thesis—There is not an expression in the Fathers, respecting the Eucharist, which cannot be reconciled with the doctrines of the Catholic Church at the present day; whilst, on the other hand, there are thousands which cannot, by any process of interpretation, be reconciled with the modern Protestant doctrine, of a mere figurative presence, or a mere imaginary eating, and drinking, of Christ's flesh, and blood.

We must first consider the circumstances under which the Fathers wrote; also, to whom, and why, they wrote;—by attending to these circumstances, we shall easily be able to account for all their apparent discrepancies of language. In the first place then, we must remember that, during the first centuries of the Christian era, the "Discipline of the Secret" was rigidly enforced. The object of this discipline was to prevent the uninitiated heathen from becoming acquainted with the Christian mysteries. Even to the Catechumens it was not granted to raise the veil which concealed the sublime mysteries of our faith; and the greatest precautions were adopted lest the doctrines of the Church should be divulged to any, save the faithful. For this purpose, the Mass was divided into two distinct portions—the first, called the "Mass of the Catechumens," because the presence even of the Catechumens was allowed up to the public recitation of the Symbol, or profession of Faith;—the second, called "of the Faithful," because—as the Creed was known only to the initiated, and could not be recited even in the presence of any others—after the reading of the Gospel, the Catechumens were dismissed, lest they should obtain insight into the sacred mysteries; and the "Faithful," or initiated, alone, were allowed to remain. Hence the distinction—which obtained for many centuries after the Ascension of our Lord—"Missa Catechumenorum"—and "Missa Fidelium." Of this, the primitive usage, the Catholic Church has preserved some traces to the present day; as, for instance, the custom of repeating the Lord's Prayer aloud, when it occurs during the Canon of the Mass; but, in silence, at Vespers, and during all her other services. This difference thus originated. During the Canon of the Mass, the Faithful, or initiated, *only*, were allowed to be present; before them, therefore, there was no danger in reciting the essentially Christian prayer in an audible voice; but, at Vespers, and the other services, the Faithful and Catechumens, assisted indiscriminately; it would therefore have been a betrayal of the "Secret," to have recited audibly, before such a mixed congregation, a form of prayer which it was given to the Faithful, or initiated, alone, to know.

Now, bearing in mind this fact—a fact known to every student of Ecclesiastical history—it is easy to see, how the writers of the first centuries, during which the "Discipline of the Secret" obtained, were obliged to be very guarded in their language, when speaking of the sacred mysteries; and how the necessity that they were under of concealing these mysteries from the uninitiated, forced them to the employment of vague, and almost ambiguous terms. A double task was imposed upon them—To reply to, and to defend themselves against, the accusations of their enemies; and yet to reply, in such a manner, as not to betray the mysterious secrets of Christianity, which the wise discipline of the Church enjoined them to conceal. We can easily see how men, writing under such peculiar conditions, would employ a language very different from that which they made use of when addressing themselves to the initiated *only*, from whom it was their duty to conceal nothing, to whom it was their duty to make known the whole counsels of God.

We must bear in mind also the nature of the accusations to which the early Christians were peculiarly obnoxious, from their nocturnal assemblies, and their secret, and mysterious rites. Incest, and cannibalism—the latter evidently owing to a distorted tradition of the Eucharist which had got abroad—were the crimes universally attributed to the followers of Jesus. They were represented to the heathen world, not only as the enemies of the Gods, but as the eaters of little children, whom, having decoyed into their infamous caverns, they murdered, and upon whose bodies, covered over with flour, they subsequently made a hideous repast.

"Infans farre contectus, ut decipiat incautos, apponitur ei qui sacris imbuitur. Is infans a tirunculo, farris superficie quasi ad innoxios ictus provocata, cæcis occultisque vulneribus occiditur; hujus (prohnefas)! sitienter sanguinem lambunt; hujus certatim membra discerpunt."—*Vide Tertull. Apolog. c. 8—Minucius Felix,—Gibbon.*

It is not difficult to account for this horrid accusation. False brethren occasionally crept in amongst the assembled Christians; by hopes of pardon, and fear of tortures, others were induced to confess what took place at these obnoxious meetings. They told of a body, of flesh, eaten under the species, or appearance of bread—the "*farre contectus*;" and of blood, given to the worshippers under the appearance of wine; their language sounded in the ears of the heathen, as the language of cannibals; and, unable to fathom the depths of the Eucharistic mystery, they at once concluded that, at their illegal, nocturnal assemblies, the hated Christians indulged in the foulest rites of bloodshed, and impurity.

