

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

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

The Catholic.

Quod semper; quod ubique; quod ab omnibus

VOL. I.

KINGSTON, FRIDAY, OCTOBER 7, 1831.

NO. 51.

SELECTED.

AMICABLE DISCUSSION.

Continued.

LETTER X.

A RECAPITULATION UPON THE EUCHARIST.

Now the far greater portion of their discourses and writings were produced in these critical and perilous circumstances: consequently they must more frequently have expressed themselves with reserve, than with unrestrained freedom. At the same time, these measured expressions, this ambiguous phraseology, while they withheld from unbelievers the adorable mysteries, failed not to discover them to the christians, and were in fact such expressions as naturally presented themselves to the mind of the holy fathers. They sprang from the very nature of the Eucharist, which is composed of two parts, the one exterior & sensible, the other internal and invisible; the former terrestrial, the latter celestial: the one presenting to our eyes the appearances of bread and wine, the latter proposing to our faith the true and real body and blood of Christ present, but invisible. Under the former point of view, it is a sacrament, a sign, a symbol; under the latter, it is the true and real body and blood of Jesus Christ, the body that was born of the blessed virgin, and was nailed to the cross. the blood that flowed from his side, and purified the earth. When therefore the fathers had to disguise the mysteries, they had only to confine their expressions to the exterior appearances, and designate them according as they fell under the cognizance of the senses: and the faithful, instructed in the doctrine, had no difficulty in penetrating the veil, and passed on from the sensible appearances to the unseen reality.

The fathers spoke the truth—but did not say all the truth. They spoke the truth: for, considering the external part alone, the Eucharist is bread and wine: it is a type, figure, symbol, sign or sacrament: and we catholics to this day frequently employ the same expressions. They spoke not all the truth: for they were silent upon the invisible and principal part, which as it must be known to the faithful alone, and not discovered to any but the neophytes, was concealed from the rest, and clearly developed to them alone. Such, most assuredly was the situation of the fathers for more than four centuries: generally constrained to adopt a mysterious phraseology, occasionally at liberty to speak openly to the faithful, and in duty bound, on the great solemnities of Easter and Whitsuntide, to expound them clearly and explicitly to the neophytes.

The fathers therefore were true to their principles, varying their expressions according to circumstances, accommodating themselves to their readers and hearers; obscure and reserved to the non-initiated, clear to the faithful, and dogmatical to the neophytes.

After the lapse of many centuries, our age has been distinguished by the expedient resorted to on the part of your controversialists, who, to prop up their opinions by the authority of tradition, have gone in quest of numerous passages in the ecclesiastical writings, where the fathers were evidently constrained to speak with reserve, and confine their expressions to what was external and sensible in the Eucharist. Had they been honestly in search of the doctrine believed and taught in the primitive ages, instead of consulting writings in which the fathers were under the necessity of veiling their thoughts, they would have preferred those in which their inmost belief was necessarily brought to light. Why do not your teachers prefer the society of the faithful and the neophyte, and listen with them to the discourses delivered, with closed and guarded doors, by Cyril of Jerusalem, Ambrose of Milan, Chrysostom of Antioch and Constantinople, Gaudentius of Brescia, &c. &c.? Why after the conclusion of the instruction, do they not assist at the liturgy immediately succeeding? Why do they not follow the priest to the altar? Wherefore not repeat with the pontiff, the admirable supplications addressed to heaven? Wherefore not advance to the sacred table together with the faithful, and the recently admitted christians, who for the first time are going to participate in the holy mysteries and adore them? He who at the present time seeks to become acquainted with the primitive belief would naturally adopt this method. It is the only rational way of proceeding. But your instructors turn to the writings that were published to the world, sit down with the catechumens and listen to their instructions. Acting thus they meet only with a few allusions to the Eucharist, thrown out on the way, or accidentally introduced by the subject. Assuredly there is nothing here to be learned but the passing and trifling information that the fathers thought proper to communicate to the uninitiated; and it is not at all to be wondered at that your instructors should discover no additional elucidation of the subject, so long as they persist in associating themselves with the catechumens. Let them join the initiate, and the bandage will be removed from their eyes and all obscurity will be at an end; if after this they mingle with the catechumens, the enigmatical discourses there delivered will be no longer to them a subject of embarrassment: Like the rest of the faithful

they will catch the hidden meaning designedly concealed under ambiguous expressions; and will know how to pass from the veil and appearance, to the object that is veiled and signified.*

If the professors of the protestant religion had pursued this proper and simple method, they would not have lost their time and labour in accumulating passages, in which the fathers referring, as behoved them, to nothing more than the sensible part of the Eucharist, have described it under the appellations of bread and wine, of a sign, a figure, a type, a symbol and a sacrament: † and catholic polemics would not have been obliged to compose so many works to explain the multitude of passages, which never will prove any thing else, than that they spoke obscurely of the mystery, when it was impossible for them to do otherwise. ‡

I am, however, far from wishing to deal fraudulently with you, and take you by surprise: if you still are in doubt and uncertainty as to the doctrine of the fathers touching the Eucharist, you are perfectly at liberty to communicate this letter and also the foregoing ones, to any of your instructors whom you wish to consult. I have but one request

* "We call it also a mystery, for another reason: which is, that we believe not what we behold, but behold one thing, & believe another: for such is the nature of our mysteries. I who am a believer, consider a thing after one manner; and the unbeliever considers the same thing after another. When he hears speak of baptism, he considers only the water; but I not only consider the visible matter, but much more the purification of the soul effected by the Holy Spirit, not judging by the eyes of the body of what appears there, but by the eyes of the soul. In like manner, when I hear mentioned the body of Jesus Christ, I conceive what is said, in one way, the unbeliever considers it in another: and as children, looking into books, know not the power and signification of the letters and understand not what they see; and us, when an illiterate person receives a letter, he sees nothing but ink and paper, while one who can read, discovers words, communicates with an absent friend, and can convey what answer he pleases in reply; so is it with the mysteries: although unbelievers hear them spoken of, they do not understand them; but the faithful being instructed by the Holy Spirit, know the virtue and efficacy of what is there concealed."—Sant Chrysostom, in his discourse on the treason of Judas.

† These expressions we ourselves are continually employing. They are found used by those fathers, who most clearly establish the doctrine of the real presence and transubstantiation. Recollect here the remarks we have made together on this particular.

‡ M. Nicole, among others, has, with unwearyed industry, entered upon a lengthened discussion of all the texts objected by his adversaries; and has demonstrated (the term is not too strong) that they are all reconcilable with the catholic doctrine and there is not a single one that is inconsistent with it.

to make: which is that, if they still pretend to have the fathers on their side, you will require them to produce those writings, in which the fathers were bound to explain themselves clearly and distinctly. Insist upon their bringing forward the instructions delivered to the neophytes between their baptism and communion. Tell them that this is what they are bound to do for you. For, most undoubtedly, then was the time to explain in what the mysteries precisely consisted; then must the development have been made, of what they were to know and what they were to profess. Consequently, it is from these dogmatical and elementary documents that we now learn to a certainty what the prelates taught, what they had learned from their predecessors, and their predecessors from the apostles. Of this you cannot be too frequently reminded. Let your ministers produce, if they can, one single dogmatical instruction of the above description, in which it is declared to the neophytes, before their admission to the communion, that the communion is received "kneeling for the avoiding all such profanation and disorder as might otherwise ensue; for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Christ therein given: that no adoration is intended or ought to be done, either unto the body of Christ, or the sacramental bread or wine, for that the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances and may not be adored, and the natural body and blood of our Saviour is 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." Where will they find that such language was ever employed to the newly baptized? The opposite is the fact: in the most distinct terms, it is the adoration of Jesus Christ present in an ineffable manner by a change of nature in the gifts offered: it is the same body that was born of a virgin, the same blood that was shed upon the cross, to which we are bound to pay upon the altar, a still more profound adoration than the magi paid to him in the crib; no one receives them without having first adored them, and so far is it from being sinful to adore him, that we should sin by not adoring him.

