

38557

45

38557.45



**HARVARD
COLLEGE
LIBRARY**



THE LORD'S SUPPER.



“The bread that I will give is my flesh, for the life of the world.”—John, vi., 51.

“For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.”—John, vi., 55.

THE
CATHOLIC'S MANUAL;
AN
EXPOSITION

OF THE
CONTROVERTED DOCTRINES
OF THE

CATHOLIC CHURCH.

Jacques Benigne
BY JAMES BENIGN BOSSUET.

WITH NOTES, BY THE REV. JOHN FLETCHER.

Ask for the old paths, where is the good way.—*Jer.* vi. 16.



NEW-YORK:
PUBLISHED BY JOHN M'SWEENEY.

From the Dublin edition.

1836.

38557.45
~~01125.40~~

I hereby approve this Book, entitled "EXPOSITION OF THE CONTROVERTED DOCTRINES OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH," printed and published by Richard Coyne, of Capel-street, Dublin, and I recommend it to the use of the faithful.

+ D. MURRAY,
R. C. Ap.

*1867, Index of 1867
of Sarah M. Kelly
of Dublin*

NEW-YORK:
PRINTED BY JAMES KELLY,
29, ANN-STREET.

AN
EXPOSITION
OF THE
CONTROVERTED DOCTRINES
OF THE
CATHOLIC CHURCH.

CHAPTER I.

THE GENERAL PLAN OF THIS INSTRUCTION.

AFTER a series of contestations, which have lasted almost three centuries, it ought to appear natural to suppose that, now at least, the minds of the protestant public should be tolerably well instructed, respecting the doctrines of the catholic religion ; or, if not well instructed, disposed, at all events, to understand them. For this reason it has occurred to me, that I shall perform a service peculiarly useful to the protestant, as well as advantageous to the catholic, if I present a statement,—a concise and simple statement,—of the real character of our principles ; distinguishing them, at the same time, from those false opinions, which the hostility of protestantism has so unjustly imputed to us.

I have, in reality, very frequently made the observation, that the aversion, which the protestant entertains for the catholic religion, reposes principally upon the erroneous notions, which, misled by misconception and prejudice, he has formed of

its doctrines; and, sometimes, even upon the mere sound of certain terms, or expressions, which have wounded his feelings, only because he has not given himself the trouble to ascertain their signification. Hence it is my opinion, that it will be particularly important to explain to our dissenting brethren, what the church, by the organ of the council of Trent, has solemnly defined, in relation to all those articles of belief, which disunite them from their parent institute; without stopping to make any reply to those objections which are urged, either against individual writers, or against objects, which are not necessarily, nor universally received amongst us. For, to impute to a whole body the sentiments of a few private individuals would be.—Daillé himself, and the most partial, own it,—unreasonable and unjust. Indeed, Daillé allows, that to separate from the parent-church, on the score of any other articles, than such as are authentically established, and generally observed, is both unbecoming, and criminal. For these reasons, I shall confine myself to the decrees of the council of Trent, since it is in these that the church has spoken decisively, respecting all those tenets, which are the subjects of contestation between the protestant and the catholic communities. What I shall myself add, by the way of elucidation, shall be only what the church authoritatively approves; and what also, by the plainest evidence, is exactly conformable to the doctrine of this holy council.

The exposition of our tenets, conducted upon the above principles, will produce two advantages. It will, in the first place, set aside, or prevent, a great deal of altercation: because it will

show, that the chief cause of the disaffection, which the protestant cherishes for our religion is founded upon erroneous explanations of its belief. It will, in the next place, remove from altercation every thing that resembles rancour: because the disputes, which thus remain to be decided, will neither, in the eyes of the protestant, appear so vitally important, as hitherto he had been wont to think them; nor will they seem to trench upon any of the fundamentals of christianity.

CHAP. II.

THE CATHOLIC BELIEVES, ACCORDING TO THE ACKNOWLEDGMENT OF THE PROTESTANTS, ALL THE FUNDAMENTAL ARTICLES OF CHRISTIANITY.

To begin, then, with the fundamental and leading articles of christian faith:—It is a fact, which not even the hostility of the well instructed protestant can presume to call in question, that, in regard to all these at least, the catholic church does, both sincerely believe and publicly profess them.

If the protestant conceive, that the fundamental articles of christianity consist in the belief, that it is necessary to adore one God, Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and that we must, moreover, confide in Him alone, through the merits and mediation of his only Son, who became incarnate, was for our salvation crucified, and arose to life again,—if the protestant conceive, that these are the fundamental articles of the christian faith, then must he likewise own, that, as catholics, we, all of us, profess them. Or, if to the above articles he

please to unite those likewise, which are contained in the Apostles' Creed,—he knows too, that we receive all these, without any exception, or restriction ; and that even we understand them in their pure and genuine signification.

Daillé—one of the most learned, and at the same time, one of the most inveterate antagonists of the catholic religion,—composed a work entitled, *Faith founded on the Scriptures*. In this, after having exposed all the articles of the protestant churches, he adds : “ These articles are not even disputed. The Church of Rome itself professes to believe them. In reality, the church of Rome does not believe all our opinions ; but we believe all its articles of faith.”

Hence, unless this minister, or the protestants, destroy their own faith, they cannot, with any thing like consistency, pretend to deny that the catholic does really believe all the fundamental articles of the christian revelation.

But, the point is, in fact, too manifest to be reasonably called in question, although even Daillé, or any other adversary, had not,—as they have done,—allowed it. The thing speaks for itself. There is not a protestant, save the stupidly ignorant, or the obstinately prejudiced, but knows that the catholic believes every individual article which the reformed churches have thought proper to look upon as fundamental.* Protestant candour

* “ Under the Papacy,” says Luther himself, “ are many good things ; yea, every thing that is good in christianity. I say, moreover, that under the papacy, is true christianity ; even the very kernel of christianity.” (*Book against the Anabaptists*.)

“ The church of Rome,” says our Hooker, “ is, no

has, not unfrequently conceded this ; regretting, at the same time, that prejudice, and ignorance, should still obstinately continue to contest it.

Aware, however, of the advantages, which we derive from the above concessions, there are among the protestants some, who pretend to deprive us of them, by contending, that we destroy the fundamental articles, which we admit, by the adoption of other articles likewise, which are at variance with them. This they affect to prove, by the consequences, which, not we, but themselves, deduce from our doctrines. Now, Daillé himself, whom I have just cited,—less on account of his learning, than for the good sense and wisdom of his testimony,—instructs his protestant brethren what opinion they ought to form of such consequences, even upon the supposition, that they could really deduce them from our principles. In the letter, which he wrote to Monglat, on the subject of his apology, he says : “ *Although the opinion of the Lutherans respecting the Eucharist, as well as that of the catholics, implies, in our ideas, the destruction of the humanity of Jesus Christ, yet would it be a calumny to impute such a consequence to them, seeing, that they most formally disclaim it.*”

In the christian dispensation there is, certainly,

doubt, to be attributed a part of the House of God ; and we gladly acknowledge them to be of the Family of Jesus Christ.” (*Eccl. Pol.*)

“ In the judgment,” says Dr. Some, “ of all learned men, and of all reformed churches, there is in popery, a church ; a ministry ; a true Christ. And if you think, that all of the popish sort who died in the popish church, are damned, you think absurdly, and dissent from the judgment of the learned protestants.” (*Def. against Penry.*)

nothing more essential than the acknowledgment of the reality of the human nature in Jesus Christ. And yet, although the Lutherans maintain a doctrine, from which the Calvinists infer the destruction of this vital truth,—and infer it, too, by deductions, which themselves deem evident,—still, not even upon these accounts, do the latter refuse them the fellowship of their communion. “Their opinion,” says Dailé, “since they disclaim the odious consequence, is harmless, and devoid of venom.” And it was hence, that the synod of Charenton, holden in 1631, admits them even to the holy table : “*Because,*” it remarks, “*they admit all the principles, and fundamental articles, of religion.*” It is, consequently, a fixed and established maxim among the protestants, that, in objects of religion, it is not the inferences, which an adversary may deduce from any doctrine, that ought to be regarded ; but those only, which its own professors acknowledge, or its advocates inculcate.

When, therefore, the malevolence of protestant prejudice pretends, by inferences, which itself deduces, that we do not honour sufficiently, either the greatness of the Divinity, or the mediatorship of Jesus Christ ; either the infinite dignity of His sacrifice, or the superabundance of his merits,—when malevolence pretends and boldly asserts this, how easily might we defend ourselves, by appealing to those maxims, which, as I have just remarked, the protestants respect, and follow, in their relations with one another ? We might, on such occasions, observe to them, that, precisely as themselves consider it “*a calumny,*” to attribute to any protestant sect consequences, which such

sect disavows,—just so, it is an act of injustice likewise to impute to catholics opinions which the catholics condemn.

But I shall now proceed, by the simple exposition of our doctrines, to show the adversaries of our religion, that, so far from destroying, either directly or indirectly, any of the fundamental articles of christianity, we, on the contrary, establish them on so strong a foundation, and hang them round with such a blaze of evidence, that no one, except the most inveterately prejudiced, can, without extreme injustice, presume to deny, that, at least, we understand them accurately, and explain them with fidelity.

CHAP. III.

GOD ALONE IS PROPERLY THE END OF RELIGIOUS WORSHIP.

WITH regard to the adoration, which is due to the Divinity, the doctrine of the catholic church upon this subject is,—that this important act of religion consists chiefly, in believing that God is the Creator, and the Lord of all things; and in attaching ourselves to Him with all the feelings and faculties of our souls, by the exercises of faith, confidence and love, as to a Being, who alone is capable of imparting happiness to our affections; by communicating to us an infinite good,—which is Himself.

To this interior adoration, which we thus pay to God in spirit and in truth, there are always appended certain exterior marks, the principal of which is *Sacrifice*. Sacrifice, therefore, is a tribute which can be presented solely to the Al-

mighty: because it is a public testimony, and a solemn protestation, of His sovereignty and of our absolute dependence on Him.

In like manner, it is our belief that all religious worship ought ultimately to terminate in God, as in its only real and essential centre. And if the honour, which we pay to the blessed Virgin, or to the saints, can be denominated religious worship, it is only because such acts of piety centre necessarily in the Godhead.

But, before I explain any farther the nature of our religious worship, I will here just make this observation,—that the protestants themselves, compelled by the force of evidence, have now the candour to acknowledge, that the custom of praying to the saints, and of honouring their relics, was generally established even in the fourth century of the christian church.* Daillè himself allows this, in his Treatise against the tradition of the Latin church on the subject of religious worship. In this work, he boldly accuses the saints—Basil, Ambrose, Jerome, Chrysostom, Augustin, with several other distinguished characters

* The Centuriators allow, that even so early as at an early part of the third century, the invocation of the Saints was practised in the church. “You may trace,” they say, “manifest vestiges of it, in the writers of this century. Thus, in Origen, you have this form of address,—‘O blessed Job, pray for us.’”

“It is confessed,” adds the learned and impartial Thorndyke, “that all the Fathers of both the Greek, and Latin Churches, viz.: the saints Basil, Nazianzen, Nyssen, Ambrose, Jerome, Austin, Chrysostom, the two Cyrils, Theodoret, Fulgentius, Gregory the Great, Leo, and ALL, after their time, have spoken to the Saints; and desired their assistance.” (*Ep. to Trag.*)

of this period; but above all, Saint Gregory of Nazianzum, who, by way of excellence, is usually called the Theologian,—he boldly accuses these holy men of having altered, upon these points, the doctrines of the preceding centuries. Now, I appeal to common sense:—Can it indeed to common sense, appear reasonable to imagine, that Daillé,—or a few protestant theologians,—should, at the end of fifteen hundred years, understand better the sentiments of the fathers of the three first ages than did the illustrious pastors who immediately succeeded them? Surely, such supposition is preposterous. And it is the more so, because the fathers of the fourth century, so far from perceiving, that any innovation had stolen into the public worship,—on the contrary, positively inform us, (and even Daillé himself adduces their attestations) that, in praying to the saints, they did nothing but follow the example of those pastors, who, in the preceding ages, had gone before them. Hence, without investigating any farther the opinions of the fathers of the three first centuries, the concessions of Daillé are, themselves, a sufficient testimony in our favour: for he thus abandons to us all the distinguished characters that graced the fourth age of the christian church.

It is true, that in order to lessen the value of the above acknowledgment; and to excite contempt against the holy pastors of the fore-mentioned periods, the boldness of Daillé has insolently presumed to nickname them,—as if they were but a sect,—“*Reliquarists*,” that is, men, who venerated relics. But, surely, the protestant community at large will not be thus grossly disrespectful to these

great and enlightened men ! They will not, surely, dare to pretend, that pastors so eminent for their piety, and so distinguished for their learning, fell, by their veneration for the saints, and their respect for relics, into the odious crime of idolatry ; or, else, destroyed that confidence, which the christian ought to entertain in the mediation of Jesus Christ. They should even hush all reproaches of us ; seeing that they cannot employ them against us, without casting them, at the same time, upon characters, which they affect to revere, as we do, for the holiness of their lives, and the purity of their doctrine. But I shall now proceed ;—being engaged, rather to expose the principles of our belief, than to enumerate its defenders.

CHAP. IV.

ON THE INVOCATION OF THE SAINTS.

THE doctrine of the church upon this subject is,—that it is useful to address ourselves to the saints, in order to obtain the aid of their intercession.* She, however, at the same time, teaches,

* *Tobias* xii. 12. “The angel Raphael says to Tobias : When thou didst pray with tears, and didst bury the dead, I offered up thy prayer to the Lord.”

2 *Machabees* xv. 12, &c. “This,” says Judas, relating his vision, “this is Jeremiah, the prophet of God, who prays much for the people, and the holy City.”

Luke xv. 10. “I say to you, there shall be joy before the angels of God, upon one sinner doing penance.”

Apocalypse v. 8. “And when he had opened the book, the four living creatures, and the four and twenty ancients, fell down before the lamb ; having, each of

that we must do this, in that same spirit of charity; and according to that same order of social fellowship, which prompts us to solicit the mutual assistance of one another, whilst we dwell together on this earthly theatre. Did the mediatorship of Christ receive any injury, or disparagement, from the circumstance of our address—

them, harps; and golden vials full of odours, which are the prayers of the Saints.

Apostles' Creed. "I believe in the communion of Saints."

The belief of the Fathers of the church respecting this article is sufficiently, perhaps, stated in the preceding chapter. But should the reader wish to see the testimonies of these holy men, either upon this, or any other controverted subject, I refer him to the work of Messrs. Berington and Kirk, entitled, "The Faith of Catholics, confirmed by Scripture; and attested by the Fathers,"—a work, which stands a splendid monument of learning, industry, and talent; and whose utility, if equalled, is not surpassed, by any modern publication.

The fact, however, is so notorious, that, in the early ages of the church, the faithful every where invoked the saints, that it is not contested by the enlightened protestant. "It is," says Bishop Montague, "the common voice, with general concurrence, without contradiction, of reverend and learned antiquity.—And I see no cause to dissent from them (the catholics), touching intercession of this kind. Christ is not thus wronged in his mediation. And it is no impiety to say, as the catholics do: **HOLY MARY, PRAY FOR ME.**" (*Invoc. of Saints.*)

Indeed, even Luther himself approves of the invocation of the saints. "I allow," he says, "with the whole christian church, and believe, that the saints in heaven should be invoked. For who can contradict the miracles wrought daily at their tombs? (*De purgat. quorund. art.*)

ses to the saints, then would it also, as the Catechism of the Council of Trent remarks, be violated in like manner by the prayers, which we thus reciprocally offer up for each others benefit.

In order, however, still further to prevent any misunderstanding, the Catechism, which I just referred to, points out the very great and essential difference that exists between the manner, in which we implore the assistance of the Almighty, and that, in which we petition the intercession of the Saints. *We entreat the Almighty, it says, either to confer upon us some blessing, or to deliver us from some misfortune. But since the saints are more pleasing to Him than we are, we hence entreat them to lend us their assistance ; and to obtain for us the grant of our requests. For this reason, the forms of our petitions, on each occasion, are extremely different. Addressing ourselves to God, we say to Him : HAVE MERCY ON US ; HEAR US. Whereas, speaking to the Saints, we say merely : PRAY FOR US. (Tit. de Invoc. Sanct.) Hence, be the manner what it may, in which men chance to present their petitions to the saints, it is, at least, to this form, that the church and its enlightened members are always careful to reduce them : and this, the above Catechism, in the subsequent parts, confirms.*

But, it may be well, too, to take notice of the manner in which the Council itself, instructing the pastors of the church how they ought to speak of the invocation of the saints, commands them to address the faithful. It bids them say, that *"The saints, who reign with Christ, offer up their prayers for the benefit of men ; that it is good and useful, suppliantly to ask their intercession ; and*

to have recourse to their aid and influence, in order to obtain favours from God, THROUGH HIS SON JESUS CHRIST, OUR LORD ; who, alone, is our Saviour, and our Redeemer."

Neither is this all that the Council teaches. For, besides this, it condemns all those, who presume to inculcate any doctrine that is at variance with the foregoing principles.

From these principles it is, therefore, easy to understand what the belief is of the Catholic Church, respecting the invocation of the saints. It is simply this, that it is useful to solicit their intercession, in order to obtain from God, *through the merits, and mediation of Jesus Christ*, those benefits which we stand in need of. It is, indeed, entirely through Jesus Christ, that we obtain, whatsoever we do obtain, in consequence of the influence of the saints ; since it is in the name of Jesus Christ, that the saints themselves address the Eternal Father ; and in his name only that their petitions are attended to. Such—expressed thus clearly in few words by the Council of Trent,—is the faith of the Catholic Church on the article of the invocation of the saints. How astonishing, then, it is, that, after an explanation so plain and satisfactory, the protestants should still obstinately accuse us of "departing from Jesus Christ." We thus, in reality, only beseech his members, who are, at the same time, ours ; his children, who are also our brethren ; his saints, who are our first fruits ; to unite their intercession to our supplications ; intreating the common master of them, and of us, to grant our petitions in the name of our common mediator, Jesus Christ.

The same council explains to us still further, and in very few and easy words, what the spirit is, or what the intention of the church, when she offers up to God the sacrifice of the mass, by way of honouring the memory of the saints. The honour, which we pay to them in this sacred action consists in naming them in our prayers, "the faithful servants of God;" in returning thanks to God for the victories, which, through his grace, they have so happily purchased; and in beseeching him humbly to allow his indignation to be softened by the influences of their intercession.

St. Austin, above thirteen hundred years ago, had made the observation, that, "although it was the custom of the universal church to offer up the sacrifice of the mass, over the bodies, and in memory of the martyrs, yet, it ought not, hence, to be imagined that it was to the martyrs that the holy oblation was presented." (L. 8. De Civit. Dei.)—In like manner, the same saint remarks again, that, "at the holy table, during the celebration of the sacred mysteries, a commemoration is made of the blessed martyrs; not by the way of praying for them, as it was the custom to pray for the rest of the dead, but rather to entreat them to offer up their prayers for us." I cite the words of the holy bishop, because they are nearly the same with those, which, upon this subject, the council of Trent makes use of in its instruction to the faithful. *The church, says the council, does not offer up sacrifice to the saints; but to God alone, who has crowned the saints. Hence, the priest, addressing Saint Peter, or Saint Paul, does not say to them: I OFFER THIS SACRIFICE TO YOU; but, returning thanks to God for*

their victories, he asks only their assistance ; in order that they, whom we commemorate on earth, may be pleased to intercede for us in heaven. (Sess. 22.) Thus it is, that we honour the saints,—wishing thus to obtain by the help of their suffrages the grace of God, and, above all, the grace to imitate their virtues ;—to which we are animated by the contemplation of their bright example ; and by the honour which, before God, we pay to their happy memories.

