

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur

Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur

Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée

Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées

Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée

Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées

Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque

Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées

Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur

Pages detached/
Pages détachées

Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)

Showthrough/
Transparence

Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur

Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression

Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents

Continuous pagination/
Pagination continue

Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure

Includes index(es)/
Comprend un (des) index

Title on header taken from: /
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:

Blank leaves added during restoration may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming/
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.

Title page of issue/
Page de titre de la livraison

Caption of issue/
Titre de départ de la livraison

Mashead/
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

Additional comments: /
Commentaires supplémentaires:

Wrinkled pages may film slightly out of focus.

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below /
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	14X	18X	22X	26X	30X
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12X	16X	20X	24X	28X	32X

The Catholic.

Quod semper; quod ubique; quod ab omnibus.

VOL. I.

KINGSTON, FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 23, 1831.

NO. 49.

SELECTED.

AMICABLE DISCUSSION.

Continued.

LETTER X.

A RECAPITULATION UPON THE EUCHARIST.

We have seen that the secrecy so religiously observed throughout the whole Church on the subject of the Eucharist during the first ages, could have been intended to conceal neither more nor less than the real presence. We have seen that, in the celebration of the sacred mysteries, the bishops and priests of these same ages, recited set forms of invocation and prayers, in which we find the clearest and most energetic terms employed to express the real presence, the change of the substance, the adoration, and the oblation of the victim, or the unbloody sacrifice of the new law. And after this what necessity can there be of entering upon a more minute and particular examination as to what these same bishops and fathers may have written in the works they have left behind them? You will easily conceive that they could never have taught a doctrine directly opposed to that which they were guarding with so much circumspection; and that, while day by day they continued, in the public liturgy, to call down the Holy Spirit, to effect the change of the bread and wine into the body & blood of Jesus Christ, they could not, in common consistency, have maintained in their writings, that no change whatever of substance was effected in the bread and wine. It is hardly to be supposed that in their temples and religious assemblies, they should have presented to the adoration of the faithful and themselves have adored the body and blood of Jesus Christ, and at the same time should have advanced in their writings that divine worship could not be paid to the consecrated elements, without idolatry, seeing that these creatures were but the figure and the memorial of Jesus Christ, absent and in heaven. Equally objectionable would be the supposition that they should in their writings have pronounced the new law to be without a sacrifice, while they themselves were daily offering a sacrifice to God upon their altars. Produce the most obstinate and inveterate Zuinglian, and let me but once persuade him that the discipline of secrecy had undoubtedly the dogma of the real presence for its cause and object, or let him be compelled to admit that the change of the substance, the adoration, the unbloody sacrifice, proclaimed in all the liturgies of the fifth century, are necessarily of apostolic origin, and I will defy him to do otherwise than conclude, that, whatever the fathers have said upon

the Eucharist, must absolutely be referred unto it. And now, Sir, I flatter myself, you clearly perceive that the occult discipline relative to the Eucharist was actually indebted to the doctrine of the real presence, and to nothing else, for its existence; I also flatter myself that you will no longer entertain a shadow of doubt as to the apostolic origin of these dogmas, uniformly expressed in all the liturgies written in the fifth century. You ought therefore, to feel well convinced, without further enquiry, that the passages of the fathers upon the Eucharist, can neither be understood nor explained, in a sense contrary to the doctrine they were secretly preserving, a doctrine they so strongly expressed in the private celebration of their liturgies. Not, however, that I would deter you from examining these passages. It shall be my pleasure now, immediately, to assist you in so doing. For, in a matter of such moment, there cannot be too great an accumulation of proofs.

From the occult discipline we learn that the mysteries of religion were studiously veiled in obscure and enigmatical expressions, whenever there was danger of their dignity being compromised before the non-initiated; and that, on the contrary, when no such danger existed, they were discussed without disguise. From it also, we are taught, that the same precaution and reservedness that attended the bishops in their public instructions, never left them in their writings. "How should it be proper," says St. Basil, "to divulge abroad to the public at large in writing, what it is not lawful to expose to the eye of the uninitiated?"

Now, to mark out the precise circumstances in which there did or did not exist danger of the mysteries being compromised, in instructions or writings, would, at this distance of time, be a venturesome undertaking. The fathers alone were able to judge of the freedom with which they could safely communicate their sentiments, and they alone could calculate the probable danger resulting therefrom. We, for instance, should never have supposed that any risk could be run in writing to a bishop; and yet we find that Innocent I. at the commencement of the fifth century, dares not speak openly of the mysteries to Decentius. It might never have entered our thoughts, that a christian of the second age could have opened himself with confidence to a Pagan Emperor. and yet Jusur made no difficulty in admitting Antoninus into many secrets of the sanctuary.

We know, however, to a certainty, that the fathers, in their discourses before the catechumens and unbelievers and in composing the works destined for the public eye, were obliged to be upon

their guard and to proceed with wariness and reserve, as they themselves very frequently testify, because, in a general way, they found themselves in these embarrassing circumstances. We know, also, to a certainty, that they must have developed this doctrine in its entire and naked form, when speaking or writing for the instruction of the newly baptized. For, on these occasions, their object was to initiate them thoroughly in the mysteries of which they were to be partakers; and it became necessary to explain the nature of the sacrament and give every other essential information respecting it, that their ignorance might not expose them to profanation or sacrilege.* Whence it follows, that if we would form a correct judgment of the opinion held by the fathers upon the Eucharist, we must investigate writings of the second kind, and not those of the first. Good sense requires that, for the discovery of the real sentiments of an author, recourse should be had to the writings in which he must have clearly expressed them, and not to those in which he was under the necessity of concealing them in vagueness, obscurity, and ambiguity of language.

There is no doubt that, in those glorious ages, every bishop was most zealous in instructing the

*"On the eve of the great paschal solemnity, and of our regeneration," says St. Cyril of Jerusalem, "we shall give you the necessary and suitable instruction; with what reverence and in what order you must enter the baptistery; what are the reasons for the sacred ceremonies there made use of; with what devotion you must, on coming forth from baptism, approach the altar of God, and participate in the spiritual and celestial mysteries there offered in order that, having your souls enlightened by our instructions and exhortations, you may each of you comprehend the greatness of the gifts conferred upon you by the Almighty."

"Of all the things," says St. Gaudentius, "that are pointed out to us in the book of Exodus, in describing the celebration of the pasch, we shall at present speak only of those, which cannot be explained before the Catechumens, but which notwithstanding it is necessary to disclose to the newly baptized. This splendid night (of Easter) requires our instruction to be adapted rather to the circumstances of the time, than to the lesson of the day, in order that the neophytes may, for the first time, be taught in what manner we partake of the paschal sacrifice.

"You not only see the same body that was seen by the magi," says St. Chrysostom, "but you are acquainted with its virtue, you know how it communicates itself, and you are ignorant of nothing that it has effected, having been carefully instructed in all these particulars at the time of your initiation."

"In the paschal solemnity," says St. Augustine, "the first seven or eight days are appointed for the instruction of the children (the newly baptized) upon the sacraments.

neophytes of his Church, and that between the baptismal font and the sacred table, he detained them for some time, for the purpose of discovering what had hitherto been concealed, and instructing them in the sublime theology of the sacrament, they were about to have the happiness of receiving.—There is no doubt that, if some of these holy prelates trusted on these occasions to the ideas suggested at the moment by their piety and learning, still many must have preferred committing their thoughts to writing, that their instructions might be more connected, methodical, and clear, for the assistance also of their memory, and to spare themselves the time and trouble of two annual preparations for the work, during their episcopacy. Not that such instructions, replete with the mysterious doctrine, were written for the purpose of becoming public. The case was far otherwise, most assuredly. You may conceive with what vigilant anxiety the prelate must have guarded his invaluable treasure from the eye of the suspected or the stranger, and with what difficulty even his friends could extort a communication of his labour, or a copy of the essay from his wary and fearful circumspection. One single elementary and dogmatical instruction of this nature would bring us more acquainted with the primitive belief respecting the Eucharist, than would a thousand mutilated passages, extracted from the writings that were made public by the fathers, and in which, of course, an apprehension of revealing the mysteries drove them to a studied reserve and obscurity of style.

