

Library of the Theological Seminary.

PRINCETON, N. J.


SCC #11,085

Abbadie, Jacques, 1654-1727.

Chemical change in the eucharis
t

Shelf

The New Museum of Natural History
Source of the white Sulphur Springs
with the Sulphur Springs, Central Missouri
Geological Survey, 1904
2 - 1








in the



In four letters shewing
the relations of faith to
sense, from the French
of Jaques Abbadie, by
John W. Hamersley, A.M.

LONDON:

SAMPSON LOW, SON, AND MARSTON,
MILTON HOUSE, LUDGATE HILL.







TRIBUTE
OF FRIENDSHIP TO
ENVOY EXTRAORDINARY AND MINISTER
PLENIPOTENTIARY,
AT WASHINGTON, FROM MEXICO.







Translator's Preface.

THE design of Louis XIV. to commit Turenne to the Roman creed gave the first impulse to the controversy that closed with these caustic letters of the Dean of Killaloo.

Louis, by instinct, bigot and despot, tempted the ambition of the chief captain of the age.

The politic Port Royalists sent the Marshal a thesis, charging the actual presence on the Protestant faith, and change of faith to be impossible.

Anne de Nompar, his wife, an ardent Calvinist, doubting the stability of her husband, he surviving her, induced Claude, the great polemic of France, to expose the fallacies of Port Royal.

The cordial reception, by the Roman laity, throughout

Europe, of Claude's *Critique*—written on a journey from Languedoc to Montauban, circulated only in manuscript—evoked the able work of Arnauld and Nicole,—*La Perpétuité de la foi dans l'église catholique sur l'Eucharistie*.

Claude replied: Arnauld rejoined: Nouet, the Jesuit, came to the relief of Arnauld, in the *Journal des Sçavans*: Claude answered Nouet in the Provincial Letter that called out two more folios from Arnauld, which Claude met with equal ability and learning. A clique of the Jansenists, secretly pleased with the confusion of Port Royal, yet bound in honor to appear in the lists, issued their *Just prejudices against Calvinism*: Claude reviewed it in his masterly *Défense de la Réformation*.

Abbadie's iron pen, ever nibbed with mercilefs courtesy, now the massive mace of Richard, now wary and keen as the Saracen's cimetar, gave the *coup de grace* to the Papal hero of the clerical tilt. Our author was born in the Canton of Berne, 1654: he studied at Saumur, was doctorated at Sedan and installed Pastor of the French church of Berlin at the instance of Count d'Espence.

He left his pastorate to follow the fortunes of Marshal

Schomberg ; in Holland, they joined the Prince of Orange in his British *coup d'Etat* of 1688.

After the death of Schomberg, who fell in the battle of the Boyne, Abbadie was presented to the benefice of the Savoy, London, and soon after, preferred to the Deanery of Killaloo, Ireland : he died in 1727.

His *Traité de la Verité de la Religion Chrétienne*, won the applause of all Christian sects, and still serves as a rich armory to the Church.

The simple question raised at Port Royal, had involved the entire Latin dogma ; *that every atom of the elements, by consecration, is changed into the natural body, soul, and divinity of the Son of God, and to the blood that flowed from his side ; that very body, born of a virgin, that hung upon the cross, rose from the dead, and sits at the right hand of the father.*

To this test of faith, Rome is pledged no less by the decrees of Lateran and Trent, than by the blood of that noble army of martyrs *who had not so learned Christ.*

She enforces it by threats of damnation, and ignores all doctrine uncovered by the concurrence of the Apostles, the

Translator's Preface.

Fathers and the Church, at all times and in all places : in her own terse language, *semper, et ubique, et ab omnibus creditum.*

The subject derives a special interest from the Quixotry of her appeal to scripture, which in waiving the frequent aegis of tradition from her most offensive and least tenable tenet, exposes a tendon-Achilles to the jest of the flippant, the shafts of wit and the scorn of reason.

Probable idolatry invests the question with yet a deeper interest ; for if the dogma is not true, and the Roman latrariant justified by intention : intention atones all idolatry, as all idolaters worship God in his image or in his works.

If the dogma is true, and by failure of intention of the Priest, the bread is unchanged to the living God, or should a defiant doctrine, adopted on credit, prove false, is the Catholic idolater secure in the sponsorship of his Church, or in the funded merits of her saints ? No facts in history are more tangible than its birth, growth and canonical adoption.

Like the figment of Purgatory until the Council of Florence, and the immaculate conception of our own day,

this monkish bantling was jostled, *de opinione*, until *vox ecclesiae* was forced to affiliate or ignore it.

The Fathers, indeed, exalted the efficacy of the supper : they hallowed the significant by names of things signified, and ascribed to the blessing a mystic virtue, consonant to Anglican teaching : yet the elements retained their normal essence, and were transubstantiated into our flesh, the living sacrifice : that, in the language of St. Augustine, *neither truth may be wanting in the Sacrament, nor Pagans have occasion to make us ridiculous for drinking the blood of one slain.*

The idol Schism of the eighth century, determined the Greek doctrine.

The Seventh Ecumenical Council at Constantinople, A.D. 754, unanimously condemned the worship of images : their decree ran :—*the Savior having left us no other image of himself, but the Sacrament, in which the substance of the bread is the image of his body, we ought to make no other image of our Lord.*

The Second Council of Nice, in 787, annuls the act of Constantinople, affirming *the Sacrament after consecration to be properly Christ's body and blood ; not the image and antitype.*

This was the first official notice of the carnal presence : Rome trod in the steps of Greece.

Paschasius Ratbert, a Benedictine monk, A.D. 831, was the first to give the novelty its odious form and prominence in the western Church ; it made him Abbot of Corbey, provoked a sharp conflict with Abbot Frudegard, a prompt rebuke from the Scholiasfs, and severed him from his abbey.

Paschasius was answered by the learned Ratram, his subordinate, by the Bishop of Auxerre, and by Scotus, the father of scholastic divinity, all of them living and dying in Roman communion ; ample proof that the change of substance was not then organic law : *we oppose this error*, said the Archbishop of Mentz, *with all our might*.

In the eleventh century, it is still an open question.

Berenger, archdeacon of Angers 1059, by *dictation* of the Council of Rome, Nicholas II. presiding, abjures the figure in form of execration against all *who deny the true body and true blood of our Lord to be veritably and sensibly handled and broken by the Priest, and veritably and sensibly*
GROUND BY THE TEETH OF THE FAITHFUL.

Nicholas sends the glad tidings of the redemption of the

Church from scandal, throughout Italy, Gaul, Germany and wherever the error had reached. Berenger, escaped from the Council, forthwith retracts his abjuration, on the ground of coercion.

This feature of the creed seems to be canonically tranquil for twenty years, although the Church has detected a *pravity of Berenger*, and doubts that his diction, unless carefully rendered, may favor of the leaven of heresy, *in making parts of Christ's body*.

Berenger is cajoled by a safe conduct of Gregory VII. to the Sixth Council of Rome, 1079: he and others boldly advocate the figure.

A minority of the 150 Bishops, after a sharp struggle, yield to the majority vote. Berenger, in fear of personal safety, revokes the retraction of his abjuration, and again relieves the anxiety of the Church, by defining the faith in a sounder form of words, to wit: the creed of Nicholas, and his Council of 113 Bishops, amended by *judicious omissions*: all which Berenger repudiates by manifesto, when safe in France.

The manner of the Eucharist, apparently quieted at

Lateran, is bitterly contested after the lapse of three centuries, between the Dominicans and Franciscans at Trent, the last general council of the Roman Church—the nuncio Verona's compromise resolution directs, *the use of as few words as possible, and terms sufficiently general to meet the views of both.*

It is a grave thought that a section of Christ's flock, retaining traits by which Protestants might profit, sometime, champion of the oppressed, the kebla of learning, the altar of sacred art, cherishing at the meridian of science, the stagnant policy that persecuted Galileo, libels *public schools as public pests, and liberty of conscience as the liberty of perdition.*

Still more sad, that a Church embracing within her pale so many, with whom—through the mercies of unpromised grace—we trust to tabernacle in the spirit land: pretends to do what God cannot do; create again the ineffable, self-existent I AM the uncreated creator.

Pagans, it is true, carve and worship their Gods, and cannibals eat their fellow-man: yet, in the annals of time, nay, in the fancies of fable, none but the devotees of Mary and

her Son, *animated with a firm hope, penetrated with a lively faith, inflamed with an ardent charity*, in an unknown tongue, chaunt a crust, into the body, soul and divinity of their Maker and Redeemer, adore and swallow him.

Yet these are they, that claim exclusive right to wear the ermine of reason, and to bear the vessels of the Lord.

Had anathema dominion of thought, ocean would not wed ocean with the iron ring, nor vapor sweep the whirlwind—lord of space—nor science, attest Jehovah's glory, and her holy mission, with the records of the rocks : nor range the skies, to map the mazes of a thousand worlds, nor forge the bolts of heaven into bonds of Christian love, pealing hosannas over zones, flashing pæans through the floods, thrill the planet with a common pulse.

The piety of the Propaganda would be exhausted in the cruel artifice of tenors, the baptism of bells, the torture of heretics, the benediction of horses and asses, and in hawking the mercies and mansions of another world.

When despotism was secure in ignorance, her specious ceremonial, her menacing oubliette and thumb-screw could shape the creed of the *Sabot* ; now, the fullen pupil of reform

taught that the *world moves*, spite of councils and curses, renews her overtures to the sense of sight.

Who can forbear a smile at your visible miracles, your winking and weeping madonnas, your fluxing the clotted blood of Januarius, your forests of *Vera Crux*? If those *fruits of sanctity* are not impostures to magnify the priest, give us a sounder word.

Are your invisible miracles less presumptuous? if wiser than Omniscience you subvene his polity by fraud, are you Lord of Omnipotence, that you degrade the infinite to the finite—speak into re-existence him that spake and it was done, and multiply and sacrifice in countless millions, him *that holdeth the waters in the hollow of his hand*, him *that inhabiteth eternity*?

The Incarnation of the mass, that filches the miracles from Christ, the foulest stain of the Roman heresy, her stake and fagot ultimatum; a living spring of laxity within, and defection from her fold, is the *great gulf*, that sunders the unreformed from the universal church; a putrid corpse chained to St. Peter's Keys.

You refer us to your own authority, we refer you to Patriſtic authority, and to the author of authority : if you abide by Holy writ, Abbadie tries the iſſue by the ordeal to which Chriſt and his apoſtles aſſigned it.

The Latin bride of Chriſt, *overſhadowed by the power of the meſt high* ; pliant, at her need or choice, wanton and vindictive where ſhe dare—*united*—unchurched by our Eaſtern mother, ignored by the Britiſh Church planted in perſon by the apoſtles, repudiated by her ſiſter of Avignon ; frantic anathemas bandied between rival popes ; councils wrangling with councils, councils with Popes—*Apoſtolic*—her Prelacy brawling, ſordid and profligate—her Hierarchs, *ſervi ſervorum Dei*, always arrogant ; vicars of Chriſt, not ſeldom impious and infamous—her creed ; *the ſame to-day, yeſterday and forever*, ſhifting with the wind—her mangling and ſhackling of Scripture—her cloiſtered and clerical celibacy ; its terrific reaction ; her denial of Chriſt, preſaged in thoſe ſtartling words, *what have I to do with thee?* her uſurpation of the Godhead ; her aſſumption of tranſomnipotence—*unerring* ; a millennium of ſchiſm, pollution, ſubterfuge and crime ſuſcribed with God's name, had nerved the

Christian world for the fiat of the first bold spirit that dared confront power with truth.

Time is the crucible of Justice ; divine rights are merged in song and story ; Pontiffs and Princes reign by the grace of the masses.

Christ's nuncios conferred and revoked crowns in heaven and on earth. Spain alone, the only Christian harbor of the slaver, offers an asylum to Pius, the only living Sovereign, Christian or Pagan, that has given *language to sympathy* with human bondage.

By the laws of reaction, Germany is sceptical, France, infidel ; the Papacy of Ireland, the price of her blood, independence and prosperity, but an ulcer of Saxon hate.

Millions of Fenians brave Pope and priesthood ; Scandinavia, Holland, Prussia, loathe their mediæval husks ; the sceptre of Europe is Protestant by edict of the needle gun ; the dry bones of Chili, Brazil, Peru, live at the touch of progress ; Mexico has faith in freedom.

Italy, the cradle and grave of bigotry, has enfranchised the word of God, and the voice of nature ; Dominican cells, inquisitors' dens, ring with the clarion tones of Gavazzi ; con-

ventual mortmains are secularized, vows of chastity are voidable, clerical marriage, a civil contract; *the Carbine, her Gospel.*

The successor of Peter, victim of the successor of Pepin, donor of Peter's patrimony, the tribute of Pepin's usurped crown of France; vice-gerent of God, omitted at secular councils, stripped of his *kingdom of this world*, his pastoral imprecations recoiled, sheathes his vicarial sword by command of his earthly master.

Such are the repayments of divine vengeance—the fall of Rome consecrates the heresy of Luther.

No one who heeds the lessons of past, or passing history, can doubt, that Papism lacks but the power to procrust all diffidends to Theophagian rule; *the same to-day, yesterday and forever.*

It is no idle fear, that the sacred college has final views in the United States, a prize worthy her traditions; the hundred millions that will tread that soil in half a century, will awe the world, for good or ill.

We distrust that sudden *solicitude for the welfare of four millions of liberated Africans*, whose liberation Romanists

opposed ; still more, those *faithful shepherds* posted on the prairies, to *protect the Christian flock, exposed to the incursions of mercenaries and the ravages of wolves.*

It may be a Napoleonic idea, in virtue of his temporal vicariate, at once to cut the Papal knot, avenge the prestige of France, sullied by his Mexican fiasco, and restore ascendancy to the Latin race, by shifting to these *partes infidelium*, the Political See, the Anachronism, the Solecism, the nuisance of Europe.

Our stern hybrid of Puritan and Huguenot, still tolerant, even of intolerance, is watchful of ambitious faith ; face to face with civil and spiritual liberty, Romanism will be deromanized—the Papal upas will wilt in a free soil.

May these crumbs thrown on the waters in the spirit of charity and peace, attract the candor and manhood of the Roman laics with whom we must live, and would not class *imperium in imperio.*

Your own records verify all our facts ; you are conscious of the Papal chill at the Protestant hearth, you cannot doubt that loyalty to your Church is treason to your flag.

You know that both sexes and all ages kneel to celi-

bate foreign officials, not yet canonized, never republican, *in loco Dei*; who, in privacy of penitent and priest; secrecy, guarded by the curse of Rome; secrecy, above the law; ferret the unguarded thoughts we dare not confide to man, or blush to confess in prayer.

You know your altars in our eyes, reek with Jesuit pestilence; with blood of Albigenſes. How my pen quivers with the cry of the Vaudois, hounded to the flaming pen—the wail of ſtrangling infancy—the ſtified groans of blood-smear'd hoary heads—the martyr's prayer—*let not this be laid to their charge*—hark—that agonized ſhriek, courſing the heart-throb of ſix hundred years—the mother in the gorging holocaust, appeals with charred hands to the God of vengeance; the frantic daughter, vainly ſtruggling from the Catholic Satyr's clutch, to purge her ſhame in the embers of her mother's breaſt.

Maidens under vows to charity and mercy, transformed by one taſte of blood from ſoftened ſweetneſs to furies, with gnawing teeth, ſwell the *Veni Creator* of the army of the Croſs, inſpired by ſaints Dominic and Francis, led by mailed prieſts, ſent and abſolved by Innocent III. now with ſurplus

righteousness, mediators for your sins before the throne of Grace—Oh, God ! how weak are words to paint that carnival of hell !

Is it a marvel that good men were stung to mad revenge ?
Is it a marvel that every Latin spire, in our eyes, is a plague spot to its vicinage, a beacon of craft and delusion, of blasphemy, turpitude and tyranny, lurid with the problem of the future ?

Is it a marvel that Bible Christians, grateful to the wardens of the oracles—albeit, living monuments of prophetic truth, divine wrath and their own shame—can easier condone the honest, unobtrusive negation of Israel, than the insolent aggression of profanity ?

Is it a marvel that the ban of social leprosy goads the sensitive Papist to bigotry or infidelity ?

We see, by faith, the meteor legate of free thought, linger over the manger of Bethlehem ; the vail is rent ; it shoots from Calvary in its path of empire.


By faith, it spans the firmament with the arc of promise, to its watch and ward, a fixed star, over the cradle of human rights.

Oppressed of all lands, you are pilgrims to its shrine, and Herod also has come to worship ; will you be apostles of that holy symbol or puppets of a blind creed ?

You are moulding the fate of distant ages ; as the stern minutes are chasing the shadows of time, invoke, not your saints, but the nobler instincts God has breathed into your hearts ; go, not to the Bulls of your Leos and Borgias ; go, kneel and watch at Gethsemane ; go, ask the oracle of Olivet, if the faith that forgot her mask in the bloody revels of Bartholomew's night, till every Catholic heart had beat *Amen* to the *Gloria in Excelsis* of the Vatican—if the faith that left her mask at the farce of Trent with the shout that shook the dome, **CURSED, CURSED, CURSED BE ALL HERETICS**—shall be the faith of your children ?

We have freely tasked the magnanimity of strength, to tone the ungraciousness of truth, almost at her peril ; gladly, with the sanction of duty, would we walk backward with our sister's garments and cover our sister's shame.

New York.





