

cannot endure to behold even the death of one executed by law? those who have renounced, as we have, the shows of the gladiators and of the beasts, believing that there is but little difference between him who beholds, and him who commits the murder!" You have seen Origen justifying their profound silence respecting the mysteries by the example of the philosophers, of the Greeks and barbarians; you have seen him in his turn reproaching Celsus for reproaching the secret kept by the Christians, while he knew not in what that secret consisted. Such were the replies of the apologists: and such also they must have been, to be consistent with our belief. But according to the doctrine of the reformation these replies become inconceivable and absurd. For is it not absurd to establish a secret and instead of being induced by the most powerful reason to break it, still to continue obstinately to preserve and justify it, even when they knew nothing in it worth concealing?*

* Truth obliges me to say that one of these apologists has not hesitated to remove the veil and lay open the mystery of the altar. Justin has done it in his first apology. We shall endeavour soon to detect his motive for so doing. But as he thought proper to act in this manner, we will ask: what did he discover? what did he make known? This is a curious and important point to ascertain. For most assuredly the doctrine that he discovered was the doctrine of the Church—the precise doctrine so carefully concealed by the other Christians. This disclosure must for ever decide the question between us. Let the Reformation triumph, as is just, let the apologist here declare in formal or equivalent terms, that the bread and wine blessed by the bishop were received by the faithful merely as, signs of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, absent in heaven: that the bread, without undergoing any change, ceased notwithstanding to be regarded as ordinary bread, because it was offered to God as an emblematical figure representing his Son. Will Justin hold such language as this? Let us hear him with attention; these are the words to the point: they are big with interest and importance. "This food we call the Eucharist, of which they alone are allowed to partake, who believe the doctrines taught by us, and have been regenerated by water for the remission of sin, and who live as Christ ordained. For we do not take these gifts as common bread and common drink, but as Jesus Christ, our Saviour, made man by the word of God, took flesh and blood for our salvation; in like manner, we have been taught, that the food which has been blessed by the prayer of the words which he spoke, and by which our flesh and blood, in the change, are nourished, becomes the flesh and blood of that Jesus incarnate." Such is the doctrine which Justin made no difficulty in revealing to the Emperor: you have here the word of God compared to the prayer of Jesus Christ; the same power and efficacy is attributed to each; by the former Jesus Christ became man, by the latter, the bread and wine become his body and blood, and this change is not less real than was that of his incarnation. From this springs the following short and decisive argument. Justin here discovers that, which the Christians universally concealed in secrecy. Now what he discovers is the Catholic doctrine; therefore the Catholic doctrine had been universally concealed in secrecy among the Christians. Pray, reflect upon this argument, alone should open your eyes to the system of belief that you are seeking in the primitive church. But what motive could induce the apologist to

From the Catholic Press.

THE REFORMERS AND THE ANCIENT HERETICS.

Did Luther, Calvin & Co revive the condemned Maxims and Doctrines of the ancient Heretics?

MR. EDITOR,

Having abrogated the holy sacrifice of the Mass, in which the body and blood of Christ are offered up to God in union with the sacrifice upon Calvary, it was but advancing another step in the march of the Reformation, to deny the real presence in the Holy Eucharist. It was a step, however, which Luther would not, and indeed could not venture to take, though he eagerly desired it. "If any person could persuade me, (he used to say) that there is nothing in the sacrament but bread and wine, he would do me a great favor. I have tried (he adds) to extricate myself from the belief in the real presence, for I know that thereby I would greatly an-