This you have seen—you have heard the catechetical instructions given to the neophytes.—Others than these I know not of. Were there such, or could additional ones be discovered, they would not be found to contain the doctrine of your church. For it is impossible that they should have believed and taught at the same time the figure and the reality; the change and not the change of substance; impossible they should have taught that the heavenly and eucharistic bread must be adored, and that this adoration would be idolatry.

I leave you, Sir, to reflect soberly and candidly on what you have learnt respecting the important question that fills the last five letters. When you have done this, I must request your attention to a proof of a totally different character. Putting a-

* The words and sense of the declaration, concluding your liturgy, are at shocking variance with all the ancient liturgies.

side all discussion of texts and monuments, I undertake to prove that the doctrine of the Catholic church on the Eucharist necessarily goes back to the apostles. The argument will be somewhat abstract and metaphysical: I do not however believe it to be above the reach of ordinary capacities: it must in my opinion, suffice to convince every reasonable mind. We will then, for a moment forget all that we have discovered from scripture, the secret discipline, the liturgies and testimonies of the fathers, and, in place of authority, we will listen to reason alone. I start with you from a fact, and I say: At whatever point of time you may choose to fix upon, at the precise time, if you please, that we are now discussing this question, millions of persons, differing in climate, customs, nations, governments, prejudices and religious communions, all agree, not only in believing in the change of substance and the adoration in the Eucharist, but in believing in them as dogmas believed and taught in all preceding ages. The above proposition demands your most serious attention: re-peruse it, before you proceed further. You have read the most authentic testimonies on the belief of the Greek and Oriental churches. You know that upon these dogmas, they are perfectly in accordance with the Latin Churches—it is certain that they, like ourselves, believe in these doctrines, as having been invariably believed by preceding generations. This being established, I pass on: and I maintain that from this fact we of necessity have a right to infer nothing less than the apostolicity of these dogmas. In fact, although it be customary to divide the generations of men, and count four of them to a century, it is evident notwithstanding that they are neither distinctly separated nor independent of each other, but greatly intermixed, and linked one within another, so that a very considerable proportion of persons existing in any given generation, belong also to the one preceding. Whence it follows that a very considerable proportion of persons existing at any given epoch, are perfectly acquainted with what was believed and taught in the preceding generation, particularly when the dogmas are of great importance, connected with daily and general observance, and requiring of each individual the most sacred acts of religion, as is the case with the dogmas of the Eucharist.

If such doctrines are not to be traced to the Apostles, there must have been some later period, when for the first time, they sprang to light, and were taught and believed in the world. But at this Epoch, when for the first time, mention was made of it, a very great proportion of persons then living, knew for certain that not a word had been said about it the day before, neither had it been mentioned in the preceding generation; they knew perfectly, for example, that instead of the reality, nothing more than the figure had been recognized; instead of the change of substance, nothing but bread and wine; instead of adoration, nothing more than a recollection of spirit. Well then! Sir, supposing that I admit, what nevertheless is inadmissible, that these same persons consented to pass from the figure to the reality, from the

substance of the bread to that of the body, from recollection to adoration, they must have gone over to say the least, to what they considered a novel opinion and a novel practice, but in substituting them from the opinion and practice with which they had till then been acquainted, it is utterly impossible that they should have adopted them as having been held and taught during the preceding generation—the contrary would be notoriously manifest to all; the falsity of the fact too evident to admit such a persuasion. It is contrary to nature that so great a proportion of mankind should spontaneously or from persuasion, with one impulse, unite in admitting as true, what they all positively knew to be false. I cannot conceive a man to exist so much the victim of folly as to propose to his fellow creature to believe that as the doctrine and faith of the year before, which he knows, which they all know, was no such thing: and were an individual sound enough to venture upon such an experiment, the nature of things and good sense alike forbid us to suppose that success would crown his enterprise. And yet if our dogmas on the Eucharist were not derived from the Apostles, it would inevitably follow, that in some intermediate generation, men began to hold them, as the belief of their predecessors, although most notoriously they had never been so. There is an absurdity in this hypothesis which is quite repugnant to our moral constitution. Consequently it is proved that these doctrines are apostolical, by the naked and single fact that so many persons of the present day believe them, as having been believed and taught in the preceding generations, and reaching from our age to that of the apostles inclusively.

We are at length arrived at the termination of this protracted dissertation, upon which I entered to justify the decrees of the church upon the Eucharist, and in reply to the difficulties proposed by you. Our investigation has entirely turned upon the simple question of fact, whether the catholic dogmas were revealed by Jesus Christ. We have alternately examined the scripture and tradition, the channels through which revelation is transmitted to us; from each of these we have been supplied with clear and abundant proofs of the catholic doctrine: in each we have discovered that the real presence and the change of bread and wine into the body and blood of Jesus Christ were certainly revealed by our Lord. You can no longer entertain any reasonable doubt concerning the truth of this fact. You must now come to a determination: you can no longer be permitted to waver and hesitate: your own reason will rise up in judgment against you, if you delay for a moment to pay to Christ that adoration, which his divine presence in the sacrament of his altars imperatively requires.

To this you will reply: "The consequence you draw is just, it is inevitable: yet notwithstanding, this simultaneous presence in many places, this change of substance, without any external indication of the same, and while even the appearances remain afterwards the same as before! how can I submit to this, how can I believe it?" If you must be enabled to conceive and understand, before you

are to believe the doctrine, I must at once give up the task: for I am acquainted with no means of enabling you to conceive what I myself am as incapable of conceiving as you are. But for how long, let me ask you, have men considered themselves authorized to deny what is most clearly demonstrated by facts, on the ground that in theory it presented obscurity? How long have they presumed to reject the most solidly established dogma in religion, on the plea of its baffling their conceptions: while in the order of nature we admit, as indeed we ought to do, without cavil or doubt, thousands and thousand of effects, without the remotest possibility of our conceiving how they have been caused, in a single instance? The incomprehensibility of a mystery does not diminish its truth and certainty. Nor is it both rational and natural for us to yield to manifest proofs, without presuming to search for a reason that is hidden from us. Believe then, and doubt not, that Jesus Christ is really present; that the bread and wine no longer subsist, because they are become his body and blood; believe it, immediately you are convinced that he himself has so declared. Proceed no further: bound your inquiry where the clearness of revelation abandons you and obscurity begins its reign. Leave to God the accomplishment of what he has been pleased to reveal. He will execute his purposes by ways known only to himself. Do not harass your mind by discussing whether these ways are or are not agreeable with the principles of your reason, and waste not your time in judging and deciding whether it be that these principles must be absolutely false, or that God has ways unknown to men by which he operates his mysteries without injury to their principles.* So, when you find the ministers of the protestant religion dilating with complacency on the difficulties of the Eucharist, and displaying its pretended impossibilities, adhere firmly to what revelation teaches on this subject. Call to mind the words of our Saviour, when he promised to give us his body to eat, and his blood to drink, and when he performed his promise, on the eve of his passion. Call to mind the doctrine and the belief of the apostles, and the first christians; the discipline, coeval with christianity, respecting the secrecy that hid these mysterious dogmas in the breasts of the faithful: call to mind the liturgies of the fifth age, all of which express the same dogmas in glowing terms, and whose uniformity proclaims their apostolical descent: call to mind that the primitive Fathers developed the same belief with the greatest clearness when they spoke free and unrestrained in presence of the faithful alone, or when they were instructing the neoplates in what it was necessary for them to know before being admitted to partake of the holy communion: think, in fine, of the moral impossibility of our belief being ever establishing, such as it now exists,

*“For as the heavens are exalted above the earth, so are my ways exalted above your ways, and my thoughts above your thoughts, saith the Lord.”—Isaiah LV. v. 9.

unless it be supposed to derive its origin from Jesus Christ himself.

