, and pure body of our Lord, God and Saviour Jesus Christ.*"—Then the priest and deacon bowing down and holding

**Liturgy of Constantinople*, called that of the Apostles, and later, that of St. Chrysostom.

the sacred host, make together an admirable confession of faith, which begins thus: "I believe, O Lord, and I confess, that thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God, who didst come into the world to save sinners, of whom I am the chief; make me a partaker of thy mystical supper. *I will not reveal the mystery to thy enemies*; nor will I give thee a kiss like Judas; but like the good thief, I confess what thou art." I regret that I cannot here transcribe the whole of this confession, which ends with these words: "O Lord our God, forgive me all my sins, thou who art goodness itself; and by the intercession of thy immaculate Mother, ever a Virgin, grant that without incurring condemnation, I may receive *thy precious and most pure body*." Then the priest presents the chalice to the deacon, who says: "Behold I come to the immortal King: I believe, O Lord; and confess thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." The priest says to him, "Servant of God, Deacon N. thou dost communicate of the precious, and holy body, and blood of our Lord, and Saviour Jesus Christ, for the remission of thy sins, and everlasting life."

The deacon going to communicate the people says: "Approach to God with fear and faith; the choir answers, Amen, Amen, Amen; blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord."—Receiving the consecrated species of bread and wine in a spoon, the communicant says: "I believe, O Lord, and confess that thou art truly the Son of the living God." The deacon says to him: "Servant of God, *receive the most holy body and the precious blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ*."

This liturgy is followed by all the Greeks who are in the West, at Rome, in Calabria, in Apulia; by the Mingrelians, Georgians, Bulgarians, Russians, and Muscovites; by all the modern Melchite Christians dependant on the patriarch of Alexandria residing at Cairo, on the patriarch of Jerusalem, and the patriarch of Antioch resident at Damascus.

Those from which we shall now give extracts are* the liturgy of St. Mark, called that of St. Cyril; that of St. Basil and that of St. Gregory of Nazianzen. The Jacobite Coptic Christians opposed to the council of Chalcedon in 451 have continued to make use of them, and have done so for 1200 years.

In the preparatory prayer, the priest says: "O Lord, do thou make us worthy, by the power of thy Holy Spirit, to perform this ministry, that we may not incur judgment before the throne of thy glory, and may offer thee this sacrifice of blessing." Some of the words of the oblation: "O Lord Jesus Christ, only begotten Son, word of God the Father, consubstantial and co-eternal with Him and the Holy Ghost . . . look down on this bread and on this chalice, which we have placed on this thy sacerdotal table; bless them, sanctify them, and consecrate them; *change them*, so that indeed *this bread may become* thy holy body; and that which is mixed in this chalice, thy precious blood." After having religiously recited the words of institution, the priest continues: "We *adore* thee, according to the good pleasure of thy will, and we entreat thee, O Christ, our God, we sinners and thy unworthy servants, that thy Holy Spirit may come down upon us, and upon his proposed gifts, to sanctify them, . . . and *to make of this bread* the holy body of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ himself, who is given for the remission of sins and everlasting life to him, who shall receive him." The people answer, *Amen*. "And *of this chalice to make the precious blood* of the New Testament of our Lord, God and Saviour Jesus Christ himself, who is given for the remission of sins and everlasting life to him, who shall receive him." The people answer, *Amen*. At the breaking of the host the priest says, "O Lord, our God, . . . thou, who hast sanctified these oblations placed before thee, by

**Liturgy of Alexandria.*

making thy Holy Spirit descend upon them." At the approach of the communion, the Deacon gives notice by these words; "be attentive and trembling before God." The people: "O Lord, have mercy on us." Then the priest taking in his hand the larger part of the host, elevates it, and then bows down and exclaims with a loud voice: "Holy things for holy persons." The people *prostrate with their faces to the ground*. Then comes the profession of faith, which the priest makes in these terms: "*The holy body, and precious, pure, true blood of Jesus Christ, the Son, our God. Amen. The body and blood of Emmanuel, our God, this is in real truth. Amen. I believe, I believe, I believe, and confess, to the last breath of my life, that this is the life giving body of thine only begotten Son, our Lord God, and Saviour, Jesus Christ. He received it from the Lady of us all, the Mother of God, the sacred and holy Mary, and made it one with his divinity, without confusion, without mixture or alteration. He gave of himself a good testimony before Pontius Pilate, and delivered himself for us to the tree of the holy cross, by his only will, and for us all. I believe truly that his divinity was never separated from his humanity, not an hour, not the twinkling of an eye.* He delivered up his body for the salvation, remission of sins and eternal life of those, who shall receive him. Thus I believe in exact truth.*"†

* These words convey a sense perfectly Catholic; they mark union and not mixture; they do not confound the two natures as the Eutychians did. And in fact the Jacobites attached to Dioscorus, rejected, it is true, the council of Chalcedon, which had condemned him; but they equally anathematized Nestorius and Eutyches, according to the edict of union of the emperor Zeno, which they always received.

† We are indebted for the information acquired upon the subject of the Coptic Jacobites, to the travels, intelligence and labours of the learned Vansleb, born at Erfurt. He studied the Ethiopian language under M. Ludolff, who induced the Duke of Saxony to send him to the Levant, and into Ethiopia, in the hope of his

The liturgies of Ethiopia or of Abyssinia so much resemble those of the Coptic Jacobites, that it will suffice to quote some passages peculiar to them. The liturgy instituted by the 318 Fathers expresses the invocation in the following manner: "We beseech thee therefore and entreat thee, O Lord, graciously to send thy Holy Spirit, and to cause him to descend, to come and diffuse his light over this bread, that it may *become* the body of our Lord, and that what is contained in this chalice *may be changed and may become* the blood of Jesus Christ.* Another liturgy translated into Latin by Mr. Ludolff, a Lutheran, speaks thus: "We beseech thee, O Lord, and entreat thee, to send thy Holy Spirit and his power upon this bread, and upon this chalice, that he may make of them the body and blood of our Saviour Jesus Christ, our Lord for ages of ages."

The liturgy called of the Apostles† after the words of our Saviour, continues thus: "The people say; Amen, Amen, Amen; we believe it, we are certain of it, we praise thee, O Lord, our God. *It is truly thy body, we believe it to be so;* and after the words over the chalice, the people say Amen, *it is truly thy blood, we believe it.*" Here we see before the communion that lively and strong profession of faith, which I have

making discoveries there favourable to Lutheranism. Not being able to reach Ethiopia, Vansleb applied himself to the Jacobite liturgies, examined them thoroughly, was convinced by them of the errors of his own communion, became a Catholic, and afterwards a Dominican at Rome. He came into France, and was graciously received by M. Colbert. This great minister, who sought nothing so eagerly as men capable of seconding his vast and noble designs, sent him back to the Levant, with orders to purchase all the oriental MSS. which he could find. Vansleb sent more than five hundred to the *Bibliothèque du Roi*. After vainly attempting to penetrate into Ethiopia, he returned in 1676 into France, where he died a few years afterwards.

* Translation of Vansleb, *History of Alexandria*, Chapter on Transubstantiation.

† Latin translation of Renaudot.

copied from the Coptic liturgy; it stands here with the same expressions. The Priest gives the communion to the people with these words: "This is the bread of life which comes down from heaven, *truly the precious body* of Emmanuel, our God." The communicant answers, "Amen," The deacon presents the chalice, saying: "This is the chalice of life, which comes down from heaven, and *which is the precious blood* of Jesus Christ." The communicant answers, "Amen, Amen."

The liturgies were much more multiplied among the Syrians, than among the other Christian Churches. That of St. James is considered by them as the most ancient, the most common, and that which contains the whole order of the Mass, to which all the others have a reference. I have already quoted some portions of it from the Greek version. I will now produce others from Syriac. At the preparation of the sacrifice, the deacon says: "O God, who in thy mercy didst accept the sacrifices of the ancient just, accept also in thy mercy our sacrifice, and vouchsafe to accept our prayers." Between the words of institution, and those of invocation, which are the same here as in the Greek version, the deacon announces the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the gifts, by a very striking admonition. "How terrible, O my brethren, is this hour, how awful is this moment, when the holy and life-giving Spirit is about to descend from the highest heavens, and bow down upon this Eucharist placed in the sanctuary, and sanctify it; be ye therefore in fear and trembling; keep yourselves in prayer; may peace be with you, and the security of God, the Father of us all. Let us exclaim three times, "*Kyrie eleison.*" Then follows the invocation, the same as in the Greek version. The deacon makes afterwards a very beautiful prayer in a loud voice: "Bless us again and again, O my God, by this holy oblation, by this propitiatory sacrifice, which is offered to God, the Father, which is sanctified,

completed, and perfected by the descent of the Holy Ghost, the life-giver. . . . Ye ministers of the Church, tremble; for you administer a burning fire: the power which is given you is greater than that of the Seraphim. Happy the soul who presents herself with purity at this altar! For the Holy Ghost inscribes her name, and carries it to heaven. Tremble deacons, at the sacred hour when the Holy Ghost descends to sanctify the body of those, who receive him. . . . Be mindful of the absent, O my God! take pity on us. Peace and repose to the souls of the departed: pardon the sinners at the day of judgment: those, who are departed and separated from us by death; O Christ place their souls in peace, with the pious and the just: let thy cross be their support, thy baptism their garment: let thy body and blood be to them the guide to conduct them to thy kingdom." The deacon addressing himself afterwards to the people, says: "*Bow down your heads* before the God of mercies, before the propitiatory altar, and before the body and blood of our Saviour." At the fraction, and communion of the priest, it is always the body of Jesus Christ, which was broken and sprinkled with his blood; the holy body, the life-giving body which he receives. The deacon administering it to the people, says: "My brethren, the Church cries out to you: receive the body of the Son, drink his blood with faith . . . this is the chalice which our Lord mingled upon the tree of the cross; approach mortals, drink of it for the remission of your sins."

The following is the invocation of the Syriac liturgy, called that of St. Maruthas, Metropolitan of Tagrit in Mesopotamia, and a friend of St. Chrysostom's;* "Have mercy on me, O my God, who lovest mankind, send upon me, and upon this holy oblation the Holy Ghost, who proceeds from thee, who receives of thy Son and perfects all the mysteries of the Church, who

* *From the Latin of Renaudot.*

reposes upon these oblations and sanctifies them." The people, "pray:" the priest: "Hear me, O my God:" the people thrice; "Kyrie eleison:" the priest, raising his voice; "that he may make this mere bread by transmutation (*transmutet atque efficiat*) the very same body, which was immolated upon the cross, the same body, which rose again with glory, and never knew corruption! the body, which prepares life! the body of the word himself, God, of our Saviour Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins (the people, "Amen,") and the mingled wine which is in the chalice, he may make by transmutation (*transmutet et perficiat*) the very same blood, which was shed on the summit of Golgotha! The same blood, which streamed down upon the earth, and purified it from sin! The same blood, which prepares for life, the blood of the Lord himself, of the word of God, and of our Saviour Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins and eternal life to those, who shall receive him.

At the offertory the priest says,* "May Christ, who was immolated for our salvation, and has commanded us to commemorate his death and resurrection, may Christ himself receive this sacrifice presented by our unworthy hands!" And as he had desired the concurrence of the people, they answer: "May the Lord graciously hear thy prayers, may he be pleased with thy sacrifice, and vouchsafe to accept thy oblation, and honour thy priesthood!" The priest says: "May thy Holy Spirit come, O my God, and repose upon the oblation of thy servants; may he bless it, and sanctify it!" In this M. S. the prayers for the consecration are wanting; but at the breaking of the host, at the mingling of the species, the liturgy speaks only of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, the precious blood, the life-giving body. At the communion, the

**Nestorian Liturgies*—that called of the apostles, from the *Latin of Renaudot*.

deacon exclaims: "Let us all approach with trembling." And again, "My brethren, receive the body of the Son—the voice of the Church—and drink his chalice with faith." And in an act of thanksgiving, the priest says: "Christ our God, Lord, King, Saviour, and giver of life, has graciously made us worthy to receive his body and his precious and sanctifying blood."

"With hearts filled with fear and veneration,* let us all approach to the mystery of the body and precious blood of our Saviour; . . . and now, O Lord, that thou hast called me to thy holy and pure altar to offer thee this living and holy sacrifice, make me worthy to receive this gift with purity and sanctity." . . . And again the priest says at the communion: "O Lord, my God, I am not worthy, and it is not right that I should receive thy body, and the blood of propitiation, nor even that I should touch them; but let thy word sanctify my soul, and heal my body?" And in the thanksgiving after communion, the priest says: "Strengthen our hands, which have been stretched out to receive the Holy One . . . repair by a new life those bodies *which have tasted thy living body* . . . God has filled us with blessings by his living Son, who for our salvation bowed down from the highest heaven, put on our body, and *gave us his own*, and *mingled his venerable blood with our blood*, a mystery of propitiation

After the words of institution, the deacon says aloud:† "Silence and trembling!" Then comes the invocation, which the priest commences thus, in an inclined posture; "may the grace of the Holy Ghost come down upon us, and upon this oblation; may he dwell and infuse himself on the bread and on the chalice; may he bless and sanctify them: . . . may the bread, by the virtue of thy name, this bread, I say, *be made the holy*

* *Liturgy of the Nestorians of Malabar.*

† *Liturgy of Theodorus, of Mopsuestia, translated by Renaudot.*

body of our Lord, Jesus Christ: and this chalice, *the blood of our Lord, Jesus Christ.*"

The invocation is expressed as follows:* "O my God, may the grace of the Holy Ghost come, and dwell, and rest on this oblation, which we are offering before thee; may he sanctify it, and *make it*, that is, this bread and chalice, *the body and blood of our Lord, Jesus Christ, thou transmuting them (transmutante ea te)* and sanctifying them, by the operation of the Holy Ghost."

In all other parts, this liturgy of Nestorius and the preceding one of Theodorus, resemble the first instituted by the apostles.

At the oblation of the mass for the dead,† we find these words: "Holy Father, lover of mankind, receive this sacrifice in memory of the dead: place their souls among the saints in the heavenly kingdom: may thy divinity be appeased by this sacrifice, which we offer thee with faith, and grant the repose of their souls!" At the canon, the priest says of our Saviour, "taking the bread in his divine, immortal, spotless hands, *which have also the power of creating*, he blessed it, gave thanks, broke it, &c. . . . O God send upon us, and upon these gifts thy holy, co-eternal and con-substantial Spirit:" [Here the deacon bows down at the corner of the altar:] "that thou mayest *make this blessed bread the body of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ;*" and holding the host over the chalice, he adds, "that thou mayest *make this blessed bread and wine, the true body and very flesh, and the true blood of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ, changing them by thy Spirit.*" . . . The priest *adores* thrice, and kisses the altar, and from that time he does not any more raise his hands above the offerings. Now fixing his eyes upon them . . . he adores them as God, and represents to him his

* *Lit. of Nestorius*, from the Latin of Renaudot.

† *Armenian Liturgy*, from the Latin of Mr. Pidou de Saint Olon, Bp. of Babylon, and the French of P. Le Brun.

desires with tears. . . . Towards the communion, the priest *adores*, and kisses the altar; taking the sacred body, he dips it entirely in the precious blood, saying: "O Lord, our God . . . we beseech thee to make us worthy to receive this sacrament for the remission of our sins." The priest with humility elevating from the holy table the sacred body and blood of our Lord, and Saviour, Jesus Christ, turns towards the people, and exhibits them, saying: "Let us taste in a holy manner of this holy, sacred, and precious body and blood of our Lord, and Saviour, Jesus Christ, who descending from the heavens is distributed among us." He says afterwards, "I confess and believe that thou art the Christ, the Son of God, who didst bear the sins of the world. . . . O Jesus Christ, my God! *I taste with faith thy holy and life-giving body* for the remission of my sins. O my God, Jesus Christ, *I taste with faith thy purifying and sanctifying blood* for the remission of my sins." Then making upon his mouth the sign of the cross, he says these words of St. Thomas the apostle; "may thy incorruptible body be in me for life, and thy sacred blood for the propitiation and remission of sins!" Then turning towards the people with the chalice: "Approach with fear, with faith, and communicate in a holy manner." During the communion of the people, a canticle is sung with these words: "This bread *is* the body of Jesus Christ; this chalice *is* the blood of the New Testament: *the hidden sacrament is made manifest to us*, and thereby shews himself to us; here is Jesus Christ the Word of God, who is seated at the right hand of the Father—he is sacrificed in the midst of us," &c.

VII. After the extracts you have now read, permit me, sir, to conclude the subject of the liturgies by a two-fold supposition, which will personally concern you, inasmuch as it will place your existence about the year 256, under Decius. I will suppose then that in the middle of the third century, certain motives of

curiosity or business had led you into different countries, and had afforded you opportunities of assisting at the divine worship. You would have found in the several countries, in substance, the same liturgy. At Rome, at Carthage, or Alexandria; at Jerusalem, Ephesus, or Antioch; at Corinth, or Athens; in Spain, or in Gaul, you would have heard the same prayers recited, the same invocations, at least in signification, to obtain the change of bread and wine into the body and blood of Jesus Christ; the same professions of faith in the real presence of the divine victim; you would have adored him upon the altar, receiving him with your brother Christians; and with them you would have derived from these sublime dogmas an angelic fervour, and sentiments above the terrors of this world, a courage unshaken and super-human in the fire of persecution, at the glare of the faggot, and the sight of the sword.

I will suppose in the second place, that at the end of your travels, arriving in some great city, you fell in with some Christian congregation, which however would have been impossible at that period, where you heard some venerable ecclesiastic explain to the people that what was elsewhere called an unbloody sacrifice was no more than a pious chimera; that the altar of the Christians was an altar without a victim; that every thing there was in figure; that the presence of our Saviour was only a fiction, since his body had been long ago in heaven, and could not at the same time be found upon earth; that the change effected in the offerings by the Omnipotence of the Holy Ghost, consisted in making a religious emblem of a domestic aliment; that after the consecration, the substances offered were what they had been before, *literal* bread and *literal* wine; and that consequently the adoration of Catholicism was gross idolatry. What then would have been your sentiments? Allow me, sir, to ask you: would you not have left this congregation with perfect

horror? Would you not have fled with precipitation from such a preacher? Doubtless you would from that time have been even more ardently attached to the doctrine of the universal Church. Well then, my dear sir, what you would have done then, do, I beseech you, now. The ancient liturgies are still those of the Catholics; your own is new, national, and discordant. The language of the supposed heterodox preacher is precisely that of the Rector of Long Newton. Both declaim against the faith of the primitive Church: both are at open war with the teaching of the apostles, with the oblation transmitted by them to the Church. Return, sir, I conjure you, to the doctrine and practice of the beautiful ages of antiquity. It is not you alone, nor the laity only, to whom I now most solemnly appeal. I appeal to all those to whom I dedicated my *Discussion Amicale*; I appeal especially to the Rev. G. S. Faber, to the doctors of your universities, to those of every communion, holding, like your own, opinions manifestly opposed to that apostolical tradition, which is imprinted on all the ancient liturgies, in characters uniform and indelible.*

*I cannot too strongly recommend to my readers the very curious work of P. Le Brun, where all the liturgies, ancient and modern are exhibited. This work is indispensable for the young clergy, who are applying to theology in the universities of Oxford and Cambridge. I invite them to take with it the dissertation of Schelestadt *De disciplina arcani*. In these two works they will find most solid and essentially necessary information on the history and doctrine of the primitive Church.

CHAPTER THE FOURTH.

GENERAL PROOF OF OUR DOCTRINE ON THE EUCHAR-
IST FROM THE CATECHESSES.*Particular Proofs from the Fathers.*

I. Every one who has studied the monuments of tradition on the subject of the Eucharist, must have remarked a singular difference in the expressions of the Fathers, when they speak of the sacrament of the altar. Sometimes they explain themselves with all imaginable clearness, on the reality of the presence of Jesus Christ under the species, and on the change of substance. At other times they designate the gifts offered, by the expressions of symbols, types, signs, figures, representations, or allegories of the body and blood of Jesus Christ. This diversity of language, occurs not only among different doctors, but often even in the same Father; for example, in St. Chrysostom, or St. Augustin. The Catholics with good reason attach themselves to the passages of the former kind, while they give the most satisfactory explanation of the others. The Protestant sacramentarians build upon the passages of the latter kind, which suit their opinions; and at the same time, glide hastily over those of the first description, which overthrow their system. Both parties, agree that the Fathers are not to be accused of being contradictory to one another, and still less to themselves. But, as far as I know, neither Catholics nor Protestants have ever yet asked themselves the cause of this difference of language on the same subject? Why the Fathers, after having spoken entirely in the sense of the *real presence*, ap-

pear in other places to express themselves in that of a *figurative presence*. It is however a duty to make such enquiry; and this is the precise point to be investigated and cleared up, in order to dissipate the slightest cloud, and bring forth in the full blaze of day the true doctrine of the Fathers—the real belief of the primitive Church.

II. The answer to this important question is by no means difficult; and I am persuaded, sir, that you have not arrived thus far, without foreseeing it yourself, without my suggestion. The Fathers, as you know, lived under the discipline of the *secret*, and observed it so strictly that they were ready to shed their blood, as were the faithful after their example, rather than violate it by betraying the mysteries; and among others, that of the Eucharist. They *could* speak openly of it, without fear, to the faithful, either in their family circles, or in the church in discourses delivered before them exclusively: they *were obliged* to expose them with all possible clearness to the neophytes, previous to admitting them to communion and on the following days.* On the contrary, in presence of the unbaptized the *secret* was scrupulously kept. And you will readily conceive, that if it were prohibited to confide the least portion to a single individual uninitiated, it must have been much more so to speak openly of the

*“On the eve of the great day of Easter and of your regeneration, we shall teach you with what devotion you must come forth from baptism, approach the altar; and partake of the spiritual and heavenly mysteries, which are there offerèd, that your souls being enlightened by our instructions and discourses, each one of you may know the greatness of the presents, which God gives him.” (*S. Cyr. of Jerus. Catech.* 18.) “We shall only speak now of things, which cannot be explained before catechumens, but which it is necessary nevertheless to lay open to those, who have been recently baptized.” (*St. Gaudentius to the Neoph.*) “In this paschal solemnity,” said St. Augustin, (*Serm. on the 5th day after Easter*,) “these first seven or eight days are devoted to the instruction of the children, (the newly baptized) upon the sacraments.”

mysteries in writings intended for public circulation. "How could it be allowed," says St. Basil, "to publish written explanations, of what the uninitiated are forbidden to contemplate?"

III. What then, in these days, has he to do, who would understand clearly the sentiments of the Fathers on the Eucharist? What course will he take to attain his object? It would be the height of folly to seek their belief *in writings where they were not permitted to divulge it*; in those, for instance, which they published against the pagans and heretics of their times: or in discourses pronounced with open doors before catechumens and gentiles. Any sensible man wishing to learn in the school of the Fathers what has been revealed on the subject of the Eucharist, will open those instructions, which they gave to the newly baptized. He will take his place, not among the catechumens, before whom they concealed the mysteries; but among the neophytes, to whom it was a necessary duty to display them. These are, in the outset, the writings, which any man of sincerity will consult, when desirous of knowing with certainty, the doctrine of the Fathers; but the *catecheses* before all, and even them alone, if he would spare himself much labour and research. For with them, he is sure to discover what the Fathers believed, and what they taught: and by consequence, with them he may save himself all farther trouble.

Nevertheless I would advise him to consult another kind of monuments, from which he will derive particular edification without any trouble, and a firmness in faith most valuable in the evil days in which we live. I allude to the liturgies, which are so evidently connected with the catecheses. In fact, what did these latter teach the neophytes? They taught what passed at the altar. And what else do the liturgies describe? Both then necessarily contain the same mysteries, the same doctrine, the same creed. What the catecheses put forth in theory, the liturgies exhibit in action.

There are the principles, motives and reasons for believing: here the sentiments of gratitude, love and adoration which faith inspires. If a more extensive knowledge were desired, it might be found in the sermons preached before the faithful exclusively; for then the orator felt no restraint in expressing himself openly, whenever his subject led him to speak on the Holy Eucharist.

IV. But at our distance from the primitive times, how are we, in these days, to distinguish among so many homilies and sermons, those at which none assisted but the initiated, from those attended by other persons? How, after so many centuries, are we to understand, whether the audience was composed purely of the faithful, or was made up of the faithful and the profane, attracted perhaps by the reputation and eloquence of the orator? We shall be supplied in this case with certain rules by sound criticism. If the language of the sermon accords with that of the catecheses, if the preacher speaks of the Eucharist as openly as the catechist, we may conclude with certainty that the auditory was wholly Christian. But when the preacher premises, like Theodoret in his first dialogue, that he shall express himself "in mystic and obscure terms, because perhaps he is speaking before persons uninitiated;" when he testifies, like St. Cyril of Alexandria, "a fear of discovering the mysteries to the uninitiated;"—when he declares, like St. Clement of Alexandria, that he will "endeavour to say certain things under a veil, and to shew them, while he is, in a manner, silent upon them;" or when he uses that expression, so common to S. Chrysostom and S. Augustin: the "*initiated understand me, the initiated know it;*" or finally, when he seems to use expressions contradictory to those which he has elsewhere employed before the faithful;—then, and in all such cases, we are perfectly assured that there were some of the profane among his hearers.

V. These preliminary observations will not appear to you, sir, as I love to believe, inspired by prejudice; but rather dictated by the spirit of impartial criticism: and if you are desirous of acquiring an exact and thorough knowledge of the primitive doctrine on the sacrament of our altars, you will doubtless seek out in the first place, the elementary discourses still extant, for the instruction of neophytes; then the ancient liturgies of the Christian churches, and finally the discourses composed exclusively for the faithful. As to the sermons addressed indiscriminately to Christians and others, as also those works intended for the public; knowing that the discipline of the *secret* required the mysteries to be concealed, you will not think of seeking for them in writings of that kind: and when you see your own divines attaching themselves by choice to such works, and quoting passages from them with self-complacency, you will say to yourself: "What can they mean by such a method? Why enquire of the Holy Fathers their sentiments on the Eucharist, in circumstances in which they were obliged to conceal them? What they said at those times was never intended by them to guide us in this matter. To persist in taking them for judges contrary to their known intention, is willfully to deceive one's self and others." This is entirely my opinion. To seek to discover what the Fathers thought on the Eucharist, in writings where they were obliged to conceal their sentiments; and not in those where duty made it a law to expose them openly, is assuredly following a method totally opposed to the dictates of common sense.*

*Here observe that your divines, when combatting the real presence, transubstantiation, or the adoration of Jesus Christ in the blessed sacrament, never reason from the catecheses, the liturgies, or the sermons preached before the faithful exclusively. At most they will quote a few insulated phrases from them, carefully concealing what proceeds and follows them. You will soon see more than one example of this.

VI. Open then with me the instructions addressed to the neophytes; read again the extracts, which I shall point out to you; and remark, if you please, their conformity in doctrine with that of the liturgies. The venerable patriarch St. Cyril, addressing the neophytes of Jerusalem, thus expresses himself:* “As then Christ, speaking of the bread, declared and said, *this is my body*, who shall dare 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?” (Who? Mr. Faber would reply to St. Cyril, I shall doubt it.) “Formerly at Cana in Galilee, Jesus Christ changed water into wine by his will only; and shall we think it less worthy of credit, that he changed wine into his blood?† . . . Wherefore with all confidence, let us take the body and blood of Christ. For in the type or figure of bread his body is given to thee, and in the type or figure of wine, his blood is given; that so being made partakers of the body, and blood of Christ, you may become one body and one blood with him. Thus the body and blood of Christ being distributed in our members, we become *Christophori*, that is, we carry Christ with us; and thus, as St. Peter says,

**Catech. Mystag.* iv. No. 1 and 2.

†After quoting thus far, the Rector stops short, and says in a note, page 68; “I have selected this passage, because, *so far as I know*, it is the strongest which can be produced from antiquity in favour of the Latin doctrine of transubstantiation.” What an appearance of candour! How could it fail to deceive his readers? He knows that the very contrary to what he says is the fact. For he sees in the same page, and he has seen in my book, the words I have cited in continuation; and yet he has the effrontery to suppress them! I blush to record so unworthy an artifice. How can a man pretending to prove to his countrymen the truth, conceal it thus willfully from their sight? I am at a loss for expressions, which, without incurring impoliteness, might inflict well merited correction on this shameful want of good faith. I defy any one, and above all, the champion of figure and moral change, to express transubstantiation more clearly than St. Cyril does, in the words Mr. Faber has artfully suppressed.

we are made partakers of the divine nature.* Wherefore I conjure you, my brethren, not to consider them any more as common bread and wine, since they are the body and blood of Jesus Christ according to his words; and *although your sense might suggest that to you, let faith confirm you. Judge not of the thing by your taste, but by faith assure yourself, without the least doubt, that you are honoured with the body and blood of Christ. This knowing, and of this being assured, that what appears to you bread, is not bread, but the body of Christ, although the taste judges it be bread; and that the wine which you see, and which has the taste of wine, is not wine, but the blood of Christ.*"† And in the succeeding catechesis, where he describes the liturgy of St. James, in use in his time in Jerusalem, St. Cyril prescribes the manner of receiving the chalice, in these words: "After having thus received the body of Jesus Christ, approach to the *chalice of his blood*, not extending your hands, but bowing in an attitude of homage and *adoration*, and answering—*Amen.*"‡

VII. St. Ambrose said to those about to partake of the sacred mysteries: "Water flowed from a rock for the Jews; but for you, *the blood of Jesus Christ himself flows.* 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. . . . Moses held a rod; he cast it on the ground; and it became a serpent. . . . If now the blessing of men was powerful enough to change nature, what must we not say of the divine consecration, when the very words of our Lord operate? For that sacrament, which you receive, is

* *Catech. Myst. No. 3.*

† *Catech. Myst. No. 6-9.*

‡ *Catech. Myst. v. No. 22.* This adoration is the same which we have seen in the liturgies rendered to Jesus Christ, under the species, and consequently the adoration of *latria*.

accomplished by the word of Christ.* 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? It was the true flesh of Christ, which was crucified, which was buried; and this is truly the sacrament of his flesh. Our Lord himself proclaims: *this is my body.* Before the benediction of the celestial words, the bread (*species*) is named; after the consecration the body of Christ is signified. He himself calls it his blood. Before consecration it has another name; afterwards it is denominated blood. And you answer *Amen*, that is, it is true. What the mouth speaks, let the internal sense confess: what the words intimate, let the affection feel. By these sacraments Christ feeds his Church, and by them is the soul strengthened. It is a mystery, which you ought to keep carefully within yourselves . . . for fear of communicating it to those, who are unworthy of it, and of publishing its secrets before infidels, by too great levity in speaking. There-

* According to Mr. Faber we should say: Moses knew how to change *physically* his rod into a serpent; therefore much more can Jesus Christ change *morally* the bread into a figure of his body; which signifies in plain English—if Moses being only a man did what was greater, Jesus Christ, *a fortiori*, can do what is less!

