

the prophecy of Malachias is fulfilled; "for from the rising of the sun, even unto the going down, my name is great among the Gentiles; and in every place there is sacrifice, and there is offered to my name a clean oblation, &c." Malach. i. 11.

The sacrifice here alluded to, cannot be that offered on Mount Calvary on the Cross, as that was only offered in one place; of course it must be the holy sacrifice of the Mass, because this is offered in almost every part of the globe, and because Jesus Christ, who there perpetuates the memory of his passion and death, is the only one who can offer a clean oblation to God.

When we consider what Jesus Christ operates in this mystery; when by faith we behold him actually present, with these signs of death, we unite ourselves to him in this state; we offer him to God; as our only victim, and as the only one who, by his blood, can show us mercy; protesting, at the same time, that we have nothing to offer up to God but Jesus Christ, and the infinite merits of his death. We consecrate all our prayers by this sacred offering, and, in presenting Jesus Christ to God, we are taught to offer up ourselves also in him, and by him, to his divine majesty, as so many living victims. Pray, dear sir, does this doctrine savour of superstition?

Here then is the great sacrifice of Christians, differing widely from that which was in use in the old law, a spiritual sacrifice, and worthy the new covenant; where the victim, though present, is perceptible only by faith; where the immolating sword is the word which mystically separates the body from the blood; where the shedding of the blood is of course but mystical, and where death intervenes but in representation; a most real sacrifice, however, inasmuch as Jesus Christ is truly contained in it, and presented to his Father under these symbols of death. But still a sacrifice of commemoration, which, far from withdrawing us, as is objected, from the sacrifice of the cross, attaches us to it, by all its circumstances, whereas it is not only totally referred to it, but in fact has no existence, except by this relation, from which its efficacy is entirely derived.

Such is the express doctrine of the Council of Trent, which teaches that this sacrifice was instituted only "to represent that which was once offered on the cross; to perpetuate the memory of it to the end of time; and to apply its saving virtues to us for the remission of those sins which we every day commit. Sess. 22. c. 1. The Church, then, far from believing the sacrifice of the Cross to be by any means defective, is, on the contrary, so convinced of its perfection, that it looks upon every thing done, in consequence, as merely to commemorate it, and to apply its virtue.

We believe then, the holy sacrifice of the Mass to be the greatest act of Religion that can be performed, the only one perfectly worthy of God, as in that sacrifice Jesus Christ, equal to his father, is both the high priest and the victim: he is the high priest, in as much as he immolates and offers up the victim, which is himself, to his eternal father; "he is the high priest for ever, according to the order of Melchisedech." Ps. cix. 5.

For ever, because although he immolated himself but once in a bloody manner, yet in the Mass he perpetuates this sacrifice day after day, in an unbloody and mystical manner. According to the order of Melchisedech, because, "as Melchisedech brought forth bread and wine, for he was the priest of the most high God" Gen. 14. 18. so does Christ, the high priest of the new covenant, bring forth bread and wine: and having by his omnipotence changed them into his flesh and blood, continues under those forms of bread and wine to offer himself up, to present to his heavenly father the merits of his passion and death, and likewise under those forms, to feed and nourish the souls of men.

Whoever is in the least versed in the history of the Church and writings of the holy fathers, will readily acknowledge, that the Mass was always considered as the great sacrifice of the new covenant, and that the practice of celebrating Mass is as ancient as Christianity.

I have already quoted the words of St. Andrew, the apostle of Christ.

"In every day sacrifice to the Almighty, the only one and true God, the immaculate Lamb upon the altar, whose flesh is given to the faithful to eat; the Lamb thus sacrificed remains whole and alive." Book of St. Andrew's passion, Surius.

St. John Chrysostome, bishop of Constantinople, says, "The wise men worshipped him in the manger; thou seest him not in the manger, but on the Altar, &c." in 1 Cor. Again,

"In regard it is offered in many places, are there many Christs? No; for as he who is every where offered, is one body, and not many bodies; so the sacrifice is one." Hom. 17. in Heb. In the same age St. Ambrose says, "when we sacrifice, Christ is present" in chap. 1. Luc. St. Jerome says "He (Christ) is the inviter and the banquet; we drink his blood, &c." Epis. ad Hædiber. q. 2. St. Augustine of the fifth age says, "When now we see this sacrifice offered to God in every place by the priesthood of Christ, according to the order of Melchisedech, and the Jews, sacrifice to cease, why do they yet expect another Christ?" De civitate Dei. c. 35. And in book ix. of Confessions, c. 3. he tells us, his mother Monica desired on her death-bed, to be remembered at the Altar, where she knew the holy sacrifice to be offered, where with the indictment against us was blotted out.

In another place, he says, "Christ is at the same time both the priest that offers, and the host (or victim) which is offered; and he would that the sacrifice which the Church daily offers, should be the sacrament and the representation of this mystery because the Church being the body of that divine head, it offers itself by him." All these holy-fathers and bishops of the Church lived, some 1100, some 1200 years before the pretended reformation; at a time when even the most learned Protestants own that the Church of Christ had not gone astray yet. In the sixth age, that is, about a 1000 years before the reformation, St. Gregory the Great, by whose

means England was converted, has the following remarkable words in a sermon, which he preached on Christmas day: "Whereas by the grace of God, we shall this day celebrate Mass three times, therefore, we cannot speak very long on the Gospel." Homil. 8. in Evangel.

Such was the practice of the Church 1300 years ago, and such is the practice of the Church at present in 1823; on Christmas day every Priest celebrates Mass three times.

If then, dear sir, we are guilty of superstition in celebrating Mass, and in believing as we do of the Mass, it is a great comfort to us to find, that our superstition is no other than that, of which were guilty all the holiest and wisest Bishops of the most remote antiquity, even St. Andrew; who was instructed by Christ himself. It is a great comfort to us to know, that the Church had already existed more than 1500 years, before it was found out that to celebrate Mass, and to believe that Christ is really present in the Eucharist, are superstitious practices and doctrines.

Before I conclude this important subject, I should not omit explaining the practice of the Catholic Church, of giving.

COMMUNION UNDER ONE KIND OF FORM:

Upon which head, we are accused of depriving the laity of an essential part of the sacrament.

From the moment, dear sir, the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist is admitted, there can no difficulty exist on this subject. It must be a matter of perfect indifference whether we receive the holy Communion under one or under both kinds.

"Christ rising from the dead, says St. Paul, dieth no more." Rom. vi. Consequently wherever Christ is, there also is Christ's body; wherever the flesh of Christ is, there also is his blood, his soul and divinity; and where his blood is, there also is his flesh, &c. To say that Christ is divided between the two kinds or forms, so as for one form to contain the one half, and for the other form to contain the other half of Christ, would be impious. But it is said, that in giving Communion under one kind, and depriving lay-people of the Chalice, we transgress the commandment of Christ, who, at the last supper said, "drink ye all of this," &c. &c.

In answer to this, we say, that Christ only spoke to his Apostles, as it is certain that none were present at the last supper but they. The precept then was directed to the Apostles, in obedience to which they and their successors to this day, when they celebrate the holy mysteries, always receive under both kinds.

St. Paul very clearly states that Communion may be validly received under either kind alone. "Wherefore whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, &c." 1. Cor. xi. 27.

I know, sir, that your Protestant translation says eat and drink, instead of eat or drink; but if you compare the Catholic translation with the genuine original Greek, you will find it correct. The sufficiency of one kind in the holy Communion is