

The Catholic.

Quod semper; quod ubique; quod ab omnibus.

VOL. I.

KINGSTON, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 30, 1831.

NO. 50.

SELECTED.

AMICABLE DISCUSSION.

Continued.

LETTER X.

A RECAPITULATION UPON THE EUCHARIST.

Saint Ambrose. * "And now, if the mere benediction of a man (Moses) was powerful enough to change nature, what must we not say of the divine consecration, when the very words of our Lord operate! You have read concerning the creation of the world: He spoke, and it was made; he commanded, and it was formed. If then the word of Christ could draw out of nothing what till then had no existence, shall it not be able to change the things that exist, into what they were not before? Why look you for the order of nature in the production of the body of Jesus Christ in this sacrament, seeing that the order of nature is equally disregarded in the same Lord being born of a Virgin?" Saint Chrysostom upon the words: *How can he give us his flesh to eat:*

"When a person asks how a thing can be done, he begins to doubt whether it can be done. . . . If you inquisitively search into this wonderful work, why do you not also ask, after the miracle of the five loaves: How did he effect so prodigious a multiplication?—But you will say the thing spoke for itself, it was plain to the eye.—And I tell you that for that very reason they should have believed it to be as easy for him to perform this last miracle. For he first multiplied the loaves, that the Jews might no longer remain incredulous as to what he had afterwards to announce to them.—" And elsewhere:—*The words that I have spoken are spirit and life, that is, are divine and spiritual, have nothing carnal about them, depend not on the ordinary laws of nature.*"

And again in another homily: "He that was present at the last supper, is the same that is now present and consecrates our feast: for it is not man who makes the things lying on the altar become the body and blood of Christ; but that Christ who was crucified for us. The words indeed are pronounced by the priest; but it is the power and grace of God that consecrates them. He said, *This is my body*: these words make the change. And as the words of God, *increase and multiply and replenish the whole earth*, though spoken but once at the creation of the world, still produce their effect, by imparting to human nature the power and virtue of gene-

* Discourse to those who were to be initiated,

rating children through the course of ages: in like manner, although the adorable words of Christ,—*This is my body*, were but once uttered, they have not failed to secure to this sacrifice all their virtue and efficacy to the present day on the altars of the Church, and will not fail to secure the same until the last coming of our Lord." I could fill twenty pages with quotations from the great Archbishop, and from many others; Hesy chius, Cesarius, Eusebius of Emessa, for example. But what have just been produced should be sufficient; for assuredly, neither Zuinglius, nor any of his followers will ever be able to enlarge upon such mysterious and wonderful operations in the Eucharist of their conception.

Again, Sir, you must here candidly acknowledge that, had the belief and persuasion of the primitive fathers been exactly that of the Sacramentarians, who in latter ages have informed us that the bread and wine remain exactly the same before and after the consecration, the faithful and neophytes could have had no difficulty in conceiving and no hesitation in believing such doctrine, neither would the fathers have had to labour in removing doubts and difficulties from their minds. And yet we find St. Gregory Nazianzen telling them:—

"Approach with firm faith to eat the body and drink the blood of Christ, and entertain not the remotest doubt respecting them." St. Hilary: Let us hold to what is written. Jesus Christ leaves no room to doubt of the reality of his flesh and blood, since the declaration of our Lord and of our faith asserts it to be his flesh indeed and his blood indeed." St. Cyril of Jerusalem: "With all confidence, let us receive the body and blood of Christ, for under the appearance of bread, his body is given to us; and under the appearance of wine, his blood is given. For, as Christ, speaking of the bread, declared and said, *this is body*, who shall dare to doubt it?" St. Ephrem: "Participate in the immaculate body and blood of the Lord, with a firm faith, resting assured that you receive the lamb, whole and entire." St. Ambrose and the author of the book on the sacraments: "The Lord assures us that we receive his body and blood: ought we to doubt the truth of his words, or the correctness of his testimony? You will perhaps object: how can it be his true and real flesh, if the bread bears no appearance of real flesh? How can it be his blood, since I behold indeed the resemblance, but in no wise the reality of blood? I have already told you that the word of Christ can change the ordinary nature of things." Reflect but for a moment on this doubt: and you will feel that it infallibly proves the real presence as taught by St. Ambrose. Such a doubt, in fact, is most natural, when

the body is asserted to be present, although the flesh appears not to human sight. But it is extravagant, if the body be supposed absent in heaven; for in that case, there would be no need for the flesh to appear, but on the contrary, it should not appear at all, since it is not there at all.

Had they believed and taught at that time, what all protestants have since pretended, that the bread and wine remained after consecration the same as they were before, neither the faithful would have had any reason to mistrust their senses, nor the fathers to admonish them to disregard their testimony. And yet we find that St. Cyril of Jerusalem says to his neophytes: "Do not consider them as common bread and wine, for they are the body and blood of Jesus Christ, according to his words; and although your senses might suggest that to you, let faith confirm you. Judge not of the thing by your taste, but by faith assure yourself, without the least doubt that you are honoured with the body and blood of Christ. This knowing, and of this being assured, that what appears to you bread, is not bread, but the body of Christ, although the taste judges it to be bread: and that the wine, which you see and which has the taste of wine, is not wine, but the blood of Christ." St. Chrysostom; "Let us believe God in every thing, and not gainsay him, although what is said may seem contrary to our reason and our sight. Let his word overpower both. Thus let us do in mysteries: not looking only on the things that lie before us, but holding fast his words; for his word cannot deceive; but our senses are very easily deceived. The former never failed, the latter often. Since then his word says:—*This is my body*; let us assent, and believe, and view it with an intellectual eye." Hesy chius: "The spirit of God which is in us, and the word that he has left us regulate the use of our senses, and prevent not only our sense of taste, but the senses also of hearing, seeing, touching, and smelling, from an undue interference in mysteries, so that they lead us not to any low ideas, or weak and presumptuous reasonings, unworthy the grandeur and sublimity of the mysteries. We must attribute the sanctification of the mystic sacrifice, and the change or transformation of the sensible into spiritual things, to him who is the true priest, Jesus Christ, that is, we must consider him as the sole worker of this miracle, because the power of the word, which he has pronounced, sanctify these visible things to such a degree that they are raised far beyond the reach of our senses." And St. Cesarius: "We must judge by faith, and not by our senses, of this undivided and perfect victim, which cannot be seen by corporeal and outward eyes, but only by those that are

interior and spiritual. Of this our Lord speaks, when, with divine authority, he pronounces that his flesh is meat indeed and his blood drink indeed.—Wherefore we must give no place to incredulous doubts in our minds, seeing that the author of this heavenly gift himself testifies to its truth and reality.”