† If the word of Jesus Christ could, out of nothing, produce what before did not exist, why should it not be able, in certain circumstances, to substitute for the common use of bread, a distinction wholly religious? Thus ought those to reason from the great miracle of the creation, who in the Eucharistic bread admit only the *moral change* of Mr. Faber. The absurdity of such reasoning is palpable. St. Ambrose afterwards compares the miracle of the production of Christ's body in the sacrament, with that of his birth from a virgin. While Mr. Faber admits the miracle of his birth, will he inform us where is the miracle of the production of his body in the sacrament? This real and physical figure was certainly miraculous: but how can a moral and figurative production be so?

fore you must watch with great care in order to keep the fidelity of your secret.”*

VIII. St. Gaudentius, bishop of Brescia, will repeat to you what he said to his newly baptized Christians: “Among all those things, which are marked out in the Book of Exodus, on the celebration of the Passover, we shall only now speak of such as *cannot be explained* before the catechumens, but which *it is nevertheless necessary to make known to those, who have been newly baptized.* In the shadows and figures of the ancient passover, they did not kill one lamb only, but several, one in each house; because one alone would not have sufficed for all the people, and because this mystery was only the figure, and not the reality of our Lord’s passion. For the figure of a thing is not the reality, but only the image and representation. But now, when the figure has ceased, the one that died for all, *immolated* in the mystery of bread and wine, gives life *through all the Churches*, and being consecrated, *sanctifies those that consecrate.* *This is the flesh of the Lamb, this is his blood:* for the bread that came down from heaven said: *the bread, which I shall give you, is my flesh for the life of the world.* His blood is rightly expressed by the species of wine, because when he says in the gospel, *I am the true vine*, he sufficiently declares all wine, which is offered in the figure of his passion, *to be his blood.* And he who is the Creator and Lord of all natures, who produces bread from the earth; of the bread *makes his own proper body*, (for *he is able*, and he promised to do it); and *who of water made wine, and of wine his blood* It is the pasch, he says, that is, the passover of the Lord; think not that earthly, which is made heavenly by him, *who passes into it, and has made it his body and blood.*† You ought not then to reject the mysteries of

*I ask again in this place—where is the mystery, and the necessity of keeping any secret in the system of figure and moral change?

† In what St. Gaudentius here tells you, you look in vain, I imagine, for the moral change of Mr. Faber. What follows is not in the least, more like it.

our Saviour's passion, by considering this flesh as if it were raw, and this blood as if it were raw, as the Jews did, nor say with them: *how can he give us his flesh to eat?* Neither ought you to consider this sacrament as any thing earthly; but rather you should firmly believe that by the fire of the Holy Ghost, this sacrament in effect is what the Lord assures you that it is. Believe what is announced to thee; because what thou receivest, *is the body* of that celestial bread, *and the blood* of that sacred vine;* for when he delivered consecrated bread to his disciples thus he said: *This is my body; this is my blood.* Let us believe Him, whose faith we profess; for truth cannot lie. . . . Receive then with us, with all the holy eagerness of your heart, this sacrifice of the passover of the Saviour of the world *whom we believe to be himself present in his sacraments.*" Do you think, sir, that the Rector of Long Newton ever delivered a discourse like this to any he prepared for the sacrament? No; no more than he did like those of St. Ambrose and St. Cyril. Such language can no where be found but in the mouth of a Catholic pastor.

IX. St. Gregory Nazianzen, addressing his neophytes,† applies to the Eucharist the precepts of Moses on the celebration of the passover. "The law puts a staff into your hand, that you may not *stagger* in your soul, when you shall hear of the death of God. Eat the body much more without any *hesitation*, and drink the blood if you sigh after life. Never doubt of what you hear concerning his flesh; be not scandalized at his passion. Keep firm, and resolved not to let yourself be shaken by the discourse of your adversaries, nor carried away by their efforts; with your foot upon the rock, and your body resting on the column of

* In the system of a moral change, there is no *living and ecclesiastical bread*; it is only earthly, terrestrial, and inanimate.

† *Second Disc. on the Passover, Orat. 45.*

temple, remain immoveable on the pinnacle which you occupy." How strange must language like this sound to the ear of Mr. Faber? What can these precautions and admonitions signify? What hesitation or doubt could arise from a figurative manducation? Is there any thing to terrify the imagination in a moral change? Or any room for fear at the sight of *literal* bread?

X. It would be too long to quote the catechetical discourse composed by St. Gregory of Nyssa in forty chapters for the instruction of his neophytes: I will however present you with a few passages. "When persons, who have taken poison, wish to destroy the mortal violence of the poison by a remedy, which will counteract it, this counter-poison must enter into their bodies, as the poison did before it, that it may diffuse and insinuate its virtue in all parts, where the venom has penetrated. In like manner, after taking the fatal poison of sin, which destroys our nature, it is absolutely necessary for us to take a remedy to re-establish what was corrupted and changed, that this powerful antidote, being within us, may drive away and repair by its contrary virtue, the evil which the poison caused in our bodies by its malignity and contagion. But what is this medicine? That body, which was shewn to be more powerful than death, and was the beginning of our life; and which could not otherwise enter into our bodies than by eating and drinking."* The body then which we eat is that which suffered death, and triumphed over it by the resurrection. But would it not suffice, according to St. Gregory of Nyssa, to eat this divine body by faith? Judge for yourself from the following words of that great prelate: "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." A question totally

* *Orat. Catech. ch. 37.*

absurd, if there were no manducation but by faith. Surely you have never either heard or read it in your Church; and certainly it will never enter Mr. Faber's mind to propose it to you. "The body of Christ, by the inhabitation of the Word of God, was transmuted into a divine dignity: and so I now believe, that the bread, sanctified by the word of God, *is transmuted* into the body of Christ. This bread, as the apostle says, is *sanctified by the Word of God and prayer*, not that, like food, it passes into his body, but that it is instantly *changed* into the body of Christ, agreeably to what he said, *this is my body* By the dispensation of his grace; he enters, by his flesh, into the breasts of the faithful, commixed and contempered with their bodies, that by being united to that which is immortal, man may partake of incorruption. This is the gift which he bestows upon us, when, by the virtue of the benediction, he changes or transforms into his body the nature of the visible species. *Virtute benedictionis in illud corpus transelementatâ eorum que apparent naturâ.*" These are expressions which would appear to me very strong, if I beheld in the Eucharistic bread nothing more than a simple transportation from the kitchen to the Lord's table, and from the commonest use, a religious change or emblem. In truth, Mr. Faber must be greatly scandalized at the doctrine taught by the ancient Fathers of the Church, to their neophytes; or rather he ought to abandon his own and adopt theirs.

XI. Let him listen attentively with us to the instructions of St. Chrysostom: "The statutes of sovereigns have often served as an asylum to men who took refuge near them; not because they were made of brass, but because they represented the figure of princes. Thus the blood of the Lamb saved the Israelites, not because it was blood; but because it prefigured the blood of our Saviour, and announced his coming. Now therefore if the enemy perceived, not the blood of the figurative Lamb marked upon our

doors, but *the blood of the truth shining in the mouths of the faithful*, he would much more speedily depart from them. For if the angel passed over at the sight of the figure, how much more would the enemy be terrified at the sight of the reality! Consider with what food he nourishes and fills you: *he himself* is for us the *substance* of this food." (Therefore the substance of bread is no longer there.) "He himself is our nourishment. For as a tender mother moved by natural affection, is eager to support her child with all the abundance of her milk, so Jesus Christ *feeds with his own blood* those whom he regenerates." Could the real presence be described or rendered by any comparison more touching and energetic.*

Let us then, in all things, obey God.† Let us not contradict him, even when what he tells us appears repugnant to our ideas, and to our sight. Let his word be preferred before our eyes and our thoughts. Let us apply this principle to the mysteries. Let us not regard what is exposed to our sight, but rather his word. For that is infallible, whereas our senses may deceive us. Since then the word has said; *this is my body*, let us obey, let us believe, and behold this body with the eyes of the soul. For Jesus Christ has given us nothing sensible; but *under sensible things*, objects which are only discernible by the spirit. For if you were without body, the gifts which he has given you would have been simple; but because your soul is united to a body; *under sensible things*, he presents you such as are not sensible. How many persons are heard to say: I would willingly behold his figure, his shape, his attire! But thou seest him, thou touchest him, *thou receivest him into thy breast*. Yet thou desirest to see his garments. He gives himself to thee, not to be look-

* *Hom. to the neophytes*, and nearly the same in a homily on St. John, in the 60th to the people of Antioch.

† *Hom. 60th, to the people of Antioch.*

ed on only, but to be touched, to be eaten, to be *admitted into thy breast!* The treason of Judas, the ingratitude of those who crucified him made the most holy body of our Lord suffer death; and thou, dost thou receive him with a soul impure and defiled, after receiving from him so many favours? For not content with becoming man, with suffering ignominies, he would also mingle himself and unite himself with thee, so that thou mightest become one same body with him, *and not only by faith, but effectively and in reality.*” Do you hear any thing like this, sir, in your churches? Do your preachers use any such language? They tell you that you receive Jesus Christ by faith only; and St. Chrysostom teaches that we receive him not only by faith, but in effect and reality. Listen yet farther, I pray you, to the admirable orator of Antioch. “How pure then ought he to be who partakes of such a sacrifice! Ought not the hand dividing this flesh to be more resplendent than any ray of the sun? The mouth which is filled with this spiritual fire, and the tongue which reddens with this most tremendous blood? Think by what an honour thou art distinguished, at what kind of table thou art made a partaker. What the angels tremble to behold, and do not indeed dare freely to look upon on account of the splendour which blazes forth from it, *with this we are fed, to this we are united, and are made one body and one flesh of Christ.* Who shall speak the power of the Lord, and make all his praises heard? What shepherd feeds his sheep with his own blood? Shepherd do I say? There are even many mothers who after the pains of child-birth, deliver their children to other nurses. But this he would not permit; but *feeds us himself with his own blood,* and unites us with himself in every thing.”

“He who did these things at that time, at that supper, is the same who performs them now. We hold the places of his ministers, but it is He himself *who sanctifies and changes them.*” Here, sir, you recognise the

language of the catecheses, and the liturgies; these are in the same terms the very mysteries which they concealed from the uninitiated: therefore there were none in the audience whom St. Chrysostom here addressed. To what class of the faithful was he speaking? Hear what he says:

“I say these things to those, who communicate, and to you, who minister. . . . And thou, O laic, when thou beholdest the priest offering, do not consider the priest doing this, but the hand of Christ invisibly extended. For he who has done more, that is, placed himself upon the altar, will not disdain to present you his body.”

We have none of those dogmatical instructions extant, which undoubtedly St. Augustin gave to his neophytes between their baptism and their communion; “*in order,*” says Hesychius, “*to make them sensible of the greatness of the gifts which God was about to bestow on them,* and preserve them from the ignorance of which those are guilty, who partake of the body of Jesus Christ *without knowing that it is in truth the body of Jesus Christ.*” We have several of his discourses to the newly baptized, to whom he explains the dispositions, which they ought to bring to the holy table, the moral significations or relations between bread and wine, and the mystical body of our Lord. Sometimes however he introduces the Eucharistic dogmas; and among others, in the following passage: “*I engaged to deliver a discourse to you who have been baptized, to explain to you the sacrament of the altar, which you now behold, and of which you have been partakers this last night. You ought to understand what you have received; what you are about to receive; and what you ought every day to receive. The bread, which you behold on the altar, sanctified by the word of God, is the body of Christ. That cup—that which the cup contains, sanctified by the word of God, is the blood of Christ.*” Here we have the doctrine of the real

presence, which St. Augustin recalls to the minds of the neophytes, who must already have known it, because they had communicated on the preceding night.

XII. The quotations you have read, though by no means numerous, will suffice. One thing appears to me absolutely incontestable:—in the primitive age there were no churches without catechumens, and consequently none without catechistical instructions. It was necessary to teach the religion to those adults, who signified a wish to embrace it. They could not be admitted to baptism and the other sacraments, until they had been duly instructed in their greatness and importance. It was therefore necessary to make them pass through a course of preparatory proof, to be assured of their progress, dispositions and piety; to make them sensible of the necessity of grace, and describe its advantages, previous to opening its channels in their favour. These various instructions formed what we call *catecheses*. It is clear that it could no more be permitted to commit them to writing than the liturgies, as long as the discipline of the *secret* was in vigour. Since both contained the same doctrine and the same mysteries, the danger of betraying them would have been the same, if by writing they had been exposed to the risk of falling into the hands of infidels. Thus we see St. Cyril of Jerusalem take the precaution of placing at the beginning of his catecheses an admonition of the most serious character, and almost like that with which the ancient author of the apostolic constitutions terminates his liturgy and performance. We may therefore consider it as certain, that in ancient times all the churches had their catecheses, which were learned and explained from memory, like the liturgies, and for the same length of time. Of those written in the fifth century, very few have come down to us. But by the small number, which Providence has preserved for us, we may fairly judge of all the rest; in the same manner as we judge of the liturgies lost, by those still in our pos-

session. These, that remain agree with each other in every thing essential, and must equally have resembled those, which are unknown to us. For whatever was the difference of language, expressions and ceremonies of the various countries, they were every where employed to arrive at one and the same end, the one only sacrifice of the new law. This reasoning is of itself applicable to the catecheses, which having been only used to explain the Christian doctrine, must ever have traced out the same dogmas, the same precepts, under whatever form, and in what language soever they were expounded. The experience of our own times will suffice to convince us of this. Collect any number of Catholic catechisms, written in English or Celtic, French, German, or Portuguese, Spanish, Greek, or Latin, or any idiom spoken upon the globe: compare them with each other, and you will find perfect uniformity in all dogmatical points. Then compare them with the remains of antiquity; and you will find them in perfect conformity in all the essential articles. But to any man of learning it will be unquestionable that the catecheses of S S. Cyril and Ambrose, the two Gregories, S S. Gaudentius, Chrysostom and Augustin, were the same in every thing essential, with all that were known to the primitive Church. It is incontestable that the catecheses of the first three centuries were in substance conformable to those of the fourth and fifth, in which we read the same dogmas, the same doctrine which we read in our own—the altar, sacrifice, presence of the victim, change of substance and adoration. Therefore these dogmas were transmitted to the Church by the apostles; and consequently they were revealed by our Lord Jesus Christ. In a word, all Catholic catechisms agree on the Eucharistic dogmas with those of the fifth and sixth centuries. But these latter necessarily agreed on the same points with the catechisms of the first three centuries. Therefore ours agree equally with them; and our doctrine on the Eu-

charist is primitive and apostolical. Or again; since the Rector is so fond of the syllogistic form—the catecheses of the first three centuries certainly agreed with those of the fourth and fifth on the subject of the Eucharist. But ours agree with these latter on this subject. Therefore ours agree with the primitive catecheses. The major and minor are incontestable, after all that I have thus far written upon the Eucharist: and the consequence results inevitably from the well-known axiom: *Quæ sunt eadem uni tertio, sunt eadem inter se.* Therefore the argument is incontestable.

XIII. To the authority of the catecheses, and to the arguments, which they had suggested to me, in my *Discussion Amicale*, what reply does Mr. Faber make? The same which he had made to me on the discipline of the *secret*, and on the liturgies; little, or rather nothing, that can deserve notice. I had asked, and I here ask again, how the Church could have prescribed such rigorous secrecy on a thing so simple as a figurative manducation? I had asked, and I here repeat the demand, how the Church, if she only admitted a moral change in the bread and wine, came to invoke in her liturgies the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the oblations, “in order to *change them* and *transform* them into the body and blood of Jesus Christ?” How it was that she commanded the faithful to *adore Him* in the sacrament, particularly at the moment of the Holy Communion? I had asked, and I now ask again, how the Fathers, if they beheld nothing in the bread but some type, or emblem, or sign of Jesus Christ absent, could have said in their instructions to those newly baptized, that what was bread before consecration, became after it the body of Jesus Christ; that it was to be received as such, whatever it might appear to the senses; because it is just and reasonable to depend on the word of the God-man, rather than on a judgment founded on the testimony of the sight and taste? I defied and I again defy any one to produce a single

dogmatical instruction from the first five centuries, in which the catechist teaches the newly-baptized, that after the consecration, the bread and wine remain essentially what they were before; that the invocations of the Holy Ghost have no other object but to obtain a moral change of the bread and wine, and to transfer them from common use to a religious destination; or that bread and wine, which were figures of the body and blood of Jesus Christ in the Old Testament, are so in the same sense in the New; or that the body of Jesus Christ, being in heaven, cannot be here below; and that consequently the adoration paid to Jesus Christ in his sacrament would be gross idolatry. To all these demands, what has Mr. Faber replied? He appears not even to have received them; he takes no notice of them, but loses himself in conjectures quite foreign to my queries. He endeavours to counteract the incontestable proofs of the secret, the liturgies and the catecheses, by certain testimonies from the Fathers, which he might have multiplied without any more advancing his cause, if he had been inclined to draw from the source which I had myself pointed out to him. These passages are for the most part, taken from writings published against the Jews and Pagans, or from homilies pronounced before the uninitiated. In such circumstances, the Fathers not being allowed to express themselves clearly, considered the eucharistic bread and wine in their relation to the senses, and denominated them types, emblems, images, allegories, figures, and sacraments, without adding that these visible appearances covered the body and blood of Jesus Christ; which would have been at once discovering and betraying the secret.*

*On this occasion the Rector does me the honour to express himself as follows: "I have rarely met with a more singular experiment upon the presumed obtuse intellect of a simple laic, than this which has been adventured by the learned Bishop of Aire. An acknowledged *symbol or image of a thing*, if we may

XIV. I will afford you, sir, satisfactory proof of what I advance, by giving you to understand more exactly than Mr. Faber has done, the principal passages quoted by him. The two first which I shall bring forward, are from St. Clement of Alexandria and Theodoret, who both give us notice that they are obliged to conceal their sentiments on the subject of the mysteries. Since their pens were guided by this principle, you will doubtless conceive, sir, that it would be unreasonable to look in their writings, for a clearness of expression on the eucharistic dogmas, which they themselves inform us that they professedly avoid.*

credit a very able divine of the Latin Church, may be at once both a *symbol of the thing in question*, and yet *the identical thing itself which it is employed to symbolize!* pp. 131 and 132. To imagine, that a man of the Bishop's superiour attainments could *himself* admit such a tissue of rhetorical absurdities, . . . is perfectly out of the question." P. 134. Undoubtedly these are absurdities palpable enough; and such as I could not have imagined entering into any man's head. The Rector would make it appear that he has seen them in my book. I can assure you, on my side, that such are only to be found in *The Difficulties of Romanism*. That Mr. Faber should have been able to conceive them, and pursue them through four consecutive pages of dulness, is a feat of strength, of which I should not have imagined him capable, or a delirious illusion of which I charitably lament to find him susceptible.

*Tertullian is of this number: I have quoted testimonies enough from him on the secret of the eucharistic mysteries. St. Cyprian, in the passage brought forward by Mr. Faber, says nothing more than we ourselves would say. It is astonishing to see the Rector claiming for his side St. Cyril of Jerusalem; such boldness is perfectly astounding. It is true, however, that at page 114 he quotes those words of his which I reproached him with suppressing in the place, where candour and equity called upon him to bring them forward. For the rest, he is satisfied at p. 114, that they would appear indeed to establish transubstantiation. Having said this, he quits the perplexing St. Cyril, and goes off to another more accommodating.

ST. CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA.

XV. "I pass over several things, fearing to commit to writing what I was afraid to say, and because I fear that those who may read these writings, may take my words in a wrong sense, and fall into error, and I may be accused, according to the proverb, of putting a sword into the hands of children for their destruction. . . . There are certain things which the Holy Scriptures will shew me, although they are not openly expressed. There are others, upon which they will insist. There are others in fine, which they will only touch upon slightly: but they will endeavour to speak them, while they conceal them, and to shew them while they keep silence."*

What is most remarkable in the quotations here opposed to us by Mr. Faber, is the rare and particular candour, which has presided over their arrangement. He presents them in a line, one immediately following the other. It is true, the references at the end of each, might sufficiently admonish the attentive and practised reader. But the greater portion not being of this description, must imagine that the texts are connected, and all come together in the originals. Yet this is by no means the case. Between the first and second, I reckon ten lines: between the second and third, fifty pages; between the third and fourth, a page and a half. Here then we have sentences detached from their proper places, and artfully reported side by side; so as to present a meaning sufficiently connected and natural. What makes the allusion pass off still better is that the sentences are found connected by the conjunctive adverbs *for* or *then*, as if they were proof or consequence of the preceding phrase. No doubt you would have suppressed them. Mr. Faber has

**Strom.* liber 1.

judged it more useful to preserve them: his intention is manifest. In the first text, he translates *autem* by *therefore*; in the second, St. Clement says, "*Ne quis vero alienum existimet quod nos sanguinem Domini lac allegoricè dicamus, annon vinum quoque allegoricè dicitur? Qui lavat inquit, in vino vestem suam, et in sanguine uæ vestimentum suum.*" (Gen. 49.) Mr. Faber translates thus: "Nor let any one think that we speak strangely, when we say, that milk is ALLEGORICALLY CALLED the blood of the Lord: for is not wine likewise ALLEGORICALLY CALLED by the very same appellation?" p. 75. And I translate word for word as follows: "But lest any one should think it strange that we call the blood of the Lord allegorically milk, is it not also allegorically called wine? 'Who washeth,' it says, 'his robe in wine, and his garment in the blood of the grape.'" Ask the Rector, if you please, why he abruptly cuts the passage short, by retrenching the proof from Genesis. I will give you the reason presently. "The scripture then," continues he fiercely, as if these two passages followed each other connectedly, although they are *fifty pages asunder!* St. Clement proves by the text from Genesis that wine was there a figure of the blood of Jesus Christ. Mr. Faber, who, by the expression, "the scripture then," leaves us to conclude that it was in the scripture, and perhaps even in the New Testament, makes it appear as if he did not see the text from Genesis. Let us leave him to argue at his ease, with his suppressions and conjunctions; and let us conclude from the very passage objected by him that wine having been in the Old Testament a figure of the blood of Jesus Christ, was to become really his blood in the New Testament, which has fulfilled and realized the figures of the Old.

You have seen Mr. Faber suppressing the text from Genesis: now you shall see him making us some amends by shewing in the fourth quotation that he knows equally well how to add as well as suppress,

when it will serve his purpose, as in these words; “*the consecrated liquor therefore,*” *consecrated*, and *therefore* are his own exclusively. He has not taken them from St. Clement, but from his own head. I cannot help observing that all this petty contrivance to adapt St. Clement of Alexandria to his own ends, discovers a deep fund of cunning in the author, which will cause less surprise in England than elsewhere.

THEODORET.

XVI. In his first dialogue, he introduces *Orthodoxus* expressing himself as follows: “Answer me, if you please, in mystical and obscure words: for perhaps there are persons, here who are not initiated in the mysteries. *Eranistes*: I shall understand you, and answer you in the same view.” And further on, the same character says: “You have clearly proved what you desired, though in mystical words.”

The Rector of Long Newton seems never able to represent things as they really are; either he suppresses, or he adds, or gives a sense to terms which they cannot have. He has passed over in silence the above extract from the first dialogue, and half of what you shall now read from the second.—“*Eranistes*: Tell me therefore; what do you call the gift that is afforded before the priest’s invocation? *Orthodoxus*: *This must not be said openly*; for some may be present *who are not initiated*. *Eran*: Answer then, *in hidden terms*. *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 the consecration what are they called? *Orth*. The body of Christ, and the blood of Christ.

* Do you remember, sir, that at p. 115 the Rector maintains, in spite of what he quotes from St. Cyril, that the change of substance had nothing to do in the mysteries: not even as the very *smallest* and *least important* secret?”

Eran: And you believe, that you partake of the body and blood of Christ? *Orth.* So I believe. *Eran:* As the symbols then of the body and blood of Christ were different before the consecration of the priest, and after that consecration *are changed*; in the same manner we (Eutychians) say that the body of Christ after his ascension, was changed into the divine essence. *Orth:* Thou art taken in thy own snare; for, after the consecration, *the mystical symbols* lose not their proper nature: they remain in the shape and form of the *former* substance, to be seen, and to be felt, as before; but they *are understood to be* what they have {been made; this they are believed to be; and as such they are adored.}* The reasoning of *Orthodoxus* is not that

* In this passage three small artifices are to be charged on Mr. Faber. 1st, he carefully avoids quoting the words of the first dialogue, and those of the second, which shew the embarrassment of Theodoret, and his fear of betraying the secret, as also the agreement between the two speakers, to express themselves in hidden terms. He lets no part of them appear; but begins his quotation from the two final sentences. 2dly, he makes Theodoret say that the bread and wine retain after consecration, their *original substance*; page 140. *Original* is here unworthily substituted by the candid and impartial bachelor of divinity. Theodoret says *former* (πρῶτον); a decisive word, which evidently supposes that a second substance has taken the place of the first, and thus authorises the more intelligible translation which I have given, and of which the Greek text is perfectly susceptible. 3dly, instead of *as such they are adored*, the bachelor translates, *venerated*; without considering that the liturgies, St. Ambrose, St. Augustin, &c. tell us that after the consecration, they paid the supreme adoration of *latría*, and therefore *adored* in the full energy of the word. And what did they adore? Certainly not the visible species, nor the substance of bread; but the body of Jesus Christ concealed under the visible qualities of bread.

It is amusing enough to compare in this place Mr. Faber and Dr. Cosin. We cannot but admire the dexterity of both. Dr. Cosin more ready in expedients, suppresses without ceremony the words, *as such they are adored*: but Mr. Faber more considerate, instead of the word which annoys him, puts another which quite alters the sense. On which I have but one simple question to put to you; which of these two worthies appears to you to exhibit the greater candour and good faith?

attributed to him by the Rector. Thou art taken, says he, in thy own snare: there is certainly a change in the bread, but not in its sensible and outward nature: for it retains its figure, its form, colour, taste, and all the qualities of its former substance (*προτερας*.) Yet we conceive it to have become what it is made, the body of Jesus Christ, of which I told thee that we partake, and which consequently is essentially there present: we believe it to be there present, though invisible, and as such *we adore it*. This answer demolishes Eutychianism triumphantly. It shews that the bread is changed, not into the divinity, as *Eranistes* imagined; but from its corporeal substance into the substance of the body of Jesus Christ: in a word, both interlocutors admitted a real change in the Eucharist; *Orthodoxus*, that of bread into the body of Jesus Christ, since otherwise he could not have partaken of that body in the sacrament; *Eranistes*, that of bread into the divinity, because as an Eutychian he acknowledged that only in Jesus Christ, since his human nature had been absorbed by his divine nature after his ascension.

I allow, without difficulty, *Orthodoxus* and *Eranistes* mutually kept their agreement. They had engaged to make use of obscure expressions, and such their expressions are at first sight. But with some attention, those who are initiated into the mysteries, as they both were, can penetrate the hidden sense of their dialogues. Mr. Faber, who is not thus initiated, has read all, heard all, and understood all in a wrong sense; like those who obstinately remained among the catechumens, who neither knew the motives, nor the objects of the discipline of the *secret*, and who in consequence had never assisted at the liturgy, nor the mystagogic catecheses, nor at the sermons delivered before the faithful exclusively.