Now, how did the Christian Apologists, and the Fathers, meet this odious charge? Nothing would have been easier for them than to have denied it, *if*, with the modern Protestant, they had looked upon the Eucharist, as the commemorative eating of mere bread and wine. They could at once have replied—"In our sacred repasts we eat *only common* bread, we drink *only common* wine," *if*, with Mr. Jenkins, they had denied the body and blood of Christ, under the species of bread and wine. Common prudence, regard for their personal safety, and jealousy for the credit of their religion, would at once have forced such a reply from them, *if*—consistently with the truth—*if*, without denying their faith—that, in the Eucharist, they did indeed eat the flesh, and drink the blood, of Christ—they could have given it; and most assuredly they would have abstained for the future, from using the unnecessary, and absurdly figurative, expressions which had excited the suspicions, and drawn upon them the persecutions, of their heathen rulers; their duty to the Church was incompatible with such studied misrepresentation of her doctrines. Yes—we may be certain that no one holding the opinions of Zuinglius, respecting the Eucharist, would have allowed such a groundless charge, as that raised by the heathen world against the early Christians, to have gone abroad.

And how did the Christians of the second century behave? As fools and knaves—as false to themselves, as well as to their religion—*if* we suppose them to have been Protestants, or deniers of the Real Presence; but with the wisdom of the serpent, with the meekness of the dove, and in the true spirit of martyrs, *if* we are correct in attributing to them a belief in that mystery, which they could not deny, but which, the "Discipline of the Secret" prevented them from fully explaining to their persecutors. Upon any other hypothesis, the language and conduct of the early Christians is perfectly inexplicable; but they could not, consistently with their faith, but, at the same time, bound not to betray the mysteries, have acted differently. "We *do* indeed eat flesh, and drink blood,"—they could not but confess; "but not in the carnal manner you think." And here the "Discipline of the Secret," with its prohibitions, closed their lips; for it forbade them to betray how our Lord had converted the substance of bread into the substance of His flesh, still leaving the *species*, or *phenomena*, unchanged. They could but speak of a mystical change, of a spiritual mystery, which it was strictly forbidden to reveal to the uninitiated, but which it was given to the faithful alone to know. Hence the "*norunt fideles*"—"the faithful will know what I mean—the initiated will understand me"—phrases which constantly occur in the writings of the Fathers, whenever they have occasion to allude to the Eucharistic mystery. It was a mystery, and therefore to be carefully concealed from the profane; but a Christian mystery, involving one of the most important points of doctrine of our holy religion, and therefore to be kept constantly before the eyes of the faithful, or initiated. Hence the necessity for reserve, for great caution, for the use of language, which should assert whilst concealing, and which therefore would seem ambiguous, inconsistent, and self-contradictory, did we not know under what peculiar circumstances the early Christian teachers were placed, and the two-fold end which their writings were destined to subserve; thus too, we can easily account for any amount of *apparent* discrepancy in the writings of the Christian Fathers, when treating of the mysteries of our faith.

Having now assigned a satisfactory reason *why* there should be apparent discrepancies in the writings of the Fathers, let us next consider *in what* these discrepancies consist, and *to what* they amount. Do they necessarily involve a denial of the Catholic doctrine—that, in the Eucharist, the body of our Lord is substantially, though supersensibly, present? Do they necessarily affirm the Zuinglian doctrine, that the Lord's Supper is merely a commemoration of our Lord's last Supper with the Apostles, in which nothing but bread and wine are given, or consumed?