Had the primitive ages believed and taught what is now generally believed in your Church and what has always been taught among the Calvinists, that the bread and wine are the signs and figures of the body and blood, the memorial of Christ present in heaven, but absent from earth, how happens it that the fathers say nothing of the kind on those occasions, when they were able, nay, even bound to give a clear exposition of the doctrine? I allude to the instructions given to the newly-baptized before their admission to the Eucharist. You have seen these instructions; all of them that are extant, have, to the best of my knowledge, been laid before you. Here is not a word said about figures or signs to represent the absent object. It is in these plain and dogmatical instructions, however, that such expressions ought of necessity to be found. Why do they not appear? Why are the bread and wine never presented to us in this simple point of view, so plain and easy to our conception? Why, on the contrary are we perpetually reminded every time that it is the true and real body of Jesus Christ, the body that was crucified, the blood that flowed from his side, and that a change of substance is effected by the all-powerful word of a God? And why do the fathers, to establish the certitude of this astonishing change, and to give additional motives of its credibility, remind the neophytes of the wonders of the creation, the miracles of Moses, Elias, and Eliseus, of the birth of Christ, the miracle of the marriage feast of Cana, and that of the multiplication of the loaves? Would it not be the height of folly to search heaven and earth for the greatest prodigies ever worked therein by an almighty power, merely for the purpose of proving to these neophytes, that a God made man, had most evidently the power of changing also the bread and wine into the signs and figures of his body and blood, a thing which the poorest mortal among us can declare and do, whenever he pleases.

Again, Sir, let me ask you, how, in your opinion will your modern notions respecting the Eucharist, accord with the following exhortation of St. John Chrysostom? “When you approach the holy table, believe that the King of all things is there present; for he is really present.—Consider, what a victim you have to handle, what a table you have to approach; think within yourselves that, being but dust and ashes, you receive the body and blood of Jesus Christ.—Consider that we eat Him, who sits on high and is adored by the angels.—O wonderful mystery! O the goodness of God! He who sits on high with his Father, is received into the hand of every one! How I should wish, do many exclaim, to behold his countenance and his garments! God grants you even more than you desire—he gives you himself; you receive him you eat him in reality.”

And when your teachers mount the pulpit to communicate to you their cherished and boasted conceptions respecting the sacrament, will they address you in the language of St. Hilary? “It would be foolish and impious to say what we do of the natural verity of Christ within us, if he himself had not taught us it, for it is he that said: my flesh is meat indeed and my blood is drink indeed: he that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, abideth in me, and I in him: he leaves no place to doubt of the reality of his body and blood; for now by the profession of the Lord himself, and according to our belief, it is truly flesh and truly blood.”

Will they say with St. Augustine: “Does it not appear foolish and extravagant to say, eat my flesh and drink my blood: he that doth not eat my flesh and drink my blood, shall not have life in him? It did indeed appear foolish and extravagant; but only to the ignorant and the foolish.” Have you ever heard your preachers adopt language similar to that which has been quoted above? How, in fact, should they speak the language, having so openly repudiated the doctrine of antiquity?

I had proposed here to conclude my observations on the doctrine of the fathers, and to close a discussion that you must by this time perceive to be decisively terminated. But the subject is inexhaustible: these ancient writings still detain me by force among them: proofs in profusion start up on every side of me. You have just learnt their sentiments and expressions respecting the majesty and sublimity of the mystery, and the insurmountable difficulties attendant upon the belief of the real presence and transubstantiation. I would willingly proceed a step further, and shew you, that they have been not less alive to the striking consequences deducible from such doctrines, nor less distinct and clear in developing the same. In fact, if the bread be really changed into the body of Christ, it is correct to say with Gelasius of Cizicum and St. Chrysostom; that the body is proposed to us, that the lamb is lying before us;” with St. Cyril of Alexandria; that it is not the Deity, but the body of the Word that is presented upon the sacred tables of the Church; with Optatus of Milibus; “that the members of Christ are stretched upon the altar: the altar is the seat of the body and blood of Christ;” with St. Augustine: “that we receive with faithful heart and mouth the mediator between God and man, Jesus Christ made man, who gave us his body to eat and his blood to drink, although it seems more horrible to eat the flesh of a man than to kill him, to drink human blood than to shed it.”

If the body of Jesus Christ is present in the Eucharist, his body must either be received in part, or whole and entire, by each communicant. We hold that each communicant receives the entire and indivisible body of Jesus. This dogma, supposing as it does, his simultaneous presence in a thousand places, we look upon as a wonderful miracle, capable of raising doubts, which are to be dissipated by faith and confidence in the all-powerful word of

God. Now we find that this wonder has struck the minds and excited the astonishment of the fathers. We must consider, says St. Gregory of Nyssa, how it can be that this single body, being distributed to thousands of the faithful should be found whole and entire in each person who receives it, and still remain whole and entire in itself.”

This question evidently supposes the unity and indivisibility of the body of Christ in every receiver to have been believed and taught. The reply, as you are prepared to expect, attempts not to explain the mystery, but proves the change of substance in the Eucharist. “The power of the Word who as man was nourished with bread, rendered the bread that he eat his holy body. In like manner, this bread is sanctified by the word of God and prayer, not passing into the body of the Word, by eating and drinking, but being instantly changed into the body of the Word, according to what he said: this is my body.”

“We always offer the same victim, says St. Chrysostom, not as in the old law, sometimes one and sometimes another: here it is always the same; for which reason there is but one sacrifice: for, if the diversity of places, in which the sacrifice is offered, multiplied the sacrifice, we should have to allow that there were many Christs. But there is but one Christ, who is entire here and entire there, possessing still but one body: for which reason there is but one sacrifice.”—He who receives but a part of the consecrated species, says St. Eutychius, receives, notwithstanding, whole and entire the most holy body and the adorable blood of the Lord: for although the body be distributed to all, being mingled up with each of them, it nevertheless always remains indivisible in itself; as one only seal, being employed to make many impressions on wax, leaves at each impression its perfect figure and form and still remains one and the same, neither changed nor divided by its image being stamped upon a multiplicity of objects.

If Jesus Christ is present in the Eucharist, it follows that, when he communicated with his apostles he bore his own body in his hands and drank his own blood. The consequence is rigorously correct: and you shall now see whether the fathers were aware of it. Saint Augustine explaining the title of psalm XXXIII. in which it is said, according to the Septuagint, that he was carried in his own hands expresses himself as follows: “Who can comprehend, my brethren, how such a thing can be performed by a man? Who is it that holds himself in his own hands? A man may indeed be held in the hands of another, but never in his own. We cannot therefore discover how this can be understood of David in the literal sense: but can easily see how it can be understood of Christ according to the letter; for Christ bore himself in his own hands, when giving his body to us, he said: This is my body, for he then bore that body in his own hands.”

