



CATHOLIC CHRONICLE.

MONTREAL, FRIDAY, APRIL 9, 1852.

VOL. II.

NO. 35.

LECTURE BY HIS EMINENCE CARDINAL ARCHBISHOP OF WESTMINSTER. Delivered in St. George's Cathedral, Southwark, on the Evening of Sunday, Feb. 29, 1852.

"PROTESTANT OBJECTIONS TO CATHOLICISM." (From the Glasgow Free Press.)

The cathedral was crowded by an immense congregation of Catholics and Protestants to hear his Eminence, who took as his subject the doctrine of transubstantiation, choosing for his text Psalm lxxvii. 19, "And they spoke ill of God; they said, can God furnish a table in the wilderness?" These words of distrust and complaint, he said, were strange words to come from a people who had so lately seen such mighty miracles worked before their eyes—who had seen the waters of the Nile changed into blood—the first-born of Egypt slain in a single night—the sea divided in the midst, and themselves passing over dry-shod, while Pharaoh, and his chariots, and horsemen, and all the hosts and flowers of Egypt, had perished before their eyes. "Are, then, all these things," they murmured, "done that we may die in the wilderness? and can God give us food to support us there?" And yet it was so with them—too often it is so with ourselves. We see and confess God in what is signal and strange; but in the common events of daily life we see Him and hear Him not; in the storm, and in the sea, and in the thunder, we behold His presence; but in the genial shower, and the growing blade and ear, we forget His hand. And so reasoned the children of Israel. God can do, and has done, great things for us; we forget not His wondrous works; but can He "provide food for His people," and "furnish a table in the wilderness?" Not, among her most sacred doctrines, the Catholic Church holds and cherishes one tender and awful mystery, in which it is not hard to find a parallel to what we have said above. A Protestant cries out, "I can believe in God's miracles; but can He now do such great things ordinarily? Can it be possible that He still supplies bread to His people? I can readily believe that God died to redeem fallen man—I can accept as true the mystery of the incarnation of the Son of God, though it is a mystery in comparison of which the fathers of the Church declare that creation itself was poor—I can believe that our blessed Saviour ascended into heaven, and, as man, is seated at the right hand of the Father; this I can believe; but that there should be a constant, though latent, flow of daily nourishment from above, I cannot believe."

On the other hand, the Catholic holds that as God once opened, so He does now open the gate of heaven, and gives to His chosen people manna, the bread of angels. Such is our faith; and what though it be the scorn and the ridicule of the world, it is to us our dearest treasure—the real, true, and substantial, presence of our Lord and Saviour in the Eucharist. It will be my aim, this evening, to consider the general objections urged against this doctrine. I will not enter into details, but I will show how utterly inconsistent is any other doctrine than our own with the types of the Old Testament, and with the account of its solemn institution in the New. It is no wonder that the remembrance of the manna in the wilderness should have remained, as we know it did remain, handed down by tradition among the Jews. For forty years it was their daily food in the wilderness—yes, even during that long series of wayward rebellion and idolatry, when they were so often seduced from their fidelity. Yet in vain was God provoked; the current of His goodness was never stayed. Even while the golden calf was being adored on Horeb, the manna still descended; it was once promised by God Himself, and His promises fail not. And that on which the chosen race were fed, we are told, "had in itself every savor of sweetness." It was milk to the child, it was meat to the strong man; it was suited to the sickly palate, and gave strength to the warrior. It was given day by day, at early morn; it was given so long as it was necessary—that is, so long as the Israelites were on their journey to the promised land; it was the food of the exile and the traveller, and it ceased as soon as they entered Canaan. Surely in all this we may expect to see the symbol of something greater far. The promised land, we know, was but a type of this life. If so, I say, we must expect to find some analogy between the food which sustained them and that which sustains us. But this is no mere conjecture. St. Paul expressly states that the children of Israel, and all that befel them, were types of us Christians; he declares that they eat of "spiritual food"—food, that is, in which a deep spiritual meaning lay hid. And what was this? Let us see. It was a striking symbol which He gave to them when He was delivering them from the angel of death, and from the tyranny of Pharaoh. They had as yet no altar nor priesthood, for Aaron and his family had not yet been set apart as holy. Yet a sacrifice was