The utmost discrepancy then that can be detected in the writings of the Fathers amounts to this—That, whereas they often speak of a real, objective change, or transmutation, of the elements of the Supper*—they sometimes speak of a spiritual presence, and a spiritual change. Now, the question is—does the latter form of expression necessarily involve the contradiction of the former?—for, if it does not, there is no *real* discrepancy betwixt them. Does a "spiritual" presence—*in the sense in which the writers employed the word "spiritual"*—necessarily exclude a real, substantial, and objective, presence, so that it is impossible to admit both? These are the questions which we have to consider, and which must be answered in the affirmative, ere Mr. Jenkins can appeal to "the authority of the Fathers in support of the Protestant disclaimer."

Evidently our first object must be to understand what the Fathers meant by the word "*spiritual*."—When used by Protestants—according to whose gross philosophy, the *sensible* only is "*real*," or "substantial," and who have no conception of the objective *reality* of the *supersensible*, or of a supersensible substance—the word "spiritual" is opposed, not only to "sensible," but to the "real," or "substantial;" and a "spiritual presence" denotes, to their intellects a "real, or substantial absence," or at best, a purely imaginary, or subjective, presence. In like manner, they oppose "spiritual" to a "real," or "substantial" change in the Eucharistic elements. But not in this sense was the word "spiritual" used, and understood, by the ancient Christian philosophers. They used it as the antithesis of "sensible," not of "real," or "substantial;" and in asserting a "spiritual presence," they denied—not the real, the substantial, the objective—but only the sensible—presence of our Lord's body, of His flesh and blood, in the Eucharist; and when they spoke of a "spiritual change, or transmutation, in the elements of the Lord's Supper, they little dreamt that their words would be so interpreted, as to deny a real, substantial, objective change, and to assert a mere imaginary change,—a change existing only in the heated, or disordered, phantasy of the worshipper. Thus, when St. Augustin asserts a "spiritual" presence of Christ's body in the Eucharist, he denies not a real "substantial" presence, but only a presence after the manner in which it was apprehended by the heathen; amongst whom the false, and revolting charge—that the Christians, devoured raw flesh, as it was sold in the shambles, and drank blood, at their nocturnal assemblies—had gone abroad—"*quomodo in cadavere dilaniatur, aut in macello venditur.*"—*St. Aug. Tract 27, in Joan. Ev.* At the present day, were a similar accusation brought against us, we know not how we should meet it, save in the words of the Bishop of Hippo. With him we should deny this revolting, this carnal, presence; but none the less would we continue to affirm a "substantial" presence of Christ's body, and a "real" eating and drinking of His flesh and blood; we would affirm a "spiritual" in opposition to a "sensible" presence; and we would assert a "spiritual," but because a spiritual, none the less a real, or "substantial," change, in the Eucharistic elements.

We can therefore easily reconcile the language of the Fathers, when they speak of a spiritual presence of the body of Christ in the Eucharist, both with their language when they seem to assert a "substantial" presence, and a "substantial" change, and with the teaching of the Catholic Church at the present day; because they employ the word "*spiritual*," in opposition, not to a *real*, *substantial* presence or change, but to a *sensible* presence, to a *sensible* change. We see for instance how St. Augustin could believe in a substantial presence, and therefore in a substantial change in the elements of the Lord's Supper—or Transubstantiation—and yet use the following language, which Mr. Jenkins cites in support of the Protestant disclaimer: because it is the very language that a Catholic Divine would employ at the present day, if called upon to combat the errors respecting the Eucharistic mystery that prevailed in the IV. century—the chief of those errors being embodied in the charge brought against the Christians—that, in their sacred banquets, they tore with their teeth raw human flesh—"*quomodo in cadavere dilaniatur.*"

"Therefore" says St. Augustin, when speaking of Our Lord's promise to give His flesh to eat—"we must not understand the flesh, after the flesh," or in a carnal manner—"Ergo nec carnem debemus sapere secundum carnem, sicut in his verbis." *Tract. 27. in Joann. Ev.* And, from the behaviour of the Capharnaites, he proceeds to explain what he means by the "*non sapere secundum carnem*," in these words—"*carnem quippe sic intellexerunt, quomodo in cadavere dilaniatur aut in macello venditur; ib*"—that is—we must not understand the "flesh" after the flesh, as did the gross Capharnaites, who fancied Our Lord was to give them His flesh to eat, in the bloody form that it appears on the carcase, or in the butchers' shambles. These men, thus carnally, or "*secundum carnem*," understanding Our Lord's words, forsook Him, and walked with Him no more, therefore—"*sapere secundum carnem mors est*"—to understand the "flesh" after the flesh, or in this carnal manner, is death.