“Jesus Christ,” says Saint Chrysostom, “himself drank from his chalice, least his apostles hearing these his words should say within themselves: Do we then drink his blood and eat his flesh? and

be troubled at the thought; for, when he spoke of these mysteries, many were scandalized. To prevent this trouble and to remove all uneasiness from their minds, in their participation of the mysteries he set the first example; and this was the reason why he drank his own blood." Saint Jerome declares; Moses gave us not the true bread; but our Lord Jesus did. He invites us to the feast and is himself our meat; he eats with us and we receive and eat him." Would such ideas ever enter into the heads of Calvinists, would they ever have come into the minds of the fathers, had they not been convinced of the real presence of Jesus Christ in the sacrament which he instituted at his last supper?*

To put a finishing stroke to our proofs and a termination to our reflection already too protracted, it is most evident that the fathers believed and taught the real presence of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist, if they positively instructed the faithful and the neophytes never to approach but with sentiments of true and perfect adoration. Now the fathers have not failed to inculcate this precept, and to require of them, together with the sentiments, the attitude also of adoration, at the moment of their approach to the holy table. "Each one must in his turn receive the body and blood of the Lord with the reverence and the fear due to the body of such a King."—Approach the chalice, says St. Cyril of Jerusalem, not stretching out your hands, but bending towards the earth, in a posture of adoration, to pay your homage." St. Ambrose bears testimony to this practice in the Churches. The following explanation supposes its existence: "We must say, therefore, that his footstool is the earth; and by the earth we must understand the flesh of Christ, which to this day we adore in the holy mysteries, and which the apostles adored formerly in his person." Saint Augustine, adopting the explanation of his master in religious belief, bears equal testimony to the fact in these words: "No one eating this flesh, without having first adored it." And on these words of another psalm: the rich ones of the earth have eaten and adored, he says: "The rich ones, that is, the proud have also been admitted to the table of Jesus Christ; they participate in his body and blood, but they adore only and are not refreshed." And Saint Chrysostom: "The magi formerly testified their respect to this divine body, when lying in the crib. These Gentiles adored him with respectful fear and profound veneration. You behold it not in the crib, but on the altar; not in the arms of a woman, but in the hands

* "We must then believe that Jesus Christ put himself into his mouth," exclaims J. J. Rousseau in a tone of triumph against the mystery of our Eucharist, as if he had discovered something as original as sarcastic. He knew full well that venerable antiquity had thought of this long before his time, and that this most just consequence, incomprehensible though it be to human intellect, had in no wise shaken the reliance due to the word of a God-man in the mind of the great archbishop of Constantinople, of the learned solitary of Bethlehem, and of all the most enlightened characters of the primitive ages.

of the priest, and under the wings of the Holy Spirit, who descends with powerful influence upon the oblations.—Let us therefore excite ourselves—and with reverential awe let us surpass even the magi in the marks of our veneration of the body of Christ.*

* Compare the above instructions and practice with those presented by your English Church at the present day to members of its communion. They too evidently appear in the declaration issued under Edward VI. suppressed afterwards by the politic Elizabeth, but again re-established in the form which it still appears at the end of the communion service, under the reign of Charles II. who agreed to it, either from weakness or from compulsion, but undoubtedly contrary to his own principles and convictions, as may be learnt from two documents in his own hand writing discovered after his death by his brother James II. who certifies their authenticity.—Now this declaration turns upon the manner prescribed of receiving the communion on the knees: "It is here declared that no adoration is intended, or ought to be done, either unto the sacramental bread and wine there bodily received, or unto any corporal presence of Christ's natural flesh and blood. For the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances, and therefore may not be adored, for that were idolatry to be abhorred by all faithful Christians) and the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here, it being against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one."

This declaration is manifestly directed against transubstantiation, since it is there said that the bread and wine are bodily received, and preserve their natural substance. It attacks or at least denies any presence of Christ, by the mere fact of suppressing adoration; for, if, while excluding from the Eucharist a corporal presence of the natural body of Christ, they had permitted the belief of a sacramental presence of his glorified and spiritualized body, so far from suppressing, they must undoubtedly have united with antiquity in paying adoration which is not less due to the sacramental presence of the glorified body, than to the corporal presence of the natural body of this divine person.

How painful to me was the discovery of such expressions attached to your rubric actually in force at the present! How I deplore the condition of those, who from their earliest youth unconsciously imbibe the poison of such a doctrine! Language has not terms to expose such a declaration in its own disgraceful enormity: it can only be effaced by tears. From the re-publication of this declaration in 1662, may, in my judgment, be dated the unfortunate Epoch, when sacramentarian opinions began to prevail in the English Church. This church had formally rejected them under James I. and Charles I. "The King acknowledges Jesus Christ truly present, and truly adorable in the Eucharist." And again, "We adore with Saint Ambrose the flesh of Jesus Christ in these mysteries."

"The sounder (and more sensible) Protestants, make no hesitation to adore Christ in the Eucharist. For on receiving the Eucharist, Christ is to be adored with true Latria."—This a monstrous error of the rigid Protestants, who maintain that Christ is not to be adored in the Eucharist, except by an inward adoration of mind, but not with any outward act of adoration, such as kneeling or other such posture of the body. All these do not believe aright of the presence of Christ in the Sacrament, he being present there in a wonderful but real manner.

"I suppose the body and blood of Christ may be adored, wheresoever they are; and must be adored by a good Christian, where the custom of the

You are now enabled to observe the close connection between the particular and general proofs, the light mutually imparted by them, and that accordance from which they both derive additional strength. In fact these dogmas, which the discipline of the church obliged these people to conceal from the unbelievers and the Catechumens, were the very same that were disclosed and explained to the Neophytes previous to their admission to a participation of the Eucharist.* Now we have seen that they were made acquainted with the altar and the sacrifice, the real presence, and the unbloody immolation of the victim, the change of the bread and wine into the blood and body of Jesus Christ, and consequently the necessity of adoration in receiving them. These dogmas are therefore effectually concealed under the discipline of secrecy. This, good sense had led us to suppose, and reasoning had improved our supposition into conviction. But now, facts speak aloud, and fairly and perfectly demonstrate the effects of reason and argument.

