

Mr. Goode considers as so amply sufficient and demonstrative? It will be a painfully interesting task, to compare their cogency with that of the Scriptural proof, which the same author thinks wholly inadequate, for the Eucharistic Presence. They are in all four (John, i. 1; Rom. ix. 5; Heb. i. 8; Rev. i. 8.) in three of which, our Lord is expressly called God; but then it is no less expressly said, "This is my Body," "The bread which we break is it not the communication of the Body of Christ?" nor do we think it a less forced and violent rule of interpretation which refuses the literal sense in the former than in the latter series of passages. We feel that our present course of argument needs an apology; but we can assure our readers, that as we write, we honestly endeavour to impress adequately on our minds the exceeding sacredness of the subjects which we are obliged to discuss for the very sake of faith.

Mr Goode excuses himself from receiving our Lord's words of institution on their *prima facie* sense, by a comparison with the texts, "I am the door of the sheep," "I am the true vine;" but it is too often overlooked that these parallels go exactly the opposite way. "Figures and metaphors," says Frönde on this subject, "are not chosen by inspired writers to give elevation to plain matters, but because the matters, of which they speak are so elevated as not to admit of being expressed plainly." The full account of our Lord's office and relations to His Church is so wholly above our comprehension, that He graciously used figures and analogies to assist us in forming some faint conception of their true nature.

Does Mr. Goode consider then, as is required for his parallel, that the consecrated Bread is so mysterious and unspeakable a gift, that it needs metaphor to enable us to advance towards its full comprehension? He has quoted indeed one other (and but one other) passage from Scripture in support of this scepticism; "that rock was Christ;" on which it is obvious to remark, without discussion on the real bearing of this difficult passage, that on his own showing he is drawing us back, who are born under the Gospel, to the allegories and empty shadows of the Jewish covenant.

Every fresh illustration of the intimate connection between Protestantism and Judaism is valuable and instructive. But if on such grounds Mr. Goode may be defended for declining the literal sense of the texts bearing on the Eucharist, how much more is to be said in support of a similar procedure on the other still more awful & sacred doctrine which we have named: if "My Body" may be taken as "the representative and sign of My Body," how much more may "God" be understood to mean "the representative & moral image of God," for the word *actually* was used in this sense under the Old Covenant. Nay, more, the author's application of the former analogies, whatever its merits, is at least conjectural, while the application of the latter passage to our Lord's nature is made by Himself. Again, there is no one passage in the New Testament which alludes to the Eucharist at all, which is otherwise

than most naturally consistent (to say the least) with the idea of its mysterious and miraculous character; whereas several passages in Scripture appear, at first sight absolutely contradictory to the allegation of our Lord's divine nature. It may be said, indeed, that Scripture is silent upon the Eucharist where we should expect mention of it; but he must be strangely constituted, or have read the New Testament in a very stiff and narrow spirit, who has not been frequently startled also by the omission of all allusion to our Lord's Divinity, where the whole context seemed naturally to introduce the idea. Lastly, there is no difficulty, whatever regards Scripture history in the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist, while on the other subject there are very considerable historical objections, which seem to require an answer, and are commonly made in the Socinian controversy.

From the Catholic Advocate.

THE GREEK SCHISM.

The great Greek schism, by which nearly the whole oriental church was cut off from the Roman See, was brought about by Photius, a man very much distinguished for his intellect and his literary acquirements, but equally remarkable, also, for his ambition, and his unscrupulous and skilful use of every species of fraud and dissimulation. Having in the year 857 intruded himself into the Patriarchal See of Constantinople, to the prejudice of the legitimate Patriarch, St. Ignatius, whom he had invidiously supplanted, he was condemned by the Popes Nicholas I. and Adrian II. This condemnation, far from humbling his pride, only served to call it into action; and with wonderful audacity he made an assault upon the authority of the Roman See, inveighed against the whole Latin church, bringing forward various heads of accusation, which however, for the most part, concerned merely the ceremonies in use, and ecclesiastical institutions. Only one point directly impugned faith, which was the question concerning the procession of the Holy Ghost.

Michael was then Emperor of the East, and this prince favored the usurper Photius. At the death of Michael, St. Ignatius was restored to his See, and Photius, having been again condemned at a Council held at Constantinople in the year 859, by authority of Pope Honorius II., was banished by a sentence of the Emperor Basil, the successor of Michael. But the cunning Photius, whose ingenuity at fraud and dissimulation could not easily be excelled, was able to ingratiate himself with the Emperor; so that on the death of Ignatius, he was recalled, in the year 878, placed upon the See of Constantinople, where he remained securely during the lifetime of Basil. But in 886 this Emperor died, and Photius was again exiled by Leo VI. known as the Philosopher. Photius did not again return to Constantinople, but dying in exile, the church was thereby in some measure restored.