The protestant, who will give himself the trouble to consider the above explanation of our doctrine, will, if he be candid, be compelled to own that, as we neither take away from the Deity any one of the divine perfections, so neither do we attribute to the creature any one quality, or operation, that is appropriate but to God.—Thus are we distinguished from idolaters ;—a name, which, as it is applied to us, was invented only by protestant illwill in order merely to make us odious.

But, it is objected, that, “by addressing our prayers to the saints, and by honouring them, as if they were present in every place, we attribute to them a kind of immensity ; or at least a knowledge of the secrets of the human heart,—a circumstance, which, according to the testimony of the Scriptures, God reserves solely to Himself.” Now this objection, although often indeed repeated, is still founded upon ignorance ; or, upon a very mistaken notion of our tenets. For, without examining upon what foundation a certain degree of knowledge of earthly things, or even of the secrets of the human heart, may be attributed to the saints,—without examining this, it is, methinks, evident that it is not raising the creature above

the sphere of its condition to say, that it does possess some knowledge of these objects, by the means of that light which God communicates to it. The example of the prophets evinces this. God has often imparted to the prophets the foresight of future events, although such quality ought to appear confined most peculiarly to Himself.

But, in short, never did there exist any catholic so unwise as to have imagined that the saints are acquainted with our wants, or read our desires, through the medium solely of their own sagacity. All that the church, after the example of every age of antiquity, teaches upon this subject, is—that it is useful to address our supplications to them, whether they learn our necessities through the ministry of the angels, for the angels, the scripture informs us, are acquainted with human transactions, being “ministering spirits,” appointed by God to promote the work of our salvation:—whether they know our desires through the medium of a particular revelation; or, in short, whether God himself discover the secret to them in the mirror of his own infinite essence, that principle, in which all truth is comprehended. These are points upon which the church has decided nothing.

Be the medium, however, what it may, by which God communicates to the saints the knowledge of our prayers, it is still true that the catholic does not,—as did the idolaters,—attribute to any human creature any one of the divine perfections: since he does not acknowledge even in the greatest saints, any possible degree of excellence which does not immediately derive from God. He entertains no veneration for them, save that which results from their virtues; owns no virtue, save

that which is the gift of grace; no knowledge, besides that which God communicates; no power to assist us, beyond that which arises from their intercessions; nor any share of happiness, except that, which is the effect of their conformity to the rule of the divine will.

Whoever, therefore, considers our sentiments concerning the saints, will conceive it manifest that we do not exalt these happy beings above the rank of human creatures. He will likewise understand what the nature is of that external honour which we pay to them.—The external honour which we pay them is merely the expression of those interior sentiments, which we entertain for their virtues and their sanctity.*

But, since the honour, which the Catholic

* The protestant, who has seriously considered the real sentiment of the catholic church, respecting the veneration which we pay to the saints, will, I am sure, —if candid,—acknowledge that there is not in it any thing that even distantly resembles the nature of idolatry. Hence, he will reprobate that insolence which daily reviles us as stupid idolaters; and he will feel astonished at that singular policy, which compels men to swear (our legislators swear) that we are such. “I do solemnly, and sincerely, in the presence of God profess, (this is the oath which qualifies our legislators for their acts of wisdom,) testify and declare, that I do believe that the invocation or adoration of the Virgin Mary, or any other saint, as now used in the churches of Rome, is superstitious and idolatrous.” Good God! how truly horrible! To swear that that is idolatry, which has not a shadow of idolatry in it! To call heaven to witness that that is idolatry, which the christian universe, through every age, the saints and the sages of every country have fervently cultivated! Pitiful is the policy which requires the frightful oath; and dreadful the hardihood which takes it.

Church pays to the saints, is manifested principally by the respect which we show to their images, and their relics, it is, for this reason, proper to explain what our belief is respecting these two objects of our veneration.

CHAP. V.

ON IMAGES.

IN relation to images, the council of Trent expressly forbids any one to believe that *there is any divinity, or any virtue, in them, which should appear to claim the tribute of his veneration*; on the contrary, it teaches that *it is sinful to ask any favour from them; or to place our confidence in them.* The decree of the council is,—that *all the honour, which is paid to them, shall be referred to the originals, whom they are designed to represent.** (Sess. 25. de. *Invoc. Sanct.*)

* *Exodus xxv. 18.* “The Lord spoke unto Moses, saying: Thou shalt make two Cherubim of gold: of beaten work thou shalt make them on both sides of the mercy seat.

Numbers xxi. 8. 9. “And the Lord said unto Moses: Make a brazen serpent; and set it for a sign. Every one that is bitten, when he looketh upon it shall live. And Moses made a brazen serpent; and set it for a sign, which, when they, that were bitten, beheld, they were healed.”

3 Kings vi. 29. “And Solomon carved all the walls of the temple round about, with carved figures of cherubim, and palm trees, and open flowers, within and without.”

Like the invocation of the saints, the early use, and veneration, of their images are conceded to us by the best informed protestant writers. The Centuriators al-

In these words of the council, the plainest distinction is made between the ideas of the catholic, and the notions of the idolater, on the subject of images. So far, according to the above definition, is the catholic from believing as did the idolater, that there resides any divinity in such objects,—that not even does he think, or conceive, there is any virtue in them whatsoever,—*except that* of awakening in the mind the remembrance of those originals whom they are intended to exhibit. This is the sole foundation of the honour that we pay to images.

It cannot, for example, be denied that the image of Christ Jesus crucified awakens in us, when we cast our eyes upon it, the lively remembrance of

low that they were common even in the third and fourth ages of the church. "Eusebius," they say, "writes, that he saw in Asia christians, who preserved the images of St. Peter and St. Paul, and of Christ himself." (*Cent. 3.*)

"Tertullian," the same writers add, "seems to declare, that the christians kept the image of the Cross, both in their public assemblies, and in their private houses. And it was hence that the pagans called them 'Worshippers of the Cross.'" (*Cent. 3.*) See also *Cent. 4, passim.* Our own English writers,—nearly all, who have treated on this subject,—make the same concessions.

In the Wittemburg editions of Luther's works, the great reformer is represented on his knees before a crucifix.

I could, indeed, adduce the authority of many celebrated protestants, who approve of the use and veneration of images. "The pictures of Christ," says Bishop Montague, "of the Blessed Virgin, and of the Saints, may be had in houses, and placed in churches; and respect and honour may be given them." (*In Epistom.*)

Him, "*who hath loved us so, as to lay down his life for our salvation.*" Whilst the contemplation of the image nourishes in the soul this useful recollection, we are, of course, inclined naturally to declare, by some external expression, the tenderness of our gratitude; and, by humbling ourselves before the representation, to testify the willingness of our submission to the divine original. So that,—to speak correctly, or theologically,—when we honour an image of an apostle, or a martyr, our intention is, not so much to honour the image, as to honour the apostle or the martyr in the presence of the image. Such is the language of the Roman pontifical. That of the council of Trent is similar to it. *The honour, says the council, which we pay to images, is referred to the originals, whom they represent; so that by means of the images, which we kiss, and before which we kneel, we adore Jesus Christ, and venerate his saints.* (Sess. 25.)

In short, it is easy to understand in what spirit the church designs to honour images, by the characters of that respect which she pays to the cross and to the book of the gospel. Bending down to the cross, our intention is to adore Him "*who bore our sins upon the tree.*" And if we bow our heads before the book of the gospel; if we rise from our seats, when the holy volume is presented to us; or if we kiss it with profound respect,—the whole honour on such occasions is referred solely to that eternal truth which is therein proposed unto us.

The protestant is indeed unreasonable, who considers, as an act of idolatry, that religious feeling of the mind which induces the catholic to

uncover, or bow down, his head before the image of the cross, merely in commemoration of Him who expired upon it for the love of man. And blind, exceedingly blind, is he, who does not perceive the infinite difference which there is between those, who put their trust in idols, under the idea that the idol contained some divinity, or at least some secret virtue,—and those who, like us, declare that the only use of images is to raise the soul to heaven, in order there to honour Christ Jesus, or his saints; and, in the saints, the Almighty himself, who alone is the author of all grace and sanctification.*

* It is a fact, that there is hardly a single passage in the scriptures, which is connected with any controverted question, that the first reformers did not, some way or other, alter and pervert; "*making*," as the learned protestant, Zanchius, admits, "*the scriptures agree with their own fancies*." They did this particularly in those texts, which, relating to idols, they thought fit to apply to images. In all these they constantly translated the word, "idol"—*image*; or else "*image*,"—*idol*; precisely as the alteration was adapted to their designs; or as it seemed best calculated to alarm the piety, and to scare the simplicity, of the ignorant. It was thus, for example, that they translated the twenty-first verse of the fifth chapter of the first epistle of St. John:—"Babes, keep yourselves from images;"—a translation, which is false, and ridiculous, as its aim was mischievous. For, in order to deceive the vulgar, and to excite confusion, they fixed up the awful words, in huge and terrific characters, throughout all, or nearly all, the churches of the nation. It was by falsehoods and impositions, such as these, that they, at length, and best, succeeded in cheating the credulity of the public.

CHAP. VI.

ON RELICS.

THE honour which, in imitation of the first christians, we pay to the relics of the saints, is similar to that which we testify for their memories.* The bodies of the saints are so many victims that have been offered up to God, either by the sacrifice of martyrdom, or by the hardships of

* *Fourth Book of Kings*, xiii. 21. "When a dead man was let down into the sepulchre of Eliseus, no sooner did he touch the bones of the prophet, than he was revived and stood up on his feet."

Acts xix. 11, 12. "And God wrought, by the hand of Paul, more than common miracles. So that even there were brought from his body to the sick, handkerchiefs, and aprons; and the diseases departed from them; and the wicked spirits went out of them."

The Centuriators allow that the veneration of relics prevailed in the church in the third and fourth centuries. "Saint Cyprian," they say, "exhorts the priests of Rome carefully to mark down the days of the deaths of the martyrs, in order that they might celebrate their commemoration in the chapels of the martyrs." (*Cent. 3.*) "It was," they add, "in this (the fourth) century, that began the translation and veneration of the relics of the saints." (*Cent. 4.*)

So manifest, in reality, is the veneration, which, in the early ages of the church, the christians used to pay to relics, that not even do the most learned, though inveterate protestants, attempt to dispute it. Daille, Blondel, Chemnitius, Whitaker, &c. attest the prevalence of this veneration frequently. Indeed, the works of the fathers are full of testimonies in commendation of it. "EVERY WHERE," says Saint Hilary, "is the blood of the martyrs received; and their venerable bones bear witness;—the devils trembling before them; maladies expelled; and wonders wrought." (*Contra Constant.*)

penance. And did the protestant reflect, that it is in this point of view that we consider them, he would not then conceive, as through prejudice he does too often, that the respect which, from such motives, we show to these venerable objects, could possibly detach us from that honour which we owe to God. -

The affection which, in the cases of human friendship, a friend experiences for a friend, extends, not only to the cherished individual, but to his children, and relations; and not merely to these, but even to whatever represents him; to whatever once belonged to him; or that brings back to the mind the pleasing remembrance of him. This is the dictate of the instincts of nature. And did the protestant again weigh this, then would he likewise understand how the progress of honour is similar to that of friendship: since honour is nothing else, in reality, than affection united with fear, and mingled with respect. In short, did the protestant consider, that the whole exterior worship, which the catholic cultivates, derives its origin from God alone, and returns solely to God again,—did he consider this, then would he, too, conceive clearly that such worship, animated as it thus is merely by the author of sanctity, cannot possibly be displeasing to any one of his divine perfections. He would, on the contrary, conceive, that, if God, jealous as He is of the love of men, does yet permit them to love each other for the love of Him, nor deems such love the division of our affections,—just so, jealous as He likewise is of the respect and veneration of the faithful, still does He allow them also,—without looking upon such act as any par-

tition of the worship which is due to Him,—to honour, *for His sake*, those happy beings whom Himself has honored so greatly.

It is, however, true, that the external marks of reverence which, at different periods, the catholic may have employed in expressing his veneration for the saints, are by no means, all of them, essential to religion. Without making any alteration in her doctrine, the church has often extended, or abridged, her external practices ; regulated, in these points, by the nature of circumstances ; by the character of times, places, and events ; not wishing that her children should be servilely subjected to visible things ; but by their means be animated only to greater fervour ; and admonished to turn the mind to God, in order to present to him, in spirit and truth, “ that reasonable service ” which he expects from all his creatures.

After this natural and simple exposition of our tenets, it is obvious, as I have remarked already, that a great part of our disputes would be prevented, or at least hushed, did men only give themselves the trouble to appreciate terms, or else conduct themselves with christian charity. Would the protestant only consider calmly the above explanations,—which comprise the express doctrines of the Council of Trent,—he would cease to reproach us with violating the mediation of Jesus Christ, with invoking the saints, or honouring their images, in a way that should be appropriated to God alone. Adoration, it is true, invocation, and the name of Mediator, do, in some sense, belong only to God, and to Christ Jesus. And hence, it is easy to abuse or

misapply these terms in order to throw an odium upon our tenets. But, if men would act candidly, and reduce words to the signification which I have just been giving them, then would their reproaches vanish, and their objections lose all their influence. Or, if they had any other difficulties less important than the foregoing, to object against us, sincerity would compel them to acknowledge that they are satisfied, at least, upon the principal subjects of their prejudices and complaints.

At all events, certain it is, that nothing can be more unjust than the objection which is so very often urged against us,—“that we make piety consist in mere devotion to the saints :”—whereas all that the church, or the council of Trent, teaches upon the subject, is simply this,—that “*it is good and useful to invoke their intercession.*”—The design, therefore, of the church is, to condemn those who, either out of contempt, or through error, reject this act of piety. Her censure, in such cases, is wise : because, whilst it is wrong to permit the contempt of practices, which are beneficial to salvation, it is wrong likewise to tolerate, under the mere sanction of a few upstart teachers, the condemnation of a doctrine which every age of christianity has authorized and cultivated.

CHAP. VII.

ON JUSTIFICATION.

THE question respecting justification will point out in a manner, still clearer than any of the preceding, how many difficulties might be terminat-

ed, or prevented, by the simple exposition of our sentiments and opinions.

Whoever is conversant, although it be but slenderly, in the history of protestantism, knows that its first authors considered this article, and proposed it to the public, as the chief, and fundamental principle of their unhappy separation from the parent church. So that it is peculiarly necessary to understand it with some precision.

It is our belief, then, in the first place, that *our sins are gratuitously remitted to us by the mercy of God, through the merits of Jesus Christ.** These are the terms precisely, which the council of Trent makes use of; adding to them, moreover, that "*we are said to be justified gratuitously, because none of the things which precede justification, whether it be faith or good works, can merit this blessing for us.*"† (Sess. vi.)

* *Romans* iii. 23, 24, 25. "For all have sinned; and do need the glory of God. Being justified freely by his grace, through the redemption of Jesus Christ, whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood."

Ephesians i. 7. "In whom we have redemption, through his blood, the remission of sins."

1 *Timothy* ii. 5. 6. "For, there is one God, and one mediator of God and men, the man Christ Jesus, who gave himself a redemption for all."

† *John* xv. 5. "He that abideth in me, and I in him, the same beareth much fruit. For, without me, you can do nothing."

Ephesians ii. 8, 9. "For, by grace you are saved, through faith; and that not of yourselves; for, it is the gift of God, not of works, that no man may glory."

Titus iii. 7. "That being justified by his grace, we may be heirs, according to hope, of life everlasting."

The scriptures explain to us the remission of sins, by saying, sometimes, that "*God covers them ;*" sometimes, that "*he takes them away ;*" sometimes, that "*he effaces them by the grace of the Holy Ghost,*" who makes us, as it were, new creatures. Induced by the variety of these expressions, we conceive it wise to join them all together, in order, from their combination, to form a perfect notion of the justification of the sinner. This process, therefore, observed, it is our consequent belief, that, not only are our sins covered, but entirely washed away, and effaced, by the blood of Jesus Christ, and by the grace of regeneration. Neither does this opinion either darken, or diminish, the ideas which we ought to entertain of the merit of our Saviour's sufferings. It, on the contrary, enlivens and increases them.

Again, therefore, the consequence is,—that the justice of Jesus Christ is not only imputed, but actually communicated, to his faithful by the operation of the Holy Ghost : so that, by his grace, men are not merely reputed just, but really rendered just.*

For, if the justice, which is in us, were justice merely in the eyes of men, then would it not be the work of the Holy Ghost. It is, consequently, justice in the eyes of God, since it is God him-

* *Romans* v. 5. "The charity of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Ghost, which is given unto us."

Ephesians iv. 24. "Put on the new man, which according to God, is created in justice and holiness."

Titus iii. 5. 6. "According to his mercy, he hath saved us by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost ; which he hath shed on us in abundance, through Jesus Christ, our Lord."

self who creates it in us, by shedding abroad his charity through our hearts.

At the same time, it is unhappily too true that *the flesh lusteth against the spirit, and the spirit against the flesh*. It is true, that *we are, all of us, wanting in many things*. For these reasons, although even our justice, by the infusion of the divine love, be real, still it is not perfect justice, on account of the combats of concupiscence, that work within us. So that the main duty of christian justice is to nourish constantly in the heart a spirit of penance, and of deep regret for iniquity. We, therefore, with St. Austin, humbly own, that, in this life, our justice consists, rather in the forgiveness of sin, than in the perfection of virtue.

CHAP. VIII.

ON THE MERIT OF GOOD WORKS.

THE doctrine of the catholic church, respecting the merit of good works, is,—“that eternal life ought to be proposed to the children of God, both as a grace, which is mercifully promised to them, and as a recompence, which, by virtue of this promise, is faithfully bestowed upon their good works, and their deservings.”* Such is the language of the council of Trent. Scss. vi.

* *Matthew* x. 42. “Whosoever shall give to drink to one of these little ones a cup of cold water only, in the name of a disciple, amen, I say unto you, he shall not lose his reward.”

Matthew xvi. 27. “For, the Son of Man shall come in the glory of his father, with his angels; and then will he render to every man, according to his works.”

Hebrews iv. 10. “For, God is not unjust, that he

Lest, however, the weakness of human pride should be flattered with the idea of any presumptuous merit, the council, at the same time, inculcates that the price, and value, of christian actions proceed wholly from the efficacy of sanctifying grace ;—a grace, gratuitously bestowed upon us in the name of Jesus Christ, as well as the fruit of the continual influence of this divine Head over the conduct of his members.

In reality, the precepts, and the exhortations, the promises, the threats, and the reproaches, of the gospel do manifestly attest,—that it is the duty of the christian to work out his salvation, by the movement of his own will, co-operating with the grace of God, who is mercifully pleased to aid us. For, it is a leading maxim of our religion, that free-will, of itself, unaided by grace, and uninfluenced by the Holy Ghost, can do nothing that conducts to the purchase of eternal happiness.

Wherefore, convinced that it is this divine Spirit, which, by the operation of his graces, produces in us whatsoever good we do,—we, for this reason, believe, moreover, that the good works of

should forget your works, and the love, which you have shown in his name ; you, who have ministered, and do minister, to the saints.”

2 *Peter* i. 10. “ Wherefore, brethren, labour the more, that, by good works, you may make your calling, and election, sure.”

James ii. 14, 17. “ What shall it profit, my brethren, if a man say, he hath faith, but hath not works ? Shall faith be able to save him ? Faith, if it hath not works, is dead in itself.”

the faithful are peculiarly pleasing to the Almighty, and valuable in his sight. And it is hence that, after the example of every age of christian antiquity, we make use of the term, "*merit*;" designing, by it, to express principally the price, and the dignity, of those actions, which we perform under the guidance, and the impulses of grace.