Now, all this explanation, which St. Augustin gives of the "*non sapere secundum carnem*," Mr. Jenkins carefully, but most dishonestly, omits; and, making a sudden jump to the end of the Homily, where he finds certain words, which by means of a slight mistranslation may be made to suit his purpose, he tacks these words on to the passage which he had previously quoted; and thus tortures St. Augustin's meaning into downright nonsense; making him apparently assert that, to eat Christ's flesh, is to dwell in Him, and He in us. Immediately after the words "*sicut in his verbis*"—Mr. Jenkins gives us, as the pretended explanation of the "*non sapere secundum carnem:*—

"For as we have said, that which the Lord hath given us to *understand* in the eating of His flesh, and drinking of His blood, is that we should dwell in Him, and He in us"—p. 156.

How far this is from St. Augustin's real meaning, is evident from his own words:—

"Hoc Dominum *commendasse* in manducatione carnis suæ, et potatione sanguinis sui, ut in illo maneamus, et ipse in nobis."—*Tract, 27. in Joann. Ev.*

That "we should dwell in Christ, and He in us," then, is to be *fruit* of our eating His flesh, but not the eating itself; and this is plainly St. Augustin's meaning, from another passage, near the end of the same discourse, where he warns his hearers:—

"Ut carnem Christi, et sanguinis Christi, non edamus tantum in sacramento, quod et multi mali"—and "*qui habebunt in fine æterna tormenta*;" *ib*:—

that we should not merely eat the flesh, and drink the blood, of Christ, in the Sacrament, *as do also many wicked persons*, who, nevertheless, reap eternal damnation, and who therefore do not fulfil the end for which Christ gave us His flesh to eat,—*quod commendavit in manducatione carnis suæ*—that "we should dwell in Him, and He in us." We are to become intimately, and *permanently*, connected with Christ, as members of His body, argues St. Augustin, or else the eating His flesh, will not profit us, nor save us from final reprobation. So far from this being inconsistent with the modern teaching of the Catholic Church, it is the very doctrine which is continually preached from every Catholic pulpit throughout the world, at the present day.

Having shown then, how the language of the Fathers is perfectly, and easily, reconcileable with the Catholic doctrine of Transubstantiation, even when they speak most strongly of a "*spiritual*" presence, we will next point out how perfectly irreconcileable is their language—upon other occasions, when they speak of a real and substantial presence, and of a real and substantial change, or transmutation, of the Eucharistic elements—with the modern Protestant doctrine, of a mere imaginary, or fanciful presence, and change. This however we must postpone until next week.

We are happy to have it in our power to announce that the appeal to the charity of the faithful of this city, made by the Cistercian Fathers, has been attended with the most happy results. From the different congregations, our Reverend visitors have received the sum of $1,664; for which they desire to return their sincere thanks, to His Lordship the Bishop of Montreal, to the Reverend Superior of the Seminary, and to the Catholic Clergy, and laity, of Montreal in general; assuring them, that their good offices, and effectual assistance, will ever be had in kind remembrance by the recluses of Gethsemani, who will cease not to offer up their fervent supplications to the Throne of Grace, for blessings upon the heads of those who so generously assisted them in their hour of need.

The Reverend Fathers left town on Wednesday; and, calling at Kingston, will return to their Monastery in the course of a few weeks. May the Lord grant them a safe voyage, and success in all their labors for the honor and glory of His name.

ST. VINCENT DE PAUL.

We would call attention to the announcement of the concert promised by this society, which is to take place on the 28th inst., in the City Concert Hall.—The proceeds will, as usual, be devoted to the relief of the sick, and indigent. We trust that our Irish friends will not be backward upon the occasion; and that they will heartily unite to procure themselves an evenings rational enjoyment, and at the same time help the funds of a deserving charity.