Besides, the metaphysics of former days had a language now no longer in use. For example, they attach to the words *natura*, *substantia*, *συστασις*, *φύσις*, a dif-

ferent sense from what we give to *substance* and *nature*. St. Peter Chrysologus, speaking of a body becoming glorious, says: *ut hoc sic mutasse substantiam, non mutasse personam*; and St. Augustin alluding to the fall of man, says: *per iniquitatem homo lapsus est a substantiâ in quâ factus est*. We might further quote Aristotle on the word *substance*, as for the word *nature*; also Cicero, Virgil and Horace, who often use it for the qualities and properties of beings. “*Substance*,” says Tertullian, “is one thing, the nature of *substance* is another. Stone and iron are substances, their hardness is the nature of their substance: *aliud est substantia, aliud natura substantiæ. Substantia est lapis, ferrum; duritia lapidis et ferri natura substantiæ.*” (Lib. de anima, c. 32.) Mr. Faber presents these words to his readers in their modern signification. But, if you please, let us appeal to the judgment of the celebrated Leibnitz. “Gelasius, the Roman pontiff, gives us to understand that the bread is changed into the body of Christ, whilst the nature of the bread remains; he means its qualities or accidents. For in those days they did not express themselves with perfect precision and metaphysical accuracy. In the same sense Theoderet says, that in this change, which he calls *μεταβολη*, the mystic symbols are not deprived of their proper nature.” (Sys. Theol. p. 227.) The *Orthodoxus* of Theoderet explains himself in the same terms: “The bread and wine lose not their proper nature; they retain their form, figure, and visible and palpable qualities.” The explanation of the word *nature* once admitted, all difficulty vanishes in the passages from Gelasius and Theodorus quoted by the Rector. There only remains that kind of mysterious cloud thrown intentionally, and by mutual consent, between *Orthodoxus* and *Eranistes*. Far from being surprised at meeting with this slight obscurity; it would be surprising indeed if it were not met with, after they had given notice that they should thus obscure their discourse, in

order to conceal their mysteries from the uninitiated. What appears to me here exceedingly unreasonable, and I may even say absurd, is to pretend in our days to discover *clearly* the doctrine of an author by those dialogues, in which he has forewarned us that he could only declare it under hidden terms.

ST. CHRYSOSTOM AND ST. AUGUSTIN.

XVII. These, as Casaubon acknowledges, have more than forty times declared their embarrassment in explaining the Eucharist in presence of the uninitiated. Every time that they spoke to the faithful alone, they expressed themselves with energy in the Catholic sense. After what I reported in my *Discussion Amicale* from these two great prelates, I should not have expected to find them among the authorities opposed to me by Mr. Faber. I cannot conceive that he could persuade himself that they were not both against him; since to give them an Anglican appearance, he has been obliged to mutilate quotations, suppress phrases before and after, and mangle the passages unmercifully. I am aware that I here bring against him a serious charge: but it is one most easy to establish. I have only to restore the mutilated passages to their integrity.

At page 76 Mr. Faber quotes a passage from the discourse of St. Chrysostom on the treason of Judas; and like myself he read in the same discourse the following words, which he has carefully withheld from his readers; "When I hear the body of Jesus Christ mentioned, I understand what is said in one way, and the infidel in another. . . . Although these unbelievers hear it spoken of, it does not seem as if they heard it. But the faithful possess the intelligence given by the Holy Ghost, and know the virtue and the power of the things there concealed. . . . He that was present at the last supper, is the same that is now present and

consecrates our feast. For it is not man who makes the things lying on the altar *become* the body and blood of Christ; but that Christ who was crucified for us. . . . He said: *This is my body*: these words make the change." We find the same train of thought in his 83d homily on St. Matthew; "We behold the order of ministers; but the sanctifier and *changer* of them is himself."* Would Mr. Faber tell us that this *change* is no more than a moral change? Would the intervention of Jesus Christ be necessary to operate a mere moral change? Would not the power of his ministers suffice to give a pious destination to bread and wine? Does not Mr. Faber do this by himself when he administers the sacrament to his parishioners? But is not his moral change incompatible again with the following passages?

"Consider, O man? the royal table is spread. The angels serve it: the King himself is there *present*: and dost thou remain in stupid indifference! Thy garments are defiled, and thou dost not grieve! But they are pure, you will say. Then *adore* and communicate:" (Hom. 45.) "This body lying in the manger, the wise men revered. . . . They came from distant lands, and adored Him with great fear and trembling. . . . Thou dost not see him in the manger, but on the altar. . . . Let us then shew him a veneration *far above* that of those barbarians." (Hom. 24.) "Go then to Bethlehem, to the house of spiritual bread . . . pro-

* I really pity your Bachelor of Divinity when I find him picking out these words; "for the Eucharist is a spiritual food," in order to turn St. Chrysostom against us, and against himself. Why did he not also select the following: "Go then to Bethlehem, to the house of spiritual bread?" These expressions are quite Catholic; we make use of them every day, and in the mouth of St. Chrysostom they have the same sense as in ours: they mean that the spiritualized body of our Saviour is communicated to us to be the nourishment, not of our bodies, but of our souls, *ut anima de Deo saginetur*, says Tertullian. Therefore this nourishment is a spiritual food.

vided however that you approach to *adore*, and not to trample under foot the Son of God take care not to resemble Herod, and say like him, "*that I also may go and adore Him*; and go not to put him to death. . . . "Let us tremble to appear as *supplicants* and *adorers*, and yet to shew ourselves the contrary by our works." (Hom. 7 on St. Matt.) I content myself with quoting these few passages, because they can leave no doubt in any impartial mind on the sentiments of St. Chrysostom, and of the Church. The adoration alone, so forcibly required by the eloquent patriarch, utterly demolishes the opinion of a figurative presence, or a moral change; demonstrates the doctrine of the real presence, and by a further consequence, that of transubstantiation.

XVIII. I am perfectly astonished at the intrepidity of Mr. Faber. He brings against me one of the discourses of St. Augustin, which I quoted in proof of our doctrines. And how does he set about it? Still by the help of the same stratagem, which assuredly he would find most disreputable in any other. He selects two or three passages, and exhibits them detached from those which precede and follow. United in their proper order, they exclude the actual doctrine of the Church of England; separately, they might appear to favour it. Let us place the passages together, and the illusion produced by their insulated appearance, will at once vanish. You have seen the same thing in St. Cyril of Jerusalem, and St. Chrysostom; you shall now witness it in St. Augustin. "But how adore the earth, when the Scripture says positively, *the Lord thy God shalt thou adore?* and yet it says here, *adore his footstool?*"* But in explaining to me what his footstool is, he says: *the earth is my footstool.*" (Isaias lxvi. v. 1.) "I hesitate in uncertainty; I fear to adore the earth, lest I find myself condemned by Him

* In Psalm xcviij.

who created the earth and the heavens. On the other hand, I fear, if I do not adore the footstool of my God, because the psalm says to me, *adore his footstool*. . . . In this perplexity, I turn towards Christ, because it is He whom I seek here, and I find in what manner the earth is *adored without impiety*, and how *his footstool is adored without impiety*. For he took upon him earth from the earth; because flesh is from the earth, and he took flesh from the flesh of Mary: and because he here walked in this flesh, *even this same flesh he gave to us to eat* for our salvation; but no *one eateth this flesh, without having first adored it*. By this we discover how the footstool of the Lord is adored; and not only we do not sin by adoring, but *we even sin by not adoring it*. But is it the flesh that quickeneth? The Lord even, in exalting this earth to us, informs us, that it is *the spirit that quickeneth, and that the flesh profiteth nothing*. Wherefore in abasing yourself and in casting yourself down before any earth, consider it not as earth, but consider in it that Holy One, of whom *what you adore, is the footstool*. For it is for his sake that *you adore it*. . . . The disciples thought it very hard to hear him say; *unless you eat my flesh you shall not have eternal life*; they understood it stupidly, and conceived it carnally, imagining that he was going to cut off pieces of his body, and give to them: . . . but our Saviour instructed his apostles; (*here begins Mr. Faber's quotation*) *the words that I have spoken to you are spirit and life*. Understand spiritually what I have said. It is not this body which you see, that you will eat; nor that blood which they will shed, who will crucify me, that you will drink. I have commended to you a certain sacrament; spiritually understood it will give you life: though it must be celebrated visibly, it must be conceived of as invisible. *Exalt ye the Lord our God, and adore his footstool for it is holy.*" Mr. Faber has thought it prudent to quote no more than the six or

eight last lines of the text:* they serve as a commentary on the words which our Saviour had just spoken to his apostles. After the example of St. Augustin, I will give a commentary, but a very short one upon the same words. *The flesh profiteth nothing, it is the spirit which quickeneth.* Understand spiritually what I say to you. It is not this body, such as you see it, that you shall eat; you feel shocked at the idea: but this body such as you do not see it. It shall be presented to you under a certain sacrament, which I have in view. Thus you shall eat it: and without that, you shall not have eternal life in you. Taken invisibly in a visible sacrament, it shall be to your souls a spiritual food, which you shall not take without having first adored it.

XIX. The modern Church of England man no longer acknowledges the body of Jesus Christ in the sacrament: therefore he no longer receives it there. For eating in imagination, in figure, in empty shadow, is after all, not eating. Hence he has suppressed the adoration. Where nothing is seen but material bread, *to adore* would be to commit idolatry. The Catholic confiding more in Jesus Christ, than in himself, believes in the word of his Saviour without hesitation, and in his invisible presence without comprehending it; he adores him veiled beneath the appearance of bread, receives and eats his body in reality; certainly not in a raw and *Capharnite* manner, but heavenly and spiritual. For there is no other way of eating a body impalpable, invisible and spiritualized.

XX. Mr. Faber would not fail to cry victory, if I were not to answer the objection suggested to him by the silence of Julian. As a last resource in a despe-

* I must observe that in the translation, these words, *as if he had said—identical, twice—on the contrary—*do not belong to St. Augustin, but to the inventive and fertile Bachelor of Divinity. They add to the text without any way increasing the difficulty. This is becoming an unfaithful translator to no earthly purpose.

rate cause, he calls to his aid that famous renegado "as an unexceptionable witness." Proud of the imperial majesty on which he leans, he comes to us with the air and tone of triumph. Would not any one suppose that he had in his possession the grand work of that emperor against the Christian religion, and in defence of paganism? Would not any one say that he had read it from beginning to end, when he is heard asserting in such an affirmative tone that Julian has not said a word about the real presence, and the change of substance? Well sir, would you wish to know how much truth there is in this boasted objection? The truth is, that neither the Rector of Long Newton, nor any one in the world possesses, or has read the work, in which he has thus blindly placed his confidence. It was composed by Julian and the philosophers who followed him into Persia, in that expedition, which put an end to his projects, his reign and his life. Some have conjectured that it was divided into seven books, others, into three. We know no more of it now than those quotations from the first book, for which we are indebted to the refutation of them written by St. Cyril, of Alexandria, fifty years after the death of the apostate.* It may be easily supposed that the author had

* "Fifty years after the death of the renegado, St. Cyril replied to a work, which Julian wrote in three books against the Christian religion, of which the saint has preserved the first We have no more of the work of Julian against the Christians, than what St. Cyril has quoted in order to refute it." *Tillemont Hist. des Emp.*

"During this journey into Persia, Julian wrote his grand work against the Christian religion It was divided into seven books, or according to others, into three. . . . St. Cyril has preserved a great part of it, inserted in the reply which he afterwards made to it." *Fleury Hist. Eccl. T. 4.* "Julian died before there was time to reply to his sophistry. . . . Nothing would have been left us of them, if St. Cyril of Alexandria, having undertaken to refute them fifty years afterwards, had not thus preserved a considerable portion." *Le Beau Hist. du bas Emp. T. 3.* "Julian wrote an elaborate work against the truth of Christianity: of which

deferred speaking of the Eucharist till the second or third book; and then of course it would be no wonder to find nothing of it in the first. But farther: if it be insisted that he ought to have spoken of it in the first book; he may still have done so; and no one can now prove that he did not. All we know of his book is from its refutation; and we are very much inclined to think that St. Cyril would take great care not to give greater publicity to the raillery of Julian against the Holy Eucharist. How indeed could he have reported them, or could he have defended our dogmas, without attracting the notice and attention of the pagans to our mysteries, and by such indiscretion injured the discipline of the *secret*, as well as the precept of our divine Legislator? This is not merely a conjecture thrown out at hazard: it comes from Julian himself; hear what he says about baptism: "But this grave philosopher affects to laugh at what ought rather to be to him a source of self-congratulation: he is utterly ignorant of the efficacy of the sacred water of baptism; he is pleased to ridicule what is the most holy thing in the world; and congratulate those who having believed in Jesus Christ, have had the happiness to find a miraculous water, which removes every stain, and has cleansed them from head to foot. He adds other *insipid jokes, and old nurses' tales*; and he says afterwards that this lustral water is without power, or virtue against bodily diseases. But know, O wise and illustrious teacher! that we do not apply the virtue of baptism to the cure

some fragments only have come to modern times." *Rees' Cyclopaedia. Art. Julian.*

"The elaborate work, which he composed amidst the preparations of the Persian war, contained the substance of those arguments, which he had long revolved in his mind. Some fragments have been transcribed and preserved, by his adversary, the vehement Cyril of Alexandria; and they exhibit a very singular mixture of wit and learning, of sophistry and fanaticism." *Gibbon's Decline and Fall*, chap. xxiii. Fabricius and Lardner have compiled fragments extant of Julian.

of the body, nor to things perceptible by the senses. The mystery of Christ requires an intelligence, of which those are not susceptible, who are plunged in errors. It is faith, which opens to us the entrance and knowledge of the divine mystery. But in *the fear of offending Jesus Christ*, who forbids us to give that which is holy to dogs, and cast pearls before swine, *by presenting to profane ears what ought to remain hidden*, I shall pass over all that requires a high and sublime intelligence." And after touching upon something of the power and miracles of our Saviour, he adds: "I could say much more, and should have very certain proofs to produce; if I were not apprehensive of exposing myself to profane ears. For people generally deride what they do not understand; and the ignorant, not even perceiving the weakness of their minds, despise what they ought most to admire."

You see then, sir, that St. Cyril does not inform you of all that Julian had written against baptism. His replies are fully sufficient to refute the feeble objections, which he reports. There must have been others, which he deemed it more prudent to pass over than to publish. He clearly alludes to them when he talks of the "insipid jokes, and old nurses' tales," which he passes over for fear of infringing the law of secrecy. We know nothing of these; we should not even suspect their existence, if St. Cyril had not made the observations, which you have just read. Are we then to conclude, because he is silent upon the Eucharist, that Julian had not turned its dogmas into ridicule? No, sir, the silence of that great patriarch is no proof that the emperor had been silent. If the Christian apologist considered himself obliged to be so reserved on the subject of baptism, how much more ought he to have thought himself so bound on the dogmas of the Eucharist, the sublimity of which would have been much more open to the derision of the profane! Besides, what passed at the altar in the assemblies of the

Christians, was, as you know, what the pagans most eagerly sought to discover, and even to extort by punishments; and it was also what the faithful concealed with the greatest care, perseverance and intrepidity, even under the most cruel sufferings: you have seen this abundantly proved.

I am tempted to retort the Rector's argument upon himself. It is a fact that Julian says nothing of the resurrection of Jesus Christ. Certainly, I may as justly say to him, this lover of derision would not have denied himself the gratification of turning that into ridicule, if the Christians in his time had believed in it. What reply would the bachelor of divinity make? That no doubt he had amused himself in so doing at the expense of the credulous Christians, in one or other of the two books, which have never come down to us. Let him not then take it amiss, that I give him a similar answer on the Eucharist. When I hear Mr. Faber so loudly extol the pretended silence of Julian; when I hear him conclude his redoubtable argument in these words, page 121—"I may be mistaken in estimating the strength of this argument; but it strikes upon my own apprehension, as being perfectly *irresistible*." I must say that one thing only astonishes me; the assurance to which he abandons himself in terminating his episode. I am of opinion that it will give you little confidence in Mr. Faber's judgment.

XXI. I believe I have now sufficiently replied to the quotations on the Eucharist, scattered up and down in the *Difficulties of Romanism*. Mr. Faber might have increased the list, by consulting the *Perpétuite de la Foi*.* I contented myself with referring to that work in my *Discussion Amicale*: and indeed to what purpose should I have accumulated them? And what will it avail Mr. Faber to make a lengthened display of them?

* The celebrated work of two of the ablest French controvertists; always excepting him, to whom none can be compared, the most brilliant genius that has appeared in the Church, BOSSUET.

They are taken from writings made for the public, or discourses preached before the uninitiated, to whom the Fathers addressed themselves more frequently than to the faithful alone. Thus the obligation of concealing the mysteries was more frequent than that of manifesting them. Candour and good faith therefore would direct us to put aside those texts, which present intentional obscurity. But in place of these texts and incidental expressions, let one single *catechesis* be finally produced against us. Then the objection would have some weight. For every one knows and acknowledges that instructions must have been clear and explicit, which were made to the newly baptized, on the subject of the sacrament of the altar, which they were about to receive. There, and there only, will at any time be found without obscurity, and treated *ex professo* the true doctrine of the Fathers on the Eucharist. Let only one of these *catecheses* be produced, where the neophytes are instructed to see nothing in the offerings after consecration, but mere signs, simple types and figures of Jesus Christ absent, as Mr. Faber affirms, without being able to give any proof of it;* let such a document be produced, and then we shall have really to solve a serious difficulty. But to go in search of the real sentiments and belief of the Fathers in discourses and writings where they could not disclose them, where they themselves apprize us of their difficulty in expressing themselves, this I must denounce as

* After saying at page 129 that I copiously adduce passages on the change of the elements into the body and blood of Christ, the Rector reproachfully adds, that I say nothing of those, "in which *this change is declared to be purely moral*, in which the elements are pronounced to be mere *symbols*," though these passages "fully explain all passages of the *former* description." My reply is simple enough. I have not indeed cited a single passage which declares, that there is nothing effected but a moral change, that the emblems are *mere symbols* or emblems: for in truth I know of no such passages, and the Rector knows none either. He produces none, and will never be able to bring forward any such passage.

a proceeding antilogical, unreasonable and absurd. That it should be pursued without reflection, and by mere routine, as your divines have formed a habit of doing since 1662, I can conceive: but that, after having been admonished by a series of convincing proofs, they should still obstinately pursue the same method, and point it out to others as the true one, is assuredly preferring error to truth, and being disposed to go wilfully astray, and draw others into their own aberrations.

XXII. I beseech you, sir, to consider seriously the method adopted by Mr. Father, and the consequences resulting from it. To the instructions exposed with the greatest clearness in the *catecheses* on the real presence, change of substance and adoration, what answer does he give? The same as to our arguments from the discipline of the *secret*, and from the liturgies. He does not enter straight forward upon the discussion: he bewilders his reader, and leads him out of the way by irrelevant quotations; he opposes his quotations to mine, and pretends that his own sufficiently explain those, which I had previously cited against him.* Your dogmas, says he, could not have been either the object of the *secret*, or the doctrine of the liturgies and *catecheses*, if it be true that they were unknown to the primitive Church. And it is precisely from the *secret*, the liturgies, and the *catecheses*, that irrefragable proofs crowd upon us, of the universality and apostolicity of our dogmas. But he, being unable to refute, and unwilling to admit them, turns away his eyes, goes out of the straight path, and imagines that he shall destroy them, or at least counterpoise them, by shewing what we do not dispute, that the Fathers in several places have designated the offerings even after consecration by the words, bread, wine, sign, sacrament, type, emblem, figure and memorial; that they have

* Passages of this latter description, . . . fully explain all passages of the former description, &c. p. 130.

spoken of them as spiritual aliments, and beverage, and mentioned manducation with faith and by faith. These expressions prove nothing against our belief, since we often use them ourselves.* They were the more familiar to the Fathers of the Church, as, without injury to their faith, they happily promoted their views, by designating the mystery by its external appearance only. The uninitiated conceived no idea beyond; while the faithful easily penetrated the veil, and from the sensible appearance, were led to the reality, which does not appear.

For the rest, sir, if you will be at the pains of examining, you will find that these expressions chiefly belong, as I must once more observe, to those writings which the Fathers gave to the public, and the discourses which they pronounced before the uninitiated. In seeking the true sense of the catecheses in writings of this kind, Mr. Faber must suppose that the Fathers expressed themselves more openly on the Eucharist before the catechumens, Jews and Pagans, than before the newly-baptized at the moment of their first communion! According to him then, the Church must

* We say, *the sacrament of the Eucharist*; we say *the type, the sign*, but the visible sign of the invisible body is understood: in the canon of the mass, and even after the consecration, we say: *panem sanctum vitæ æternæ et calicem salutis perpetuæ*: before receiving the precious blood, the priest says: *calicem salutaris accipiam*; we sing *panis angelicus fit panis hominum*; *dat panis cælicus figuris terminum*: we oppose to the idea of the Capharnaïtes a *spiritual* manducation.

It is done with us by faith; with you, not at all. For what great act of faith must be made, I pray you, to remember Jesus Christ at the sight of bread and wine placed on the communion table in memory of his death? Much the same as we make to remind us of the Blessed Virgin, his mother, when we hear the Angelus-bell ring. But we must have a lively and firm faith in the word of our Saviour, to believe him present under the outward species, notwithstanding all that is suggested by taste, colour, and smell. This is so true, that the Sacramentarians rejected our doctrine, because they could not bring themselves to make such an act of faith, and they oppose incessantly the authority of the senses, to our confidence in the word of Jesus Christ.

have prescribed greater reserve before the latter, and kept her most intimate confidence for the former! But she ordered precisely the contrary; you have seen it already demonstrated. It is therefore evidently false reasoning to wish with the reverend Bachelor to interpret the doctrine which was of necessity to be exposed as clearly as possible to the neophytes, by that which was as necessarily to be concealed before unbelievers; to explain what must have been manifest, by what must have been intentionally hidden; that is, what is clear, by what is obscure—light, by shade. This is a first consequence of the method which I oppose.

XXIII. In the second place, admit for one moment the principles and argumentation of Mr. Faber, and you will be forced to conclude that the primitive Church never knew any uniformity in her doctrine; that she at this day presents nothing but a discordant scene of opposite and contradictory opinions, a succession of bishops in intestine war about doctrines, teaching *pro* and *contra*, some the real presence and transubstantiation, others a figurative presence, a real absence, a moral change, the bread and wine retaining their own substance with their sensible qualities, and only passing from ordinary use to a religious distinction. Among the latter you must enumerate, if you believe Mr. Faber, St. Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, St. Cyprian, &c. while among the former we cannot but reckon St. Ignatius of Antioch, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, S. S. Ephrem, Ambrose, Zeno, Gaudentius of Brescia, &c. whose testimonies we have seen, leaving not a shadow of doubt on the Catholic belief. This is a second consequence.

XXIV. Thirdly, not only will the Fathers be found in contradiction with each other, but even contradictory to themselves. For example: according to Mr. Faber, page 68, there is nothing *physical* in the change of the bread and wine spoken of by St. Cyril of Jerusalem, (Catech. Myst. 4) every thing there is *moral*;

and consequently it proves neither the real presence of Jesus Christ in the sacrament, nor a change of substance. But St. Cyril, who apparently knew what he was saying, explains himself in these words in the same catechetical instruction: "Believe that what appears to you bread, is not bread, but the body of Christ, although the taste judges it to be bread; and that the wine which you see, and which has the taste of wine, is not wine, but the blood of Christ." According to Mr. Faber, St. Chrysostom acknowledges no more than a moral change in the Eucharist, because he calls it *spiritual* food, which after all is quite a Catholic expression; but besides that in the same homily on the treason of Judas, and in a hundred other places, several of which I have already quoted, he clearly establishes our doctrines, it will suffice to inform you in this place that he is considered among the learned as having been raised up by the Almighty to exalt and extol in the Church the grandeur and sanctity of the Holy Eucharist. None ever discoursed upon it with so much pomp and eloquence as this great patriarch. If we are to believe Mr. Faber, St. Augustin teaches simply a moral change in the Eucharist, when he declares that the words of Jesus Christ to his disciples are to be understood *spiritually*. But if we must attach the sense of Mr. Faber to this expression, St. Augustin contradicts what he had just established a little earlier in the very same discourse. For he had just been proving that we not only may *adore* Jesus Christ, when we receive him in the Eucharist, but even that we should sin if we did not there *adore* him. Here then we should have the real presence demonstrated by the adoration, and rejected a few lines farther on by the assertion of a simple moral change! The same reasoning must be applied to Theodoret. Indeed it is impossible for the Fathers to escape the charge of self-contradiction, if you adopt the method of Mr. Faber. On the contrary, that which we have deduced from the *secret*, the liturgies and the *catecheses*

save them from all contradiction with each other and with themselves. They uniformly express themselves as they ought; openly, when they could; obscurely, when they found it necessary; clearly, before the faithful, dogmatically explicit before the newly-baptized; but reservedly and in hidden terms before the unbelievers. The error of Mr. Faber and all the sacramentarians, is in looking for the doctrine of the Fathers where it was necessarily involved in obscure terms; instead of seeking it where it ought indispensably to have been explicit.*

XXV. Fourthly, it is highly important to observe, that Mr. Faber's method would convict the Fathers of farther and still more fatal contradiction. Opposed to each other, and at variance with themselves in their instructions, they would have been still more so in their conduct; their teaching would have condemned their practice, and the doctrine which they taught in the pulpit, must have destroyed that which they professed at the altar. Those apostolic men, those pious and learned bishops celebrated the divine mysteries as often as circumstances permitted, at the head of their flocks. There united in profound recollection, pastors and people humbled before the majesty of God, addressed to heaven prayers animated with the fire of charity. There when profound silence announced the approach

* The Rev. Bachelor, at page 135, makes me say that on the one hand, the Fathers communicated to the *myste* the grand secret of transubstantiation, while on the other, they declared to the uninitiated that the elements of bread and wine were *only* types, or figures, or representations of the body and blood of Christ. "By this contrivance," he adds, "and at no greater expense than that of a direct falsehood, every thing continued as it ought to be." Now here is a twofold and gross falsehood. It exists in the word *only*, which he palms upon us, but which never came from the mouths of the Fathers, nor from mine, when speaking of the sacrifice of the new law. Take away this *only*, as truth, honour and good faith demand and then are we all absolved—the Fathers and myself, from falsehood, and Mr. Faber from imposition.

of the holy sacrifice, the celebrant offered to heaven those sublime prayers, in which he invoked the descent of the Holy Ghost upon the offerings, that he would come *to change and transform* by his omnipotence the bread and wine into the body and blood of Jesus Christ. There before communion, each one made aloud a fervent profession of faith in the presence of our Saviour by the change of substance. There in fine, advancing in turns towards the holy table, bowing down in silent *adoration*, they received with love and trembling the body of our divine Saviour veiled beneath the species. These things, sir, you have seen in the ancient liturgies of all the Christian churches. The Rev. Bachelor must have read them. Finding it impossible to answer them, he has turned away from them in sorrow. I do not blame him for his silence, for neither he, nor any one else will ever obscure the unalterable splendour of the liturgies. What I blame in him, is his not having the candour and courage to acknowledge it and surrender himself to it; I blame him for having persisted in his method, for continuing to suppose the Fathers of the primitive Church contradictory to themselves in instruction and practice; disclosing the mystery without disguise to the uninitiated, and concealing it from the neophytes; teaching the nations that in the new law as in the old, the bread and wine are only signs and figures of Jesus Christ absent, and at the same time inviting the faithful by their example to adore Jesus Christ as present under those signs, emblems and figures. I accuse him in fine, of supposing the Fathers to have been alternately Sacramentarians in theory and Catholics in the sacred functions of the priesthood; advocates of a moral change in their writings and sermons, after having shewn themselves at the altar intimately persuaded of a change of substance; declaiming out of doors against the idolatry of paganism, and in their secret assemblies erecting a new system of idolatry for the faithful, and obliging them by their

own example to prostitute their vows and adoration to mere material substances.

XXVI. I figure to myself that numerous and venerable train of pontiffs and doctors, the witnesses of the apostolical doctrines, and our true masters in faith—I imagine those holy and illustrious personages, shaking off the dust of the tomb, returned to life, placing themselves between us and the Sacramentarians, and addressing all those who share the *profession* and *theology* of Mr. Faber in the following words:—"You, who seem to attach such value and authority to the uniform traditions, which we bequeathed to you; and who only need, as you say, to know them, to induce you to adopt them; how came you to misunderstand those, which we faithfully transmitted from the apostles to our various Churches, concerning the most august of all the sacraments? How came you not to understand what we so often expressed in our writings, and what we shall now briefly repeat to you? We admonished you that "the sublimity of the Eucharist so far surpassed the limits of the human understanding, that it would have been folly in us to believe it, if it had not come to us from the very mouth of our divine Founder. He has said, *my flesh is meat indeed, my blood is drink indeed*. He leaves no room to doubt of the reality of his flesh and blood. Is not that the pure truth? Let those only account it false, who deny Jesus Christ to be the true God."*

XXVII. "In vain do you seek to persuade us that you would not be staggered by mysteries, but would admit the real presence and transubstantiation, if it were proved to you that *we* had ourselves admitted them. You have abundant proofs that we did so; therefore you deceive yourselves. The truth is, that your reason seeks to sound and penetrate every thing; and because it cannot fathom the mystery, it imagines a

* *St. Hilary*, Book 8, on the Trinity.

certain moral change, and certain empty signs to evade our testimonies, and strive to reconcile faith with your senses."