maké so public an exposure, contrary to the general discipline of secrecy to which we find but this single exception recorded in history. To form a correct judgment upon the conduct of Justin, we should thoroughly understand how the writer was circumstanced. For my own part, I should be inclined to consider this first apology as a private memorial presented to the Emperor alone, he probably having called for such a declaration from the Christians. The title prelacing the document to be addressed to the Emperor or the Senate and the Roman People, in no wise deters me from venturing this conjecture, since it was possibly nothing more than the usual form of petitions. In his second apology addressed to Marcus Aurelius and the Senate he entreats him to publish it that the world may be enabled to form an opinion upon the Christians. We find no such request in the first from which we may infer that he neither intended nor desired its publication. As he exposes the great mysteries of religion, which it was forbidden to publish we are to presume that he did not apprehend that they would be published and that his object was not to divulge the secret but merely to make a confidential communication of it, to one most deserving of confidence, an excellent Prince who was considered as a second Socrates upon the throne. The Prince does not appear to have betrayed the confidence reposed in him, for we do not find the pagans any better informed, in consequence of it. Thus the event would have justified the apologist on the supposition that he confided the secret to Antoninus alone, with the hope, that so just and sensible a prince would terminate the bloody persecutions of the Christians, when once he became better acquainted with their real character. Although this expectation was not entirely, it was at least partially realized. Whether it was that Antoninus did not do all that he could, or, which is perhaps more probable, could not do all that he wished, the persecutions did not entirely cease, and, on this account, we regret to find considerable numbers of martyrs in the subsequent years of his reign. This much however is certain, that he published edicts favourable to the Christians.

He had received letters from various governors of provinces consulting him on the mode of treatment to be adopted in their regard, to which he replied that they must not be molested; unless they were discovered plotting against the state. He wrote also to the cities of his empire, prohibiting the Christians to be disturbed; and by name, to Larissa, Thessalonica and Athens and to all the Greeks. Of this we are informed by the historians Rufinus and Eusebius, and also by Melito, bishop of Sardes, in his apology addressed shortly after to Marcus Aurelius.

noy the Pope; but the text of the gospel is too plain.* Thus poor Luther was obliged to continue sore against his will in the belief of the real presence. The express declaration of Jesus Christ in promising this heavenly food, and in presenting it to his disciples at the Last supper, chained down even Luther's stubborn mind, to this belief. But Zuingle and his Calvinistic associates were not bound to Luther's interpretation of the sacred text. *Nullius addictus jurare in verba magistri*, was the motto of their sect, from which the words of Luther or of Christ, like the words of the Church or the Pope were not to be excepted. They had become free in the enjoyment of that glorious Gospel liberty which allowed them to "think what they pleased, and say what they thought;" and therefore they would not submit to the dictation of Luther or any other man. They had the Bible, and the means of understanding it as well as he; and they determined to exercise their right of private interpretation, which was the grand principle by which they justified their schism and heresy and by means of which they too, hoped by the boldness of their opinions to rise to celebrity; a distinguished honor which they could not expect, if they tamely walked in the footsteps of Luther or the Pope. Accordingly they now started in advance of Luther in the march of Reformation. It was in vain he proclaimed himself an Evangelist, and that, *whoever did not receive his doctrine could not be saved.*† He stormed and threatened "to recant all he had written and taught," and return to the Pope; but they cared not.‡ He called them *heretics, blasphemers, infidels &c;*;" but to no purpose. They bid defiance to his threats, they smiled at his anathemas; for they knew that his was but human authority, that they had as good a right and were as competent to interpret the rule of faith—the Bible, as he could be, and where he found a real presence, they could discover nothing but a real absence. Moreover they had received light and assistance, to which Luther laid no claims on this point, though he had acknowledged such favors on other occasions. It was by the counsel and instruction of Satan, that he tells us he was induced to suppress the Mass; and Zuingle had the advantage of the same monitor, who appeared to him by night to suggest that passage from Exodus, chap. xii. 11, by which he learned to understand the words *this is my body*, as if Christ had said "this signifies my body." It is true indeed that Zuingle does not like Luther absolutely state that his nocturnal visitor was Satan himself.—"He does not remember, he says, whether the spirit was

* Si quispiam mihi persuadere potuisset, in sacramento, preter panem et vinum nihil esse, ille magno beneficio a me derivatum me reddidisset, omnibus nervis me extricare conatus sum, cum probe perciperem hac in re papam cum primis me valde incommodare posse. Verus textus evangelii nimis apertus est. *Luth. Epis. ad Argent. Tom. vii.*

† Quisquis doctrinam meam non acceptaverit, salvari non potest. *Luth. Conf. Statum. Eccles.*

‡ Non dubitabo omnium quæ scripsi aut docui pallodium canere, a vobis discedere. *Sermo. Tom. vii. 270 276.* Sacramentarii heretici, blasphemæ, infideles, &c.