And because this instruction of the neophytes, with the exclusion of the Catechumens, is ancient as christianity, it follows, that the doctrines in which they were instructed previous to the communion, are of an original equally ancient and apostolical. Again, the instructions delivered to the neophytes turned upon what they were soon to behold upon the altar, on the essential part of the liturgy, at which they were for the first time to assist, on the prayers they were to hear, and on the worship rendered by the faithful to Jesus Christ. It is then certain that the altar, the sacrifice, the victim, its presence effected by the change of its immolation gifts offered, the adoration of it, all dogmas then made known to the neophytes, formed an essential part of the liturgy. Thus the chain of our proofs is unbroken and complete. The private instructions given to the neophytes, plainly shew what was kept concealed from the catechumens and unbelievers, as also every thing essential connected with the Christians in the liturgies. Such Sir, is the character of truth: the more it is examined, the more plain and manifest does it appear: the more it is scrutinized in all its bearings, the more solid and satisfactory it is found.

And now, Sir, if those illustrious prelates of the church which a Christian is obliged to communicate with, requires it. And is not the presence thereof in the sacrament of the Eucharist, a just occasion to express on the spot, by that bodily act of adoration, the inward honor, which we always bear towards our Lord Jesus Christ, as God?—Not to baulk that pardon, which hath led me to publish these my sentiments: I do believe that it was so practised (adoration was paid) and done before receiving the symbols in the ancient church; which I maintain to have been from the beginning the true church of Christ, obliging all to conform to it, in all things within the power of it."

* What have we in the church concealed from the public? The sacraments of baptism and the Eucharist, for our good works are seen by the Pagans while the sacraments remain concealed from them. But it is precisely the things they do not see that give rise to that which strikes them in our conduct.—St. Aug. on Ps. CIII. Vol. IV. p. 1140.

primitive church, a Cyril of Jerusalem, or Alexandria, a Chrysostom of Constantinople, an Ambrose of Milan, were called to life again, and, appearing in your religious assemblies, heard your preachers declaiming against the doctrine in which they had been nurtured full fourteen or fifteen centuries ago, and which they themselves had most religiously inculcated to their neophytes and their flocks, what, let me ask you, would be their language, in such circumstances? What would they say, if assisting at your public service, and finding neither altar nor sacrifice, nor the invocation for the change of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Jesus Christ, they heard the people publicly cautioned to beware how they entertained any sentiment of adoration, seeing that the sacrament was but bread and wine, that Christ was not there present, but was solely and unceasingly in heaven? What would they say, I ask you? Would they not be agitated with feelings of horror, indignation and pity? Would they not consider themselves to be among the enemies of Christ, rather than among his faithful adorers? Would they not lament their lot in being again restored to life?

But without insisting any further on the sentiments and feelings they would unavoidably experience, permit me to make a simple statement of my own. I have applied myself to the study of the ancient liturgies, and have not failed to compare them with the liturgy employed by your church.—I have also paid attention to the doctrine of the fathers respecting the Eucharist, and have discovered but too plainly those precise doctrines, which your preachers and controversialists so thoughtlessly and unmercifully assail. How completely are the primitive liturgies and your liturgy at variance! How meagre and dry is the latter! How poor and pitiful are the prayers filched from us and left mangled and imperfect by the barbarous hand of the awkward plagiarist, a monstrous and disgusting spectacle to the admirer of pure and venerable antiquity! What a figure would it present, if I were to dwell upon that heterodox and monstrous declaration, that terrified the protestants under Elizabeth, and yet was fearlessly and shamelessly appended to your liturgy under Charles II! As for your preachers, their instructions do not even correspond with the prayers recited by them in what is called the *Lord's supper*. Whatever appears inexplicable in the words of Christ they reject; the mysteries transmitted by the ancient fathers, they impugn, and teach their flocks to do the same—they reason and argue where reason, coalescing with authority, imperatively calls for their silent acquiescence. In vain does St. Hilary insist "that we must not pretend to regulate the effects of divine power by the ideas of man; that wisdom consists in placing no bounds to the power of God; that it would be downright folly and impiety to assert what we do assert of the real and natural truth of Jesus Christ's presence with us, if he had not himself declared it to be so." They will have nothing to do with St. Hilary, or his doctrine: and instead of uniting with him in receiving the declaration of the Lord preferably to the information of their senses, they cherish by preference the dictates of their proud and indocile senses, and reject the asseveration of the God of truth. In vain does St. Ambrose proclaim, "I ask no reason of Jesus Christ.—

Wherefore talk not to me of arguments, when faith is required; let dialectic be silent in the schools. Stop your mouth: you may not search into mysteries. We are permitted to know that the Son has

been begotten, but not to require in what manner it was effected." Your ministers, far from imposing silence on dialectic in the schools, make its voice resound from their pulpits: far from stopping their mouths, they declaim against mysteries; and because they cannot comprehend how Christ can be present in the Eucharist, they authoritatively pronounce that he is not, and cannot be present in the sacred mysteries. In vain does St. Chrysostom beautifully advise them as follows: "I receive with submission what the scripture says, and pry not into things on which it is silent. I understand what it discovers, and have no wish to investigate what it veils in obscurity, for the very purpose of deterring me from such researches.—Why do you your labour to fathom that which is unfathomable? Why attempt to comprehend things incomprehensible? Why be ambitious to penetrate into that which is impenetrable?—Pretend not to judge of things divine, by reason, neither attempt to subject them to the laws of nature. For by so doing Nicodemus became incapable of conceiving great and sublime truths. We receive the name of faithful, that spurning the lowliness of human imaginations, we may rise to the sublimities of faith.

—Let us believe God in all things, and gain-say him not, although what he says appears to be contrary to the testimony of our eyes and our reason. Let the authority of his word supersede the testimony of our eyes and our reason. Since therefore his word said, *this is my body*, let us rest satisfied and believe, let us behold it with the eyes of faith."—In vain does St. Ephrem exclaim in language peculiarly applicable to your teachers: "What are you about, ye daring mortals? Is it not the extreme of folly and temerity, in you who are but a compound of dust, to think of fathoming such an abyss? Partake of the immaculate body and the blood of the Lord with a full and firm faith, and doubt not that you eat the lamb whole and entire: for the mysteries of Christ are an immortal fire.—Beware of rashly searching into them, lest they consume you when you partake thereof."

