

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 424 and 426 Richmond street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.50 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NOTTEGRAVE, Editor.

REV. WILLIAM FLANNERY, Editor.

THOMAS COFFEY, Editor.

Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY.

Author of "Mysteries of Modern Mysticism."

Agent for Alexandria, Glennevis and London, Ontario.

Special Agent for the Dominion.

Approved by the Archbishop of Toronto.

Approved by the Archbishop of Ottawa.

Approved by the Archbishop of Kingston.

Approved by the Archbishop of Hamilton.

Approved by the Archbishop of London, Ontario.

Approved by the Archbishop of Montreal.

Approved by the Archbishop of Quebec.

Approved by the Archbishop of Halifax.

Approved by the Archbishop of St. John's.

Approved by the Archbishop of Vancouver.

Approved by the Archbishop of Victoria.

Approved by the Archbishop of San Francisco.

Approved by the Archbishop of Los Angeles.

Approved by the Archbishop of New York.

Approved by the Archbishop of Baltimore.

Approved by the Archbishop of Philadelphia.

Approved by the Archbishop of St. Louis.

Approved by the Archbishop of Chicago.

Approved by the Archbishop of Cincinnati.

Approved by the Archbishop of St. Paul.

Approved by the Archbishop of Minneapolis.

Approved by the Archbishop of St. Louis.

Approved by the Archbishop of Kansas City.

Approved by the Archbishop of Omaha.

Approved by the Archbishop of Denver.

Approved by the Archbishop of Salt Lake City.

Approved by the Archbishop of Portland.

Approved by the Archbishop of Seattle.

Approved by the Archbishop of San Diego.

Approved by the Archbishop of San Antonio.

Approved by the Archbishop of Austin.

Approved by the Archbishop of Dallas.

Approved by the Archbishop of Houston.

Approved by the Archbishop of New Orleans.

Approved by the Archbishop of Mobile.

Approved by the Archbishop of Savannah.

Approved by the Archbishop of Charleston.

Approved by the Archbishop of Richmond.

Approved by the Archbishop of Norfolk.

Approved by the Archbishop of Washington.

Approved by the Archbishop of Baltimore.

Approved by the Archbishop of Philadelphia.

Approved by the Archbishop of St. Louis.

Approved by the Archbishop of Chicago.

Approved by the Archbishop of Cincinnati.

Approved by the Archbishop of St. Paul.

Approved by the Archbishop of Minneapolis.

Approved by the Archbishop of St. Louis.

Approved by the Archbishop of Kansas City.

Approved by the Archbishop of Omaha.

Approved by the Archbishop of Denver.

Approved by the Archbishop of Salt Lake City.

Approved by the Archbishop of Portland.

Approved by the Archbishop of Seattle.

Approved by the Archbishop of San Diego.

Approved by the Archbishop of San Antonio.

Approved by the Archbishop of Austin.

Approved by the Archbishop of Dallas.

Approved by the Archbishop of Houston.

Approved by the Archbishop of New Orleans.

Approved by the Archbishop of Mobile.

Approved by the Archbishop of Savannah.

Approved by the Archbishop of Charleston.

Approved by the Archbishop of Richmond.

Approved by the Archbishop of Norfolk.

Approved by the Archbishop of Washington.

Approved by the Archbishop of Baltimore.

Approved by the Archbishop of Philadelphia.

Approved by the Archbishop of St. Louis.

Approved by the Archbishop of Chicago.

Approved by the Archbishop of Cincinnati.

Approved by the Archbishop of St. Paul.

Approved by the Archbishop of Minneapolis.

Approved by the Archbishop of St. Louis.

Approved by the Archbishop of Kansas City.

Approved by the Archbishop of Omaha.

Approved by the Archbishop of Denver.

Approved by the Archbishop of Salt Lake City.

Approved by the Archbishop of Portland.

(phases) body, corn and bread, and Him-

self also a vine, honored the symbols

which are seen with the title of bread

and wine—not changing the nature but adding

grace to the nature (T. IV, 25, Ed. Seb.)

Again: Let us take St. Hilary, who, if any

one, used language most like the language

of later ages; still the very object of his

reasoning was to prove that in Christ's

person there are two natures—one not

extinguished because the other is added.

He illustrates this by the Bread of the

Eucharist, which still retains the nature of

the Bread unchanged, although the nature

of Christ's Body is added to it. Mark, not

changed into it, as Transubstantiation

would have it. The last I shall give is from

the writings of a Bishop of Rome, Gelasius.

He writes: "Certainly the sacrament of the

Body and Blood of Christ, which we re-

ceive, is a divine thing, therefore also we

are by the same made partakers of the

divine nature, and yet the substance and

nature of bread and wine cease not to be."

In the course of your articles you

attempted to prove that Transubstantiation

is derived directly from the words of Holy

Scripture. If it is, will you kindly ex-

plain how it is that in the Holy Scriptures

in connection with the Eucharist wherever

mentioned, the bread is from first to

last called "bread." The bread which

we break is it not the communion of the

Body of Christ? Again, the Apostle three

times calls the bread, after consecration,

bread: "As oft as ye eat this bread (which

has been consecrated) ye do show the

Lord's death till He come." Again, "who-

soever shall eat this bread... unwor-

thly shall be guilty of the Body... of

the Lord." Again, "Let a man examine

himself and so let him eat of this bread."