"What do you attempt, O daring mortals! Is it not an excess of folly and temerity in you, who are but a little dust kneaded together, to presume to sound this abyss? Partake of the immaculate body and blood of the Lord, with a most full faith."* "Why do you attempt to fathom what is unfathomable? Why do you seek to comprehend things incomprehensible; and to penetrate what is impenetrable? Let us believe God in all things, and not contradict him, although what he tells us should appear to us contrary to our thoughts, and to our sight. Since it is his word which says to us: *this is my body*, let us be convinced of it, let us believe it, and behold it with an eye of faith."† "I ask no reason of Jesus Christ Therefore let no one talk to me of argument, when I am required to have faith: let reasoning be silent in the schools. Place your hand upon your mouth; it is not lawful to dive into mysteries."‡ "The mere animal and indocile mind, when any thing is beyond its reach, rejects it as an extravagant notion, because it surpasses its capacity. Its ignorant temerity leads it to extreme pride The Jews ought to have received the words of our Saviour without hesitation, as they had often admired his divine virtue, and invincible power upon earth And yet behold them coming forth against God with that senseless *how*:—*How can this man give us his flesh to eat?* As if they were not sensible how blasphemous was such a manner of speaking, since in God resides the power of doing all without difficulty If thou persistest, O Jew, in advancing this *how*—I will ask thee, in my turn, how the rod of Moses was *changed into a serpent?* How were the waters changed into

* St. Ephrem, *Against curiosity in fathoming Myst.*

† St. Chrysostom, Hom. 23, on St. John.

‡ St. Ambrose, on Abraham.

blood? It behoves thee then much more to believe in Christ and give credit to his words . . . As for *you*, when you receive the divine mysteries, have faith free from all curiosity.—This is what is required; and we must not oppose a *how* to the words which are there said.”* Candidly, gentlemen, do you find this doctrine at all in unison with your own? Do men express themselves in this way, when they behold nothing in the Eucharist but your inanimate signs, your lifeless figures? Does this vehemence of language suit your moral change; or this elevation of sentiments, your pitiful transition from a domestic use of the bread to a religious use? Would ideas so gross and material as these have inspired what you have just heard, and what yet remains to be presented to your attentive consideration?

XXVII. “A man may well be carried in the hands of another, but no one, in his own hands; we cannot therefore understand these words *literally of David*; (he was carried in his hands)† but we see how that may be understood of Jesus Christ *to the very letter*. For 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.” Jesus Christ drank himself of his chalice, lest his apostles, hearing him say these things, should say to themselves: what then. Do we drink blood, and eat flesh? and should be troubled. For when he spoke of these mysteries, many were scandalized. In order therefore that they might not then be troubled, he himself gives them first the example, thus inviting them to partake without trouble of the mysteries: therefore it was that he drank of his own blood.”‡ Do not deceive yourselves, gentlemen; these ideas and comments are evidently incompatible with your systems of a figurative presence, and a moral change.

* *St. Cyril of Alexandria*, B. 4 on St. John.

† *St. Augustin*, on the title of *Ps. 33*, according to the *Septuagint*.

‡ *St. Chrysost.* Hom. 71.

XXVIII. One single word ought to have sufficed to convince you that the real presence of the body and blood was always the object of our belief. This word cannot have escaped your notice; so often is it repeated in our writings; it is this, once again: "*adore and communicate.*"* "After having communicated of the *body* of Jesus Christ, approach to the chalice of his blood, not extending your hands, but bowing down in the attitude of homage and *adoration*, saying, *Amen.*† *Mary adored Jesus Christ, the Apostles also adored him, and the angels even adore him, according as it is written; let all the angels of God adore him.* But they not only adore his divinity, but also his foot-stool, because it is holy. If the heretics deny that the mysteries of his incarnation are to be *adored . . .* they may read in the scripture that the apostles also *adored* him, when he was risen with a body clothed in glory. For we ought not to consider this foot-stool of his according to the common use of men. Moreover we ought not to *adore any but God. . .* Therefore we must examine more particularly what this foot-stool is, which is beneath the feet of the Lord. For we read elsewhere: *the heaven is my throne, and the earth my foot-stool.* But we must not adore the earth, because it is but a creature. Let us take notice however if the earth which the prophet would have us *adore*, be not that earth with which the Lord Jesus was clothed in his incarnation.—We must say therefore that the footstool is the earth; and by this earth, is to be understood *the very flesh of Jesus Christ, which we still adore in our holy mysteries,*‡ and which the apostles *adored* in his person."

The adoration spoken of here, and in several other texts, and which we render to him in his sacrament,

* *St. Chrys. Hom. 71.*

† *St. Cyril, Hom. 4, Mystag.*

‡ *St. Ambrose, B. 3, of the II. Ghost.*

cannot be reduced to a mere profession of honour, or a simple feeling of respect. You have just seen that it was precisely the same which he had received from Mary, and the wise men in the manger, from the apostles before and after his resurrection, from the angels at his birth, and at his baptism, the same spoken of by St. Paul, when he tells us that before him every knee should bow, in heaven, on earth, and under the earth; that adoration in fine which is due to God alone. It was therefore the worship due by all men to the supreme majesty of their Creator, the worship of *latria*.

XXIX. But, gentlemen, you who speak in admiration of the primitive Church, and boast of having revived the beauty and purity of her doctrine, you have basely rejected the adoration which she held due to Jesus Christ in the Eucharist. You attempt to justify yourselves before the people, and in your own eyes, by bringing together those passages of our writings, where we designate the offerings by the names of signs, types, emblems, representations, figures and memorials. But in the first place, you ought to know that these expressions do not exclude the invisible presence of the body of our Saviour: you find our successors in the ministry, and in doctrine, making use of the same before your eyes: we ourselves also occasionally used them before the faithful, to shew them the agreement of both testaments, the connexion between the old and new laws, the figure and the reality, the promise and its accomplishment. We expressed ourselves thus: "The sacrifice offered by our Lord to his Father is the same as that which Melchisedech had offered in the figures of bread and wine. Jesus Christ rendered present the truth of his body and of his blood."* "After the manducation of the typical passover, Jesus Christ proceeded to the true sacra-

* St. Cyprian, Ep. 53, to Cecilius.

ment of the true passover; and as Melchisedech had offered in the figure of bread and wine, Jesus Christ rendered present the truth of his body and of his blood.”* There is no less difference between the loaves of proposition and the body of Jesus Christ, than between the shadow and the body, the image and the truth, the figures of things to come, and what was represented by those figures.”† Every time that we approach to the body and blood of Jesus Christ, and receive him in our hands, we believe that we become flesh of his flesh and bone of his bone, as it is written.—For Jesus Christ did not give to this body the name of figure or appearance, but he said: *this is truly my body, this is my blood.*”‡ The faithful who knew perfectly well that Jesus Christ came to fulfil the figures, as well as the prophecies of the old law, understood without difficulty the relation between the figures of his body, and reality of his presence.§

In fine we made frequent use of the words, signs, types, figures, &c. and with a very different intention. You are not ignorant that we lived in the midst of Jews and Pagans; that our divine Legislator had expressly forbidden us to disclose our mysteries to them. Place yourselves in our situation: what would you have done, if from the pulpit you had discovered, as was often our case, some of those profane persons in the assembly of the faithful? Would you not then have made choice of the vague, ambiguous, and indefinite expressions which you often meet with in our discourses and homilies? Would you not have equally employed them in writings intended for public circula-

* *St. Jerom. Ep. to Hedilia.*

† *Ibid, Ep. to Heliodorus.*

‡ *St. Maruthas, Bp. of Tagrit, Bibl. Orient. T. 1, p. 179.*

§ It was reserved for Mr. Faber and his masters since the year 1662, to imagine that all the figures of the Old Testament had not been fulfilled in the New, and to inform us that bread was nothing more for Christians than for Jews; still continuing the perpetual figure of the body of Jesus Christ.

tion. And what would you say in these days to persons pretending to judge of your real sentiments, after the lapse of so many centuries, by passages which you found yourselves obliged to disguise? This point we especially recommend to your notice; and may you never forget it! If our belief on the sacrament of the altar had been like yours, we should have had no motive to conceal it; but on the contrary the most urgent reasons for its manifestation.

XXX. Would you know in exact truth what we concealed with so much care, concerning the Eucharist; what we did in the divine service; and in what that service consisted. You have only to open our liturgies, and you will see these things faithfully detailed. By our practice you will become thoroughly acquainted with our belief. The connexion between both is so evident, that we were commanded to withhold both alike from the knowledge of Jews, pagans, and catechumens; but to shew them openly to the newly-baptized. We faithfully discharged this twofold obligation. We scrupulously excluded the uninitiated at the moment when the sacrifice was about to commence; and when we had to speak on the Eucharist in their presence, we confined ourselves to the exterior qualities of bread and wine. With the neophytes we went further; we proceeded from the appearance to the reality of the body which they were about to receive, and explained to them the order of the divine service, at which they were, for the first time, about to assist.

Providence ordained that by exception from the general prohibition, some few of our *catecheses* should be committed to writing, and descend even to you. They suffice to give you a knowledge of all the rest; for in every thing essential, they were alike in all the churches of Christendom: those which you have exhibit the universal doctrine of the first five centuries. During that long period of fervour, there was not a

single Christian who heard from our mouths any other. We instructed our adults, as you instruct your children; except that we developed our dogmas more fully, because their more enlarged understanding rendered them capable of receiving them so developed. Had you lived in our times, you would have received the lessons which we gave to them; you would have had the same doctrine delivered to you; and if it be true, as you constantly declare, that you are anxious to live and die in their communion, adopt we entreat you, their faith and their works: believe and practice, on the most important subject of the Eucharist, what they believed and practised.

XXXI. Alas! why is it not possible for us to assure you, that you may safely persevere in the opinions which you have received from childhood, and which you preach so zealously! For we should be delighted to speak to you none but pleasant things; God is our witness! Yet at the hazard of displeasing you, we love rather to render you a solid service. We tell you therefore plainly; your belief is not that of the primitive Church; we never knew such a creed. Compare our catechisms with your own, on the subject of which we treat; compare the explanations which you give of them, with those which you read in our *catecheses*. How remarkable is the difference! Yet you must choose; and to which will you give the preference? You cannot hesitate without contradicting yourselves; since, by your own acknowledgement, the first five centuries breathed the true, pure doctrine of the apostles.

XXXII. Jesus Christ has said to us; *Amen, Amen, I say unto you: except you eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you.* And you gentlemen, say; eat the type of his flesh, and it is enough; we then promise you life. The intention of Jesus Christ was to communicate himself to all his followers, and thus to procure for them a fore-

taste of heaven by a sacrament which no mortal could conceive, much less invent. And this heavenly and mysterious communication you reduce to the manducation of mere animal and sensible matter, and a remembrance which leaves the heart cold, and the soul empty, and without nourishment. Jesus Christ said; *this is my body*, no, you reply in equivalent terms, it is only the figure of your body; the bread has only undergone a moral change; and since its own substance is still there, yours is not there at all. Our Church taught by the apostles, invoked throughout the universe the descent of the Holy Spirit, to *change* by his grace, *to transform and transubstantiate* the bread into the body of Jesus Christ: but if we are to listen to you, this change, transformation or transubstantiation is no better than a polluted source of idolatry and superstition.

XXXIII. But O friends and separated brethren! If you knew how afflicting to us is the boldness of your thoughts; if you knew how much we lament the endless evils which it entails on yourselves and on your people; if you could conceive the resources, the consolations and delights, of which you deprive so many souls redeemed by the blood of Jesus Christ, and disposed to consecrate themselves to him and receive him with love, if they were otherwise instructed! Forgive these admonitions, dictated solely by a regard for your interest, and drawn from us by alarm but too well founded for your security; return to the creed of your forefathers, to that received by all the Christians of the first five centuries: believe henceforth with them, and according to our uniform teaching, "that after consecration, what appears to your eyes bread, is not bread, though your taste judges it to be so; but that it is the body of our divine Redeemer."

XXXIV. Unhappy is he, who having heard the truth, persists in rejecting it! But more unhappy he, who after having discovered his errors, obstinately

continues to impose them upon his people! There are countries, as we see but too often, where it is deemed honourable to disfigure the truth, and to embellish error and falsehood; where at the expense of so doing, men obtain applause and emolument. But to advance in life, and soon after to have to appear before the last awful tribunal, laden with this fatal applause, this perfidious emolument;—great God! how can such a thought be endured, without trouble and terror?

PART THE THIRD.

SUCCINCT REVIEW OF THE "DIFFICULTIES OF ROMANISM."

I. I enter with painful feelings upon this last and unpleasant portion of my defence. How sorrowful is the task which remains for me to fulfil! Instead of the pleasure and consolation which I should have found in praising the accuracy, uprightness, and candour of an antagonist, I find myself condemned to point out the faults with which his production swarms; sometimes infidelity in quotations, or design in suppressions; at other times falsehood in allegations: in this place, hostile disposition under the assumed tone of regard and politeness; in that—treachery, speaking the language of simple ingenuousness; and in a third, malevolence and ill-will, evaporating, in calumnious imputations. I have already had occasion to exhibit several reprehensible defects, and I have sometimes chastised them with severity, because in a religious controversy I regard them as disgraceful prevarications. I shall now recommence a rapid review of the pretended *Difficulties of Romanism*, and shall more or less lightly visit upon what I find blameable.

I have dwelt at length upon the questions which occupy my first and second parts; because they are of general interest to Protestants and Catholics, and are decisive against the Reformation. As to those faults of the author, which I now proceed to notice, as they more personally concern him, I am aware that they may be but of feeble interest to the public. I should on this account have spared myself the unpleasant

task of bringing them forward, had I not feared the dangerous impressions which they might have made on readers of moderate information. My natural inclination, in accordance with charity, would have led me to throw a veil over them: but the interests of truth, and zeal for the salvation of souls, impose on me the duty of producing them to the light.

II. In the preface, page x, line 17—I read as follows: “To charge a Latin (he means a Catholic) with what he holds not, and then gravely to confute opinions which all the while he strenuously disclaims, is alike unfair and unprofitable.” A maxim which is admirable, because it is just. If it were honourable to advance it, it was surely the contrary to forget it and contradict it, as Mr. Faber has done in his attacks on Satisfaction—Invocation of Saints, and Veneration of Images and Relics.

INTRODUCTORY STATEMENT.

III. At page 6 “of this work (*Discussion Amicale*) the main object is evidently the proselytism of the English laity.” This reproach is for ever in the mouth of the author: it is repeated “usque ad nauseam” from beginning to end of his work. My object is, as he would represent it, to deceive the English laity and families travelling on the Continent, incapable from circumstances of discovering the falsity of my assertions and proofs. But it happens that this work destined thus to effect conversions on the Continent was first printed in London, and in great measure sold in that capital. But what is most surprising is, that in the same page the author had just made this observation: “In an epistle prefixed to it, this important work is dedicated to the clergy of all the Protestant communions.” In fact, the epistle begins thus; “Gentlemen, I cannot consent to give the publicity demanded of me to a discussion undertaken and conducted in the secrecy of confidence, without wishing to address it directly to

you. It appears to me just that I should present it in the first place to those of the Reformed communions, who with more interest to become acquainted with it, have also more right to decide upon it. Let it go forth then, and arrive where I desire; let it be examined by you, and receive from you its first judgment." And in several places I refer my supposed correspondent to the doctors of his own Church. Take as an instance, the following, at page 8, vol. 2d, "Your divines, as well as ourselves, have the *catecheses* at hand; but I imagine, they have never appeared very anxious to make you acquainted with them. Ask them to communicate these to you, and tell you what they think of them. You will see that they will not comply with your request with a very good grace: and in truth, to speak to you sincerely, they cannot do it." Or another: "For the rest, I am far from wishing to take your religion by surprise. If your doubts are not yet dissipated—if there remains in your mind any uncertainty as to the doctrine of the Fathers concerning the Eucharist, you are at perfect liberty to communicate this letter, *as well as those preceding*, to such of your doctors as you may please to consult." And at page 409, vol. 2, I address myself exclusively to the established Church throughout two whole pages; so that my discussion begins and ends by exciting the attention and provoking the judgment of your doctors.

This, I am of opinion, is a sufficient answer to the narrow-minded views, the miserable artifice which Mr. Faber would impute to me, when he supposes my object to have been to cast dust into the eyes of readers incapable of judging accurately. I could here adduce twenty persons among your countrymen, whom I have requested at various times to submit my work to the examination of your leading divines. I have always wished it, and I wish it still: and were I not fearful of acting imprudently, I could name in the

church of England persons of extensive erudition, and possessing a zeal for re-union, alas! too rarely met with, who have expressed a wish that my *Discussion Amicale* were dispersed all over England. For my own part, so far from fearing any thing from real intelligence, I have appealed to the enlightened, and now appeal to them again, provided they be accompanied with good faith.

IV. At page 20, Mr. Faber introduces to us for the first time his favourite chimæra of a *moral* change of the Eucharistic bread, which returns a hundred times upon the stage, always with a bad grace, and ever exciting the pity of men of information. The learned Bachelor, delighted with his *moral* change in the Eucharist, undertakes to prove its apostolic origin from the united testimonies, as he says, of St. Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, St. Cyprian, St. Augustin, St. Athanasius, St. Gregory of Nyssa, Theodoret, Pope Gelasius, Facundus, and St. Ephrem: and thus he ranges them with some small deviation from chronological order; but no matter. I have demonstrated precisely the contrary assertion, as you know, by the authority of the very same Fathers, as I may here observe by the way; for this is not what I wish to remark upon just at present. **These same Fathers** are clear, express, and conclusive, upon the invocation of saints: consequently on that question, I quote them with confidence. And what reply does Mr. Faber make to this at the bottom of p. 238? "The bishop cannot produce a single authority, for the invocation of the saints, however modified from the two first centuries." This sentence stands triumphantly in small capitals. I perfectly understand the tactics of the Rector: the Fathers of the third and fourth centuries are irrefragable witnesses, when he thinks them favourable to his opinions. But if they are opposed to him, they are no longer of any value—then

he must have apostolic Fathers! Behold the admirable equity and logic of this gentleman!

CELIBACY.

V. He has devoted pp. 25, 26, and 27, to the refutation of the prohibition for priests to marry. This time the Bachelor cannot keep his temper; he is quite warm, and for three deadly pages in succession, he vents his fire and bile against the right reverend Fathers of the second council of Lateran. He attempts no less a task than to prove them to be in opposition to St. Paul. I have already proved that they were not. But I will here go farther, and in one word exhibit the conformity between the strongest expressions of the council, and those of the sacred scripture. They are these: "*indignum est eos (sacerdotes) cubilibus et immunditiis deservire.*" these are words which provoked Mr. Faber so furiously against the Lateran Fathers. But let him cool a moment, if possible. I beseech him and his readers to cast their eyes upon the first four verses of the 14th chapter of the Apocalypse. St. John enraptured with the admirable harmony he has just heard, informs us that the celestial canticle was sung by 144,000 voices, and could be sung by no others. The Rector and many others with him, would have attempted it in vain. But from what mouths did these harmonious sounds proceed? Of what kind was this class of privileged singers? Observe well, Mr. Faber: "These are they who were not *defiled* with women: for they are virgins." *Hi sunt qui cum mulieribus non sunt COINQUINATI: virgines enim sunt.* Now cry out loudly against St. John. For you see that he has divided mankind into two classes, that of virgins, and that of persons defiled. You must take your choice: if you are no longer of the first, you must of necessity belong to the second. Well then, would it not have been better to have spared yourself

a sally so virulent and scandalous? Would it not have been wiser to have held your tongue and respectfully bowed your head before your superiors of Lateran, who so far surpassed you in knowledge?

TRADITION.

VI. In chapter third, on Tradition, page 46, the reproach is personally addressed to me. "No accurate investigator can read the bishop's remarks on these topics, without being struck with the singular *fallacies* which pervade them:" and he cites my fourth letter, wherein I establish the necessity of tradition by the doctrine of the primitive Church. Now what course does the Batchelor take? For the primitive and universal Church, of which I speak, he substitutes the *Latin* church, which is here out of the question. He sets out with this ingenious amendment to argue more at his ease against the reasoning, which he imputes to me. Open my fourth letter, sir, I entreat you: you will see that I draw my proofs from St. Clement of Alexandria, St. Basil, and St. Chrysostom, as well as from Tertullian, St. Cyprian, St. Augustin, and St. Vincent of Lerins; and in the first rank from the 318 bishops of the first council of Nice in the affair of rebaptization, and the condemnation of Arius. Let me ask you, if the universal and primitive Church could be marked out more magnificently than by that grand ancient council, accepted at the time by all Churches, and celebrated ever since by every age of Christianity. And yet Mr. Faber has the effrontery to insinuate that my proofs are confined to the *Latin* Church! And in his pretended answers, he sees nothing but the *Latin* Church, which he ridicules with so much taste and good manners. Thus by fraudulently substituting a word, he deceives his readers, and sets himself to refute what I never said. I have seen you persuaded that Mr. Faber was a formidable theo-

logian. Now judge of him by this single trait, and rest assured that he is not even an honest, fair-dealing man. This is not the language of politeness, I am truly grieved to own it: but, if you can, pray tell me how to expose politely so disgraceful a manœuvre.

In the same place, No. 1, you read as follows: "The *Latin* Church, as we all know, has handed down to the present time various doctrines and various practices. Some of these are *received* by Protestants; others of them are *rejected*. Now this electric process is censured by the bishop; and he requires us, as we value the praise of consistency, either to *receive* the whole mass or to *reject* the whole mass." So the Bachelor makes me say: and it is always the *Latin* Church, instead of the universal Church. The following is what I really said, p. 196, vol. 1, referred to by him. "Many already perceived (in the early controversies) that in the violence of party spirit, things had been carried too far. They began to compound for the principle, being ready to admit tradition on certain points, and yet rejecting it on others, in honour of the reformation. These first concessions led the way for others more free and less circumscribed. Wise and enlightened minds, considering calmly the precepts of the apostle, the spirit of the primitive Church, and the confidence, which must be yielded to the piety and fervour of the primitive ages, to the deposition and testimonies of all those holy bishops, and illustrious martyrs of Jesus Christ, have felt the irresistible force of the proofs, and have freely adopted the ideas and language of antiquity on the subject of tradition." Now do I speak in this passage of the *Latin* Church alone, as the Bachelor would have his readers believe? Do I not speak in express terms of the apostle, the primitive church, and the first ages? And in express terms of all their holy bishops, and their illustrious martyrs? Do you see nothing in all this but the *Latin* Church? And could any one, without the most disgrace-

ful falsity, pretend to see her only, who is neither named nor designated exclusively? Was I not right in affirming that the authority of the primitive ages, as I described them, ought to be admitted in every question; and that it could not be lawful to reject it on some points of doctrine, when it was necessarily admitted on others?

VII. You shall now see another specimen of bad faith exhibited by the Rector at page 51—"In the judgment of the bishop, tradition is of such vital importance, that the very canon of scripture depends upon it. By renouncing, therefore, the tradition of the Latin Church, we effectively invalidate the authority of the canon of scripture." But who has said a word to him about the tradition of the *Latin* Church? I have only spoken of universal and primitive tradition. My words are these, p. 177, vol. 1—"Most positively you are indebted to tradition for the scriptures, you have them from the hand of tradition, and without that, you would not know how to proceed to demonstrate their authenticity: for it can only be proved that such a book is of such an apostle or evangelist, by its having been received and read as such in the Churches." This is a general expression, comprehending at once all the Churches founded by the apostles and their successors, those of the East, no less than those of the West, the Churches in fact of all Christendom. It is clear that upon their testimony I build the authenticity of our scriptures, and not on the single authority of the See of Rome, as my truth-telling antagonist makes me do, "on the naked dogmatical authority of the See of Rome." He knew full well that such was not my opinion, for my book was before his eyes; but it suited his purpose to make those believe it, who are unable to read my work. This is the third time in the same chapter that he deceives his readers by a most odious artifice. If I have not formed an erroneous estimate of the English character, Mr. Faber will gain no cre-

dit among his countrymen by methods so dishonourable, and proceedings so far below a man of real rectitude.

REAL PRESENCE.

VIII. In the fourth chapter, p. 56, Mr. Faber teaches that the words, *this is my body*, may be understood in the sense of the Catholic Church, and in that of the Church of England; in the literal sense on the principles of grammar, and in the figurative sense on the principles of rhetoric; and thereupon he goes into confused attempts at explanation. A body present only in figure, is absent in reality. But according to the sense of your Bachelor, the body of Jesus Christ is present in the Eucharist only in figure. Therefore according to him, it is absent in reality; and he every where labours to prove it so. So far so good. But since he possesses so much penetration, as to perceive clearly in the words, *this is my body*, the real absence of that body, how could he begin his chapter by telling us that the two Churches, ours and his own, both admit the doctrine of the real presence? "The disagreement between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, in regard to the doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, chiefly respects the supposed process denominated *transubstantiation* With respect to the doctrine of the real presence, they both hold it." What! one believes in the real presence of her Saviour, the other in his real absence, and yet both hold the same doctrine! The Catholics reject the figure, to embrace the reality, the modern Anglicans have set aside the reality, to attach themselves to the figure; and yet both are said to maintain the dogma of the real presence, each party remaining on their own side! What an extravagant assertion! What surpassing absurdity! Was ever any thing like it thought or said before? Can a

man be permitted thus to contradict himself, and trifle to this degree with his readers?

IX. At p. 66, it is curious to hear him again: "If, during the term of several centuries, we shall find that the *figurative* interpretation was the interpretation adopted by the early Catholic Church, we shall possess a moral certainty of its truth." You see plainly what Mr. Faber wishes to find in the primitive Church; he is running after his *figurative* sense; he would prove it morally certain. Then he did not speak truth; when he declared that he maintained like ourselves, the dogma of *reality*. Here he extends the primitive Church to a "term of several centuries," and he is right in so doing. In other places he confines it to the second century, and there he is wrong. You see, sir, we have only to confront him with himself, to exhibit endless contradiction between the opposite notions, which he alternately adopts.

X. In the note at p. 71, the passage of St. Gregory of Nyssa presents some examples of internal changes were none appears outwardly: such as the stones of consecrated altars, which still preserve the same qualities apparent to the senses: such as the laic, who by consecration and unction of the holy oil is changed into a priest, without his ceasing to appear the same as he was externally: such is the Eucharist, in which the change of the bread is not preserved outwardly. Under this relation, it is most justly classed with the other examples; and yet, because differently from the other changes mentioned, that of the Eucharistic bread affects the substance, St. Gregory is careful to declare that expressly; fearing no doubt, that some on seeing nothing more in that than in the other objects brought in comparison, might wrongly interpret his opinion.—And this is precisely what has happened to Mr. Faber, and he would have escaped it, if he had weighed attentively these words, which he transcribed without understanding them; "but, when it has been consecra-

ted in the holy mystery, *it becomes, and is called the body of Christ.*" Mr. Faber traced this sentence with his hand; but his tongue would not pronounce it. If he consent to do so, God be praised! I ask no more of him in this place. For the rest, I thank him for having furnished me with a proof, in the very passage, which he deemed favourable to his own opinion.

XI. I know not, dear sir, if you will agree with me, but I am convinced that in the important concerns of salvation, it is highly criminal to present falsehood to one's readers' with the confidence with which an honourable man would present truth. Open Mr. Faber's work at p. 73 and read at the top the following dogmatical sentence of two members; "Whenever the Fathers descend to the strictness of explanatory definition, they plainly tell us, again and again, that the consecrated elements are only the *types*, or *figures*, or *symbols*, *allegorical images* of the body and blood of Christ: (first member of the sentence) and, not unfrequently, as if anxious to remove all possibility of misapprehension, they assure us in express terms, that *we do not eat the literal body*, and that *we do not drink the literal blood* of Christ, when we participate of the blessed Eucharist." (Second member.) To eat the body and drink the blood in the literal sense; is to eat and drink according to the gross idea of the Capharnaïtes; a carnal and barbarous manducation; which all ages and all Christian people have held in horror; and of which consequently there can be no question between us. But how can the Fathers be said to have taught that after consecration there is nothing but types and figures in the Holy Eucharist; they who inform us that it was adored by all the faithful previous to their receiving it? They who have told us that not to adore it would be a sin? They who adored it as often as they celebrated the liturgy at the head of the faithful? You have seen, sir, multiplied and demonstrative proofs of the belief of the Fathers in the reality of the body and

blood in the sacrament of the altar. The *truth* then is, that in their *catecheses* they taught it with as much energy and clearness as we could do, and that they spoke of it without disguise, when they could do so without betraying the *secret*. But it is *falsehood* to assert that, even when they concealed the mystery, they ever went so far as to say that there was nothing in the consecrated elements but types, or figures, or symbols of the body of Jesus Christ. Never, never did such expressions exclusively negative proceed from their lips; never did their hands write them. But assuredly they would have written and spoken them a thousand times, had they corresponded with their belief. Then Mr. Faber might have victoriously brought forth the numerous passages. But neither he, nor any other has ever discovered them: they have not produced, nor will they ever produce a single one. And yet this unfortunate man has dared to affirm to his countrymen, and before God, that the writings of the Fathers were full of passages of that description. How much do I feel for his readers! For they naturally give credit to the minister who defends their creed, and presents them, with the greatest assurance, assertions which they can neither suspect nor discover to be false. O! if I could make my voice be heard over all England, I would say to its generous people: "Be you our judges! Pronounce between one doctrine, which can only be attacked by continual outrages against truth, and another, which can only be defended by such disgraceful artifices."