In vain does Cyril, the great bishop and Patriarch of Alexandria, admonish them so long before, "that it is not becoming to abandon the ancient tradition of the faith, derived from the apostles to our times for mere subtleties of such a character, and to subject to an idle curiosity mysteries that exceed the power of our minds; that we must not even call them in question, or follow the example of some, who regardless of their own peril, have the hardiness to decide upon articles of faith, approving or rejecting them, as seems good to themselves. Is it not more reasonable to commit to God the knowledge of his own works, than impudently to carp at what he has thought proper to do?—They indeed had the hardiness to ask how, as if they were ignorant that such language was blasphemy, &c." One might imagine that these great masters of antiquity, these venerable successors of the Apostles, even at the distance of so many centuries, were thinking of your teachers, and were delivering these keen reproaches as a lesson to them in person. But your teachers are deaf to such monitions; they will have nothing to do with these charming models of Christian eloquence and philosophy; nothing to do with these illustrious and admirable defences of Jesus Christ: they are desirous of taking lessons and examples from the seditious promoters of the religious revolution of the sixteenth century—these are their masters—these their models.

The children have surpassed their fathers: without difficulty I concede this superiority to your teachers. Yet, in each are discoverable in the main, the same presumption, and the same mode of conduct. In your teachers are to be found united together the school of the cell of Wittenburg, and of the presbytery of Zurich; for they attack, at one time, the real presence; at another, the change of substance, and at all times the adoration, which they even convert into idolatry. Thus then their

dialectic is unyieldingly decisive, their philosophy earthly, their ideas low, their notions contracted and dry, and their declamation as modern as their origin. In their works upon the Eucharist, I discover throughout aridity, novelty, and therefore falsity of doctrine. Every thing wears the appearance and characteristic features of youth: whatever may command veneration, awake the recollection of primitive forms, or bear the rugged and sacred impress of antiquity, is sought among their writings in vain.

To this you will reply: our teachers and apologists are very far from considering themselves as isolated from antiquity: their language is that of men connecting us more intimately with it: even on the Eucharist they claim the authority of the fathers: from them they produce a thousand passages in support of the figurative sense; with these their works are filled, as you must of necessity allow.

All this is very true, Sir, but the great point is to ascertain from what writings these passages are extracted, and whether they do not claim with better title an explanation different from the one which your ministers have palmed upon them. After the passages I have cited, replete as they evidently are with catholic doctrine, it must be acknowledged that the fathers could never have taught elsewhere the protestant doctrine, without the most palpable contradiction to be found in them: that they are true to their principles throughout; and that if their expressions were not always the same, the reason is, because it was both impossible and improper that they should be so.

For the space of four centuries and more, during which the secret discipline was enforced, the fathers must always have measured their expressions respecting the Eucharist according to circumstances. When they spoke or wrote exclusively for the faithful, they could without reserve explain the mystery: the same unreservedness must also have attended their first instructions to the neophytes. Not so, however, when they preached before the catechumens and the non-initiated: not so, when they wrote for the public. On such occasions, the apprehension of betraying the secret compelled them to adopt obscure and ambiguous expressions.

From the Working Man's Advocate.

HISTORY OF THE ENGLISH TITHES.

Although the tithes of England are collected oppressively, and applied unjustly, and are therefore detrimental to the interests of true religion, yet they were, for hundreds of years, the cause of some of the greatest blessings enjoyed by Englishmen—more particularly by the Working Men.

It is an error to suppose that tithes always were what they now are—a curse to England. No. The founders of the tithe system had no other motives of inducement than those of love and gratitude to their God, and good will towards their fellow creatures.

The Britons, or English, were Pagans, until towards the close of the 6th century. At that period, England was divided into seven kingdoms, called the Heptarchy. Egbert, king of one of these parts, called the West Saxons, was a Pagan; but he had married a princess who was a Christian, and the daughter of the king of France. This woman, who was of excellent character, took great pains to convert her husband to the religion of Christ, and at length prevailed on the king to invite into England Au-

Augustine, a monk, who was considered one of the most pious and learned men of that day. He came to England, preached to the king, and converted him. He next obtained permission to preach to the people, and his success was wonderful. English parents no longer shed the blood of their innocent offspring on altars raised to pagan idols, but preserved them, and taught them that belief to which their fathers and mothers had been converted.

To assist him in his labors, Augustine was joined by forty monks who dispersed themselves throughout the land. These men had one common home at Canterbury, in the county of Kent. Here a church was built, and Augustine was made head of it by the title of Bishop. The churches of Bishops are called *Cathedrals*, and are by that name distinguished from the churches of parishes. As christianity spread, societies of priests similar to that established at Canterbury, established themselves at London, Exeter, Lincoln, Gloucester, York, and other places. But how did the priests support themselves, and how were they enabled to build these churches? At first, the priests had no revenue but what was freely and cheerfully given to them by the people; but after a few years a tenth part of the produce of the land was granted to the priests, by landlords or tenants, and these gifts were called *tithes*.

The English of those days could hardly be said to consist of more than two classes. The first was composed of the owners of the land. The second of their vassals or tenants. Whenever a great man became converted to christianity, it was customary for him to invite a priest to come and reside on his estate, and perform all the offices of religion—a church was built for the people to assemble in, a house was erected for the residence of the priest, and for his use a small portion of ground was attached. An estate with such an establishment of it, was called a *parish*. The landlord had the privilege of always nominating the priest to the parish, but none but the Bishop could displace him. It was the custom of that day for the great land owners to support or relieve all necessitous persons who resided on their estates but after a while the performance of this holy duty was placed in the hands of the priest, and, that he might have sufficient means for the purpose, the owner of the estate or parish granted a tenth part of the produce of the land to the church, or rather to the priest who officiated. But in those happy days, the poor did not multiply in proportion to the increasing produce of the land, and enormous surpluses accumulated in the possession of the priests. To prevent any misapplication of this wealth, the Catholic Bishops directed that the priests should receive the tithes from the people, keep a written account of them, divide them into three parts, and appropriate them as follows:

One third part for building new churches, or for repairing and ornamenting those already built;

One third part for the relief of the poor and the stranger;

One third part for the use of the priest.

This method of distributing the tithes was continued for hundreds of years, till that bloody wretch, Henry the Eighth, and his still more bloody daughter, Queen Elizabeth, (the latter of whom the parsons and aristocracy of England call "Good Queen Bess,") gave the death blow to this beautiful system, or *tithes as they were*, and introduced in their stead the present system, or *tithes as they are*.

Henry the Eighth ascended the throne of England at the death of his father, Henry the Seventh, in 1509, and in the same year was married to Catherine of Arragon, widow of his deceased brother, Prince Arthur. She was the mother of Mary, afterwards Queen of England. Henry lived with Catherine 17 years, when he became enamoured with a young girl named Ann Boleyn, one of the queen's attendants, and determined to marry her. But it being necessary to be first of all divorced from his queen, he wrote to the Pope, with whom he was a great favorite, and stated that his conscience dictated to him that he was living in adulterous sin by being the husband of Catherine, she having formerly been the wife of his brother. The Pope, of course, refused to grant his divorce. Henry was determined, nevertheless, to get rid of Catherine, and possess Ann, and as the divorce must be sanctioned by the *Head of the Church*, he determined to make himself the head, by overthrowing the Pope's power in England. But how was he to prevail on the parliament to consent to this? And on the priests to acknowledge his supremacy? Henry was not a man to be frightened by difficulties out of any determination he might form.

