

intended for the instruction of children, nor for the conversion of Pagans, nor with a view to convince heretics. The plain purport of them is, to instruct christians in a doctrine with which they were not sufficiently acquainted, or to direct their attention to a subject of which they were not sensible of the importance.

In whatever light, then, we consider this matter, it is undeniable that multitudes in the time of Paschasius either from ignorance or conviction were adverse to his sentiments. The fact is, as clearly appears from his writings, as well as the history of that age, that many of the learned were convinced of the falsehood of his doctrine; and many of the vulgar had heard nothing or, at least, very little of the subject. To suppose the contrary, is ridiculous. What should we think of the man who would devote his time and talents to prove the doctrine of the real presence to the Roman Catholics of the present day? What should we think, if he farther complained that many were slow of belief and difficult to be persuaded? And if he boasted also that many others had been led by him to a knowledge of the truth? Would not all the world assure him that his labors were of no use; that his complaints and his boasting were both without foundation? The existence of these writings, and the reputation which they procured to their author, prove beyond all controversy that the sentiments which they contained, had many opposers. Otherwise, what purpose could they have served? What service could they have done to the church? No man can acquire reputation by teaching what every body knows. Nor will any one be applauded for proving what every body believes.

It is clear from the words of Paschasius, that Frudegarde had entertained doubts on this subject. This he could not have done, if the church had been as unanimous as they are represented in the belief of it. Hence also it appears that it was not then deemed impious to doubt of this doctrine.

Hincmar also says there were persons, who from a love of novelty and a desire to acquire a vain reputation, denied the real presence. These must have been persons of some learning. For the common people are neither fond of novelty, nor desirous of gaining reputation by singularity.

Hincmar attributes the denial of the real presence, to a love of novelty which had seized some persons. The truth is, that before this period, none had expressed themselves determinately on either side. Christians, during the preceding ages,

had contented themselves with using the words of scripture on this subject, without minutely inquiring how they were to be understood. No sooner had they begun to give range to their imaginations, than different opinions were started. Each party accused the other of innovation; and with some degree of justice. For each made use of language that had never been used before. All that can be said therefore on this part of the subject is, that the innovation which explained the words of our Saviour as denoting his real presence in the sacrament, came to be the prevailing sentiment. It was favoured by most of the clergy, and by many princes and great men. From this cause, and from the fondness which ignorant people always discover for things marvellous and extraordinary, the opinion of the real presence at last triumphed over the other.

We may next inquire whether it be possible that the doctrine of the real presence could ever have crept into the church, if it had not been received from the beginning?

The *Sieur Barthelemy* has determined this question in the negative, and by a train of reasoning from the nature of the thing, he professes to have proved it impossible for such a doctrine ever to be added to the faith of the church if it had not been believed from the beginning by the first followers of our Lord.

Indeed, according to the supposition which he makes respecting the state of the church during the eight, ninth, tenth, and eleventh centuries, such a thing is impossible. For he supposes the state of the church to have been the same, during these centuries that it now is, and that it has been since the reformation. He supposes, for example, that such as admitted the real presence, regarded those persons who denied it as heretics. He supposes farther that the former worshipped the *host* as at present, and were consequently considered by the latter as idolaters. Had those suppositions been just, it is clear that the most violent disputations must have followed. Even in the darkness of the tenth century, much discussion and wrangling must have taken place, and numerous records of these disputes must have remained to the present day. The non-existence of any account of such violent disputes is a proof that they never existed. There were debates indeed, of a certain kind, as we learn from the writings of Paschasius and others of the same sentiments, as well as from those of *Joannes Scotus* and other opposers of the doctrine of the real presence. But these were neither so violent, nor so lasting as those which, in later times have been agitated between the church