All the proofs attesting this point of revelation are most certain: the metaphysical arguments brought forward against them are far from being so, they leave them totally untouched. The former are within the comprehension of our minds the latter are far beyond the limits of human intelligence. We cannot therefore, without overthrowing the laws of good sense, throw aside plain and palpable proofs, to cling to conceptions that, to say the least of them, are founded on no certainty and are hazardous in the extreme. If, however, such metaphysical difficulties should rise up in our imagination, they must be driven away: proofs built upon facts must be introduced into their place: on such occasions, raise up your heart to heaven, whence all revelation is derived; take refuge under the Divine Majesty which veils its own mystery, and forbids you to examine it with too curious an eye: place all your confidence in him who proposes it to you, and, at the moment of communion, cry out to him with St. Peter, with the apostles and the christians of all ages: Yea, Lord, I believe that thou art the Son of the living God, and that thou hast the words of eternal life. This is the clear and luminous side of the column: fix your eyes upon this together with the chosen people of God, and you cannot fail of being secure: whereas you will be infallibly lost like the Egyptians, if you place yourself with them on the side that diffuses nothing but darkness and uncertainty. This mixture of light and darkness, which is equally found in the order of nature as in religion, was no doubt intended for the trial of our faith during the days of our pilgrimage: with our earthly pilgrimage it will terminate: then shall the evil be withdrawn and the truth be clearly laid open to our eyes: then, to our astonishment shall we find the simplicity of all that, which at present confounds and defies the ingenuity and imagination of man.

In the mean time, thus let us argue the point: it would no doubt be a madness believe, on the testimony of man, what we do believe respecting the Eucharist: but there would be a thousand times more madness in refusing to believe it on the positive testimony of our Saviour. You confess with us his divinity demonstrated by all his works: you acknowledge with us in Jesus Christ the God who created the universe, who rules nature, and who “hath done whatever he pleased in the heaven, in earth, in the sea, and in all the depths.” It would be highly unreasonable to oppose our weak understanding to his divine word and to place more reliance on our limited and ever erring reason than on his almighty power and infinite wisdom.*

* Hear the same language from the mouth of one of your own divines: “We confess with the holy Fathers that the manner of Christ’s presence is as inaccessible to our thoughts as to our language; that is, we confess, that it is not to be fathomed by human reason, but must be believed by faith. However incredible it may appear to us that, at so immense a distance, the flesh of Jesus Christ should come down to us and become our food, it must never be forgotten how much the power of the Holy

APPENDIX.

Testimonies of the Fathers.

Saint Ignatius, the disciple and successor of St. Peter in the see of Antioch, speaking of certain heretics, who denied the reality of the body of Christ, says: “They abstain from the Eucharist and from prayer, because they do not acknowledge the Eucharist to be the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins, and which the Father by his goodness resuscitated.” *Ep. ad Smyrn. p. 36. T. II. P. P. Apost. Amsteladami, 1724.*

Justin in his apology to the Emperor Antoninus, expresses himself as follows: “Our prayers being finished, we embrace one another with the kiss of peace. Then to him who presides over the brethren is presented bread, and wine tempered with water: having received which, he gives glory to the Father of all things in the name of the Son and the Holy Ghost, and returns thanks, in many prayers, that he has been deemed worthy of these gifts. These offices being duly performed, the whole assembly, in acclamation, answers, *Amen*; when the ministers, whom we call deacons, distribute to each one present a portion of the blessed bread, and the wine and water. Some is also taken to the absent. This food we call the Eucharist, of which they alone are allowed to partake, who believe the doctrines taught by us, and have been regenerated by water for the remission of sin, and who live as Christ ordained. For we do not take these gifts as common bread and common drink; but as Jesus Christ, our Saviour, made man by the word of God, took flesh and blood for our salvation: in the same manner, we have been taught that the food which has been blessed by the prayer of the words which he spoke, and by which our blood and flesh, in the change, are nourished, is the flesh and blood of that Jesus incarnate. The apostles, in the commentaries written by them, which are called Gospels, have delivered that Jesus so commanded, when taking bread, having given thanks, he said: *Do this in remembrance of me, This is my body.* In like manner, taking the cup, and giving thanks, he said: *This is my blood*: and that he distributed both to them only. If you find this reasonable, respect it: if you think it impertinent, despise it: but do not on that account condemn to death people who have done no evil. For we declare to you that you will not escape the judgment of God, if you persevere in this injustice. For our parts, we say: God’s will be done.”

Irenæus, in his fourth book against heresies, ch. XVII. al. 32. speaks thus: “Jesus Christ, having taken what of its own nature was bread, blessed

Spirit surpasses our comprehension, and how foolish it would be to think of measuring his immensity by our weak understandings. Let faith, then, admit what reason cannot conceive.”

“O God incarnate, how thou canst give us thy flesh to eat and thy blood to drink! How thy flesh is meat indeed! How thou, who art in heaven, ART PRESENT ON THE ALTAR! I can by no means explain. But I firmly believe it all! because thou hast said it. I firmly rely on thy love, and on thy omnipotence to make good thy word: though the manner of doing it I cannot comprehend.”

and gave thanks saying: *This is my body*: and in the same manner, having taken the chalice, he confessed that it was his blood: he taught the obligation of his Testament: the Church has received it from the apostles and offers it to God throughout the world." You shall now read Doctor Grabe's commentary on these words. "It is certain that Irenæus and all the Fathers whose writings we possess, whether contemporary with the apostles or their immediate successors, have held the Eucharist to be the sacrifice of the new law. Now, that this doctrine, and this practice, was not that of any particular Church or of any private divine, but that it was the doctrine, and the practice, of the universal Church, which it had received from the apostles, and the apostles from Jesus Christ, is what we are taught by Irenæus in express terms, and before him by Justin the Martyr, whose testimonies, as well as those of St. Ignatius, Tertullian, St. Cyril and others, have been so often quoted, not only by the adherents of the pope, but also by the most learned protestants, that there is no need of repeating them. There would scarcely have been the least doubt that this doctrine respecting the sacrifice of the Eucharist was derived from the apostles and that it consequently claimed our faith and attachment, should there even have not been found a single word for it in the writings of the prophets or the apostles. For the precept of St. Paul is general: Brethren stand fast; and hold the traditions which you have learned whether by word or by our epistles. But a sufficient number of passages from scripture have been adduced, after Irenæus and the other Fathers, by modern divines not only by those attached to the Pope, but by protestants, and above all by the divines of the church of England, from among whom I shall name only one, but one, eminent for learning and piety, Joseph Mede, who in a treatise written in English, on the sacrifice of the christian law, has proved and established this point in the clearest manner. And not only am I willingly of his opinion, but I moreover subscribe with all my heart to the wish he has expressed at the end of the eighth chapter; and since so many learned and pious persons among protestants have recognized the true doctrine of the apostolic Church and shewn their contempt for Luther and Calvin, I earnestly wish with Mede, that these sacred liturgical formularies, in which sacrifice is offered to God, and which have been unadvisedly banished from their assemblies, may be again brought into use among us, that we may render to the divine Majesty the supreme honor we owe it.