Preface

PREFIXED TO THE EDITION, FROM WHICH THE FOLLOWING
TRANSLATION IS MADE.



PRIVATE judgment, the gift of the Reformation, is denounced by the Church of Rome, as the source of error and schism: the highway of atheism and heresy.

In the blindness of zeal, she forgets that conviction relates to faith, as the solar rays to vision, or as digestion to assimilation.

Bossuet's raid on Protestant variances, the eloquent essays of Bellarmin, Duperron and Baronius all challenge our reason. Is Rome the rule of faith, the touchstone of truth, because she claims the proxy of omnipotence? does she assume the baton of infallibility? we examine her creden-

tials; we collate the Fathers with the decretals and councils.

If she exults in unity: to find that one true united Church; we scan her records, which rebuke her idle boast with the quarrels of Jansenists, of Molinists, of Quietists, of the Church of Abbé Châtel, of Ultramontanists, and of Gallicans with their endless contests.

To unravel her succession: we trace her bickerings through centuries, and encounter a dilemma, too subtle for the Council of Constance, which *votes itself above the Papacy and deposes in a breath three sovereign Pontiffs*.¹

Should a Protestant, Jew or Heathen seek ghostly counsel, a priest will arrogate the course he denies to them; whenever Rome warns us, that there is no safety beyond her pale, she exhorts with Paul; *prove all things, hold fast that which is good*.

If research is delusive, if truth may be sought only in the ruts of authority: our missions are vicious: all should

¹ This schism began in 1378: was suspended in 1414 by the Council of Constance, and forthwith renewed; survived to the Council of Bâle in 1431, and ended in 1477 by the abdication of Felix V. who consented to resume his cardinalate, though elected Pope by the Council of Bâle.

cling to the faith of their Fathers: there live, and there die.

Islam has her vouchers: she dooms the pervert to death, and threatens him with the pains and gates of hell.

Let us imagine a collision between Turks and Papists.

The *locum tenens* of God cannot err in faith: the language of our Doctors rejoins the Moslem.

The Popes have an unbroken succession: so also have our Imams: and Caliphs *superadd temporal to spiritual power*.

Rome may glory in the pomp of her temples, in her solemn ritual, in her discipline, in her fasts: Islam also has her stately mosques, prescribed prayers, and her vigils, more rigid than those of Rome.

Does Rome ban with heresy all who reject her rule? the disciples of Ali and Omar mutually curse: they have their saints, pilgrims and legends: 'tis true, they lack a holy office, armed with the terrors of the stake and rack to awe the froward, and win sheep to the Prophet's fold: but in conquest, heretics must elect between the Koran and the bow-string.

Or suppose an infidel, convinced of inspired truth, and the

completion of prophecy, perplexed by jarring creeds : you quote your councils, your divines, your decrees of succession.

He learns that the Greek Church, the Arminian, Nestorian, Ethiopian has each her divines, her councils and her succession : he sifts their standards ; how can he else decide between a breaker and worshipper of images, who both appeal to Ecumenical Councils ?

The cyclic logic, "Rome has Scripture authority, and Rome is the exponent of Scripture," ignores the wholesome checks of judge and party.

To ensure our obedience, a Church must hold God's warrant : his word is our stay and staff : *search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life, and they are they which testify of me : Believe not every Spirit, but try the Spirits, whether they are of God : blessed is he that readeth, and they that hear the words of this prophecy.*

The youth of Timothy was devoted to sacred study, and the Bereans were applauded *for searching the Scriptures daily, whether those things were so.*

Cheered by Christ's promise of his Holy Spirit to guide him into all truth, the Christian bears in mind, that *the*

Heavens and the Earth shall pass away, but the words of Christ pass not away; that all Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness.

Submission to God's word is the Shibboleth of the Reformation: the Socinian, with whom the Romanists wish to confound us,—neither Christian nor infidel—exalts reason above the Bible, and with the daring of criticism, rejects any fact, or any doctrine, that humbles his pride or passes his wisdom.

Although the Scriptures may often assert, yet I do not believe that Christ is God: for I hold it to be absurd to believe that which is beyond the reach of my reason: is the language of Smalcus, their leading polemic.

The Bible, says Priestly, chief of a kindred school: *was written with no particular inspiration.*¹

Such, are not the views of the Reformation: the word of God is our sole guide, our light and hope: crying with Samuel; *Speak, Lord, for thy servants hear.*

¹ Priestly—*Histoire des opinions primitives*, vol. 4. p. 5. Belsham fur Wilberforce, p. 19. *Investigations calmes*—pp. 451, 452.

Variance gives bolder relief to the unity of our faith : hallelujahs rise above the din of discord : Anglican and Gallican : Helvetian and Lutheran ; all profess the fall of man ; the incarnate word ; salvation through the Atonement ; a trinity in unity : *knowing nothing save Jesus Christ*, and the affluence of his grace and love.

Rome confines her Laity to her dicta, lest the study of Scripture might wreck them on the Scylla or Charybdis of heresy or infidelity.

Experience shows, how ill-sustained are they in the hour of death, who rely on human faith : the Priest pronounces the words of absolution : the conscience answers ; *there is no peace.*

We humbly confide the weal of Christ's Church, to the broadcast of his Holy word : that man may quench his thirst at the fountain of living waters.

God grant that these letters may rescue many *from Babylon*, that they receive not of her plagues.



Letter First.

SIR,



Y the test I gave you when we last met, it is easy to determine, if the Fathers allowed the substantial presence of Christ's body and blood in the Eucharist: their views are subordinate only to Scripture, with which we now confront the Roman dogma.

Two points comprise the issue.

Is the Bible our rule of faith?

What are its teachings?

You, a Christian by grace, will not question, if Holy Writ announces to man the whole counsel of God, and invokes in behalf of saving truths, even the aid of example and precept. You will admit, that its inspired penmen would not ignore a

grave mystery; a covenant of mercy, involving faith and practice, and that all Revelation must harmonize.

Listen with candor to the lessons of inspiration: I engage, to tear the mask of Divine authority from this monkish fiction.

We fault the Church of Rome with
 The oral manducation of the Lord's body;
 The material presence;
 The change of substance;
 The worship of the Sacrament;
 Withholding the Cup; and
 The sacrifice of the mass.

This Church assumes a literal eating from the words of the institution and the sixth chapter of St. John: we rely on Origen and Augustine, those great lights of the primitive Church, and on Jesus Christ, as safe teachers of divine truth.

*If we render literally those words of Jesus Christ: if you do not eat my flesh and drink my blood: that letter kills,*¹ is the emphatic dictum of Origen.

¹ Homil. vii. in Leviticum.

Augustine sustains him; *the language that prohibits a wrong, or commands something useful or beneficent is not figurative: but if it commands a crime, or forbids what is beneficent or useful, it is metaphorical, hence the mandate; to eat the flesh of the son of man, and drink his blood; enjoins a communion with his passion, in recalling profitably and sweetly that his flesh was torn for our sins.*¹

Our Lord, as if to forestall all possible cavil, promptly defines his ordinance: *the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life:*² and as Rome admits, that, Christ here directs a spiritual and quickening construction of his language, such sense must warrant a strict eating, or fails to justify her theory.

This *United Church* writhing under his lash, charges Origen with mystic tendencies; and we reply; could that great divine, believing that he actually swallowed the flesh and blood of his Redeemer, assert, *that the letter kills* and escape conviction of falsehood and blasphemy? She con-

¹ August. Lib. iii. cap. xvi. de doctrina christiana.

² John vi. 53, 63.

tends, that Augustine in the above citation conformed to the ruling of Rome, rejecting only, the sense of the Capernaïtes; a strange delusion indeed, as he clings to the metaphor, lest the letter might command a wrong or a crime.

Let us humor for a moment the caprice of our literal friends.

With touching modesty, and in deference to revelation, they exclude our senses—as false witnesses in matters of faith:—we renounce our senses—are they now content?—far from it—with still more engaging *naïveté*, they demand the surrender of our reason—as a sacrifice to God—and we submit, if God requires it.

But what is this long expected Revelation, this full equivalent to all the functions of body and soul, and every instinct of nature? a single phrase—by the Son of God, Origen and Augustine pronounced allegorical, by Rome, literal: has fatuity a lower deep?

To identify the language of John with that of Christ, you will please observe that the words: *take, eat, this is my body*; and, *he that does not eat my flesh and drink my blood*, though not spoken in connection, are but varied terms: and

that as both, if either, are bound by a quickening and spiritual sense, the letter of both, if either, *must seem to command a crime.*

I now challenge a denial of any of these points.

If the oral, has scripture authority, it is confined to the above and parallel texts.

Those passages should receive a figurative, spiritual, and quickening sense on the authority of Origen, Augustine and of Christ himself.

That in such terms, we are not bound to seek a gross eating.

I further insist, that if the letter is vague and inconsistent, or false and delusive, we are limited to the figure.

Our Lord was wont to illustrate his lessons : he talks with fishermen ; the preaching of the Gospel is imaged by a mystical fishing : near a fountain—water, is the emblem of his grace—he presses the figure ; water, as gushing up into endless life ; who so drinks thereof shall never thirst.

To Nicodemus, he says : *except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God,*¹ and who so simple as Nicode-

¹ John iii. 3.

mus, and asks: how can a man re-enter his mother's womb?

To the hungry throng: *labor not for the meat which perisheth, but for that meat which endureth to everlasting life:*¹ *that it is his meat to do the will of his father.*

Before speaking of eating his flesh, and drinking his blood: he declares—*that he is the living bread, which came down from heaven and whosoever shall eat thereof shall never hunger,*² and all admit the bread to be an image, and the hunger spiritual.

Again, he says, *he that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me,*³ and no one imagines that we can dwell in Christ in a proper sense: he then repeats: *this is that bread which came down from Heaven, he that eateth of this bread shall live for ever.*⁴

The Papal Church here makes a merit of necessity, as Christ cannot be properly bread, nor bread properly Christ, and limits her letter to the terms *eating* and *drinking*.

¹ John vi. 27.

² John vi. 35, 50, 51.

³ John vi. 56.

⁴ John vi. 58.

There then is the proper sense, swarming with figures ; the letter, engulfed in metaphor.

Jesus was rebuking the multitude which had said : *that Moses had given their fathers bread from heaven : but what sign shewest thou then, that we may see, and believe thee?*¹

He shews his gift to be greater than that of Moses : the promised bread, is *living* ; the true bread of Heaven ; he contrasts it with the manna.

He then calls that living bread himself ; his flesh ; and thus exalts the living bread over the manna : they who eat the manna would hunger again, while whoever eat this bread would hunger no more ; they who eat the manna died, but who so eat this bread would live for ever.

Such are the teachings of Jesus Christ, repeated and enforced by his own lips ; and in such sense, he requires us to feed on his flesh and blood.

Now, may I ask our opponents when citing John's Gospel ; either, to deny that such are the lessons of Christ, or being such they favor an oral eating.

¹ John vi. 30, 31.

It seems to me, that Christ here opposes the carnal to the spiritual ; the manna, a sensual bread to his flesh an emblem of bread : the effect of the manna, a mortal life, to the efficacy of his flesh, eternal life : the manna feeds the body, his flesh feeds the heart : thus far no Christian can dissent.

If then, the flesh of Christ be but the type of bread, meet only to cherish the soul and animate the spirit ; does a strict consumption of his flesh, or the nourishment of our souls by a symbolic bread, answer to an eating in spirit and in faith ?

Now, if Christ, in figure, promises bread from Heaven in contrast to the manna—in figure, declares his flesh to be that bread—in figure, affirms its sufficiency to satisfy for ever, and its all sufficiency for salvation : I insist, that an express apocalypse only can clothe the words *eating* and *drinking* with a proper and literal sense.

We are told, that in the phrase : *he who eats the bread that I shall give him, shall never hunger* : though the bread is an image, and the hunger ideal : the *eating*, must be literal to escape the ban of heresy.

In our view, the ideas of hunger, bread, and eating seem to bear such close and mutual relation, that when found

united, and dependent, it is natural to refer them all, either to the letter or the metaphor.

And when our Lord subjoins, *except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man,*¹ he implies the flesh which he calls bread : a bread capable of satisfying.

This is no illusion of fancy, it is the emphatic language of our Lord : *the bread that I will give is my flesh.*²

With what conscience can they claim, that a flesh which they admit to be mere bread, and can satisfy, but in figure, should be eaten properly ?

I also contend, that the letter mars, while the trope retains the truth and force of Christ's teachings.

The eating in St. John has two salient traits.

It is a condition of salvation : *verily I say unto you ; except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you :*³ It is all sufficient : *whofo eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day.*⁴

¹ John vi. 53.

³ John vi. 53.

² John vi. 51.

⁴ John vi. 54.

Nor do I stand on debateable ground in alleging, that there is a spiritual eating of Christ's body by faith.

The oral eating, is not essential, as the converted thief, the catechumen or newly baptised, barred by death or just hindrance from taking Christ in his stomach, does not forfeit grace.

It is not conclusive, as the standards of Rome denounce the mockery of an eating, without the concurrence of the heart ; whereas the spiritual eating, is both a rule of faith, and all sufficient, the true partaker in act, or will having already passed from death to life.

Is then the carnal, void of every feature required by John's Gospel, or the spiritual eating which embraces all those features, to be learned from the lessons of Christ ?

The Latin Church now seeks to evade the issue by garbling Christ's ordinance, she limits his promises to worthy eaters of his flesh.

Before adopting this view, I demand its authority : reliance on St. Paul is hopeless : he applies the terms, worthy and unworthy, only to the reception of the bread : who so eateth the flesh of Christ, eats it worthily ; because it is eaten in spirit and in faith.

Judas ate the bread of our Saviour, says Augustine, but he did not eat the bread, which is the Saviour, being an unworthy recipient.

However that may be, can we reconcile this restriction with the tenor of Christ's preaching to the Jews? that his flesh, not the manna, is the true celestial bread; as the manna could not save their fathers from death; but, his flesh secures eternal life to those who eat it.

He simply compares the eating of his flesh, with the eating of the manna, irrespective of personal merit.

Mark, Sir, how it enervates his language; who can doubt, if the flesh of Jesus Christ, rent for our sins, the object of our faith and trust, is more precious to us, than was the manna to the Israelites? but why should the strict eating of that flesh, by the faithful or faithless, have more efficacy than the bread of Moses?

The manna could not save the Jews from temporal or eternal death, so, the gross reception of Christ's flesh, exempts men, neither from the death of the body, as they remain mortal; nor from the death of the soul, as they are sinners still: by faith only are we saved.

If then, a feeding on Christ by faith has all the possible efficacy of the manna, and its actual deglutition has no more efficacy than the manna : the spiritual, not the oral, sustains the truth and force of his teachings.

Do we live and dwell in Christ, by his entrance into our throats, or into our hearts? by taking his flesh into our mouths, or through the exercise of faith in the merits of that flesh, mangled for our sins?

Would not a Christian in a Pagan land, without access to the holy table lead a spiritual life? Will not Rome allow that after the bread and wine have passed from the viscera in the course of nature, the elements of life remain in the heart? Are not faith and repentance the constituents of spiritual life? how then can that eating be sensual, which in contrast to the manna, is lifegiving; life to the soul; life eternal?

Other passages in John fortify our case : *I am the bread of life ; he that cometh to me, shall never hunger ; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst.*¹

¹ John vi. 35.

The clauses; *he that cometh to me, and he that eateth my flesh: he that believeth on me, and, he that drinketh my blood,* are obvious equipollents in the diction of our Lord.

In the same chapter, we also read, of a lifegiving eating; the neglect of which is death: this eating, must be oral solely, or solely spiritual, or spiritual and oral; in which last sense, whoſo eateth not Chriſt's fleſh, and drinketh not his blood, both by mouth and faith, hath no life in him.

Our Lord did not command the oral ſolely, as the un-holy derive no benefit therefrom: nor the joint reception, as many can commune only in the deſire of the heart: ergo: thoſe texts enjoin a ſpiritual eating of his body.

Again, Sir, Scripture is either metaphorical, or literal: if thoſe words in John are figurative, Rome admits a ſymbolic eating; if literal, conſiſtenſy demands a proper drinking of the blood.

A natural drinking differs from a natural eating, unleſs eating and drinking are ſynonyms: now the blood of Chriſt, by the uſage of Rome, is no more drunk than eaten, nor eaten than drunk; as the blood, not parted from his veins is received in the guiſe of bread and wine.

There being no mean between real and typical sleep, we are bound to believe that the disciples knew no mean, between drinking Christ's blood figuratively, and literally.

Those simple, earnest men, unschooled in metaphysics, who had never read Aquinas nor Scotus, would have inferred, that their master spoke of drinking his blood either spiritually or carnally: *dwell in me: I am the vine; I am the way; I am the door; I am the bread of life; whosoever believeth in me, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living waters;* with like tropes ringing in their ears, and training their minds to recognize in figures, the veiling of spiritual precepts under sensible images.

We now submit, that we are not chargeable with verbal criticism and wild theory in affirming, that Christ's literal precept, *to drink his blood*, implies a literal drinking

That the reception of Christ's body, with blood in his veins, under the forms of bread and wine, being no less an eating than a drinking, is not a proper drinking of his blood.


That, as an injunction to eat his flesh, and drink his blood, literally, cannot be obeyed in the Supper, nor elsewhere, we are confined to the metaphor.


Verily, Sir, that is a false position, which rejects the figure, but dares not claim the letter: which culls from an allegorical chapter, two lone phrases, for which they exact a rigid sense, yet curses those who do not drink our Lord's blood in a manner, not happily defined, but neither typical nor proper.