If it be true, as there is every reason to suppose, that the generality of the bishops during the four first ages, actually composed detailed instructions upon the dogmas of the Eucharist, we can only regret that the far greater number of these are lost. It has pleased Providence however, that some of these authentic and incontestible records of primitive faith should be transmitted to us. In them we must interrogate antiquity, whose voice may still be heard, and by whom we ourselves may be instructed in the discourses addressed to the Neophytes, and which, of their nature, plainly decide the matter for or against, between us and the Protestants. Whatever was the belief at that time, whether protestant or catholic, must there be found clearly delivered. For it was necessary to inform the neophytes what they were going to receive; whether it was really the body and blood of Jesus Christ, or merely a little bread and wine, as a figure and representation, and nothing more; whether the substance of the body took the place of the substance of the bread, and consequently required the adoration of the faithful; or, whether the bread and wine, still preserving their own nature, became simply a memorial of Jesus Christ absent, and called of course, for no other respect, or reverence, than what might be due to any other religious ceremony. Again, one or other of the two contradictory tenets must be expressed in positive terms, in these dogmatical and elementary instructions. Your own theologians, no less than ourselves, have them in their hands; but I suspect you will never have found them much inclined to

bring you acquainted with such documents. Ask them to communicate these documents to you, together with their sentiments respecting them. You will soon find that they take your request with no very good grace; and, in truth, to deal plainly with you, it is impossible that they should. Ah well! Sir, I will spare them the embarrassment, and so far as you are concerned, I will go on to accomplish their defective ministrations. Now, therefore, imagine yourself among the ancient neophytes of Jerusalem; and that you, as well as they, are about to be addressed by the venerable patriarch Cyril, on the sacrament you have hitherto known little about, in language and instructions as follows:—“The doctrine of blessed Paul is alone sufficient to give certain proofs of the truth of the divine mysteries.” He quotes the passage from Paul to the Corinthians, and thus proceeds: “As then Jesus Christ, speaking of the bread, declared and said, this is my body, who shall ever dare to call this word in question? And as speaking of the wine, he positively assured us and said, this is my blood, who shall doubt it and say, that it is not his blood? Once, in Cana of Galilee, he changed water into wine by his will alone; and shall we think it less worthy of credit, that he changed wine into his blood? invited to an earthly marriage, he wrought this miracle, and shall we hesitate to confess that he has given to his children his body to eat, and his blood to drink. Wherefore with all confidence let us take the body and blood of Christ. For under the type or figure of bread, his body is given to them, and under the figure of wine, his blood is given, that so being made partakers of the body & blood of Christ, you may become one body and one blood with him.—Wherefore I conjure you my brethren, not to consider them any more as common bread and wine, since they are the body and blood of Jesus Christ, according to his words: and although your sense 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 honored 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.”

Saint Gregory of Nazianzum, addressing the faithful and neophytes, says: “*Waver not in spirit*, when you hear speak of the blood, passion, and death of God; but rather eat the body, and drink the blood *without any hesitation*, if you would live. *Never doubt* of what you hear said respecting his flesh, and be not scandalized at his passion. be firm and constant, and in no wise shaken by the language of our adversaries.”

Saint Gregory, of Nyssa, speaking of the newly-baptised, says: “Man being composed of two parts, the body and the soul, united and mixed up together, it necessarily follows that those who are to be saved communicate in each of these parts with him who conducts to life, that is, with Jesus Christ. Thus the soul, becoming united to

him by faith, arrives at salvation by that way; for what is united to life, participates no doubt of life. But the body also must find another life: by communicating itself with him who is to save it. For as they, who would counteract the effect of poison in their body, must have recourse to an antidote that may diffuse its healing virtue through every part of the body to which the poison had penetrated; so, in like manner, after taking the fatal poison of sin, which is destructive of our nature, it becomes indispensably necessary for us to employ a remedy that may restore what is decayed and disordered, and operating as a powerful antidote within us, may dispel, by its contrary quality, the malignant effects of the poison we had received. But what is this medicine? That body which was shown to be more powerful than death, and was the beginning of our life; and which could not otherwise enter our bodies than by eating and drinking.—The body of Christ, by the inhabitation of the word of God, was transmuted into a divine dignity; and so I now believe, that the bread, sanctified by the word of God, is transmuted into the body of Christ.” One might suppose, that Saint Gregory or Nyssa, had in his eye, and was refuting before hand, the sacramentarians who were afterwards to tell the world, that the body of Christ was to be eaten by faith alone. This great bishop teaches, in opposition to them, that as man is composed of two substances, so he is in two different ways united to God; the one adapted to the nature of the soul by faith: the other conformable to the nature of his body, by the real manducation of the body of Christ made present in the Eucharist by a change of substance.

I now request your attention to the discourse delivered by St. Ambrose to his neophytes: “I entreat you, who are soon to become partakers of the sacred mysteries, seriously to consider, which is the most excellent, the nourishment given by God to the Israelites in the desert, and called the bread of angels, or the flesh of Jesus Christ, which is the *very body* of him who is life itself: the manna which fell from heaven, or that which is above the heavens. Water flowed from out of a rock in favour of the Jews, but for you, *it is blood that flows from Christ himself*. Thus, this meat and drink of the old law, were but figures and shadows: but here we speak of the truth and the validity. And if the shadow so much excited your admiration, how truly noble must be the substance. For light is preferable to the shadow: truth to the figure: the body of Christ to the manna of heaven. But you may say; I see somewhat else; how do you assert that I shall receive the body of Christ?—this remains to be proved. How many examples may we not make use of to show, that we have not here what nature formed, but what the divine blessing has consecrated, and that the virtue of this blessing is more powerful than that of nature: because by its nature itself is *changed*? Moses held the rod: he cast it on the ground: and it became a serpent; again, he took it by the tail, and again it became a rod. If now the blessing of men was powerful enough to *change nature*, what must we not say of

the divine consecration, when the very words of our Lord operate? For the sacrament which you receive, is accomplished by the word of Christ.— Now if the word of Elias could call down fire from heaven, shall not the word of Christ be able to change the nature of created things?

You have read concerning the creation of the world. *He spoke and it was done, 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!* For it is not a less effect of power, to give new existence to things, than to change the nature of things that previously existed. We will now establish the truth of this mystery, from the example itself of the incarnation. Was the order of nature followed when Jesus was born of a virgin? Plainly, not.— Then why is that order to be looked for here. It was the true flesh of Christ, which was crucified, which was buried, and this is truly the sacrament of his flesh. Our Lord himself proclaims. *This is my body.* Before the benediction given by the celestial words, it is called bread; but after the consecration of the body of Christ is signified. He said also; *This is my blood.* Before consecration it has another name, and after consecration it is denominated blood. And you answer Amen; that is, *it is true.* What the mouth speaks, let the internal sense confess: what the words intimate, let the affection feel. By these sacraments Christ feeds his Church, and by them is the soul strengthened. It is a mystery you should carefully keep to yourselves, — lest you communicate it to the unworthy, and publish the secret before unbelievers, by an unrestrained freedom of speech. You must guard your faith with the utmost vigilance, that you may preserve the purity of your life and the secret of the mystery with inviolable fidelity." To argue on the foregoing words would weaken their force. I shall merely observe; 1^o that Saint Ambrose not only makes a clear exposition of the doctrine of transubstantiation, but proves it moreover by adducing the very proofs and examples that have been produced in its defence since it became a contested point: 2^o that the Eucharist is several times called a sacrament, which circumstance will be found of service, later: 3^o that the neophytes, when instructed in the mysteries, were cautioned to preserve the most profound secrecy respecting them.

