

credly connected, and so near to the first origin of christianity? The same observation would apply to the Church of Jerusalem, of which the second bishop, Simeon, was 129 years old when crowned with martyrdom, and the liturgy of which was explained by St. Cyril to his neophytes about the middle of the fourth age, and likewise to the Church of Lyons, where St. Irenæus disciple of St. Polycarp, sealed the faith with his blood in 204, &c. Now if a change of this nature could not have been effected in any given Church, how are we to conceive it possible in them all? How are we to imagine, that, in times so pure & so devoted to the doctrine of the apostles, men could ever have come to an understanding to change and corrupt that doctrine. that they could, for the adopting of an unheard of faith and novel practices, have concerted together, in Italy, the Gauls and in Spain, in Syria and in the Kingdoms of Asia? But this is not all. how are we to imagine that the Nestorians, who appeared at the precise time when the liturgies were first published, would have borrowed them from the Church which condemned their heresy, instead of retaliating upon her by reclamations which they might reasonably have made, and which their interests would not have allowed them to forego? How are we to conceive again, that the partisans of Eutyches would have followed the same conduct, and that the numerous enemies of the council of Chalcedon—the Jacobites, Copts or Syrians—would have taken pride in celebrating the catholic liturgies, notwithstanding so many essential and manifest interpolations? This supposition is full of every thing so contrary to the laws that rule the heart of man, that it would be loss of time to dwell any longer on the subject. As it cannot with any shew of reason be contradicted, nothing remains but frankly and honorably to acknowledge, that the unanimity, and uniform agreement of all the christians of the fifth age, without even a trace of the most trifling reclamation, clearly prove that the liturgies of that period must faithfully express the belief and practice of the first ages.*

These ancient liturgies you have just been reading—In them you have every where discovered the altar, the oblation, the immolation of the victim and the unbloody sacrifice: every where have you found the invocation for effecting the change of substance, which, on the one hand, supposes the real presence, and, on the other, commands our adoration. From north to south, from east to west you have heard words expressing these dog-

*I add, to what hath been already observed the consent of all the Christian Churches in the world, however distant from each other, in the prayer of oblation of the christian sacrifice; in the holy Eucharist or sacrament of the Lord's Supper; which consent is indeed wonderful. All the ancient witnesses agree in this form of prayer, almost in the same words, but fully and exactly in the same sense, order and method; which, whosoever attentively considers, must be convinced, that this order of prayer was delivered to the several Churches in the very first plantation and settlement of them." Bishop Bull's "Some important Points of Primitive Christianity maintained and defended." London, 1714, 2nd Edit. Vol, II. Serm. xiii. p. 553.

mas proceed from the mouth of the priests and bishops, even, if I mistake not, with more energy and spirit in the oriental Churches than in the Roman Church. You have beheld all the christians of the world approaching the altar with faith, fear and adoration. Such therefore was incontestably the belief of the world, united with the general and almost daily practice of this golden age of christianity. The liturgies* of every thing that bore the christian name to the 5th century and of every thing that still bears it, excepting only yourselves, trace them in characters so bold and legible that I cannot conceive how any man of sense, who is solicitous for his salvation, after having once read them, should not immediately abandon every communion, in which these dogmas are despised, that he might unite himself to the faith of the primitive Church, become associated to her sacred liturgy, and join with her in adoring Jesus Christ present under the sacred species in the august and adorable mystery of the Eucharist.

PARTICULAR BELIEF OF THE PRINCIPAL CHURCHES RESPECTING THE APOSTOLICITY OF THEIR LITURGIES.

It will be but just and proper to commence by the eminent and primitive church, in which all the others unite as in their centre. See, then, in what manner the Sovereign Pontiffs have spoken of their Liturgy. "Who does not know that what has been left to the Church of Rome by Peter, and is practised to the present day, ought to be observed by all: that no one can add to it, or introduce any thing into it without authority, or from any other source: it being manifest above all things that, throughout all Italy, in the Gauls, Spain, Africa and Sicily, no Church has ever been established, but by those, to whom the venerable Apostle Peter or his successors had confided the priestly administration of it?"