Irenæus again, in book IV. against heresies, ch. XXXIV. thus refutes certain heretics who denied that Christ was the Son of the Creator: "How can these prove, that the bread over which the words of thanksgiving have been pronounced, is the body of their Lord, and the cup his blood, while they do not admit that he is the Son, that is, the word, of the Creator of the world?" Attend now to what your countryman, the celebrated Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, has written upon these words: "In the sacred words, Irenæus affirms as most certain, that

the bread and wine are the body and blood of the Lord. It appears also, that the heretics, against whom he was writing, acknowledged that they admitted the same, and that, resting upon this their acknowledgement, he reasoned against them as follows: How come you to believe, that the bread, after the thanksgiving, is the body of our Lord, and the chalice his blood, if at the same time you deny that your Lord is the Son of the Creator of the world, that is to say, the Word itself, by virtue of which the vine fructifies, and produces the grape; the earth, grass, corn and bread? For if the Christ as you imagine, had an adversary in the Creator of all things, he never would have chosen, from amongst created things, bread and wine, from which to form his body and blood." I could here adduce two other passages from the same Irenæus; but the great number of those I have still to produce, admonish me to proceed to another authority.

Origen, explaining the words of the royal prophet, *adore his footstool*, expresses himself thus: "By footstool some suppose that we are to understand the body of Christ, because he received it from the earth, and that this body ought to be adored, because of Christ. Therefore now the Christ himself claims our adoration, because of the word of God which is in him."

The same Father, notwithstanding the reserve with which he spoke of the mysteries to pagans, ventures to tell Celsus, that the breads offered become by prayer a holy body. "We, who study to please the Creator of all things with prayers and giving of thanks for benefits received, eat of the breads that are offered, which by prayer are made a holy body. By this, they who partake of it with a pure spirit, are rendered more holy."

When treating of the sacrifices of the old law, he writes as follows in allusion to the sacrifice of the new law: "Attach not so much importance to the blood of animals; but rather make yourselves acquainted with the blood of the Word, and hear what he himself says: *This is my blood*. He who is imbued with the knowledge of the mysteries discerns the body and blood of the Word-God. We will not therefore dwell upon things known to the initiated, and which must be kept concealed from the uninitiated."

"When you receive the sacred and incorruptible food, when you taste the bread and the cup of life, you eat and drink the body and blood of the Lord: then the Lord enters under your roof. You ought therefore to humble yourself, and to exclaim with the centurion: "Lord I am not worthy that thou shouldst enter under my roof." These words are still used by the Church when administering the holy communion.

Saint Cyprian primate of Africa, at the approach of a fresh persecution, wrote thus "Let us prepare ourselves for the combat, and think of nothing but how we may obtain the glory and the crown of a life eternal, by confessing the Lord.—The approaching combat will be more severe and cruel than ever: by an unshaken faith must the soldiers of Christ prepare themselves, reflecting that they

drink daily the chalice of his blood, to the end that they may be the better disposed to shed their blood for Christ—"

He severely condemns the unbecoming conduct of a christian, who leaving the church went to the theatre: "Scarcely dismissed from the temple of the Lord, and bearing the Eucharist still in his bosom, the wretched man walked off to the theatre, carrying with him the sacred blood of Jesus Christ.

"We are to put on the breast plate of justice, that our heart may be defended against the shafts of the enemy—Let us fortify our eyes, that they may not rest upon these detestable idols: let us fortify our mouth, that our victorious tongue may confess the Lord and his Christ; let us arm our hand with the spiritual sword, that it may intrepidly repel these fatal sacrifices; and that, at the remembrance of the Eucharist, the hand which has received the body of the Lord, may embrace and clasp its God, being assured of soon receiving from him the reward of a heavenly crown."

To prepare those for martyrdom, who, having fallen in the persecution, were desirous of returning to their duty. St. Cyprian proposes that they should be admitted to communion sooner than the laws of public penance would otherwise have allowed.

"Thus," says he, "it is necessary to grant them the peace, that, being exhorted and animated to the combat, they may be sent fortified and protected by the body and blood of Jesus Christ, and not naked and unarmed; for the Eucharist was instituted to be the support of those who receive it."

"The sacrifice that we offer is the passion of our Lord."

"Who ever was with better title priest of the Most High, than our Lord Jesus Christ, who offered sacrifice to God his Father? The sacrifice that he offered, is the same as the sacrifice of Melchisedech, bread and wine, that is to say, his body and blood."

"The great honour and glory of our Episcopacy is to have given the peace (communion) to the Martyrs; and to celebrate daily as priests the sacrifice of God, to prepare for him his victims.

Saint Dionysius Archbishop of Alexandria, being unable, on account of his great age, to comply with the urgent request of the bishops, that he would attend at the council of Antioch, wrote to Paul of Samosata a letter which Eusebius has preserved, and which Saint Jerom most highly commends.

In it we discover the respect entertained by this great and holy father for the divine and incorruptible blood of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist, which he compared to the holy Spirit, whereas Paul preaches that it was corruptible, because Jesus Christ had said: "Take it, and divide it among you."—"By this ineffable mystery," adds he, "which Christ calls the new Testament he gives himself to us in the mysterious supper. Formerly, the flesh of irrational animals was placed upon the altar—now it is no longer so; but the Lord him-

self, the Saviour and the God of Israel, has said, He that eateth me, shall live by me.—Now if we cannot say that the Holy Ghost is corruptible, although he has descended and been distributed among many, we must reason in the same manner respecting the life-giving blood of Jesus Christ.—And thus do we demonstrate to Paul, that the most sacred blood of Jesus Christ our God is not corruptible; that it is not the blood of a mortal man like ourselves, but of the true God, who is a torrent of delights to those who have the happiness to partake of it."

"What a crime," cries out Firmilian, bishop of Casarea, is committed by those who admit and those who are admitted, when they have the presumption to receive the holy communion, before they have declared their sins, and washed away their stains in the bath of the Church, impiously touching the body and the blood of the Lord, since it is written: He that shall eat this bread, or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord!"

The following testimony must be considered as belonging both to the third and fourth centuries: it is the testimony of three hundred and eighteen bishops; or to speak more correctly, of the universal Church, because it emanates from the first general council. "We must not confine our attention to the bread and the chalice offered on the sacred table; but elevating our mind, let us discover by faith this Lamb of God lying on this sacred table, taking away the sins of the world, and immolated by the priests in an unbloody manner; and when we truly receive his precious body and blood, let us consider them as the pledges of our resurrection."

Saint James bishop of Nisibis, who attended at the general council of Nice, speaks as follows: "Our Saviour washed the feet of his disciples, giving them thereby a noble example of humility.—Having washed the feet of his disciples, he sat down again to the table, and then gave them his body and blood."

"There is a door to thy house, and it is the temple of God. It would certainly be a crime, O man to allow filth and dirt to come through the door, where thy king enters. Beware of every impure word, and then take the body and blood of Jesus Christ. Guard thy mouth with circumspection, remembering that thy king has entered therein.—Thou can'st no longer be permitted, O man, to let indecent expressions escape from thy mouth."

Eusebius bishop of Emessa, and disciple of Eusebius of Casarea, speaks thus of the Eucharistic blood, in allusion to the passage of Exodus.—"They shall take the blood of the lamb, and sprinkle both the door posts:—They sprinkle the blood of the lamb upon both the posts, who receive it with both their mouth and heart. They who receive unworthily, or who receiving do not believe it to be the blood of Christ, sprinkle the blood upon one post only.—As for us, receiving it with both our mouth and heart, let us be persuaded, that it is the blood of Christ. let us place it upon both posts, by receiving it into our bodies and our souls."

Let us hear what St. Hilary says "If the word,

truly, was made flesh, and we, truly, receive this word for our food: how can he be thought not to dwell naturally in us, who assumed the nature of flesh inseparably united to him, and communicates in the sacrament, that nature to us? For thus, we are all one: because the Father is in Christ, and Christ in us.—We are not to speak of heavenly things as we do of human.—Of the natural verity of Christ in us, whatever we speak we speak foolishly and wickedly, unless we learn it of him; for it is he that said: My flesh is meat; indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. There is no place left to doubt of the truth of Christ's flesh and blood: for now, by the declaration of the Lord himself and according to our belief, it is truly flesh, and truly blood. But he himself attests how we are in him by the sacramental communication of his body and blood: And the world, says he, sees me not, but you see, because I live and you shall live: for I am in my Father, and you are in me, and I am in you. (John XIV. 19 20. If he wished the unity of will alone to be understood, why should he establish a certain order and progression in the formation of it; but that he should be in the Father, by the nature of the divinity, we in him, by his corporal birth, and he in us, by the sacramental mystery."

