

But Dr. Nicholson followed up this first blow by another equally severe. The Archbishop had said in his letter, "The human nature is so assumed by the Divine Person, that in Christ it is true to predicate of Him (*Homo*) the Divine attributes, and *vice versa*." If this statement had been made respecting the Whole Christ, God and man, One Christ, it would, of course, have been true, but to apply it to Christ viewed only in His humanity is undoubtedly heretical, and is the express error condemned by the Council of Ephesus. And the distinct insertion of the word "*Homo*" did so limit the statement.

It will be seen that Dr. Manning's error consisted in this—that he separated the human heart of our Blessed Lord *per se*, as the *objectum materiale* (or, subject matter) of Divine worship, whereas it is only such an object of worship when considered as part of the whole Christ in the Hypostatic union.

In defence of his position the Archbishop refers (without quoting) to the Fifth General Council; the Canon in question runs thus: "If any one says that Christ is adored in two natures, [which the Archbishop does say] from whence they introduce two adorations, separately to God the Word, and separately to the man [which is Dr. Manning's precise position] . . . but does not adore with one adoration God the Word incarnate with His proper flesh, as it was from the beginning delivered to the Church, let him be anathema."

Compare this, says Dr. Nicholson, with the dogmatic statements of Archbishop Manning in the letter aforesaid—

(1) The Divine Person is adored, and the humanity which He assumed is adored.

(2) The two natures of Christ are both objects of Divine worship, but in a different degree.

(3) They are both the *objectum materiale* of adoration.

Hence it will be seen that Archbishop Manning has attempted to defend an error of the gravest kind condemned by a General Council. His words can only be understood as rending the humanity or part of the humanity, viz., our Blessed Lord's Heart, from the Hypostatic Union, deifying it, and elevating it so as to be in itself an object of Divine worship—in other words he has been guilty of teaching, and when called to account, of attempting to defend Euty-chianism.

With this Dr. Nicholson distinctly charges the Archbishop; and in his reply, the latter manages to flounder still deeper into the mire of heresy than he was before. Here is the unfortunate sentence: "The Catholic Church teaches that the Humanity of Christ is an object of *Latria*, because, though distinct, it is indivisible from the Divine Person."

The Archbishop's inexorable antagonist quietly points out that the former clause in this statement is palpably untrue in fact, inasmuch as the direct contrary is laid down by accredited Roman Catholic theologians, nay, in all the authorized text-books used in clerical seminaries, and that the latter has been anathematized by the General Council already referred to.

After giving his authoritative proofs of these assertions, Dr. Nicholson sums up this letter as follows:—