Careless, if the language of the Son of God is incoherent, unconcerned, if its beauty, truth, and power are marred; the abortive letter must refute itself.

At war with Scripture, with sense, and with reason, we leave them at variance with themselves: so much for the sixth chapter of John.

I am, &c, &c.





Letter Second.



S we approach the words of the ordinance,¹ call to mind that St. Paul constantly styles the Eucharist, Bread:² that the disciples continued steadfastly in prayer and in breaking of bread:³ that Jesus Christ vanished from their sight, after breaking bread:⁴ all which, and like passages are allowed allusions to actual Sacraments.

Were Paul and Luke at variance with Christ, we should be bound by the higher law, but as they spake with his Spirit, we must seek to harmonize their teachings.

The Church of Rome contends, that Paul applies the

¹ Matt. xxvi. 26. Mark xiv. 22. Luke xxii. 19.

² 1 Cor. xi. 23, 24, 25, &c. ³ Acts ii. 42. ⁴ Luke xxiv. 30, 31.

term bread to the body of Christ, because his body is veiled under the accidents of bread: we hold, that our Lord honored the bread with the name of his body, in view, only, of that body's mystic presence: hence, our issue with Rome, is not, whether Scripture refers in figure to the Eucharist; but whether, it employs the figure, in calling the Eucharist, the body of Christ.

I claim that we are free to consult:

Our senses:

Our reason:

The holy Scriptures:

And the analogy of faith.

Sense. We rely on the senses, because the Son of God calls them as witnesses to his resurrection, saying to his disciples, *Handle me and see*,¹ and who will doubt, that the proof tendered by Christ, as a voucher for his truth, is competent to decide the spirit of his language?

The senses aver that the Eucharist is bread, and that Christ speaks in figure, not Paul and Luke.

¹ Luke xxiv. 39.

Reason assures us, that as the simple body of Christ cannot be in each atom of the bread, in full volume, and proportion : a synchronous tenant of divers places, it is more rational to adopt the clearer phrase of St. Paul than the obscurer term employed by our Lord.

The rejection of reason as witness against faith, assumes the standards of Rome to be the arbiter of Christ's language : when she shews her doctrine to be the doctrine of inspiration, I silence my reason ; until then, she must not forbid me its aid, when perplexed between the lessons of Christ and his apostles.

And who are they that scorn the evidence of reason and sense ? even they, whose senses reveal the existence of the bread, and whose reason confirms their faith in Christ's sacramental presence ; which if unseen, must be in the nature of spirit, unless sense and reason, like the cloud-guide of Israel, are light to them, but darknefs to us.

The Latin theory would be more plausible, were we arrayed against the sacred Canon—listen—*Jesus Christ is gone—he has left the earth—we shall have him no more with us—we must raise our hearts on high, where Jesus is seated at*

the right hand of God the Father—if he were on earth, he would not even be Priest—we must wait until he shall come as the lightning, which shineth from the East even unto the West ; and the Heavens shall be his habitation until the re-establishment of all things.

Such is the tenor of Scripture, which never alludes to presence visible, natural nor latent.

Scripture. This tenet jars with sacred history : our Lord, before quitting the earth, often declares *that he leaves the Earth and goes to the Father.*

The Church of Rome, here, draws her lines of visible, and invisible presence, forgetting, that if Christ intended, that his cloaked humanity should dwell on the earth, and enter the mouths and stomachs of his disciples, he would surely have noticed so consoling a fact, when in the sadness of their hearts, he calls them his friends ; his little children ; assures them tenderly of his love, and promises *not to leave them comfortless ; and that he would send a Comforter who would guide them into all truth.*

The Son of God bars all presence, warranting outlay in behalf of his humanity : *for ye have the poor with you always,*

*and whensoever ye will, ye may do them good, but me, ye have not always.*¹

He here excludes, not merely that physical presence, admitting alms or expense, like Mary's honorary unction, whose value, provoked the censure of Judas ; but, also, that occult presence, which prompts the costly pageants of Rome.

Analogy. Perhaps, the letter may elicit light from the harmony of inspired truth.

The assumption of the flesh is a solemn mystery, passing human reason ; a mean of man's salvation, and of God's glory.

This Roman dogma trenches on the laws of nature, exposes the Messiah to useless shame and countless hazards in the sacrificial hands of a thousand priests.

The Bible teaches no more plainly that Redemption is the object of the Incarnation, than that the Eucharist is a token of Christ's death : *this do ye, for as often as ye eat this bread, &c, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come.*²

It is clear, that the Incarnation must precede Redemption,

¹ John xii. 8. Mark xiv. 7.

² 1 Cor. xi. 26.

as the atonement is a decree of God, and a demand of the law : but it is not clear, that Christ's natural flesh and blood should be swallowed by us, in memory of his death ; while a type, consecrated with the name of his body, as a fixed symbol of that body broken for us, satisfies his manifest purpose.

Rome urges the letter of a single passage ; we produce many, with like claims—we conflict—the senses, reason, Scripture and analogy sustain us and condemn her.

If you bear in mind that Paul is the exponent of Christ, not Christ of Paul, and that scholia are more literal than the text, I will not fear your verdict.

I now offer, to abandon the issue, or prove the words of Paul to be susceptible only of the letter, and those of Christ, only of the figure.

We will sift the design of St. Paul, in the eleventh chapter of the first Corinthians.

It is well known, that the early Christians held their agapæ after public worship, which love feasts closed with the communion ; and that the Corinthians at such times, were prone to excess.

Now let Paul speak—*When ye come together into one*

place, this is not to eat the Lord's supper. ' For in eating, every one taketh before other his own supper; and one is hungry and another is drunken. What! have ye not houses to eat and to drink in? or despise ye the Church of God, and shame them that have not? What shall I say to you? Shall I praise you in this? I praise you not.

For I have received of the Lord, that which I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread: and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner, he also took the cup, when he had supped, saying, this cup is the New Testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.

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

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

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

Chemical Change in the Eucharist.

For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body.

This extract, in extenso ; a variance from the usage of Rome, which adroitly culls the text, in defiance of the context, is due to the argument.

It is obvious that the Corinthians ate the bread with a license, that provoked the reproof of the apostle, who pressed the sanctity of the supper.

With these simple truths, we thwart the ruling of Rome, and prove our view to be just and natural.

The apostle charges them with greediness and drunkenness, *they do not eat the supper of the Lord, they despise the Church of God: he had not instituted the Eucharist, but was commanded by his Master to celebrate it.*

Paul shews that the ordinance was designed, to recall Christ's death, and thus points a climax: *he who eats or drinks unworthily, eats and drinks damnation to himself.*

Is it debateable, if those pledges and symbols which our Lord ordained and hallowed with the name of his body and blood, are defiled by irreverence ?

Imagine, St. Paul, in communion with the Vatican, and

his hearers guilty of taking Christ's flesh and blood into stomachs gorged with meat and wine.

In what scathing terms would he brand such mockery of the elements ; in what tones of thunder, would he hurl the curse of Rome at such loathsome sacrilege ?

Listen—*The Corinthians despise the Church of God* : scorching rebuke, forsooth, to men who stain the mass with the revels of the Bacchanal : *its object is to revive in memory the death of Christ till he come*, a gentle demur, to the pollution of their Saviour's real flesh and blood.

But hark ; the apostle reserves his censure ?

No sir ; he then terms the Eucharist bread, in three distinct passages : for, as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew, &c. Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord, shall be guilty, &c. let each one examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, &c.

Then, if ever, would and should he have urged the significance and dignity of that holy mystery, and clothed it with awe : but mark ; he calls it bread, not the body of the Lord ; why so lukewarm ? Marvellous indeed, if Paul was Papistic.

Shall I yield even this point? is so much deference due to our biased friends? be it so—all is crased.

I now scale their ramparts, and dismiss all I have said, unless I prove :—

That the trope is neither strange nor strained :

It had a signal fitness :

The disciples adopted it :

Rome cannot escape it :

The letter is forced and absurd :

First—Imagery was habitual to our Lord; to Peter, he says ; *if I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me* :¹ hear him, in the agony of the cross, confiding the blessed virgin to St. John—*woman, behold thy son ; then saith he to the disciple—behold thy mother.*²

Are Sacraments excepted? the Paschal Lamb a mere token of the angel's passing over the houses of Israel, was styled the Passover or Passage: does the prescript of a Rite call for proper terms? No Sir, I hold that the Saviour in ordaining the bread and wine, signs of his bruised body, and spilled

¹ John xiii. 8.

² John xix. 26, 27.

blood, should have challenged reverence for the symbols, by hallowing them with the names of the things signified.

In the new covenant, Baptism is the washing of Regeneration, and in the language of Paul, *we are buried with Jesus Christ by baptism unto death.*¹

Thus, in every aspect, be it speaker, or hearer, subject or incidents, there is no strain in the figure.

Second. The occasion suggested the metaphor. It is familiar history, that the epoch of the advent was prone to allegory, and mystery : the day, as well as the Lamb bore the name of the Angel's passage.

A custom, however, at the supper of the Passover, is emphatic : the father of the family took a piece of bread, and ate it with bitter herbs : reciting the formula—*This is the bread of misery and affliction, that our fathers ate in Egypt : let him that is an hungered come and eat ;* a form surely not adopted by the Jews from courtesy to us, but derived from the sixteenth chapter of Deuteronomy ; *seven days shalt thou eat unleavened bread therewith, even the bread of affliction.*

¹ Romans vi. 4.

Moderate wit may here discern the exemplar of the Sacrament: our Lord chose the immersion of Jewish Neophytes as a model for Baptism; in like manner, he adapted a Jewish rite to the Eucharist.

As the bread, steeped in bitter sauce, served to recall the affliction of their fathers; so, would the broken bread be an emblem of Christ's body, bruised on the cross.

Thus runs the ritual of the Passover: *this is the bread of misery and affliction, which our fathers ate in Egypt: let him that is an hungered come and eat.*

Take, eat, this is my body, broken for you, is the language of the last supper: their affinity is obvious.

We pause, to meet the plea that the disciples who had not yet regarded the bread, as a type, would have found equal obscurity in the phrases: *this is my body: this tree is Alexander.*

Strange as it may seem, this sorry conceit brandished in triumph twenty-five times in two hundred pages, is the gift of M. Arnauld's position: his armor offensive and defensive.

It is untrue, that our Lord always announced a metaphor.

To Nicodemus, who had said, *Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God, for no man can do those miracles that thou doest, except God be with him* : Jesus answers, *verily ; verily ; I say unto thee ; except a man be born again he cannot see the Kingdom of God.*¹

The notion of Nicodemus was coarse and literal ; the figure was patent from the conflict of the letter, as the phrase : *this that I have taken is my body broken for you*, was due caution to the disciples.

If you call to mind, that notice with, or following a metaphor, derives force from transient doubt, the sophism is patent.

If talking with a friend of the battles of Alexander, I say, pointing to a tree ; *That tree is Alexander*, however low, he may rate my judgment, he will not imagine that I mistake a plant for the victor at Arbela ; but when I add, *fancy his army here ; the Persian there* ; his suspense ceases.

I further say that even without notice, the idea of an

¹ John iii. 2, 3.

object in the hand of Christ, being the body of Christ, condemns the letter.

The mental shock would surely have secured an instant's pause, until hearing their master institute a memorial of his death, the disciples could not doubt his meaning; *this will represent to you my broken body till I come*; irrespective even, of the equivalence of the verbs *is* and *signify* in the language in which they were spoken.

We thank the Author for raising the question of probability.

Were the disciples ready to reject their senses, till then never doubted; those senses, which had witnessed the miracles of our Lord; those channels of every truth that underlies our faith?

Were they free to concede, that a body can at once, fill divers places, and that they took their master's body from their master's hand, in spite of their life tried reason?

Had they leisure to ponder on effects without cause, or on the import of the verb *is* (in the Syrian dialect of the period, I repeat, a term convertible with *signify*),¹ had they the

¹ Hebræo Aramæan.

acuteness at such a time, to discern Christ's body in the bread, and a change initial and in abeyance till the words of consecration were fully uttered?

Subtlety, sharpened by centuries of wrangling, may discover that Christ did not intend the bread, when he said; giving, what he had taken, and broken; *this is*, or, if the pronoun applies to the bread, that the bread is his actual body; but men, who in their simplicity would question, one with another; *what the rising of the dead should mean?* could scarcely be equal to such scholastic nicety.

Presumption favors us; The mysteries of the day; the bread of misery and affliction; sense, reason; the dimness of the letter; the disciples' artlessness; the act of Christ who took, brake and gave the bread; its prompt exposition in those pregnant words; *do this in remembrance of me*; his habitual imagery, were each, full notice of the figure; and I marvel much, that so adroit a disputant, in framing laws of language for us, reserves none for himself.

Third. You may arrive at the impressions of the disciples, by noting the absence of any act of worship; there was no clamor for the solution of a mystery; not even a change of

posture ; so palpable was the figure, not a question was asked ; not a comment made ; not a word spoken.

Was this apathy the fruit of private teachings ? their master had foretold his rising from the grave : strange indeed, that after waiving their sight, and all their senses to assume his entrance into their stomachs, they would not trust their eyes in proof of his resurrection ; supposing it a dream.

Could those men, on the warrant of a few words, and in defiance of their senses, have credited miracles, unparalleled, latent, and awful : those very men, who rejected a public fact, often predicted ; with its type and proof before their eyes, in the person of Lazarus, in the son of the widow of Nain, and in the daughter of Jairus ?

They fancied, they had seen a spirit ; *Thomas will not believe, unless he put his fingers in the print of the nails,*¹ and Jesus appeals to their senses ; *Behold my hands and my feet, handle me and see.*²

Shall we now be told that he was forced to invoke the

¹ John xx. 25.

² Luke xxiv. 39.

witnefs he impugned? I will not charge my adverfary with folly.

Read our Lord's language after the fupper: *I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom:*¹ it was the fruit of the vine, not his blood: again, he fays; *this cup is the New Testament in my blood:*² is the cup properly a New Testament? and if not, is it an image?

Moreover, Chrift ufed a figure, not only in giving the cup, but in giving the bread; *This is my body broken for you:* his body was then broken, either literally or not; fo Sir, he faid ftrictly; *this is my body;* and abruptly attached the figure to the letter: *my body, broken for you*—verily; aftutenefs is a great bleffing, but we fimple fouls believe, that the bread is Chrift's body, in the fame fenfe that his body was broken.

Fourth. It is paffing ftrange, that thefe literalifts reject the natural, and exact our confeffion of forced figures: a figure in the words; *he broke the bread and gave it,* fince he

¹ Matt. xxvi. 29.

² Luke xxii. 20.

gave his body under the semblance of bread; a figure in these words; *this is my body*, as the bread was not his body, until he had uttered those words; a figure in this; *my body, my body broken for you*, as his body was not broken on the eve of his passion; a figure, in the injunction, *do this in remembrance of me*, from which no sane man can infer a sacrifice of the Lord's body.

We meet a figure in the term *cup*, as applied to its contents; a figure, when he calls it *the New Testament*: a figure, in styling it, *the New Testament in his blood*; a figure; that *his blood was poured out for the remission of sins*, before it was shed; a figure, in giving the cup; *I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine*; and a figure, when he adds: *when he should drink it new in his father's kingdom*.

Gracious God—are these the men, who spurn a figure in the words of the institution?

Speſtatam admiſſi, riſum teneatis amici?

Fifth. No leſs fore to this unerring Church, may be the proof, that her letter is violent and ſtrained.

The task is eaſy, by ſimply ſuppoſing the word *this*, ſo to

ſpeak, a prefix of the bread, uſed by our Lord, when holding that, which he had taken, and broken, and ſaying, *this bread*, to refer to the bread.

Who will ſay that the phraſe, *this is my body*, is ſtrictly true? that bread, a lump of grains, is properly a ſtructure of blood, bones and nerves?

Let us hear in behalf of the letter, the claims of the pronoun to a divorce from the noun.

However jarring may be the views of our Latin brethren: ſome, holding with Bellarmin, that our Lord intended, *this*, to imply, *under this ſemblance, here is my body*: others, *this bread is i. e. will be my body*: all are ſhocked at the quibbling which perverts its obvious, natural and literal ſenſe, to a notion, figurative, obſcure and fanciful.

With effrontery no leſs offensive, than the oſtraciſm of ſenſe, and reaſon, they cloſe the ſacred canon, abounding in metaphor, and lacking a ſingle term ſerving their theory.

A falſe poſition now drives them both from image, and letter to ſenſeleſs jargon.

To your candor we ſubmit the iſſue.

Thus runs the *figure*—this bread, a type of my death till my coming is my body, mystically and virtually.

The *letter*; this bread is my body, properly, and literally.

The subtlety or logic, if any, thus far, is confined to the said pronoun, which I assume, covers the bread.

It is the logic of the eyes, and common sense, the logic of the disciples, and of every donee of bread, whose donor, in the act of simple transfer, so joins that pronoun with that noun.

The letter, now involves utter confusion: we must admit the bread, in a strict sense, to be body of Jesus Christ; while conscious that the bread is not his carnal body.

Who now needs the succor of subtlety? let him say, who claims *two distinct senses for that pronoun, one, transient, allied to the subject before the change, i. e. to the bread: the other, fixed, qualifying the attribute after its utterance, but that the two this-es do not differ, because both express the same idea.*¹

Verily Sir, are not these sneerers at our shelter of meta-

¹ Perp. de la foi, tom. ii. lib. ii. chap. 11.

physics the first to seek, and most in need of it? do they realize that unless our complaisance invests this pronoun with a novel function, favoring much of being *got up for the nonce*, they must admit the metaphor, or charge Christ with duplicity?