St. Basil has already been cited in the liturgy which bears his name among the Greeks. We have seen that he composed various magnificent prayers for the altar, and that they were in great request in the East, and affixed to the canon in a great number of Churches.

St. Ephrem deacon of Edessa, whose life was written by St. Gregory of Nyssa, brother of St. Basil, expresses himself in the following remarkable manner: "Sedulously consider all these things, and believe that they are true, as they are related. For if you view them not with the eyes of faith, you cannot rise from the earth to heaven, nor in spirit behold what Christ suffered. When the eye of faith is clearly open, it contemplates, in a pure light the lamb of God, who was immolated for us, and who gave us his body for our food to the remission of our sins. This same eye of faith manifestly beholds the Lord, eating his body and drinking his blood, and indulges no curious enquiry.—You believe that Christ, the Son of God, for you was born in the flesh. Then why do you search into what is inscrutable.

Doing this, you prove your curiosity, not your faith. Believe then, and with a firm faith receive the body and blood of our Lord, being assured that you eat the Lamb itself whole and entire. For the mysteries of Christ are an immortal fire. Beware how you rashly attempt to fathom them, lest, whilst you are a partaker, you be consumed by them.—Abraham placed earthly food before celestial spirits, (Gen. XVIII.) of which they ate. This was wonderful. But what Christ has done for us greatly exceeds this, and transcends all speech, and all conception. To us, that are in the flesh, he has given to eat his body and blood. Myself incapable of comprehending the mysteries of God, I dare not

proceed: and should I attempt it, I should shew only my rashness."

The priesthood, raising itself bodily from earth to heaven, ascends to the throne of the Almighty, and supplicates the King of mercies, that his Holy Spirit may descend, at the same time, and sanctify the gifts offered on the altar."

What offence had Christ given, whose body and blood, at certain times, do there dwell?—This enormity was doubled, whilst you broke also the chalices, which contained the blood of Christ: Christi sanguinis portatores. O abominable crime! unheard of impiety! You have imitated the Jews, they pierced the body of Jesus Christ upon the cross; and you have struck him upon the altar."

St. Optatus, bishop of Milevum in Africa, reproaches the Donatists, as follows: "What is so outrageous as to break, to erase, and to remove the altars of God, on which you yourselves made offerings? On them the vows of the people and the members of Christ were borne; there the Almighty was invoked, and the Holy Spirit descended; and from them the faithful received the pledge of eternal life, the buckler of faith, and the hope of resurrection?—For what is the altar, but the seat of the body and blood of Jesus Christ?"

Saint Cyril of Jerusalem, has left us eighteen catechetical discourses for the instruction of the catechumens, and five others addressed to the newly baptised: they appear to have been composed about the year 347, whilst he was yet a priest. Hear how he addressed the Neophytes, when explaining the liturgy: "You have seen the deacon present to the officiating priest, and to the attendant priests, water to wash their hands.—After that the officiating priest says aloud; Raise up your hearts; for it is at this awful moment particularly that you should raise up your hearts to God, and have them disengaged from all that is earthly.—At these words of the priest, you answer; We have our hearts raised up to the Lord; and by this you profess to do what he requires. The priest continues; Let us give thanks to the Lord—You answer; It is right and just to give thanks to the Lord. We then recite that sacred hymn which the seraphims chant in heaven, in honour of the three Divine Persons, that by this celestial psalmody, we may communicate with the angelic host, and that being more and more sanctified by these spiritual canticles, we may with greater purity entreat so good and kind a God to send down the Holy Spirit on the things that are offered, and to make the bread become the body of Jesus Christ, and the wine his blood. For all that receives the impression of the Holy Spirit is sanctified and changed into another substance. Now, when the spiritual sacrifice is ended, and this unbloody worship rendered to God by means of the host of expiation is completed, we pray for the peace of all the Churches, for the tranquility of the world, for kings and their armies, and for their allies, for the afflicted, in a word for all, who stand in need of the Divine assistance." (Here comes the prayer for the dead, which I will introduce in another place.) "You say afterwards: Our Father, who art in heaven.

"After this, you hear the voice of the chanter, who, by a melodious and divine canticle, invites you to the communion of the sacred mysteries, saying these words: Taste and see how sweet is the Lord. Do you think that you are commanded to make this discovery by the mere taste of the palate? In no wise: but by the testimony of faith, which is certain and leaves no room for doubt. For when you communicate, you are not commanded to taste the bread and wine, but to take the sacrament of the body and blood of Jesus Christ.

"Now, when you approach to communicate, you must come with your hands stretched out, or your fingers open; but with your left hand supporting

your right hand, which is to hold so great a king, receive the body of Jesus Christ in the hollow of that hand, saying, *Amen*. Then, having carefully sanctified your eyes by the touch of the sacred and venerable body, you will communicate by eating it. But, be very careful that nothing falls, considering the loss of the the smallest particle as if you should lose a member of your body. Were you to receive ingots of gold, how anxiously would you guard them, that nothing might be lost? What precaution ought you not to take that not the smallest part be lost of that which is infinitely more precious and dear to us than gold or diamonds.

"After having thus communicated of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, approach to the chalice of the blood, not stretching out your hands, but bowing down in the attitude of homage and adoration, and saying: *Amen*. Then sanctify yourselves by the touch of the blood of Jesus Christ which you receive, and whilst your lips are still moistened with it, wipe them with your hand & apply it immediately to your eyes, your forehead and the various organs of your senses, to consecrate them. Then till the priest begins the last prayer, thank God that he has made you worthy to participate in mysteries so sublime and elevated."

St. Gregory, bishop of Nyssa, brother of the celebrated St. Basil, and who, from his great age as well as from his learning, was called the father of the Fathers, explains the change of the bread and wine in the Eucharist: "It is with reason then that I believe that the bread, being sanctified by the word of God, is transformed and changed into the body of the Word-God; for this bread is sanctified, so says the apostle, by the word of God and by prayer, not in such a manner, that by eating and drinking it becomes the body of the Word; but it is changed instantaneously into the body by the word, as the Word has said, *This is my body*." He concludes this chapter by observing, that "it is by virtue of the benediction, that the nature of the visible species is changed into his body: *Virtute benedictionis in illud transelementata eorumque apparent natura*."

He establishes in general that the sacred things are very different from what they were before the consecration: this he shews by many examples; among others, by that of the eucharistic bread, of which he speaks thus: "The bread is, at first, but common bread, but when it has been sanctified, it is called, and is made the body of Christ."