But, since the sanctity of every action is the operation of God, who himself creates it in us, the church, for this reason, in the council of Trent has adopted, as the expression of her faith, that saying of Saint Austin,—that, *in crowning the merit of his servants, God merely crowns his own works.*

I recommend it seriously to every lover of truth and charity, to peruse, at some length, the words of the above-mentioned council; in order that, instructed, and disabused by them, he may divest himself of those false impressions, which, as a protestant, he has too easily imbibed respecting our catholic principles. "Although we remark," say the fathers of this assembly, "that the sacred scriptures affix so much importance to good works, that Jesus Christ himself promises a reward even for a cup of cold water bestowed upon the poor; and that the apostle assures us, that momentary sufferings here shall produce an eternal weight of glory hereafter,—although all this be true, still, God forbid that the christian should confide, or glory, in himself, and not in the Lord; whose goodness towards men is so great, that he regards, as their merits, the very gifts which himself bestows upon them." Such is every where the doctrine of the council of Trent.

In another session, (the 14th, ch. viii.) this assembly teaches, that, "although we can do nothing of ourselves, we can yet do every thing through Him who strengthens us: so that man has nothing wherein to glory; nothing wherein, as in himself, to place his confidence; but that all his confidence and glory repose in Jesus Christ, in whom we live; in whom we merit; and in whom we satisfy; performing worthy fruits of penance,—fruits, which derive all their efficacy from Him; by Him, are offered to the Eternal Father, and through Him, accepted." For these reasons it is, that, in all our prayers, we petition; in all our hopes, we trust; in all our acknowledgments, we return thanks, "*through Jesus Christ, our Lord.*" We loudly own that it is in Him, and by Him alone, that we are pleasing to the Almighty. It is ignorance only, or else malevolence, that has presumed to impute any other opinion to us.

In the sacrifice of the mass,—so completely is all our hope of salvation centred in our divine redeemer—we every day address the following prayer to God: *Vouchsafe, O God, to grant to us sinners, thy servants, who confide in the multitude of thy mercies, some portion and fellowship with thy blessed apostles and martyrs; into whose society we entreat thee to admit us; not induced by our merits, but forgiving us by thy grace, in the name of Jesus Christ, our Lord.* How singular, then, it is, and great the misfortune, that the prejudices of the protestant against his own parent church should be such, that neither the explanation of our faith; neither the decisions of our councils nor the prayers of our sacrifice, will induce him to believe

that we place all our trust in Christ Jesus; that from Him alone we derive life; and to Him alone we look up for eternal happiness.

So great, in fact, is the confidence which animates those children of God, who walk faithfully in his paths, that it produces "*a peace*," as the apostle expresses it, "*which surpasseth all understanding*." However, notwithstanding that such be its effect, or although this blessed hope be stronger than the promises and the threatenings of the world,—sufficient even to calm the uneasiness of the conscience,—still it does not entirely extinguish fear; because, spite of the assurance which we have, that God never abandons us, of Himself, we are, yet, never completely certain, that, through our own fault, by the rejection of his inspirations, we may not unhappily chance to lose him. By this salutary fear, his wisdom is pleased to temper that confidence which his goodness excites in the hearts of his children. For, as St. Austin observes, "such is our weakness in this scene of dangers and temptations, that security, —complete security,—would produce in us a spirit of pride and relaxation:" whereas, this salutary fear,—which, according to the precept of the apostle, *makes us work out our salvation with trembling*,—renders us vigilant; and with an humble dependence attaches us to Him, *who*, as St. Paul says likewise, *worketh in us, by his grace, both to will and to do, his good pleasure*.

Thus, therefore, I have explained the most essential points in the doctrine of justification. The protestant is unreasonable who refuses to acknowledge that its obvious tendency is to teach the christian to refer the whole glory of his sal.

vation to God, through the mediation and influences of Jesus Christ.*

If, after all this explanation, the enemies of our religion endeavour to screen themselves, as they often do, beneath the shelter of some subtily,—I will, in such case, make this observation to them, that it is extremely inconsistent in them to invent so many difficulties in *our* regard ; whilst in regard of each other, and in particular in regard of the Lutherans, on the subject of grace and predestination, they allow so much latitude and freedom. Their mutual concessions to one another, upon a great variety of contested questions, ought doubtless to prompt them to require nothing from the catholic beyond what is essential to the fundamentals of christian piety.

Could the protestant, indeed, be induced to confine himself within these boundaries, then would he soon be reconciled to catholic doctrines : and he would cease to reproach us with the odious imputation of annihilating the grace of God, by

* If the reader will consult the writings of the modern divines of the established church, on the subject of good works, he will find that there is hardly a shade of difference,—often there is no difference whatever,—between their doctrines and ours. The dissenters frequently notice this ; reproaching them with teaching,—as here they do,—the tenets of popery.

I will, however, at the same time, make this observation, that, whilst the members of the establishment defend good works, they contradict the eleventh article of their creed ;—just as this article itself contradicts the scripture. For while, with us, after St. James, they declare that “ a man is NOT justified by faith ONLY,”—their eleventh article declares positively, that “ we ARE justified by faith ONLY.”

attributing every thing to our own good works. Our doctrine upon this subject consists, as I have clearly demonstrated from the council of Trent, in the three following propositions,—first, *that our sins are pardoned by an act of pure mercy, on account of Jesus Christ*; secondly, *that we are indebted to the operation of a gratuitous liberality for that justice, which is in us by the influences of the Holy Ghost*; thirdly, *that whatsoever good works we do, they are, all of them, the effects of grace.*

Hence, it is a fact, that the most enlightened members of the protestant community, unlike the first reformers, no longer now contest the wisdom of our principles. They even candidly now acknowledge, that it was wrong to break asunder the bands of unity on account of the question of justification. Now, if this be the case, and if this important article, which was once considered the leading motive of the reformation, be at present no longer, by the wisest, looked upon as capital, let me, in this case, just ask the protestant to judge,—what he ought, in reason, to think of his separation from the parent church? There is little room to doubt, but that, if men would lay aside their prejudices, and resign the spirit of contestation, peace would, ere long, be the fruit of the fortunate revolution.

CHAP. IX.

ON SATISFACTION.

OUR doctrine respecting the satisfaction, which is due to God for sin, is another of those questions which demand a few words of explanation,

in order that no doubt may remain upon it in the minds of our dissenting brethren.

The belief, therefore,—the unanimous belief,—of catholics respecting satisfaction, is this—that Jesus Christ, at once both God and man, was alone, in consequence of the infinite dignity of his person, capable of offering up to God a sufficient atonement for the sins of his guilty creatures. Having, however, done this—and done it even superabundantly—it was in his power to apply the benefit of such expiation in two different ways; either, in the first place, by an act of entire abolition, without the reservation of any punishment whatsoever, or else, by the commutation of a greater punishment into a lighter; that is, by the exchange of eternal sufferings into temporal ones. The former of the two methods is the most complete, and at the same time the most conformable to the notions of infinite goodness. And for these reasons it is, that God applies it, in the first instance, in the sacrament of baptism. The latter is that which, we believe, he makes use of in the forgiveness of those sins which are committed after baptism; being compelled, as it were, to this diminution of his tenderness, by the ingratitude of those who have thus abused the first benefits of his mercy. They are, consequently, obliged to endure a certain process of temporal punishment, although that, which is eternal, has been kindly remitted to them.*

* Our first parents, the Israelites, in the desert, David, &c. sinned, and excited the divine displeasure. They repented: and God pardoned their sins. Still he inflicted upon them a heavy weight of tem-

It would, however, be wrong to infer from these principles, that Christ Jesus has not satisfied completely for us. He has done so : and the inference, which the above principles present, is, on the contrary, this,—that, having by the infinite price, which he has paid for our salvation, acquired an absolute dominion over us, he, for this reason, forgives us upon such conditions, under such laws, and with such restrictions, as to his wisdom appear becoming.

poral chastisements. See *Genesis* iii. *Numbers* xiv. *2d Kings* xii.

Joel ii. 12. "Therefore, now saith the Lord, be converted to me, with all your hearts, in fasting, and weeping and mourning."

Ezekiel, xviii. 30. "Be converted ; and do penance for all your transgressions : and your iniquity shall not be your ruin."

Romans viii. 17. "We are heirs indeed of God and co-heirs with Christ ; PROVIDED we suffer with him, that we be also glorified with him."

Colossians i. 24. "I fill up the things, that are wanting of the sufferings of Christ in my flesh."

As for the opinion of the Fathers,—even the most early Fathers, respecting the article of satisfaction, this is too notorious to require any attestations to point it out. The Centuriators,—the best protestant vouchers, because the most learned,—upon this, and similar subjects, allow, that the doctrine of satisfaction was taught even in the second and third centuries. "In the third century," they say, "when the Fathers speak of penance, they speak chiefly of contrition and satisfaction." (*Cent.* 3.)

"The Lord," says St. Cyprian,—and this was the language of every other Pastor,—"the Lord must be appeased by our satisfactions. NOSTRA SATISFACTIO PLACANDUS EST. (*L. de Lapsis.*)

It would even be an act of injustice and ingratitude, did we dare to contest with our beneficent Redeemer the infinitude of his merits; under the illusive pretext, that, forgiving the sin of Adam, he has not, at the same time, released us likewise from all its consequences; leaving us still subject to death, and to a variety of infirmities, both corporal and spiritual, which that offence had called down upon us. It is enough that his goodness has paid, once, that ransom, by which we shall, one day, be delivered from all those evils which distress us now. It is ours to receive, with gratitude and humility, every token of his beneficence,—be they ever so small,—which his goodness is pleased to bestow; considering in these the steps, by which, in his wisdom, he accelerates the work of our reconciliation; and displays, by a more striking manifestation, both the tenderness of his mercy, and the severity of his justice.

For reasons similar to the preceding, we ought not to be astonished if He, who has shown so much lenity, in baptism, should also, after the violation of our sacred promises, show himself more rigorous and severe. It is reasonable, and even salutary to us, that God, whilst he remits both sin, and the temporal punishment which sin had merited, should yet, by way of check, to restrain us within the boundaries of duty, demand from us some kind of temporal chastisement; lest, emancipated too soon from the bands of justice, we nourish a presumptuous confidence, and abuse the facility of obtaining pardon.

It is, consequently, in order to fulfil this obligation, that we are subjected to a certain series of painful duties,—duties, which, also, we are bound

to comply with, in a spirit of deep humility and contrition. It was the necessity of these labours of satisfaction that compelled the church, during the early ages, to impose upon sinners those heavy mortifications, which we call *the Canonical penances*.

When, therefore, now, the church imposes upon sinners any painful and laborious duties, the act of performing these is what we denominate *Satisfaction*. And when, in consequence of the extraordinary fervour, or piety, of the penitent, the church thinks proper to mitigate the severity of her discipline, this act of relaxation is the thing which we term *an Indulgence*.

CHAP. X.

ON INDULGENCES.

ON the subject of Indulgences, the only doctrine, which the council of Trent proposes to us as an article of faith, is—*that Jesus Christ has imparted to his church the power of granting indulgences, and that the use of them is beneficial.** At

* *Matthew* xviii. 18. "Amen, I say unto you, whatsoever you shall bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven, and whatsoever you shall loose on earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven."

1 *Corinthians* v. 3, 4, 5. In this passage, St. Paul excommunicates the man who had been guilty of incest. But, in the second chapter of his second Epistle, having been now informed of the sorrow and repentance of the criminal, he tells the Corinthians that he remits the punishment which, lately, his wisdom had deemed so salutary. "Wherefore," he says, "I beseech you, that you would confirm your charity towards him. And to whom you have forgiven any thing, I also. For, what

the same time the council remarks, that, *although the use of them ought to be retained, still it should be retained with moderation; lest, by any unbecoming facility, the force of ecclesiastical discipline should become enervated and relaxed*;—an observation, which proves that the mode of dispensing indulgences is a mere point of ecclesiastical discipline.*

I forgive, if I have forgiven any thing for your sakes, I have done it in the person of Christ." This mitigation by Saint Paul is precisely what we mean by an indulgence.

In like manner, during the early ages of the church, it was the frequent practice among the bishops to grant, at the request of the martyrs, a remission of the canonical penances to those individuals whose repentance was marked by peculiar fervour. Tertullian, in the second century, St. Cyprian, in the third, and many fathers, and Councils, in the fourth and fifth ages, attest the frequency of this custom; whilst also they inform us that, sometimes, without any solicitation from the martyrs, it was observed in favour of the sick and the infirm. This relaxation, again, was exactly our indulgence.

* The catholic is very far from denying that indulgences have been abused. They have been abused very often and very grossly, and we lament the evil more feelingly than the protestant derides it. But, after all, where is the great room for wonder? For, what do not men abuse? They abuse every thing; and frequently the best things the most. There is nothing here that is completely screened from the intrusion of the human passions. The mischiefs, however, that have resulted from indulgences, did not arise from the nature itself of the institution, but from the perversity and wickedness of the individuals who misapplied, and from the ignorance and superstition of the men who misconceived, them. An indulgence is not—as the protestant imagines—an encouragement to sin. On the contrary, it

CHAP. XI.

ON PURGATORY.

WHEN the faithful depart out of this world, in a state of grace and charity—but yet, without having undergone those punishments which, as a debt, were due to the severity of the divine justice—in such case it is their fate, we believe, to endure them in the life to come.* It is hence that,

implies, and presupposes, a sincere conversion from sin; a real detestation of vice; and a fixed determination to avoid it for the time to come. It is not a dispensation from penance: it demands penance. Not an exemption from acts of piety:—it requires prayer, mortification, humility, &c. In short, just like the act of Saint Paul to the incestuous Corinthian, or like that of the early pastors in favour of the sick, and the peculiarly penitent, an indulgence is simply a remission, or mitigation, of those temporal punishments which the sinner still owes to the eternal justice, even after the forgiveness of the guilt of his offences.

* 2 *Machabees* xii. 43, 44, 45, 46. “Judas, the valiant commander, having made a gathering, he sent twelve thousand drachms of silver to Jerusalem, for sacrifice to be offered for the sins of the dead; thinking well and religiously concerning the resurrection. For, if he had not hoped that they, that were slain, should rise again, it would have seemed superfluous and vain to pray for the dead. And because he considered, that they, who had fallen asleep with godliness, had great grace laid up for them. It is, therefore, a wholesome and holy thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from their sins.

1 *Corinthians* iii. 15. “If any man’s work burn, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire.”

1 *Peter* iii. 19, 20. “He went also, and preached, to those spirits, that were in prison, which had been sometime incredulous.”

at every period of christian antiquity, the christian universe was every where accustomed to offer up prayers, and alms, and sacrifices, for the faithful, who had died in the peace and communion of the church—convinced that these acts of piety were beneficial to their salvation. This is all that the council of Trent proposes to our belief, respecting the souls that are detained in purgatory. It decides nothing concerning the nature of their punishments. Upon this, and such like questions, the holy Council prescribes the most prudent reserve and

Matthew xii. 36. "I say unto you, that every idle word, that men shall speak, they shall render an account thereof at the day of judgment."

I need not here cite any passages from the holy Fathers; because, upon this article, their agreement with our belief is acknowledged by the most learned and enlightened protestants."

"Let not, for example," says Dr. Forbes, "let not the ancient practice of praying and making oblations for the dead, received throughout the universal church of Christ, almost from the very time of the apostles, be any more rejected by protestants, as unlawful, or vain. Let them reverence the judgment of the primitive church; and admit a practice strengthened by the uninterrupted profession of so many ages." (*Discourse on Purgatory.*)

"Nay," says Dr. Taylor, "we find by the history of the Machabees, the Jews did pray, and make offerings, for the dead This practice was at first, and universal; it being plain in Tertullian, Cyprian, and others." (*Liberty of Prophesying.*)—Hence we find, that some of the most distinguished members of the establishment—Sheldon, Blandfort, Barrow, Thorndyke, &c.—were wont, like the catholic, to pray for the dead. "Indeed," say the Encyclopedists, "the belief in purgatory is now, by one of those strange revolutions to which the human mind is subject, becoming the general belief of protestants."

circumspection ; condemning those who pretend to speculate on so awful and obscure a subject.

CHAP. XII.

REFLECTIONS UPON THE PRECEDING CHAPTERS.

IN the preceding chapters, I have briefly explained what the nature of our doctrine is, respecting those *satisfactions* which the protestant rejects, or impeaches, in us, as criminal. If, after such explanation, it be still contended that we do an injury to the merits of Christ, I must, in this case, remark, that the man, who makes this objection, must surely have forgotten that our belief is, as I stated it—"that this benevolent Redeemer has paid the entire price of our ransom ; that to this price, since it is infinite, there is nothing wanting ; and that as for the punishments, which I have been speaking of, the reservation of these does not proceed from any deficiency in the atonement, but from a certain regulation of things, which the divine wisdom has established, in order to restrain mankind from sin by the checks of fear, or by the influences of a salutary discipline."

Or, if we be still reproached with the imputation of believing that we can, of ourselves, make satisfaction for a certain portion of the punishment which is due for our offences, we can with confidence to such accusation reply—that, even by the evidence of the few maxims, which I have just established, it is groundless and unjust. Those maxims do, certainly, very plainly attest that we consider the work of our salvation, as the pure effect of the divine grace and mercy ; that

whatsoever we do by the grace of God is not less God's than what Himself does by his own absolute will ; in short, that every thing, which we give to God, belongs equally to God, as does that which his own goodness bestows upon us. And, to these principles of our faith, let me add this one further observation—that what, in imitation of the whole primitive church, we now call “satisfaction” is, after all, nothing more or less than the mere application of the infinite satisfaction of our Redeemer, Jesus Christ.

In like manner, the same consideration precisely ought to satisfy, or, at least, silence those who affect to be scandalized at us, when we say that “God so loves the virtue of fraternal charity, and the communion of the saints, as to receive frequently, with pleasure, the satisfactions which we offer to Him in behalf of one another.” It would indeed seem that the protestant does not properly conceive, either how all, that we are, is God's, nor how all the benefits, which His mercy confers upon those, who are the members of Jesus Christ, ought essentially to be referred, as so many tributes to His greatness. But surely, those men who have read and reflected, that God himself inspires his servants with the desire to punish themselves by fasting, and piously to weep in sackcloth and ashes, not for their own offences merely, but for the sins likewise of the public—surely the men, who have considered this, will not be astonished if also we assert, that, moved by the love of gratifying his favourite creatures, He is pleased moreover to accept, in his mercy, the sacrifice of their voluntary mortifications, in extenuation of those chastisements which, in his justice, he had

prepared to inflict upon the guilty. It is thus, that, satisfied with the former, he is induced to relent towards the latter—honouring, in this communion of his members and in this holy society of his mystic body, his own divine Son, our Redeemer, Jesus Christ.

CHAP. XIII.

ON THE SACRAMENTS.

THE plan of my instruction, as well as the order of our doctrine, require that I should now say something concerning the holy sacraments—those important mediums by which the merits of Christ are applied to the souls of christians. Since, however, the disputes which the protestants have excited upon these objects are, with the exception of what relates to the eucharist, less violent than those which they have created upon several other questions, I shall, for this reason, confine my explanation to a rapid elucidation of the principal objections which they have made to the other sacraments, reserving to the end of my work, as its most interesting part, what relates to the holy eucharist.

The sacraments, then, of the christian covenant are not only sacred signs, representative of grace; not only seals, which ensure and confirm grace to us—they are, moreover, the instruments of the Holy Ghost, which apply it to the souls of men; and which even, by the efficacy of the words, and the virtue of the action, which are then made use of, do actually—provided we be properly disposed—confer the divine gift upon us.