Our Author argues, that the ordinance has two aspects; *this*, which is bread, at the present instant, *is*, my body, at the next.

In the absence of precedent, he fancies what our Saviour might have said, in turning the water of Cana into wine.

The phrase, *this is wine*, pending a change, he thinks may intend, *this which is now water, is wine at the next instant*; the argument, which he terms *executory*, forces the present, to embrace two tenses: he applies it to Aaron's rod, which became a serpent, and to Lot's wife, transformed to a pillar of salt.

No one doubts, that had Moses said, pointing to his rod: *this is a serpent*: the words would fairly imply: *this will be a serpent*; or that at the doom of Sodom, *this is a sea of Sulphur*, might fairly express, *this will be forthwith a sea*, which he is pleased to call *a virtual, and operative proposition*.

Whence it seems, that all his logic resolves in the dictum of his Church, that the verb *is* unites the present and the future.

Should he abandon the letter for the figure, we claim a hearing for our figure; and though he may tangle subtlety with subtlety, and still more grossly, add insult to insult, *this*, that I give you and have broken, *this bread is my body properly and literally*, is the only literal sense, that can attach to the words of the supper.

We hold, that the clauses, *this is wine; this is a serpent; this is a sea of sulphur*; if found in Scripture, should be governed by the context: as in the phrase *a tree is a man*,¹ we see no change, but a simple trope, imaging the tree as a warrior, or an element of power.

A charge of undue notice, against the figure, recoils against the letter, for which no warning is claimed.

The cases are parallel; we will not grapple with shadows; we insist, that it is more natural to believe, that

¹ Deut. xx. 19.

our Lord ordained an emblem of his broken body, under the name of his body; than that he changed the loaf into his flesh: that it is less natural, to construe his words, as *operative*, than as typical, even as the disciples viewed the bread of affliction, the passover and the chalice.

To this issue, I challenge all my opponents' acumen, but not his cant, and verbiage.

Will this champion of the faith deny that the Eucharist is a holy sign? it is the ruling of his Church—will he deny that the Eucharist shadows Christ's body, dying, and nailed to the Cross? let Rome answer; escape is vain, at every turn, metaphors swarm his path.

Can his labored rules of language, *his operative propositions*, his unreal shapes, his double duty of the pronoun, or his desperate theses avail him?

He makes but three points—

The incidents of the Institution—

Its natural intent—

Prejudice—

He gains nothing by those *incidents*, plunged in trope and mystery; nor yet, from the *natural force* of the words, be-

cause to the disciples, unwarned of a latent change, the darkness of the letter, was ample notice of the figure : *to prejudice*, only, can we refer the letter with its endless shifts.


We fault Rome, with treason to her intellect ; to the analogy of the faith ; to the word of God : we show that subtlety is confined to her school, that Our Lord taught his disciples, that he should be no longer with them as an object of expense ; but never even in the pangs of parting, promised his veiled humanity on earth.

We shew that Paul constantly calls the Eucharist bread ; nay, while urging its claims to reverence : that the disciples adopted, and every incident implied the metaphor, which the Papal Church admits in the Cup.

We define ten bold figures in the words of the ordinance : we shew that its use was enjoined, as a token of Christ's broken body, an obvious image ; and its letter, to be senseless, revolting and monstrous.

Sir, with wisdom, and learning, you have common sense ; the safest guide to truth and duty.

I am, &c.



Letter Third.

FULL of solemn emphasis is the language of Cardinal Richelieu ; “ protestants are impious, if they do not adore what they should, and we are idolatrous if we adore what we should not.” The worship of the Elements, prescribed by Rome, is a yawning chasm to the hope of fusion : we charge it with

Temerity :

Disobedience :

Absurdity :

Impiety : and

Superstition.

Temerity.—This is not the cant of controversy ; God is my witness, that the severity of truth forbids milder terms.

The Bible reveals the essentials of Salvation, with divers matters of minor moment, but neither Prophet, Evangelist,

nor Apostle has even alluded to Eucharistic homage ; a silence, that would alarm me if in fellowship with Rome.

Would God thus prove our faith, and humble our hearts ? I am willing to surrender my reason, if he requires the sacrifice : I will adopt any doctrine he teaches, but I am not chargeable with contumacy until shewn his precept.

You will find that sacred truths are pressed, in the ratio they bear to the needs of faith and practice.

Christ's glory is magnified ; *he is our mediator ; the light of the world ; the life ; the truth ; the brightness of his father's glory ; he was from the beginning ; he was God ; he thought it not robbery to be equal with God ; he made the world ; the periods of time ; creatures visible and invisible—he sustains and governs all things, and his years shall not fail.*

Hence it is, that all the Angels of God adore the divine Saviour ; and that every knee should bend at the name of Jesus, the only name by which we can be saved.

Omission in the narrative of the supper finds no apology in its brevity ; they who state that Jesus ate the Passover with his disciples, in a large upper chamber, swept, and made ready, would not slur a vital fact.

Mark the precision and harmony of the Evangelists; *Jefus Chrift broke the bread; when he had given thanks, he gave the bread to his difciples, he charged them to do this in memory of his paffion; after this, they fung a hymn; and then they went to the mount of Olives:*¹ a racy minutenefs for a church, conceding the mutenefs of Scripture in fo grave a matter.

It is noteworthy, that the hiftory of the Inftitution is both our model and rule; the intent being clear from the mandate, *do this in remembrance of me*; and from the text of the Gofpels, quoted, *totidem verbis*, by St. Paul.

Disobedience. If this recital is a Chriftian manual, he who deviates from the leffons of our Lord on the eve of his death, is guilty of temerity, and contumacy.

How do you know, afks Rome, that Chrift was not adored at the fupper?

We reply, that every incident repels the fact: the difciples neither recognize a myftery, nor his entry into their ftomachs, nor vary their recumbent pofture, a cuftom of the

¹ Matt. xxvi. Mark, xiv. Luke, xxii.

period, and inapt for the act of worship: they rise only, to go to the Mount of Olives; and they style the Sacrament, the breaking of bread; that the early Christians not only broke the loaf with marked simplicity, but gave it to the laity, to carry to the sick and absent.¹

In view of these facts, it will appear not only incredible, but impossible, that either the disciples of Christ, or of the Apostles, could have so adored the body of our Lord; and moreover, there being no record of the fact in that history, which has all the force of law, or elsewhere, and as Christ directs us to do in his memory, as he did with his disciples, and St. Paul enjoins it—we hold that such homage transcends his teachings.

Absurdity. Our opponents brave both the sacred Canon, and common sense; their loyalty to either, would be a source of consolation: we dismiss their vague maxims, claiming precedence for mystery over the lights of reason, with the question; if the human reason which condemns their dogma, is sanctioned by the Holy Spirit; shall we try conclusions with God?

¹ Justin Martyr, Narrative of.

Read Sir, the Prophets on the vanity of idolatry : hear Ifaiah—they lavish gold out of the bag, and weigh silver in the balance and hire a goldsmith ; and he maketh it a God ; they fall down, yea, they worship.

They bear him upon the shoulder, they carry him and set him in his place, and he standeth ; from his place shall he not remove ; yea, one shall cry unto him, yet can he not answer, nor save him out of his trouble.¹

Again, in the xlv Chapter : he heweth him down cedars, and taketh the cypress and the oak, he planteth an ash, and the rain doth nourish it.

Then shall it be for a man to burn, for he will take thereof, and warm himself ; yea, he kindleth it, and baketh bread ; yea, he maketh a God, and worshippeth it, he prayeth unto it, and saith, deliver me ; for thou art my God.

They have not known nor understood for he hath shut their eyes, that they cannot see, and their hearts, that they cannot understand.

And none considereth in his heart, neither is there knowledge nor understanding to say, I have burned part of it in the fire ;

¹ Ifaiah, xlv. 6, 7.

yea also, I have baked bread upon the coals thereof; I have roasted flesh and eaten it; shall I make the residue thereof an abomination? shall I fall down to the stock of a tree?

Thus spake the Prophet of idols; and what think you of the apotheosis of paste; made of grains, ripened by the sun and rain, and cooked in an oven or between two plates of iron; part of which, not from the hands of a goldsmith, but from those of a baker, is their daily meat?

Can a priest transmute this baked dough into a God, which they carry, because he cannot walk; which they lock up; which they do not carry on their shoulders, but in their hands; which they put in his place, from which he cannot stir; which does not answer those who cry unto it; part of which is useful to man, not to cook his food but as food; which has eyes, but sees not; ears, but cannot hear; before which they kneel and pray, deliver me; for thou art my God?

Who will forbid us the indignant rebuke of the Spirit, and none considereth in his heart; neither is there knowledge nor understanding to say; I have made the half of this my bread, which I have cooked in an oven; of the

residue thereof, shall I make an abomination? shall I adore a cake?

Can the Holy Spirit be so foolish, and false?—I shudder as I pen those words—would he pander to the mockery of Pagans?

Credat Judæus Apella, non ego.

If even the Jews, who ascribed God's presence in their groves and statues, solely, to the efficacy of their ritual, scorning the worship of mere wood and stone, were branded with idolatry, as faithless to instinct, will Rome exclude the exercise of common sense, which Scripture exacts? or if the word of God denounces the superstition, that a tree the fruit of showers, becomes a God; may we not judge the devotees of simple bread: which we have seen made of cereals by the hands of a workman; do we err in reasoning like the Holy Ghost?

Impiety and Superstition.

If such homage is offensive to God's spirit; it is impious and superstitious.

Many maintain, sir, and with much force, that if the Eucharist is material, Christ's body should not there be worshipped; unless visible and glorious.

They distinguish between Deity, refulgent, and Deity, unseen and ubiquitous: Rome attributes to Christ's humanity a dual synchronous presence; as majestic; likened to the splendor of the firmament: and as veiled, in the guise of bread and wine.

Now, all Christians concede that he who filleth immensity should not be adored in the trite objects of nature, he is in a shrub, a rock; but the reverence allied with either is profane.

Christ teaches us to extol God in the starlit depths of space; as *our Father who art in Heaven*; because, there, his essence is glorious: in paying divine honors to a tree, we might be suspected of deifying the tree, but who would imagine me worshipping a strange God; lifting my eyes to the golden garniture of the skies, which is the throne of God?

Be that as it may; they assume a truth which neither creed will question; that Deity should not be glorified in the frequent forms of matter, but in the grandeur of power.

Imagine the contempt, Sir; even of infidels, who watch you cold and tranquil, kneading and toasting your wafer; and, *presto*, bowing to your wafer God; and as you kneel in

the mire before the Host, will they not say, that you value Christ's cloaked humanity more than his Divinity; his body, more than his Spirit?

Jesus Christ was adored, whilst Deity shone in the incarnate God; when he hushed the tempest; healed the sick, and raised the dead; let us adore him, when visible in his wise Providence, let us adore the Father, as throned in power; but do not insult the majesty of Jehovah; heap not blasphemy on superstition, in adoring Christ's veiled body, ignoring his divine local and latent presence.

If Rome changes the issue to a corporal presence, in the nature of spirit; we repeat; why does she honor Christ's body more than his Divinity?

If she abandons the simple presence, for that of grace; we reply, that in such sense, the Holy Spirit quickened the apostles, the cloven tongues at Pentecost, the hearts of Christian converts, and in such sense animated the rite of baptism, without claim to objective worship.

The ark of the Covenant is not a case in point; before it, the walls of Jericho fell, before it the floods of the Jordan divided and closed behind it; there, God dispensed his living

oracles to mortal ears; there was the Shekinah vivid between the Cherubim, thence called the Cherubim of Glory.

The ark was a lesser heaven, evoking like emotions; verily, eyes have they, but they see not; ears, but they hear not; mean, and present in an atom: only present, at the pleasure of a Priest; and not present, when the voided elements are dead and loathsome: all which we are told is the *crucial test* of faith.

That God's presence in the ark was glorious, all admit: and Rome admits a glorious presence of Christ only in heaven; in heaven, at the right hand of God, let us adore him, as he was adored in the ark.

And now, Sir, with all possible respect for my opponents, I ask with Theodoret¹ *if it is not superstitious, and the chief of superstitions, to adore what we eat, or to eat what we adore?*

Is it not impious to worship that which the disciples eat without change of posture; which sight, taste and reason pronounce bread; which the Gospel calls broken bread; and of which, Christ enjoins no homage when teaching us to do, as

¹ Theodoret in Genes.—Ques. 55.

he then did : that which was eaten at the cloſe of a common feaſt ; which was freely ſent to the ſick and abſent by any applicant, and which, being a germ of the ſoil, cannot be God, ſave in defiance of his Holy Spirit.

Raſhneſs, folly, contumacy, blaſphemy and ſuperſtition are harſh terms for Roman cars ; I am loth to utter them.

Believe me, &c.







Letter Fourth.

SIR,



GLADLY accept the issue, whether the disciples could have regarded the bread as a type, without previous teaching.

It seems to me, that seeing our Lord take, break, bless and give the bread, they could have held many views more natural than the actual presence or the change of substance.

I. The words, *this is my body*, would have recalled the passage of Deuteronomy, to which they are the key; *this is the bread of misery that our fathers ate in Egypt*.

The senses of the disciples, their reason, the dissonance of the bread and body; the nature of things; common sense,

all forbid the letter ; but conceding the letter and the absurdity of the figure ; it is incredible, that they could or would have inferred a change of substance.

II. Had they wavered between what they saw, or supposed they saw, and heard, or thought they heard ; it would have been more natural to mistrust their sense of hearing, as we rely more on our eyes than our ears.

They knew by the sight that the substance they received was bread ; and they could only know by the hearing, that it was the body of their master.

Again, allowing equal weight to eye and ear, the perceptions of our direct vision are more certain than the impressions we gather from the sounds we hear ; the disciples saw the bread, but could only infer from the language of Christ, that the Eucharist is his body.

Nor can it be supposed that the ear was specially controlled by divine influence : its functions are free ; by that channel only, I know that it is our Lord who speaks ; if the medium is false, it is untrue that he speaks ; if faithful, it is true ; if doubtful, I may doubt if the Son of God speaks.

The disciples were more certain that they heard the words

of the institution, than that the Eucharist is Christ's body ; because they believed it to be Christ's body on the credit of the hearing.

If they were equally sure that they saw a real bread, and truly heard those words ; they had a higher certainty that they saw a real bread, than that the Eucharist is the body of Christ.

No one will deny that the disciples had greater doubt that the Eucharist is Christ's body, than that they heard his language : I hear Christ who tells me that the Eucharist is his body, then the Eucharist is the body of Christ, provided, the fact proved is more certain than the proof of the fact.

Nor will a certainty be denied to the sight, at least equal to that of the hearing, for if it is possible, that an object of our vision is a mere semblance, it is more possible, that the speech which we think we hear, may be delusive sound.

III. To the disciples, lacking the training of the Propaganda, self-distrust was more natural, than abnegation of sense, which their master had not imposed.

A change of substance implies either, that the color, taste and form before our eyes are not the color, taste and form of

bread, which is not pretended, or that all the accidents of bread remain after the bread has ceased to exist.

The ideas of species without matter ; color without substance ; bulk without body, are not easily grasped by men, who have not yet learned that what they see, is not what they see.

Could then the disciples, like ourselves subject to error—they who often mistook their master's purpose and never when doubtful, scrupled to question him—have adopted such an anomaly in silence ? and had they mastered all his lessons, could they without temerity and presumption, have brooked a dogma, so monstrous, even to conception ?

IV. Be that as it may, folly only would deny a truce to Judgment, when the letter is offensive to sense and reason.

We read of the feet, hands, arms and eyes of God ; of his approach ; his presence is manifest ; he kindles the clouds with the fire of his breath, &c.—common prophetic images, suggesting the functions of a human frame.

Now, as reason rejects the attributes of God to a body like Christ's, equally with corporeal faculties to Jehovah, and, as on no occasion had the senses and judgment of the disciples

been more startled ; they could not have supposed, that their master's body, had, like God, a plural presence, synchronous and latent.

But another view, and not without its force ; a plural presence not claimed even for God, is ascribed to the body of our Lord ; in heaven and on earth, but not in space ; and that his own body, with its bulk, unity, and proportions, was held in his own hand, and received into his own mouth and stomach.

Do we err in saying, that reason and common sense revolt against the letter, and that then, if ever, Judgment would have been arrested, or the ear suspected, or first impressions rejected ?

V. The disciples would rather have questioned the normal condition of their sight, smell and taste, a common event, than credit a disguised change of the object of those senses ; and I insist, that such mistrust was more natural than the assumption, that the bread they saw was not bread.

VI. The words in question, imply no less, that the bread is changed to the body of Christ, than that Christ is changed to the bread ; was it not then more credible, that instead of

the bread, ceasing to be bread, and becoming Christ's body, under the form of bread ; that the body of Christ had ceased to be his body, and the object that suffered death, was a semblance, the bread being his body by consecration ? This sense more natural than the tenet of Rome, absurd as it is, would have saved the scandal of the cross, so appalling to the disciples.

VII. M. Arnauld, who doubtless makes the most of his case, thus construes the ordinance : *This which is bread at the present instant, is my body at the next ; in common parlance, this is about to become my body ;* the exact letter of which will read, This bread which I share and eat with you is about changing to the substance of my body, really, and strictly ; being my food ; and this wine will soon blend with my blood, as it quenches my thirst.