St. Ambrose the illustrious bishop of Milan, shall now display in its full light the doctrine of the Church respecting the adoration of Jesus Christ in

*This general description of the liturgy of St. James proves the conformity of our liturgy with his. For in his we find the *Sursum corda*, the *Habemus ad Dominum*, the Gracious *agamus domino deo nostro*, the dignum et iustum est, the *Sanctus*, the *paternoster*, and even the pouring of water upon the fingers of the priest; in it we find the altar, the unbloody sacrifice, of the bread and wine into the body and blood, the prayer for the dead, the invocation of Saints, and at the time of communion, the adoration. How consoling and delightful is it to find ourselves, after so many ages still in the track of primitive and apostolical christianity, and to feel, that we still proceed in the same order and in the same worship, and that the dogmas which we profess, are precisely the same as those which fifteen hundred years ago, were professed by the first and the most ancient of all churches! Therefore the unfortunate authors of this insinuation must have sinned equally against good taste as against faith, when separating themselves from Saints reigning in heaven, the souls suffering in Purgatory, and the first christians on the earth, they retrenched from the liturgy all that was most moving, most sublime and most ancient.—Died about the year 400.

the Eucharist. "Mary adored Jesus Christ, the apostles also adored him and even the angels adored him, as it is written; Let all the angels of God adore him. Now they adore not only his divinity, but also the foot stool under his feet, because it is holy. And if heretice deny that adoration should be paid to the mysteries of the incarnation of Jesus Christ—they may read in the scripture that the apostles also adored him, after he had risen again in a glorified body. For we must not consider this foot-stool according to the ordinary custom of man; and again we are to adore only God. It is then rather difficult to know what must be done in these circumstances; and for this reason, it will be necessary more particularly to examine what is this foot-stool of the Lord, we read in another part *heaven is my throne, & the earth is my foot-stool*. Now, we must not adore the earth, because it is but a creature: we should, however, examine whether the earth, which the prophet requires us to adore, be not that earth, with which the Lord Jesus clothed himself in his incarnation. We must therefore say, that the foot-stool is the earth, and by this earth we must understand the very flesh of Jesus Christ, which to this day we adore in our sacred mysteries, and which the apostles formerly adored in his person, as we have already said. For Jesus Christ is not divided, but is indivisible; and whilst they adored him as the Son of God, they did not disown him for the son of Mary."

"Although we may be insignificant of ourselves," says this holy Archbishop elsewhere speaking of himself and the priests, we cease not to be venerable, on account of the sacrifice which we offer; for, although it seems as if it were not Jesus Christ who now offers himself, it nevertheless is he who is offered upon the earth, every time that his body is offered: or rather it is manifest, that it is he who offers in us, because it is his word that sanctifies the sacrifice which we offer."

"And I wish that when we incense the altars and offer up the sacrifice, the angels would assist, or rather manifest their presence; for you are not to doubt that the angels are present when Jesus Christ is present, and is immolated."

Neither Caiphas nor Pilate had the power to deprive us of Jesus Christ, nor can we fast as if we had lost our spouse, because we have Jesus Christ: and are nourished by his flesh and blood."

In his fourteenth epistle he testifies that he daily renewed the sacrifice; and in his commentary on the epistle to the Hebrews, he says: "Do we not make an offering every day?" and he adds, that where this offering was not made every day, it would be necessary to make it at least twice a week.

Here I will add what is said by the Author of the books on the sacraments, because this work was for a long time attributed to St. Ambrose, is visibly formed upon the doctrine of this bishop, and cannot possibly be thrown back later than the sixth century. Attend now to his language upon the Eucharist; "You will perhaps say: It is common bread; but this bread is bread before the words of the sacrament. After the consecration, from bread that it was, it becomes the flesh of Jesus Christ. This then is what we have to prove. How is it possible that this bread, which was bread, should become the body of Jesus Christ? By the consecration. But by what words is this consecration accomplished? By the words of our Lord Jesus. For, whatever other words are said, are either the praises of God, or prayers for the people, for Princes, or individuals. When we come to the consecration of the adorable sacrament, then the priest no longer makes use of his own words, but of the words of Jesus Christ.—But what then is the word of Christ? The same, by which all things were made; The Lord commanded, and the heavens were made, he commanded, and the earth was made: he commanded, and the seas were made.

If then the word of the Lord Jesus had power to give existence to what was not before, how much more will it have power to make that, which was, still exist and pass into another substance! The heavens were not, the sea was not, the earth was not: but hear his word: He spoke and they were made: he commanded, and they were created. Thus to reply to your difficulty, before consecration the body of Christ was not there: but after consecration; I tell you that it is there. He spoke, and it was done; he commanded, and it was formed;" Here the author relates, like St. Ambrose, the miracles of Moses, Elias, Eliseus, and of the nativity, and concludes: "Thus you have learnt, that the bread becomes the body of Christ: you have learnt, that wine and water are mixed in the chalice, and that they become his blood by the consecration of the heavenly word."—He says afterwards: "You will tell me perhaps: I see no appearance of blood.—The Lord assures us himself, that we receive his body and his blood: ought we then to doubt of the truth of his words, and call in question his testimony?"

ORIGINAL.

THE PAPAL SUPREMACY.

14. ° After Christ's ascension into Heaven, when the Faithful had assembled together in an upper room, with the Apostles; we find in their enumeration by Saint Luke, still Peter mentioned as the first of them.—He is the first to address the congregated Faithful; and to recommend the Election of an Apostle, in the room of the Traitor, Judas the Iscariot,—Acts 1. 13, 15.

15. ° After the descent of the Holy Ghost, he is the first who, after refuting the mocking surmises of the Jewish multitude, preached openly the Divinity of Jesus Christ, whom they had crucified: and his Doctrine of Baptism, penance and the remission of sins, by which discourse and exhortation he won over to the faith, and added to the Church by Baptism, about three thousand souls,—Acts 2. 14, 41.

16. ° He was the first who proved the truth of his Doctrine by a public miracle, in the case of the lame beggar at the Temple Gate, Acts 3. 6, 7, 8. On which occasion, he again boldly preached the Faith of Christ to the astonished multitudes, whom the rumoured miracle had drawn together; v. 12. So that many, hearing the word, believed, and the number of the men was made five thousand. He was the first also, on whom hands were laid, and who had the honor to suffer in his divine Master's cause; and to bear testimony to his Divinity before the Jewish princes and antients, and Scribes, and Annas, and Caiphas, the very murderers of his Lord, and John, and Alexander, and as many as were of the kindred of the High Priest, Acts 4. 3, 6, 8.

17. ° He was the first who showed by miracle, in the case of Ananias and Saphira, the danger of lying to the Holy Ghost, Acts 5.—His very shadow too delivered the sick on whom it fell, from all their infirmities. He again bears testimony before the High Priest to the Divinity of the Savior, and is scourged, with his companions, notwithstanding the dissuasive counsel of Gamaliel, Acts 5. 15—29, 40.

18. ° Peter and John were deemed by the rest of the apostles, the fittest to be sent to con-

firm the Samaritan converts; and thus begin the extension of the Faith beyond the hitherto chosen, but now rejected House of Israel, Acts 8. 14.

19^o Peter anathematized on that occasion the first Horetic, Simon Magus; and in him condemned the sin of Simony: the reproach and scandal of the Church of England.

20^o And it came to pass that Peter, as he passed through, visiting ALL, &c. Acts 9, 32. Peter had then the Superintendent care of the whole Church.

21^o The miracles wrought by Peter, resemble most those wrought by the Savior; such as those he performed on Oneas, whom he healed of the palsy; and on Tabitha, whom he recalled to life, *ibid*, 34, 40.

22^o To Peter was first revealed the universal call of the Gentiles, in the vision thrice exhibited of the linen sheet, let down by the four corners from Heaven; and containing all kinds of Reptiles, Birds and Beasts; which, in the law of Moses, were accounted unclean: but which now God was to make clean, from all the four quarters of the earth, by Baptism and Belief in the Blessed Trinity. He was also the one who received into the Church the first fruits of the Gentile race, in the person of the Centurion Cornelius, and in those of his household. Nor was it to any other, but Peter, that Cornelius was directed to send for by the Angel, Acts 10. &c. He is the first then also, who preached to the Gentiles, and opened to them the door of salvation. He sets, in fine, the Faithful of the circumcision right in their notions concerning the call of the Gentiles, with whom he had, by the evident order of God, communicated, ch. 11.

23^o We observe that, while Peter was confined in prison, from which he was delivered in so wonderful a manner by an Angel, prayer was made without ceasing by the Church unto God for him, ch. 12. 5, that which, we read, not to have taken place for any other; and that which still takes place for his successor, the Pope, all over the world.