In all these cases the thing spoken of as

bread, and as therefore remaining bread,

is that bread which had been consecrated.

And still more plainly are we taught

that after consecration the wine in the

cup remains in substance the same as

before, for Our Lord called it, after con-

secrating it, "the fruit of the vine."

So that respecting each kind in this

words are said or written from which we

are bound to infer that both bread and

wine remain as to their natural sub-

Catholic Record.

London, Sat., July 26th, 1890.

TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

To the Editor Catholic Record:

Sir—Kindly allow me to make some

further remarks on the above subject

with special reference to your comments

on my last letter.

As you still insist that the teaching of

the Fathers of the Church is in favor of

the change of one substance into another

in the Eucharist, and in your present

comments assert that my statement

"your quotations from the Fathers will

be found to be in perfect harmony with

the Anglican doctrine" is very in-

sufficient, I will confine myself for the

present to a brief consideration of their

testimony.

As it is impossible, within the limits of

the present letter, to consider each se-

parate quotation by itself, I will confine

myself to one or two of the most impor-

tant.

Let us first take the one of St. Gregory

of Nyssa, which you quoted twice, evi-

dently thinking it the strongest in your

favor. The passage is "we rightly

believe that the bread is changed into the

Body of the Word of God." The Greek

equivalent of the word changed is *metab-*

asthai; now those who translate this by

the Latin *transubstantiare* think we

have here the very word made use of

which exactly answers to the doctrine

of Transubstantiation, viz, the change of

the elements into something different

from their original substances. Yet, first

of all, *transubstantiare* is not certainly or

probably a right translation. Secondly,

St. Gregory speaks not only of a change

in the Eucharist but in the sacraments

generally; and whatever sanctifying

efficacy may have been attributed to the

waters in baptism no change of its sub-

stance was ever believed to take place,

for, in the very next sentence after the

one quoted above, he says, "these things

he gives by virtue of the benediction

upon it, changing the nature of things

which appear.

The same observations apply to the

passage cited from St. Cyril of Jerusalem,

where he speaks of Christ's changing the

water into wine, and then adds "where

fore with all certainty let us receive the

Body and Blood of Christ; for His Body

is given to thee under the appearance (or

figure) of bread, and His Blood under

the appearance of wine." But here St. Cyril

happily explains himself; for soon after

he speaks of the bread not only as

changed into the Body of Christ, but

as changed into the Body of Christ, but

as changed into the Body of Christ, but

as changed into the Body of Christ, but

as changed into the Body of Christ, but

as changed into the Body of Christ, but

as changed into the Body of Christ, but

as changed into the Body of Christ, but

as changed into the Body of Christ, but

as changed into the Body of Christ, but

as changed into the Body of Christ, but

as changed into the Body of Christ, but

Toronto, June 21, 1890.

Already in our treatment of this sub-

ject, in answer to our correspondent

Anglican, we pointed out that previously

to the time of the "Angelic Doctor," St.

Thomas of Aquinas, the Fathers of the

Church, on whose testimony we rely to

prove that the doctrine of Transubstantia-

tion, as believed by the Catholic Church of

to-day, was constantly the doctrine, did not

enter upon the subtle philosophical en-

quiry into the nature of substance and

form. They were contented to accept

simply the words of Christ, which implied

His actual presence in the Holy Eucharist,

without undertaking to explain the pro-

cess by which He brought about the ineff-

able change. But the extracts which we

already quoted from their writings prove

abundantly that it was the universal belief

that not merely is Christ present in that

Sacrament, but that the bread and wine

are actually changed into His Sacred

Flesh and Blood.

Our quotations to this effect might

have been much more numerous than they

were. As the statement made by our

esteemed correspondent was that the

doctrine of Transubstantiation is found

in the "realistic philosophy," and not

upon the words of Scripture, and that

taught by the Fathers before the realistic

philosophy was applied to it, we suffi-

ciently refuted the statement.

There is a case in point which illus-

trates well our meaning. Before geology

became a science, there were Christian

writers who so far penetrated the signifi-

cance of the creative words of Genesis i,

as to inform us that there is nothing in

that chapter to imply that the creation

of the universe out of nothing took

place, say four thousand years before

Christ. St. Augustine, Basil and Gre-

gory of Nazianum, pointed out that "in

the beginning God created heaven and

earth" is not put down as the work of

the first of the seven days during which

the earth was prepared for man. Yet

the generality of Christians undoubtedly

believed that all things were created

during that period. Not until geology

as a science was invented did it become

clear that the earth must have existed

thousands of years before man existed on

it. This discovery caused more atten-

tion to be directed to the almost pro-

phetic words of the illustrious writers we

have named, and it was since the de-

velopment of the science of geology that

other Christian writers have bethought

themselves of methods of reconciling the

words of Scripture with the discoveries

which geology brought to the view of

mankind; and they have succeeded admir-

ably.

No one can say truly that the Scriptural

dogma of Creation is based upon any one

of the many theories by which the history

of Creation is shown to be consistent with

geological discovery. The history of

Creation was written, and was under-

stood, at all events, as far as was needful

for the making of an act of divine faith,

before geology was dreamed of as a

science, and before the theories of recon-

ciliation, to which we here refer, were

thought of. And yet we are not bound