When God attaches so signal a benefit to the application of external signs,—objects which, of their own nature, bear no proportion to so wonderful an effect—his wisdom in such case takes care to show us that, besides whatever we can do in ourselves by the goodness of our own dispositions, there must still necessarily intervene, for the effect of our sanctification, a special operation of the Holy Ghost, and a particular application likewise of the merits of Jesus Christ—a blessing this, which the sacraments are designed to point out to us. It is, indeed, impossible to reject these principles, without injuring, at the same time, the merits of Jesus Christ, and without depreciating the work, which the divine greatness has created for the purpose of our regeneration.

We admit seven signs, or ceremonies, instituted by Jesus Christ, as the ordinary mediums of our sanctification, and as the principles of the perfection “of the new man.”* The divine establishment of these objects is manifest in the holy scriptures, either from the express word of Jesus Christ, who instituted them, or else from the effusion of those graces, which, according to the same sacred volume, are appended to them, and which point out necessarily the order of the divine economy.

* “The belief of seven sacraments,” says Calvin, “has always been common amongst men; and so much maintained in sermons, and controversies, that their antiquity is rooted in the hearts of all, and is still fixed there.”
(*Inst.*)

CHAP. XIV.

ON BAPTISM.

Not only are infants incapable of supplying for the want of baptism by acts of faith, hope, and charity,—they are unable to do this even by the desire of the salutary institution. Hence, it is our belief, that, if they do not receive it in reality, they do not, of course, participate in the benefit of our redemption; and that, dying in Adam, they enjoy no inheritance in Jesus Christ.*

It may be proper to remark likewise in this place, that, in relation to the absolute necessity of infant baptism, not the Lutherans alone, but the chief part of the protestant community, profess the same doctrine as does the Catholic, and are even, just like the catholic, astonished that any one should have presumed to deny the important truth—a truth so deeply engraved upon the public mind, that, before Calvin, not a single individual had ever had the boldness to call in question its reality.

* *Matthew* xxviii. 19. “Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations; baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.”

John iii. 5. “Except a man be born again of water, and the Holy Ghost, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.”

Acts ii. 38, 39. “Be baptized every one of you,—for the promise is unto you, and to your children.”

Thirty-nine Articles. Art. ix. “Original sin in every person born, in this world, deserveth God's wrath, and damnation.” On this account, the twenty-seventh article ordains, that “the baptism of children be retained in the church, as most agreeable with the institution of Christ.”

It is, therefore, an afflicting circumstance to observe that, notwithstanding the certainty, and the admission likewise, of this truth, there are multitudes of protestants who—if the opportunity be not convenient—suffer their infants, just like the children of infidels, to die unbaptized, without having imprinted upon them any mark of Christianity, or without having imparted to them any one of the benefits of their redemption.

CHAP. XV.

ON CONFIRMATION.

THE imposition of hands, as it is related to have been practised by the apostles, in order to strengthen the faithful against the rigours of persecution, is another institution which we revere as a christian sacrament.* We do this, because its principal effect is to introduce the Holy Ghost into the soul, and to create in the heart an effusion of his gifts and graces. The pretext for rejecting this sacred action, because the Holy Spirit does not now visibly descend upon us, is unreasonable and groundless. Hence have all christian churches

* *Acts viii. 14, 15, 16, 17.* “Now, when the apostles that were in Jerusalem, had heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent to them Peter and John, who, when they were come, prayed for them, that they might receive the Holy Ghost. For, he was not, as yet, come upon any of them; but they were only baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. Then they laid their hands upon them; and they received the Holy Ghost.

Acts xix. 5, 6. “Having heard these things, they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus. And when Paul had imposed his hands on them, the Holy Ghost came upon them.”

since the time of the apostles, religiously retained and practised it;* making use, in its administration, by way of expressing its virtues, of chrism: †—for chrism is an emblem of the interior unction of the Holy Ghost.

CHAP. XVI.

ON PENANCE AND SACRAMENTAL CONFESSION.

IT is an article of our belief, that it has pleased the wisdom of our Redeemer that those who, by baptism, have subjected themselves to the authority of the church, but who, since the benefit of this sacrament, have violated the laws of the gospel, shall be amenable to the tribunal of penance; wherein, exercising a power divinely entrusted to her, she either remits, or retains, the guilt of our offences. ‡

* "Confirmation ought to be administered by Bishops, . . . its institution being apostolical, and consonant to the ancient practice of the church." (*Protestant Synod of London. Canon 60.*)

† "It was the custom," say the Centuriators, "to impose hands upon those who were baptized; and to imprint upon their foreheads, with chrism, the sign of the cross." (*Cent. 7.*)

"It is necessary," Saint Cyprian says, "that he, who has been baptized, should be, moreover, anointed; in order that having received the chrism, that is, the unction, he may be anointed in God; and possess the grace of Christ." (*Ep. L. xx.*)

"Chrism," adds the learned Lecturer, Dr. Hey, "was enjoined by the council of Laodicea, in the year 367." (*Vol. iv. p. 286.*)

‡ *Matthew xvi. 19.* "And I will give to thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven, and whatsoever thou shalt bind

So general are the terms of the commission, which Christ Jesus has given to the ministers of the church to absolve the penitent from their ini-

upon earth, shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven."

Matthew xviii. 18. "Amen, I say to you: whatsoever you shall bind upon earth, shall be bound also in heaven; and whatsoever you shall loose upon earth, shall be loosed also in heaven."

John xx. 21, 22, 23. "As the father hath sent me, I also send you. And when he had said this, he breathed on them; and he said to them: Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven them: and whose sins you shall retain, they are retained."

To the largest portion of the protestant community, the Lutherans, the sense of the above texts has appeared so manifest, that, with us, they rank Penance among the number of their sacraments. "As for absolution," says Melancthon, "there is no doubt about it. For it is evident that we retain it in our churches, and approve and defend it." (*Acts of Ratisbon. Art. xi.*) See also the *Augsburg Confession*.

In this country, although the Establishment does not name Penance one of its sacraments, yet, by an inconsistency, which no wisdom can explain, it acknowledges in its clergy the same power of absolving sinners, which we do; and a power, which must be exercised precisely in the same manner, as it is done in the catholic church—with the same process of Confession, and the same form of pardon. See, in the Common Prayer Book, the Rubric for the visitation of the Sick; and the Exhortation before Communion.

The Centuriators acknowledge the antiquity of the belief in Penance, as well as the early practice of confession. "Private confession," they own, "was practised in the time of Saint Cyprian." (*Cent. 3.*) Hence, I need not cite here any testimonies from the Fathers.

quities, that it would be rashness to pretend to confine it solely to public sinners. And since, on the occasion when they pronounce absolution in His name, they merely observe the precise terms of this said commission, the consequence is, that the judgment, which they then pass, is considered as being passed by Jesus Christ himself, in whose room they are established judges. It is this invisible Pontiff who interiorly absolves the penitent, whilst the priest exercises the external ministry.

The sacrament of penance, if administered, not as the protestants usually administer it, by a general declaration of pardon, but, after a particular investigation and confession, and by a real absolution in the name and authority of Jesus Christ—the sacrament of penance, if administered thus, is a powerful barrier against the licentiousness of the passions; a fruitful principle of enlightened counsel; and, under the uneasiness, which sin creates, the most pleasing source of confidence and consolation.* All this is so certainly the fact, that I wonder much that our protestant brethren do not seriously regret the loss of such advantages; and even that they are not ashamed of a reformation, which has annihilated to them one of the most salutary and sanctifying practices of christian piety. †

* "Private confession," says Luther, "pleases me wonderfully. It is useful; yes, it is even necessary. I rejoice that it is practised in the church of Christ. For it is the only remedy for an afflicted conscience." (*De Captiv. Bab.*)

† It is, indeed, true, that multitudes of protestants have lamented the abolition of confession; attributing

CHAP. XVII.

ON EXTREME UNCTION.

THE Holy Ghost, according to the testimony of Saint James, has attached to extreme unction the express assurance that it shall both remit the sins, and alleviate the sufferings, of the sick individual who receives it worthily.* The holy cere-

to this the dreadful inundation of vice which burst upon society at the era of the reformation. There were even some protestant cities that solemnly solicited the re-establishment of the holy institution. The appeal from Strasburg, in particular, is curious.

* *Saint James* v. 14, 15. "Is any man sick among you? Let him bring in the priests of the church; and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord; and the prayer of faith shall save the sick man; and the Lord shall raise him up; and, if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him."

Mark vi. 12, 13. "And going forth, they preached that men should do penance. And they cast out many devils; and anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them."

"I acknowledge," says Calvin, "that extreme unction was used by the disciples of Christ, as a sacrament: for, I am not of the opinion of those, who imagine that it was a corporal remedy." (*Comment. in Ep. Jac.*)

Extreme Unction was retained, for some time, in this nation, by the established church. "And might we not," says the Lecturer, Dr. Hey, "adopt some ceremony in the visitation of the sick, analogous to that mentioned by Saint James? For my own part," he continues, "I know not whether such an alteration would not seem to me an improvement." (*Vol. iv.*)

To Luther there seemed to be no other means of getting rid of Extreme Unction, nor any other apology for denying it to be a sacrament, except that of rejecting,

mony, therefore, wants nothing to render it a real and perfect sacrament. It is true, indeed, as the council of Trent remarks, that the penitent, who receives the holy unction, is benefited in the soul more effectually than he is relieved in the body. The reason is, because spiritual advantages are the chief objects of the law of grace, and those which, if we be properly disposed, we ought always most confidently to look for in this salutary institution. In regard to the relief which, frequently, it affords to our corporal maladies,—this it confers, merely in the view to our eternal welfare, according to the hidden designs of God's providence, and to those different degrees of faith, and preparation, which inspire and animate the faithful who receive it.

CHAP. XVIII.

ON MATRIMONY.

WHOEVER reflects upon the circumstances, that Christ Jesus has imparted a new form to Matrimony, reducing this holy union to the society of two individuals, immutably and inseparably* link-

at once, the Epistle of Saint James. Accordingly (what did not the boldness of Luther dare?) he did so. He rejected the Epistle,—calling it “an epistle of straw.” His profaneness was, no doubt, exceedingly criminal. But, after all, I think his consistency was greater, than is that of those men who, retaining the Epistle, still reject the sacrament.

* *Matthew* xix. 5. “For this reason, shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and they two shall be one flesh.”

Matthew xix. 6. “What, therefore, God hath joined together, let no man put asunder.”

ed together; and that this indissoluble union is, moreover, the emblem of his own eternal union with his church,*—whoever reflects upon these circumstances, will, without any difficulty, comprehend that the marriage of the faithful is sanctioned by the Holy Ghost and accompanied by the gift of grace. He will even praise the divine goodness, which, in this manner, has been pleased to consecrate, and sanctify, the principle of our nativity.

CHAP. XIX.

ON HOLY ORDER.

SINCE the imposition of hands, as it is received by the ministers of sacred things, is accompanied by the virtue of the Holy Ghost, and by the infusion of a powerful grace, it ought, hence, to be ranked amongst the number of the christian

* *Ephesians* v. 31, 32. "For this cause, shall a man leave his father and his mother; and shall stick to his wife, and they shall be two in one flesh. This is a great sacrament: but I speak, in Christ, and the church.

The protestant acts of Ratisbon, drawn up principally by Melancthon, and generally approved of by the reformed churches, say: "Moreover, the sacrament of Matrimony belongs only to christians. It is a holy and constant union of one single man with one single woman, confirmed by the blessing and consecration of Jesus Christ." (*Art. xvi. De Sacram. Matrim.*)

"Matrimony," says Luther, "is called a sacrament, because it is the type of a very noble and a very holy thing. Hence," he adds, "the married ought to consider and respect the dignity of this sacrament." (*De Matrimonio.*)

sacraments.* This is so manifestly consistent, that not even do the protestants neglect the consecration† of their own ministers. What they do, is merely to excludè order from the class of those sacraments "which are common to all the faithful." (*Conf. Art. 35.*)

* 1 *Timothy* iv. 14. "For which cause, I admonish thee, that thou stir up the grace of God, which is in thee, by the imposition of my hands."

Acts vi. 6. "These they set before the apostles, and they, praying, imposed hands upon them."

Acts xiii. 3. "They, fasting, and praying, and imposing their hands upon them, sent them away."

† The acts of Ratisbon again—which, I just remarked, the protestants in general have approved—say, in relation to order:—"There is this distinction between the sacraments conferred in the church by the public ministry, and which, by this divine function, confer grace upon the faithful, that some of them, such as baptism, order, the eucharist, and absolution,—without which the church does not subsist—are more august, and important, than the others; which, though very useful, and necessary, when administered and received religiously, are not yet so necessary as are the former." (*Art. xi. De Sacram. Ordinis.*)

"I have no objection," says Calvin, "that men receive the imposition of hands, as a sacrament. It is a ceremony, taken in the first instance, from the scriptures. Neither is it, as Saint Paul says, "vain or superfluous; but a faithful sign of spiritual grace." (*Inst. L. i. Cap. xix.*)

In this country, order is every where, by the members of the established church, considered a divine institution, a principle of grace, and an essential qualification for the performance of spiritual functions. "It is," says Archbishop Wake, "a divine Institution; and we do not at all doubt, but the grace of God accompanies this ordinance." (*Principles.*) Why, therefore, with the whole of christian antiquity, not own it, at once, a sacrament!

CHAP. XX.

ON THE REAL PRESENCE OF THE BODY AND BLOOD OF JESUS CHRIST IN THE HOLY EUCHARIST.

I AM now come to the important article of the Eucharist—a subject upon which it will be necessary for me to explain our doctrine somewhat more at length ; although, still, I shall not exceed those limits, to which it is my plan to confine my present instructions.

The real presence, then, of the body and blood of our Lord in this holy mystery, is established very solidly and very satisfactorily by the words themselves employed in its institution—**THIS IS MY BODY.*** These words we interpret literally.

* *Matthew* xxvi. 26, 27, 28. “And whilst they were at supper, Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake, and gave it to his disciples, and said: Take ye, and eat; **THIS IS MY BODY.**—And taking the chalice, he gave thanks; and gave it to them, saying: Drink ye all of this; **FOR THIS IS MY BLOOD IN THE NEW TESTAMENT, WHICH SHALL BE SHED FOR MANY, FOR THE REMISSION OF SINS.**”

Mark xiv. 22, 23, 24. “And whilst they were eating, Jesus took bread; and blessing, brake, and gave it to them; and said:—Take ye; **THIS IS MY BODY.** And having taken the chalice; giving thanks, he gave it to them; and they all drank of it. And he said to them: **THIS IS MY BLOOD OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, WHICH SHALL BE SHED FOR MANY.**”

Luke xxii. 19, 20. “And taking bread, he gave thanks; and brake, and gave it to them, saying: **THIS IS MY BODY, WHICH IS GIVEN FOR YOU.** Do this for a commemoration of me. In like manner, the chalice also, after he had supped, saying: This is the chalice of the New Testament, in my blood, which shall be shed for you.”

Neither ought we to be any more questioned why we attach ourselves to their natural and obvious signification, than the traveller should be asked

1 *Corinthians*, xi. 23, 24, 25, 26. "For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered to you; that the Lord Jesus the same night, in which he was betrayed, took bread, and giving thanks, brake it; and said: Take ye, and eat; **THIS IS MY BODY, WHICH SHALL BE DELIVERED FOR YOU.** Do this for a commemoration of me. In like manner, also the chalice, after he had supped, saying: This chalice is the New Testament in my blood. This do ye, as often as you shall drink it, for a commemoration of me."

"I should have wished," Luther says, "to have denied the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, in order to incommode the papists; but, so clear, and so strong, are the words of the scripture, which establish it, that, spite of my inclination, and although I strained every nerve to do so,—yet never could I persuade myself to adopt the bold expedient." (*Ep. Car. Amic.*)

Instead of producing the testimonies of the fathers, respecting this article of our belief, I will cite—the attestation is particularly striking—the acknowledgment of the chief reformer upon the subject. "Among the fathers," he says, "there is **NOT ONE** who entertained a doubt, concerning the real presence of Christ Jesus in the Holy Eucharist." (*Defens. Verb. Cœnæ.*) He calls the contrary opinion, "blasphemy; an impeachment of the veracity of the Holy Ghost; an act of treachery against Christ; and a seduction of the faithful." (*Ibid.*)

In this country, the belief in the real presence was *once*, and that, too, for a very considerable space of time—during the reigns of Elizabeth and James, and the two Charleses—the prevailing opinion of the established church. "We believe," says Bishop Andrews to Bellarmine, "a real presence as much as you do." "The difference," adds Bishop Montague, "betwixt us, and the popish writers, is only about the manner of Christ's presence in the blessed Eucharist." (*Appeal.*) In short,

why he keeps the high road. It is theirs who have recourse to a figurative sense, and who take by-ways to account for the motives and peculiarity

citing the general belief of the establishment, in his time, Archbishop Laud says: "As for the church of England, nothing is more plain than that she believes and teaches the true and real presence of Christ in the Sacrament." (*Conf. with Fisher.*)

The above sentiments are certainly, but simply, consonant both to the language of the public catechism, and to the expressions of the prayers of the Common Prayer Book. In the former, to the question—"What is the inward part, or thing signified?"—the answer is—"The Body and Blood of Christ, which are **VERILY, AND INDEED** taken, and received, by the faithful in the Lord's Supper." In the latter, among other similar expressions, it is said: "Grant us, therefore, so to **EAT THE FLESH** of thy dear Son, Jesus Christ, and so to **DRINK HIS BLOOD**, that our sinful bodies may be made clean, by his Body, &c. The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thy body and soul. The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ preserve thy body and soul," &c. Can any form of words express a Real Presence more clearly, or more accurately, than these do? In fact, they were intended to express it; for, it is the genuine belief of the established church.

But, what is *now* the belief of the established church, respecting this article of the Eucharist? God knows. For neither, I am sure, can my ingenuity, nor, I suspect, any possible ingenuity, find it out. Nothing can be more obscure, nor more preposterous, than the writings of some of its clergy upon this important question. They, many of them, make that a pitiful riddle, which the divine wisdom has made so plain. However, I believe this tolerably correct—that the much larger share of the established clergy differing entirely from their earlier predecessors, (the notions of error are always changing,) are now, upon this article, completely Calvinistic; considering the Holy Eucharist as little more than an emp-

of *their* conduct. For our parts, we see nothing in the words, which our Redeemer employed in the institution of the mystery, that seems to require a figurative interpretation. We, therefore, consider this a sufficient motive for deciding in favour of their plain and proper signification. But, we are even the more forcibly inclined to do this, when we come to consider in this divine mystery the design, and intention, of its sacred Author. These are circumstances, too, which I shall endeavour to explain, as briefly as I can, and by the light of those principles likewise, which not the protestant himself will, I conceive, undertake to call in question.

I therefore remark, in the first place, that these words of Christ—*Take and eat ; this is my body, which is given for you*—establish the certainty of this truth—that, in the same manner precisely as the ancient Jews were wont to unite themselves in spirit to the immolation of the victim which was offered for them, and moreover, as a mark that they had shared in its oblation, partook also of its flesh—just so, Christ Jesus, being Himself our victim, has ordained that in the Eucharist the christian, also, shall eat effectually of the flesh of the holy sacrifice, in order that the actual communication of the adorable aliment may be to us a perpetual memorial, that it was for our sakes that He took flesh, and for our salvation that He was pleased to immolate it.

In the next place, I observe that God had forbid-

ty figure. "Thus," says Dr. Marsh, "On many points I am a Calvinist. I am a Calvinist in the doctrine of the Eucharist."

den the Jews (*Lev. vi. 30.*) to eat the flesh of the victim which had been offered up for sin. He did this, by way of instructing them, that the real expiation of sin was not to be effected, either under the law, or by the blood of animals. And the people, by this prohibition, lived under a kind of interdict; since thus, they could not actually participate in the remission of the guilt of sin. For a reason, therefore, precisely opposite to the above, it was proper, if not necessary, that the body of Jesus Christ, the true victim offered up for sin, should be really eaten by the faithful, in order, by such manducation, to show them that, under the new law, the remission of sin was accomplished effectually.