Had our Lord said to his disciples—eat this bread that I am eating, and turning into my flesh, which must be broken for you ; drink this cup, that I am drinking, a fluid combining with my blood, that must be shed in sanction of the new covenant ; he would have implied that it was their last meal together ; and that all was accomplished but the sacrifice of his

body, fed by that food, and the oblation of his blood, assimilating with the wine ; as he seems to express it ; *I will drink no more of this fruit of the vine, until I drink it new with you, in the kingdom of God.*

We might further infer, that Christ gave his disciples this food, as a pledge, that his body should be broken, and his blood shed for their sakes, as a communion with the means of life eternal.

Here, is a rigid sense, not reasonable I admit, but less shocking, and more tenable than the letter of Rome.

VIII. If the disciples believed that Christ had but the one body, which he strictly promised to give them ; they would have concluded, either, that he was guilty of a breach of truth, which would be impious ; or that the body of Christ they saw being a phantom, the bread should take his name : the only escape from the concession that the body before their eyes, was the same that had entered their stomachs.

IX. If the disciples thought that Christ had a body which extended its hand, and gave an object, and that Christ had a body which they received from his hands, they could not

suppose that the Giver of the object and the object given were one.

To avoid the dilemma that one body was two bodies, or, that two bodies were one body, they had a fourfold choice.

That the body of Christ which extended the hand, had ceased to be his body, and had become bread.

That he, not the bread held out the hand, the same body, referred to in the institution, and in the passage: *destroy this temple*, although the disciples understood him to speak of the temple at Jerusalem.

That Christ had two bodies, the one giving; the other given.

That the body of Christ which had been one, was duplicated.

They knew that two objects, are two objects; they saw the substance given them by Christ, parting from his body, and without the aid of metaphysics, could not have divined that the two were an unit.

X. The disciples, unskilled in the subtleties of the schools, and retaining their reason, would be wronged by the suppo-

sition that the language of the Ordinance, would convey the same ideas to them, and to the adroit logician : for, as no one would say, *here is the body of Peter, or here is his blood*, purposing to indicate the human nature of Peter ; so, the disciples, could not have inferred from the words, *this is my body, this is my blood*, the humanity of Christ veiled in the elements.

The literal sense must be natural, and obvious : if then, in colloquial phrase, *this is my body, this is my blood*, can only imply a body without spirit and blood without body ; the disciples must have so construed the ordinance, if they adopted its letter.

The clause *my broken body*, was surely a metaphor, before Christ was actually broken, or crucified.

To cover this tender point, Rome resorts to a subterfuge, transposing the past, and future, and even argues as if the word *broken*, were omitted.

We contend, that in the phrases : *this is my body, this is my blood* : *body* and *blood* correspond with *broken body* and *shed blood*. As it may not be said of a body, or rather of humanity, *this is blood*, whilst that humanity has a body,

with blood coursing its veins, without braving every rule of diction.

The letter of the language ascribed to Antony ; *the blood of the Roman Cæsar speaks to you*, does not intend the person of Cæsar speaking, but his blood free from his body ; and when Plutarch states, that a slave found the body of Pompey on the shore, a vivid fancy, only, would infer, that such body was living.

Back and fill as they please, *this is my body*, can never mean, *this is the living Christ Jesus*, nor can *this is my blood* ever be referred to his humanity ; therefore, the body of Christ was a body, severed from its spirit, and its blood, was blood, parted from its body.

Now take the place of the disciples, and ask our Lord, what he enjoins us to eat and drink ?

Take eat ; drink ye all of it.

Are we required to eat the bread ?

Are we commanded to drink the wine ? if we must drink his blood, how can we drink it properly while yet in his veins ?

You reply, that Christ does not exact an absolute eating

and drinking, and why not? If we adopt the letter of the institution, why not the letter of the conjoined mandate, *eat, drink?* Most marvellous indeed, whilst the Saviour says, *this is my body*, and startled sense and reason concede the figure, you insist on the primary sense, and when he naturally adds, *eat, drink ye all of it*, and sense and reason demand a strict compliance, you take refuge in the metaphor.

How can you properly drink the blood of Christ's veins, in the guise of wine? the drinking of a seeming substance, is but a seeming drinking; and a seeming drinking is not a proper drinking.

Pardon, Sir, this short apostrophe to the infallible Church: and here let me ask, what the disciples could have understood, by a *body broken*, and by *blood shed* literally and properly: could they have regarded the Eucharist as a bloodless sacrifice, could they have conceived that Christ spake to them of aught save a dead body, and of blood from his own veins?

XI. Nor can I see the virtue of a blind change which annuls the bread; is Christ's body less free in substance, than in semblance? if it can enter the form of bread, it can

enter the bread itself; and if no exception is taken to disproportion of the body to the bread, why should the substance of one, be inconsistent with the substance of the other? in the silence of revelation, would not the modesty of ignorance, be the soundest philosophy?

XII. We will offer two hypotheses; both clearly false:

That the disciples were bound by the letter; and, that Christ's words, admit of no other literal sense than that of Rome, which I assure you is a stretch of courtesy.

Had the disciples been sharply schooled at Port Royal, the notions of *presence visible*, and *latent*; *entities*, *actual*, and *sacramental*; *unreal forms*; *conversions*, and *occult miracles* might have occurred to them; but they were poor fishermen, blessed with common sense, nothing more.

Had they been philosophers; they might not have fathomed in a breath, all the subtleties that Rome has needed centuries to devise; and had they discerned all those niceties, even by grace; it still is possible, they were not free from doubt.

Tortured as they were by fear, and sadness, a suspicion of

delusion, or delirium would have seemed more natural, than the letter, subversive of all their experience : it being more supposable, that the minds of a few men may be disturbed, than the abiding convictions of all men are false.

If the disciples were satisfied, that one and one, make two, that the whole is greater than its part ; or a vessel greater than its contents ; that a human body, without loss of bulk, is greater than a point, or that a substance, cannot properly and literally sever from itself ; I contend, that a concession of the marvels of Rome would belie every element of consciousness.

Imagine them taught, that the body which they saw, was the food they were eating, that Christ held his own body in his own mouth and hand, and gave himself from himself with his own hands, still keeping himself to himself, or that his entire body, was taken into its own stomach, and with its full members, and proportions existed in the bread, and in each crumb of the bread, and was severed from itself, when they parted from their master.

We are told, that these are seeming flaws—but seeming—Gracious God—how far, is patience a virtue ? dare they tell

me that the disciples would not have spurned an hypothesis which outraged their life-long convictions?

There is no escape; they must abide by the stern letter of every passage of Scripture, without the exercise of reason, or abandon their dogma.

And how may I ask, do the Roman Scholiasts construe the passages—*a tree is a man*; ¹ *that rock was Christ*? ² “the letter is barred by common sense.”

Pause, Sir, while I apply that answer to the words, *This is my body*; or *this bread is my body*; if the pronoun is assignable to the bread; is there more affinity between the bread, and the body, than between the tree, and the man? prejudice apart; what could you charge against my serious averment, that a tree is a man, that would not recoil against your letter?

Hence, I infer, that the disciples would rather have doubted their conception, or wakefulness, nay, even their reason, than harbor a doctrine involving absurdity.

XIII. In fine Sir, I contend, that it is as natural, and

¹ Deut. xx. 19.

² 1 Cor. x. 4.

reasonable, to sink in Pyrrhonism, as to accept a sense, which entails a doubt of our senses.

Call to mind, Sir, that those senses sustain the certainty of all our convictions ; if false, our perceptions are false ; if loyal ; our perceptions are true ; and our perceptions vague, if our senses are treacherous.

If then, it is possible that our healthy senses deceive us, in mistaking the elements for bread and wine, we must regard their whole agency as fickle, if not as false ; we must doubt the existence of a heaven, an earth, and of our fellow man.

The Apostles could have fairly demurred to every process of sense : they who heard the preaching of the Apostles, with greater reason, should have doubted their report of what others had heard or that which others had seen with their eyes, and which *their hands had handled of the word of life*.¹

Let us traverse the scale of confidence, accessible to the disciples.

It is more certain that they saw Christ, than that they

¹ 1 Epist. John, i. 1st and 2nd.

truly heard him ; more certain, that they so heard, than that they understood him ; more certain, that they understood him, than that they adopted the letter, and rejected the figure.

Again they were not less certain that they saw a real bread, than that they saw a real Christ ; since both facts have a common base—Ergo—It is much more certain as regards them, that the Eucharist is bread, than that the Eucharist is the body of Christ : to this issue, I invite all the subtlety of all the schools.

The reply, that the verdict of the senses is only true, *pari passu*, with the sanctions of faith, is fallacious : first ; because, it is senior of faith, and whether true, or untrue is independent—it is older than faith, because the disciples saw Christ, before they believed in him.

Secondly ; All our ideas of faith rely solely on sense ; and their value to us, is measured by its certainty ; and to faith, which is a conviction of Divine truth ; there are four essentials :

God exists ;

He is truthful ;

He has revealed himself ;

Each mystery of our faith appears in such revelation.

Sir—it is noteworthy—that the senses are the sole channels of all those truths, and their sole vouchers.

We are assured, that *there is a God*, from the wonders of the universe, which striking our senses, prove in the language of Paul, the divinity and power of its Author.

We believe, that *he is truthful*; being taught by the visible creation, that he is too wise, to deceive himself, and too good, to deceive us : that *he has revealed himself*, by miracles, which have impressed our senses, or the senses of those who attested them, with their blood and lives : that *each mystery of our faith is found in Scripture*, because our eyes have read, or our ears have heard it.

Thus the senses, are the media of all evidence : if they cannot err, the grounds of your faith are firm—it is true, that we gaze on objects, whose variety and grandeur proclaim the being of God : that we see marks of his wisdom and love : that the eyes of six hundred thousand witnesses of the miracles of Moses ; and the eyes of the disciples who

certified the miracles of Christ, and the glory of his resurrection; and the eyes of Christians who for ages have read the mysteries of their faith, have not mocked them.

Could our senses delude us, all ideas of faith would be unhinged: we lose St. Paul's proof from the marvels of nature, of God's existence: suspicious of all reality, we have no conviction of his truth: doubtful would be the miracles dependent on the vision of others; doubtful would be the mysteries, nay the fact of the written word.

I now offer some thoughts to the champions of Rome.

1st. As no geometric truth can ignore the axiom, *the whole is greater than its part*; so, if faith relies on sense, the certainty of faith, being a conclusion, is subordinate to the certainty of sense; hence the certainty of faith cannot dispute the verdict of the senses, that the Eucharist is bread.

2nd. The evidence which proves is more clear, and conclusive to us, than the fact proved: now as the senses underlie the truths of faith, our sensual assurance is more clear and conclusive to ourselves, than the truths of faith: consequently, the truths of faith cannot bind us to discard our senses, which affirm the Eucharist to be bread.

3rd. The convictions of our normal senses, are, either always false, or always true : or, sometimes true, and sometimes false.

If always false, we can never emerge from error : if sometimes true, and sometimes false, their report is dubious, and faith is unstable, being a vassal of sense : *Ergo*: the report of our sane senses is always true ; and that which my eyes pronounce bread in the Eucharist, is bread.

4th. Common sense demands the best evidence ; that of our senses, ranks all evidence recognized solely through the senses ; by their agency only, we know either him, or his miracles, his doctrine, or his mission—*sequitur* ; although the authority of the speaker may seem to imply that the Eucharist is his body, the evidence of sense, pronounces it bread.

5th. This dogma strikes at the root of faith, which rests on the testimony of the Prophets, of the Apostles, of Evangelists, of Martyrs, of God the Father, speaking at the Jordan, and of Christ himself : all subject to sense.

6th. If suspicious of my senses, I have no proof of the world's existence : if uncertain of the world's existence, I have no assurance that there is a God, who has revealed his

will : if not assured that there is a God who has revealed his will, I cannot trust either the sincerity of the narrator, or even the fact of the institution : if not convinced of the truth, or fact of the institution, I am not bound to abandon my senses, by adopting its letter.

Thus—*a primo ad ultimum* : I should not slight my senses in the matter of the Eucharist, until sure of their fidelity, which is amazingly cheering.

7th. There is equal certainty in the two premises—I see the Heavens, the Earth, the world : I see bread and wine in the Eucharist.

Equally clear, are the two conclusions : the Heavens, the Earth, the world exist : the bread and wine exist.

Nay, I have a firmer faith in the existence of the bread and wine, than in that of the Heavens, because, I only see the latter, while eyes, taste, touch and smell, attest the reality of the former : however, assuming their equality, those data afford a demonstration

I see the Heavens, the Earth, a world really existing, is clearer to me, than that there is a God who revealed himself.

The first being an axiom, the last, an inference ; now, the

term, *I see the bread and wine actually existing*, has the same clearness, force, and certainty, as the term; *I see the Heavens, the Earth, a world really existing*.

Therefore, we are more confident that we *see the bread and wine really existing*, than that, *there is a God who revealed himself*.

Can then the authority of God who revealed himself, require me, herein, to rule out the evidence of my eyes?

8th. There is a greater certainty, that *there was a person Christ who made the supper with his disciples*, than that *the Eucharist is properly the body of Christ*, and we have a higher conviction, that *the Eucharist is bread*, than that, *there was a person Christ who made the supper with his disciples*; in logical sequence, we are more sure, that *the Eucharist is bread*, than that *the Eucharist is the body of Christ*.

Surely, our conscious certainty that, *there was a person Christ, who made a last supper with his disciples*, is higher than the certainty, that *the words which Christ spake at the supper should be rendered literally*.

That the Eucharist is bread, is more clear than, that *there was a person Christ who made the supper with his disciples*,

since we learn the latter truth, only from testimony, but the former by vision, our own eyes, being safer evidence, than the eyesight of others, to ourselves.

For First—The disciples saw their master dispensing the Eucharist, and all see that the Eucharist is bread.

Second—It cannot be denied, that at the supper, the disciples were in sore affliction, while we see the bread with tranquil minds.

Third—Our senses, have no contact with the statements of the disciples, but testify directly, to the bread of the Eucharist.

A truce to logic, as we track the shifts of bigotry.

Let us fancy a mission, to some Pagan race, to teach, the being of God, and the mystery of the Eucharist.

Suppose, they commune without comment, and after frequent partakings of the sacred elements, which those Neophytes believe, to be real bread, and real wine, you wish to undeceive them.

It is certain, on Roman theory, that their deluded senses, mistake for sensual food the body and blood of our Lord ; it is still more certain, that you cannot surmount their prejudice.

Would you urge Christ's miracles? As yet they know

him not : appeal to authority ? they recognise none : talk of faith ?—talk to the winds : prove God's existence and his revealed will in the wonders of nature ? they will ask you to taste, and smell the elements, and to prove them bread, and wine, and your faith false, will require you to open your eyes without reasoning.

Would you press the lights of natural religion, and gently lead to surrender of sense, on the dictum of Christ ? You are again at fault, as those men are void of common sense, or will refer your exactions to insanity.

Hence it seems, that with sound faculties acting in healthy concert and in their simplest functions, we are victims of self-delusion.

If so—Adam could not and ought not to have been certain, that he was eating forbidden fruit ; for if he was sure that it was fruit, the Pagans, we imagine, unwittingly eating the hallowed bread, have like certainty of its reality, and if they are capable of such certainty, it is real bread, unless we may be certain of that, which far from being certain is not even true.

If so, our first Parents might justly have questioned all they had seen and all they saw.

If Adam could have doubted his senses; *à fortiori*, could Abraham have doubted, that he heard the voice of God, calling him to quit his country and kinsfolk: *à fortiori*, had Moses cause of doubt, that God spake to him in Horeb: *à fortiori*, should the Jews have defied their eyes when they saw the sun stand still to ensure the triumph of Israel; when they saw rivers, changed to blood, and the terrors of the Exodus, rivalled by Pharaoh's jugglers: *à fortiori*, should the Prophets have suspected those dim types, and parables, shadowing the counsel of God, their dreams, and visions, of day, and night: their trances, their raptures, and those multifiform revelations, sustained by evidence, subordinate to sense: *à fortiori*, should the Eastern Magi have scouted their senses when their meteor guide stood over a child, whose manger cradle, chimed so ill with majesty: *à fortiori*, should the disciples, have assigned to illusion, those miracles of the Saviour, which infringed nature's laws; for, if ever inclined to question sense, it is not in matters of bread, and wine; but in marvels, that awe the sense, and challenge the reason.

The beacons of Rome strand us on the quicksands of

doubt ; in fancied sacrifice to faith, she hazards the bulwarks of faith ; hazards, did I say ? she rends the fortrefs, and up-roots its base ; insensible to satire or shame, she sanctions the atheist's scoff, nay, poisons the infidel's shaft, and stultifies herself, in blasting the keystone of faith.

Our wayward mother must pardon our zeal for the senses, which as witnesses for the universe, warn us to be jealous of their rights.

I have now fir, to apologize for the haste of these letters, in behalf of their matter, which I claim to be conclusive.

I have exposed the hazards of truth, tampering with duplicity, and of craft, and arrogance, being snared by their own devices.

The partizans of Rome may boast an able defence of a bad cause : God in his wisdom, suffering an era, brilliant with eloquence and genius, to task its giant energies in clouding truth, that attrition of intellect might shed fresh lustre on his holy faith.

I may seem bold, to enter the lists with such stalwart foes ; but while those proud Philistines, are defying the armies of the living God, may I not hope, though as feebly armed as

the Shepherd warrior of Israel, to confound them with a single blow?