Saint Ambrose, or rather the very ancient author often work upon the sacraments, which was for a long time attributed to that arch-Bishop, after repeating the above cited passage nearly in so many words, has the following additional observations in another book: "As our Saviour is the true Son of God, not merely by grace, like men, but by nature, being of the self-same substance with the Father; so, according to his own words, it is his true and real flesh that we eat, and his true and real blood that we drink. But you may here propose the objection stated by many of his disciples, when he spoke to them of eating his flesh and drinking his blood: how can it be his true and

real flesh and blood, seeing, as I do, the resemblance, but not the truth and reality of blood. I have already instructed you above of the power inherent in the word of Christ to change and transform the works of nature. Moreover, when any of his disciples could not endure his words, but went away from him on hearing him talk of giving them his flesh to eat and his blood to drink, Saint Peter remained firm, and said in the silence of all, Thou hast the words of eternal life; to whom else should we go? Thus, to prevent similar objections being made by others, on the ground of a natural horror to human blood, it has pleased the Almighty to favour you with a sacrament which, while it bears the resemblance, supplies you also with the grace and virtue of his true and real nature. I am the living bread, says he, which came down from heaven. Now his flesh did not come down from heaven, since it was derived from the blessed virgin upon earth. In what manner then, did this celestial and living bread come down from heaven? By the union of the divinity and humanity effected by Jesus Christ in his person. You, therefore, who receive his flesh, participate of his divine substance in that sacred rite." That the manducation here treated of is not one made by faith is most evident. It is that kind of manducation which excites the doubt; how can it be his true and real flesh, since I do not see it? Now it would be absurd to suppose, that the circumstances of the flesh, not being seen, would ever raise a doubt in any one's mind about its spiritual reception by faith, since contrarywise, for such reception by faith, it is indispensably necessary that the flesh be not seen.

Saint Gaudentius of Brescia spoke in the same strain to the newly baptized, as you will hear.— Describing the celebration of the pasch, he says: "Of all the things pointed out in the book of Exodus we shall at present treat of those only, which cannot be explained before the catechumens, but which nevertheless it is necessary to discover & explain to the newly-baptized.* In the shadows & figures of the ancient pasch, not one lamb, but many were slain, for each house had its sacrifice; because one victim could not suffice for all the people, and also because this mystery was a mere figure and not the reality of the passion of the Lord. For the figure of a thing is not the reality, but only the image and representation of the thing signified. But now that the figure has ceased, the one that died for all, immolated in the mystery of bread and wine, gives life through all the Churches, and, being consecrated, sanctifies those who consecrate. *This is the flesh of the lamb, this is his blood:* for the bread that came down from heaven said: The bread, which I will give you, is my flesh, for the life of the

* Here is an additional and direct proof that the famous secret, kept by the christians as well from the catechumens as from the unbelievers, positively concealed the mysteries revealed to the newly-baptized, viz. the real presence and the change of substance in the Eucharist, as Saint Cyril, the two Gregories and Saint Ambrose have clearly explained it to them, and as we shall now see Saint Gaudentius also explaining it.

world. His blood is rightly expressed by the species of wine, because when he says in the Gospel. I am the true vine, he sufficiently declares that the wine, which is offered in the figure of his passion, is his blood. — He who is the Creator and Lord of all things, and who produces bread from the earth, *of the bread makes his own proper body.* (for he is able, and he promised to do it;) and he who changed water into wine, now changes wine into his blood.

The portion of scripture we have read, closing its subject with an excellent and mysterious conclusion, says: For it is the pasch of the Lord.— O the depth of the riches of the knowledge and wisdom of God! It is the pasch, he says, that is, the passover or passage of the Lord, to the end that you may not think that to be earthly which has been made heavenly by him, *who himself passes into it by making it his body and blood.* For what we have said above in general terms touching the manner of eating the flesh of the paschal lamb, we must particularly observe in the manner of receiving the same mysteries of the passion of our Lord. Therefore you ought not to reject them, considering them, like the Jews, to be rude flesh and blood and with the Jews exclaiming: How can he give us his flesh to eat? Neither ought you to represent this sacrament to your minds as any thing common or earthly, but rather believe with a firm faith, that, by the fire of the Holy Spirit, this sacrament is in effect become what the Lord assures you it is. For what you receive is the body of him who is the living and heavenly bread, and the blood of him, who is the sacred vine. And we know that, when he presented to his disciples the consecrated bread and wine, he said: *This is my body, this is my blood.* Let us therefore believe him, whose faith we profess: *for truth cannot lie.* — As then it was ordained in the old law to eat the head of the paschal lamb and also the feet, we must now, in the new law, eat both the head of Jesus Christ, which is his divinity, and the feet, which is his humanity, united and concealed as they are in the sacred and divine mysteries: believing every thing that has been transmitted to us by the tradition of the Church, and being careful not to break this solid and firm bone, that is, the truth delivered from his own mouth: *This is my body, and this is my blood.*

"And now, if there remain any thing, which you do not understand in this explanation, let it be consumed by the ardour of your faith. For our God is a consuming fire, purifying and enlightening our minds for the understanding of divine things, that, discovering the mysterious causes of this same celestial sacrifice instituted by Christ, we may render him eternal thanks for so great and ineffable a gift. For it is the true inheritance of his New Testament, which he left us on the very night of his passion, as the pledge of his presence. It is the viaticum, with which we are fed and fortified in the pilgrimage of this life, until we arrive at heaven, and the full and unveiled enjoyment of him, who, when on earth, proclaimed to us: Unless you

eat my flesh and drink my blood, you shall not have life in you. It is his will that we should perpetually be favoured with his graces and blessing, and that his blood should continually sanctify our souls by the representation of his passion. Therefore did he command his disciples, whom he had established the first pastors of his Church, to celebrate without ceasing these mysteries of eternal life, until Jesus Christ should come down again from heaven; to the end that the pastors and the rest of the faithful having always before their eyes the representation of the passion of Christ, and even receiving it in their mouth and stomach, the remembrance of our redemption should never be effaced from our memory, and that we might always have at hand an easy remedy and sure preservative against the poison of the devil. Do you therefore, as well as we, receive, with all the holy avidity of your hearts, this sacrifice of the pasch of the Saviour of mankind, that we may be thoroughly sanctified in soul and body by our Lord Jesus Christ, whom we believe to be personally present in these his sacred mysteries." Were it not for fear of spinning out this dissertation to a needless length, I should feel much pleasure in remarking upon the passages that chiefly strike me in this discourse. We here perceive that ancient simplicity which invites, and a solidity of doctrine that supports and fortifies faith. We must not fail at least to observe that the holy bishop professedly derives from the tradition of the Churches all the instructions he gives to the newly-baptized, and that he moreover testifies that the apostles, pursuant to the command of their master, were accustomed to celebrate the liturgy at all times and in all places. Observe also that after establishing the real presence and transubstantiation in the clearest and most unequivocal terms, he still gives to the Eucharist the appellations of sacrament, and pledge of the presence of the mystery of bread and wine, and goes so far as to say that the blood is well represented under the species of wine. You see then that these different forms of expression are perfectly consistent with the catholic doctrine; and I intreat you to carry this in your mind to the conclusion of this subject.