XII. If Mr. Faber is so little scrupulous with the Holy Fathers, and takes the liberty of making them say what they never said nor thought, I need not be surprised to find him allowing himself the liberty with me to suppress and change my words, and to put his own into my mouth. It is true that to give currency to this habitual species of impoliteness, he takes care to associate with it immediately some complimentary epithet: or else to add, as at page 100, that my argu-

ment appears to him managed "with no small dexterity;" while it appears to me, in his exposition of it, insupportably clumsy and ill-managed. I have frequently had occasion to notice parts of my book, which he has metamorphosed in his own peculiar manner. It would be tedious to follow him in all his turns, and to expose all the artifices which he allows himself in this way; it is a poor and pitiful resource for those, who are determined at all hazards to defend a desperate cause, and who would have no rational reply to make, were they not to begin by disfiguring the arguments, which they undertake to refute.

XIII. One of his artifices however richly deserves to be exposed; for I must own that the bold mendacity which distinguishes it would make it of itself suffice to establish its author's reputation. "The theory of the bishop," says he, p. 98, as might be anticipated from the purport of his work, is this. The secret discipline of the primitive Church had for its *sole* cause the doctrine of transubstantiation: for, in the very nature of things, *it could not possibly have had any other cause than that which is thus assigned to it.* Hence it will follow, that the *grand* and *exclusive* and *special* secret of the Christian mysteries was the doctrine of transubstantiation." Here are as many falsities almost as words. I speak of the real presence, Mr. Faber puts in place of that, transubstantiation. I say that the secret discipline *relative to the Eucharist* had no other, and could have no other cause than that of the real presence: he makes me say that the "secret discipline of the primitive Church had for its *sole* cause the doctrine of transubstantiation." After advancing this in my name, he makes me conclude that "the *grand*, and *exclusive*, and *special* secret of the Christian mysteries was the doctrine of transubstantiation." This last word occurs twice in his two sentences, while it is only found once in my whole chapter. I confine myself to the mystery of the Eucharist, and

he represents me as taking in all the mysteries of Christianity.

Mr. Faber addressing himself particularly to those of his countrymen who are ignorant of French, affects great impartiality in quoting a passage of my book, which proves that I speak truth, and he falsehood. He adduces it as follows in a note at p. 98: "Or je me flatte a présent, Monsieur, que vous voyez clairement que la discipline du secret sur l'Eucharistique a eu effectivement le dogme de la réalité pour cause, et *n'a pu en avoir d'autre.*" I appeal to any one who knows French, whether this passage is susceptible of the sense given to it by Mr. Faber. Who could discover in it transubstantiation? I am only speaking of the real presence; and who could find there the mysteries of Christianity? I speak only of the real presence; I give that as the cause of the secret discipline on the subject of the Eucharist. For all that is exalted in this august sacrament arises from the reality of the presence. But whence did the Rev. Bachelor draw the conclusion which he attributes to me, if not, like the rest, from the delirium of a capricious and over-heated imagination?

There only could he further have read that the *real presence* was the *sole* cause of the secret discipline. This assertion is not mine. I distinctly wrote the contrary assertion, vol. 1, p. 344, in these words: "I purpose to examine thoroughly with you, the discipline regarding the inviolable secrecy, which all the faithful observed *on the sacraments*, and especially on the sacrament of the altar." I knew well at the same time that this secret discipline concealed from the pagans the mysteries of the Trinity and Incarnation. I might have said therefore, that it extended to both these mysteries, as well as to all the sacraments. I did not say it, for the obvious reason that I was not writing the general history of the discipline in question. My sole object-being to consider it exclusively in relation to

the Eucharist, my duty was to confine myself to my subject; and not to run out unseasonably into a diffuse digression on the several other subjects comprised under the law of secrecy.

XIV. At page 100, the Bachelor returns to the charge that all my argument is built upon the ruinous foundation, that "the true doctrine of the Eucharist was the *exclusive* secret of the Christian mysteries." He supports the contrary with perfect justice: but how does that affect me? Whom is he combating? I never advanced any such thing. He goes on further to maintain that "the true doctrine of the Eucharist was neither the *exclusive* secret of the mysteries, nor yet even their *principal* secret." How again am I concerned in this? Whom is he attacking now? There is not a syllable of all this in any part of my book. It appears to have suited his purpose to impute to me the expressions *exclusive* and *principal* secret: but once again, I disclaim them, they are not mine. They belong exclusively to the *Difficulties of Romanism*, not to the *Discussion Amicale*; and for Heaven's sake, let each keep his own property where he finds it!

XV. Mr. Faber here enters upon the exposition of the *catecheses* of St. Cyril; of which the first eighteen are for the catechumens, the five last for the neophytes. The former often speak upon the Trinity, and present but one short though powerful allusion to the Eucharist,* which was developed at a later period to the

* It is as follows: "If the Lord shall deem thee worthy, thou shalt hereafter know, that the body of Christ, according to the gospel, sustains the type of bread." Mr. Faber declares it difficult to say what these words can mean, unless "that the bread is a type, or symbol, or figure, or representation of Christ's body." But this is precisely reversing the declaration of St. Cyril. The sentence is quite clear to any one initiated: the divine substance sustains the appearance of bread, its qualities, apparent to the senses, sustain the figure, or type, or representation of bread. In St. Cyril, it is the body of Jesus Christ which represents the image of bread: in Mr. Faber, it is the bread which represents the body of Jesus Christ.

newly-baptized in two of the five *catecheses*, which were intended for them. Every one knows that baptism is conferred in the name of the most Holy Trinity. This established, the observation of the Rector becomes absolutely silly. He is quite surprised that the doctrine of the Trinity should be so often discussed before those who were to be baptized in the name of the Trinity! And he appears to wonder that there should be but a single short hint of the Eucharist, before those from whom the law required it to be concealed till after their baptism! But we have a new proof of his erudition in another way. The Bachelor remarks that in the last of the *catecheses*, mention is made of prayers for the dead: "which," he most learnedly observes, "had then begun to be partially introduced, which Cyril owns were objected to by many, &c." He was not aware then that this practice is in all the liturgies; a certain proof of its apostolicity. As to the great opposition made to it in the fourth century, that is a pure fiction. For we cannot make any account of such men as Aerius and Vigilantius, who were condemned at the time by all the churches in the world.

XVI. After a long digression on the doctrine of the Trinity, which is no way connected with my *Discussion Amicale*, Mr. Faber triumphantly concludes that the Eucharist was neither the *exclusive* nor the *principal* secret of the Christians. I wish him joy of his discovery; I am no way concerned with the ten deadly pages of this dissertation. But at page 115 he at length arrives at the point; he announces his intention to prove that the real presence—transubstantiation according to him, for he always uses one word for the other—"was not taught *at all* in the mysteries, even under the form of the very *smallest* and *least important* secret." O! now I feel interested. I trust you know by this time what to believe on this question: and I am convinced that the Bachelor will proceed more

carefully, if he returns to the subject. I give up my proofs to him, to the divines of his Church, to all those of the Protestant Communion who accord with him in opinion against the real presence of our divine Saviour in his most holy sacrament of the altar. They will labour in vain to demolish them.

Mr. Faber exhibits and admires with reason the secret discipline, as one of the most curious subjects of ecclesiastical antiquity. Yet he does not appear to have searched it deeply. Had he done so, it would have suggested to him very different reflections. I even suspect that before the appearance of the *Discussion Amicale*, he was very little acquainted with that venerable and ancient law of secrecy, sealed by the blood of many martyrs; which is a mine rich in proofs on the most important points called in question by the ignorant temerity of these latter ages. I am far from having exhausted it: others will penetrate yet further into it. I applaud their success beforehand, happy in having pointed out the opening, and put them in the way.

XVII. In my *Discussion Amicale* I seriously challenged all the Sacramentarians, and I now challenge them again, with Mr. Faber at their head, and with him all his brethren of the Church of England since the year 1662, to declare to us plainly why the primitive Church ordained an inviolable secrecy on the subject of the Eucharist. Let us allow them time to consider their answer well. They will take a long time, I am afraid, before they produce one satisfactory. Every one knows that the primitive Church had strictly enjoined to conceal from the infidels what was said and done in her assemblies, from which the profane were excluded. After the lapse of so many ages, how are we to discover what the faithful practised there among themselves for so long a period, unknown to the uninitiated? When the liturgies appeared in open day, they made it known to the whole

world. They displayed to the eyes of all, the interior of these holy assemblies. They indicate even at this day the prayers, the acts of faith, hope, and charity, the thanksgivings, which preceded, accompanied, and followed the bloodless sacrifice of the new covenant. I have given abundant details of these things in my ninth letter, from p. 388 to p. 445 of my first volume. Mr. Faber makes mention of this letter, he must at least have gone through it, and yet, what does he say of it? Nothing, sir: he does not dare to look steadily upon the liturgies, their brilliancy dazzles his visionary organs, he turns away from them, and runs for refuge to mere common-place observations. You have seen these refuted in the second part of the present work.

XVIII. I had remarked that the Fathers laid open the mystery clearly to the faithful, while they concealed it from the uninitiated. Mr. Faber, at p. 135, reproaches me with having attributed duplicity to the Holy Fathers, both in principle and practice: he accuses me of having represented them as guilty of direct falsehood. "To the mysta, they declare, without reserve, the grand secret of transubstantiation:" (he ought to have said, of the real presence; he regularly uses the wrong word in this matter,) "to the pagans and catechumens, they propound the symbolical or allegorical nature of the consecrated elements; assuring them, that these elements are only types, or figures, or representations of the body and blood of Christ." This assertion is completely false; the great falsehood lies in the word *only* inserted by Mr. Faber: I have shown this repeatedly. I will merely in this place justify the process of the Holy Fathers, and acquit them of falsehood with the support of a decision of St. Augustin, who was apparently quite as well versed in morality as the Rector of Long Newton. "He who seeks simplicity of heart, ought not to consider himself culpable, if he conceal something which the man from whom he conceals it, could not under-

stand. Nor is it hence to be inferred that it is lawful to lie. For it does not follow that we speak falsehood, when we conceal the truth.”* This is precisely the case with the ancient Fathers. They had no need of reserve or caution with regard to the faithful; therefore they spoke the whole truth to them openly. But it was quite otherwise with respect to the uninitiated, to whom it was forbidden to reveal the mystery; therefore before them they confined themselves to the exterior part of the Eucharist. They said then that it was the sign, the figure, the sacrament of the body of Jesus Christ: but they never said that it was *only* the figure of the body, as Mr. Faber loudly declares, and wishes to persuade his readers. Thus did the Fathers fulfil all justice; strong nourishment for grown up men; milk for children and the infirm. What Mr. Faber calls “contrivance,” “dexterity,” “falsehood,” was no more than prudence, charity, and obedience to the divine and ecclesiastical law. The Catholic finds every thing intelligible, connected, and consistent in this method of the Holy Fathers; but to the Sacramentarian all is confusion, embarrassment, and contradiction: a proof that the belief of Catholics is true, and that of the Sacramentarians false.

CHARACTER OF THE FIRST REFORMERS.

XIX. Passing on to p. 150 I find another reproach which Mr. Faber thinks proper to bring against me with his usual rectitude of mind. He accuses me of being “superfluously copious,” because I exposed Luther, Zwinglius, and Calvin at open war with each other. But how could I pass over in silence the three

*“Qui simplex cor habere appetit, non debet sibi reus videri, si aliquid occultat quod ille, cui occultatur, capere non potest. Nec ex eo arbitrandum est licere mentiri. Non enim est consequens, ut cum verum occultatur, falsum dicatur.”—*S. August. contra Mendacium. Cap. x.*

champions of the reformation in a work *on the Church of England in particular, and the Reformation in general?* I am perfectly aware that you do not recognize the spiritual supremacy of any one of these three: but if you acknowledge no one of them as a Father, all three must feel pride in claiming you as their children. And for this reason: you have borrowed from one and the other, and from their several contributions arose your body of doctrine, which you have worked up and established under the form which suited your convenience.* You are not properly speaking, a Lutheran, nor a Zwinglian, nor a Calvinist in particular; but in a general point of view, you are all three—Lutherans, Zwinglians, and Calvinists. Not so; exclaims Mr. Faber, “we are Catholics of the Anglican Church, no less than the bishop of Aire (Strasbourg) is a Catholic of the Gallican Church.” This was very true before the fatal introduction of your King Henry to Ann Boleyn; since that, your situation is altered. A man is no longer a Catholic when he departs from unity. You say in the creed, “I believe in one . . . Catholic Church.” Return then to this one Catholic Church, if you wish to be Catholics in England, as we are in France.

XX. “Certainly,” continues our author, “we honour Luther and Calvin and Zwingle for their works’ sake” . . . “without feeling ourselves pledged to act as umpires between these three *eminent* foreigners.” It becomes then incumbent on me to give the reader a just idea of these three heroes, on whom he respectfully

* I do not even except the episcopacy among you. The name is of little consequence; the superintendants of Germany, and the bishops of Sweden, Denmark, and England, are in reality on a similar footing. They labour under the same doubts as to the validity of their ordinations, the same certain nullity of their spiritual jurisdiction. For schism has abrogated that every where alike; in the same manner as the revolt of every ambassador or minister puts an end to the power which he held from his sovereign.

bestows the title of *eminent*. This may lead me to some length, but it is necessary. Luther claims the first place; "I burn," says he, "with a thousand fires in a flesh untamed. I feel excited towards women with a fury which borders upon madness. I, who ought to be fervent in spirit, am only fervent in impurity."* "Strong in my knowledge, I would not yield either to Emperor, King or Devil: no, not even to the whole universe."† His cherished disciple informs us that Luther knew his immorality so well, that he wished to be removed from the ministry of preaching.‡ "I tremble," wrote Melancthon, "when I think of the passions of Luther; they do not yield in violence to the fury of Hercules."§ "This man," says one of his contemporaries of the reformation, "is absolutely furious. He does not cease to combat the truth against all justice, and even against the cry of his own conscience."|| "He is inflated with pride and arrogance, and seduced by Satan."¶ "Yes Satan has so made himself master of Luther, as to make us believe that he is determined to possess him entirely."** "He has written all his books by the impulse and under the dictation of the Devil, with whom he had an interview, and who in the struggle appears to have overthrown him with victorious argument."†† "Truly," said Calvin, "Luther is very wicked. Would to God that he had taken care to put more restraint upon the intemperance which rages on all sides of him! Would to God that he had thought more of gaining a true knowledge of his vices."‡‡ O what an honourable and *eminent* personage!

**Luther's Table-Talk.*

†*His reply to the King of England.*

‡*Sleiden, book xi. an. 1520.*

§*Letter to Theodore.*

||*Hospinian.*

¶*Æcolampadius.*

***Zwinglius.*

††*The ch. of Zurich against the Confess. of Luther, p. 61.*

‡‡*Quoted in C. Schlussenberg.*

XXI. Now let the second appear on the stage. Zwinglius speaks thus of himself: "I cannot conceal the fire which burns me, and urges me to incontinency; since it is true that its effects have brought upon me already but too many disgraceful reproaches among the churches."* Luther declared openly that Zwinglius was the progeny of hell (what an origin for the honourable and eminent personage of Mr. Faber!) an associate of Arius, a man not deserving to be prayed for by any one.† "Zwinglius" Luther wrote, "is dead and damned, wishing like a thief and a seditious man to force others by arms to follow his error."‡ Brentius, whom Bp. Jewell called the grave and learned old man, declares that "the doctrines of Zwinglius are diabolical, full of impieties, depravity and calumnies; that the error of Zwinglius on the Eucharist (that of a figurative presence, so dear to Mr. Faber,) led to many others still more sacrilegious."§ "Blessed is the man who hath not gone into the council of the Sacramentarians (the partisans of the figurative sense, such as the modern Anglicans) blessed is the man who hath not stood in the way of the Zwinglians, nor sat in the chair of Zurich! You understand what I mean."|| Such in doctrine and deeds was that Zwinglius, in these days so honourable and *eminent* in the eyes of Mr. Faber!

XXII. Let us complete the sketch of this noble and pious triumvirate by a few traits of Calvin. "Do not scruple," he wrote to one of his powerful friends, "to rid the country of those zealous fanatics, who . . . would represent our belief as a reverie. Such monsters ought to be smothered, as I did in the execution of the Spaniard, Michael Servetus. For the future, I do not ima-

**In Parenes. ad Helvet.* fol. 44.

†Tome 2, fol. 36, quoted in *Florimond.*

‡*Ibid.*

§*Brentius in recog. Proph. et Apost. in fine.*

||*Luther. Ep. and Jacob. presb.*

gine that any one will do such a thing." "Calvin, I know, is violent and perverse; so much the better. That is the man we want to promote our cause."* "Calvin," said Bucer, "is a real mad dog. That man is bad; and judges of people, according to his own love or hatred of them." In 1588 there appeared in London a writing approved by the Anglican bishops† against the Calvinist sect. Calvin and Beza are therein represented as proud, intolerant men, who, by open revolt against their lawful prince, had established their gospel, and assumed the government of the churches with a tyranny more odious than that, with which they so often reproached the sovereign pontiffs. The English bishops protest before Almighty God that among all the texts of scripture cited by Calvin or his disciples in favour of the Church of Geneva against the Church of England, (which at that time believed in the real presence) there is not one which is not distorted to a sense unknown to the Church and the Fathers from the days of the apostles.‡ So that were they to return to life, . . . they would be astonished that there should be found in the world a man of such extravagant audacity as to dare thus to abuse the word of God, himself, his readers, and the whole world. "Happy," exclaims Bishop Bancroft, "a thousand times happy had it been for our island, if no Englishman or Scotchman had ever set his foot in Geneva, if he had never known a single one of these Genevese doctors!" Calvin declared that Luther had done nothing of any value . . . that people were not

**The German Wolmar*, who while he gave him lessons at Bourges in Greek and Hebrew, had filled him with the new doctrines of Germany.

†"*A Survey of the pretended Holy Discipline, by Bishop Bancroft.*" At this period, the Church of England professed the doctrine of the real presence, which she did not abandon till seventy-four years afterwards.

‡It is remarkable that the Fathers quoted by Bishop Bancroft are precisely those whom Mr. Faber has been bold enough to adduce in favor of his *moral* change, his allegorical and purely figurative sense: they are S. S. Ambrose, Jerome, Augustin, Chrysostom, &c.

to amuse themselves with following his footsteps, and being half-papists; but that it was far better to build a new Church altogether.*

By this time, sir, you will know what opinion to form of these famous triumvirs. They aimed at the same point, each in his own way: they understood each other thoroughly. It would therefore be the highest injustice to call in question the judgment they have passed upon each other and upon themselves. Our Rev. Bachelor particularly cannot but believe his honourable and *eminent* personages: he could not refuse them credit, without contradicting himself. Let him reconcile, as he thinks proper, his opinion of these gentlemen with the characters they have left us of themselves. As for you, sir, I flatter myself that after acknowledging the justice, which they have mutually rendered to each other, you will so far do them justice, as not to consider them worthy of credit on any other subject.

XXIII. Thus when they tell you that Jesus Christ did not establish the apostles and their successors to preserve the faithful in the unity of his doctrine and of his Church; that he did not promise to be with them and direct their teaching till the end of the world; you will not believe them. When they tell you that the right of interpreting this Testament was left by Jesus Christ to the faithful individually, or even to some particular teachers, you will not believe them: and you will be the less disposed to give them credit, as you see in your own country at this day, Christianity torn in pieces and laid waste by a multitude of sects, all sprung out of this absurd presumption.

If they shall tell you that in the most Holy Eucharist, there is no change of substance, or that our Saviour is not there really present, but that there is only a type,

* See the Appendix, p. 77, of my 1st vol. where will be found what the early reformers thought and wrote in all truth.

an emblem or figure of his body, you will not believe them. When they tell you that confession to a priest, though useful in some cases, is never necessary in any; and that you can always obtain pardon of your sins, without recourse to the ministry of those, to whom alone Jesus Christ gave the power of remitting them, you will refuse to believe them. When they say that our Divine Saviour's satisfaction exempts you from any personal satisfaction in this world, or the next, you will not believe them. When they shall tell you that at the moment of death, souls still defiled with those smaller stains, which heaven cannot admit, will be at once cast into hell, you will refuse to believe them. When in fine, they shall tell you that prayers for the dead, in use from the first beginning of Christianity, cannot afford them any comfort, you will not believe them.

XXIV. "But," you will exclaim, "all these points of doctrine are exactly our own: did they really come to us from such depraved men?" If you consult Mr. Faber, he will tell you that however great a resemblance may be found between the doctrine of the Church of England and that of the three reformers, the utmost that can be discovered is an imperfect family likeness. For the established Church acknowledges none for its progenitors, and heads, but those sages, those venerable bishops, who in the convocation of 1562 modelled their doctrines upon the antiquity, the faith, and practice of the primitive Church. Certainly it is not well to deny our parentage. We may blush at what our fathers were, but we ought not to disown them. With history in our hands, let us compel Mr. Faber to carry up his pedigree a step higher, though it will not thereby be more ennobled. Ask him from what source Queen Elizabeth's bishops derived their reformed theology. The new doctrines had for more than forty years been accredited in Switzerland and Germany; from those countries they had been introduced into

France and Holland. In the time of Henry VIII. they had clandestinely found their way into England with the most Rev. Dr. Cranmer and his wife; and under the youthful Edward they spread abroad their sweet odours more freely. When Mary came to the throne, those ecclesiastics who were seduced or infected, sought asylums at Geneva, in Switzerland, and various states of Germany. Hence, after long draughts at the fountains of Luther, Zwinglius, and Calvin, they returned to their country, quite full of the new opinions, which they afterwards produced in the form of the 39 articles; and seasoned to the taste of the country in the holy and venerable convocation of 1562. Such is the historical fact: such is the cause of that filial resemblance, which you judiciously observed between the Fathers of the famous convocation and the immortal triumvirate of the Continent. I am sensible how humiliating is such a descent to the Church of England: but there is still a way of escaping; it is to destroy it, and retreat from it with all expedition.

XXV. At the end of the same note, Mr. Faber appears to find fault with my having adduced, p. 333. vol. 1—Forbes, Montague, Thorndyke, and Parker, as favourable to transubstantiation. He alleges that they only maintain what the Church of England has ever maintained, and what he himself has said. It is true that Mr. Faber has expressed the sentiment which I quoted from Forbes, and that I signified my satisfaction thereupon. But would he also consent to say with the celebrated Thorndyke, that “the elements are really changed from ordinary bread and wine, into the body and blood of Christ, mystically present, as in a sacrament; and that, in virtue of the consecration, not by the faith of him that receives?”* Would he declare with Bp. Montague, after S. S. Cyprian, Cyril of Jerusalem, Basil and Ambrose, that

* *Epilogue*, b. 3, ch. 5.

the change caused by the consecration of the elements is called a *transmutation* and *transelementation*?* Would he acknowledge with Bp. Parker, that, “the ancient Fathers, from age to age, asserted the *real* and *substantial* presence, in very high and expressive terms? The Greeks and Latins styled it *conversion*—*transmutation*—*transformation*—*transfiguration*—*transelementation*, and, at length, *transubstantiation*; by all which they expressed nothing more or less than the *real* and *substantial* presence in the Eucharist.”† Let Mr. Faber honestly adopt the doctrine and language of these learned divines; and I shall then quote him at the end of them, with much more joy than I felt pain in refuting his pitiful invention of a moral change, and the opinion of a figurative presence, which he affects to discover in antiquity, with the moderns of the Church of England, since the year 1662. They borrowed it genuine from the schools of Zwinglius and Calvin.

Mr. Faber concludes his long note by shewing great indignation at a liberty, which every controvertist of good sense would have taken equally with myself—that of producing against him his own divines, Montague, Thorndyke, and Parker, who were so favourable to transubstantiation. So natural and just a proceeding he denounces “a stratagem unworthy of the Bishop of Aire,” (Strasbourg): and particularly as he observes “In a work professedly addressed to the English *laity*.” The Rector must have a very short memory: he continually forgets that he himself represented my *Discussion Amicale* as not addressed to the laity, but to the clergy of all the Protestant communions, in a dedicatory epistle at the head of the work.‡

* *Appeal*, ch. 1.

† *Reasons for abrogating the Test*, p. 13

‡ See *Difficulties of Romanism*, page 6.

CONFESSION.

XXVI. In his ninth chapter, on Confession, Mr. Faber scarcely touches the proofs developed by me in sixty-six consecutive pages. Since he has found it convenient to leave my arguments and authorities unrefuted, I shall content myself with entreating his readers to compare my eleventh letter with his ninth chapter. I shewed by reasoning suggested to me by texts from the New Testament, and by testimonies furnished by the Fathers of Antiquity, that auricular confession is of divine institution; that it is indispensably necessary, in act or desire, to obtain pardon for our faults, and that it requires the enumeration of all grievous sins of which we feel ourselves guilty. Mr. Faber has read these arguments and testimonies: and yet it seems that he wishes to ask me of what kind of auricular confession I would be understood to speak? Whether of that obliging to a special enumeration of sins, or that which requires no more than a general acknowledgment of our having sinned? Surely he might have spared himself such a question, superfluous to say the least, after my discussion of this important matter.

He comes next to compare our confession made in detail, with that of his own Church made only in general terms: and, as would be readily presumed, gives the preference to the latter. It is curious to see the reason on which he builds his preference. He has discovered with singular penetration, and rare sagacity, that with the most exact detail, a hypocrite may deceive his confessor as to the actual dispositions of his mind. Assuredly, his supposition will not be disputed; for no man can clearly read the heart of another: but have I not the same right to suppose that the sinner whom Mr. Faber represents "without a single specification in detail," may be equally a hypocrite when he chooses to conceal his actual disposi-

tions? He will even find it the more easy to succeed in his deception, as he will have no probation to undergo, fewer facts to declare, and fewer words to speak. But what avail these poor attempts, and what can be inferred from these imaginary suppositions, against the habitual and voluntary course of the tribunal of penance?

XXVII. Mr. Faber makes small account of entire confessions. It is enough for him if the sinner acknowledges in general terms that he has deeply sinned against God, and declare himself repentant from the bottom of his soul. He seems to have no true idea of the ministry of a confessor. This does not solely consist in granting or refusing absolution, but in deciding upon it judiciously from an accurate knowledge of the case. This, you will at once conceive, obliges the priest to study the actual disposition of his penitent, to feel assured, before he absolves him, that his repentance is true, and not merely the effect of some transitory emotion: therefore he will have recourse to delay of absolution and to suitable probations. In the mean time, he will summon him from time to time, examine his predominant inclinations, and fortify him against those temptations, to which he finds him most exposed. He will insist, in case the sinner has injured his neighbour, on the necessity of his making good the injury he has caused to his neighbour's fortune or reputation. In fine, it is his duty to exhibit towards him the solicitude of a father, the tenderness of a friend, and the prudence of an enlightened judge: or if you prefer considering him under a more striking image, I will tell you that the art of a spiritual director is to apply to withered and languishing souls suitable remedies and succours, with the same zeal and attention with which a skilful physician applies them to bodily diseases. The justice of this comparison will become more evident from the following supposition; for which I crave your indulgence.

XXVIII. I will suppose, which God forbid—that Mr. Faber is seized with some serious attack of illness. The physician is sent for, and attends. “What ails you, my good sir? You seem greatly reduced: where do you feel pain?” “O I am very ill, my suffering is excessive.” “How did it begin? Where do you feel it particularly?” “O, sir, I have acted very wrong, I acknowledge; and I am truly sorry for it: if you did but know what I suffer!” “But tell me then; is it in your head, or stomach, or side? let me know where your pain lies.” My pain weighs heavily upon me; it is intolerable; I can tell you no more.” In vain does the physician persist in endeavouring to obtain some further information, some particular avowal of his real situation; he can elicit none. Not knowing therefore what remedies to prescribe, and fearful of bringing on his death, instead of promoting his recovery, *quod enim ignorat, medica non curat*, he leaves the patient to himself, and to his friends, who are driven to despair by his obstinacy, which is so likely to cost him his life. But be well assured, sir, that Mr. Faber would never adopt for the cure of his body, the plan of proceeding which he recommends you to follow for that of your soul. He would conceal nothing from his physician, he would tell him at once the cause, the seat and the nature of his disorder; and he would scrupulously *confess* the smallest circumstances, however slightly they might appear to aggravate his distemper. Accurately informed by his account, the physician would act directly upon the evil, and triumph over it by suitable remedies. Perhaps Mr. Faber might relapse from time to time, but he would be re-established by speedy recourse to the physician, whose excellent treatment would long preserve him to his family, his friends, and his dear parishioners. I shall not be surprised if, after reflecting on his own experience, he finds it not so objectionable a plan to compare the confessor to the physician.

the sinner to the patient, and the infirmities of the soul to those of the body; and perhaps even ends by making trial upon his own soul of that very process of cure, which he at present so unreasonably condemns in the practice of Catholics.

XXIX. I have been most struck in Mr. Faber's work, with a certain peculiar method, which I find him constantly pursuing. When he applies himself to refute any one of my arguments, instead of bringing it forward in my own words, he sums it up in his own fashion, and says, that my whole proof, reduced to regular form, would run as a syllogism thus—or words to the same effect. Then he attacks his own syllogism, of course with ample success; but leaves my real argument untouched. If I produce the belief of the primitive and universal Church, he very soon substitutes for it the *Latin Church*: and by this manœuvre, escapes the former, and insults the latter as he pleases. Am I reasoning on the real presence? He makes me argue on Transubstantiation, which pre-supposes it certainly, yet is not identical with it. Speaking of that part of the *secret discipline*, which regarded the *Eucharist*, I say that the real presence was the sole cause of the *secrecy concerning the Eucharist*; but Mr. Faber declares to his readers, that, according to my account—First, Transubstantiation was the sole cause of the secret discipline. Second, that it was the *sole, exclusive* cause of the secrecy observed upon the mysteries, and that Third, it was the *principal* cause of the general discipline of the secret. Then he goes into a long refutation of these allegations attributed to me, but of which you will not find one syllable in either of my volumes.