At this period of our history, England contained a great number of religious houses, under the denomination of Abbeys, Priors, Monasteries and Nunneries, almost every one of them endowed with large estates by the pious men or women who founded those establishments. The rents were appropriated solely to benevolent purposes, such as feeding the hungry, curing or relieving the sick, entertaining travellers, instructing youth of both sexes, and often in supplying the king with money in time of war. The administration of these was lodged in the hands of persons named Abbots, Priors, Monks and Nuns, who were merely trustees of the property; they could hold no property of their own, nor could they make a will, or be ever married.

In order to win the parliament to his purposes, Henry promised to the members thereof large grants of Abbey lands if they would pass laws to enable him, as Head of the Church, to seize upon the estates of the religious houses, and to the priests he promised the *whole* of the tithes to themselves, instead of *one third*, which was all they at that time had a right to possess. All the rogues, both among the priests and in the parliament, soon fell in with the king's wishes;

the honest men refused to barter their honor and their country for gold, and thereby incurred the hatred of the king, who persecuted them in all the varieties of burning, hanging, shooting and beheading; besides depriving the widows and orphans of the laymen of the property of their murdered parents.

There was a fellow called *Cranmer*, a priest, who kept a woman or two, and was outwardly given generally. Henry, in want of some dare-devil fellow for his ecclesiastical factotum, having heard of the qualities of Cranmer, patronized him at once, and made him *Archbishop of Canterbury*! Cranmer, to suit circumstances, altered his creed five different times, and though none but Satan himself can perhaps say of what religion he actually was, yet, as he was *sometimes a Protestant*, we shall by courtesy call him the first *Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury*; but, what a contrast was he to the pious Augustine, the first *Catholic Archbishop of Canterbury*!

A *spiritual Court* was held at Dunstable, in Redfordshire, at which, of course, Cranmer presided, for the purpose of divorcing the Queen; before this Court Catharine was cited to appear. The injured Queen very properly treated this summons with deserved contempt; and after the Court had been kept open a few days, Cranmer declared the marriage between the King and Queen null and void, thus bastardizing the princess Mary. This divorce took place in *April*, 1533; but the king had married Anne Boleyn in *January of the same year*, thus being for three months the husband of two wives. Eight months after the marriage, Anne was delivered of a daughter, (afterwards Queen Elizabeth,) much to the annoyance of the king, who wanted a son. Henry lived with Anne three years, and then—he cut off her head! He went on marrying and killing his wives, until his sixth wife became a widow.

Although Henry was now "*Head of the Church*" in England, yet, as the Catholic was still the national religion, the Pope was the *real* head, after all, which determined Henry to cut out a *new* national religion, over which the Pope should have no control. Just in the nick of time, the Protestant religion came out spick and span new from the manufactory of Messrs. Luther & Company. Henry patronized it, and at the word of command all the king's men, from Cranmer, Archbishop of Canterbury, down to the shoe cleaners and scullions of his Majesty's household, became pious, converted, red hot Protestants.

The next job was to satisfy the wretches who, as members of parliament or priests, had aided and abetted the king in his iniquitous doings. As head of the Protestant church, Henry began turning out from the Monasteries and Nunneries into the wide world, the Catholic Monks and Nuns, and gave way to his blood-thirsty supporters, the rich estates that had thereto appertained. To the priests he gave *all* the tithes,

instead of one third, which they had hitherto possessed. Thus were the poor deprived of their rights, and death by starvation became, for the first time, common in England!

In 1547, Henry died, aged 56 years, having reigned 38. He left two daughters (Mary and Elizabeth) and one son, (Edward). The latter succeeded him.

Edward VI. was only ten years old at his father's death; but Henry had left a will, appointing sixteen executors, who were to act as Regents during his son's minority.

There still remained some property worth robbing, and those sixteen Regents, including Cranmer, helped themselves and made the little boy, who was their king, sanction their plunderings by his royal sign manual. After reigning seven years, Edward died, and was succeeded by his sister Mary, who was daughter of Catharine of Arragon. Mary was a Catholic: she endeavored to restore to the poor that portion of the tithes (one third) of which her father had so unjustly deprived them, and, as far as possible, to cause the rentals of the church property to be applied to their proper and benevolent purposes. In these humane intentions she was opposed by the robbers and murderers who had shared in the plunder; but Mary, firm in her benevolent purpose, determined, though surrounded by traitors, to bring the wretches to justice. Many of them suffered death by the same means which they had made use of to exterminate the virtuous men who had opposed the bloody acts of Henry the VIII. this was by being burnt at the stake. The lying historians of England, as well as the clergy and aristocracy, call this Queen "Bloody Queen Mary," because many persons suffered death during her reign; but they are very cautious in stating what were the real crimes of which they were guilty. The liar Fox, who wrote the "Book of Martyrs," wishes it to be believed they suffered death because they were Protestants.

Unfortunately for England, Mary reigned only six years, and had not therefore time sufficient to complete the good work she began. She was succeeded by Elizabeth, her younger sister. The eaters of the taxes and tithes of England style Elizabeth "Good Queen Bess," with as much truth and justice as they do her sister "Bloody Queen Mary."

Elizabeth soon overthrew all the good her sister Mary had done—restored to power all the tyrants who had kept aloof during Mary's reign—and so unmercifully oppressed the poor, that, in order to prevent a revolution which would shortly have broken out, she was compelled, in the forty-third year of her reign, to pass a law to cause all necessitous persons to be relieved by the parishes to which they respectively belonged, by rates levied on land and houses. What a miserable substitute was this for that of which the poor had been deprived. It must not be forgotten that this law did not extend to poor unhappy Ireland, and this is the great cause of her horrible degradation and misery.

Among other acts of robbery was one of giving the tithes of parishes to laymen, or, in other words, to people who were not parsons, and who, of course, did not perform any religious rites for the people. Instances of this sort are common throughout England and Ireland. Persons who possess such property are called lay-impropriators. I shall give a few instances which have come under my own notice in one county only—Devonshire.

In the parish of Compton-Gifford there is no Church! but the tithes are paid nevertheless. One part was a few years since the property of a Banker who was an Unitarian, and who has since sold it to a Captain of a Man of War! The other part belongs to the Vicar of the parish of Charles, in Plymouth, who never once preached, married, christened, or buried in Compton-Gifford in his life time.