Saint Chrysostom frequently observes the relationship that exists between the Eucharist and the Jewish pasch, and teaches that the blood of the paschal lamb is the emblem of the blood of Christ that the figure belonged to the Old Testament, the reality to the New. Listen to his instructions on this subject to the newly-baptized. "The statues of princes have often served as an asylum to men who had fled to them for refuge, not because they were made of brass, but because they were the images of the princes. In like manner, the lamb saved the Israelites, not because it was blood, but because it prefigured the blood of our Saviour, and announced his coming. Now therefore, were the enemy to discover, not the blood of the figurative lamb printed on our door-posts, but the blood of the truth and reality resplendent in the mouth of the faithful, he would keep at a still greater distance

from us. For if the angel passed by at the sight of the figure, how much more will the enemy be scared at the appearance of the reality?—Consider with what kind of aliment he feeds and nourishes us. He himself is the substance of the aliment: he himself is our food. For as a tender mother, impelled by the feelings of nature, is anxious to feed her offspring, with all the milk she can supply: so Jesus Christ feeds, with his own blood, those whom he regenerates."

"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 words prevail and be preferred before the testimony of our eyes. 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 sense is very easily deceived. That never failed. This often. Since then, his words says; This is my body: let us assent, and believe, and view it with the eyes of our understanding: Christ left us nothing sensible, but spiritual and intellectual objects, under sensible forms—for if you were incorporeal, he would have bequeathed to you gifts purely incorporeal, but as your soul is united to a body, those gifts are to be comprehended under sensible and corporeal signs. How many persons are heard to say: I would wish to behold his figure his shape, his attire! But you see him, you touch him, you receive him into your breast. You would, however, wish to see his garments. He gives himself to you, not only to be looked on, but to be touched also, to be eaten, to be admitted into your breasts. If you cannot reflect, without indignation upon the treason of Judas and the ingratitude of those who crucified the Lord, see that you do not render yourselves guilty of the profanation of his body and blood. Those unfortunates inflicted death on the sacred body of Christ, and you, after so many benefits received, usher him into an impure and defiled soul! for not content with becoming man and being ignominiously treated, he has chosen moreover to become united with you, so that you form but one body with him, and this, not only by faith, but actually and in reality.

"How pure and holy ought he to be who is made partaker of so sublime a sacrifice!" How much purer than the rays of the sun should be the hand that distributes this flesh, the mouth that is filled with this spiritual flame, the tongue that is purpled with this adorable blood! Reflect, to what an honour you are raised, to what a table you are admitted! He, whom the angels tremble to behold and at the contemplation of whose majesty they are struck with awful terror, He feeds us with his own substance; with him we are intimately united,

*Hom. to the Neophytes. The same sentiments are found in nearly the same words, on the Hom. in St. John, and in the LX. to the people of Antioch.

† Hom. LX. to the people of Antioch, repeated in great measure in Hom. LXXXIII. on St. Matthew.

so as to become one body and one flesh with him. Who shall tell the wonders of the Lord? Who shall duly celebrate his praise? What pastor ever fed his sheep with the members of his own body? But why do I mention pastors? Even mothers sometimes permit their infants to be suckled by strange nurses. But he will not allow his own to be thus treated. He himself nourishes them with his own blood, and gives himself entirely to them.

† "Jesus Christ, who formerly operated these astonishing effects at his last supper with his disciples, is the same who operates them now. We act as his officers and ministers: but it is he who sanctifies the offerings and changes them into his body and blood.——This discourse I address not only to you, who participate of them, but also to you who are the dispensers of them.* And you, since, when you approach the sacred body, believe that you receive it from the invisible hand of Christ: for he who has done more, that is, has laid himself upon the altar, will not disdain to present you his body." The illustrious prelate proceeds afterwards to treat of the duty of charity, which he greatly extols as the best disposition for the mysteries: and alluding to the Lord's supper, he adds: "The table at which he eat was not of silver, nor was the chalice from which he poured out blood to his apostles of gold; and yet how precious and awful was this vessel, by reason of the spirit with which it was replenished!——"

Although we possess not any of the first instructions that Saint Augustine must have given to his neophytes on their leaving the baptismal font and previous to their participating of the Eucharist, although the discourses of his that are extant turn generally upon the paschal solemnity or the congruence of the bread and wine with the mystical body of our Lord, or on the moral dispositions that should accompany us and render us worthy of approaching daily to the sacred table, we still may occasionally find the doctrine and belief of the Church briefly yet clearly touched upon. "I am mindful," says he to his baptized adults, "of my promise made to you. I engaged to deliver to you, who have been baptized, an explanation of the sacrament of the Lord's table, which you at present behold, and of which you were, last night, partakers. You should know what you have received, what you do receive, and what you ought to receive every day. The bread that you behold on the altar, being consecrated by the word of God, is the body of Jesus Christ: this chalice, or rather that which is in the chalice, being sanctified by the word of God, is the blood of Christ." Such is the compendium of the instruction that had already been given to the newly-baptized the evening be-

*These words sufficiently indicate that there were none but ecclesiastics and the faithful present: this is still better proved by the clearness with which the doctrines are propounded and explained in every point of view. On this account I have made no hesitation in annexing this homily to the dogmatical instructions delivered for the neophytes.

lore, previous to their admission to the sacred table, for which reason the holy bishop merely makes reference to it without dwelling further upon it, and passes on to the particular subject of his discourse, which is to know why the body and blood are given under the form of bread and wine.—

"This," says he, "is explained by the apostle: We being many are but one body, one bread." He admirably develops the thought of the apostle, shewing that the mystical body, of which we are all members, is represented by the numerous grains of corn that compose the same bread and the different grapes that compose the same wine: hence, he concludes that this was the reason why the artist made choice of the matter of bread and wine to form of them his body and blood.

This instruction is precisely the same in substance and nearly the same in words as is found in another discourse, which Saint Fulgentius has preserved, and which was delivered in the same circumstances. "Yesterday eve you beheld the same that you behold at present. But you have not as yet been informed what they were, what they signified, and how great and excellent were those things of which they were the sacrament. What you see, then, is bread, this your eyes declare it to be: but according to the testimony that faith must give concerning it, *the bread is the body of Christ, and the wine of this chalice is the blood of Christ.*" Here is the doctrine in its abridged form; and because it had been fully detailed by him the evening before, Saint Augustine proceeds to another subject that he had not as yet treated, to the explanation of the mysterious congruence and conformity of the matter of the sacrament with the mystical body of Jesus Christ.

"Our Lord Jesus Christ, who hitherto had not permitted himself to be known by the two disciples, was pleased that they should know him in the breaking of bread. The faithful understand what I say: they know Christ in the breaking of bread. For it is not all bread, but that which receives the benediction of Christ, that becomes the body of Christ."

"Tell me, my brethren, on what occasion was it that our Lord was pleased to make himself known? It was when he broke bread with two of his disciples at Emmaus. We then may rest assured: we break bread & we recognise our Lord. He determined to be known in this action alone, for our sakes, who were not to behold him in his mortal flesh, and yet were to eat his flesh."

"Reason itself and the discipline of the Church convince us that no bishop could dispense with himself from complying with the duty of instructing the newly-baptized before their admission to the sacred table. It cannot therefore be doubted that Saint Augustine composed discourses similar to those of S. S. Cyril, Ambrose, Gaudentius, &c. for the purpose of instructing his regenerated children in the mystery of the Eucharist, previous to their participation thereof. He has left us none of his purely elementary and dogmatic instructions. We have many of his discourses addressed to the neophytes and the people. We have his sermons for Easter-Sunday and the days of the octave. All

"Receive," says St. Augustine again, "receive in the bread what was fastened to the cross; receive in the chalice what issued from the side of Jesus Christ. For he will receive death and not life, who shall believe that life is capable of a falsehood."

"Doubt not," says St. Cyril of Alexandria, of this truth, since Christ so manifestly assures us that it is his body, but rather receive with faith the words of our Saviour; for, being the truth, he cannot speak what is untrue."