24^o In the first Council of the Church, held in Jerusalem, on the subject of the circumcision; when there had been much disputing, Peter, rising up, gave judgment; in which all present acquiesced for all the multitude held their peace, Acts 15. 7, 12 — Saint James speaks only after Peter, and confirms his sentence, *ibid*, 14

25^o St Paul, after laboring three years in the ministry, to which he was so miraculously called, went, as he tells us, to Jerusalem, to see Peter, Gal 1. 18. Why to see Peter, more than any of the rest of the Apostles? For other of the Apostles, he assures us, he saw none, saving James, the brother of the Lord, *ibid* 19.

26^o The same holy Apostle, fourteen years afterwards going up again to Jerusalem, according to revelation, to confer apart with those, who seemed something, the gospel, which he preached among the Gentiles; lest perhaps he should run, or had run in vain: *ibid* ch. 2. mentions James, and Cephas, and John, the three chose companions of the Lord, as seeming pillars of the Church;

who gave him the hand of fellowship; that he, and his companions, Barnabas and Titus, should go unto the Gentiles; as they unto the circumcision.

This is the only instance, in which Peter is not named in scripture the first, where any of the other Apostles are mentioned: and the reason of this may have been, that James, the first named, was then the resident Bishop of Jerusalem.—The special call of Saint Paul to the Gentiles, or uncircumcised, is here recognized by the three great pillars of the Church: that of Peter, and the other Apostles, was first to the Jews, or circumcised; and afterwards to the Gentiles.—As for St. Paul's reproof to Peter, mentioned in the same chapter; it was nothing more, as just, than what the meanest in the Catholic Church might venture to the Pope; whom none suppose infallible, in his private conduct, or opinions.—This much we learn from the context, that St. Paul, though a miraculously chosen and inspired Apostle, was, notwithstanding, ordered by Almighty God to go up to Jerusalem, and confer with the Chief Apostles upon the gospel which he preached among the Gentiles; lest, perhaps he should run, or had run in vain: that which shows the necessary unity and uniformity of Doctrine in the Church of Christ. Very unlike our protestant Apostles, who, though uncalled, and uninspired, subject their Doctrines to the criterion of no other deciding authority, than that of their own imaginations, influenced by their views of worldly interest or celebrity.

THE PAPAL SUPREMACY PROVED FROM THE HISTORY OF THE PRIMITIVE CHURCH.

We think we have superabundantly from Scripture, demonstrated that St. Peter was, not what the *Sentinel* represents him to have been; only PAR CUM PARIBUS, or, but an equal with his equals. but the Prince of the Apostles, and visible Head of the Christian Church: on which account, as we shall as fully demonstrate from the History of the primitive Church; has his successor, the Pope, or Bishop of Rome, been at all times, and in all places, acknowledged as the Chief of Bishops; and the rightful Heir of St. Peter's Supremacy, or spiritual jurisdiction.

But first, we would ask the *Sentinel*, and all those of his persuasion; has their small and modern Church; their national and parliamentary synagogue, as a visible body, no visible Head? It has, to be sure, an acknowledged one; and one every way corresponding with its limited, lay-legal and national character. It has the British Sovereign, man, woman or child!!! whose temporal Supremacy is considered as necessarily including in itself the spiritual Supremacy; for, as to the Archbishop of Canterbury, he is only the first ecclesiastical officer of male or female royalty: so whose Crown and Sceptre, (the emblems of its worldly power and authority,) we see thus subjected the Mitre and Crosier; the emblems of the spiritual power and authority of him, who is King of Kings, and Lord of Lords: to whom was given all power in Heaven and on earth; and before whom every knee is commanded

to bow: whose jurisdiction, though not of this world; for he declared his Kingdom is not of this world; is yet, in its own distinct and spiritual character, above all worldly jurisdiction. We would ask all those of the Anglican persuasion, what warrant they have in Scripture for so subjecting to earthly power the Heavenly power of Jesus Christ; for thus surrendering up to Caesar and his Courtiers, what exclusively belongs to the Redeeming God, and his lawful Pastors? Is there any hint in all the Scriptures that the British Parliament, with its King or Queen, should prescribe to all the world, in their thirty-nine Articles, the only true and saving code of Faith?—Let the *Sentinel* show us as sure warrant from Scripture for the spiritual Supremacy of Henry the Eighth, and his successors, as we have shown for that of St. Peter and his successors, the Bishops of Rome; and then we shall own that his UNANSWERABLE ARTICLE against the papal Supremacy, has not been sufficiently ANSWERED.

The irrefragable authorities which we could cite from the History of the primitive Church, in favor of the papal Supremacy, are so numerous, that they would fill a volume of no ordinary size. We shall therefore, only mention a few; which, considering their unquestionable character and antiquity, we think sufficiently decisive on the subject in question.

1^o St. Ignatius, a disciple of the Apostles, and next successor after Evadius, to St. Peter in the See of Antioch; addressing his celebrated Epistle to the Church of Rome, calls it the Church which PRESIDES in the country of the Romans. (PROKATHATAI.)

2^o Nearly at the same time, dissensions having arisen in the Church at Carinth; the case was referred to the Church of Rome; to which Pope Clement, whose name, St. Paul says, is written in the Book of life, Philip. 4. 3, returned his answer.—(Coteler.)

3^o St. Ireneus, Bishop of Lyons in the second century, who had been instructed by St. Polycarp, the disciple of St. John, the Evangelist, confutes all heresies and false doctrine by the authority of the Church of Rome alone; which he calls the greatest, most ancient and universally known, as having been founded by St. Peter and St. Paul: to which, says he, every Church is bound to conform, by reason of its superior authority. Contra Heeres. 1. 3, cap. 3.

4^o Tertullian calls St. Peter the Rock of the Church; and says that the Church was built upon him, Prescrip. 1. 1. cap. 2.—In different places of his works, he styles the Bishop of Rome, the Blessed Pope, or Father; the High Priest: the Apostolic Prelate, &c.

5^o Origen, in the third age, explaining the text, thou art Peter, &c. says. "It is true, though not said expressly, that neither against Peter, nor against the Church, shall the gates of hell ever be able to prevail; for, if they could prevail against Peter, in whom the Church is founded; they would also prevail against the Church."

St. Cyril, Patriarch of Alexandria, speaking on the same text, *thou art Peter*, concludes thus: "According to the promise, the apostolical Church of Peter remains immaculate; free from all seduction and heretical circumvention." He, as well as Origen, repeatedly declares the Church to have been founded on Peter that he fixed his Chair at Rome: that the Church of Rome is the *Mother Church, and the root of Catholicity*, Epist. ad Cornel.—Epist. ad Anton.—De Unit &c.—1 Hom. 5, in Exod. Hom. 17, in Luc. The latter expresses great indignation "that certain African Schismatics should dare to approach the *See of Peter; the Head Church, and source of ecclesiastical unity*, Epist. ad Corn. It is true, this Father had afterwards a dispute with Pope Stephen about re-baptizing converts from Heresy. but this proves only that he did not think the Pope's authority superior to *general Tradition*; which, through mistake, he supposed to be on his side. To what degree, however, he did admit this authority, appears, by his advising this same Pope to *depose Marcian, a Schismatical Bishop of Gaul; and to appoint another Bishop in his place*, Epist. 29.

7° Eusebius, the Greek Historian, declares in the clearest terms, that the Roman Pontiff derives his *superior authority from Peter*, Euseb. Chron An. 44.

8° Saint Hilarius says that it was in order to confound Satan, that the Saviour appointed Peter, the first proclaimer of his divinity, to be the foundation of his church; the door keeper of his kingdom; & in his decisions here on earth, the judge of Heaven, O thou, in thy new appellation, (he exclaims,) thrice happy foundation of the church! the rock deemed worthy to uphold such a fabric, which art destined to frustrate all the infernal schemes; to dash to pieces the gates of Hell; and demolish all the strong holds of death! comments in psal. 131.