The tithes of the parish of Brentor, near Tavistock, are received by the Duke of Bedford, who pays a small salary to a parson for performing divine service once every Sunday.

The tithes of the parish of St. Thomas, near the city of Exeter, are received by James Buller, Esq. of Downs, near Crediton. He pockets 5000 pounds, or about 22,500 dollars, a year—a sum nearly equal to the salary of the President of the United States. Buller pays a parson a salary of a few hundreds for doing the duty of the parish.

The tithes of the parish of Plympton are the property of John, Earl of Morley, a British Peer, who hires a parson to do the needful, pays him for it, and sometimes takes the folds out of the clergyman's waistcoat by a good dinner and a bottle of wine at the Earl's seat at Saltram.

The parish of Crediton, the largest and one of the most fertile in the lovely county of Devon, yields all the tithes to a set of men who live at Crediton, called "Corporators." These men pay the parsons. What becomes of the overplus I know not.

Justice to a virtuous body of men compels me here to state, that those clergymen, or Journey-men Parsons, employed by the lay improprators, are, as far as my observation has extended, men of strict piety, and of unsullied honor and integrity.

I could go on to a great length, but must now proceed to show up another abomination. I have before stated, that the owners of the land, had, originally, the exclusive right of presenting priests to churches. This right, in time, came occasionally into the hands of bishops and the heads of religious houses. The right of presenting to the parish of Saint Andrew in Plymouth, once belonged to the prior of Plympton, but after the destruction of the priory at Plympton, Henry the Eighth gave the lands attached to it to one of his cut-throats, but the right of presentation to Saint Andrew's parish, slipped somehow into the hands of the Mayor and Corporation of the borough of Plymouth, who, be it known, are not elected by the people, but are a sort of hereditary body who elect each other into offices. The right of voting descends from father to son. Now, mark! previous to the reigns of Henry and Elizabeth, it was unlawful to receive money as a compensation for placing a priest in a parish, but now—the vacancies in parishes are filled by public sale, and as openly as the retailing of potatoes in a market. Here is one instance. About seven years ago, the vicar of the parish of St. Andrew, in Plymouth, having seen his eightieth year, and the Plym-

outh corporation being greatly in want of cash, the latter publicly sold to a banker at Plymouth, for about 20,000 dollars, the right of filling up the vacancy that would in the natural course of nature, soon occur, by the death of the parish clergyman. The banker shortly afterwards sold his right, at a good profit, to a London bookseller. At length, the old clergyman died; he had served the parish for fifty years, and was a worthy man. The bookseller popped his son into the vacant pulpit. The new parson preached a few sermons to the sheep who composed his flock—and next proceeded to shear them! That he might be enabled to give this important subject his undivided attention, he hired two persons to assist him: the first, a curate or journeyman to feed the flock, the second, a lawyer to assist in the shearing. The latter went to work like a man of mettle, raised the amount of tithes considerably above what the former clergyman had exacted, and soon set the whole parish in open rebellion against the parson! Thundering rattat-tats at the parson's door day after day announced parishioners to protest against the advanced assessment of tithes. The parson weakly referred them to the lawyer; and the lawyer mildly referred them to the law, which settled the disputes, but could not prevent many of the farmers from swearing by wholesale at the parson, even in the presence of the lawyer!

I knew a poor industrious man who possessed a small cottage in the parish; at the bottom of his garden ran a small rivulet, into which the tide-water flowed at intervals. The man, by great industry, reclaimed from the salt water, some twenty square feet of land, and therein he planted some leeks. The parson's lawyer waited until the leeks were nearly ready for the pot, and then made a demand of one tenth of the crop. The poor man, half frantic with rage, flew to the parson's house, and began a lamentation which would have been as long as Jeremiah's, but the parson cut him short by referring him to the lawyer, "who," he said, "manages all my mundane affairs!" Those were his very words. The leek-cultivator next attempted to soften the heart of the lawyer, but without success. He was told that the leeks or the value thereof, must be immediately forthcoming, or the law would take its course.

Citizens of the United States! If ever you permit any approaches towards an union between church and state in your own country, or sanction the smallest attempt at the introduction of tithes, you will richly deserve to be enslaved worse than the negroes in the West Indies!

THE CHRISTIAN SENTINEL, Vol. 2, No. 2.

We are truly astonished at the ignorant assurance with which the *Sentinel*, blind as a Beetle, continues to dash himself against our popish pinnacle; which he thinks thus to upset: and reckons every rebuff he gets from it, the last demolishing stroke he has dealt it. His mettle however, exceeds by far his might: else might we, poor Romanists cry out, as if viewing a flea through a Microscope: O murder! were the thing only as big as it would seem, it would bleed us all to death with that terrible trunk it has.

Can the *Sentinel* then not perceive in 1. Cor. 2, 6, that the word *Adelphen*, or *Sister*, is purposely added to *GunaiKa*, woman, by the Apostle, (the preacher up of celibacy, 1. Cor. 7, 38, who declares himself in the same chapter, verse 8, an unmarried man;) to shew that the holy women, whom

at times the Apostles admitted to minister in their suite to their own necessities, or to those of their converts; were not married, but single; and considered as sisters, whom to use as wives, would be incest. Besides the incumbrance which such breeding females would cause with their growing offspring, to those early teachers of christianity in their wide excursive Missions among the pagan nation.

We never denied the word GUNAIKA to signify wife as well as woman: but what we denied, (and we defy the Sentinel to prove that we were wrong) was that it signified a wife exclusively: unless he can shew that as every wife must be a woman; so every woman must be a wife. GUNAIKA in the Greek, like MULIEREM in the Latin, signifies a woman, who indeed may be a wife: but neither of these words determine her to be such. We therefore affirmed, and evidently with reason, that Protestants, in their versions of the sacred text, had settled the point in their own way; by translating the generic term GUNAIKA, as if they had read in the original *Akaien*, or *Alochos*; which have the same meaning as wife in English, or a married woman; or as if they had read in the oldest translation, the Latin one, *Uxorem* for *Mulierem*.

Has the Catholic then broken through the horns of the Sentinel's dilemma?—Out of this dilemma, says he, there is no escape. It is too point blank to be set aside by quibbles and evasions, and scholastic nonsense. A point blank dilemma to be set aside by evasions, &c.!!! Where has this high flier been fledged with his classical pinnions? Or whence has he derived all his logical and theological lore; which he deals out so overwhelmingly, to the utter confusion and discomfiture of us, ignorantly ginsaying Papists? O, to be sure, as it is evident from the religious Tract matter; that wide circulating dike of protestant learning. We know it from the smell; for we are pretty well accustomed to its savoury aspersions. Dr. Burgess too, we could perceive, has been lately helping the Sentinel to fill his kit from it: on which account we called in Dr. Lingard, the Bishop's old antagonist, to mark his transatlantic interference.