The same patriarch teaches again that "he, who was eaten figuratively in Egypt, voluntarily immolates himself in this supper, and that, after having eaten the figure, because it was for him to accomplish the legal figures, he produced the reality, by giving himself to be the food of life."

"The mystery, we speak of, is awful and astonishing. There the lamb of God, who taketh away the sins of the world, is immolated. There is the Father rejoiced, and the son voluntarily immolated, not now by his enemies, but by himself, that man may understand that the torments he has endured for his salvation have all been voluntary."

You probably did not expect to find such clear and decisive evidence. All this, is however well known, and our apologists have often cited it to Protestant theologians. And shall it always be produced without effect? Shall it be always our fate to be perpetually producing the most convincing proofs, & yours to be as perpetually refusing them your assent? I have notwithstanding, the courage to hope, that in this new point of view in which they have been presented, they will leave a deeper impression upon your mind. The more you reflect upon the doctrine of the Fathers, the more you will perceive an almost irresistible force impelling you towards catholicity. Allow me to put it to your candour, whether it is not most clear and evident, that, if the fathers had trained the neophytes and the faithful in the principles of Luther and Zuinglius, they would never have dreamed of assuring them, that in the Eucharist, what is bread before the consecration becomes after the consecration the true and real body of Christ. Now St. Justin positively testifies, "That the bread and wine, having become the Eucharist by the prayer of the word of God, are the flesh and blood of the same incarnate Christ." St. Gregory of Nyssa declares "that the bread is but bread at the first, but that no sooner is it consecrated by the mystical prayer, than it is called and actually is the body of Jesus Christ." St. Ambrose inculcates the same doctrine in the following terms: "Our Lord himself proclaims: This is my body. Before the benediction of the celestial words, the bread is named; after the consecration, the body of Christ is signified. He himself calls it his blood. Before consecration it has another name; after consecration it is denominated blood. And you answer, *Amen*, that is, *it is true*. What the mouth speaks, let the mind inwardly confess and assent to." And the author of the book of the sacraments says after him. "You will perhaps say, it is nothing but common bread. It is indeed bread before the words of the sacrament; but after the consecration, from being bread, it becomes the flesh of Christ."

these go upon the supposition that they had communicated the evening before, and had consequently been initiated in the doctrine concealed from them while catechumens, but necessarily revealed and explained to them before communion, that they might know the greatness of the presents there made to them by God: and that they might not fall into the criminal ignorance, of which those are guilty, says Hesychius, who partake of the body of Christ, without knowing that it is really the body of Christ.—

Do you not see most clearly that according to the notions of persons professing the protestant religion, it never would have entered into the minds of the fathers to establish a change of substance in the Eucharistic bread and wine, or to prove this change to the neophytes and the faithful? Yet the Fathers frequently and urgently believe of the change of substance upon them, and support the doctrine by proofs. We find even in Origen the following passage: "We eat the bread that is offered which by prayer is made a holy body by which, they, who partake of it with a pure spirit, are rendered more holy." St. Cyril of Jerusalem speaks still more clearly and pointedly: "Jesus Christ, in Cana of Galilee, once changed water into wine by his will only; & shall we think it less worthy of credit, that he changed wine into blood?" St. Gregory of Nyssa: "By virtue of the benediction the nature of visible things is changed in his body.....And so I now believe that the bread, sanctified by the word of God, is transformed and changed into the body of Christ." St. Ambrose teaches us "that by the benediction nature itself is changed (he proves it by a reference to the double change wrought by Moses in the rod) and that, if the blessing of a man be powerful enough to change nature, much more may be said of the divine consecration, when the words of our Lord operate. that, if the word of Elias could call down fire from heaven, the word of Christ must be still more capable of changing the nature of the elements, and of changing things that are into that which they were not." And again; By the mystery of the sacred prayer, the sacramental bread and wine are changed into body and blood." St. Gaudentius; "The Creator and Lord, who produces bread from the earth, of the bread makes his own proper body, (because he is able, and he promised to do it;) and as of water he made wine, so of wine he makes his blood." St. Chrysostom: "The things that are proposed, are not the effects of human power: but he who effected them at his last supper, effects them still at the present time: we only act as his ministers, he who consecrates and changes them is Christ himself." Saint Cyril of Alexandria, exclaims against those who denied the possibility of the change. "If thou persisteth in asking how, I, in my turn, will ask thee how the rod of Moses was changed into a serpent; how the waters were changed into blood.....Hesychius: "The sanctification of the mystic sacrifice, the change and transformation of sensible into spiritual things, must be attributed to him who is the true priest." "It is this invisible priest (says Saint Cesarius of Arles) who, by the secret virtue of his divine word, changes visible creatures into the substance of his body and blood.As then, by a simple word, God, in an instant, formed out of nothing the height of the heavens, the depth of the sea, and the wide extension of the earth; so, likewise, in the spiritual sacraments, by a power equally great, the virtue of his word is instantly followed by the effect." Eusebius of Emessa, or the author of the homilies, which for a thousand years have gone under his name: "The invisible sacrifice converts by a word, pregnant with a secret power, visible creatures into the substance of his body and blood.....And what is there wonderful in his being able, to change by his word the things which he was able to create by his word? On the contrary, one would imagine it to be less wonderful for him to change into something more excellent, that which he had created out of nothing."

Do you not here again perceive that, according to the figurative sense of Zuinglius, the fathers would have had nothing wonderful to present in the Eucharist to the admiration of the faithful and the neophytes? And yet attend to the words of the holy and learned deacon Ephrem: "The illustrious patriarch, Abraham, presented terrestrial food to angels descended from heaven, and they eat it,

Doubtless it was most miraculous to see incorporeal spirits eating meats on earth. But that, which the Son of God, Jesus Christ, our Savior, has done for us, baffles language, and surpasses imagination; since, notwithstanding our fleshly composition, he feeds us with spirit and fire, giving us his body to eat and his blood to drink."

THE CHRISTIAN SENTINEL, No. 52.

Our Three River HABAUKUK, who says in his motto: *I will stand upon the watch, and set me upon the tower*, (the tower of London perhaps, or of Babel rather,) and will watch to see what HE, (the lying spirit) will say unto me: and what I shall answer when I am reproved:—The self-dubbed CHRISTIAN SENTINEL seems now indeed at a loss what to answer, when he is reproved: since all he can do is, instead of using decent discussion; or civil and christian ratiocination; to discharge against us, with all the fury of a heedless Maniac, the well saved stink-pots and whole remaining ordure of his nothing nice nor scrupling reformation. These we thought, had all been emptied forth from their wonted hold; the lately clean swept precincts & purified purlieus of the British Parliament. But there are those, it seems, with the hireling scavenger Southey at their head, who think them worth the saving still; as well known anti-Catholic repellents, and the best and readiest ammunition to be used in every polemical skirmish with the Romans. Were our homely HABAUKUK in a humour to bear reproof; we would give him here some plaguy posers although he be a prophet. Let him stand then on his tower, and watch to see, what for this once in our stead, Dr. Lingard will say to him on the *Papal Supremacy*: and what he shall answer, when he is reproved, the next time we ourselves resume the subject. As for Cobhett, who has let the cat out of the bag, we leave him, to his well merited execration. Neither will we just now stop to prove to him that a wife is not a sister: that a solemn vow is not to be broken, even were it one of *Celibacy*: and that the Jews kept not the bible otherwise than as Catholics do; always subject to the pontifical, the only legal and authorized interpretation. For thus we read in that very bible, what constitutes, not the Protestant's, but the Catholic's rule of faith: *If thou perceive that there be among you a hard and doubtful matter in judgment &c., thou shalt come to the priests of the levitical race; and to the judge, that shall be at that time; and thou shalt ask of them; and they shall shew thee the truth of the judgement. And thou shalt do whatsoever they shall say, that preside in that place, which the Lord shall choose; and what they shall teach thee, according to the law: and thou shalt follow their sentence; neither shalt thou decline to the right hand, nor to the left. But he that will be proud, and refuse to obey the commandment of the priest, who ministereth at that time to the Lord thy God; and the decree of the judge; that man shall die, and thou shalt take away the evil from Israel. And all the people hearing it, shall fear, that no one afterwards swell*