At page 115 he pretends that the “five first centuries recognised no change save *a moral* change in the consecrated elements”—an expression unknown before his own time—and that the Church “esteemed the bread and wine to be only *types, or figures, or symbols,*

or *images* of . . . the *literal* body and blood of Christ." Now he has not only quoted no Father, nor can quote any, who has made use of these negative and exclusive expressions of the real presence; but it is a fact on the contrary, that all the Fathers have professed their belief of the real presence. I have placed before you proofs of this; and assuredly, if they are not demonstrative, there are none such in questions of evidence and history. At page 133 he makes me, and even Bossuet say, that the figure of a thing may be at the same time the thing itself: an absurdity created only in his own brain. For I merely said that a thing may be a sensible sign, a sign apparent to the senses, of another thing, which is not so: I said that the visible and material species concealed the spiritualized and invisible body of our Saviour.

XXX. Now, sir, be pleased to interrogate Mr. Faber: call upon him most seriously to explain clearly to you by what right he has chosen to alter my expressions, and put his own in their place; to impute to me opinions, which are foreign to me; and personal to himself: Ask him if such a mode of refuting an antagonist be that of an honorable man: or if he would be satisfied to have such a method employed against himself. I appeal to your exalted mind and rectitude of soul: I feel assured that you will agree with me, that in a matter of indifference such jugglery could be considered no better than low cunning, but that in religious controversy it is a crime. Is it not true moreover, does it not appear to your eyes as clear as to mine, that had he detected me in any false reasoning or quotation, he would have exhibited my false assertions, just as I had written them? That he would have exposed my argumentation and testimonials exactly in my own words? Instead of recurring to his usual skill in metamorphosing and condensing my passages unfaithfully, he would have refuted what he had read in my work, and not what he had been un-

able to find there? From this disgraceful manœuvring, I conclude that he found it impossible to reply to the arguments I used, and the authorities I quoted: I conclude that he would have had nothing specious to write against either, had he not substituted his own words for mine, and falsely represented the Fathers of antiquity in contradiction to each other and to themselves: I conclude in fine, that the *Difficulties of Romanism* is the most flattering eulogium upon the *Discussion Amicale*, and a new triumph for the Catholic faith?

SATISFACTION.

XXXI. In his chapter on Satisfaction, I detect your Bachelor again; and there you will see him relapsing into his habitual sin, his ruling infidelity. I entreat you to read this chapter X: he is prodigiously wrath with me for the *merit* which, he says, I attach to works of satisfaction. He makes a great stir to shew that neither I, nor any one can call them *meritorious*: at every page he reproaches me with this epithet, which, he assures his readers, is given by me to the satisfaction of the penitent.* I dare say, sir, you are quite convinced that I do in fact speak of the *merit* of our satisfactions, that the expression—*meritorious* works—occurs in my book frequently. Well, sir, only be at the pains of looking over my 12th letter, vol. 2, and to your great surprise, you will neither find the *merit* of our satisfactions, nor *satisfactory* works. These words, *merit* and *meritorious*, for which Mr. Faber so sharply reproves me, are not to be found at all in my

* “The bishop, not content with gratuitously carrying it (the temporal punishment) into the next world, seems evidently to consider it in the light of a *meritorious expiation* made on our part when we either devoutly submit to it as sent from God, or when we freely and artificially inflict upon ourselves”—p. 168; and at the bottom of the following page—“The bishop clearly deems them *meritorious*.”—*Et passim*.

letter, applied to our personal satisfactions; no, not in a single instance. What I here declare may appear bold, but it is perfectly true. Where then has Mr. Faber found these expressions? How comes it that he incessantly attributes them to me, and takes occasion thence to reproach me? What does he mean by this mode of replying to what I have never advanced; and appearing to disregard what I have said? I defy him to answer these questions satisfactorily. No doubt it would have pleased him to find me really attaching a proper, independent merit to our satisfactory works, as he represents me to have done. But fatally for his honour and good faith, I have done no such thing; but have written precisely the contrary. My words are these, p. 215, vol. 2—"Is it undervaluing the merit of the cross, to acknowledge that without the particular application of its infinite merits to us, it is impossible for any one to derive benefit from it; that this application nevertheless requires our co-operation, because he who created us without our concurrence, will not save us without our concurrence; and that still *our personal and satisfactory works are no more in themselves than dead works*, but that by being united to those of our Saviour, by approaching his cross, and touching the sacred and life-giving wood, they derive life, strength, and value, as they are then offered by Jesus Christ to his Father, and in Jesus Christ, are accepted by the Father?"* Is it derogatory to the merit of the cross of Jesus Christ, to become his imitators, *as far as possible*; to punish ourselves for our sins after his example, as he was pleased that they should be punished in his holy and divine person; to unite a *feeble and inefficacious satisfaction* to that, which he fully and abundantly paid for us with his blood? Tell me: is it not our duty *to imitate as closely as possible*, Him, who came to be our model, and who said: 'If any

* Council of Trent. sect. xiv. ch. xviii.

man will come after me, let him take up his cross and follow me?" And is it not manifest that so far from being derogatory to the merits of our Saviour, or incompatible with his sufferings, our temporal satisfactions are absolutely inseparable from them? What then? Because we cannot offer sufficient satisfaction, are we to offer none? Are we exempt from all expiation, because we cannot carry it to an infinite extent? And because we are unable to pay the whole debt, are we dispensed with from all efforts to pay according to our means?"* Such is the passage of which Mr. Faber has quoted some few words. Do you find in it a single expression objectionable? Do you see there the *merit* of our satisfactions, and our *meritorious* works? I say on the contrary that our works are only in themselves *dead works*, and our satisfaction a *feeble* and *inefficacious* satisfaction. But it is not the less necessary on our part. Still the obligation of satisfying, and the merit of it are different things! Mr. Faber has thought proper to be silent upon the words above in italics, and to withhold them from his readers by a perfidious suppression. In place of them he brings forward what he wished to attack, and what is not there to be found—the merit of our works, our meritorious satisfaction. O equity! O candour! I look for you in my antagonist, but I cannot find you!

In proof of the necessity of satisfaction, I quoted the testimonies of Tertullian, St. Cyprian, St. Ambrose, and St. Augustin.—These are the very Fathers to

* I will here call to my support a grand and noble authority: "Without the penance of our divine Saviour, yours would be *unfruitful*: without yours, his would remain without effect. It is his which gives value to yours, yours alone can give effect to his. Let the sight of his satisfaction support and direct yours; let it be its *encouragement* and *pattern*: let it teach you both the *necessity* and the method of putting it in practice." The immortal Card. De la Luzerne in his pious and profound *Considerations on the Passions*, p. 328.

whom Mr. Faber himself appeals at page 19, though certainly most unwarrantably, in favour of his *moral* change, and whose authority he there exalted to its deserved height. But what does he say of them here? At first he does not know well how to understand the very clear passages by me adduced; but be the case as it may, he adds: "If they use the term in his lordship's apparent sense, I shall have no hesitation in saying, that their grossly unscriptural language merely shews how soon and how easily a specious and flattering corruption crept into the Church." So modest a declaration suggests to my mind a parallel sufficiently rich between Mr. Faber and his *eminent* foreigner Calvin. "I am little moved," says Calvin, "with what we find at every step in the writings of the ancients concerning satisfaction. I see that the greater part, or, to speak more explicitly, almost all those whose works remain to us, have either positively erred on this subject, or have spoken upon it too severely." The reformer candidly allows that almost all the ancient Fathers taught the necessity of satisfaction. Our reformed author does not dare to make the like avowal; he still doubts: but in his hypothetic conclusions, he agrees with his *honourable* patron; and it is easy to see that the spirit of the sire has descended unimpaired to his very distant progeny. Both are decisive in their decrees against the Fathers, and have no hesitation in arraiging of ignorance and error the most enlightened geniuses of Christianity. What blindness and effrontery, not to discover in themselves the ignorance, which they have the audacity to attribute to the great luminaries of antiquity! Who can refrain from indignation, or at least pity, to see both coming forward to dictate, on an article of revelation, to illustrious doctors, who received it from the disciples of the apostles, and taught it with so much glory, in times, it is universally acknowledged, that faith shone in all its primitive splendour?

XXXIII. Passing in fine, from speculation to practice, I exhibited the doctrine of the Fathers put in operation in the canonical penances, so generally established under the persecution of Decius; a striking and incontestable monument of the universal belief of the necessity of making satisfaction to Almighty God. At the sight of this austere and imposing discipline, Mr. Faber remains dumb. He finds no answer to make, and is silent. I applaud his silence; why did he not keep silent on all that preceded: He would have saved himself the displeasure, which he has forced me to give him, and me the sad and truly painful duty of exposing his theological disqualifications, and his continual forgetfulness of good faith and probity in controversial discussion.

INDULGENCES.

XXXIV. Whoever rejects with Mr. Faber the precept of satisfying God by works of penance, must, with him and Calvin, not only accuse the Fathers of error and severity in their teaching, and by an inevitable consequence, the primitive Church of injustice in the institution of canonical and satisfactory penalties; but disdainfully refuse the helps and favours, which the Church offers, and adds to the insufficiency of our satisfactions. He must dismiss with the multitude of fabulous inventions, the belief of a place of expiation, between heaven and hell, and send without mercy to eternal torments those souls who carry into the next world any stains contracted in this. He must consider all communication with his departed friends cut off—renounce the consolation of interesting himself for their happiness, and regard the practice of praying for them as vain and superstitious, since our prayers are alike unprofitable to them, whether their abode is with the elect or with the damned, with angels or devils. Thus Mr. Faber will hear nothing about indulgencies, or

purgatory, or prayers for the dead. He reasons consistently, I acknowledge, but as he sets out with a false principle, his conclusions are equally erroneous.

● XXXV. The twelfth letter of my *Discussion Amicale*, established the precept of satisfaction to the divine justice: the thirteenth solidly proved the existence in the Church of right and power to grant indulgences, as also their utility and importance to sinners. Mr. Faber attempts in his eleventh chapter to invalidate my proofs; but in vain. You may judge by comparing our respective writings. I need not observe, that in this eleventh chapter he incessantly puts into my mouth the *merit* of our satisfactions, our *meritorious* works and *meritorious* expiations. It is clear that he is determined to palm these expressions upon me, though they never proceeded from my pen: but if he repeat them a hundred times in succession, so many times shall I reply that what he says is untrue. He maintains that to attribute to the Church the power of granting indulgences, is as much as conceding to her the privilege of depriving the divine justice of a part of the expiations otherwise due; and this idea appears to him so luminous and well imagined that he repeats it in the next paragraph. But who was it that invested the Church with this high prerogative? Was it not our Saviour himself? Who then can restrain the exercise of a right, which our Saviour promised her by those solemn words: "whatsoever you shall loose upon earth, shall be loosed in heaven?" I perceive also in page one hundred and seventy-nine, that he would make you believe that this right belongs to every priest. This is another notion entirely his own. Yet he ought to know that priests never make use of it but by delegation from bishops in the extent of their jurisdiction; and that the power of communicating to the whole earth the benefit of indulgences belongs only to the supreme head of the universal Church.

XXXVI. I know not, or rather I can pretty well guess, why he has chosen to misrepresent the affair of the incestuous Corinthians, at p. 180. "The Corinthians, as St. Paul expresses himself, had delivered an incestuous member of their community unto Satan," &c.—So says Mr. Faber; but in chap. 5, of the 1st epistle, the apostle reproves them for having kept him in their community: "I indeed, absent in body but present in spirit, have already judged . . . to deliver such a one to Satan. . . . Your glorying is not good. Know you not that a little leaven corrupteth the whole lump?" And in chap. 2d, of the 2d epistle: "To him that is such a one, this rebuke is sufficient, that is given by many: so that contrariwise you should rather forgive him, and comfort him lest perhaps such a one be swallowed up with overmuch sorrow. Wherefore I beseech you that you would confirm your charity towards him . . . and to whom you have forgiven any thing, I also." Therefore it was St. Paul who punished and who relaxed the punishment. According to Mr. Faber the faithful chastised and afterwards pardoned: "satisfied" he says, "of the sincerity of the man's contrition, they pardoned him the disgrace which he had brought upon the church, and re-admitted him to the enjoyment of his former privileges as a baptized Christian. The circumstance and ground of his re-admission were communicated to St. Paul; and St. Paul, in reply, informs them, that as *they* had forgiven the offender, so likewise did *he* for their sakes in the person of Christ."* Would not any one really say that it was decreed that this unfortunate Bachelor should spoil every thing he touched, and never represent things as they really are?

XXXVII. "The bishop," he goes on p. 182, "has no hesitation in pronouncing, with or without the consent of his Church, that *the validity of indulgences . . . entirely depends upon the dispositions of the sinner.*"¹ Why should Mr. Faber raise a doubt on this head?

after reading the admirable dogmatical letter of the learned and pious pontiff who now fills, in so worthy a manner, the chair of St. Peter? The principle is there most clearly developed.* The Rev. Bachelor passes next to those abuses, which in the 16th century reflected dishonour on the publication of indulgences; and it may well be supposed that under his pen, these abuses would lose nothing of their enormity. "What," says he, with much warmth, "what was the crying abomination, which first roused the indignant spirit of the great and much-calumniated "Luther?" No, Mr. Faber; *calumniated* is not the right word. No one has painted this *great* Luther in more odious colours than himself, and his associates in the work of the reformation, Zwinglius and Calvin, those two *eminent* personages, who composed with Luther the *honoured* triumvirate of the Rector of Long Newton. No one has better informed us of his passions and fury than his intimate, but timid friend, Melancthon, who complained of having received blows from him, and I engage, they were none of the lightest.† To judge by the original portrait, which I have seen in the temple of Wittenberg, the vigorous reformer must have had a heavy hand. Taking altogether what we find in these four contemporary authors concerning Luther, of the impetuosity of his passions, and his unbounded pride, we must feel convinced that this *great, honourable, and eminent* man has left nothing even for calumny itself to invent against him.

To return to the abuses spoken of by Mr. Faber, in the publication of the indulgences of Leo X; an impartial and honourable writer would not have failed to observe that the council of Lateran, under Innocent III.

*I have lately read with fresh admiration this encyclical letter to all the bishops of the Catholic world. I wish it were known to Protestants: it would make on many a very different impression from what Mr. Faber appears to have felt from its perusal:

†"Ab ipso colaphos accepi." *Epist. ad Theodor.*

in 1215, and that of Vienne under Clement V. in 1311, had previously fulminated against the greater part of the same kind of abuses; and that the council of Trent, grieving to find that the prohibitions of those councils had not been effectual in eradicating the abuses in question, considered it necessary to cut to the quick, and suppressed the employment of questors, abolished their very name in detestation of their scandals, and ordained that in future indulgences should be published by the bishops.*

XXXVIII. On the subject before us, allow me, sir, to place again before you a passage in my *Discussion Amicale*, vol. 2, pp. 232, 234: "If Luther, supported by the councils of Lateran, Vienne, and Trent, and by the concurrent sentiments of the most able divines, of such a man, for instance, as Cardinal Cusa, who gained the admiration of Germany in the legation, which he performed, and in which he published the indulgence of the jubilee in 1450; if Luther had only risen up against the ignorance of the preachers in his time, and the disgraceful traffic, which was made of indulgences, he would have merited the applause of the Church, and of all succeeding ages. But this man of violent passions neither knew how to master himself, nor curb the impetuosity, which urged him, step by step, to rebellion. The consequences of that too celebrated dispute are well known, as also how, passing on from the abuse to the principle, he went so far as to deny that the Church had any power to grant indulgences to penitents.

"'Give rather to the poor,' he exclaimed again and again to his hearers, 'give for the love of God, to the poor the money which is demanded of you for the building of St. Peter's.' Who ever doubted that we ought to give to the poor? How often have Churches given up their vessels of gold and silver, their ornaments and jewels to feed the poor? But does charity

*See *Discussion Amicale*, vol. 2, p. 231.

towards our indigent brethren forbid extraordinary succour for the erection of a temple to the Lord, particularly in the mother-church? If the abuses in collecting alms in Luther's time are to be condemned, where is the man of sense and good taste who could blame the intention of those alms? Surely none of those who have visited and admired that Church, the most worthy monument, which men ever erected with their feeble hands to the supreme majesty of God."

Mr. Faber interprets in his own way my silence on the subject of the riches, which constitute the inexhaustible treasure of indulgences. It is clear however that I had no need to repeat what is written in all the jubilee bulls, and in every elementary book on indulgences. This treasure is composed of the merits of Jesus Christ, with which are associated those of such holy persons, who by an especial grace, led upon earth a life of innocence and purity. Their charitable and angelic works, ever united to those of our divine Saviour, derived during this life all their merit from their union with our Saviour's merits, in the same manner as after death, they derive all their merit from the infinite merits of the God-man. What can be objected to in this doctrine? In truth, to find any thing here which we should blush to acknowledge, can only be done by a head deplorably disordered by prejudice. He that would cast ridicule on this pious and ancient belief, would only bring derision upon himself.

PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD—PURGATORY.

XXXIX. I had joined Purgatory and Prayers for the dead in one article; because the custom of praying for the dead evidently pre-supposes the belief of a middle place between heaven and hell; and because when we shew this practice in the primitive Church, we, by this single fact, demonstrate her belief in this middle state, where souls are purified from every stain, before they are admitted to the abode of innocence

either preserved or recovered. Now what does Mr. Faber? He separates prayers for the dead from purgatory, in order to deprive them of their natural support, and attack them singly with greater advantage. You will see that he succeeds none the better. But it must be acknowledged that these two chapters display more of the artful sophistry, which he habitually exercises, and uniformly with a tone of assurance, calculated to impose upon readers unable to detect it. He sets out in his usual manner with making me say what I never did say, and even affecting to compliment me. "The bishop fairly and honestly confesses, that we have received no revelation concerning it from Jesus Christ." No, sir, I have no claim to the fairness and honesty of such a confession, for I never made it: and he who would compliment me, ought to know that I maintain precisely the contrary, in the following words, p. 248, vol. 2: "Let us go farther, and boldly assert that Jesus Christ did himself approve and recommend this practice to his disciples," (praying for the dead.) I said, "There must remain for the most part, much to expiate in the other world. But where? In what place and manner? Had it been necessary for us to be informed on these points, doubtless Jesus Christ would have revealed them to us. He has not done so: and therefore we can only form more or less probable conjectures." Here Mr. Faber omits the interrogations, and after reporting only the answer, he concludes thus: "The doctrine, then, of purgatory is confessedly not a matter of revelation: whether it be true or false, we confessedly cannot ascertain from any thing that Christ has said on the subject." (P. 186.) Thus he makes me speak of the *existence* of purgatory, when I am only treating of its *locality*. In his note at the next page, he does pretty nearly the reverse. I observed in a note, p. 243, v. 2, as follows: "You admit *limbo*, because its *existence* is proved to you, although its situation remains unknown. Let it equally

satisfy you *to be assured of the existence* of purgatory, without troubling yourself to discover its local position." But Mr. Faber distorts my reasoning in this manner: "You believe the existence of such a place, though its local position is unknown to you. Rest then assured of the existence of purgatory, though he may not be able to define its strict local position." Is this what I said? Would any man of good sense have reasoned in such a manner? Mr. Faber gravely reminds his countrymen that "the point at issue is not the *locality* but the *existence* of purgatory;" as if I had spoken of the former only and not of the latter! I hope, sir, you will pity the unfortunate lot of the *Discussion Amicale* to have fallen into hands so little disposed to be *amicable*.

XL. In the succeeding page I find again his *meritorious* expiation. He repeats it for ever; persuading himself, no doubt, that by continuing to impute it to me, he shall at last succeed in making it pass as mine; and by perseverance in bringing it forward, from false, he shall render it authentic. How pitiful are all such artifices! And how necessary is patience to endure such a tissue of false imputations, joined to infidelities so often repeated! With a candid and able antagonist, I should have had, no doubt, points of erudition to clear up, and important difficulties to resolve. But assuredly I should not have found what I have had to expose in this third part of my answer. We are not yet at the end of these unpleasant subjects: there are many more to claim our attention.

XLI. I shewed that the practice of praying for the dead was anterior to Christianity by the book of Macchabees, which is deuterocanonical, but not, as Mr. Faber would have it, apocryphal. For the third Council of Carthage, resting on tradition, St. Augustin, Innocent I. and Gelasius, with seventy bishops, place it in the rank of divine Scripture. I said, that though its canonicity had been doubted for a time, its historical

truth had never been questioned. This ought certainly to suffice to shew that praying for the dead was in use among the Jews before our Saviour, who would not have failed to turn them from it, if he had judged the custom bad and superstitious.

I afterwards shewed in concert with celebrated doctors of your own, that this practice prevailed in the primitive Church, from the testimonies of Tertullian, S. S. Cyprian, Chrysostom, Epiphanius, Jerome and Augustin; I shewed that Origen, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, and St. Gregory of Nyssa, had acknowledged by name a middle place, where souls must be *purified* from all defilement before they could enter heaven. What reply does Mr. Faber make? First, He opposes to them the silence of the apostolic Fathers, as if in the small number of their writings which have come down to us, they had been able to treat of every point of doctrine, and their negative testimony could overturn the positive attestation of the others. Secondly, He observes that the oldest of my authorities goes no farther back than the end of the second century, namely, Tertullian; who, he says, was too far from the apostles, to justify us in grounding upon him an apostolical tradition. I will just observe, in my turn, that Mr. Faber himself brought Tertullian against me, when he believed that Father's testimony in favour of his cause: then he was represented as close to the days of the apostles. But it is not the authority of Tertullian to which I wish in this place to appeal, but solely to his evidence. Tertullian, who died in 216, at the age of 84, must have been born in 132. He was brought up at Rome, where he studied the law, leading at that time a dissolute life, and ridiculing the Christians, as he himself informs us. He entered upon the examination of Christianity, through mere curiosity, embraced it, became its illustrious defender against pagans and heretics, and found himself involved in the great affairs of the Church. What better informed or more strictly

upright witness of what was then practised in the churches could be desired? He speaks of praying for the dead as a universal practice, and ranks it with the points taught by tradition. Now what think you of a practice universally established and come down by tradition, less than 72 years after St. John? Can it, I ask you, be other than apostolical? Will there be a man of sense among us, who will be persuaded by the assertion of Mr. Faber, and contrary to that of so grave a witness of the second century, that this practice so far from belonging to tradition, proceeded from an error newly broached at a period when, as the reformed churches acknowledge, doctrine flourished in its native integrity and purity?

XLII. But let us come to an argument, which will cut short all the entangled confusion in which Mr. Faber envelopes his readers and himself, and demonstrate that praying for the dead is not, as he calls it, *a crude phantasy* started by the “imaginative” Tertulian. All the liturgies published from the Council of Ephesus to the sixteenth century, Catholic, Nestorian, Eutychian, Malabar, Chaldean, Egyptian, Abyssinian, and Ethiopian; those of Constantinople, of the Greeks, Syrians, whether Orthodox or Jacobites; those of St. Basil, St. Chrysostom, St. James, explained in the fourth century by St. Cyril of Jerusalem; that, in fine, of the apostolic constitutions written before the others in the third century—all are uniform on this subject of praying for the dead. I have given extracts from them in my Appendix, vol. 2, p. 259. Mr. Faber does not say a word about them: he would make it appear that he did not observe them. But pray ask him to account for this uniformity in the Liturgies of churches separated in the fifth century. If he fail, all well informed divines will answer you in the words of your own Bishop Bull: “All the Christian churches in the world, however distant from each other, agree in the prayer of the oblation of the Christian sacrifice in the

Holy Eucharist, or Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; (and the same applies to the prayers for the dead) which consent is indeed wonderful. All the ancient liturgies agree in this form of prayer, almost in the same words, but fully and exactly in the same sense, order, and method; which whoever attentively considers, must be convinced, that this order of prayer was delivered to the several churches in the very first plantation and settlement of them."*

Mr. Faber, fond of harping at words, will say that the liturgies did not suppose souls to be in what we understand by purgatory. But let him cavil as he pleases against our denomination of purgatory, it is certain that the ancients did not pray for the inhabitants of heaven, nor of hell. Where then dwelt the souls for whom they prayed? In what place? He may call it by what name he chooses; we dispute not about the name, but the thing. Let him pray in the style of the ancient liturgies, and say with the apostolic constitutions: "Vouchsafe, O God, to look upon thy servant whom thou hast made to pass into another state. Pardon him if he has sinned wilfully, or involuntarily. Place him in the bosom of the patriarchs, prophets, apostles, and all those who had the happiness to please thee here below." Let him make such a prayer in all sincerity: we shall for the present require no more of him.

XLIII. The Rev. Bachelor, at page 191, brings against me a passage from St. Cyprian, and at p. 200 a sentence from Tertullian. The latter is as follows: "On a certain annual day we make oblations for the dead and for nativities." Mr. Faber has very justly observed that the nativities indicate the days on which the departed saints dying to the world, were born to immortality. But he did not observe that Tertullian has distinguished the dead from the nativities; that is,

* *Bp. Bull on Common Prayer*, sermon 12, vol. 1

those, who had died a natural death, from those, who had lost their lives to receive the crown of martyrdom. The oblations were the same, says Mr. Faber. Undoubtedly they were; for it was, and always will be, the oblation of the sacrifice of the new law, bloody upon the cross, but unbloody upon our altars. It is therefore necessarily one and the same. But the prayers which accompany it were, and always will be different for the saints, and for the common faithful departed. They made commemoration of the elect of both testaments, to thank and glorify God in their persons; and generally of all that died, to beg of God to pardon them, and fix them in a place of light, repose and happiness. This, all the liturgies of antiquity uniformly shew. Would Mr. Faber wish for a proof from Tertullian himself? Let him read No. 10 of his book of Monogamy. Tertullian speaking of the wife who survives her husband, desires that thenceforth in her widowhood "She should pray for the soul of her husband, solicit for him refreshment, and offer on the anniversaries of his death." "*Pro animâ ejus (mariti) oret, refrigerium interim adpostulet, et offerat diebus dormitationis ejus.*" *Dormitationes* expressed natural deaths; *natalitia*, the birth of the martyrs and saints to immortality. Doubtless Mr. Faber will now reproach himself with having made Tertullian contradict himself, as well as the liturgies, which certainly he constantly frequented after his conversion to Christianity.

I trust he will find equal reason to reprove himself with regard to St. Cyprian, who in the passage quoted at p. 191 begins with these words: "When once departed this life, there is no longer any place for repentance, nor for *satisfaction*." The last word must have cost Mr. Faber a great deal; his hand must have trembled as he wrote it. I am sorry to have again to bring it before him: "What do they mean," said this Father, to those who reconciled sinners before the

time, "but that Jesus Christ shall be less appeased by prayers and *satisfactions*? But that sins shall no more be redeemed by just *satisfactions*? . . . Let every deep wound have long and careful treatment: let not the penance be less than the crime."* And again: "Behold the greatest wounds of sin, behold the greatest transgressions; to have sinned, and not to *satisfy*: to have offended, and not to weep." But I am fatiguing Mr. Faber's ear too much with the disagreeable words, *satisfy* and *satisfaction*. Let us return to the contradiction which would result from the passage quoted and explained by Mr. Faber, and that adduced by me in the *Discussion Amicale*. Mine is as follows: "Our predecessors prudently advised that no brother departing this life, should nominate any churchman his executor; and should he do it, that no oblation should be made for him, nor sacrifice offered for his repose." And he adds that Victor having contrary to this law, nominated the priest Faustinus his executor, "*non est quod pro dormitione ejus apud vos fiat oblatio, aut deprecatio aliqua nomine ejus in ecclesiâ frequentetur.*" It is evident that this law, and its application to Victor, suppose the custom of praying for the dead anterior to St. Cyprian. But Mr. Faber would have it, that according to the doctrine of that illustrious primate, there were only heaven or hell to be expected after death. Were that the case, it would be alike evident that this great man contradicted himself.

But let us comfort ourselves for the honour of St. Cyprian, with the assurance that the contradiction is entirely the act of his interpreter. The works of penance and satisfaction belong only to this life; they are strangers to the other world: purgatory knows them not. That is the abode of sorrowful expiations: there purification is effected by suffering. Yet who

* *Let. 55 to Pope Cornelius.* "Ecce majora peccati vulnera, ecce majora delicta; peccâsse, nec satisfacere; deliquisse, nec flere."

would not think himself happy in this life, if he were certain of going thither at his death? St. Cyprian then would have had reason to say, that even when satisfaction remains to be made in the next world, we pass from this life to a blessed immortality. But must he by this blessed immortality have meant heaven? Even so it is unquestionable, that after we have done, as he requires elsewhere and supposes here, penance proportionable to the sins, which it has been our misfortune to commit, we pass immediately from death to eternal happiness. But what I have here said regards only Christians, and I acknowledge that St. Cyprian in this place is not addressing them. He is writing to a pagan named Demetrianus. What then is the case? He seeks to attract him to Christianity; he exposes the danger of deferring his conversion, and places before his eyes the salutary effects of faith, which from repentance and confession necessarily leads to baptism, and thus opens the gate of heaven to those, who have just received the grace of regeneration.