to be offered by each family. The paschal lamb was to be slain as a victim, and then eaten; it was to become the food of the rescued race; its blood was to be sprinkled on the door-posts, and it was after partaking of this feast that their deliverance came; and year by year a lamb was slain to remind them of their great salvation, and to keep alive in their minds one eternal truth, that the lamb which was slain was for ever to become the food of the saved. We can, then, at once recognise the antitype of the manna in the Christian Church. The same doubts are raised now against it as were uttered of old by the Israelites in the wilderness; and, though the same objections are raised against it, the same results of mercy follow now as then. St. John tells us of a certain miracle performed by our Blessed Lord, which carries our minds back to the miracle of the manna. A crowd of 5,000 people has followed Him into the wilderness; they were hungered; and, forgetful of His wondrous powers, the disciples cry, "Whence shall we buy bread that these may eat?" Here we have the parallel to the cry of the distrustful Israelite, "Can God furnish a table in the wilderness?" Our Blessed Lord led their minds to the spiritual meaning of the manna. He feeds them, and the fragments are gathered up, and because of this miracle, so clearly marking him to be the true Messiah, the people crowd upon Him. Then, in a most sublime and magnificent discourse (John, vi. 31, 59), He declares that He is Himself the true manna, the true bread which came down from heaven; and then, arousing their attention, He says, "I am the bread of life." Now, the Catholic Church takes these words as they were spoken by His lips, and builds upon them her sacred doctrines, corresponding to His words. She believes and teaches that the living bread still comes down from Heaven transcendentally upon our altars. The manna was perishable, but our bread is undying; for it is the Incarnate God, and once worthily received it gives immortality. We may gather it daily if we will. It still adapts itself to every want—it is strength to the martyr, and love to the chaste virgin in her cloister. It is still the "Vinum germinans virgines," uniting to God the souls of His beloved ones, and nerving them for their daily life in the world; and verily like the manna, but in a higher degree, "it hath in itself all sweetness," for it is He, very God and very man. You see that we alter not a word. We have no need of distorting the words of Scripture; and yet we are told, forsooth, that this sacred doctrine is incredible. Hence, as the Jew of old said, "This is a hard saying, who can bear it?" so the Protestant now rejects it as incredible and impossible. I would say to them, then, "If our interpretation be false, you are bound to give us one that suits the context better. The burden of proof lies with you, who reject the literal and take up with a figurative meaning. If prejudice be put aside, you will admit that the Catholic doctrine, if it be true, is more near the words of Scripture than your own. "But," you say, "the Catholic doctrine is not true." Now; this is unfair; it is a mere assumption; you then bend Scripture to your ideas. Can anything be clearer? And how is the new meaning found? No learned commentator among Protestants denies the literal meaning. They all strive to admit the words, but to evade their consequences. The platform, and pulpit, and pamphlet interpretation, is known to us all. It says, "Oh! it is all easy enough; by 'eating' our Lord means believing," and by "flesh and blood" He meant simply His death—"believe in my death." And is God's word to be thus set aside, and that for the sake of persons, no two of whom can agree as to the manner in which they admit their Saviour's words to be true. We take all literally; we fill up the type given us; nothing is more simple, more noble, or more complete. But destroy the literal interpretation of those words, and what is the result? An absurdity. The people, already when He spoke, believed Him to be the true Messiah, He speaks therefore of something further. What sense would there have been in saying, "You must do that which most of you do now, and which all of you soon will do;" surely such speech would have been superfluous. Could then He, the simple and gentle prophet, go on thus deluding them? And could He have allowed the Jews and the disciples to go away thus puzzled and perplexed? Nay, if this had been all His meaning, what need for them to go away at all, as they did, in disgust at the stumbling-block which His words presented to them? Can you reconcile this? Can you account for this? No. But our version of His words is simple, "He cannot have intended to deceive or perplex." Thus as you see, the Catholic who is accused of hating his Bible, takes his Bible in its plain and obvious sense, while Protestants distort it and get from it at best a diluted meaning; they find in their Saviour's words no fulfilment of a type, no connection with anything that has gone before or that follows after. There is one expression in our Lord's discourse, on which, perhaps, I ought to touch in passing; it is that which declares