The seeds of dissension, however, had been broadly scattered over the eastern church, and continued to grow. Discord still troubled the faithful, and things gradually were being prepared for the event which occurred under Michael Cæsar.

us, when in the eleventh century the unfortunate schism was completed, and the disorganizing principles were widely disseminated through all the churches of the East, infecting nearly all the Greeks.

Much regret and sorrow were felt by all true Christians on account of this serious injury done to the fold of the Great Shepherd, and in consequence, various were the attempts made to bring about peace and harmony. Among others, may be specified the effort made by the Council of Lyons, in the year 1274, and that made by the Synod of Florence, in 1439. But although some hope of success appeared at first to cheer and encourage these laudable efforts, this was soon destroyed by the perceptible insincerity of the Greeks, and their persevering obstinacy. Not long after the failure of the effort made by the Council of Florence to restore unity and peace, the city of Constantinople, and the larger portion of the Grecian Church, was brought under the dominion of the Ottomans, when by the victorious Mohammed the Second, the Eastern Empire was subverted, and the last Paleologus Constantine XI., perished beneath the ruins of his throne. This event took place in the year 1453.

From the same.

THE SCHISM OF THE MUSCOVITES OR RUSSIANS.

The Christian faith had been carried in the tenth century, from the East to the Russians; and when first converted to Christianity, those people became Catholics, and were in communion with the See of Rome. But it was not long before they were infected by the pernicious principles of the Greek Schismatics, many of them having adhered to the schismatical Patriarch of Constantinople. Their separation from the church was not, however, general, since at the period of the Council of Florence, we find among the Russians about equal numbers of Catholics and Schismatics. In the fifteenth century a Russian Archbishop, having the name of Photius, certainly a name of no good omen for unity, succeeded in propagating the schism throughout the whole nation.

Towards the end of the sixteenth century, about the year 1583, at the instance of the Patriarch of Constantinople, Jeremias, Bishop of Moscow, was created Patriarch of the Russians. But the new dignity flourished and grew to the great prejudice of the See of Constantinople, and we find that about one hundred years after its creation, under the Patriarch Nikon, it withdrew itself from under the authority of that Patriarchal See.

At a later period, under the reign of Peter the First, surnamed the Great, this Patriarchal dignity of Moscow was suppressed, this prince having decreed that ecclesiastical affairs should be administered by an ecclesiastical council, of which he constituted himself the head or president.

The Greeks have the same faith as the Catholic church, except that they do not admit "the supremacy of the Pope," and "maintain that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father only."

The Russian Church, being a scion or

offshoot of the Greek, has the same doctrine, and rites with it. The celebrated canonical or ecclesiastical statute of Peter the Great, is the authentic monument from which we are to learn the doctrines of the Russian church. An examination of this will show that they admit all the dogmas of the Catholic church, with the exception of the Pope's supremacy.—They pass over in silence the question concerning the procession of the Holy Ghost.

NEW ZEALAND.

THE MISSIONS.—Dr. Dieffenbach, Naturalist to the New Zealand company, in his two volumes, just published by Murray speaks very disparagingly of the Missionary Societies. After speaking of the evil tendency which the introduction of European civilization has commonly had among the natives of such islands, and the dissensions and demoralization which it has frequently produced, he refers more immediately to the Church Missionary Society. He informs us that the expense of this mission is £17,000 a year. He states as a fact, that eleven missionaries—the only ones that had given in their claims to the land-commissioners when he left the island—demanded as their share 96,219 acres of land; and that four others had not yet submitted their claim, which would be equally large. Some of these persons, he says, are now retiring on their property, and their sons have become so independent as to refuse lucrative situations under government. This fact speaks loudly us to the kind of soil which these clerical speculators are prepared to cultivate.

Dr. Dieffenbach's language as to the Catholic Priests is somewhat different:—"The humble and disinterested manner of living of the Priests, and the superior education which they have generally received, have procured them many friends, both amongst European and natives, and also many converts amongst the latter." Vol. 2, p. 169.—*Tablet*.

ROMAN CATHOLICISM IN STAMFORD.

Much excitement is caused by the conversion of Miss Amelia Perkins, niece of the Rev. Denis Edward Jones, Rector of St John's church. She left Stamford on the 14th inst. for the house of the Roman Catholic Bishop at Northampton (Dr. Dowling) and made a public declaration of faith at the chapel in that town on Sunday. This is the third conversion to the Romish faith which has taken place in Stamford within a few years by ladies connected with the families of Clergymen of the Establishment; the first being Miss Sanders, daughter of the Rev. Chas. Sanders, who afterwards married a gentleman of large fortune near Liverpool; the other is the widow of the Rev. T. C. Wilkinson, the late Vicar of All Saints; the last named lady is now at Erdington, near Birmingham, doing much good by attending at the schools, giving alms, &c.—Miss Perkins is now in London; and we hear she will shortly proceed to Brussels, to join her relatives in that place.—*Stamford Mercury*.