You see that the passage brought against me is by no means incompatible with purgatory, and that admitting this abode of temporary expiation, St. Cyprian might well express himself as he did, whether you extend this expressions to Christians, who had or had not entirely satisfied the divine justice in this life; or confine them to the pagan Demetrianus; and since it cannot be doubted, after what I have quoted from St. Cyprian, that in his time, and long before, praying for the dead was in use, that explanation must absolutely be admitted, which makes the saint consistent with himself, with the practice of the Church, and with the apostolic liturgies.

Mr. Faber looks well indeed, when at p. 204 he tells us with perfect satisfaction at his performance: "Cyprian I have already disposed of."*

* *Epilogue*, p. 337.

XLIV. Enquire, I entreat you, sir, of your learned Thorndyke; he will tell you: "One subject of reformation, in my opinion, would be to re-establish prayers for the dead, according to the primitive sentiment of the universal Church: and I maintain that the suppression of such prayers, was not retrenching an abuse, but cutting to the very quick." Listen to Bishops Forbes, Barrow, Sheldon, Blandford, &c.* Compare your modern divines with their predecessors; and you will see that instead of returning to antiquity, they every day depart more widely from it. They have taught you to believe that death breaks off all communication between those, who remain upon earth, and those, who have quitted it. Thus you have accompanied your relations and friends with tears to the grave: but the stone once closed down upon them, you have left them to their fate. You have hoped; it is true, that they were happy, but without daring to pray for their happiness to the sovereign Judge. I am well assured that your affection for them was not extinguished with their life: but it remained sterile and unprofitable to them. Educated in the unhappy principles of a gloomy and discouraging creed, you have never yet known the secret calm and resignation infused by the thought that we can benefit our friends beyond the tomb. Enter at least now upon this solid and consolatory belief. Were it imaginary, were it an illusion, it would still be delightful; and cruel is that reformation, which presumes to forbid it. But it is incontestable, and a matter of primitive tradition; you have seen that it is built upon the teaching of the apostles, and consequently upon that of their divine Master. Harken then no more to those ignorant and unfeeling sophists, who strive to deprive you of a resource so precious to those, whose lot it is to survive. Practice it henceforth; betake yourselves to it with

* See *Discussion Amicale*, vol. 2, pp. 254, 255, 256.

confidence; I venture to affirm that you will find it a source of hope, of tender feelings and pious emotions.

INVOCATION OF SAINTS.

XLV. Mr. Faber's chapter XV. is a succession of faults, mistakes, and infidelities, which it would be too long and tedious to exhibit piece by piece. He had just before blamed me for adducing Tertullian as a witness of the primitive faith; and here he himself would have this primitive doctrine estimated by the single testimony of St. Epiphanius, who lived two centuries later! I had said that Asterius implored of Phocas that intercession, which he himself had solicited and obtained of the martyrs; and he makes me say—p. 227—that Asterius begged “that Phocas, *in the plenitude of his power*, (these words are an addition of Mr. Faber's) would give to his survivors those blessings, which he himself possessed!” I quoted in favor of the Invocation of Saints, St. Irenæus, Origen, St. Athanasius, Eusebius, St. Ephrem, St. Augustin, St. Ambrose, and the Councils of Ephesus and Chalcedon, that is to say, the brilliant ages of the Church, admitted as such by the most able Protestants; and this man reproves me for so doing! He does not then comprehend how these great doctors, these learned bishops, revered as saints even by the followers of the reformation, could have been other than Idolaters! Nor does he blush to charge them with idolatry, by attributing sentiments to them, which they never entertained! Let it suffice for me to reply that the testimonies of these great personages of antiquity will undoubtedly weigh a little more towards establishing the apostolicity of any dogmatical usage, than the high authority of the Rector of Long Newton, towards overturning it.

XLVI. He next proceeds to shew, p. 231, that the idolatry of the early ages has passed down from hand to hand in the Catholic Church, where it still holds

sovereign sway. He quotes from the Hours according to the use of Salisbury, and draws his proofs from the comments upon them, left us by the learned and truth-telling Burnet. He sets out with informing us that these Hours were even printed at Paris in 1520; and with powerful logic he concludes from their Parisian date, that it seems abundantly *evident*, that they met with very general acceptation among what the bishop styles *the Catholic body*. Let us not disturb him in the "abundant evidence" of his splendid conclusion. Without taking the trouble to search out the old rubric of Sarum, he need only have opened our breviaries and the liturgical books in daily use among us. He would have found there the same hymns, the same invocations to the blessed Virgin and the Saints; and with the honest and charitable industry, which he is so fond of exercising, he might have easily changed our prayers into acts of detestable idolatry.

Would you wish to know, sir, how he proceeds to convert our devotions into idolatry? He separates certain passages, certain words, suppresses those that precede or follow, and thus by a very honest process, he succeeds in giving them a sense, which they were never meant to convey. In the hymn to the blessed Virgin, which so particularly offends him, he suppresses this verse: *Monstra te esse matrem, Sumat per te preces, Qui pro nobis natus, Tulit esse tuus*. Show thyself a mother, and let him, who for us deigned to become thy Son, through thee, hear our prayers. As also the words, *bona cuncta posce*, obtain for us *all good things*, and consequently all those, expressed in the insulated verses produced by Mr. Faber. In this manner those words, which serve to explain all the rest, are adroitly concealed by him. He only exhibits such passages as he chose to extract, in imitation of his master the faithful Burnet; and thus the hymn appears entirely covered with a shining varnish of idolatry.

You will readily conceive that Mr. Faber has taken good care not to let those versicles and prayers appear which follow the above hymn, and all those which we address to the blessed Virgin. One of the versicles is as follows; "Pray for us, O holy Mother of God; that we may be made worthy of the promises of Christ." In the subsequent prayers, you will find the intercession expressed in direct terms: "*intercedente sanctissima Dei genitrice.—Beatæ Virginis Mariæ intercessio gloriosa nos protegat; Genetricis Filii tui intercessione salvemur, &c.*" Mr. Faber would have apparently required that the word *intercession* should be repeated in every verse. I fear Mr. Faber is no poet; if he is, he must know that the measure would not admit of all this dogmatical exactness, and that the short lines of our hymns reject words of five syllables. Let him not then be so hard upon our sacred poets, but allow them some license in favour of metre and precision; and instead of interrupting their free and rapid course, assist their words by supposing throughout, what they every where wish to be understood.

But on the contrary, he is so blinded by the mania of viewing us as absolute idolaters, that he does not observe the intercession of Mary traced by his own hand in the very prayers, which he quotes, and in which he pretends that we invoke her as omnipotent. P. 232—"By thy pious intervention wash away our sins." "Have me excused with Christ thy Son." P. 233.—"Pray for the people, interpose on behalf of the clergy, intercede for the devout female sex." He gravely attributes the prayer containing these last words to the Church of Salisbury, and little suspects that it is taken word for word from St. Augustin, from an admirable prayer composed by that splendid genius, and which the Bachelor would not repeat, or report without horror.

For our part, sir, we have been taught by pious and learned antiquity to invoke the most holy of creatures,

Mary, mother of our Saviour, and all the Saints; and they solicit in our behalf. Our invocation is made upon earth; their intercession, in heaven. Thus a continual religious intercourse is kept up between the inhabitants of both worlds, between the blessed, who enjoy the happiness of heaven, and mortals exposed to the dangers of a life of storms and tribulations. This is what we call the Communion of Saints, a consoling doctrine, a source of charming and pure delights of which you would partake with us, if your dry and gloomy doctrines had not taught you to dread it as a fanciful bug-bear.

XLVII. We have told your divines a hundred times, and we will not cease to tell them, till at last we drive it into their heads, that idolatry is no less odious to us, than to them; that we reject the very idea of it far from us in our prayers; that we should hold it blasphemy to say to the most holy of creatures what we address to Jesus Christ, and blasphemy to address Jesus Christ as we do holy creatures. Witness our litanies, where we repeat to the blessed Virgin Mary and the Saints: "*pray for us;*" but to Jesus Christ, "*have mercy on us—deliver us—graciously hear us.*" In a word, however strong may be the poetical expressions in our hymns, intercession is always understood by us of necessity and right, whenever it is not repeated. Mr. Faber had very judiciously observed, p. x. of his preface, that "to charge a Latin (a Catholic) with "what he holds not, and then gravely to confute opinions which all the while he strenuously disclaims, is alike unfair and unprofitable. And here he is employing this unfair and unprofitable method himself! *Ex ore tuo te judico!* Let him cease therefore to contradict himself, to condemn himself, and to bring against us a charge of idolatry, which we shall never cease to repel with all the energy in our power.

For the rest, be it known to him, for he has forgotten what he must have read in the book, which he

professed to adopt as a text for his refutation—be it known to him that though we admit the invocation of Saints as useful and profitable, we do not hold it to be absolutely necessary, acting according as the Council of Trent has decided. What does he mean then by the conclusion of his note at p. 234, and the quotations which overturn his thesis instead of supporting it? What signifies the question proposed with such assurance to his readers, with an emphatical tone completely ridiculous? “When such rituals were approved and commonly used in the Latin Church of the West, *was*, or *was not*, a reformation necessary?” In my turn, I have a question to put to him, resting on a very different foundation. Let him produce an answer. “All that uproar and overthrow of every thing religious and political, *was it*, or *was it not* necessary to abolish that, which was never held to be necessary?”

RELICS.

Let us endeavour to come to a conclusion: for in truth, disgust makes the pen drop out of my hand; and yet the most odious parts would remain to be refuted, were I as much affected at the insults offered to me, as at those directed against truth and religion. I will confine myself now to a few passing reflections, short and rapid. And first, on the subject of *Relics*, I must observe, what I have already had to remark over and over again, that the Bachelor makes me still say what I never did say, and even the very opposite to my own words; and that he delights in repeating it, in order to impress it upon his readers. The following are my words at the bottom of p. 309, vol. 2. “They talk of the erroneous and superstitious notions, which people have often entertained on the subject of relics; I do not deny that such has been the case.”* Mr. Faber

* On parle de notions, erronees, superstitieuses, que les peuples ont souvent prises, sur les reliques; je n'en disconvien-drai pas.

gives my sentence as follows: "Men talk of erroneous and superstitious notions, which *we* have often taken up concerning relics: *but I have never been able to discover them*"—page 245. You see he exhibits throughout, the same tactics, the same upright and honourable proceedings!

The Rev. Bachelor next affects the *esprit fort* on the subject of miracles wrought by occasion and in presence of relics: he will not even listen to those, which he finds solemnly attested by such illustrious men as St. Cyril of Alexandria, or St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Ambrose, an eye-witness equally with St. Augustin, who was then at Milan. See *Discussion Amicale*, vol. 2, p. 315. Let us congratulate the Bachelor on his high opinion of his own wisdom, and the perfect self-confidence, which he perpetually exhibits. Rest assured, sir, that he knows much more about what took place at Milan nearly 1500 years ago, than the Learned and holy archbishop of that metropolis; who when he learned that certain Arians in that city called in question the miraculous cure of a blind man, of which he himself had been an eye-witness, mounted the pulpit the following day, and publicly proved the fact before an immense assembly.

THE SIGN OF THE CROSS.

But the powers of vision possessed by the oracle seated in Durham, penetrate still farther into the darkness of remote ages. Go and consult him at Long Newton; ask him why the Christians in the second century signed their foreheads with the sign of the cross, when they rose in the morning, when they lay down at night, before work, before and after meals, &c. Ask him the reason; he will tell you, and be sure to rely on his word, do not listen to such a man as Tertullian. This Father acknowledges that such a custom observed so faithfully did not come from any gospel precept, but solely from tradition.

You will perfectly understand what must have been the source of a custom established by tradition *in the second century*. But Mr. Faber decidedly pronounces that it did not come from tradition; he understands and maintains that it is no older than Tertullian; that the custom and the Father entered the world much about the same time—p. 286. It is evident that his ideas must be more correct than those of the learned African, as to what was believed and practised seventy years after St. John the Evangelist. Happy is the Church of England to foster in her bosom so bright and even miraculous a luminary! Really the more I think, the more I am persuaded that this gentleman must be inspired: and here is my proof.—If he were not, could he himself go so far as to imagine that he knows the second century better than the most admired man of that period? Would he dare to give the lie to that celebrated personage, and on a fact in its nature so notorious, since the old men of that time must have known perfectly well, whether when they were young people they made the sign of the cross? How then stands the case? Tertullian attests that the practice of signing the cross on the forehead came from a custom more ancient and handed down by tradition; and here Mr. Faber says to him in equivalent terms: “It is not so; but the practice began in your own time; you saw its beginning; and I am even tempted from your evident peevishness when asked for a scriptural proof of its obligation, to suspect that you may have been the author of it yourself.” This language proves indisputably one of these two things; either inspiration, or a certain degree of folly. But assuredly a grave and learned Rector could not be accused of the latter. Therefore we must acknowledge his inspiration.

I observe that towards the end of the *Difficulties of Romanism*, Mr. Faber no longer admits any authority but Scripture. If he does not find there every letter of

what you maintain against him, he accuses you without ceremony of gross ignorance, and mere unscriptural superstition. At the beginning he was more polite, and more respectful towards oral and primitive traditions. He did homage to them; he acknowledged their authority: several times he attempted to support himself upon them against my assertions; and it has been seen with what success. However, I content myself here with observing that on the Invocation of Saints, Relics, and the Sign of the Cross he pays no longer any regard to primitive traditions, and those authorities, which he delighted to quote when he conceived them favourable to his cause. This contradiction of mind and opinion is not exactly insanity; it would be wrong to pronounce it so: it is only caprice, and versatility of principle.

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

L. By beginning his refutation with my third Letter, after announcing in his preface that he should follow me step by step, Mr. Faber led me to believe that he considered it most prudent not to enter upon the discussion of the two preceding Letters. I had no expectation of what I discovered as I advanced further in my reply, that he had deferred the examination of the first to the second Chapter of his Book II. page 309. He has nothing to say against the historical summary of the establishment of the Anglican Church, at the beginning of my work. He attacks the consequences which I deduced from it, but he does not in the least invalidate them. They remain strictly correct, and my arguments retain all their strength.*

* Mr. Faber has no just idea of the jurisdiction and character of a bishop. He confounds the one with the other in what he calls the *power of order*. Consecration gives the character: mission imparts jurisdiction, which is lost by schism, while the character remains, because that is indelible. If the consecration of Parker had been valid, he would have received the character, but not jurisdic-

I argued the nullity of your church establishment, not from the character of Elizabeth, as Mr. Faber supposes, but from her radical defect of competency. The only method by which he could refute me, would have been to prove that Elizabeth had a right to bring about the change, which she effected by violence; and this he has not even attempted to demonstrate. On the contrary, you shall see how he himself furnishes me with a fresh proof of the incompetency of that Queen. "Suppose," says he, p. 314, "that we were deprived of our present legal establishment: what would be the consequence? Should we lose our spiritual authority as bishops or as presbyters? Such, I apprehend, would by no means be the result. . . . The spiritual power of order we assuredly derived not from Elizabeth: hence, of that power no present or future Sovereign of England can deprive us." It is certain that temporal rulers have only a right to take away what they gave. It is equally certain that they never could give spiritual authority; nor in consequence, take it away. *Therefore Elizabeth could not take away spiritual authority from the Catholic bishops, who occupied their sees, before she occupied her throne.* Therefore they preserved their authority: therefore the successors she gave them were mere intruders, without power and without jurisdiction. In a word, Elizabeth had undoubtedly a right to deprive the Catholic bishops of their palaces, their revenues, and their places in parliament: for they held these temporal advantages from the Crown, but their spiritual power came not from the Crown as Mr. Faber has so justly maintained. I was right then in saying, and he must from his own principles acknowledge it; that "without a right to throw down, and

tion; which the four consecrators, being in open revolt against the Church, could not have, and of course could not impart to him.—When speaking of the submission due to the successor of St. Peter, and head of the universal Church, Mr. Faber allows himself to designate him disdainfully as "an Italian prelate," "a bishop of Italy," he only adds a pitiful insult to his bad defence of a worse cause.

without a right to re-build, her (Elizabeth's) undertaking was null from the beginning."*

SUPREMACY.

LI. In chapter III. page 319, Mr. Faber enters upon a long dissertation, which corresponds to no part of my work. He directs it against the primacy of the holy see, and begins by justifying the separation under Elizabeth, by the right, which he attributes to every national Church to choose such a form of government for herself, as she shall think proper; as if it could be proper to choose for herself any other, than the one which Jesus Christ himself traced out for the universal Church. Bp. Jewel in his apology, justifies the schism by the necessity of departing from a Church degenerated, and disfigured by her innovations, her idolatry, and her errors, on the subject of the real presence; thus designating as innovations, errors and idolatry, the dogmas, which you have seen taught and practised by the primitive Church.

Mr. Faber proceeds next to the supremacy; against which he renews old attacks, a hundred times repelled, and with which, for that reason, I shall not here occupy my attention. I shall only make some rapid reflections on certain allegations contained in this chapter.

According to this author, and in opposition to the universal belief of all parties, St. Peter is not to be considered as the first Bishop of Rome, but St. Linus. The proof he adduces is precisely the proof of the contrary. For he insists that St. Linus was chosen by the common consent of St. Peter and St. Paul. But before the arrival of St. Paul, at Rome, St. Peter

* See vol. 1, p. 11, of the *Discussion Amicale*, a very striking passage from Dodwell quoted in a note. It seems to have been written expressly to demonstrate the nullity of your ecclesiastical constitution through the incompetency of the Queen and her parliament. It is also quoted in the 1st part ch. 1, No. 2, of the present Answer.

had founded the Church there, and governed it for some years. Therefore he was its first Bishop; and St. Linus was called in the same manner as St. Ignatius was of Antioch, the first Bishop of that See after St. Peter. For this reason, St. Irenæus speaking of St. Clement's elevation to the See of Rome, styles him the third Bishop from the death of the apostles.*

St. Irenæus thus expresses himself on the See of Rome: "Ad hanc ecclesiam, propter potentiorē principalitatem, necesse est omnem convenire ecclesiam; hoc est, eos qui sunt undique fideles." Mr. Faber thus translates the passage in a note at p. 345: "To the Roman Church, on account of its more potent principality, it is necessary that *every* Church should resort; that is to say, those of the faithful who dwell on every side of it." The text does not say, *those of the faithful who dwell on every side of it*; but *the faithful who are on every side*. He had just said *every* Church; therefore he adds likewise, *all* the faithful. And in fact, in the time of St. Irenæus, the Churches of Smyrna and Corinth had already resorted to Rome in affairs of importance. It is to be observed that the word *resort*, which Mr. Faber prefers to *agree with*, which we commonly employ, renders very energetically the pre-eminence of the Roman see: for people only resort to superior authority.†

* *Post Anacleum tertio loco ab apostolis, episcopatum sortitur Clemens.* Iren. adv. Hær. lib. III. c. 3, § 2, quoted by Mr. Faber.

† In a note, p. 346, Mr. Faber supposes that in the above passage St. Irenæus recommends the circumjacent churches to resort to Rome partly to inspect the autographs of the apostles, in case of any doctrinal difficulty. Let him attend on this subject to the following admirable observations of a celebrated German divine: "Qui ecclesiam sine litteris scriptis fundavit, multisque annis conservavit, ipse et sine autographis veram in ea fidem, ac puram doctrinam conservavit servatque. Nec unquam Jesus Christus dixerat, qui non legerit codicem sacrum, sed qui non audieret ecclesiam, sis quasi ethnicus et publicanus; nec unquam S. Paulus suis mandavit, et eodidem aut epistolas custodirent; bene tamen depositum fidei, quod tradidit ipsis."

Binterim *Epist. Cath. de lingua originali N. Test.*—Note of the TRANSLATOR.

Tertullian, who was converted at Rome, towards the middle of the second century, and who lived afterwards under the primates of Africa, gives to the bishop of Rome, the same title, which we give at this day, that of *sovereign pontiff*. This Mr. Faber admits: but he wrangles about St. Cyprian, and proves nothing after all, but that this learned and illustrious primate of Carthage admitted no infallibility in the Pope, no more than Firmilian, the churches of the islands, and of Africa. It is utterly false that St. Cyprian ever opposed or disputed that Pope St. Stephen was the successor of St. Peter. St. Cyprian wrote as follows to Antonianus: “Cornelius has just been made bishop of Rome, the place of Fabian, that is, *that of Peter*, and the step of the sacerdotal chair having become vacant.” Nothing certainly could be more clear and precise.

The passage of St. Cyprian, which Mr. Faber would turn against the holy see, becomes even stronger in its favour and more decisive, by his own explanation of it. You will see this by the note at p. 348 of Mr. Faber’s book; “Cyprian speaks of *one chair founded upon Peter by the voice of the Lord*. . . . By this chair, he meant, *not the see of Rome in particular, but the chair of the collective united episcopate in general*.” If this be the case, it is most evident that not only the chair of Rome, but all the episcopal chairs in the world are founded upon Peter, and consequently upon his successors. It is impossible to say more for the universal supremacy of the see of Rome: see then how error betrays itself!

The Greeks acknowledged the primacy of jurisdiction in the Holy Father at the Council of Florence, and more remotely in that of Lyons, as they had done from the beginning of Christianity to the time of Photius. On that account the deputies of the holy see presided by universal consent at the first Council of Nice, at that of Constantinople, &c. For that reason St. Poly-

carp, at ninety years of age, crossed the seas, and went to render an account to Pope Anicetus of the reasons which attached the churches of Asia to the custom of celebrating Easter on the 14th day of the moon: it was moreover on that account that the Corinthians sent a deputation, not to St. Clement, who was not then in the chair of St. Peter, as Mr. Faber seems to suppose, but to St. Anacletus, to induce him to interpose his authority to repress the schism, which threatened their Church.

LII. I must beg Mr. Faber to explain, why, in his discussion of the claims of the holy see to supremacy, from the Holy Scriptures, he chose to pass over in silence the celebrated text; *feed my lambs—feed my lambs,—feed my sheep*. Here are most certainly universal superintendance and jurisdiction given to St. Peter, and in his person to his successors. If Mr. Faber has any desire to be comprised in the flock of Jesus Christ, he must acknowledge the shepherd placed at the head of it by our divine Saviour. If he persists in refusing to acknowledge him, he voluntarily separates himself from the sheep and lambs of Jesus Christ. I seriously invite him, his readers and mine, to meditate on this awful consequence, and apply it in earnest to themselves.

PROJECT FOR RE-UNION.

LIII. To my great surprise, Mr. Faber appears at p. 355 to represent me as a kind of plenipotentiary to the Anglican Church to bring about a reconciliation between her and ourselves. I am represented as undertaking to promise for the Catholic Church, and propose concessions on the one hand and adoptions on the other. This reminds me of what Lord Chesterfield writes to his son, which I also recommend to Mr. Faber: "See what you see; read what you read." He did not read what he read; he read what he did

not and could not read in my book, for I have written no such thing. Nevertheless I can hardly find fault with Mr. Faber, since some of my own countrymen have given into the same mistake, if I may credit reports which I have heard. I must rectify the error of both parties. I did then advance that though faith is unchangeable, discipline is not so; and that if concessions on the former were impossible, they might be made on the latter. I named some of these possible concessions, after the example of Bossuet, choosing, as he did, such as would be best relished by Protestants.

But it is one thing to say that such or such concessions might be made, and another, to promise that they will be "freely conceded." Here are two questions: the first may be decided by any individual; the second, by the Church alone. What are the articles of discipline susceptible of change? All. What are those which it would be expedient to change, for obtaining the return of a separated people? To the Church alone belongs the right to answer.

For many years have I ardently desired the return of the nations departed from unity. For many years it has appeared to me that it would not be impossible to bring them back: and my reading and reflections, no less than my desires, have spontaneously turned to an object so much wished for by all good men.

I have thought that the period in which we live, presented more favourable chances of re-union among Christians than any time preceding. On the one hand, three centuries of commotions, of overthrows, of animated controversies, of intestine and cruel wars, have fatigued the earth: on the other, the world is terrified at the number of sects which the leading principle of the reformation has produced, and after them, the incredulity, which has already caused so many revolutions, and threatens nations and sovereigns with yet

more.* It must be evident that if temporal interests formerly induced princes to adopt the reformation, temporal interests of a higher nature involving their very existence ought in these days to convince them, that there can be no repose and no security for them, but under the guardianship of unity, and of one supreme authority in matters of revelation. I have said to myself many times, will not Christians at length listen to their own experience? Will they condemn themselves to pass their days in dissensions and troubles; and leave the same inheritance to their posterity? Redeemed by the same blood, regenerated by the same baptism, called to the same hopes, to the happiness of another world, will they never give each other the hand of union in this? Will they be forever seen separated in communion, prayer, and worship? God our Saviour declared that he would have on earth but one sheepfold, one flock, one shepherd; and can they in defiance of the order by him established, feel assurance and delight in a multitude of flocks and sheepfolds? No; there must either be a speedy end of this disorder, or the termination of all human things.

In the midst of these reflections, I became very sensible that to lead mankind to one belief, the first step must be to prove its truth. I was perfectly aware of the difficulty of such an undertaking; nor should I have attempted to surmount it, had I reckoned solely upon my own ability. My only confidence was in Him, who had so long inspired me with the thought and resolution. I never ceased to implore his assistance and all-powerful grace in the course of my researches and labours. Subsequently, the result was

*“Divisions in religion when multiplied, are sources of atheism:” so said Bacon; and never was the assertion so fatally verified as it has been in our days.

“By so many paradoxes, the foundations of our religion are shaken, the principle articles are called in question, heresies enter in crowds into the churches of Christ, and the road is thrown open to atheism.” Sturmer, *Ratio ineundæ concordia* An. 1579, p. 2.

submitted to enlightened friends: I wished it to be placed before well informed persons of other communions. It was so; and not always without approbation, and some effect. An antagonist has at length arisen, who certainly is not wanting in penetration of mind, facility of language, or elegance of style; why am I not permitted to add, in sincerity, love of union and experience in matters of theology! By turns he extols the character of the author, with whom he is unacquainted, and abuses the book which is before him. He is wrong in both: in his commendations, which unhappily the author does not in any degree deserve; and in his critique upon the *Discussion Amicale*, which this answer will, I flatter myself, have placed above the reach of his censures. He decomposes my proofs, adds or retrenches, changes my words, palms upon me his own, substitutes his own reasoning for mine, and what is still more culpable, is equally unceremonious with the ancient Fathers. With a boldness hitherto unheard of, he makes them say what they do not say, and even the very opposite to what they do say; yes, the very opposite; I am truly sorry to have to reproach him with such conduct. I should never have expected to detect such proceedings in an Englishman. I knew a great many during a residence of thirteen years among them; but I never met with one of this stamp. The most intellectual writer may undoubtedly be allowed to be no theologian; but never to act dishonourably.

At page 370, Mr. Faber attempts to show that my attacks upon the reformation would equally fall upon Christianity itself, and does not perceive that his own parallel between them is very closely allied to blasphemy. Yet he knows that the Christian revelation came to us from heaven; that it presented itself to the world with proofs of its divinity; that the apostles, their disciples and their proselytes attracted mankind by their virtues and heavenly doctrines; that they suf-

ferred with resignation, without inflicting suffering on any; that they shed no blood but their own, and prayed for their persecutors; he knows, in fine, that the preaching of the gospel was by the command of God, and the establishment of the Church was a work purely divine. But what were the reformers? They have answered the question themselves. Was it—I will not say by the command of God—but purely for his glory that they announced their doctrines? “This quarrel did not begin for the honour of God; nor will it end by it,” said Luther on one occasion.* Did they bear contradictions with Christian humility, and pray for those, who condemned their preaching? Luther exhausted his threats and imprecations against the holy see and the Church in communion with Rome†. Calvin called those monsters who opposed his doctrines, and wished them to be treated as he had treated Servetus.‡ Zwinglius at the head of his troops received that death which he would have dealt upon his enemies. And what was the tendency of their

* At the dispute at Leipzig, in 1519, by order of Prince George of Saxony, between Eekins of Ingolstatt, Carlostadt and Luther. See *Hist. of 70 years, dating from 1500, by Laurence Surius, the Carthusian translated by Estourmeaux. 2d edit. 1572; Paris.* Emser an auricular witness reproached Luther with this, and he did no deny it.

† “By my hand his death-blow shall be given,” Luther wrote in 1520; “my doctrine shall prevail, and the Pope shall fall.—He has refused peace, therefore he shall have war; we shall see who will be tired first, the Pope or Luther . . . Let us assail, assail with all sorts of arms which we can devise, this master of perdition, these Popes, cardinals and all this Roman rabble of ordure: *let us wash our hands in their blood.*”—And in his epistle to the people of Strasbourg he testifies, that he did not engage so deeply in this quarrel for the love of Christ, but through his hatred of the Pope, against whom he proclaims a war of fire and blood.”

‡ Call to mind here his letter to the Marquis of Poët, quoted already.—“*Calvini discipuli, ubicunque invaluerunt, imperia turbavere:*” says Grotius against Rivet. “Calvanism must necessarily produce civil wars, and shake the foundations of states . . . there is no country where the religions of Luther and Calvin have appeared, without causing an effusion of blood.” *Voltaire Siecle de Louis XIV. ch. 33.*

principles? To ruin our mysteries, and overturn religion.* Who then was the real instigator of the reformation, and whose work must we all call it? I leave you to answer.