that 'the flesh profiteth not; it is the spirit that profiteth,' a text which Protestants consider to be decisive in favor of the metaphorical interpretation—in fact, to be the key of the whole discourse. But if this be an assertion that His words are not to be taken literally, why (as we said above) did the disciple turn away disgusted? I have read all modern Protestant commentators on this passage, and they one and all confess that this Protestant solution is hopeless and will not hold. Where in the Bible do the words 'flesh' and 'spirit,' in opposition, mean 'the literal' and 'the metaphorical sense?' They occur at least thirty times in the sacred volume, and in every place they have a totally different meaning; they point to the corrupt and to the sanctifying principle which are in conflict in degenerate man; and so far from favoring the Protestant version, they, in reality strongly condemn those who went away in disbelief, crying, 'This is a hard saying.' But as I cannot enter into details, I refer my Protestant hearers to my lectures on the Eucharist for further solution of the texts of Holy Scripture usually advanced against the Catholic doctrine of the Real Presence. (The book, we may observe, is a small 8 vo., published by C. Dolman.) In the desert God fed the Israelites, and Jesus Christ fed the crowds that followed him. It was at the paschal table that the victim became first the food and then the salvation of those who fed upon it. The parallel to this is to be found in the Church alone. The spotless lamb; and who is this 'lamb' but He, 'the Lamb of God who taketh away the sins of the world.' He, whom St. John saw in the Apocalypse as the 'Lamb slain from the foundation of the world.' The lamb of old was to be eaten on the eve, to become a means of salvation on the morrow. This points to Him, and to the last Paschal Supper which He eat with His disciples, when He, who was on the morrow to die for the sins of the people, gave Himself to be the food of the chosen ones. His words on that occasion were simple; he spoke not to his disciples then in parables; he spoke as the dying Patriarch Jacob spake to his children, I gave them the legacy of his latest blessing. 'With desire, I have desired to eat this Pasch with you.' Why this desire, if, after all, it were a mere commemorative rite? No; in effect, He says, 'the Lamb which is to redeem you must first become your food.' Let us observe Him; He rises, he girds himself; He washes their feet. He is about to do and to say that which, as He then well knew and foresaw, though the most loving act of His life, should hereafter become the cause of strife and division among professing Christians. Oh! blessed Lord, let thy words be simple and few, yet clear and full; let all be intelligible. What dost thou, and what sayest thou? See, He takes the bread, and gives thanks, and blesses it, saying, 'This is my body.' He takes the cup and says, 'This is my blood.' Come now, ye men of simple faith, on the one side; come, ye doubters and cavillers, on the other. Come, ye learned and disputatious Protestants. The Catholic adores in simple faith; the Protestant still questions. Stand, then, on either side, and let Him stand between us and judge. He says, 'This is my body.' The Catholic falls down, and adoring says—'Yes, Lord, this is thy body.' The Protestant cries, 'No, it is not; it is a figure.' Who is the Scriptural Christian now? And who is it that presumes to question His sacred words? There is no middle ground here between believing and rejecting. Let us, then, choose each our champions. First, then, we will choose one on behalf of the Protestants; he shall be one who has read the sacred text again and again; he shall be the very first and earliest discoverer of the Protestant interpretation. It is Luther's disciple, Zuinglius; for till 300 years ago no simple Christian, for 15 centuries, had dared to doubt or question the truth of the Redeemer's words; even Luther himself, when he adopted heretical notions on other points, still firmly believed, or professed to believe the real presence, and much did He revile Zuinglius for his novel discovery. But how did this 'Reformer' get at such a meaning? Let him speak for himself. 'Conscience,' he says, 'compels me to state whence this interpretation of mine was derived. I could not persuade the Senate at Zurich to adopt my view, and I racked my brains in vain for proof, but I could find none. At length I lay down to sleep, and in my dreams an angel came, whether white or black I cannot tell, and he quoted to me Exodus xii.—'This is the Lord's Pasch.' Good God, and is it thus that, after 1,500 years, the truth of thy word is to be found out, from a vision which some 'Reformer' cannot tell whether it is an angel or a devil? Think, my brethren, whether it follows, because our blessed Lord sometimes spoke in parables, that, therefore, He always must have spoken so? And see to what fatal lengths you will be led by such a principle of interpretation. Take these simple words—'The word was God.' The Arian, of course, says that they mean, 'The word was a figure of God';