N.B.—Persons desirous of attending should take care to provide themselves with tickets in advance. Tickets can be had of all the Catholic Booksellers. Price, a quarter of a dollar.

We publish on our second page, a letter from the gentleman alluded to in the Rev. Mr. Dewar's speech at the Toronto Synod, "as the son of a priest."—We have no desire to prolong the controversy.—Mr. Dewar says he did *not* make use of certain expressions; the *British Canadian* says he did; there we are content to let the matter drop.

"THE MISSION OF DEATH."—A tale of the New York Penal Law. by Mr. J. Walworth.—Messrs. Sadliers, Montreal.

THE METROPOLITAN for December.—This sterling Catholic periodical is rapidly advancing in public favor, and has obtained for itself a prominent and honorable position amongst the Catholic periodicals of this Continent. We trust that it may soon have as large a circulation amongst our friends in Canada, as it deserves. The extensive circulation of works like the *Metropolitan* amongst the people, is one of the best antidotes against the poison constantly infused into our moral system, by the villainous popular literature of the day. Every Catholic, therefore, should make it his duty to encourage the diffusion amongst his neighbors of good, wholesome, intellectual provender such as is afforded at a cheap rate by our talented cotemporary.

We have received from the publishers—Ramsay's "Scripture Atlas for the use of Schools"—and the "Quarter Dollar Atlas of Modern Geography,"—which we have much pleasure in recommending for the use of schools, as very cheap, and exceedingly well executed.

We have received the *Anglo American* for December, full as usual of well selected and interesting matter. The "Editor's Shanty" is always good, and we are happy to see that he has admitted the noble art of "chess," to a place in his interesting lucubrations. The present number contains some simple chess problems, which to the lovers of the game, will prove an additional source of interest.

The *Maple Leaf* for the present month has come to hand; doubly welcome at this season of the year. Its table of contents promises a rich fund of amusement.

Died.

In this city, on the 4th inst., Thomas, Youngest son of Mr. Terence Moore, Proprietor Railroad Hotel.

On the 26th ultimo at Sillery Cove, Quebec, deeply regretted, Mrs. Widow Elizabeth Brogan, aged 50 years—an old and respectable resident of the place.

At Philadelphia, U. S., on the 30th ult., Anastasia Dunne, wife of Mr. John M'Carty. May her soul rest in peace.

PROMENADE CONCERT.

THE SOCIETY OF ST. VINCENT DE PAUL

BEG to inform the Public, that, instead of their Annual Bazaar, they will give

A PROMENADE CONCERT,

On WEDNESDAY, the 28th inst.,

IN THE CITY CONCERT HALL,

UNDER THE PATRONAGE OF THE

LADY MAYORESS,

MRS. C. MONDELET,	MRS. J. BOURRET,
" PERRAULT DE LINIERE,	" U. S. CHERRIER,
" A. LEVESQUE,	" A. COUILLARD,
" A. LAROCQUE,	" P. LACOMBE,
" J. U. BEAUDRY,	" N. DUMAS,
" H. PELTIER,	" A. PREVOST,
" T. DOUCET,	" J. A. BERTHELOT,
" M. CUVILLIER,	" F. X. BRAZEAU.

By the kind permission of LT. COL. HEMPHILL, the Band of the 26th Regiment will attend and play several choice pieces.

MR. LABELLE has consented to take charge of the vocal part, to be executed by Canadian Amateurs, under his direction.

The proceeds of the Refreshment Table will be for the benefit of the Society.

Tickets of admission can be obtained from the Members of the Society. Price, 1s. 3d.

All Tickets obtained at the door on the evening of the Concert will be 5s. each.

The Door will be opened at SEVEN o'clock, and the Concert will commence at EIGHT, P.M.

O. LEBLANC, President of the Society,
L. A. HUGNET LATOUR, Secretary.

Dec. 7.

---

* Mr. Jenkins himself admits "that there are passages in the Fathers which *seem* to favor the doctrine of Transubstantiation." We shall see that they positively assert it, ere we have done with him.