THE INQUISITION.

LIV. I know nothing worse than a man of genius without good faith: he poisons what he touches at pleasure, and presents to his readers, under the attractive air of truth, what he knows himself to be false. How often has it pained me to apply this reflection to the Rector of Long Newton? He undertakes at p. 372, No. II. to represent me to his countrymen as a friend and partisan of the inquisition; and that they may not doubt his sincerity, he appears to translate a note which I beseech you to read in my 2d. vol. p p. 416, 417. He suppresses and adds, as he pleases, so that the words which he attributes to me express sufficiently well the very opposite to what I declared. "I do not undertake," said I at the beginning, "to justify the tribunals of the "inquisition in theory and principle." He certainly read this first sentence carefully, because he has taken good care to suppress it; and although I there give notice that I am not going to defend the inquisition, he represents me as its defender. "They are accused (and would to God it were with less

*"From thy doctrine and that of *all thy accomplices and followers*, all the condemned heresies receive, and the whole service of God is repudiated. At what period were there ever more sacrileges of men consecrated to God, than under thy gospel? When was rebellion against the magistracy more frequent than during thy gospel? When have there been seen more pillage of churches, more ~~h~~arceny and robbery? At what time had Wittemberg more unfrocked monks than at present? When were wives taken from their husbands to be given to others, as under thy gospel? When did men commit more adulteries, than since thou wrotest that if a man can hope for no issue by his wife, he may take another, and that her husband is obliged to support the offspring which may follow; and that a woman may act the same in the like case, &c. &c." *Reply of Prince George of Saxony to Luther in 1526.*

reason!) of having carried severity to injustice and cruelty!" Is this the exclamation of a man applauding the severities, the injustice and cruelty of those tribunals, or of one deeply lamenting them? Is it taking up their defence to consider them in such a light? Or is it not rather condemning them with feelings of pain and disapprobation? "Why did they not *imitate those of Italy?—Without defiling themselves with innocent blood, they would have obtained the success which sovereigns expected from their vigilance.*" The Rector read this sentence, and suppresses it! But is it defending the Spanish inquisition, to reproach it as I have done above? Could Mr. Faber have expressed his disapprobation more forcibly than I have done by those words which he has purposely suppressed; "*without defiling themselves with innocent blood?*" After observing with writers worthy of credit that the number of innocent victims had been much exaggerated, I add: "had this not been the case, Spain, while she reproached herself with all these *cruel* and *unjust* executions, would not have to regret the lot of other states, where religious wars have shed a deluge of human blood, &c." The Rector makes me say: "*But Spain, blessed with the inquisition, has been happily exempt.*" This little interpolation is very ingeniously put in, to keep in countenance the accusation, which the Bachelor wishes to bring against me, and at the same time to stand as evidence of his own candour.

He would have me clearly point out what I mean by innocent and guilty victims. But surely I was nowise obliged to do this. He may divide them as he pleases; I have no objection. The discrimination is no part of my concern: I am not writing the history of the inquisition. I gave notice that I should defend neither its tribunals, nor its *unjust* and *cruel* executions; that I confined myself to the consideration of its general consequences relative to the condition of Spain, as the English author whom I quoted had done before

me. During my long residence in England, I never met with any man of information and good faith, who would undertake to justify the revolution of 1688 in its principles and the means by which it was effected; but I met many who rejoiced at its results, on account of the actual prosperity of the country. While they considered it unjust in its origin, they held it to be advantageous in its effects. This is very much the view which I have taken of the inquisition, which by preserving Spain in unity of faith, has saved it in our days from certain and total ruin.

“I may be mistaken;” says Mr. Faber, p. 374, but I have always understood, that the special object of the inquisition was to take cognizance of what the *Latin* Church (he means no doubt the Catholic Church) pronounces to be *heresy*.” He will be very glad, I imagine, to learn what we are informed on this subject by a man to whom we may all refer, the Abbé Fieury, (*Instit. au droit Can.* v. 2, 12mo. p. 86, and 90 Paris 1763.) “The origin of the inquisition is traced up to Theodosius the Great, against the Manicheans. His law of the year 382 is addressed to the prefect of the East. In 1224, the emperor Frederick 2d issued four edicts with orders to the secular judges to pursue and punish by fire obstinate heretics condemned by the Church In France, it began against the Albigenes at Toulouse in 1229; in Arragon, in 1233, but very feebly, until Ferdinand, having expelled the Moors, and wishing to confirm the pretended conversions of the Moors and Jews, who obtained leave to remain in Spain by becoming Christians, solicited of Pope Sixtus IV. in 1483, a bull to nominate Cardinal Turre-cremata grand inquisitor and president of the council of the inquisition It is this council which makes regulations, decides differences between particular inquisitions, *punishes their faults* and those of the inferior ministers, and receives all appeals. This council is exclusively dependent on the king.”

Were I a member of the Spanish Church, which Mr. Faber is so zealous in stigmatizing, I should address him thus: "Be so good sir, as to look a little more at home. Think of the pious and illustrious foundress of your *Church by law established*, to the supreme governess in things spiritual as well as temporal: think of the mild and gentle laws, which she published against such of her subjects as would not join her in renouncing the religion of their fathers: think of the searches, the domiciliary visits, made by her orders to discover the smallest traces of the Catholic worship and ministry; of the savage cruelty with which the priests were pursued, of the barbarous joy even in the capital when any had been discovered under their disguise, or in their secret hiding-places. Think of the instruments of torture, which awaited them in their prisons, and the ingeniously contrived machines* employ-

* *Atrociora pœnarum ingenia.*" *Tertull. de resur. carnis. c. 9.*

The following were the kinds of torture chiefly employed in the Tower.

1. The rack was a large open frame of oak, raised three feet from the ground. The prisoner was laid under it, on his back, on the floor: his wrists and ancles were attached by cords to two rollers at the ends of the frame: these were moved by levers in opposite directions, till the body rose to a level with the frame. Questions were then put; and, if the answers did not prove satisfactory, the sufferer was stretched more and more till the bones started from their sockets.

2. The scavenger's daughter was a hoop of iron, so called, consisting of two parts, fastened to each other by a hinge. The prisoner was made to kneel on the pavement, and to contract himself into as small a compass as he could. Then the executioner, kneeling on his shoulders, and having introduced the hoop under his legs, compressed the victim close together till he was able to fasten the extremities over the small of his back. The time allotted for this kind of torture was an hour and a half, during which time it commonly happened that from excess of compression the blood started from the nostrils; sometimes, it was believed from the extremities of the hands and feet. See Bartoli, 250.

3. Iron gauntlets, which could be contracted by the aid of a screw. They served to compress the wrists, and to suspend the prisoner in the air, from two distant points of a beam. He was

ed with cold ferocity to punish them. Think of the cries of pain, the lengthened groans of innocent and resigned victims; of the streams of blood, which gushed out beneath the pressure of iron, from their dislocated members; and after those horrible tortures, think of the execution which terminated their martyrdom and their life; when they were dragged from prison to the place of execution, and the hangman after letting them hang

placed on three pieces of wood, piled one on the other, which, when his hands had been made fast, were successively withdrawn from under his feet. "I felt," says F. Gerard, one of the sufferers, "the chief pain in my breast, belly, arms and hands. I thought that all the blood in my body had run into my arms, and began to burst out of my finger ends. This was a mistake; but the arms swelled, till the gauntlets were buried within the flesh. After being thus suspended an hour, I fainted: and when I came to myself, I found the executioners supporting me in their arms: they replaced the pieces of wood under my feet; but as soon as I was recovered, removed them again. Thus I continued hanging for the space of five hours, during which I fainted eight or nine times." Apud Bartoli, 418.

4. A fourth kind of torture was a cell called "little ease." It was of so small dimensions, and so constructed, that the prisoner could neither stand, walk, sit, or lie in it at full length. He was compelled to draw himself up in a squatting posture, and so remained during several days.

I will add a few lines from Rishton's Diary, that the reader may form some notion of the proceedings in the Tower.

Dec. 5, 1580. Several Catholics were brought from different prisons.

Dec. 10. Thomas Cottam and Luke Kirbye, priests (two of the number,) suffered compression in the scavenger's daughter for more than an hour. Cottam bled profusely from the nose.

Dec. 15. Ralph Sherwine and Robert Johnson, priests, were severely tortured on the rack.

Dec. 16. Ralph Sherwine was tortured a second time on the rack.

Dec. 31. John Hart, after being chained five days to the floor, was led to the rack. Also, Henry Orton, a lay gentleman.

1581, Jan. 3. Christopher Thompson, an aged priest, was brought to the Tower, and racked the same day.

Jan. 14. Nicholas Roscaroc, a lay gentleman, was racked.

Thus he continues till June 21, 1585, when he was discharged. See his Diarium, at the end of his edition of Sanders. *Rev. Dr. Lingard's History of England.* vol. viii. 8 vo. Note U. p. 521.

a moment on the gallows, cut them down while still alive, opened their bodies, tore out their palpitating bowels and threw them into a cauldron in the sight and amid the furious acclamations of an exulting populace. Read the history of this period so faithfully written by your immortal Lingard, whom you have reason to place at the head of your historians; or in the Memoirs of Missionary priests by the venerable Challoner. Come, sir, read these works, and be in future at least a little more reserved in your declarations against foreigners. But no; rather unite with me in drawing a veil over these scenes of horror; let us sigh over our ages of barbarism, and the errors of human nature. Where is the nation that has not had to lament her own share of them? The inquisition of France after being softened down for a long time, disappeared altogether. Your own has much relaxed in rigour of late years: let it then disappear entirely; and restore to repose, to happiness and to their country eight millions of your fellow-subjects, whom you have deprived of these blessings for near three centuries, for no other crime than their unshaken devotedness to the religion of your fore-fathers.

INTOLERANCE.

LV.—In the last article, and in twenty others before it, you must, sir, have admired the dexterity with which Mr. Faber changes, turns and distorts my expressions, gives them any sense he pleases, and substitutes for what I say, what he wishes to make me say. He possesses this art in a superior degree: I cannot cease to wonder at it, for never should I have looked for such a talent in England; and I am willing to believe that you could not find such another specimen in your country. In the concluding pages of his book particularly he quite surpasses himself. For instance, he has chosen to exhibit me to his countrymen as intole-

rant; and you shall see how he proceeds; p. 378. "The bishop having thus censured the reformation and vindicated the inquisition, nothing more was wanting to the rotundity of his system than that he should bear his testimony against freedom of religious worship." And then he goes on with an air of great seriousness and in a very angry manner to refute an opinion which he attributes to me without the least reason upon earth. For he well knows in soul and conscience, that I do not say a syllable about "freedom of religious worship;" so far am I from imputing it as a "crying abomination" to his Church.*

He has too much penetration not to perceive the difference between this sentence: "The adder, which the Church thus warms only for the purpose of stinging herself to death, is **FREEDOM OF RELIGIOUS WORSHIP:**" and the following: "I see that the Established Church carries in her bosom the principle of her destruction in that **LIBERTY OF MAKING A RELIGION AND FORM OF WORSHIP FOR THEMSELVES**, which she cannot now deny to any, after claiming it herself." The latter sentence is mine; the former belongs to Mr. Faber, who artfully substitutes it for mine, that he may ground an accusation against me. But let me beg of him to take back his own; I have certainly no wish to deprive him of his property. I much doubt however, if his cunning will do him any honour in your eyes, and before a nation so universally upright and generous as his own.

Mr. Faber very loudly proclaims the tolerance of his Church. It is true that it extends far to those sects which like that Church herself have proceeded from the fundamental principle of preferring private interpretation to the authority of the universal Church; a principle, which I have designated as the cause of

* See *Discussion Amicale*, vol. ii. pp. 409, 410, and vol. i. pp. 149, 150, 162, 163.

inevitable destruction to your Church. But even to the present day her tolerance has been little better than a name towards Catholics, that heroic race of confessors of the faith, who for three centuries have suffered so many evils from father to son, and still endure so many privations for having constantly refused to sacrifice *unity* to the anti-christian principle of schism and divisions. Even when in 1791 the English government was willing to allow them to celebrate their worship with open doors, it took care to punish them another way, by a refusal indefinitely prolonged to restore their ancient civil and political rights. Has my own country, France, though represented as so intolerant by Mr. Faber, thus treated, or does it thus treat its Protestant subjects? Call to mind Sully, Turenne, Marshal Saxe; and in our own days you will find Protestants of various communions admitted to every post in her army, navy, and administration; sitting in both chambers of parliament and even in the king's privy-council. If Mr. Faber would see complete toleration, let him come over to France. Truly it is something more than logical unskilfulness to exalt his own country at the expense of ours, on the score of toleration.

The established Church, who in despite of her thirty-nine articles, royal proclamations and acts of parliament, cannot prevent sects from swarming around her to her own cost, can claim no merit for leaving them freedom of religious worship. They have sprung, like herself, from one and the same principle, though at various periods. They form together one same family, and are all sisters. It is true that they wage deadly war against her who is the most favoured and exalted, for which I cannot commend them; for I dislike hostilities, and above all intestine hostilities. Yet I cannot lose sight of the rights and titles, which they all derive from one common origin; they are such as cannot be justly contested by the *Church* by *law estab-*

lished. They exercise them, and will exercise them;—they undermine her, and they will undermine her, as I see great reason to fear; until they see her expire in the midst of them through exhaustion and inaction.

This freedom of religious worship, which “the bishop censurés in the Church of England,” continues Mr. Faber, “is a principle, which the Church of Rome has ever abhorred.” It is written then that the Rector of Long Newton shall be wrong even to the end. Let him attend to the following: “*above all things*, never force your subjects to change their religion. No human power can force the impenetrable intrenchment of liberty of heart. Compulsion can never persuade men; it only makes hypocrites. When kings interfere with religion, instead of protecting, they enslave it. Grant to all *civil toleration*; not approving all as indifferent, but suffering with patience what God permits, and endeavouring to bring men back by gentle persuasion.” This advice given by an illustrious Catholic bishop to the Pretender, son of James II. would be given at this day by the bishops of France, if any occasion required the expression of their sentiments. I know not one among them who would not feel it an honour to subscribe to such an advice. But were Mr. Faber called to discuss the Catholic question on the episcopal bench, would he adopt the decision you have just read? Would he express himself in such terms in favour of his oppressed countrymen, the Catholics of the three kingdoms? Or if he were consulted by the bench of bishops at the next session, would he counsel them to hold such language fearlessly in the house of peers? Let his readers judge by his *Difficulties of Romanism*. Then let him no longer raise a trophy with his pretended toleration: but let him openly confess that Protestants have found, and still find from our bishops that ample toleration, which the

Catholics have never yet obtained from the clergy of the Church of England.*

RECAPITULATION.

LVI.—At length Mr. Faber proceeds to sum up at the end of his work. But in what terms? My pen transcribes them with horror and indignation. The bishop, says he, p. 382, “calls upon us to unite, or rather to submit, to his Church: and as the consistent advocate of that Church, he vindicates idolatry, stigmatizes the reformation,† patronises the eve of St. Bartholomew,‡ lays the blame of persecution upon the persecuted, . . . and censures freedom of religious worship.” There is not one of these lines which does not contain a most splendid falsehood. Every one of these accusations is diametrically opposite to my principles, sentiments and expressions. In truth it is a cruel thing to be thus depicted in such odious colours before a nation which I honour, and from which I ever received marks of esteem, protection, and bounty.

* Many affect to apprehend what the Catholics would do, if they were once emancipated. Independent of their protestations so often and solemnly repeated on this head, it is difficult to conceive what great influence or authority they could derive from emancipation. But if you really wish to be more secure from their future dispositions, I say, prove yourselves just towards them in the first place; restore their rights which you have so long withheld. Then be generous, and make them some amends for the past. You will have a far better hold on them by kindness than by cruelty; you will bind them in the bonds of gratitude. It is of sovereign efficacy in noble hearts, born in privation, and long fed with humiliation and bitterness.

† She has stigmatized herself, I had only to let her speak her own language.

‡ Speaking of calamities which Europe would never have known but for the reformation, I said, vol. ii. p. 414: “Nor would France have had the shame of that frightful night of the St. Bartholomew;” and the charitable Rector of Long Newton purposely puts a misconstruction on these words, to change an expression of horror into an apology for a massacre executed under favour of darkness.

Yet I shall make but one reply to the calumnies of Mr. Faber; it shall be briefly this: I beseech his readers and mine to forgive him, as I freely forgive him myself before men, and before God.

CONCLUSION.

LVII.—And now, sir, I have finished the task which I undertook at your solicitation. You are now enabled to form a judgment of my antagonist, in whom you had placed confidence. He stands before you, not, I feel assured, such as he at first appeared in your estimation, but such as he is in reality. You will now know how to appreciate his merit in theological knowledge, his veracity in quotation, his accuracy in reasoning, his love of truth, his inclination for peace, his desire of re-union, his sincerity in praising, and his fidelity in accusing. Grant him, if you will, ease and address in the use of his pen; allow him, with all my heart, the skill to mutilate a passage, to substitute his own ideas for those of his opponent, and by this honourable process to bring odium against his person, and deprive him of the estimation of the public; and in fine, the art of colouring falsehood and decorating error with the ornaments of truth. Add to these, if you will an affectation of candour even at the moment when he himself disregards it; a habit of disguising a premeditated insult by empty compliment; assurance in his pretensions, and a tone of decision in assertions of the most palpable mendacity. This judgment will result from the answer you have now read; and I do not conceive it possible to allow him any other merit, without attributing what does not belong to him.*

Nevertheless I beseech you to bear in mind that I only speak of the writer, and not of the person: it is only my province to judge of the author of the *Difficulties of*

* I am sometimes tempted to think that he has served an apprenticeship in the school of Voltaire.

Romanism, and by no means of the reverend pastor of Long Newton, to whom I am far from wishing to deny pastoral and affectionate zeal, and every amiable and social quality. But why have I not the same happiness as his parishioners, that of finding these in his book, as they may enjoy them in his discourses, and to observe that sincere and tender interest for the Mother-Church, which he, no doubt, testifies for his Church at Long Newton! Perhaps in writing for his cause, he may have thought it a duty to dissemble his real sentiments on the solidity of my proofs. Can he have so far honoured the *Discussion Amicale*, as to consider it dangerous to his party, and therefore conclude that it was necessary to discredit the work and its author in public opinion?

However this may be, I found myself compelled in my reply to defend the Catholic doctrine against his unjust attacks: and this could not be done without producing his false allegations, unfaithful quotations, false reasoning, cunning and unworthy artifices. Why did he stoop to employ them? I have been obliged, against my inclination, to exhibit them in open day. But I have discharged this painful duty without passion or animosity; rather indeed with an uniform feeling of pity. How much has my patience been tried?—the whole task appeared to me ungrateful and revolting! I have endured it once, disgusting as it was; but I could not support it a second time. And I declare beforehand that let him write henceforth what he pleases, I shall not read a line of his production. I have taken advantage of the opportunity which he has afforded me, and have proved the errors of his creed, and the apostolicity of ours. I have insisted more plainly and forcibly upon our Eucharistic dogmas, because, he represented them as the principal subject of division between us. From the conformity of our faith with that of the primitive ages you must have concluded the doctrine of your Church is essentially opposed to

that of the primitive Church, to that of the apostles, and of Jesus Christ.

LVIII.—Well then, you may say then, what am I to do, and all those of my communion, who value, above every thing else, the salvation of their souls? I will answer you candidly and with perfect conviction. Had there existed a single reason to justify the separation in the sixteenth century, or did there exist one to justify the actual separation and schism of the various societies of Protestants, I should say to you—remain in your own. But I say—not only do I know of none, but I see most clearly there could have existed none. Bring together all the writings published by the reformed communions for these three centuries; congregate all the enlightened men who exist in these communions; you will never extract from either any one available and peremptory cause, to authorize at the time the original schism, or its continuation in our days. Therefore, sir, go out from it. You are now too well admonished, and too enlightened to be excusable if you continue therein. With great reason do you attach the highest importance to the salvation of your soul. Well, sir, I declare to you distinctly, that you must secure its salvation in *unity*, in the Mother Church, the faithful guardian of the primitive faith, the sole heiress of the promises, ever pure in her doctrine, incorruptible in her dogmas, and pious in her worship. If you have detected some abuses in her children;—and where will not some abuses be found?—be assured that if they were pernicious, she herself would be the first to condemn them; if not pernicious, she tolerates them for the sake of peace. Do you in like manner; and do not imagine it obligatory to observe certain minute practices, which she never commanded, but which she suffers without either approving or prohibiting them. Do not suffer yourself to be withheld by such unimportant matters; look to what is essential. Return to *unity*: for without that

even martyrdom would not save you.—Believe me, sir, you have no room for hesitation. Were I to hold a different language, I should belie my own conscience, and deceive yours.

LIX. But, sir, I am far from requiring you to depend solely on my opinion. I am prepared to offer you, if you please, authorities more worthy of your regard and better calculated to bring you to a determination. I will choose them from the very bosom of the Reformation. I know of none that can be opposed, on the questions of which we treat, to Grotius and Leibnitz, the honour and admiration of their age, as they are of our own, and will be of posterity. You may absolutely consider them as the two wisest heads of Protestantism. Educated in the prejudices of their Communion, attached for a length of years, the former to Calvinistic opinions, the latter to those of the Lutherans, they emancipated themselves by the force of genius. The one was long engaged in the warmth of religious disputation, the other in grave theological discussions; both made controverted points their profound study, looking with a curious and penetrating eye into Christian antiquity; and both ended by erecting immortal monuments to the truth of our doctrines. In his *Votum pro pace*, the last of his polemic productions, the incomparable Grotius concludes on every article which divides us, in favour of the Catholic doctrine: and Leibnitz in his admirable *Systema Theologiae*, the fruit of thirty years of research and reflection as he himself wrote to his intimate friends, proves and establishes the Catholic faith on the same subjects, with a degree of erudition, depth, and accuracy which could only have belonged to himself or Bossuet. After these illustrious defenders furnished even by the Reformation to the Catholic Church, no more human authorities need be investigated. Where could you find any to outbalance these two men of transcendent genius? Go then and stand by their side: think as they

thought; believe as they believed; and more happy than either of them, begin to practise before death overtakes you.

This is not my counsel alone, though in perfect conformity with my principles. It comes to you even from another Protestant, very celebrated in these latter times, and worthy to walk, though at a great distance, in the train of the two preceding. "Since it is impossible," says the Baron de Starck, "to extricate Protestantism from its ruins, as I have demonstrated, what will remain for those, who have preserved any attachment to Christianity . . . but to re-unite with the Catholic Church, which, as even Protestants acknowledge, is the preserver of the principal and fundamental truths of Christianity? This Christianity being totally destroyed among Protestants, those who still love and desire it, are absolutely obliged to seek it in the only asylum where they are still sure of finding it."*

* *Entretiens Philosophiques sur la Reunion des differentes Communions Chretiennes*; p. 286, of De Kentz' French Translation, and p. 220, of the Original German.

THE END.

CATHOLIC BOOKS

Published and for sale by

F. LUCAS, JR.

NO. 138 MARKET STREET,
Baltimore.

THE CATHOLIC MANUAL, containing a selection of Prayers and Devotional Exercises, for the use of Christians in every state of life.

“Ask and it shall be given you.”—MATTHEW vii. 7.

Price, neatly bound in sheep, \$1.

This popular manual was prepared by the direction, and under the superintendance of the late Archbishop Marechal. It is printed with accuracy and elegance, and embellished with four engravings; among which, is one giving a view of the grand altar of the Cathedral; and another, of the admired picture of the “Descent from the Cross,” which was presented to the Cathedral by Louis XVI.

THE CHRISTIAN’S GUIDE TO HEAVEN; a Manual for Catholics; with the evening Office of the Church, in Latin and English; and a selection of Pious Hymns—embellished with six beautiful engravings.

Price 62½ cents, in neat plain binding.

This prayer book was compiled under the inspection of Archbishop Carroll. The present edition has been much improved, by a difference of arrangement in part of the contents, as well as by the correction of many errors that had crept into former editions, and also by some additional matter; and may now be fairly estimated as a most perfect pocket manual for Catholics.

THE PATH OF PARADISE; a selection of Prayers and Devotions for Catholics—embellished with five beautiful engravings.

“O! praise ye the Lord, for he is good; for his mercy endureth forever.”—PSALM cxvii. 29.

Price 37½ cents per copy, in sheep binding, lettered.

This neat little pocket volume, as it may be truly so called, has been compiled with great care. Independently of its convenient form, it will be found to combine a judicious selection of matter, with beauty of execution and cheapness of price.

THE SOUL UNITED TO JESUS in his adorable sacrament; or, a Devout Method of Hearing Mass before and after Communion, &c.

Price 37½ cents, neatly bound in sheep.

This very excellent little work is printed on beautiful paper, and makes a volume of the same size as the "Path to Paradise," and is recommended to the pious as worthy of their acceptance.

THE PIOUS GUIDE TO PRAYER AND DEVOTION; containing various practices of Piety, calculated to answer the demands of the devout members of the Roman Catholic Church; embellished with neat engravings.

"Let my prayer be directed as incense in thy sight."

PSALM cxi. 2.

Price 75 cents, in neat sheep binding.

TRUE PIETY; or, The Day well spent; a manual of fervent Prayers, pious reflections, and pious instructions, calculated to answer the use of the members of all ranks and conditions of the Roman Catholic Church; embellished with engravings.

"Ask and you shall receive, that your joy may be complete."

JOHN vi. 24.

Price 75 cents, in neat sheep binding, lettered.

A SHORT CATECHISM for the use of the Catholic Church in the United States of America—published with the approbation of the Most Rev. Archbishop Marechal.

Price 6¼ cents single—by the gross \$4.50.

A CATECHISM OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC FAITH; published for the use of Young Children, Servants and others of small capacities or limited time, in his diocess—by the Rt. Rev. John England, Bishop of Charleston.

Price 6¼ cents single—by the gross, \$4.50.

THE MOST REV. DR. JAMES BUTLER'S CATECHISM; enlarged, improved, and recommended by the four Roman Catholic Bishops of Ireland.

Price 9 cents single—\$6.00 per gross.

A COMPARATIVE VIEW OF THE GROUNDS OF THE CATHOLIC AND PROTESTANT CHURCHES—by the Rev. John Fletcher, D. D.

*“Look at the rock from which you
“have separated.”—ISAIAH.*

Price \$1, in neat plain sheep.

FATHER ROWLAND, a North American Tale.

*“Who would and then fairly represent
“Must study well his character and manners.”*

Price 50 cents, in extra boards.

THE FOLLOWING OF CHRIST, in four books—by Thomas A. Kempis, with reflections at the conclusion of each chapter, by the Abbe F. de la Mennais, translated from the French for this edition.

Price, neatly bound in sheep, 87½ cents.

It were superfluous to bestow commendations on the “Following of Christ.” We shall merely mention that the notes of the Abbe de la Mennais, have been translated expressly for this edition. The enlightened reader cannot but be pleased to see with what sentiments the perusal of this inimitable work inspired a man not less venerated for his piety, than admired for his unrivalled eloquence.

THE OFFICE OF THE HOLY WEEK, according to the Roman Missal and Breviary, in Latin and English. Second American edition.

Price \$1, neatly bound in sheep.

An attempt has been made to present this work under an improved form; many inaccuracies of expression have been corrected, the translation has been thoroughly revised, and the volume reduced to a more convenient size.

THE DEVOUT COMMUNICANT—embellished with a neat engraving of the last Supper, and also of the Crucifixion—by the Rev. P. Baker, O. S. F.

Price 62½ cents, in neat plain binding.

THE SPIRITUAL COMBAT; to which is added the Peace of the Soul and the Happiness of the Heart, which dies to itself in order to live to God, embellished with an engraved frontispiece of Christ bearing the cross.

"The life of man on earth is warfare."—JOB vii. 1.

Price 62½ cents in sheep binding, lettered.

AN ABRIDGEMENT OF THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE—by the Rt. Rev. Bishop Hay.

Price single 37½ cents—by the dozen, \$2.50.

A HISTORY OF THE CHURCH—by the Reverend Charles Constantine Pise.

4 vols. boards—price \$8. *Vol. 5 is in press.*

THE LENTEN MONITOR—by the Rev. P. Baker.

"Behold, now is the acceptable time—now is the day of salvation."
2 Cor. vi. 8.

Price \$1, bound in sheep.

A HISTORY OF THE PROTESTANT "REFORMATION" IN ENGLAND AND IRELAND.

1 vol. 12mo. neatly bound in sheep—price 62½ cents.

A DEFENCE OF CATHOLIC PRINCIPLES.

Price 37½ cents, in half binding.

THINK WELL ON'T; or, Pious Reflections, &c.

Price 37½ cents, in neat binding.

PRINCE HOHENLOE'S PRAYER BOOK.

Price 75 cents—neatly bound in sheep, and lettered.

LETTER TO A CONVERT; to which is added A NET FOR THE FISHER'S OF MEN.

Price 25 cents, in sheep filleted binding.

DOWAY BIBLES, in 4to and 8vo.

DOWAY TESTAMENTS, various sizes and binding.

In Press, and will be soon Published.

AN AMICABLE DISCUSSION with the Church of England, &c. By the Rev. J. F. M. Trevern, D. D.

2 vols. 12mo. neatly bound—price \$2.

BOURDALOUE'S SPIRITUAL RETREAT.

1 vol. 18mo. neatly bound in sheep—price 75 cents.







Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 01131 2214