God had likewise ordained, (*Lev. xvii. 10.*) that the Jewish people should not eat blood. The motive, at least one of the motives, of this prohibition was— that *it is the blood that maketh an atonement for the soul.* (v. 11.) But our Redeemer, on the contrary, commands us to drink His blood; because *his blood was shed for the remission of sins.* (*Matt. xxvi. 28.*)

Thus, therefore, the manducation of the flesh and blood of the Son of God is, in fact, just equally real at the holy table, as grace, as the expiation of iniquity, and the participation in the sacrifice of our redemption, are, under the new covenant, actual and effective.

At the same time, since it was the design of our benevolent Redeemer to exercise the faith of his followers by this mystery, and to prevent, likewise, any repugnance that might arise from eating his flesh and drinking his blood under their natural appearances—it, for these reasons, became his wis-

dom to present the sacred aliments to us concealed under some kind of veil. If, however, he were prompted by these motives to oblige us to eat the flesh of our christian victim, in a manner which the divine wisdom did not prescribe to the Jewish people, still he ought not, upon this account, to deprive us of any share, either of its reality, or of its substance.

It was, therefore, in order to fulfil the ancient figures, and by way of putting us into actual possession of the victim which was offered up for sin, that Jesus Christ was, in his mercy, pleased to bestow his true body and blood upon us. This is even so incontestable, that the protestants themselves are desirous that, upon this point at least, we should be assured their sentiments are precisely the same with ours. They, hence, are for ever telling us that they do not, by any means, deny either the real presence, or the real participation, of the body and blood of Jesus in the Eucharist. However, this is a subject which I propose to discuss hereafter, when, having explained our own doctrine, I will also lay open theirs. Meanwhile, I conclude, that, if the simplicity of the declaration of our Saviour be such as to compel them to own that it was really the design of this beneficent Being to give us his true flesh, when he said, *This is my Body*—if this be the case, (and they own it is) then ought they not to wonder if, withholden by such evidence, we cannot bring our reason to conceive that his words should be interpreted figuratively.

In fact, if the Son of God were so careful—as he was—to explain to his apostles whatever he had taught them under the forms of parables and

figures, is it not manifest that, since to the foregoing words he affixed no explanation whatsoever, consequently it was his intention that mankind should understand them in their plain and obvious import? It is true, the protestants pretend that the thing explains itself, because it is notorious, they say, that what Christ thus presents appears only to be bread and wine. Preposterous and feeble reasoning! For, is not He, who speaks, possessed of a degree of authority, which is more than paramount to that of the senses, and superior even to all the powers of nature? There is not any greater difficulty for the Son of God to give his Body to us in the Eucharist, by simply saying, *This is my Body*, than there was to cure the sick woman, by saying to her, *Woman, thou art loosed from thy malady*: (Luke xiii. 12.)—than there was to preserve the life of the young man, by saying to his father, *Thy son is living*: (John iv. 50.)—than there was, in short, in remitting the sins of the paralytic, by merely telling him, *Thy sins are forgiven thee*. (Matthew ix. 2.)

Without, therefore, perplexing ourselves about the means by which the divine power of Jesus executes what he announces—what we do is thus respectfully to attach ourselves to his words. That Being, who does whatsoever he pleases by his *word*, also performs whatsoever he speaks. More easy it is for the Son of God to bend the laws of nature to obey his word, than it is for us to reconcile our reason to those singular interpretations which infringe, by their violence, all the established rules of language.

By the established rules of language, we are instructed that the sign, which represents any ob-

ject naturally, receives, not unfrequently, the appellation of such object; because it recalls naturally its idea to the imagination. The same kind of observation—although with certain restrictions—may be made in relation to signs of *institution* when these are generally received and by habit become familiar. But, to establish a sign, which, of its own nature, bears no reference, or analogy, to its object—for example, a bit of bread to signify a human body: or else to give it a certain name, without giving, at the same time, any explanation of its meaning; and before any one, and much less the public, have agreed in its acceptance, (and this is what Jesus did, on the occasion of his last supper,)—to do this is a thing that is quite unheard of; a thing, of which neither the whole series of the sacred scriptures, nor any instance in human language, supply one single example.

Accordingly, it is true that, although indeed the protestant theologians—many of them—apply to the words of Christ a figurative signification, yet are they not so obstinately attached to it, as not at the same time to own that, when the benevolent Being made use of the striking expression, he designed, in using it, to give us really his Body and his Blood.

CHAP. XXI.

ON THE WORDS—“DO THIS FOR A COMMEMORATION OF ME.”

AFTER having pointed out the sentiments of the church, respecting the words, *This is my Body*, I will proceed to explain, likewise, what her opi-

nion is concerning those which Christ Jesus has appended to them,—*Do this for a commemoration of Me.*

The design, then, of the Son of God, in this latter expression, is manifestly to induce or oblige us to bear constantly in our recollection that death which he endured for the purchase of our salvation. It is from it, that St. Paul concludes, that "*we announce the death of the Lord*" in this mystery. Now, it ought not to be supposed, that the remembrance of the death of our Lord excludes the real presence of his body. On the contrary, whoever considers attentively the explanation, which I just have been giving, will conceive it manifest, that it is upon this real presence, that such commemoration, in fact, is founded. For, as the Jews, by eating of their peace-offerings, recalled to their recollection, that it was for their sakes that the victim had been immolated,—just so, by eating the adorable flesh of our christian sacrifice, we too should be induced to remember, that it was for our salvation that Jesus laid down his life. It is the participation, therefore, of this sacred banquet, that not only awakens in us the memory of his death, but confirms us, moreover, in the faith of the wonderful mystery. And so far is the solemn commemoration, which Christ here commands us to make, from excluding the presence of his flesh, that it is, on the contrary, upon the actual manducation of this adorable food, that he bids us, at our altars, found the tender remembrance of his sufferings. In reality, it is impossible for us to forget, that it was for the love of us that He immolated his sacred body, when, each day, we see that he still gives us the holy

victim to be the food and nourishment of our souls. And is it not wrong in christians,—under the pretext of celebrating the memorial of our Redeemer's passion,—is it not wrong, under the shelter of such apology, to suppress that very object, which, in the act of the holy commemoration, is precisely the most powerfully efficacious, and the most tenderly affecting? Ought they not rather to reflect, that Jesus does not merely command us to remember him, but to remember him by eating his Body and his Blood? For, let only the sequel of his words and the force of his expressions be well noticed. Not only does he say,—as the protestants appear to understand him,—that in the Eucharist, the bread and wine are *a memorial* of his Body and Blood:—he says, and he reminds us of it,—that, by doing what he prescribes, that is, by receiving his Body and his Blood, we do really recall the remembrance of him to our affections. Indeed, what circumstance is there, that can possibly awaken the dear remembrance with more effect? If the child remembers so feelingly the kindness of a parent, when he sees his tomb,—with how much tenderer love should our sensibility glow, when, under these sacred veils,—under this mystic tomb,—we possess, and behold, the very flesh of our divine Redeemer; that living, life-giving flesh; that blood, still warm with the love of us, and replenished with grace, and spiritual unction? Or should the enemies of our religion still vainly persist in telling us, that “He, who commands us to remember him, does not bestow upon us the real substance of his body,”—if they tell us this, I, in return, will merely request them to agree at least amongst them.

selves. They assure us, for example, positively, and protest, that, in the Eucharist, they do not deny a real communication of the true substance of the Son of God. Now, if this assurance be serious, and their doctrine be not a mere illusion, the consequence is, that then they must necessarily say, as we do, that the remembrance, or memorial, does not exclude every mode of presence ; but that alone, which acts upon the senses. Thus, their answer would be precisely the same with ours : since we, when we say that Christ is present in the Eucharist, at the same time, acknowledge, that he is not present under a form which strikes the senses.

Should, then, the protestant here ask us, why we do not believe it sufficient, that Christ should be present in the Eucharist, merely by faith, seeing that we believe,—as we do—that the senses have nothing to do with the mystery ?—if the protestant should ask this, our answer to him would be easy ; and we should, without any perplexity, unravel the specious quibble.—It is therefore a very different thing to say, that “the Son of God is present in the Eucharist, by faith,”—from saying that “it is, by faith, we know that he is present in this mystery.” The former mode of speaking implies nothing more than a mere moral presence ; the latter points out a real one : both because faith is infallible, and because a real presence made known to us by faith, is sufficient to produce, “in the just man, who lives by faith,” all those happy effects which I have just said are always appended to it.

CHAP. XXII.

ON THE PROTESTANT DOCTRINES RESPECTING
THE HOLY EUCHARIST.

ALTHOUGH I had undertaken to explain the doctrines solely of the catholic church, in relation to the Holy Eucharist, yet will I also,—because the thing may perhaps be useful,—present a short exposition of the sentiments of our protestant brethren upon the same important subject.* Such ex-

* It is a very singular, and a very striking, circumstance,—a circumstance, which, if prejudice did not darken the eye of reason, would astonish, and confound, the protestant,—that, the rejection of the two leading catholic tenets respecting the Eucharist, and the adoption of the two leading protestant tenets concerning the same mystery, were, both of them, “professedly” derived from the suggestions “of the prince of darkness.”

We have, in the first place, the authentic testimony of Luther, informing us, not only candidly, but triumphantly, that it was the above wise and enlightened monitor, who instructed, and convinced him, that transubstantiation is an error; and engaged him to substitute the system of companation in its room. The conference between the two learned doctors upon the important subject, is minutely described in all the early editions of the great Reformer's works.

In like manner, we have also the testimony of Zuinglius, express and formal, as that of Luther,—that it was the same acute and skilful master, who kindly taught him that the Real Presence is but a human invention; and that the Eucharist, in fact, is no more than a holy figure. The dialogue, again, between these two great divines is circumstantially related by Zuinglius, in his book *De Subsidio Eucharistie*. He only omits to in-

position, if considered attentively, will produce the fortunate effect, if not of staying, at least of answering, the many quibbles, and equivocations, to which they have recourse so often: whilst, moreover, it will, at the same time, show how very nearly, on some occasions, they have approximated to our catholic principles.

There are two leading systems amongst the protestants, in relation to the presence of Christ Jesus in the Eucharist. The former teaches, that his body and blood are present in the mystery, merely "*in figure*;" the latter professes, that they are present "*in reality*." I shall examine each of the two opinions alternately.

It is, therefore, in the first place, a very prevailing notion amongst protestants, and a notion, which they frequently inculcate, that the great miracle of the Real Presence, which we catholics admit, and venerate, is superfluous, and of no avail; and that it suffices for all the purposes of our salvation, that Jesus Christ has laid down his life for our reconciliation. This sacrifice, they again say, is sufficiently applied to us, "*by faith*:" and this application, "*by faith*," they still farther

form us,—for he says, "he had quite forgotten the interesting circumstance," whether his instructor *was black, or white*.

I will make no reflections upon a subject, which yet presents room for so much reflection. But is it not astonishing, that men, the professed envoys of heaven, should boldly have declared, that they had received their most important doctrines from the devil! And is it not more astonishing yet, that such doctrines, even *now*, (they are still the leading protestant doctrines,) should be venerated as divine!

add, is sufficiently made known and certified to us "*by the word of God.*" Or if,—they once more say,—if indeed there be any necessity of clothing this word in the forms of sensible signs, then it is enough to create, for our benefit, symbols, that are extremely simple,—such, for example, as water in the sacrament of baptism; without any necessity of calling down from heaven the Body and the Blood of our Great Redeemer.

To explain the sacrament of the Eucharist, in this manner, is, no doubt, a very easy thing. However, it is a fact, that not even have the defenders of this system thought proper to abide by its maxims. They know, that notions, similar to the above, have induced the Socinians to deny the divine mystery of the Incarnation. "God," say these unbelievers, "could surely save us without having recourse to so arduous, and complex, a method. He needed but at once to forgive our iniquities: and, as for instruction, he could also instruct us sufficiently, both in regard of doctrine, and morality, by the words and example of a man animated by the Holy Ghost, without any necessity of making such personage a God. But, here, the protestants, as well as the catholics, felt the palpable weakness of such arguments. They felt, in the first place, that it is not ours,—blind and ignorant as we are,—either to deny, or to maintain, any mystery, merely according to the circumstance of its appearing to us useful or else unavailing to our salvation. It is God alone, that knows the secrets of his own councils. It is ours, to render them beneficial and salutary to ourselves, by believing them in that sense, in which his wisdom has proposed them to us; and by accepting his

benefits, in that way, in which his goodness has been pleased to offer them.

In the next place, without entering into the question, whether God could not have saved us by any other method, except that of the incarnation, and death of his Son,—an useless controversy, which many of the protestants have long, in their schools, very ardently maintained,—it is enough for man, upon the testimony of the sacred scriptures, to know that the Son of God has, in his mercy, been graciously pleased to testify his love and interest for his creatures by effects, which are truly wonderful, and incomprehensible. It was the greatness of this love, that created that blessed union, by which he became man; and that prompted him, as really to lay down, for our sake, that same body, as he had really taken it up. These dispensations of the divine wisdom are, all of them, consistent, whilst the love, which suggested them, is every where strikingly impressive. When, therefore, it is His wish, by communicating himself to any one of his children, to testify to such happy individual that tenderness, which he has testified to all in general,—he discovers, at once, in the treasures of his wisdom, the easy means of satisfying his benevolence,—means, just equally effectual, as are those by which he had accomplished the great work of our redemption. There is, consequently, no room for astonishment, if, in the infinitude of his power and goodness, he bestows upon each of us the real substance of his own flesh and blood. He does this, in order to imprint deeply upon our hearts, that it was for the love of us, that he took them up; and for our benefit, that he laid them down. The character of his

life renders these inferences credible. The order of his mysteries disposes us to reverence them : whilst his own positive declarations forbid every doubt respecting their infallibility.

Neither were the protestants themselves insensible, that mere simple figures, and simple emblems, of the Body and Blood of Christ could not satisfy the piety of christians, who are familiarized to the mercies of God, who so really bestows himself upon them. For this reason, they do not like to be accused of denying, in their system of the Eucharist, a real and substantial participation, when they communicate, of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ. They, on the contrary, assert positively, as we do, that in sharing the holy mystery, they participate truly "*of his proper substance.*" (*Cat.*) They even say, in their confession of Faith, that "*Christ there feeds and enlivens us, by THE VERY SUBSTANCE of his Body and Blood.*" And conceiving, still farther, that it would not be sufficient to show us by a mere sign, that we have a share in his sacrifice, they, hence, expressly declare, that the Body of our Saviour, which is given to us, in the Eucharist, does really "*certify*" this blessing to us,—an expression, upon which, because it is remarkable, I shall, ere long, make a few observations.

It is therefore acknowledged by our protestant brethren, that the body and the blood of Jesus Christ are truly present in the sacred mysteries. The Calvinists themselves allow this. For, no doubt, "*what is communicated IN ITS PROPER SUBSTANCE,*" must, of course, be truly present. It is true, they explain this communication, by saying that it is made "*in spirit and by faith.*" But,

it is still true, that they maintain likewise that it is "*real*." And, because it is impossible to conceive how a body, which is communicated only "*in spirit, and by faith*," can yet be communicated "*really, and in its proper substance*," they have, for this reason, in the defence and explanation of a system, whose parts are so grossly inconsistent with each other, singularly wavered, and contradicted themselves. They have even been reduced to acknowledge two things, which can be true only in the supposition of the certainty of our catholic doctrines. The first of these is—that Jesus Christ is given to us in the Eucharist, in a way which is neither applicable to baptism, nor to the preaching of the gospel;—in a way, which is peculiar to this mystery. I shall remark, ere long, the consequence of this principle. But, first, let me observe how it is conceded to us by our adversaries.

It is not my intention to appeal here to the testimony of any particular theologian. I shall cite the words only of their own catechism, in the article wherein it explains what relates to the Eucharist. In this article, it is in the most positive terms asserted, that, in this mystery, Jesus Christ is given to us "*really, and in his proper substance*." Whereas, both in baptism, and in the gospel, although he be here truly communicated to us, "*yet, it is only in part, and not completely*." The consequence, therefore, is—that, in the Eucharist, He is given to us completely, and not in part.

There is, certainly, a very great difference between the circumstance of receiving "*in part*," and that of receiving "*completely*." If, therefore, upon all other occasions, Christ Jesus is but received "*in part*;" and it is only in the Eucha-

rist that he is received "*completely*"—if this be the fact, it, of course, even in the acknowledgment of our adversaries, must follow—that it is then, in the Eucharist, that the christian ought to seek for a participation, which is peculiar to this sacrament—a participation, which is not appropriate either to baptism or to preaching. At the same time, another consequence is, that such participation is not the fruit, or appendage, of faith; since faith, animating generally all the actions of the christian, extends equally to preaching, and to baptism, as it does to the action of communion.

In reality it is a very remarkable circumstance, that, notwithstanding the desire, which the protestants have manifested so often of placing baptism and preaching on an equality with the Eucharist—because "Jesus Christ is in them communicated truly to us"—yet they have never, in their catechisms, ventured to assert that in baptism and preaching, He is given to us "*in his proper substance,*" as he is given to us, they acknowledge, in the Holy Eucharist. For this reason, they felt the inconsistency of refusing to attribute to the Eucharist a manner of conferring Jesus Christ, peculiar to this sacrament; whilst also they were compelled to own that faith, which is diffused through all the actions of the faithful, could not be this peculiar manner. It is, indeed, manifest, that the peculiar manner of possessing Jesus Christ in the Eucharist ought, of course, to be real; since the sacrament, as the protestants allow, communicates "*really*" to us, even "*in its proper substance,*" the Body and the Blood of Jesus Christ. So that, in fact, from the very concessions of the protestants themselves, the conclusion is manifest, that

there is in the Eucharist a real manner of receiving the Body and Blood of our divine Redeemer, which is not the effect of faith. This is precisely the doctrine of catholicity.

The next thing, that the protestants admit, is again deduced from their own catechism, in the article immediately succeeding that which I have just been citing. In this article it is said, that "*the body of our Lord, Jesus, in as much as it was once offered up in sacrifice, in order to effect our reconciliation, is now given unto us, in order to certify to us that we have a share in this reconciliation.*"

Now, if the foregoing words have any kind of signification; if they be not an empty sound, or a mere illusion, their meaning is, that Jesus Christ, in order "to certify" to us that we share in his sacrifice, and in the benefit of our redemption, presents to us, not a symbol only, but his own real body. For, if the reception of the body of our Lord "certify" our participation in the fruits of his death, then must this participation, of course, be distinguished necessarily from the reception of his body; because thus the one is the pledge of the other. Wherefore, I remark still further, that, if the protestants be reduced to distinguish in the Eucharist between the participation of the body of Christ, and the participation in the fruit and grace of his sacrifice, the consequence must manifestly be, that therefore they distinguish likewise between the real participation of his sacred body, and that spiritual participation which is made by the means of faith. For, surely, this latter kind of participation can never be the principle of two distinct and separate actions; by one of which the christian receives the body of Christ; by the other,

the fruits of his sacrifice. Not even can any one conceive what real difference there can possibly exist between the participation "by faith" of the body of Christ, and the participation "by faith" of the fruits of his death. Hence, besides the communion, by which we participate spiritually of the body and spirit of Jesus Christ, on the occasions when we receive the fruits of his death—besides this communion, there is, moreover, another real communion of the body of this same Redeemer; a communion, which is a positive pledge of the security of the former; if, by the criminality of our dispositions, we do not counteract the influences of so great a blessing. This consequence is included necessarily in the principles which the protestants themselves acknowledge. And never will they explain this momentous truth in a way that is any thing like wise, and consistent, until they resume the sentiments of that church which they have so unhappily abandoned.