In my own cause, I would despair; but I am fearless in thine, O God, *who out of the mouths of babes and sucklings hast perfected praise.*

I am, &c.





Notes to Translator's Preface.



Reed.

Atteri et frangi fidelium dentibus.

Council of Rome, 1st Session, A. D. 1059.

Collectio Regia : tom. 25, p. 592.

De latere effusus est.

6, Council of Rome, A. D. 1079.

Collectio Regia : Rom. Coun.

4 Lateran 1215, capitula 1.

Summa conciliorum, tom. 1, p. 296 B.

Sub singulis, seu particulis—una cum anima et divinitate.

Conc. Trid. 13th Session, A. D. 1551.

Test of faith.

Summa conc. de fide catholica, tom. 1. p. 296.

The Church decrees that all who neglect to receive the

Eucharist at Easter shall be excluded from the house of God when living, and deprived of Christian burial when dead.

Butler cites 21 Lateran—Cat. Lesson 21.

Semper, &c.

St. Vincent de Lerens, 5th century commonitorium
cap. 2. Milner, end of Con. p. 179.

Appeal to Scripture.

Butler's Cat. Eucharist Bellarmine, Arnauld, &c. &c.

Iest.

Hocus pocus—hoc est corpus—&c. &c.

Merits of Saints.

St. Dominic did penance for others—the canons stated the terms—to wit: ten years for a homicide: a man guilty of many murders, being precluded by death; St. Dominic by commutation, completed an hundred years with 20 chaplets and flagellation in six days: he thought that during Lent, he could accomplish one thousand years.

Fleury, A. D. 1062, lib. 60, sec. 52. Paris, 1758.

This treasury entrusted to the Pope, consists of the merits of Christ, Mary and the Saints. Pope's Bull, 1825.

Charlemagne was invoked as a Saint, miracles were performed at his tomb 250 years before his canonization : he had four queens and five morganatic wives in thirteen years. Fleury takes much pains to show a possibility that he had not two at the same time.

Fleury, A.D. 814, lib. 46, sec. 9.

Charlemagne was canonized 29 Dec. 1165, by an Anti-pope (Pascal III.) ; the honor approved by the Pope.

Fleury, A.D. 1165, lib. 71, sec. 22.

Pierre d'Abre—Inquisitor, slain by the populace for cruelty ; was made a saint by Paul III. *at request of Charles V.*

Vol. 24th Fleury, A.D. 1485, lib. 106, sec. 16.

Purgatory.

The council of Trent enjoined *sound doctrine* in the matter of Purgatory *without defining it*. The Benedictine editors admit that the fathers not only differed from each other on this subject, but that each was not consistent with himself : Conc. Trid. 25th Sess.

Benedic. Ed. St. Ambrose I. 385.

It is the pious opinion of illustrious men that souls do not suffer in purgatory on Sunday, but return to their punishment on Monday. The mass in honor of the angels is celebrated on Sunday to propitiate their mediation for the dead and dying. Fleury, A.D. 1062, vol. 13, lib. 60, sec. 54.

Council of Florence—

Purgatorium ignem esse.

Souls are purged from venial sin by fire and the prayers of the priests ; mortal sins by eternal fire—(if not dispensed ?)—

Questio de igne purgatorio.

4th June, A.D. 1438. Collec. Regia, de Purgatorio,

Summa conciliorum, tom. 1, p. 396.

Purgatory—confirmed at Trent—25th Session, A.D.

1563, Summa conc. tom. 1. p. 588.

Immaculate conception.

This dogma seems to have been broached in the 12th century. John Duns (Scotus) formally introduced it in 1307—he sustained the position, that the conception of the virgin by her mother, was immaculate, by 200 arguments before the university of Paris.

Fleury, A. D. 1308, vol. 19, lib. 89, sec. 28.

Chal. Dic. Duns.

St. Bernard condemned it as a *novity* unsustained by authority of Scripture, reason or tradition.

Fleury, A. D. 1140, vol. 14, lib. 68, sec. 70.

In the liturgy of St. Basil the virgin and saints are prayed for. St. Basil, Op.

Anterior to A. D. 1307, both Franciscans and Dominicans opposed this doctrine—the Franciscans changing their faith contested the point with the Dominicans. The former offered proof by miracles, the latter quoted Scripture and the Fathers. F. Paul, Trent, A. D. 1676, p. 170.

The Council of Basle recommends the observance of the festival of the conception, not as an article of faith, but in compliance with usage. 36 Session, A. D. 1439.

A. D. 1546, Paul III. directs the Council of Trent not to meddle with it. F. Paul, 171, Trent.

About A. D. 1845, the Pope collected by letter the views of the bishops, of whom 40 are known to have dissented—and made it a part of the Roman creed, and a condition of salvation.

The Bishop of Arras, France, in his Pastoral, A.D. 1867, expresses himself forcibly, *Satan howled in hell, when the doctrine was proclaimed.*

Pfalter of Bonaventura, Genoa, A.D. 1606.

Come to her all ye that are weary and heavy laden and she shall give you rest.

Christ says, *Come to me all ye, &c.* Matt. xi. 28.

There is but one mediator between God and man—the man, Christ Jesus. 1 Tim. ii. 5.

Blessed are the paps which thou hast sucked—yea, says Christ, rather blessed are they that bear the word of God and keep it. Luke xi. 27, 28.

St. Paul asks prayers for himself.

2 Thefs. iii. 1.

Hebrews xiii. 18.

1 Thefs. v. 25.

Romans xv. 30.

Efficacy of the Supper.

The views of the fathers, schoolmen and Roman divines are collected by Archbishop Tillotson. Some of them are noted below. Calixtus—published at Helmstadt—is the best authority, as the object of his life was to effect

a comprehension of the Calvinists, Lutherans, and Romans.

2nd Century—*Tertullian*—The first Latin father whose works are extant. “The bread is his own body, that is, the figure and image.” Ad Marcionem I. 4, 571.

Edit. Paris, 1634.

“If we doubt our senses, we may doubt whether our Savior was deceived in what he heard, saw and touched : he might have been deceived in the voice from heaven, in the smell of the ointment at his burial, and in the wine at the supper.” Lib. de anima, p. 319.

3rd Century—*Origen*—The highest name in Church history.

“The bread is Christ’s typical or symbolical body.”

Edit. Huetii, Commonit. on Matt. xv.

Cardinal Perron says that “here Origen talks like a heretic.”

3rd Century—*St. Cyprian*, to Cecilius, Ep. 63, “by wine the blood of Christ is figured.”

4th Century—*St. Augustin*.

“The elements are the figure and sign of Christ’s body and blood. Our Lord does not doubt to say : this is my

“body when he gave the sign of his body.”

Tom. 6, p. 187. Edit. Basil, 1596.

Speaking of Judas: he delivered to the disciples the figure of his body.

Enarat, 3rd Pfalm.

Tom. 8, p. 16.

Commonitorium, 98 Pfalm. Ye are not to eat this body which you see, &c. the sacrament spiritually understood will give you life.

Tom. 9, p. 1105.

Speaking of his body: ye shall have me according to grace but not to the flesh.

Traēt 50 in Joan.

The term, Sacrament, implies that from resemblance, things take the names of things they represent.

Tom. 2, p. 93, 23rd Epistle.

As we receive the similitude of his death by baptism so may we also receive the likeness of his flesh and blood: that neither truth may be wanting, &c. quoted by Gratian de consecrat. dis. 2.

Sec. utrum.

4th Century—*Theodoret*.

Christ honored the symbols with the name of his body and blood, not changing nature, but adding grace to nature.

Dialog. 1.

They remain in their former substance. Dialog. 2.

5th Century—*Gelasius*—Pope.

The sacrament ceaseth not to be the substance or nature of bread.

Adv. Eutych. et Nest. sec. v. pars 3.

Biblioth. Patrum, tom. 4.

6th Century—*Facundus*—African bishop.

Bread not properly his body, p. 144. Edit. Paris, 1676.

13th Century—*Scotus* Duns ; until the Council of Lateran, 1215, it was not necessary to believe the doctrine of Transubstantiation.

In Sent. 1, 4, dis. 11, 9, 3.

15th Century—*Tonstall* ; before the Lateran Council—the manner of the Eucharist was a matter of opinion.

De Eucharist. 1, p. 146.

16th Century—*Erasmus*.—It was late before the church defined Transubstantiation unknown to the ancients, both in name and thing.

In 1 Epis. ad Corin. c. 7.

16th Century—Cardinal *Cajetan*. Card. of Leo X.

There is nothing in the gospel that requires the belief that the words of Christ, *this is my body*, are to be taken in a proper sense.

In Aquin. 3rd part, c. 75, art. 1.

Mem. This passage is expunged in the Roman edition by

order of Pius V. Ægid.—confid. sacram. 21, 75, art. 1, n. 13.

16th Century—*Fisher*, Bishop of Rochester.

In the words of the institution, there is not one word from which the true presence of the flesh and blood in the mass can be proved. Contra Cap. Bab. c. 10, n. 2.

Seventh Ecumenical Council.

Great, holy and universal, held by Constantine V. with 338 Bishops, including the most eminent prelates in the Church: the mission church of Rome was not represented.

Col. Regia, tom. 17, p. 591.

At the 2nd Council of Nice, the seventh Council of Constantinople was denounced as *mendacious calumniators of Christ: the council of Iconoclasts*.

The church claim 377 bishops present—better opinion, 318. 6th Session, 6 Oct. A.D. 787.

Vid. Collectio Regia.

Sacrofancta concilia, tom. 8, p. 1046.

Images must be *adored* with relative affection, reserving to

God the higher worship of Latria : unanimous. 2nd Session of 2nd Nice, 27th September.

God does not prohibit the worship of manufactures.

Sacrofancta concilia, tom. 8. p. 759.

The text of this decree in the Roman authorities is an afterthought. Seven years after second Nice, the Council of Frankfort, called by Adrian I. A.D. 794, charges that Council by its second canon *de adorandis imaginibus*, with anathematizing all who do not worship images with the same adoration as the Holy Trinity. Eginhartus pretends that it is not the Council of Nice that passed the canon that Frankfort condemns, because it is called by Frankfort the Council of C. P. ; Fleury, more honest, although his conscience is galled by superstition, not only asserts the fact, but leaves Adrian with the stain of subterfuge.

It is well known that the seventh council of C. P. was not held at Constantinople, but at Hieres in Asia Minor, and only so called from its proximity to C. P. Nice, modern Isnick, is but seventy-five miles south-east of C. P. It is not supposable that the fathers at Frankfort, many of whom no doubt were at second Nice—the matter public and recent—

would have condemned that canon—disregarding Adrian's denial that such canon existed—without an official knowledge of its text.

Conc. Francofordiense, Col. Reg. tom. 20, p. 149.

Fleury, A. D. 794.

Pascallus.

Pasc. *ad Frudegardum*. Pasc. admits substantially the novelty of his doctrine.

Ratram, 12mo. Latin and French, 1686—he wrote this treatise by order of Charles the Bald, and dedicated it to him.

John Scotus—Erigena—his works were condemned at the council of Verceil, but not until 200 years after they were written.

Fleury, A. D. 859, lib. 49, sec. 51.

Scotus was a saint for many years—Baronius struck his name from the calendar—as unfound on the Eucharist.

Archbishop of Mentz, better known as Rabanus Maurus, Abbot of Fulda.

Epis. ad Heribal, cap. 33.

Berenger.

Council of Rome, A. D. 1059.

Ego Berengarius, &c. non solum sacramento, sed in veritate manibus sacerdotum, tractari, frangi, et fidelium dentibus atteri—also *relapse* of Berenger. Collec. Regia, tom. 25, p. 592.

6th Council of Rome, February, A.D. 1079.

De virgine natum—in cruce pependit—corpus in dextra Patris sedens esse, in proprietate naturae et veritate substantiae.

Judicious Omissions.

Tractari and *frangi fidelium dentibus*, are excluded from Berengarius' second confirmance of the faith.

Collec. Reg. tom. 26, p. 588.

The carnal theory of the Eucharist has been a source of chronic agitation to the Church. The minorite Friars, A.D. 1371, under the leadership of John de Laune, raised test questions with fanatic zeal.

If the host falls in a foul place or is eaten by a beast, is Christ thereby elevated to Heaven? or does he pass into the stomach, or does the bread resume its nature?

St. Thomas held that the bread, once changed to the body and divinity of Christ, could not be restored to its cereal nature. Viclefqui in England, contra; Gregory XI. would

not take the responsibility of deciding : at the suggestion of the grand Inquisitor, he declared all excommunicate who should entertain the questions.

Fleury, A. D. 1371, lib. 97, sec. 21.

Manner of the Eucharist.

Verona's substitute "to accommodate the views of both parties."

F. Paul. C. of Trent, lib. 4, p. 309, 310.

Edit. Lon. 1676.

Sacros. cons. tom. 20, p. 611.

Liberty of Conscience, &c.

Encyclical Pius IX. A. D. 1864.

Artificial Tenors.

Pius IX. suspends this practice during his reign : he is a rare instance of personal purity in the papacy. Antonelli has machiavellized the Pontiff, who commenced his career as a Reformer. There are many exemplary prelates in America, among whom Bishop McClosky is eminent for capacity and

private worth. The clergy of Cuba and Mexico have not yet felt the effects of the Reformation.

Baptism of Bells.

Now so common, was forbid by the capitular of Charlemagne. Fleury, A.D. 789, lib. 44, sec. 46.

The Diet of Nuremberg, A.D. 1518, condemned the practice as superstitious, its object being to drive away tempests and devils. Recently at Montreal 2 bells were baptised, one named Marie, the other Edward Albert Louis, with godfathers and godmothers.

Indulgences.

Trent, 4th December, A.D. 1563, 35th Session.

All are anathematized who deny this power to the Church.

Summa concil. tom. i. p. 598.

The world moves.

Galileo.

13th Century. Roger Bacon the philosopher was imprisoned six years by the General of his order (Franciscan) on charges like to those against Galileo.

Uera Crux.

The monks of St. Medard had a milk tooth of Christ.
At Laon they had the milk of the Virgin.

Fleury, A. D. 1124, lib. 67, sec. 36.

At the recent destruction of the convents of Mexico, Dr. Navarro, now Consul General from Mexico at New York took some of the relics, bones of saints—to the family of President Juarez; when broken they proved to be papier maché, made of music paper, lines and notes still distinct.

Honor and veneration to relics.

Trent 35th Session.

Summa conc. tom. i. p. 588.

Fruits of Sanctity.

Miracles are so-called. Miracles were performed by false relics at Dijon.

Fleury, A. D. 844, lib. 48, sec. 21.

Sacrifice—hostia.

Host,—victim or sacrifice. The mass continues the sacrifice of Christ.

But. cat. Eucharist.

Ultimatum.

More martyrs have been burnt for rejecting this doctrine than for disbelief in any other.

Pliant.

A. D. 597—Gregory I. instructs St. Augustine to accommodate the ceremonies of the Church to heathen rites.

Chalmers Dic. Aug.

Henry of Liege, nearly allied to the Duke of Brabant, consecrated Bishop before he was Priest, was guilty of crimes not fit to repeat : *he was advised by the Pope to be converted and not to trust to his youth.*

Fleury, A. D. 1273, lib. 86, sec. 27.

Benedict XII. promised Petrarch a dispensation that he might retain his benefices, if he married Laura.

Fleury, A. D. 1374, lib. 97, sec. 33.

Alexander VI. grants a dispensation to Ferdinand of Naples, to marry his own aunt, a child of 13.

Fleury, A. D. 1495, lib. 118, sec. 75.

Clement XI. instructs his missionaries to suit Christianity to the liking of the Emperor, and incorporate Chinese ceremonies in the ritual, A. D. 1700.—Life of Claude.

The Roman Church has a discriminating discipline (known as the policy of imitation) for every country. She would hesitate to trammel the Bible in the United States—as she does among more submissive nations.

The Maronites—originally monothelites, protected by Emperor Heraclius—are now incorporated in the Church of Rome—their priests marry—service in Arabic—mass in ancient Syriac.

The United Greeks estimated at two millions are united to Rome with reservations : their Priests marry—sacrament in both kinds : Greek fasts, and liturgy in Greek.

Unchurched.

The Patriarch of Antioch with advice of Patriarch of Constantinople, excommunicates the Pope and the whole Roman Church for persistent simony, usury and many other errors.

Fleury, A. D. 1238, lib. 81, sec. 11.

Ignored by the British Church.

The Reverend R. W. Morgan in his learned work—*St. Paul in Britain* proves beyond doubt that the Anglican

Church received her creed from the lips of the apostles.

Catena autoritatum.

Clemens Romanus, co-laborer with St. Paul: Tertullian, 2nd century—Eusebius, 3rd century—Chrysostom, 4th century—Theodoret, 5th century—&c. &c. &c.

St. Paul preached probably in both Greek and Latin. Cæsar states that the Greek was known to the Druids.

Mr. Morgan makes a probable case from the undersigned chronology of historical fragmenta, that Christianity was first introduced into Britain by Joseph of Arimathea, A. D. 36—quotes the admission of Cardinal Pole in Parliament A. D. 1555, that the Britons were the first to receive the Christian religion. At that date Rome was Pagan.

It is now generally admitted that Constantine, and his mother Helena, were native Britons of the Royal blood, and there can be little doubt that the East was more indebted for purity of faith to the Apostolic Church of Britain, than Britain to the East.