with pride. Deut. 17, 8, &c. This rule the Saviour confirms, when speaking to his pastors he says:—*He who hears you, hears me; and he who despises you, despises me.* Luke 10, 16. And he, *who will not hear the church, let him be to thee as a Heathen, and a Publican.* Mat. 18, 17. Protestants, on the contrary, and their *Bible Societies* in dealing out the scriptures as a mercantile monopoly, and money making concern; tell every purchaser or receiver of the sacred book, to judge of it, as he thinks best, and scorning all other authority on earth, to abide by his own sole and self-sufficing interpretation of it: though St. Peter so clearly testifies that in it *there are many things hard to understand; which the unlearned and unstable, rest to their own damnation*: 2, Pet. 3, 16, and hence declares, that *no prophecy of scripture is made by private interpretation*, 2, Pet. 1, 20. We now bid our HABAUKUK on the tower see what he will answer when he is reproved; as at present he is, for advancing what, a prophet, should know to be an arrant untruth: that Catholics are forbidden the use, not the abuse of the bible. Catholics all know how false is this allegation; and so also may all enquiring Protestants: excepting those, (& the number of such is great,) *who love the darkness rather than the light*: and will not believe their own very eyes, should they tell them that Catholic's are born without horns on their heads.—*Editor.*

Thou art Peter, (or Rock,) and on this rock I will build my church. Matt. xvi. 18.

The title which the Bishop of St. David's has prefixed to his publication, will justify a doubt whether he properly understands the doctrine that he has undertaken to refute. In his title he asserts that Christ, and not Peter, is the rock of the christian church. Does he then mean to insinuate that, according to the Catholic creed, Peter, and not Christ, is that rock? If he do, he must allow me to inform him better. It is indeed true that Catholics, in imitation of our Saviour, call Peter the rock, on which the church was built: but they do not give him that title to the exclusion of Christ, or in the same sense in which it is given to Christ. Of Christ they teach that he, by his office of Messiah, was the true rock; of Peter, that he was the rock only in a subordinate and vicarious capacity. Our blessed Lord claimed that appellation in his own right: Peter could hold it only by delegation from his master. Christ, by his doctrine and blood, founded the church: Peter, by the appointment of Christ, was made his representative, when he should no longer be visible upon earth. Nor let it be said that this doctrine is at variance with itself. As well may you say that, because Christ is called in scripture "the shepherd and bishop of our souls," (1 Pet. xi. 25.) he could not appoint other shepherds and bishops to minister in his place; or that, because he is said to be the only foundation that can be laid, it was an error in St. Paul to give that appellation to the apostles and the prophets, (Eph. xi. 19.) Indeed the objection is not new. It was

made many centuries ago. The answer which it received then, I have given to it now. *Ei gar Kai Petra, ouk os Kristos Petra, os Petros Petra. Kristos gar ontos Petra asaleutos. Petros de dia ten Petran—Phos estin humeis este to phos tou Kosmou. Iereus esti, poiei iereas Petra esti, petran poiei.**

Now whether Christ did, or did not confer this title on St. Peter, depends on the meaning of the passage, which I have quoted above: "and I also say unto thee, that thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my church." To whom, or to what are the words, "this rock" to be referred? To Peter himself, if we may believe the Catholic divines; to his profession of faith, if the reasoning of the right reverend prelate be conclusive.

The better to understand this passage, the reader will call to his recollection what happened during the first interview between our Saviour and the apostles. We learn from St. John (c. i. v. 41.) that Simon, one of the sons of Jona, was originally introduced to our blessed Lord by Andrew, his eldest brother. Jesus, as soon as he saw the young man, addressed him in these remarkable words: "thou art Simon, the son of Jona: thou shalt be called Cephas, (that is Peter in Greek, and Rock in English.) Now let me ask, what was the meaning of this unexpected prediction? Why was the name of Simon to be changed, more than that of Andrew, or of any other apostle? What was there in him, that he in particular should receive the mysterious appellation of the "rock?" It could not be on account of the constancy of his faith, for he denied his Lord. That it portended something of consequence in the future destiny of the apostle cannot be doubted: but its real import probably remained a secret, till it was disclosed by Christ on another occasion. He had asked his disciples, "Whom do men say that I, the Son of Man, am? And they said: some John the Baptist, some Elias, and others Jeremias, or one of the prophets." Not satisfied with this answer, he again asked, "But whom say ye that I am? And Simon Peter answered and said thou art the Christ, the son of the living God. And Jesus answering said unto him: blessed art thou Simon, the son of Jona; for flesh and blood has not revealed it unto thee, but my father, who is in heaven. And I say also unto thee, thou art Peter, (a rock) and on this rock will I build my church, and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven. Then charged he his disciples that they should tell no man that he was Jesus the Christ. (Matt. xvi. 16-20.)

From this passage we learn both the reason why the name of Simon was changed into Cephas, and the meaning of his new appellation.

* Hom. de Pcen. in appen. ad op. S. Bas. tom. 11.

Christ had not yet openly disclosed either to the public, or to his disciples, who he really was. When Simon, by the inspiration of heaven, declared him to be the Christ, the son of the living God. Jesus immediately pronounced him blessed, for having been thus selected to announce this important truth to mankind and in return for the declaration which he had made, appointed him the Cephas, or rock, on which the church should be built, promised to him the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and engaged that whatsoever he should bind or loose on earth, should be bound or loosed in heaven. Simon had said, "thou art the Christ," a word expressing the office of him, who was the Redeemer of the world. Jesus answered, "and I say also unto thee, that thou art the rock, a word expressive of the office to which Simon was called, of being, after Christ, the rock on which the church was to be founded. Then in consequence of his elevation to this office, a promise was made to him of the keys, the symbols of pre-eminence and authority; and a declaration was added, that in the exercise of that authority, his decision on earth should be ratified in heaven.

In this exposition of the words, "thou art Peter, and on this rock I will build my church," there is nothing forced or unnatural. It is what first offers itself to the mind on the perusal of the passage. It is the sense in which it was generally understood by the ancient writers; and, I am happy to add, the sense which has been given to it by the more candid of the Protestant expositors; who, though they may not admit the papal supremacy, yet acknowledge that St. Peter was appointed by Christ to be the rock of the christian church. Dr. Whitby thus paraphrases the passage: "As a suitable return for thy confession, I say also unto thee, that thou art by name Peter, that is a rock: and upon thee, who art this rock, I will build my church.

And I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, the power of making laws to govern my church."* It is explained in the same manner by Dr. Hammond. "Seeing thou hast so freely confessed me before men, I will also confess thee. Thou art Peter, &c. that is, the name by which thou art styled and known by me, is that which signifies a stone or rock, and accordingly my church shall be so built on thee, founded in thee, that it shall never be destroyed.—What is here meant by the keys, is best understood by Is. xxii. 22. where they signify ruling the whole family or house of the king, and this being by Christ accommodated to the church, denotes the power of governing in it."† To these I will only add the testimony of Dr. Tomline, the present bishop of Lincoln, who in his elements of christian theology, repeatedly supposes that by the words, "this rock," was meant Peter himself. Thus after telling us, that the many remarkable circumstances recorded concerning Peter in the gospels, and acts

seem to point him out as the chief of the twelve apostles, he adds. "our Savior said to him in explanation of the name, which he himself had given him. thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my church;" and again he informs us, that by being the first who preached to the Jews and afterwards to the Gentiles, Peter may be said to have founded the universal church; which is supposed to have been the meaning of our Lord's words, "upon this rock will I build my church."