How very striking, therefore, is the force of truth! and what mind will not admire it! There is not a consequence, that results from the acknowledged principles of our dissenting brethren, but what is completely intelligible in the sentiments of the catholic church. The catholic—even the most unenlightened catholic—without the slenderest difficulty, understands that there is formed, by the medium of the Eucharist, a communion with Jesus Christ, which no other institution furnishes:—as he also easily understands this other circumstance—that "*the Body of Christ is given to us, in order to certify to us that we have a share in his sacrifice and his death.*" In like manner, the catholic knows how to make the clearest distinc-

tion between the two necessary methods of uniting ourselves to our divine Redeemer;—the one, by receiving his real Flesh; the other, by receiving his Spirit:—the former being established as the pledge and security of the latter. But these are objects that are inexplicable in the principles of our protestant brethren, although still they are unable to disavow them. Hence, we must conclude, that it is the illusions of error that have involved them in contradictions.

To me it has, indeed, been always a subject of surprise, that the ingenuity of the protestants has never yet furnished a more simple explanation of their doctrine relating to the Eucharist. For example, why have they not always, without so many quibbles and evasions, persisted in the simple declaration, that, since Christ Jesus was pleased to shed his blood for our salvation, he was pleased moreover to ordain that this effusion should be represented by the institution of two separate signs of his Body and his Blood?—that to these signs he has given the name of the thing itself?—and that they are, still farther, the pledges of our participation in the fruits of his death; and the assurances that we are spiritually nourished by the virtues of his Body and his Blood? After having laboured so indefatigably to prove that signs do receive the name of the thing, and that, consequently, the sign of the body might, with propriety, be called the body, it is to these two opinions that they ought, in consistency, and most naturally likewise, to have adhered.

In order to render these signs efficacious, the only requisite that was required, was simply this—that the grace of our redemption should be append-

ed to them ; or rather, according to the maxims of protestantism, that this grace should merely be confirmed to us by their means. It was entirely needless to perplex themselves, as our dissenting brethren have done, in the unmeaning endeavour to make us comprehend that we receive the very Body of our Saviour for the purpose solely of certifying to ourselves that we share in the benefits of his passion. In the sacrament of baptism, they deemed the water a sufficient sign of that blood which effaces iniquity : nor did they ever dream of asserting, that, in this institution, we receive “ the proper substance ” of the blood of Christ, for the purpose “ of certifying ” to us that its virtue is thereby imparted to us. How much less obscure, then, would their doctrine have been, had they reasoned in this same manner in relation to the Eucharist ! But, it is the general fate of innovators to be reduced to suppress, or conceal, much of what, frequently, they would wish to say. They meet, for ever, with established truths, and unvarying maxims, which, perplexing them, oblige them to do violence to their reason. Thus, the Arians would have been glad not to have given the name of “ God ” and “ Only Son ” to Jesus Christ. Thus, the Nestorians, in their writings, admitted with reluctance, in the same divine personage, an ill defined and imperfect kind of unity. Thus, the Pelagians, in like manner, who denied original sin, would also, with satisfaction, have denied that baptism ought to be administered to infants for the purpose of remitting their offences :—for, by this means, they would have got rid of the argument, which the catholics borrowed from this practice as another proof of the existence of original sin. But, the fact is, as I have just been remarking, that,

when men find a truth once forcibly established, they have not the hardihood, usually, to venture to overturn it wholly.

Let, then, the protestants own candidly the truth:—they were disposed, and would have been glad, to have admitted in the Eucharist the figure only of the body of Jesus Christ, with the real participation merely of his spirit;—leaving out those awful words, “*participation of his proper substance* ;” along with several others, which, expressing a real presence, serve only to embarrass them. To them, and to their prejudices, it would have been peculiarly pleasing not to have acknowledged in the Eucharist any other kind of communion with Jesus Christ, save that which is common to baptism and to preaching, without telling us, as they reluctantly have done, that, “*in this sacrament, men receive their Redeemer COMPLETELY ; whilst, in other institutions, they receive him BUT IN PART.*” However, although inclination prompted the suppression of this sort of language, yet did the words of Christ—so plain is their signification— forbid it. Instituting the holy mystery, Christ Jesus had said distinctly—*This is my Body : This is my Blood*—words which he never applied to any other object, nor used on any other occasion. And how, therefore, pretend, with any thing like consistency, to attach generally to all the actions of the christian what his word attaches formally, and positively, to an individual sacrament ? Moreover, the whole economy of the divine counsels ; the order of the mysteries, and doctrines, of the christian institute ; the design of Jesus in the establishment of the Eucharist ; even the very words which he made use of on the awful occasion, and the impression, which they are calculated naturally to

make upon the mind—all these are circumstances which convey no other idea than that of a real and substantial presence. It is upon these accounts, that our protestant adversaries have been compelled to have recourse to words, which, in sound at least, give some confused notions of this kind of reality. When men, as the catholics do, attach themselves completely to the principles of faith, or else, like the Socinians, obey only the guidance of human reason, in either of these two cases it is easy to establish a regular system, and to form a fixed and connected plan of doctrine. But when, as the protestants do, men form a compound of faith and reason—adopting a something of the principles of each—the consequence is, that they are for ever saying more than they would wish to say, and then falling into opinions, whose incoherency alone is the evidence of their falsehood.

Such as these have been the effects of the pretended Reformation ; God permitting them, it may be, for the purpose of facilitating to the protestant his return to the bosom of his parent-church—the only centre of real unity. For, since experience has now convinced our separated brethren, that, in order to speak the language of truth, they are necessarily reduced to speak as we do—ought they not, hence, in like manner, to conceive that, in order to understand the truth itself, they should judge of it likewise in the same way that we do ? In their creeds they cannot help remarking a great variety of expressions, which, unless they be interpreted in a catholic sense, present no meaning whatsoever. And is not this circumstance alone sufficient to convince them that it is merely in the catholic church that the depositum of revelation

subsists unaltered and unimpaired? Those terms and mutilated remnants of our catholic doctrines, which are interspersed here and there throughout all their catechisms—but which seem to beg, as it were, to be once more re-united to their parent-whole—these are objects which ought forcibly to urge every thoughtful protestant to seek, in the communion of our divine establishment, the complete explanation of what relates to the Holy Eucharist. I am, indeed, convinced that, if the perplexities of human reasonings did not confuse their faith, and render it too dependent upon the senses—I am convinced, if this were not the case, that there would be found very few who would not, with eagerness, measure back their steps to the paths of our happy sanctuary.—But, having thus pointed out the effects which ought to result from the exposition of the protestant doctrines, I shall hasten to complete the explanation of our own.

CHAP. XXIII.

ON TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

IT was proper, and consistent with the rules of the divine wisdom, as I have remarked already, that there should not exist in this mystery of faith, any thing that the mortal eye can penetrate, or that the human senses can discover. For this reason, there ought not, after the act of consecration, to appear any visible alteration in the qualities of the sacred elements. It is because we do not perceive such alteration; because we still trace the same appearances, and witness the same effects, that we sometimes, and in a certain sense, still call the sacrament by the name of the veils

which cover it. However, conducted by His all-powerful word, who does whatsoever he pleases, faith acknowledges in the divine mystery no other substance than that which this same word expresses—that is, the Real Body, and the Real Blood,*

* *John* vi. 51. “The bread, that I will give, is my flesh, for the life of the world.” Verse 55. “For, my flesh is meat indeed: and my blood is drink indeed.”

Matthew xxvi. 26, 27, 28. “Take ye, and eat: This is my body . . . Drink ye all of this: For, this is my blood of the new testament, which shall be shed for many, for the remission of sins.” See also, *Mark* xiv. 22, 23, 24; *Luke* xxii. 19, 20; *1 Corinthians* x. 16; xi. 23, 24, 25.

So natural a consequence of the real presence is transubstantiation, that, even the most inveterate enemies of our holy religion,—the Calvinists,—allow, that, if the former be admitted, the rejection of the latter is preposterous. “For,” say the ministers in the synod of Czenger, “as the rod of Moses was not changed into a serpent, but by transubstantiation; as water did not become blood in Egypt, or wine at Cana, without a change,—so in the Eucharist, bread cannot become the body of Christ, if it be not changed into his flesh, by losing the substance of bread.”—I could produce many similar attestations from the leading apostles, and ministers, of the Calvinistic community, who candidly and forcibly acknowledge, that transubstantiation is the necessary appendage of the real presence. “If,” says Beza, “men will take these words, **THIS IS MY BODY**, in their literal sense and without figure, it is impossible not to own that they establish transubstantiation.” (*De Cæna Domini*.)

For a considerable length of time,—even until the close of the reign of Charles I,—the divines of the church of England made, in general, very slender opposition to the doctrine of Transubstantiation. They, many of them, considered it as the most obvious method of accounting for the mystery of the Real Presence. What has chiefly contributed to introduce the aversion, with which men now view it, was the adoption of that barba-

of our Redeemer, Jesus Christ, into which the bread and wine are, by his power, miraculously converted. It is this mysterious change that now we express by the appropriate term—*Transubstantiation*.

Neither do the internal properties of the Eucharist prevent it from being, as to its external

rous act of policy, which declared our worship to be "idolatrous;" and compelled every individual bearing office, to swear solemnly that it is so. "In all disputes, relating to that mystery, before the civil wars, the Church of England Protestant writers owned the Real Presence, and only abstracted from the *Modus*, or manner of Christ's body being present in the Eucharist; and therefore, durst not say, but it might be there by transubstantiation, as well as by any other way. . . . It was only of late years, that such principles have crept into the Church of England, which having been blown into the Parliament House, have raised continual tumults about religion ever since. Those unlearned, and fanatical, notions were never heard of, till Dr. Stillingfleet's late invention of them, by which he exposed himself to the lash, not only of the Roman Catholics, but to many of the Church of England controvertists too." (*Life of James II.*)

"Many protestants," says Bishop Forbes, "deny too boldly, and too dangerously, that God can transubstantiate the bread into the Body of Christ. For my part, I approve of the opinion of the Wittemburg divines, who assert that the power of God is so great, that he can change the substance of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ." (*De Euch.*) Bishop Montague positively asserts, that a conversion takes place, by the power of the act of Consecration; and he cites the Fathers to confirm his opinion. "The Fathers," he says, "from age to age, attested the real and substantial presence in very high terms; and they styled it, conversion, transmutation, transformation, transelementation," &c. &c.

and sensible qualities, *a sign*. But, it is a sign of such nature, that, so far from excluding the reality, it on the contrary includes it necessarily; because these words, *This is my Body*, pronounced over the elements, which Christ Jesus had selected to be the matter of the holy sacrament, are a sure sign to us that He is really present under them. And, although, to the senses, things still appear as they had done—yet, *now*, since a superior has interfered, the mind forms a different judgment of their properties. Hence, notwithstanding that certain appearances, and a certain order of natural impressions made upon the body, are wont to point out to us the substances of bread and wine—still, the authority of Jesus, whose word cannot deceive us, is the cause why, *now*, those very same appearances begin to exhibit to us a substance that is completely different. Thus, do we not remark that the apostle says—*What we take, and what we eat, is His Body?* Such is, indeed, the authority of the divine word, that it permits us not to refer those external appearances to the substance of bread, but engages us to affix them to the Body of Jesus Christ, which is miraculously concealed beneath them. So that the presence of this adorable object being thus certified to us by this sign, we with piety bow down to worship it.

CHAP. XXIV.

ON THE ADORATION OF THE EUCHARIST.

RESPECTING the adoration of this sacrament, I shall here say very little. The reason is—because the most learned, and the wisest, of our protestant adversaries have, long since, admitted that

its adoration is but the natural and the necessary consequence of the presence of Christ Jesus in this mystery.*

It is our belief, moreover, and a belief, which is manifestly wise—that, since the omnipotent words of our Redeemer operate whatsoever they announce,—they, hence, produced their effect, in the Last Supper, the same instant in which they were uttered. The necessary consequence again, of this, is—that therefore we admit the real presence of the body of Jesus before the act of its participation.†

* “If Jesus Christ,” says Calvin, “he present in the Eucharist, then, no doubt, it is necessary there to adore Him.” (*Contra Heshusium.*) Beza is even quite indignant with this said Heshusius; and calls him very politely, “an ass,” for having denied the obligation of adoring the Eucharist, on the supposition of the real presence.

“The sounder protestants,” says Bishop Forbes, “make no difficulty about adoring Christ in the Eucharist. It is a very monstrous error of certain rigid protestants to deny, that Christ is to be adored in the Eucharist, by any adoration, except that of the mind.” (*De Euch.*)

“With Saint Ambrose,” adds Bishop Andrews, “I also adore the flesh of Christ in the Eucharist.” (*Resp. ad Bellarm.*)

† The words of Christ—“This is my Body; This is my Blood”—were true the moment in which he pronounced them. Consequently, his Body and Blood must have been present before the apostles either eat the adorable food, or drank of the heavenly cup. No inference can be more manifest. And for this reason, Luther himself decided,—that, “in the mass, Christ ought to be acknowledged as present, from the beginning of the Lord's prayer to the end of the communion”—an inter-

CHAP. XXV.

ON THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS.

THE mystery of the real presence, and that of transubstantiation, once established and admitted, there is hardly any further difficulty in establishing likewise, or admitting, the divinity of that great Sacrifice in which the holy Victim is offered up.*

val which, when the communicants are numerous, and the service solemn, includes, frequently, the space of an hour, or more. Now, if it be owned, that Christ is thus present, for an hour—why should it not be admitted that he may be present for a day, a week, a year? We have the plainest attestation of the divine word to prove his presence. We have not a syllable to prove, or even to insinuate, his absence.

* *Malachy* i. 10, 11. "I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord of hosts; neither will I accept an offering at your hand. For, from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense shall be offered to my name, AND A CLEAN OFFERING."

Matthew xxvi. 28. "This is my Blood of the New-Testament, which is SHED for many, for the remission of sins."

Mark xiv. 24. "This is my Blood of the New-Testament, which is SHED for many."

Luke xxii. 19. "This is my Body, which is GIVEN for you. Do this for a commemoration of me."

Luke xxii. 20. "This is the chalice of the New-Testament in my Blood, which is SHED for you."

1 Corinthians xi. 24, 25. "This is my Body, which is BROKEN for you. Do this for a commemoration of me. This chalice is the New Testament in my Blood: Do

In the mystery of the Eucharist, I have already taken notice of two actions, which are really distinct, although the one bears a relation to the

you this, as often as you shall drink it, for the commemoration of me."

In these words of our Redeemer, reported by the apostles, there is manifestly question, in the first place, of an oblation, or *immolation*, by the actual effusion of blood, for the remission of sin; and, in the next place, of the *perpetuation* of this oblation to the end of time,—expressed by the command, "Do this for a commemoration of me." Hence, we find, that the apostles were assiduous in offering up the holy sacrifice. "And as they were *sacrificing* to the Lord, and *fasting*, the Holy Ghost said to them," (*Acts* xiii. 2.) "The chalice of benediction, which we bless, is it not the communion of the Blood of Christ? And the bread, which we break, is it not the partaking of the Body of the Lord?" (*1 Cor.* x. 16.)

Instead of producing the testimonies of the Fathers, which invincibly prove that these holy men all cultivated and adored the sacrifice of the mass, precisely as the catholic does at present—instead of producing such testimonies, I will cite—which perhaps is better—the acknowledgments of our protestant adversaries respecting the opinion of these enlightened personages.

"It is certain," says Dr. Grabe, in his Notes on St. Irenæus, "that Irenæus, and all the fathers, either contemporary with the apostles, or their successors, whose works are still extant, considered the blessed sacrament to be the sacrifice of the new law. And this was not the private opinion of any particular church, but the public doctrine, and practice, of the universal church; which she received from the apostles, and the apostles from Jesus Christ."

The Centuriators make frequently the same concession, at the same time condemning the opinion which they describe. "Saint Irenæus," they say, "taught

other. The former is the action of *consecration*, by which the bread and the wine are converted into the Body and the Blood of Christ; the latter is the *manducation*, by which we participate of the sacred food.

In the consecration, the Body and the Blood are mystically separated from each other; because Christ Jesus had separately said—*This is My Body: This is My Blood*—a circumstance, which presents to us a very lively, and an efficacious, representation of the violence of that death which he was pleased to endure for our salvation.

Thus, by the power of these words, the Son of God lies revealed upon the altar, clothed in those symbols which represent his death. Such is the

the new oblation of the new testament, which the church, having received from the apostles, offers up to God throughout the world." (*Cent. 2.*) "Saint Cyprian," they add, "says, that the priest performs the function of the vicar of Jesus Christ; and that a sacrifice is offered up to God the Father." (*Cent. 3.*) "Tertulian," they also complain, "makes frequent mention of oblations for the dead." (*Cent. 4.*) "Ambrose," they angrily own, "makes use of the very terms, which we do,—*to celebrate mass; to offer; to offer sacrifice,*" &c. (*Cent. 5.*)

Even Luther himself, although he rejects the mass, still cites, in his letter to our Henry, the passages of the Fathers, attesting their veneration for it. But, the daring innovator triumphantly adds:—"What care I for a thousand Austins, or a thousand Cyprians," &c.

"We are wrongly accused," says the Confession of Augsburg, "of having abolished the mass. We have always continued, and celebrated it, with great respect." (*Art. xxii.*)

efficacy of the solemn act of consecration. This sacred act is, moreover, a tribute of acknowledgment offered up to God's sovereign majesty ; in as much as, by it, Jesus Christ, who is here personally present, renews, in some respect, and perpetuates, the memorial of his own obedience even to the death of the cross. So that, in fact, there is nothing wanting to render it a real and perfect sacrifice.

Neither can it be doubted, that this holy action, although considered separately from that of the manducation, is, of itself, peculiarly pleasing to the Almighty, and calculated powerfully to induce Him to look down with an eye of pity upon the distress of his creatures. It thus replaces before him the voluntary death, which this Beloved Son underwent for the sake of sinners : or rather, it thus replaces before Him, this Beloved Son Himself, under the emblems of that death, by which, once, his indignation was appeased.

The mere circumstance of the presence of Christ Jesus upon the altar, is, itself, as every christian must acknowledge, a kind of intercession, extremely powerful with God, in favour of mankind,—according to that saying of Saint Paul, *Christ presents himself ; and appears in the presence of God in our behalf.* (Heb. ix.) It is, therefore, our belief, that our benevolent Redeemer, present upon our altars under the symbols of death, intercedes there for us, and presents, there continually for us to his Eternal Father, that death which he once suffered for the sanctification of his church.

It is in this sense that, speaking of the Eucharistic sacrifice, we say that Jesus Christ therein

offers himself up to God in our behalf ; and it is thus that we believe that the holy oblation disposes the divine goodness to be the more kind and propitious to us. Hence it is, that we give it the name of *propitiatory*.

When, indeed, we consider what our Redeemer has done for us in this mystery ; and when we contemplate him actually present upon the Holy Table, with all the marks of death imprinted on him—we, of course, seeing him in this striking situation, endeavour to unite ourselves in affection to him ; we offer him up to the Eternal Father, as our only victim, and propitiation ; protesting that, except Him, and the infinite merits of His death, we have nothing worthy to be presented at the throne of the Almighty. It is by this sacred oblation that we sanctify all our prayers ; and whilst we offer it to the divine Majesty, we also, at the same time, united to it, offer ourselves, through it, as so many living victims before his throne.