Gelasius, who occupied the holy see from 492 to 496, has left us a sacramentary bearing his name, which is the most ancient of any that have come to us in the Roman Liturgy. He has arranged the prayers handed down to him by tradition, and has also introduced some prayers and prefaces of his own. Following the opinion of the learned, we must consider the sacramentary of Gelasius as a collection of what was read at mass in the Church of Rome from the time of the Apostles, and of some few additional prayers, which this saint thought advisable to introduce.

*There is not one of these ancient liturgies which together with the oblation and sacrifice, does not also mark out, and often in the same phrase, the change of substance and the adoration. Bishop Bull must have been aware of this: yet he passes it over in silence. From the uniformity of the liturgies, he infers with good reason the apostolic doctrine of the oblation and sacrifice: but he refrains from drawing the same inference respecting the change of substance and the adoration! He loudly proclaims the apostolicity of the former, while he conceals that of the latter! What ties his tongue and checks his manly progress towards truth? Deplorable weakness of human nature! The acknowledgment of the whole truth would have exposed him to sacrifices, which he had not the courage to make.

From Rome the Churches of Spain received the Liturgy, as we learn from Innocent I. just quoted. and also according to the tradition among the Spaniards, of which Isidore, the celebrated and learned bishop of Seville, assures us in the following most positive terms: "The order of the mass together with the prayers by which the gifts offered to God are consecrated, was first instituted by St. Peter." We may add, that he did it at the instigation of St. Paul; for Saint Clement, successor of Saint Peter, says in his letter to the Corinthians that the apostle, after having instructed the East announced the Gospel to the extremities of the West, which will apply to Spain. We know, further, from St. Paul himself, that he projected the apostolic course. "When I shall begin to take my journey into Spain" wrote he to the Romans "I hope that as I shall pass, I shall see you." And a little afterwards: "I will come by you into Spain." It appears also that after this voyage St. Peter and St. Paul sent from Rome seven bishops into Spain, who extended the faith in that vast and barbarous country, and there also sealed it with their blood, after having founded many Churches and established the public worship and divine service according to the liturgy of St. Peter.

Pope Vigilius sent the order of the Roman mass to Probalanus, bishop of Brague, that he might see how it was drawn up. The council of Brague in 563 adopted it for all Spain. Now, in the letter of Pope Vigilius, the canon is called by excellence the canonical prayer: we there learn that it comes down traditionally from the apostles, *quem ex traditione apostolica successimus*; that it was said straight forward in every mass and that there were not different canons for different feasts, *sed semper eodem tenore oblata Dio numero consecramus*: that there were merely some additions made on certain solemn festivals by way of commemorating them. This testimony confirms what has been already mentioned, that, according to the Roman tradition, the canon, that is, the essential part of the liturgy, came from the apostles.

The liturgy, that Pepin and Charlemagne caused to be put aside for the Roman rite, was undoubtedly brought from the East into Gaul. We come to this decision from its close resemblance to the oriental liturgies. It appears that St. Paul, on his way from Rome to Spain, passed through Gaul and left bishops there, Crescentinus at Vienna; Paul at Narbonne, Trophimus in Arles. Pothianus, first bishop of Lyons, where he suffered martyrdom when upwards of ninety, was a disciple of St. Polycarp: Irenæus, his successor, came also from Smyrna, where he had been brought up by the same apostolic man. The letter of the Churches of Vienna and Lyons to those of Asia and Phrygia clearly shews the relation existing between christian Gaul and the East. This should suffice to shew the origin of the Gallic liturgy and its apostolic institution, because it was indubitably practised and taught by its first bishops. It is indeed probable that the apostles of Gaul went to Rome, and there received authority from Saint Peter or his successors. But this sanction of the Holy See did not prevent them from forming the liturgy according to