

of unbelievers, impious, blasphemers, impostors, heretics, incredulous people struck with the spirit of blindness, barefaced and shameless men, turbulent ministers, busy agents of Satan, &c.

Heshusious, after exposing the doctrine of Calvinists, indignantly declares, that "they not only transform God into a Devil, the very idea of which is horrible; but that they annihilate the merits of Jesus Christ to such a degree that they deserve to be banished for ever to the bottom of hell."

The Calvinists themselves objected against this doctrine of their leader. Bullinger proves its erroneousness from Scripture, the Fathers of the whole Church. "We do therefore" said he "prove clearly from Scripture this dogma taught every where since the Apostles' time, that God is not the author of evil, the cause of sin, but our corrupt inclinations or concupisence, and the Devil who moves, excites, and inflames it." [c] And Chatillon, whom Calvin had for a long time taken into his house and fed at his table, was one of the first to take up the pen against his benefactor, and master, although he did it with all the deference due to his double title. "He is a false God" said he "that is so slow to mercy, so quick to wrath, who has created the greatest part of men to destroy them, and has not only predestined them to damnation, but even to the cause of their damnation. This God, then, must have determined from all Eternity, and he now actually wishes and causes that we be necessitated to sin; so that thefts, adulteries and murders are never committed but at his impulse; for he suggests to men perverse and shameful affections; he hardens them, not merely by simple permission, but actually and efficaciously; so that the wicked man accomplishes the work of God and not his own, and it is no longer Satan, but Calvin's God who is really the father of lies."

Calvin in his turn forgets not to reproach Chatillon with his ingratitude, and adds: "Never did any man carry pride, perfidy and inhumanity to a higher pitch. He who does not know thee to be an imposter, a buffoon, an impudent cynic and one ever ready to rail at piety, is not fit to judge of any thing." Towards the end of his reply, he dismisses him with the following Genevan benediction: "May the God Satan quiet thee. amen. Amen. Geneva, 1558."

To be continued.

DEFENCE OF CATHOLIC PRINCIPLES,

By Demetrius A. Gallitzin, a Russian Prince; now a Catholic Priest; addressed by him to a reviler of our Holy Religion.

Continued.

From this short explanation I have given of the Catholic doctrine of Confession, you will candidly agree, dear sir, that the practice of sacramental Confession, far from being superstitions, is a very useful one. I shall now explain what the Catholic Church teaches and commands us to believe with regard to

THE HOLY EUCHARIST,

OR

LORD'S SUPPER.

It is sufficient to read the words of Christ in the gospel, to form an accurate idea of what the Catholic Church believes on that important subject.

Jesus Christ says, "I am the bread of life."

John vi. 35 and 48. "I am the living bread which came down from heaven: if any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever; and the bread which I will give, is my flesh, for the life of the world." John vi. 51, 52.

"Unless you eat the flesh of the son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed; and my blood is drink indeed."

"He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, abideth in me, and in him."

"As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father; so he that eateth me, the same also shall live by me." John vi. 54, 58.

Here you see in plain words what we believe on the subject of the Eucharist.

We believe that Jesus Christ is the living bread the food of our immortal souls. John vi. 35, 48.

We believe that we must feed on the sacred flesh and blood of Christ, in order to obtain eternal life. John vi. 54, 55.

We believe that the flesh of Christ, and the blood of Christ, are our spiritual food indeed, and not in figure, 56; and finally, that in the holy Eucharist we receive Jesus Christ himself the spiritual food of our souls, 53.

Divine mysteries being impervious to human reason, we do not arrogate to ourselves the right of philosophising on the present mystery, nor do we make ourselves uneasy about the means by which Christ is to enable us to accomplish what he here requires. We do not ask with the Jews: How can this man give us his flesh to eat? but with Simon Peter we say, "Lord! to whom shall we go! thou hast the words of eternal life." John vi. 69. Surely sir, we ought not to be blamed for believin that Christ meant what he said.

The Jew may be scandalized, the Philosopher may smile in his self-sufficiency but the Catholic, with the humility of a child, submits, not knowing what it is to reason upon impenetrable mysteries. He may stand in silent raptures of astonishment at the depth of God's unfathomable wisdom; but he does not know what it is to doubt, and he has that comfort to know, that before the tribunal of Christ, he will be able to bring the very words of Christ in evidence of the orthodoxy of his belief.

Pray, sir, laying aside all prejudice, will you say that Christ, on the great day of retribution, will condemn me as guilty of superstition, for believing precisely what he tells me? viz. that I must receive his living flesh and blood; that I really receive both in the blessed Eucharist; that I receive Christ himself according to his own repeated declaration. You will hardly say no.

On the other hand, what excuse, what plea, will any one have, who, notwithstanding Christ's positive declaration, can see nothing in the sacrament but bread and wine.

Christ says, you must eat my flesh and drink my blood. No, no, says limited reason, for how can Christ give us his flesh to eat? Christ says, my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. No, no, says corrupted reason, it cannot be so indeed, it must be meant as a figure only. Christ says, "he that eateth me, shall live by me." What? (says limited reason,) what? To eat Christ—that is absurd—that cannot be. And thus does man's corrupted reason do away and make void, the sacred words

of Christ, and substitute a shadow, a mere nothing to the most precious gift which Jesus Christ ever bestowed on man.

To a superficial mind, there is perhaps something specious in these dictates of limited reason. But, sir, we must remember, that to understand and explain divine mysteries, is not the province of human reason. If we are justifiable in rejecting one mystery, because it is beyond the limits of reason, then we may, nay, (in order to be consistent,) we ought to reject all divine mysteries, as beyond the same limits. Thus we ought to expunge from our creed the mystery of the Trinity, and of the Incarnation the very fundamental mysteries of the Christian Religion: Who, indeed, can conceive, how there are three distinct persons in God, and every one of them God, and yet there is but one God? Even the existence of a God invisible and immense, in every place whole and entire, and yet but one, even the existence of that God, I say, ought to be rejected, if we are justifiable in rejecting any mystery, on account of its being impervious to limited reason.

Here I would beg leave to observe, that a distinction ought to be made, between a thing being against reason and being above reason. If a thing is really against sound reason, we cannot submit to believe it, neither would Almighty God require it as in doing so he would contradict his own work, which is impossible. If a thing is above reason, that is, beyond the limits of human understanding, this is by no means a proof of its being false.

With regard to the present mystery, then if it is really against sound reason, Christ cannot, and will not require a belief of it; if it is only beyond the limits of reason, it ought to be believed, where the words of Christ are plain: Nay, sir it being impervious to reason, stamps on it a character of divinity, which essentially belongs to the works of God.

Revelation, similar to the pillar of fire which guided the Israelites in the desert, has its dark side; but it has likewise its luminous side, from whence emanate the purest and brightest rays of truth. In vain will human reason penetrate into the dark recesses of the sanctuary; a veil hangs before it, and in furnishing us with the blessings of revelation it certainly was the will of God to supply the wants, the insufficiency of reason. It was the will of the Most High, that to him, with the most profound humility, we should make a sacrifice, not of reason itself, but of that vain and presumptuous confidence which we are too apt to have in the dictates of our limited reason. As Voltaire observes "Reason conducts you; advance by its light, proceed a few steps more; but limit your career on the brink of the infinite stop short there an abyss begins, which you must respect."

"The most common things (says the celebrated Locke) have their dark sides, where the most piercing eye cannot penetrate; many difficulties are found in natural religion.

Conceive, if you can, how any thing can be crea-