Such is the character of our christian sacrifice, a sacrifice exceedingly different from the sacrifices of the Jewish law ; a sacrifice, spiritual and worthy of the sanctity of the new alliance ; a sacrifice, in which the victim is seen only by the eye of faith ; in which the word is the sword that mystically separates the Body and the Blood ; and in which, consequently, the blood is shed, but mysteriously, and death exhibited only as a memorial ; a sacrifice, however, that is truly real, because Jesus Christ is really therein contained, and really in it, under these symbols of his passion, offered up to his Eternal Father ; a sacrifice still of *commemoration*, which, so far from detaching us, as the protestant pretends it does, from the sacrifice of the cross,

does, on the contrary, by all this variety of circumstance, attach us even the more forcibly to it; because, not only is the former, in our belief, referred wholly to the latter, but it subsists solely by this relation, and from it derives the whole of its sacred efficacy.

Such is the express doctrine of the Catholic church; inculcated to the faithful by the council of Trent. *The sacrifice of the Mass, says the holy Synod, was established, in order to represent that which was once accomplished upon the cross; to perpetuate its memorial to the end of ages; and to apply to our souls its salutary virtues for the remission of those sins which we every day commit.* (Sess. xxii.) Far, therefore, from believing that the sacrifice of the cross was incomplete, the church, on the contrary, believes it to have been so perfect, and so fully satisfactory, that every subsequent institution of religion is but designed to commemorate it, and to apply its sanctifying influences to the souls of men.

In like manner, and for the reasons just assigned, the Catholic church professes that the whole merit of our redemption is attached to the death of the Son of God. The protestant might, indeed, easily understand, even from the few principles which I have been explaining, that when, in the celebration of our sacred mysteries, we say to God, "*We offer up to Thee this holy sacrifice,*" we do not pretend, by such oblation, to offer up to him a fresh price, or another ransom, for our salvation. Our only intention is, to present to the Eternal Father the merits of his divine Son, and that infinite price, which, for the love of us, the beneficent Being once paid upon the cross.

Our dissenting brethren, the protestants, do not conceive that they give any kind of offence to their Redeemer, when they offer him up to God, as he is present to their faith. Therefore, if they believe that he is present in reality, what objection can they seriously pretend to make, or what reasonable repugnance could they have, to the action of offering him up, when thus effectually present? It is, consequently—if men were but reasonable and candid—it is to the article merely of the real presence that the whole controversy between the catholic and the protestant, upon the subject of the Eucharist, ought properly to be reduced.

If, indeed, the truths which I have just laid down, were but wisely understood by the enemies of our religion, they would be sensible how false are the notions, and how ill-founded the opinions, which, hitherto, they have entertained of the sacrifice of our altars. They would—if thus wisely instructed—own that the catholic does not, as they now accuse him of doing, pretend to set up a new scheme of propitiation, in order, anew, as if the sacrifice of the cross were insufficient, to appease the divine displeasure; or else—as if it were imperfect—to add some supplement to the price of our redemption. Not one of these imputations would be considered—did men judge only from our real doctrines—to have any foundation whatever. For, according to our real doctrines, the whole that is done at our altars, and in our sacrifice, is done, as I have been explaining it, in the mere form of intercession and by the way of application.

CHAP. XXVI.

ON THE OBJECTIONS MADE TO THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS, DERIVED FROM THE EPISTLE TO THE HEBREWS.

THE explanation, which I have given in the preceding chapter, is sufficient, if it be seriously considered, to refute those objections which are sometimes urged against us from the Epistle to the Hebrews; and to evince, at the same time, the emptiness of those accusations, which, upon the alleged authority of the same Epistle, reproach us with the crime of setting aside, and even annihilating, the sacrifice of the cross. But, since the best proof, which reason can suggest, that any two doctrines are not at variance with each other, is the evidence, that none of the propositions, relating to the one, are repugnant to the propositions belonging to the other—I shall hence proceed to explain, in a very cursory manner, the doctrine of Saint Paul in his Epistle to the Hebrews.

The intention, therefore, and the plan of the apostle in the above epistle, are to make us sensible that the sinner could not escape death, except upon the express condition of substituting some other person to undergo the awful sentence in his stead;—that, whilst men substituted, in room of themselves, the oblations only of slaughtered animals, their sacrifices, in such cases, were very little else than public declarations that it was themselves who deserved to die;—that, since so inadequate an exchange was insufficient to satisfy

the severity of eternal justice, men, upon this account, were compelled to renew daily the sacrifices of fresh victims; (this latter circumstance is, no doubt, a plain attestation of the insufficiency of the legal substitutions)—but, that, since Christ Jesus has been mercifully pleased to lay down His life, in the room of sinners—satisfied by the voluntary substitution of so great a victim—God does not now demand any thing from man, which ought, any way, to be considered as the price of his reconciliation. Such, in his Epistle to the Hebrews, are the principles of the apostle. From them he concludes—not only that, after Jesus Christ, no other victim ought to be immolated, but that even Jesus Christ himself ought only to be immolated once under the bleeding forms of death.

Let the reader, therefore, who, loving his own salvation, is also the friend of truth—let him recall to his remembrance the maxims, which I have laid down, respecting the manner in which this beneficent Redeemer offered himself to his Eternal Father in our behalf, in the mystery of our altars. Not a single proposition, I am fully convinced, will he discover amid those maxims, that would seem, I do not say to contradict, but even to weaken, any one of the principles which I have just cited from the apostle. So that the only objection, founded upon this Epistle, which, with any thing like plausibility, could be urged against us, must repose upon the silence of the sacred document. But, surely, the man, who reflects attentively upon the characters of the divine wisdom, in the dispensation of its secrets, throughout the different books of the sacred scriptures—surely, such man will

not pretend to restrict our instruction, or information, respecting the mystery of the Holy Eucharist; to the mere Epistle to the Hebrews; particularly, since the subject is even foreign, or at least unnecessary, to this Epistle. For, the aim of the apostle in it is to explain the perfection, simply, of the sacrifice of the Cross; and not those various expedients which the divine goodness has instituted as the mediums of its application.

If, indeed, (I make this remark in order to prevent all equivocation,) if the word, "*offer*," be understood, in this epistle, as implying the actual death of the victim—then I allow it to be true, that, in such case, Jesus Christ is neither offered up any longer in the Eucharist, nor even on any other occasion whatsoever. But, the fact is, that, in different parts of the sacred writings, the word "*offer*" has a much more extensive signification. Often it is said, that we offer to God whatever we present before him. And the church, which regulates its language, as well as its doctrine, not by the mere Epistle to the Hebrews, but by the entire body of the sacred scriptures, does not hesitate to say, that Christ Jesus offers himself to God whenever, presenting himself before his Majesty, he appears there in behalf of men:—consequently, that he offers himself likewise in the sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist. This, is, indeed, an expression that is general in the writings of the Fathers.

Neither can it, with any semblance of reason, be objected that the manner, in which Jesus presents himself in the Eucharist to his Eternal Father, can possibly be any injury to the sacrifice of

the Cross. Such conclusion is repugnant to the whole tenor of the sacred scriptures, and, above all, to the Epistle which is here made the source of objection to our doctrines. For, by a similar mode of reasoning, it would, in this case, be necessary to conclude, that when Christ Jesus, "*entering to the world,*" (Heb. x. 5.) offered himself to God, in the room of those victims, "*which pleased him not;*"—he, consequently, did an injury also to that oblation, which, subsequently, he made upon the cross. It would be necessary, even, in this case, to conclude that, when "*he continues to appear before God in our behalf,*" he lessens the value of that sacred offering, "*by which, once, he appeared to put away sin, by the sacrifice of himself;*" (Heb. ix. 26.) and that, "*ceasing not to intercede for us,*" (vii. 25.) himself, equivalently deems inadequate, and accuses of insufficiency, that pious intercession which he made at his death, "*with strong crying, and tears.*" (Heb. v. 7.)

Now, the truth is, that inferences such as these are not only false; they are absolutely absurd. And the consequence therefore is, that although Jesus Christ has offered himself once to be the humble victim to the justice of his Father, still he does not, for this reason, cease to offer himself, yet in behalf of his creatures. The infinite perfection of the sacrifice of the cross consists in this—that whatsoever precedes, as well as whatsoever follows it—all relates, and should be referred, entirely to it;—that, just as what precedes it, is the preparation for it, just so, what follows it, is its consummation and application; that the payment, indeed, of our redemption is not now any more reiterated; but, that what applies this redemption is

perpetuated constantly; in short, that it is necessary to know how to make a distinction between those things which are repeated as imperfect, and those which are continued as necessary and perfect.

CHAP. XXVII.

REFLECTIONS ON THE FOREGOING DOCTRINE.

I SHALL pause here a moment, to request my dissenting brethren to make a few serious reflections upon the maxims, which I have been suggesting to them, on the subject of the Holy Eucharist.

The essential basis of our doctrine, respecting this adorable mystery, is the real presence. This, too, is the basis which forms the chief foundation of our contests with many of the protestant, but in particular with the calvinistic, societies. The controversy is peculiarly important, since it relates to the presence of Jesus Christ himself. It is important, because there is no mystery of religion that appears more perplexing to the faith of our adversaries, nor any upon which they are more completely at variance with us.

In most of the disputes which we are unhappily obliged to maintain with our protestant brethren, when the good sense of the latter permits or induces them to listen to us with moderation, they are always sure to find that their difficulties are softened down, and that, hitherto, they have been much more offended, and hurt, at the sound of words, than at the reality of things. But, on the article of the Eucharist, the contrary is the fact.

Upon this article the catholic and the protestant most strikingly agree in their forms of language ;—the latter, exactly like the former, employing the terms “*real participation*,” along with a great variety of expressions similar to this. However, when we proceed to explain the intrinsic properties of our respective tenets, the more we do so, the more we are found to differ. And the reason is, because the protestant is not willing to admit all the consequences of those truths which he professes to acknowledge ;—disconcerted, and perhaps even shocked, as I before remarked, at the difficulties which his senses and the pride of the human mind affect, in such consequences, to have detected.

It is, therefore, unfortunately too true, that although the article of the Eucharist be perhaps the most important, it is also, at the same time, the most perplexing of all our religious controversies ; and that wherein the catholic and the protestant are most decidedly at variance with each other.

It has, however, pleased the divine wisdom to permit, that one, and perhaps the largest, portion of the protestant community—the Lutherans—should still continue as firmly attached to the belief of the Real Presence, as is the catholic church itself. Neither is this all ; for, the same providence has permitted, likewise, that even the Calvinistic sects should have decided, and formally declared, that the above doctrine of the Real Presence is completely inoffensive ; or, to use their own expression, “*devoid of venom* ;” that it does not destroy the foundations, either of salvation, or of faith ; and finally, that it ought not to cause

any breach of communion between the members of the reformed societies.

Here, then, let the protestant, who feels any serious interest for the security of his salvation, be all attention to the wonderful ways of Providence ; ways, which are doubtlessly designed to call back the wanderer to the paths of truth, and to reconduct him insensibly to the bosom of his parent-church. As for all other subjects, which serve sometimes to excite the complaints of our protestant brethren, these, by the means of a little explanation, it would be easy, if not wholly, to set aside—at all events, to reduce them to little or no difficulty whatsoever. But, upon the subject of the Eucharist, a subject which could not thus easily be adjusted, the reformers themselves, very fortunately, have removed the most serious obstacle ; having positively declared, that there is nothing in the doctrine of the Real Presence, that is either injurious to salvation, or repugnant to the fundamental principles of the true religion.

It is true that the Lutherans, whilst they agree with us in the fundamental doctrine of the Real Presence, do not still, along with us, acknowledge all the consequences of this doctrine. They suppose that the bread and the body of Christ are joined together. Some of them condemn the action of adoring the holy sacrament ; and it is in its actual participation only that they seem to acknowledge the real presence of their Redeemer. But, surely, it is not the subtilty of a few artful theologians, that ought to induce any reasonable individual to believe that, where men admit and defend the Real Presence, they ought not likewise to admit its consequences ; for, com-

paring objects together, the former is more important, and even more difficult to be conceived, than the latter.

Neither is this the only thing that the goodness of Providence has permitted. For, labouring by secret artifices to recall the protestant once more to the fold, from which he has gone astray, and laying the foundations of peace and reconciliation, even amid the bitterness of animosity, and the violences of contention, the divine mercy has still further so ordained it, that the calvinistic societies should, all of them, have acknowledged, and publicly attested, that, on the supposition that the words of the institution, *This is my Body*, ought to be taken literally: the catholics, in this case, reason far better, and draw their conclusions with much more consistency, than do their own Lutheran brethren.*

I shall not repeat—neither is it necessary—the various passages which many authors have so often cited upon this subject. With the exception, indeed, of those individuals, whose minds are fast

* Both the language, and belief, of the Lutherans, respecting the real presence, are, in my opinion, more preposterous than those of the papists. *Calvin. (Amonit. Ult. ad Westphal.)*

I assert, that the Papists, understanding as they do, the words, **THIS IS MY BODY**, without any figure, believe that the divinity follows the body by concomitance, with much greater reason, than you Lutherans do, who, denying the words of concomitance, still retain the sense of it. *Zuinglius. (De Cæna.)*

The dogma of consubstantiation is farther removed from the words of Christ, than that of transubstantiation; whether we consider the letter, or the sense, of these words. *Hospinian. (Hist. Sacram.)*

chained to prejudice, there are few men so unenlightened, or so illiberal, as not to own that, if once the Real Presence be admitted, then are the catholic tenets, of all others, the most rational and the most consistent.

It is, consequently, an established truth, that the catholic doctrine concerning the Holy Eucharist contains, and inculcates, nothing, *except the Real Presence, PROPERLY UNDERSTOOD*. However, it is true, we do not stop here. We deduce inferences from the circumstance of the Real Presence. But we request the protestant to consider, that, neither in these inferences, nor in our explanations of the divine mysteries, do we employ any other maxims besides these which are necessarily included in the fact of the Real Presence.

Should it then be asked why the Lutherans, believing as they do in the Real Presence, refuse still to admit our sacrifice—which, according to us, is its obvious result—our answer, compressed into one word, is this—that our tenets respecting the Eucharistic sacrifice ought to be ranked amongst those other consequences of the real presence which the Lutherans have not comprehended, and which we, in the opinion even of the calvinists, have penetrated more rationally than they have done.

But, if our catholic explanations be sufficient to convince the calvinist, that our doctrine concerning the Eucharistic sacrifice is included virtually in that of the Real Presence, he ought, in such case, to see, moreover, and to acknowledge, that then the grand dispute respecting the Mass—a dispute, which has filled volumes, and given occasion to so much rancour—should henceforth be

abandoned, and expunged from the rolls of controversy. In fact, in this case, the chief difficulty is done away : and, what is still more important, this holy sacrifice, for which the protestants entertain so decided an aversion, becomes the necessary consequence, and the natural explanation, of a doctrine which, even by their own confession, "*is devoid of venom.*" Let the adversaries, therefore, of our divine religion look well into their own hearts ; and, placed piously in the presence of God, let them examine seriously, whether indeed they have all that reason which they flatter themselves they have, for having abandoned those sacred altars where their forefathers, for so many ages, used to feed on the Bread of Life.

CHAP. XXVIII.

ON COMMUNION UNDER BOTH KINDS.

ANOTHER consequence, which results from our doctrine concerning the Real Presence, and which, also, it would be wrong to pass over without notice, is the following :—that, since Christ is really present in this holy sacrament, it is not to the sensible elements, which clothe it, that grace and benediction are appended, but to the proper substance of His living and life-giving Flesh ; because it is to this that the Divinity is united. On this account, whoever believes in the mystery of the Real Presence, ought not to make any difficulty respecting the circumstance of receiving under one kind only.* Because, under one kind, he receives what-

* *John* vi. 50, 51. "This is the Bread descending from heaven ; that, if any man eateth thereof, he may not

ever is essential to the character of the sacrament. He receives wholly, and without any partition, Him, who alone can replenish all the vast capaciousness of the human heart; and he receives Him, too, with a plenitude the more certain, as the separation of the body and the blood is not real, but, as I have observed before, mysterious.

Behold, therefore, the wise and strong foundation, upon which the church, in her interpretation

die. . . If any man eat of this Bread, he shall live for ever. . . He, that eateth this Bread shall live for ever." (V. 58.)

Luke xxiv. 30, 31. "And it came to pass, whilst he sat at table with them, he took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to them. And their eyes were opened; and they knew him."

Acts ii. 42. "And they were persevering in the doctrine of the apostles; and in the communication of the breaking of bread; and prayer."

Acts xx. 7. "And, on the first day of the week, when the disciples came together to break bread."

1 *Corinthians* xi. 27. "Wherefore, whosoever shall eat this Bread, or drink this Cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord."

"Although," says Luther, "it may be well to use both kinds in the sacrament, yet has Christ commanded nothing on the subject, as necessary." (*Ep. ad Bohem.*)

"They sin not," the pretended reformer adds, "who use but one kind; Christ having left this to the choice of each one. (*Capt. Bab.*)

"They sin not," says Melancthon, "who use either kind." (*Hist. Sac.*)

There are, in like manner, many of the most distinguished English theologians, who speak the same sort of language; asserting that Christ never ordained the use of communion under both species; and that therefore its participation, under both species, is not essential. Such is the doctrine of Montague, Forbes, White, &c. &c.

of the precept of communion, has declared, that the faithful may reap every benefit of sanctification; which the sacrament administers, through the medium of one kind only. If her wisdom have thought proper to confine the laity solely to one kind, it was not by any means her design to do so out of contempt or from disregard, for the other. On the contrary, she did so, out of a principle of veneration, in order to prevent those irreverences which the confusion and negligence of the public had too often created, above all, in these latter ages. But she reserves to herself still the power of re-establishing the use of communion under both of the species, whenever she conceives that this form of discipline may be eventually beneficial to the peace and unity of the christian public.

Our catholic theologians have demonstrated to their protestant antagonists, that themselves have very frequently made use of interpretations, in relation to the sacraments, very similar to the foregoing. The interpretation, in particular, is remarkable, which is contained in the twelfth chapter of their book of discipline, in the seventh article, under the title of the Lord's Supper. In this they say :—*The BREAD of the Lord's Supper ought to be administered to those who cannot drink wine, upon their making a protestation, that it is not done out of contempt ; and on endeavouring to do the best they can—even applying the cup close to their mouths, in order to prevent all scandal.* The inference, which this regulation presents, is manifest. It is that these teachers of protestantism did not, therefore, conceive that, by the institution of Jesus Christ, the participation of both kinds is essential

to the action of communion. For, if such were the case, then the sacrament ought to be absolutely withheld from all those who cannot receive it entirely. It should not be administered in a way which is repugnant to that which its divine Author had established and commanded. The inability of receiving it would, in such case, justify its omission. But, the truth is, these pretended reformers felt that the severity would be excessive, should they refuse to administer the sacrament, under one kind at least, to those who were incapable of receiving it under both. And since their condescension upon this point is not founded upon any authority of the scriptures, the consequence is, that they are reduced to admit, with us, that the words, in which Christ Jesus proposes the two kinds to us, are subject to some sort of interpretation, and that it is even by the judgment of the church that such interpretation ought necessarily to be conducted.

It may, however, possibly be imagined, that the point of discipline, which I have just been citing, and which was instituted by the synod of Poitiers, in the year 1560, was reformed, and altered, by that of Verteuil, in the year 1567; wherein it was ordained that, "*It is not the opinion of the society, that the bread ought to be administered to those who will not receive the cup.*" But, not even spite of this decision, are the two synods at variance with each other. That of Verteuil speaks of those only, "WHO WILL NOT receive the cup." That of Poitiers speaks of those "WHO CANNOT." In reality, notwithstanding the decision of the synod of Verteuil, the article of Poitiers forms still a part of the protestant code of discipline; and has even

been approved by another synod posterior to that of Verteuil—the synod of Rochelle, holden in 1571 ; when the article was revised, and confirmed in the form just cited.

But, had it even happened that the protestant synods had varied in their sentiments upon this question, the circumstance would tend merely to demonstrate this—that the object is not a point of faith, but a point which, according to their own principles, the church may, in its wisdom, either alter or improve, precisely as occasions and circumstances may seem to dictate or require.