None but a lunatic would doubt, says Baronius, that Constantine and Helena were born in Britain.

Baronius ad. ann. 306.

Repudiated by Avignon.

From A. D. 1305 to 1377, seven Popes at Avignon—called by papal historians the Babylonish captivity of the Popes.

Their licentious lives provoked the Romans to expel them: ad interim, the Germans elected rival Popes at Rome.

Clement VII. at Avignon and Urban VI. at Rome excommunicate each other. Fleury, A. D. 1379, lib. 97, sec. 61.

Pope against Pope.

Stephen VII. A. D. 896, condemns his predecessor Formosus—A. D. 891—has his body exhumed and brought into council, dresses him in Pontifical robes, assigns him an advocate—calls on him to answer for his crimes—has 3 fingers cut off; the body thrown into the Tiber. Col. Regia, tom. 24, 688.

Stephen is put in irons and strangled.

Fleury, A. D. 896, lib. 54, sec. 27.

Pope Sergius III. condemns Formosus.

Fleury, A. D. 906, lib. 54, sec. 42.

A. D. 963, Pope John XII. drives Pope Leo VIII. from Rome.

A. D. 972, Benedict VI. and Boniface VII. are rival popes. Benedict is strangled, Boniface ejected.

Fleury, A. D. 972, lib. 56, sec. 36.

A. D. 997, Gregory V. Pope. John XVI. Anti-pope.

A. D. 1118, Gelasius II. Pope. Gregory VIII. Anti-pope.

A. D. 1130, Innocent II. Pope. Anacletus II. Anti-pope.

A. D. 1159, Alexander III. Pope. Victor IV. Anti-pope.

A. D. 1164, Alexander III. Pope. Pascal III. Anti-pope.

A. D. 1168, Alexander III. Pope. Calixtus. III. Anti-pope.

A. D. 1175, Alexander III. Pope. Innocent III. Anti-pope.

A. D. 1295, Boniface VIII. confines Ex-pope Celestin V. in a cell about the size of his body lest he may elect to resume the Pontificate he has resigned—guards him night and day with 6 knights and 30 soldiers. Celestin dies of cruelty. Boniface celebrates a solemn mass for him at Rome.

Fleury, A. D. 1295, lib. 89, sec. 41.

A. D. 1389, Pope Clement VII. at Avignon, and Pope Boniface IX. at Rome, interchange excommunication,

Fleury, lib. 54, sec. 42.

A. D. 1463, Pius II. issues a bull condemning his own books.

Fleury, lib. 112, sec. 101.

Council with Council.

Second Ecumenical Council of Nice, repudiates seventh Ecumenical Council of Constantinople. Col. Regia.

Council of Frankfort, called by the Pope, condemns the idolatry canon of 2nd Nice. See ante, p. 119.

Fleury, A. D. 794, lib. 44, sec. 38.

The Council of Rome condemns the council held by Pope Formosus same year. Stephen VII. Pope.

Col. Reg. tom. 24, p. 688.

Fleury, A. D. 896, lib. 54, sec. 28.

The Council of Rome condemns the Council of Stephen VII. and sustains Formosus.

Col. Reg. tom. 24, 903, A. D. 896, Col. Reg.

Sergius III. A. D. 906, condemns Formosus and honors Stephen VII.

The Pope and Council of Ferrara excommunicate the Council of Basle as seditious and contumacious.

Fleury, A. D. 1438, lib. 107, sec. 79.

The Council of Basle annuls the Council of Ferrara as schismatics and fornicators. 2nd Session.

Councils with Popes.

Council of Rome deposes John XII. for incest, murder, blasphemy, and elects Leo VIII.

Fleury, A. D. 963, lib. 56, sec. 6 and 7.

John XII. with most of the same council who deposed himself condemns Leo as adulterer and usurper; also condemns the council.

Fleury, A. D. 972 to 975, lib. 56, sec. 7.

Gregory VII. deposed by the Council of Worms.

Fleury, A. D. 1076, lib. 62, sec. 28.

The general Council of Pisa denounces Benedict XIII. A. D. 1394, and Gregory XII. A. D. 1406, as perjured heretics.

15th Session.

The Council of Constance deposes Pope John XXIII. for detestable habits.

Fleury, A. D. 1415, lib. 103, sec. 59.

Pope Eugenius IV. equips galleys to fight the galleys of the Council of Basle.

Fleury, A. D. 1437, lib. 107, sec. 44.

The Council of Basle deposes Pope Eugenius IV. as a perjured, incorrigible and dangerous heretic.

34th Session.

Fleury, A. D. 1439, lib. 108, sec. 74.

The Council of Milan suspends Julius II. in the name of

the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, as hardened, contumacious and incorrigible. 8th Session.

Fleury, A. D. 1512, lib. 122, sec. 113.

Prelacy.

Gregory I.—St. Gregory—describes the prelates as concealing wolves' teeth under the faces of sheep.

Fleury, A. D. 595, lib. 35, sec. 39.

The most holy bishops engage in war like the laity.

Fleury, A. D. 674, lib. 29, sec. 50.

Battle and bloodshed—murder at St. Peter's; quarrel between Pope and Bishop.

Fleury, A. D. 864, lib. 50, sec. 33.

Bishop Athanasius puts out the eyes of his brother, the Duke of Naples, sends him prisoner to Rome and usurps his Government. Pope John VIII. praises the bishop as loving God more than his brother and plucking out the eye that offended according to the precepts of the scripture.

Fleury, A. D. 877, lib. 52, sec. 47.

Council of Mayence—Shocking incest of bishops.

Fleury, A. D. 888, lib. 54, sec. 2.

Some of the clergy live in open licentiousness.

Fleury, A. D. 956, lib. 55, sec. 55.

King Edgar's address to the Council.

The clergy jest and laugh at masques, are drunkards, gamblers, gluttons, wantons.

Fleury, A. D. 969, lib. 56, sec. 30.

The Bishops, bigamists, drunkards, usurers, perjured, &c.—many of the clergy do not know the apostles' creed—guilty of every possible crime. Fleury, A. D. 974, lib. 56, sec. 44.

Benedict VIII. forbids the clergy to have mistresses—orders their children to be slaves in the churches where their fathers are priests. Fleury, A. D. 1022, lib. 58, sec. 47.

The prelates dream of nothing but the gratification of their brutal passions. Fleury, A. D. 1394, lib. 99, sec. 1.

The bishop of Prague causes a bishop to be beaten and a priest to be robbed and beaten.

Fleury, A. D. 1074, lib. 62, sec. 10.

In convention at London, the archbishop of York sits on the knees of the archbishop of Canterbury; their partizans then fight with fists and clubs. King laughs: the legate adjourns the Council, *sine die*. Fleury, A. D. 1176, lib. 72, sec. 58.

The Council of Ravenna condemns the conduct of the clergy as scandalous and contemptible—forbids the clergy to enter houses of debauchery or bear arms.

Fleury, A. D. 1317, lib. 92, sec. 37.

Debauchery the occupation of the clergy of Spain.

Fleury, A. D. 1473, lib. 114, sec. 8.

Clergy often appear in public with loose women.

Fleury, A. D. 1537, lib. 138, sec. 31.

Bloody fights with fists and clubs between the Greek and Roman priests were common at the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem until within a few years—the Turkish authorities interposed with force to restore peace.

Hierarchy.

St. Cyprian at the Council of Carthage charges the See of Rome with tyranny. Each bishop is answerable only to God.

Fleury, A. D. 256, lib. 7, sec. 29.

Canon of John VIII. confirmed at the Council of Troyes :
no layman, unless desired, must dare to sit in the presence of a bishop.

4 Sefs. Council of Troyes, A. D. 878.

Fleury, A. D. 878, lib. 52, sec. 53.

Gregory VII. threatens to anathematize all France unless King Philip abandons simony—the authority of Zachary who deposed the King of France, is given—Zachary also absolved the French from allegiance.

Fleury, A. D. 1073, lib. 62, sec. 6.

Gregory VII. deposes and excommunicates Henry, Roman Emperor—absolves his subjects from allegiance—authorises the election of another Emperor.

Fleury, A. D. 1076, lib. 62, sec. 36.

Gregory VII. deposes and excommunicates the Emperor of Germany—condemns him to be worsted in all combats—the anathema is in form of a letter to St. Peter, his brother Paul, and all the saints. Fleury, A. D. 1080, lib. 63, sec. 1.

Gregory VII. claims the right to subject all the kingdoms of Europe to the Papacy—he claims most of them as fiefs of St. Peter.

Fleury, A. D. 1081, lib. 63, sec. 8.

Hildebrand—Gregory VII. was elected Pope by acclamation of the lower orders of Rome, and called to his aid the arm of secular power—the act of canonical election is antedated to the day of his popular election *before Alexander was buried.*

Dupin, Hildebrand.

Celestin III. when crowning Henry VI.—kicks the crown which he holds in his hands, to the floor, to assert his claim to depose Emperors. Fleury, A. D. 1191, lib. 74, sec. 29.

Clement V. deposes John of England, and absolves his subjects from allegiance—no one may eat with him or speak to him under pain of excommunication.

Fleury, A. D. 1211, lib. 77, sec. 5.

The Council of Lateran with approval of Innocent III. orders large numbers of heretics to be delivered to the secular power for punishment—their property confiscated. Secular officers must swear to chase all heretics *pointed out by the Church* from their lands—Those suspected of heresy, after one year to be condemned as heretics.

Fleury, A. D. 1215, lib. 77, sec. 46.

Gregory IX. excommunicates the Emperor Frederick.

Fleury, A. D. 1215, lib. 79, sec. 38.

The Pope repeats the anathema and absolves the subjects of Frederick from allegiance.

Fleury, A. D. 1229, lib. 79, sec. 57.

Gregory IX. writes to St. Louis, King of France, that God has confided to him imperial power over Earth and

Heaven—threatens him with excommunication—St. Louis pays no attention to the demands of the Pope.

Fleury, A. D. 1236, lib. 80, sec. 54.

The decrees of Councils where legates presided prepared at Rome—no one permitted to examine them.

Fleury, A. D. 1237, lib. 81, sec. 7.

The Emperor's manifesto styles the Pope, the great dragon that seduces the world, antichrist, Balaam, the Prince of darkness—German prelates support the Emperor.

Fleury, A. D. 1239, lib. 81, sec. 24.

The Pope after deposing the Emperor of Germany, offers the Empire to Count Robert, brother of St. Louis, King of France.

Fleury, A. D. 1240, lib. 81, sec. 36.

Innocent IV. wishes to escape to England—the English say—*we will not permit the Pope in person to rob the Church and Kingdom.*

Fleury, A. D. 1244, lib. 81, sec. 17.

The Pope abstracts more money from England than comes to the hands of the King.

Fleury, A. D. 1245, lib. 82, sec. 28.

Innocent IV. by Encyclical, dated 25th June, 1251, *invites the heavens and earth to rejoice at the death of the*

Emperor Frederick. Fleury, A. D. 1251, lib. 83, sec. 25.

In procession of the consecration of Boniface VIII. the King of Sicily holds the Pope's bridle, and waits on him at table, wearing his crown.

Fleury, A. D. 1295, lib. 89, sec. 35.

Julius II. excommunicates Louis XII. of France, and offers his kingdom to the first who would seize it—he marches at the head of his armies against the Duke of Ferrara.

Fleury, A. D. 1510, lib. 121, sec. 112.

Julius II. conducts the siege of Mirandola, rides over the field—night and day in the batteries—points the cannon—harangues the troops.

Fleury, A. D. 1511, lib. 122, sec. 1.

Leo X. creates a cardinal aged eight years, on condition that he should not exercise his functions until the age of fourteen.

Fleury, A. D. 1517, lib. 125, sec. 7.

Paul III. creates his two nephews cardinals—ages fourteen and sixteen.

Fleury, A. D. 1534, lib. 134, sec. 162.

Pius V. excommunicates Queen Elizabeth as a rotten member of the Church's body—slave of crime—monstrous usurper—dispenses her subjects from their oath of fidelity—all excommunicated who obeyed her orders—Felton posts the

bull on the house of the Bishop of London.

Fleury, A. D. 1570, lib. 173, sec. 2 and 3.

Sixtus V. excommunicates the King of Navarre.

Fleury, A. D. 1585, lib. 177, sec. 33.

The King of Navarre posts Monsieur Sixtus, the heretic, antichrist, self-styled Pope—as a liar, on the palaces of the cardinals, on the houses of Rome, and on the doors of the Vatican.

Fleury, A. D. 1585, lib. 177, sec. 35, 36.

Sixtus V. excommunicates Queen Elizabeth—*she has not rendered homage for England as a fief of Rome*—offers a reward for the seizure of her person, that she may be punished for her crimes—he opens the treasures of the Church to all who execute his orders.

Fleury, A. D. 1588, lib. 178, sec. 32.

Sixtus V. excommunicates Henry III. King of France.

Fleury, A. D. 1589, lib. 178, sec. 110.

Vicars of Christ.

Impious and infamous.

At the election of Damasus—the two factions fight—137

dead bodies of men, women, and children found in the church besieged by Damafus.

Fleury, A. D. 366, lib. 16, sec. 8.

Sergius III. having been elected Pope, A. D. 891, and exiled seven years, is recalled—he declares John IX. and Benedict IV. Leo V. and Christopher, the three Popes following him, usurpers.

Theodora, mistress of Sergius III. absolute in the Government of Rome—her two daughters, Marofia and Theodora, less circumspect than herself—Pope John XI. the son of Sergius and Marofia, A. D. 931.

Fleury, A. D. 907, lib. 54, sec. 42.

John X. is elected Pope by the interest of Theodora, his paramour.

Fleury, A. D. 912, lib. 54, sec. 49.

John XII. elected Pope at the age of 18—grandson of Marofia and her husband Alberic—raises troops and attacks the Prince of Capua—John XII. changes his name from Octavian: the first instance of change of name in papal history.

Fleury, A. D. 956, lib. 55, sec. 50.

The Council of Rome condemns John XII.

1. He ordained a boy of 10 years a bishop—simony.

2. He abused several women, one of them, the mistress of his father—called incest.
3. He had made the sacred palace a place of debauchery—also an incendiary.
4. He put out the eyes of his spiritual adviser, resulting in death.
5. He killed a cardinal, sub-deacon, first mutilating him in a manner not proper to repeat.
6. He drank for the love of the devil and invoked heathen Gods.
7. He did not observe matins—neglected to make the sign of the cross.

The Pope does not deny any of the charges, but excommunicates the Council in the name of God Almighty.

Fleury, A. D. 963, lib. 56, sec. 6, 7.

John XII. the above Pope is killed by a blow on the head in the commission of adultery.

Fleury, A. D. 964, lib. 56, sec. 10.

Benedict IX. aged 12 years, elected Pope by bribery—his life is infamous—reigns eleven years.

Fleury, A. D. 1033, lib. 59, sec. 31.

Benedict IX. is driven from his palace for murder and other crimes.

Sylvester III. becomes Pope—Benedict IX. returns to Rome with his forces and continues his excesses—sells his pontifical rights to enjoy more license in pleasure, for 1500 livres to John Gratian who takes the name of Gregory VI.—*non obstante*—the purchase and sale—Gregory VI. Sylvester III. and Benedict IX. all claim the Papacy.

Fleury, A. D. 1044, lib. 59, sec. 47.

Leo IX. marches his army, collecting all the rabble he can enlist, against the Normans—a bloody fight—the Pope is captured—he releases the Normans from excommunication as the price of his liberty. Fleury, A. D. 1053, lib. 59, sec. 82.

Alexander IV. on his death bed orders the Inquisitors to sell the confiscated property of heretics and apply the proceeds to the needs of the Church.

Fleury, A. D. 1261, lib. 85, sec. 7.

Clement V. sells his benefices—his mistress is the beautiful Countess of Perigord—he speaks of it openly—leaves immense wealth to *nephews*.

Fleury, A. D. 1314, lib. 92, sec. 11. Villani.

Clement VI. licentious as archbishop and Pope—exceeds the young nobles in gallantry.

Fleury, A. D. 1352, lib. 96, sec. 13. Villani.

Innocent VIII. has seven children—different mothers—before his election—the exact sums of money and names of the *Chateaux* given to the Cardinals to secure the election specified—generous and courteous before his election—took for his motto *I will wash my hands in innocence*.

Fleury, A. D. 1484, lib. 115, sec. 142 and 145.

Corps of Innocent VIII. hooted with maledictions by the populace in defiance of military authority.

Fleury, A. D. 1492, lib. 117, sec. 30.

Alexander VI. (Borgia) is elected Pope—his Holiness is forthwith adored by the Cardinals: the cross placed in the window: the prelates kiss his feet: the young nobles have a torch light carousal in the Place of St. Peter's and receive the approval of the Pope.

Alexander VI. has four sons and a daughter: their mother is the wife of Dominic Arimano—his second son, Cæsar, a cardinal.

Fleury, A. D. 1492, lib. 117, sec. 31.

Alexander VI. seeks the assistance of the Turks against

the French.

Fleury, A. D. 1494, lib. 117, sec. 90.

Alexander VI. in an attempt to poison four of his richest cardinals whose heir he is as Pope, poisons himself and dies.

Fleury, A. D. 1503, lib. 120, sec. 5.

Julius III. creates the keeper of his monkey, a cardinal.

Fleury, A. D. 1549, lib. 145, sec. 156.

Julius II. Leo X. Clement VII. and Paul III. all believe in astrology.

Fleury, A. D. 1559, lib. 154, sec. 32.