but the very Protestant feels obliged to object here, and to say, 'I cannot admit that the words must have such a meaning—they may, perhaps, but I am not forced to adopt it.' The Protestant is right; and just so, we refuse to give up the literal meaning, when our blessed Lord says, 'This is my body.' But let us take the second champion of the Protestants. He comes forward and says, 'I am a philosopher; I know the laws of nature; I tell you plainly that you must take the words in a figurative sense; all science is against you; sense is against you; a body cannot be in two places at once.' But Jesus Christ was not addressing wise men or philosophers, nor did he intend twelve Galilean fishermen to wait for 1,500 years, till the discovery of the laws of nature and science should direct them aright. Is it not absurd to think that they were to wait until the discovery of chemical properties, and the powers of steam and of the telegraph should clear up all difficulty? Alas! the laws of nature, when once they are brought into conflict with the power of God, make sad havoc with the holiest doctrines of our faith, such as the Incarnation, and the union of the divine and human natures in one person, in our blessed Lord! The two champions of Protestantism, then, are the Swiss Reformer and the modern man of science. Against them we place our champion. That champion is a little child; and our Lord says, 'Except ye become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of Heaven.' The little child is the type of unreasoning faith. It will say—What, did not Jesus Christ walk on the water, change water into wine, and raise the dead? And are not 'all things possible with God?' Thus speaks the little child; and faith is the only fit judge of divine truth. And which champion will Christ approve?—surely the child. If we judge with the child by faith (the type is at once filled up; we have our sacrifice and our paschal Lamb; all is filled up, and becomes a consistent whole. Destroy this, and what remains? No lamb, but mere bread and wine; and so the Protestant view brings Christianity down to something lower than Judaism, and gives us a type of less meaning, less clear, and less spiritual than the type that was given to the Jew. It is only the Catholic who has a reality answering to this type; he has the Lamb, at once the victim and the food of the redeemed.

In conclusion, let me exhort the ignorant or prejudiced to 'search the Scriptures' well, and see whether so long as they adhere to the Protestant interpretation, it be not because they themselves know neither those Scriptures nor the power of God. This one doctrine once received, all Catholic truth at once rests itself upon it; it is the full realisation of our Blessed Lord's incarnation. Then concentrate your attention on this doctrine exclusively. In the end, if you do so it will make you a Catholic; and in that Holy Sacrament, on the altars of the Catholic Church, you will find all strength and sweetness, and never-failing life.

The lecture was listened to with breathless attention. We observed among the audience several Protestant clergymen. Benediction with the Most Holy Sacrament was afterwards given by the Rev. Dr. Doyle.

ST. PATRICK'S DAY IN LONDON.

THE CARDINAL'S VISIT TO ST. PATRICK'S, SOHO.

The Retreat which has been given by the Rev. Fathers Gaudentius and Joseph was to have closed on Sunday last, but, in consequence of St. Patrick's Day falling on the Wednesday after, at the desire of the Pastors the Fathers prolonged the Retreat till that day. Great numbers poured round the sanctuary at the early Masses to partake of the Bread of Life, and at eleven o'clock Solemn High Mass was sung by the Rev. T. Long before his Eminence the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster, who sat under the throne, erected for him in the sanctuary, until the Gospel, when he ascended the altar platform, and delivered a most impressive eulogy on the Saint, of which the following is a brief and meagre outline. Taking his text from St. Paul's Epistle to the Corinthians, iv., 15, "For if you have ten thousand instructors in Christ yet not many fathers; for in Christ Jesus, by the Gospel, I have begotten you," his Eminence showed that besides the immediate Apostles of our Lord's, to few of the Saints had been given the glorious title of Apostle of a nation—the Father of an entire race. "Who has been given to you for your apostle?" said the Cardinal addressing his hearers. "Whom do you acknowledge for spiritual father? Your hearts answer in the name of that glorious Saint whose memory we celebrate today. For you are the descendants of those who received the Faith from him, and who have clung to it throughout ages in spite of all the persecutions and efforts directed against you to deprive you of that treasure." His Eminence then showed how contrary were the means employed by the Almighty to pro-