9° "Hear, says St. Chrysostom, what Christ says to Peter, the pillar and foundation of his faith; who, for the strength of his confession, was called the *Rock*: Christ saying to him: *thou art a rock, and upon this rock will I build my Church*, Com. 16. in Matt.

10° St. Athanasius, appealing against his opponents, to the Bishop of Rome, calls that see the *mother and head of all other churches*.—Epist. ad Marc.—In fact the Pope reversed the sentence of deposition pronounced by the Saint's enemies; and restored him to his patriarchal chair.—Soerat. Hist. s. 2, c. 2. Zozom.

11° St. Augustine in many places of his works, testifies to the Pope's supremacy; particularly where he mentions the condemnation of the Pelagian Heresy by the Roman pontif. *Rome, says he, has spoken forth: the cause is ended: would that the error were ended also.* ROMA LOCUTA EST: CAUSA FINITA EST: UTINAM FINIRETUR ET ERROR!—Serm. 3. de verb. Apost.

12° St. Jerom, distracted with the disputes among three parties, who divided the church of Antioch; to which he was then subject; wrote to Pope Damasus, imploring him to set him right on

the subject. "I, said he, who am but a sheep, apply to my shepherd for succour. I am united in communion with your holiness, that is to say, with the Chair of Peter. I know that the Church is built on that rock. He, who eats the paschal Lamb out of that house, is profane. Whoever is not in Noah's Ark, will perish in the deluge. I know nothing of Vitalis: I reject Meletius: I am ignorant of Parlinus. He, who gathereth not with thee, scattereth."—Epist. ad Damas.

But why unnecessarily add more testimonies from the Holy Fathers on this head, to which all of them in word and deed have borne witness. St. Hippolitus, in lib. de cons. mundi. St. Dionysius, in Epist. and Tim. St. Basil, in anabo. St. Gregory Nazianzen, in orat. de moderat. in Disp. St. Ambrose, Serm. 47. de fide petri, et 69. de Nat. petri et pauli. &c. The Council of Sardica confirmed the Bishop of Rome in his right of receiving appeals from all the churches in the world. Even the Pagan Historian Ammianus about the same time bears testimony to the superior authority of the Roman Pontiff.—Rerum gest. l. 15.

We might here add many protestant authors of the first standing in favour of Papal Supremacy: such as even Henry the eight, in a book written in defence of it. James the first, in his first speech in Parliament, and in his writings. Arch-Bishop wake, Bishop Bramhall, Hugo Grotius, and Melancton himself, with numberless others, too tedious to mention.

And now we take leave of the *Sentinel* upon this subject, and every other in future. nor should we have thought his poor stuff worth all the notice we have taken of it, were it not for the sake of his ignorant, yet well-meaning subscribers, who relish the garbage he deals out to them, only because they have never tasted any thing better, and especially as the subject started in his *unanswerable article*, was an unusually interesting one, and meriting an answer.

EXTRACTED FROM THE MONIAD.
AN ORIGINAL POEM.

Happy they seem, who, nurs'd in fortune's lap,
Have all their wants supplied; and ev'ry wish
Not sooner form'd, than granted: happy, lodg'd
In stately palace: cloth'd in rich attire,
With gold and gems adorn'd, and sumpt'ous fed
On nature's delicacies pour'd profuse:
While music soothing breathes soft harmony
On costly beds of down to lull them laid;
And ling'ring sleep invite, with opiate spell,
To shut their sense, and weary eye-lids close.

Happy, when forth they fare; and proud attract
With gorgeous equipage the public gaze:
Or at the ball, or mingling in the rout,
As pastime's round enchanting they pursue,
Still meet the courteous smile, th' aduring look;
And homage, lowly bending at their nod,
Rejoic'd th' seems their mandates to obey.
Fresh honours round their path, like flow'rs, are strew'd;
And ev'ry rugged step, or rude access
By mental hands before them straight is smooth'd!

Yet, look behind the scene, where all so gay
These actors figure o'er life's crowded stage:
Not hers is inward peace; not heart's content:
Found sole in virtue's duty well performed.
But lassitude from friv'ous toils you spy;
Or listless languid apathy; each thought,
Like gulf absorbing; and each sense of joy
Lost in the hollow void of time mispent;
When all the ceremonial bustle's o'er;
And fled the faithful vision of the day.

So glides their life apace, at best a dream,
On fashionable follies vainly spent,
Yet has that dream its horrors, and, ev'n here
Amid their short enjoyments, oft the rich
Their woe denounc'd anticipating feel:
On easy chair though stretch'd; and cushion'd round;
When rack'd their punon'd limbs they feel by gout,
Of gutted m' silence the dire disease;
Like tort'ring fiend, that stings intense, and burns;
And wrings their pamper'd frame with mortal throes.

Nor less is felt their mental anguish keen;
Which sullen mood, and low'ring aspect shew,
And peevish humour; oft in sudden blaze
Of anger kindled, and convulsive rage,
At slightest trifle mov'd, though show appear'd.
For smoothest stream first ruffles in the breeze.

Breathless, what care to keep; what dread to lose
The gather'd self their anxious thoughts employ!
Or how to turn to worldly best account
The hoarded treasure.—No provision made,
No store laid up for th' endless life to come!

Woe to you rich! the Saviour said; who here
Have all your comforts! But, ye poor are blest,
If poor in spirit: then you're blest indeed:
Since yours, for short privations here endur'd,
Is everlasting bliss by him assured,
Whose words can never fail. And oft on earth
He grants sweet foretaste of the promised joy.

Say, in your humble homes, when toil is o'er,
How grateful rest is found! what relish then,
Seasons, though coarse, your fare! and to your couch,
So hard and lowly laid, does balmy sleep
From palace boats'd, ev'it wing his silent flight
No surfeit yours, to break your slumbers soft;
Or scarce with frightsome dreams your troubled minds.

For you does nature wear her loveliest forms
Unnotic'd by the great. For you her trees
Sigh waving in the gale; and soothe you stretch'd
Careless beneath their shade. For you the birds
Warble their gladsome notes, the bleating flocks,
The lowing herds; the hoarsely rum'ring floods,
Wild nature's chorus, more delight your ear,
Than sounds combin'd of sweetest minstrelsy.

What though not yours the pomp and pride of wealth:
Not yours are then its cares, its dangers not,
And all its duties in proportion great.
For think not pleasure's cup, when sweetest pour'd,
Untemper'd e'er with gall. And, though her strain
Delights the ear; and fair her form is seen;
Tis all seductive snare of Syren fell,
Who thus th' unthinking portion of our race,
Her easy prey, from virtue's path decoys.

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. Belleville
- Mr. MacFall. Wellington
- Patriot Office. Kingston
- Rev. J. Macdonald. Perth
- M. Hugh O'Beirne. Yarmouth, near St. Thomas
- Mr. J. A. Burdock, P. M. Larark
- Alexander McMillan, Esq. Prescott
- Mr. Tench Merchant. Mariatown
- Rev. Wm. Fraser. Saint Andrews & Cornwall
- Mr. Cassidy, Student, St. Raphael's. Glengary
- Angus McDonell, Esq. P. M. Alexandria. Ditto
- Col. J. P. Leprohon, Compt. of Customs. Coteau du Lac
- Mr. Moriarty. Schoolmaster at the Recollets, Montreal
- Hon. James Cuthbert. Manoroche, Berthier
- Mr. Jon. Byrne. Lower Town Quebec
- Rev. Mr. Camusky. New York
- Rev. Dr. Parucel. President of St. Mary's College
[Emmet's Burgh, Maryland.
- Mr. Michael Fitzgerald. Augusta, Georgia