The Sentinel must now be well convinced that Dr. Slop, as he is pleased to call us in his 52d number, has not fallen asleep at his post: but that we are sufficiently awake to observe and note down all his evasive tricks and trimmings. We can tell him too, what will surprise him, that we have been able to mark the various sources, from which he draws his weekly dribbles. Nay, more we can assure him that we are up to all the arguments he can possibly adduce against us, and that we are acquainted with all the outs and ins; the sly holes, and secret hiding corners of his protestant sion, better than he is himself, although he be its inmate. We would therefore again with Horace, remind him, in the most friendly feeling, to be more guarded in future.

Cautus enim metuit Foveam Lupus: Accipiterque
Suspectos laqueos; et opertum Milvius hamum.
Oderunt peccare Boni, Virtutis amore:
Tu nihil admittes in to formidine pona:

Sit spes fallendi; miscetis sacra profanis:—
Nam de mille Faba molus dum surripis unum;
Dammum est, non Facinus in hi pacto lenius isto.

Let us now see if we may not as easily and convincingly refute his unanswerable article on the Papal Supremacy.

THE PAPAL SUPREMACY,
PROVED FROM SCRIPTURE.

It is acknowledged by all the world that the Pope inherits all his supremacy, and distinctive powers from the Apostle Peter; the founder of his See.—Now, without dwelling any longer on the changing of his name by the Saviour from Simon to Peter, or the rock: or on the further declarations of Christ to him on the occasion: let us see if, in the whole context of the New Testament, Peter be not pointed out as the chief, and prince of the Apostles.

1° Peter is the only one, whose name was changed, if we except James and John; whom the Saviour called, no doubt for their zeal in his cause, *Buanurges*, sons of thunder. But they never after went by that name: whereas Simon was ever after distinguished by the name of *Cephas*, or *Peter*, the rock.

2° In the list given of the twelve Apostles in Matthew Mark and Luke, Peter is always named the first, as Judas is the last, Matt. 10, 2, Mark 3, 16, Luke 6, 14, John 21, 2. And of the three chosen close companions of our Lord, Peter is always named the first, Mat. 17, 1. Mark. 9, 1, Luke 9, 28. Matt. 26, 37, Mark, 14, 33. John, 21, 2, Acts, 1, 13.

3° Peter always answers for, and speaks the mind of the other Apostles. He is the oracle, the mouth, or declaratory organ of the Apostolic College; and his successor, consequently, of the Episcopal order; the guardians of the faith. Matt. 16, 6, *ibid* 19, 27, John, 6, 69, Acts, 1, 15, *ibid*, 16, 7. &c.

4° He is the only one for whom the Saviour besought the Father that his faith should not ultimately fail; and whom he commissioned, when converted, to confirm his brethren, Luke 22, 32. This prayer is seen evidently verified in the indefectibility of Peter's see in Rome; and in the deference paid to his confirming authority by all the Catholic Bishops in the universe.

5° In the payment of the tribute money, Christ put him as the head of the Apostolic College, on a level with himself; when he said to him, go to the Sea, and cast in a hook; and that fish which shall first come up, take; and when thou hast opened its mouth, thou shalt find a stouter; take that, and give it to them, (the tax gatherers,) FOR ME AND THEE, Matt. 17, 26.

6° It was from Simon's ship that Christ taught the Multitude. It was from it that he desired the nets to be let down, which enclosed the miraculous draught of fishes. The other Apostles were but his assistants in hawling home the captured fishes. It was to Simon in particular that he said, in reward of his humility, fear not, from henceforth thou shalt catch men, Luke 5, 3, 10.

7° He is the only one like Christ, who walks upon the water. Matt. 14, 29. John 21, 7.

8° When the Saviour so humbled himself as to wash the feet of his Disciples, he came first for that purpose to Simon Peter. John 13, 6, who was struck with amazement at the condescending dignity of his Lord; and from a humble sense of his own unworthiness, said, Lord! dost thou wash my feet;—thou shalt never wash my feet. But when Jesus told him that unless he washed him, he should have no part in him: from his ardent desire to be altogether, and more than any one, united with him, exclaimed: Lord! not only my feet, but also my hands and my head. *ibid*, 9. This lesson of humble condescension towards inferiors, though directed to all, seemed intended particularly to Peter; whom, and his successors, he was to leave behind him, as his vice-Gerants and masters of the sacred household, *ibid* 13, 14, 15.

9° Peter, as the only one of the Apostles destined to carry the sword, was warned by his Lord not to use it, as the worldlings, who perish by it do; nor to think of defending with so profane a weapon the divine cause of his master, John, 18, 10, 11.

10° To Peter nominally were the holy women at Christ's sepulchre bidden by the Angels to bear the glad tidings of the Lord's resurrection. Mark, 16, 7. Peter also was the first of the Apostles, to whom the Lord appeared after his Resurrection, Luke 24, 34.

11° Simon Peter, and the other disciple whom Jesus loved, were those, whom Mary Magdalene ran to apprise of the circumstance, which she, the first, had witnessed, viz:—that the stone was taken away from the sepulchre. John 20, 1, 2. Then both these Apostles ran towards the Sepulchre, but John, the youngest, outrunning Peter, and arriving at it the first, yet went not into it: but waited for Peter to enter it before him. *ibid*, v. 3, 4, 5, 6, 8. To Mary Magdalene, of the women, (except, as all must suppose, his most blessed and afflicted Mother,) and to Peter, as we observed, of the men, both repentant sinners; did our Saviour first manifest himself after his resurrection: affording thus to real penitents the encouraging pledge of his mercy and love.

12° It was still from Peter's ship, after the resurrection, as before it, that Jesus bade the net be cast, which enclosed the miraculous draught of fishes. For the other Apostles had, at his proposal, only gone with him as his assistants. John, 21, 3, 6. The first draught of fishes represented the Jewish converts: the last, after the resurrection (when the net was cast on the right side of the ship), the christian converts. Peter also, now on the firm land, while the others were still afloat, went up, at Christ's command; and drew the net to land: and, although there were so many fishes in it, (the faithful of all ages and Nations,) the net was not broken: the unity of Peter's Church remains still undissolved. John, 21, 8, 10, 11.

13° After the Apostles had partaken of the repast, to which their Lord had invited them; and during which none of them durst ask him, who art thou? knowing that it was the Lord, *ibid*, v. 12. (emblematical of his divine repast, to which his followers are invited by him in the blessed Eucha-