Sixtus V. feigns decrepitude : before the votes were fully counted, assured of his election, he flings his crutch into the middle of the hall, stands erect and looks like a man of 30, and sings the *Te Deum* with a ringing voice.

Fleury, A. D. 1585, lib. 177, sec. 22.

Sixtus V. in council applauds the zeal and courage of Jaques Clement, the murderer of Henry III.

Fleury, A. D. 1589, lib. 178, sec. 121.

Shifting Creed.

The first Council of Nice A. D. 325, prohibits any additions to the creed (Nicene).

Cup.

A. D. 1195. The Council of Clermont decrees the communion in both kinds—28th canon—*nisi corpus, separatim et sanguinem*, &c. Col. Reg. tom. 26, p. 663.

The Council of Constance admits that the primitive Church communed in both kinds, but decrees that whoever so communes is a heretic, must be subjected and punished.

Fleury, A. D. 1415, lib. 103, sec. 79.

The general Council of Basle gives the Cup to the Hufites—*non obstante*, they declare it a heresy.

Fleury, A. D. 1436, lib. 107, sec. 14.

Twenty prelates of the one hundred and sixty-six voting at the Council of Trent, favored the cession of the cup : there were six conflicting views respecting it.

Fleury, 1562, lib. 160, sec. 37.

The Cup was first forbidden by the Latins A. D. 1300, although instituted by Christ, preached by the apostles, and observed by all Christian nations to that time.

Father Paul, Conc. Trent, p. 153.

Cardinal St. Angelo at Trent, would not give a cup full of such deadly *poysen* to the people of France : it was better

to let them die : the French ambaffador did not think it right to give the name of poyfon to the *bloud* of Chrift, nor that of poyfoners to the apoftles.

Father Paul, Conc. Trent, p. 430.

Purgatory.

Unsettled until the Council of Florence 15th century—based on 2 Macc. xii. 46, Apocrypha.

See Butler's cat. purgatory.

Immaculate Conception.

Did not become a doctrine of the Church until the present century.

Transubstantiation.

Penance.

A sacrament by which venial fins, committed after baptism, are forgiven.

Papacy.

Indulgences.

Conc. Trid. XI. 25, Butler's cat.

Mariolatry.

Infallibility.

The forged Decretals embracing the period from Clemens Romanus to Servitius, 300 years—pseudo Isidorian collection—for many centuries were law to the Church—although now allowed to be spurious, the Papacy clings to the material advantages of the fraud, to wit : the supremacy of the See of Rome, &c. &c.

Tradition.

Of equal authority with holy writ.

Butler's cat. lesson.

Hail Mary.

The above ten and many other novelties were adopted after the prohibition of the first Council of Nice.

Two Natures of Christ.

The Nestorians were excommunicated A. D. 431, for holding among other views, two natures of Christ.

The Council of Chalcedon, A. D. 451, confirmed the doctrine of the two natures of Christ, which the Church had repudiated.

Mangling and Shackling of Scripture.

Scripture was first forbidden to the Laity at the Council of Thouloufe, A. D. 1229—a Pfalter, breviary and hours of the Virgin being allowed but not in the vulgar tongue.

Fleury, A. D. 1229, lib. 79, sec. 58.

Celibacy.

The power and crimes of Rome are all referable to the confessional and celibacy. If marriage be conceded to the clergy, said the Cardinal di Carpo at Trent—the priests not being dependent on the Pope, but on their Prince, the authority of the Apostolic See would be confined to the walls of Rome.

The Roman Church calls celibacy, a holier state than that

from which Enoch was translated, and imposed by God on the high Priest of the Israelites, Levit. xxi. 14—and in which Abraham, the friend of God, lived—James ii. 23.

In 1 Timothy iii. 2, we are told that a Bishop must be the husband of one wife.

In 1 Timothy iii. 4 and 5, his children must be in subjection or how shall he take care of the Church of God?

In 1 Timothy iv. 3—*The Spirit speaketh expressly that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith forbidding to marry.*

1 Timothy iii. 11—Paul instructs deacons how to choose their wives.

The blessed Virgin was married—Peter, *first Pope*, was married—all did well—those who in times of persecution were hiding in the clefts of the rocks did better to remain single.

Terrific reaction.

Notes omitted.

Schism.

Vid. conflicts of councils, popes, &c.

Dominicans and Franciscans—on immaculate conception—
lasted many centuries.

Schism at Florence. A. D. 1062.

Schism at Worms. 1076.

Schism during vacancy of Papacy after death of Celestin
IV. — 1 year and 8 months. 1241.

Innocent IV. a fugitive—no one will shelter him. 1244.

Papal throne vacant 2 years and 9 months	}	1269-71.
Gregory X. elected by compromise		

Thomists and Scotists : efficacy of grace and imm. con.

Papal See vacant from death of Clement V. 20th April,
1314, to John XXII. 28th June, 1316.

Jesuits and Jansenists on the doctrine of grace.

The history of the Church is a history of Schism.

Subterfuge.

Gregory VII. says that the Church has dissembled many
things which were subsequently adjusted with great care.

Fleury, A. D. 1080, lib. 73, sec. 7.

Gregory VII. claims that the Roman church has never erred.

Fleury, A. D. 1081, lib. 73, sec. 11.

Forged decretals—vid. ante, p. 147.

Corrupting canons—text of authors, &c. Vid. ante, p. 119.

Harbor of Slave Ships.

The ports of Spanish Islands are the only harbors of slave ships.

It is now proposed in Spain to restore the Inquisition.

Ireland.

Adrian IV. A. D. 1155, by bull authorizes Henry II. of England to reduce Ireland, to establish pure Christianity, claiming all the Islands professing Christianity as fiefs of the Church. He requires Henry to subject the Irish to the laws of England, extirpate their vices, and tax them a penny on each house as dues to St. Peter.

Fleury, A. D. 1156, lib. 70, sec. 16.

Previous to that time Ireland called the land of saints from the purity of her people.

In virtue of this sale or gift in A. D. 1169, an English

army invades Ireland. In 1361, the province of Ulster still independent: In 1541 Henry VIII. whose title is Lord of Ireland under the Pope, is proclaimed King by the Irish Parliament—the island not conquered until 1603, by the invasion of the Spaniards at the request of the Pope.

Peter.

The papacy is based on Matt. xvi. 18—*Thou art Peter; on this rock I will build my Church.* Protestants show that Cyril, Jerome, Chrysostom, Leo I, Hilary, Ambrose, &c, referred *πετρα*—rock—sometimes to Peter, sometimes to his confession, sometimes to Christ. St. Augustine in his *Retractions*, is satisfied that it applies only to Christ.

Peter as spokesman of the Apostles, makes the first inspired avowal of the Messiahship—Christ answers—thou art *πετρος*—Peter—a stone or piece of rock, and on this *πετρα*—rock—I will build my Church—not on the flesh, but on the faith of Peter, or as Augustine hath it, on Christ himself—for we know that *the Church was built on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ being the chief corner stone*—Eph. ii. 20.

Our Savior used the word *keys* to designate Peter's office as first, to open the Church to Jews and Gentiles : so Peter understood it—Acts xv. 7.

In his discharge of that duty he introduced the present policy of Rome—*imitation*—for which he was blamed by Paul and checked by the Council of Jerusalem.

No supremacy was ever claimed by or accorded to Peter : on the contrary, at the Council of Jerusalem, Peter was defendant ; James as President gave the decree commencing, *My sentence is*, &c, and also ruled against the worship of images—Acts xv. 19, overruled by 2nd Nice which was again overruled by the Council of Frankfort.

Had Peter been Primate, no power was given by Christ to his successor—nor did Peter appoint a successor, but instructed the Presbyters *not to be lords over Christ's heritage*—1 Peter v. 3.

The same power was given to all the apostles to bind and loose—to remit sins, &c.—John xx. 23. Matt. xviii. 18.

Moreover the ultramontane rock, not as bad as Judas, yet was most exceptionable—the foolish Peter walked on the water : the vengeful Peter cut off Malchus' ear : the Juda-

ising Peter was withstood by Paul to the face—the infidel Peter rebuked his master and received from Christ the name of Satan—Matt. xvi. 23—*vade post me Satana*, in the Vulgate. Satana is the proper Hebrew name of the Devil—so applied 34 times in the New Testament and only so applied, the word used for Satan in the wilderness—Luke iv. 8.

The parallel of Peter with the Papacy fails with Peter's reformation; the offensive Peter *that favoured not of the things that be of God, but of those that be of men*—the faithless Peter that after his confession and boastful love, although forewarned and invested with the keys, denies his Master again and again, with curses and oaths—denies himself—takes up his cross and follows Christ.

Peter was never at Rome except by tradition—Paul wrote to the Romans calling many by name—he wrote six letters from Rome, but neither in those letters, nor in the narrative of the *Acts* does it appear that Peter was ever there. There can be no question that Peter was at Corinth—He wrote from Babylon, the See of his Diocese—thither no doubt, he led his wife, and there no doubt he died, after fulfilling the duties of husband, father and bishop.

Patrimony of St. Peter.

In the eighth century, all the Princes of the Merovingian family being imbecile, the Mayors of the Palace exercised royal authority over the Franks. Charles Martel held this rank at his death—his son and successor Pepin, ambitious of the title of King, consulted Pope Zachary who replied *that he should have the name of King who had the power of a King.* Pepin was crowned A. D. 752, and confined Childeric III. King of France and his son, Theodoric, in separate monasteries.

Rome was attacked by the Lombards—Stephen II. presuming on the credulity of Pepin, sent him a letter in imitation of the Epistles—*Paul, called to be an Apostle of Jesus Christ, Son of the living God, &c.* in which the Apostle Paul conjured Pepin in the name of the virgin, angels, martyrs, saints, to aid his spiritual mother and fight the Lombards, promising, if obedient, eternal salvation ; if contumacious, the penalties of hell.

Pepin, conscious that his only claim to the Crown was derived from the Pope attacked and defeated the Lombards and gave to the Papacy as Patrimony of St. Peter 22 Lom-

bard cities—whence arose the temporal power of the Popes.

Flcury, A. D. 741, lib. 42, sec. 24.

„ 752, lib. 43, sec. 1.

„ 755, lib. 43, sec. 17.

„ 755, lib. 43, sec. 18.

Liberated Africans.

Pastoral of Rt. Rev. Augustin Verot, Bishop of Savannah, to Churches of Georgia and Florida, Sep. 1866.

Plenary Council of Baltimore, 1866.

Pius IX. is the only sovereign that conveyed his sympathy by letter to Mr. Davis during the Southern rebellion.

Letter of Bishop Quinlan and others, of Mobile, to Pius IX. May, 1867.

Faithful Shepherds, &c.

Letter of Cardinal Barnabo—Prefect of the Propaganda. March 5, 1866.

Latin race.

Napolcon III. to General Forey—*Moniteur*, January 16, 1863.

Translation of Papacy.

Pius IX.—allocation—October 31, 1866—If need be he will seek the freer exercise of his ministry in a foreign land.

Dec. 17, 1866—the leading Romanists of the Council of Baltimore invite the Pope by letter to visit the United States.

The evident sympathy for the Fenians in the Federal States is mainly due to their defiance of the Roman Church.—There is a reckless tendency among American politicians to bid for popularity—The chief executive of the U. S. was conspicuous in the Plenary Council of Baltimore.

The same motive largely enters into the design of absorbing Mexico, Cuba, and Canada.

In the Roman *Ordo* of 1866, page 52—It seems that the *Hierarchy* in the United States is divided into seven Provinces and five apostolic vicariates. Page 49, the *Hierarchy* is John Mary Mastai Feratti—crowned June 1, 1846, at Rome.

On page 64, the Bishop of Axieron who succeeded the Bishop of Basilopolis has charge of the *partes*—infidel regions—*infidelium*—omitted here, but not omitted on page 53—province of Oregon—comprising the province of New

York south of 42 degrees north latitude, except Long Island.

On page 54, the Propaganda decides that the Sec of Baltimore has precedence in America—The Bishp of Lingone, Baltimore, has a chancellor, and a council of 12 ecclesiastics.

Page 72, the Bishp of Pompciopolis lives *in partibus* at Cincinnati. The Bishp of Claudiopolis has charge of the space between 29th and 31st degrees of north latitude, which are not *in partibus*.

It does not appear by the Gazetteer that Claudiopolis, Pompciopolis or Basilopolis are cities in America.

Of the 310 churches in the City of New York, the Pro-

testant Episcopalians have	60
Presbyterians	43
Hebrews—Synagogues	26
Romanists	33
Ritualists—St. Albans	1

In the United States the Papacy has Bishps and Arch-	
bishps 47

Mitred Abbots	3
Priests	2400
Churches	3671
Colleges, Schools and Academies	1500
Convents, strictly so called	99

A large number of Monasteries.

A. D. 1867, the Papal population is about 6,500,000 : in 1831, about 600,000.

Confessional.

Husbands and fathers of daughters may consult Sanchez to learn the questions authorized by the Church : and Dens, to learn the standard of purity of the Confessor—Dens is a textbook at Maynooth. Liguori, a similar *free* authority has been a saint fourteen years.

Jesuit Pestilence.

By Jesuit statistics published in Rome, February, 1865, the Society has 7,728 members, of which there are 726 in North America, 1 in Mexico, 28 on the continent of Europe out of the Roman States—In the United States they often

conceal the name of Jesuit under some less odious designation.

Plague Spot.

Roman Catholic churches and institutions, especially those of the Jesuits, largely depreciate values of Real Estate in their vicinity.

The People of the United States now tolerate the Roman worship; the Pope excludes from the City of Rome, the Churches of all creeds but his own. What may Americans expect if Rome should gain the political ascendancy at which she now openly aims? The American Protestant Chapel within the walls of Rome has caused much contention—it is however as yet unmolested.

The Papal Church in the United States has recently adopted the title of *Roman Catholic*. It appears in large iron gilt letters over the gate of the Asylum in 5th Avenue, New York—*Roman Catholic Male Orphan Asylum*.

Pasquin ever critical and classical has latinized the word *male*, in dividing the syllables *ma* and *le*, by the point of the gothic arch: an opinion, entitled to respect, traces this reading, to a *Bull of Milesius*.

Massacre of St. Bartholomew.

25,000 butchered in the Provinces.

50,000 at Paris—the carnage continued a week.

See Fleury, Sismondi, and Froude.

Charles IX. and his Court join the procession formed to return thanks to God for the success of the massacre—medals struck to perpetuate its memory—Charles makes an edict from the throne of *Justice*, that all had been done by his orders.

Fleury, A. D. 1752, lib. 173, sec. 35.

Gregory XIII. goes in procession from St. Peter's to the Church of St. Louis, returns thanks to God, and strikes medals in honor of the occasion.

[A large painting of the massacre still remains on the walls of the Vatican, a memorial of the Pope's gratification and approval—public attention is not drawn to it—although much obscured by dirt, the antiquary may identify it by the inscription.]

Philip II. of Spain attends the eulogium of the massacre. It is styled *the triumph of the Church militant*.

Fleury, A. D. 1752, lib. 173, sec. 39.

Philip is never known to have laughed during his whole life except at the announcement of the massacre. Froude.

Charles IX. amused himself by shooting from the windows of his palace all that came within reach.

Priests with crucifixes and swords headed the murderous gangs, inciting them to kill friends and relatives.

Farce of Trent.

The legates write to Rome that the instructions of the Pope would make them the ridicule of the world.

Fleury, A. D. 1546, lib. 142, sec. 41.

To secure a majority of votes, the Pope sends back the Venetian bishops who had left the Council for their homes.

Fleury, A. D. 1546, lib. 144, sec. 11.

The papalins are abusive: the merry prelates could not forbear obscene jokes. Father Paul—Trent, 598.

Henry II. of France for a long time refuses to send delegates, as the Council is neither free nor general.

Fleury, A. D. 1551, lib. 146, sec. 121.

Cardinal Loraine says the Council is not free, and its infolency great. Coun. Trent, Father Paul, 593, 594.

The chief legate enjoins secrecy on the fathers, lest the world might know how little of moderation and harmony exists in the Council; many shed tears of shame, but conceal the facts until they become notorious.

Fleury, A.D. 1562, lib. 158, sec. 74.

The Council is completely under the control of Pius IV.—this fact gives occasion to the witticism of the French ambassador, *that the Holy Spirit comes from Rome to Trent in a mail bag.*

Fleury, A.D. 1562, lib. 159, sec. 12, &c.

Pius IV. during the Council, orders the Inquisition to cite Cardinal Caligni and several archbishops to Rome, to answer to the charge of favoring heresy. F. Paul, Coun. Trent.

Cursed be all heretics.

Card. *Anathema cunctis hæreticis.*

Resp. *Anathema—Anathema.*

The last words of the last general Council of Rome in the afternoon of Saturday the 4th day of December, 1563, A.D. 35th Sess.

Collectio Regia, Paris, tom. 35, p. 638.

Summa conciliorum, tom. 1, p. 600

The 255 delegates subscribe under pain of excommunication.

The Cardinal of Loraine leads this acclamation with a voice of thunder: the hall shakes with the enthusiastic response.

Cardinal Loraine entered the Council in the opposition, complaining that the Council was packed by tools of the Pope, and that it was neither general nor free: he was *con-ciliated* by Pius on his visit to Rome at the Pope's invitation—Loraine had committed the acclamations to writing.—It was remarked that such premeditated use of the word *heretics*, included the then present, past and future.



BOUND BY *
ROSS & REMNANT *
LONDON *

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library



1 1012 01030 5946