To this exposition, however, the Bishop of St. David's has opposed three feeble and evasive answers. 1st. He tells us that the rock on which Christ promised to build his church, was the profession of faith in the Messiahship of Jesus. Now that such profession was the immediate cause, why Christ pronounced St. Peter to be the rock, will be granted; but if the learned Prelate meant to disjoin the faith from the person of Peter, and to confine to it alone the promise of our Savior, he both violates the propriety of language, and contradicts the obvious meaning of the speaker. "I also say to thee that thou art the rock, and on this rock I will build my church;" are words perfectly intelligible, and mutually illustrative of each other. It points out why Simon was originally called Peter, and shows that on him, as on a rock, the church was to be built. But if, instead of this, you substitute the exposition of the bishop, the whole passage will become unnatural, involved and incoherent. "And I say unto thee that thou art the rock, and on the confession of my Messiahship, as on a rock, I will build my church." It must, moreover, be evident to the reader, that Jesus, in his answer to Peter, meant to confer on him some reward in return for his confession. Yet where could have been this reward, if Christ had only told him that the church would be built upon faith, and that he, no less than his colleagues, should be instrumental in raising it on that foundation.

2. Dr Burgess observes, that as Christ addressed the question to all, and St. Peter answered in the name of all, so the reply of our Savior was intended for all. Now supposing the premises to be true, yet I see not how the conclusion can be maintained. As well might it be pretended, that when a sheriff, for example, is knighted for presenting an address, the same honor is intended to be conferred on all the freeholders of the country in whose names he is commissioned to act. In effect, if it be possible for language to confine the meaning of an answer to one individual, it is so in the present instance. The evangelist declares that the words of Christ were addressed to Peter: "Jesus answering, said unto him," and the words themselves are exclusive of all other persons: "Blessed art thou, Simon, son of Jona—I say unto thee—thou art Peter—and I will give unto thee—whatsoever thou shalt bind," &c.

3. But, says the Bishop of St. David's, "there is a change of the terms in the words of our Savior. Thou art Petros (Peter) and on this petra (rock) I will build my church. If our Savior had meant that St. Peter should be the rock, the same term might have been repeated thou art Petrus and on this petrus I will build my church. He was not the foundation on which the church was to be built, but a part of it. He was not petra but petrus;" that is, he was not the rock, but one of the stones to be employed in the building on the rock. This is one of the luminous and important distinctions for which we are indebted to the genius of the reformation. As long as Christendom was enveloped in the darkness of popery, it was not given to man to discover the true meaning of that elegant discourse, which we are now told, took place between Christ and the apostle:

Christ. Whom do ye say, that I, the Son of Man, am?

Simon. Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God.

Christ. And I say also unto thee, thou art a stone, (Petrus) and on this rock (petra) I will build my church.

But the Right Rev. Prelate should recollect, that *petrus* and *petra* are not the words of Christ, but of the translator. Christ did not speak in Greek, but in Syrochaldæic. If for the same word *cephas*, the translator employed both *Petrus* and *petra*, it is not difficult to assign the reason. He adopted *Petrus* in the first instance, because a masculine termination was more proper for the name of a man, and *petra* the second, because it was more analogous to the metaphor of building an edifice. †

At the close of this part of his publication, the bishop lays down the three following propositions; that "the first christian church was the church of Jerusalem; that the president of the first christian council was not St. Peter, but St. James; and that the first christian bishop was St. James, the bishop of Jerusalem." ‡ These

* Bish. of St. David's; p. 5.

† Dr. Burgess will not allow St. Peter to be the rock, because there is a change of terms, *Petrus* and *Petra*. Would he then acknowledge him to be the rock, if there were no change of terms? That there was none in the original discourse of Christ, is certain. He must have used *Cephas* in both places. The same word is also used in both places, in the Syriac, Arabic, and the other oriental versions.

‡ Ib. p. 10. Another extraordinary assertion, hazarded by the learned Prelate, is, that "St. Paul was the first founder of the church of Rome." From what ancient writer this information has been derived, we are not told; nor is it possible to conjecture. It could not be from St. Paul himself, for he wrote a long epistle to that church some years before it could have been in his power to found it. But may I ask the Bishop of St. David's one question? If he knows any thing of ecclesiastical antiquity, he must know that the See of Rome was always called the See of Peter, *sedes* or *cathedra Petri*. Now if St. Paul was the first founder of that church, how came it not to be called the See of Paul instead of the See of Peter? Even supposing that, according to the discovery of the bishop, St. Peter afterwards assisted St. Paul in preaching the Gospel at Rome, yet why should that church derive its distinguishing appellation from the assistant rather than the principal? Truly, I think he must surrender one of his two favorite opinions. He must acknowledge that either St. Paul was not the first founder of the church of Rome, or that the name of Peter superseded that of Paul, on account of the superior dignity of the former.

* Whitby, in Matt. xvi. 16. Tom. I. p. 143.

† Hammond, *ibid.*, p. 92.

* Elements of Christian Theology, par. II. c. 25. p. 470—479.

propositions appear to be considered by his lordship as so many theological axioms, which require neither proof nor illustration. If I may be allowed to deliver my opinion, I will say of them that the first is probably true. For it was at Jerusalem that St. Peter laid the foundation of the christian church, on the festival of Pentecost, (Acts ii. 1-4) and of course, the church of Jerusalem may be considered as the most ancient local church. The second proposition is very doubtful. The scripture does not expressly declare, who was the president of the first council; but as far as I can judge, the narrative of St. Luke seems to attribute that office to St. Peter, (Acts xv. 7.) The truth of the third proposition will depend on the meaning which is given to the word *Bishop*. If it import no more than the spiritual superintendance of a certain limited district, St. James may perhaps have been the most ancient bishop. but if, as most divines maintain, all the apostles were invested by Christ with the episcopal character, I know not how any one can claim the priority in point of time before his colleagues. But what follows from these propositions? That "the words *thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church*, were not meant to convey any supremacy to St. Peter." Reader, if thou art acquainted with any logical process, by which such an inference may be extracted, thou art more fortunate than I am. While the vigorous mind of the bishop gains remote conclusion at a jump, my more feeble intellect is compelled to feel its way in the dark, I cannot return an answer to that, which I am unable to comprehend. The right reverend prelate has shown us the two extremities of the chain. Let him disclose the intermediate links, and we shall then be able to judge in what manner they are connected together.

* Ib. p. 10.

IGNORANCE AND THE VICES.
A M. S. POEM.

Continued.

Th' allarm is caught by all the bellish crew,
When spied among our race this wonder new,
Yet, whom they dare not tempting more assail,
They strive to ruin through his brethren fail.

Straight envy's sting into their wounded heart,
Its whole collected rankling venom darts:
Till all the demon's torment they endure,
Awak'd at sight of such perfection pure.

Revenge calls sudden forth the savage yell
Of his dread pack, turn'd by his wond'rous spell
From men to brutes; which, worse than Circe's feign'd,
Each grow'ing slave had to some fury chain'd.
These on be leads, all panting for their prey,
Now 'gainst the main disturber of his way
Who thwarting durst his precept neck oppose.
Not merely to forgive, but leve our foes.

Lust grieves, and gluttony, intemp'rate pair,
And sensual pleasure drops her syren air.
To see the dreaded dawn of reason bright
Fast opening on their horror-crowded night:
In all their hideousness, exposing true
Their disenchanting forms to human view
These, now the threatening danger to avert,
On blind, unconscious man their pow'rs exert
They pour successive on his mental sight,
The tempting scenes of criminal delight.
Each to the taste elate, with magic skill

High colouring; and the wish for such instal,
Then hid him scout the mandate, st austere
From these, his wont enjoyments, to forbear
And loath a law, that would from his deter,
Enjoining here ev'n sufferings to prefer.

But none 'gainst reason's Lord such numbers arms,
As coward fear, the fiend; who now alarms,
With dangers new his palsey stricken slaves;
And 'gainst such precepts harsh, thus loudly raves.
"What? for this preaching mortal, self-still'd God,
Your comforts quit, nay brave affliction's rod?
You, frail, the tort'rer's brand and steel defy;
Ev'n death's dread stroke endure without a sigh!
Is this his proudly boasted perfect law,
Absurdly made your rational minds to awe;
While nat'ral instinct teaches all to fly,
The threatened ill; and snatch the pleasure nigh?
Haste then, my sons; your jeerings all unite,
And hoot this teacher odious from the sight,
'Gainst one so weakly passive freely dare."
He said, and straight their scoffings rend the air

Though last, not least, of this unsightly band,
Lo pride appears, and claims o'er all command.
His plea admitted, to his host combin'd,
The largest portion far of human kind,
Whom various spell, or false suggestion draw
And blends together in one common cause.
He holds discourse in such imposing strain,
As may the gen'ral approbation gain;
"Would you, he says, at such mean upstart's call,
Your dignities forego; your wealth, your all?
Count poverty your gain, and covet scorn?
Rejoice in sull'ring, but, if fort'nate, mourn!
Ev'n ill with good repay; and love your loss?
Yet friends and kindred hate, nor care to lose?
Ev'n sorrow fondly seek, and pleasure shun,
For sake of him, a low mechanic's son?
Your limbs submit to every tort'ring smart,
And ev'n of death defy the brandish'd dart.
Would you not haste, such easy yoke to bear?
You're all invited: why so tarry here?
You're right—this dogmatizer can beguile
None, but th' unthinking, ignorant rabble vile
They, who have nought to loose, and nothing know
Their hopes of future good may cred'ulous show,
Ours be the present certain; theirs unsure,
For which they're bid such misery to endure.

To check this growing madness, for it gains,
And thousands now believe, what'er he feigns:
"We must, (or with his wretched follow'rs join,)
To explode his odious doctrine, all combine
Nor stop our efforts short, till from the stage,
We've thrust this cens'ring self-proclaiming sage.

He said: and vanity applaudive cheers,
His mimick'd argument, that sound appears.
Talks much of toys, which she no more might deal,
Should such revolting doctrines e'er prevail;
And cites, now lost among the rabble mean,
Her late distinguish'd vot'ry, magdalene;
Th' imposing threat her childish vot'ries awes,
And firm unites them in their Sov'reign's cause.

The Yell is up: hark! far and wide resound
The clamours mis'd the just one to confound:
He, like a rock amid the roaring tide,
Can all unmov'd the tempest's rage abide,
Till from its side, the baffled billows fall.
And all in murmurs hoarse their spray recal
When o'er the fast subsiding deep it rears,
Its head sublime, and statelier hence appears:
So, when assailed, majestic and serene
Amid the railing for the Lord is seen.

Ye vice-deluded worldlings! can you stay
The orient sun, fast hast'ning on his way!
Far less may you obstruct, now rising clear,
The sun of justice in his bright career.
Still in his mien and manner might you spy,
In human form, though hid, the deity.
Who, but th' eternal wisdom, thus dignify'd,
Could dash your plans, so artfully devised?
Your puzzles solve' your columns refute.
So with a word; and leave you wond'ring mute!
Yet should not this your minds convincing move;
With prodigies unmatch'd behold him prove
His mission all divine, himself that God,
Whom nature owns, obedient at his nod!

See round him crowd, th' afflicted of our kind,
The sick, the lame, the deaf, the dumb, the blind.
He speaks, and lo! to each, straight at his word,
Health, strength and hearing, speech and sight restor'd.
Life's author he, the dead to life returns;
And bids each kindred heart rejoice that mourns
In barren solitude whom forth he leads.

With bread, by miracle supplid he feeds.
And, sanctioning with an act of pow'r divine,
The nuptial rite; ev'n a water turns to wine.
Up from their oozy beds the finny prey,
He calls; and straight his summons these obey,
He stills the tempest, lulls the raging deep:
Walks, like a spirit o'er its surgy steep.
In jordan's stream, and where on Thabor's height;
Was round him roll'd a cloud of glory bright,
The voice peternal issuing from on high,
Proclaims him God, the filial deity,

AU PUBLIC.

Les pseumes, aux quels nous voila arrives dans le cours de nos explications Bibliques, etant une portion si importante et interessante de l'écriture Sainte; nous voudrions en presenter a nos lecteurs un commentaire plus choisi et etudie; ce que, pour le moment, nous nescaurions realizer a notre pleine et entiere satisfaction. En cessant donc pour un temps, de continuer nos e'pliations de la Bible nous esperons pouvoir avec avantage les recommencer dans notre second volume; s'il paroit que nous puissions hazarder la continuation de notre periodique: ce qui depend de l'exactitude avec laquelle les abonnements sont remis au publicateur. Car, quelque disposes que nous soyons a dedier veilles gratis et sans retour icibas, a l'instruction publicque, et a la defence de la religion: nous ne nous trouvons pas a meme de souffrir une si grande perte annuelle en suppleant le defect des payments a l'imprimeur, au fournisseur, et a la poste, pour la publication la moins dispendieuse qu'on puisse nommer.

NOTICE TO THE PUBLIC.

THE Psalms, at which we are now arrived in our *Biblical Notices and explanations*, are so important and interesting a portion of the inspired writings; that we could wish to give a more choice & studied commentary upon them, than we can well at present accomplish. We must therefore suspend for a while our scriptural notes; which we intend renewing in our second volume: should we be induced to continue the publication. This, however, entirely depends on the exactness, with which the subscriptions are remitted to the publisher, for, though willing to yield, as we have hitherto done, even single handed, our labours GRATIS to the public in the cause of truth; we cannot afford to be at so very considerable a yearly loss, to make up the defalcation of payments to the Printer of the cheapest periodical in existence.

THE EDITOR.

THE CATHOLIC.

Will be published weekly at the Office of the Patriot and Farmer's Monitor, Kingston, Upper Canada and issued on Friday. Terms—\$2 per annum. (exclusive of postage, which is four shillings a year payable in advance

All Communications to be addressed "to the Editors of the Catholic, Kingston," and *Post Paid*

Agents.

- Mr. Bergen, Merchant. York
- Mr. Macan. Do. Niagara
- Mr. L. O'Brien. Town of London
- Rev. Mr. Crowley. Peterboro.
- Rev. Mr. Brennan. Melville
- Mr. MacFall. Wellington
- Patriot Office. Kingston
- Rev J. Macdonald. Perth
- M. Hugh O'Beime. Yarmouth, near St. Thomas.
- Mr. J. A. Murdoch, P. M. Lacark.
- Alexander McMillan, Esq. Prescott.
- Mr. Tench Merchant. Mariatown.
- Rev Wm. Fraser. Saint Andrews & Cornwall
- Mr. Cassidy, Student, St. Raphaels. Glengary
- Angus McDonell, Esq. P. M. Alexandria. Ditto
- Col. J. P. Lepronon, Compt. of Customs. Coteau du Lac
- Mr. Moriarty. Schoolmaster at the Recollets, Montreal
- Hon. James Cuthbert. Manoirhouse, Berthier
- Mr. Jon. Byrne. Lower Town Quebec.
- Rev. Mr. Camusky. New York
- Rev Dr. Purcell. President of St. Mary's College
[Emmet's Burgh, Maryland.
- Mr. Michael Fitzgerald. Augusta, Georgia