CHAP. XXIX.

ON SCRIPTURE AND TRADITION.

THE only articles which, after the foregoing explanations, I have yet to discuss, are the opinions which we entertain respecting the word of God and the authority of the church.

Christ Jesus laid the foundations of his church upon the authority of preaching. And the consequence, therefore, is—that the unwritten word was the first rule of christianity,*—a rule which,

* *Matthew* xxviii, 19, 20. “Go you, therefore, and **TEACH** all nations ; baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost : **TEACHING** them to observe all things, whatsoever I have commanded you.”

Mark xvi. 15. “Go into the whole world ; and **PREACH** the gospel to every creature.”

1 Corinthians xi. 23. “For, I have received of the Lord, that, which also I have **DELIVERED** to you.”

1 Corinthians xv. 3. “For, I **DELIVERED** to you, first of all, that, which I also received.”

even when the books of the New Testament were superadded to it, did not, upon this account, lose any share of its former authority. For this reason it is, that we receive, with an equal degree of veneration, whatsoever has been taught by the apostles; whether this were communicated by writing, or inculcated only by word of mouth,*—

* *2 Thessalonians* iii. 6. "And we charge you, brethren, in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, that you withdraw yourselves from every brother walking disorderly; and not according to the TRADITION, which they have received from us."

1 Corinthians xi. 2. "Now, I praise you, brethren, that . . . you keep my ordinances, as I DELIVERED them to you."

2 Timothy i. 13. "Hold the form of sound words, which thou hast HEARD of me in faith."

2 Timothy ii. 2. "The things which thou hast HEARD of me, before many witnesses, the same commend to faithful men, who shall be fit to TEACH others also."

There is not, indeed, any where in the scriptures, a syllable to be found, that would seem to intimate that Christ ever commanded his disciples to compose a code of faith, much less a complete code, for the direction of his subjects:—not a word to attest that the writings of the apostles are a code of the above description; not a line to prove, in the eye at least of wisdom, that it is the privilege of each individual to interpret the sacred volumes, and to cull from them, as he judges right, the articles of his belief. The obscurity alone of the holy Books is a plain demonstration, that they were neither designed by the divine wisdom to be an ordinary code of faith, nor to be subjected to the notions of private interpretation. Indeed, not even do they contain the whole depositum of the christian faith. Bishop Montague, although a protestant, declares that "there are

according to the express declaration of Saint Paul to the Thessalonians, commanding them *to hold fast the traditions, which they had been taught, whether BY WORD, or by epistle.* (2 Thess. ii. 15.)

There cannot, indeed, exist a sign more indisputably certain, that any peculiar doctrine derives its origin, and has descended down to us, from the apostles, than when it has been embraced by all the churches of the christian world, without the possibility of pointing out any fixed period of its introduction. We cannot help receiving whatever is established in this manner. We do it even with that willing submission which is due, we feel, to the divine authority. Indeed, I am convinced that the protestants themselves, where their reason is not warped, and rendered obstinate by prejudice, entertain, at the bottom of their hearts, the very same opinion; for, it is impossible to imagine, that any tenet, which has been admitted since the dawn itself of christianity, could really have derived its origin from any other source, save that of the apostles. Hence, the protestant ought not to be astonished that the catholic—careful to collect, and retain, whatever his forefathers have bequeathed unto him—preserves with veneration the holy depositum of tradition, just as, with piety, he reveres the sacred treasure of the scriptures.

six hundred particulars, instituted by God in the point of Religion, commanded and used by the church, of which, we own, that the scripture delivers, or teaches, no such thing." (*Orig.*) At all events, it is certain, that the protestant believes, and cultivates, several things—for example, the institution of the Sunday; infant baptism, &c.—for which he has no authority in the texts of the sacred volumes.

CHAP. XXX.

ON THE AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH.

THE church has been established by the power and wisdom of its sacred Author, in order to be the guide of christian faith, the director of christian piety, the guardian of the scriptures, and the preserver of tradition,* We, therefore, receive from her hands those holy writings, which we reverence, as canonical. I am even convinced—spite of the contrary assertion—that it is her authority, principally, that induces the protestant himself to

* *Matthew* xxviii. 18, 19. “All power is given to me, in heaven, and on earth. Go, you, therefore, and teach all nations.”

Matthew xviii. 17. “And if he will not hear them, tell the church. And if he will not hear the church, let him be to thee as the heathen and the publican.”

Mark xvi. 15, “Go into the whole world; and preach the Gospel to every creature.”

Luke x. 16. “He, that heareth you, heareth me; and he, that despiseth you, despiseth me; and he, that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me.”

Romans x. 17, 18. “Faith, then, cometh by hearing; and hearing by the word of Christ. But, I say, have they not heard? Yea, verily, their sound hath gone forth into all the earth; and their words unto the ends of the whole world.”

1 *Corinthians* xii. 28, 29. “And God indeed hath set some in the church; first, apostles; secondly, prophets; thirdly, teachers. . . . Are all apostles? Are all prophets? Are all teachers?”

1 *John* iv. 6. “He, that knoweth God, heareth us. He, that is not of God, heareth us not. By this we know the spirit of truth, and the spirit of error.”

receive, as inspired, several portions of the holy volumes. It is hence, that he admits, as divine, the Canticle of Canticles, or Song of Solomon, which, in fact, possesses hardly any intrinsic marks of inspiration;—hence, that he reveres the Epistle of Saint James, which Luther rejects as spurious; hence, that he respects the Epistle of St. Jude, whose authority, on account of certain apocryphal books which are quoted in it, might, to many, appear suspicious. But, in short, it is not, it cannot be, upon any other authority, in reality, that the protestant receives, as inspired, the whole body of the sacred scriptures. For, it is his custom to reverence these, even before their perusal has convinced him, that the spirit of God is infused into them.

Attached, therefore, as we inseparably are, to the holy authority of the church, by the means of the scriptures which we receive from her hands,—we from her learn likewise the doctrines of tradition, and, by means of tradition, the genuine sense of the sacred pages. It is for this reason that the church professes to teach nothing, as from herself; nor to invent any new article of belief. What alone she does, is under the influence and direction of the Holy Ghost, simply to declare the divine revelation, and, after having declared, to follow it.

And that the Holy Ghost does really explain himself by the mouth of the church—of this, we have a positive evidence on the occasion, of the dispute which, in the time of the apostles, took place respecting the ceremonies of the Law. The acts of these founders of our holy institute, in the decision of this important controversy, form a

record which instructs all succeeding ages where that authority resides, by which all religious differences ought always to be determined. So that, whenever any dispute shall unhappily occur to divide the faithful; the church, upon such occasion, will always interfere with her authority: and her pastors, convened in council, will always, in imitation of the apostles, say—“*It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us.*” (Acts xv.) When she has spoken in this manner, then shall her children be instructed and made to understand, that now it is no longer theirs to examine anew the articles which have been thus decided, but, in humble acquiescence, to submit to her decrees. This is merely imitating the examples of St. Paul and Silas, who, when they carried to the faithful the first ordinance of the apostles, so far from allowing them any fresh discussion of the point, which had been just decided, they, on the contrary, *went through the provinces, teaching all to observe the injunctions of the apostles.* (Acts xvi.)

Thus it is that the true children of God, with humble acquiescence, submit their judgments to the wiser judgment of the church, convinced that, by her mouth, they hear delivered to them the oracles of the Holy Ghost. It is in consequence of this conviction, that, after having said in the Creed, *I believe in the Holy Ghost*, we immediately add, *And in the holy catholic church*;—tying ourselves, by these words, to acknowledge that the depositum of truth is, in this universal church, preserved for ever, unfailing, perpetual, and entire. Indeed, this church, which we reverence as perpetual, would cease to be a church, did she once

cease to teach the genuine truths of revelation; so that the individuals who think, or are apprehensive, that she will abuse her authority for the purpose of propagating error, do not in reality possess that faith, which they ought to do, in that divine Spirit, by whom the sacred institution is directed.

And let the protestant consider objects in a merely human point of view; he will, even in this case, be reduced to acknowledge that the catholic church, so far from endeavouring—as her adversaries often assert she does—to tyrannise over the belief of her members, she, on the contrary, has employed every possible expedient to bind herself, and to deprive herself of the means of introducing innovations. For these ends, not only does she submit to the sacred scriptures; but, in order to stay, or for ever banish, any arbitrary interpretations—which cause sometimes the thoughts of men to pass for scripture—she ties herself, moreover, to interpret, and understand, whatsoever belongs to faith and morals, according to the interpretation and sense of the holy Fathers. She solemnly professes that, from the interpretations of these enlightened personages she will, on no occasion, deviate. She declares, in all her councils, as well as in all her professions and instruments of faith, that she does not receive any article of belief, which is not exactly conformable to the tradition of each, and of every preceding, century.

Men may reason as they please; but it is true, that, if the protestant would consult the dictates of his own conscience, he would find that, after all, the word "*Church*" possesses a much greater

influence over him than, in his disputes with us, he is willing to admit. I do not, for my own part, believe that, in the whole protestant community, there is a single individual who, if he be possessed of good sense, would not tremble at the prospect of seeing himself stand alone in the profession of any peculiar opinion, although even such opinion might appear to him well founded. So true it is, that, on a subject so vitally important as that of religion, men, to be contentedly confident in their own sentiments, require the sanction moreover of some society, which thinks and believes as they do. It is upon this account, that the Being, who created us, and who knows what best suits our circumstances, has, for our great benefit and happiness, decreed that each individual amongst the faithful shall be subject to the authority of the church ; an authority which, for this reason, is, of all others, the most forcibly established. In reality, the authority of the church is established, not only by the testimony which God himself has furnished in its favour in the sacred scriptures, but by a great variety of sensible attestations also, which point out, in the most striking manner, that, with a tender providence, He still watches over the holy institution. The proofs of this may be distinctly traced, not less in its inviolable and perennial duration, than in its wonderful and miraculous propagation.

CHAP. XXXI.

ON THE PROTESTANT OPINIONS RESPECTING THE
AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH.

So necessary is the supreme authority of the church for the regulation of those disputes and differences which take place among the faithful, either concerning articles of faith, or respecting the sense of the holy scriptures, that the protestants themselves, although they had reviled the thing as a piece of tyranny, have yet, after all, been reduced to call it back, and to re-establish it, in their own communities.

When the Independents proclaimed publicly, that it is the right of each and every individual to follow the dictates of his own conscience, without submitting his judgment to any society of men, or to any ecclesiastical tribunal; when they did this, and upon this principle, moreover, refused to obey the mandates of the Synods, the Synod of Charenton, in the year 1644, condemned loudly the daring doctrine, and condemned it, too, for the very same reasons, and on account of those very inconveniences for which we catholics condemn it likewise. In the first place, the ministers of the above Synod remark, that the error of the Independents consists in teaching that, "*Each particular church should govern itself by its own laws, without any dependence upon any individual in ecclesiastical concerns; and without any obligation of acknowledging the authority, either of Consistories, or Synods, for its regulation, or its conduct.*" In the next place, the same Synod decides, that the above

sect "*is prejudicial to the state, just equally as it is to the church; that it opens a door to every kind of irregularity and extravagance; that it destroys every means of remedying these disorders; and that if it were once established, there might be formed as many religions as there are parishes, or even as there are private assemblages.*" These last words make it manifest that it was principally in matters of faith that the Synod wished to establish a system of *dependence*. For, the main inconvenience, it observes, into which the faithful would fall, by the illusions of independence, is—that, seduced by them, "*they might form as many religions as there are parishes.*"

According to the doctrine, therefore, of this protestant Synod, it is necessary that each private church, and still more of course, each private individual, should depend, in all matters of faith, upon some supreme authority; an authority residing, either in some assembly, or in some society; and to which all the faithful are bound to submit their judgment. For, it is a fact, that not even do the Independents themselves refuse to yield obedience to the word of God in that sense which their own judgment has affixed unto it. Neither do they reject the decisions of Synods, *provided* that, after having examined them, they conceive they have found them reasonable. What alone they refuse to do, is this: they refuse to submit their judgment to the judgment of any assembly whatsoever. And the reason is, because it is the leading principle of protestantism, that every assembly, even that of the universal church, is a society of men, liable to error; and to which, therefore, the christian ought not to subject, or submit, his judgment,

the tribute of such submission being due to infinite wisdom only.

It is this pretended privilege of the Independents, that forms the great source of all those inconveniences, which the Synod of Charenton has pointed out so correctly. For, be the professions of men what they may, and although even they may profess to submit to the word of God, yet, if each individual have the privilege to interpret it, according to his own ideas, and contrary to the sentiments, and final determination, of the church, in such case, there can be no doubt but that the illusive pretext "*opens a door to every kind of irregularity and extravagance, destroys every means of remedying these disorders,*" (for the decisions of the church are no remedy to men who do not conceive themselves under any obligation of submitting to them) and, in short, "*gives occasion to the formation of as many religions, not only as there are parishes,*" but even as there are individuals.

It was for the purpose of avoiding the above inconveniences, which are pregnant, in fact, with the ruin of christianity, that the Synod of Charenton was compelled to institute a system "*of dependence in ecclesiastical concerns;*" and not only indeed in these, but even in matters of faith. However, spite of these precautions, the misfortune is, that never will this protestant system of subordination prevent those pernicious effects which, professedly, it has been created to obviate. In order to do this, the only expedient would be to establish, along with the catholic, the rational maxim, that each private church, and, still more, each private individual, ought to consider themselves obliged to submit their judgment, in all matters of religion, to the judgment and authority of the church.

In the fifth chapter, on the subject of discipline, (Tit. Consist. Art. 31,) our pretended reformers, affecting to prescribe "*the means of putting an end to these debates, which might arise respecting any point of doctrine, or of discipline,*" &c.—ordain, in the first place, that the Consistory shall endeavour "*to appease the whole without any noise; and with all the mildness of the word of God.*" After the establishment of a Consistory, of a Conference, and a provincial Synod; institutions, which they consider as so many different degrees of jurisdiction; after these comes the National Synod, an authority which they regard as paramount to every other. Of this, they speak in the following manner: "*In the National Synod, there shall be formed the entire and final resolution by the word of God; to which, should any refuse to submit, in every particular, and with an express disavowal of their errors, they shall be cut off from the society of the church.*" It is thus evident, that these imaginary reformers do not attribute the authority of this ultimate determination to the word of God, considered abstractedly by itself, and independently of the interpretation of the church; because, although this "*word*" had been employed, on the occasions of their former decisions, in their inferior assemblies, yet from these we remark they allow the privilege of an appeal. It is, consequently, this "*word,*" according as it has been interpreted by the supreme tribunal of the church, that constitutes "*that final and irrevocable resolution, in which whoever refuses to acquiesce, in every particular,*" although even he may conceive himself ever so well authorised by the word of God, is, nevertheless reprobated as profane; corrupting that Word which he pretends to reverence, and insolently abusing it.

There is, however, in the form of the Letters of Deputation, which were drawn up by the Synod of Vitre, in 1617, in order to be observed by the provinces, on the occasions of their sending any member to the national synod; there is, in the form of these letters, something that is even much more forcible and expressive than what I have just cited from the acts of the Synod of Charenton. The following is the extraordinary instrument: *We promise before God to submit to whatsoever shall be concluded, and resolved upon, in your holy assembly; to obey all its mandates; and to execute them with all our power; persuaded, as we are, that God will preside over it, and conduct you by his Holy Spirit in all truth and equity, by the rule of his word.* Here the question is, not whether the individuals shall receive the determination of the synod, *after* they have made the discovery, that it has spoken according to the sense of the holy scriptures; the question is, of submitting to such determination, even *before* the assembly has been actually called together! And they do this, because *“they are persuaded”*—they solemnly declare—*“that the Holy Ghost will preside over it.”* Now, if this conviction be founded upon a merely human presumption, can any individual, possibly, in his conscience, *“promise before God to submit to whatsoever shall be concluded, and resolved upon? to obey all the mandates of such assembly? and, with all his power, to execute them?”* Or else, if this conviction be founded upon the complete certainty, that the Holy Ghost does really impart his assistance to the church, on the occasions of its final determinations, then I will remark that not even do the catholics themselves require any thing more than this.

Hence, the conduct itself of the protestants demonstrates this—that upon the subject of supreme authority, these enemies of our holy religion agree, in reality, with us. They agree that, without such authority, it is impossible to remove doubts, or to put an end to controversies, in religion. And if, on the unhappy occasion of their rebellion, they denied that the faithful are bound to submit their judgments to the judgment of the church, still the necessity of calling back something, that looked like order, compelled them, ere long, to establish what their first engagements, and the early darings of their presumption, had prompted them to reject.

But, in the National Synod of St. Foi, they proceeded even to still greater lengths than any which I have hitherto stated. An overture, it would seem, had been made towards a reconciliation with the Lutherans, by means of “*A Formulary of profession of general faith, common to all the churches,*” which it was proposed, at this time, to draw up. In France, the protestant churches were solicited to send to an assembly, convoked for this purpose, “*certain respectable individuals, approved of, and authorised, by all the said churches; and invested with ample powers TO DISCUSS, TO AGREE UPON, AND TO DECIDE, EVERY POINT OF DOCTRINE, and whatever else relates to union.*” Upon the suggestion of this singular proposal, behold the terms in which the resolution of the Synod of St. Foi was expressed: “*The National Synod of this kingdom, after having thanked God for such an overture; and praised the care, the diligence, and the wisdom, of the aforesaid deputies; and approving the remedies, which they have suggested, (that is,*

the plan of drawing up a new Confession of Faith, and of commissioning certain individuals to do so) —ORDAINS, *that, should the copy of the aforesaid Confession of Faith chance to be sent in time, it shall, in this case, be examined by each separate provincial synod; or else, according to the convenience of each province. Nevertheless, the synod has deputed four of its ministers, the most experienced in such transactions, to whom express orders have been delivered to repair to the place appointed, by the day agreed upon; holding letters, and full powers, from all the ministers and ancient deputies of the provinces of this kingdom, as well as from his lordship, the Viscount Turenne, in order to attain the objects expressed above. And should it even happen, THAT THERE BE NOT ANY MEANS OF EXAMINING, THROUGHOUT ALL THE PROVINCES, THE AFORESAID CONFESSION, THEN SHALL IT BE LEFT TO THEIR PRUDENCE, AND SOLID JUDGMENT, TO COME TO A CONCLUSION UPON ALL THE POINTS, which shall have been the subjects of deliberation; whether those points relate TO DOCTRINE, or to any thing else, that concerns the good, the union, and the tranquillity of all the churches.*" Such are the effects of protestant liberty and of protestant consistency! How often do the enemies of our religion upbraid us with the weakness of giving up our opinions to the judgment of the church?—which is nothing else, they insultingly add, but a society of men, who are liable to be deceived. And, behold! when themselves are assembled in their National Synod, representing nearly all the churches of France, they boldly venture to compromise, and endanger, their own faith, by confiding it to the disposal, or judgment of *four individuals!*—and even with 110

complete an abandonment, at the same time, of their own private opinions, as to give to these four individuals the full power to alter that very Confession of Faith, which they now publish to the whole christian world, as a confession that contains the pure word of God;—a confession, for which, on the occasions when they presented it to their sovereigns, they said “an infinite multitude of their members were prepared to lay down their lives !”* But, I shall leave it to the wisdom of the

* Error is always incoherent ; and I could easily cite instances of inconsistency in the established religion of this country, which, if not exactly similar, are at least equal, to those with which Bossuet reproaches the French calvinistic churches. However, I need not appeal to such examples. For, is it not a fact, that the whole constitution of the established religion,—its basis, and its buttresses, its fences, and its securities, are all of them nearly made up of very little else than inconsistencies ? Thus, for example, the established church, in conformity with the principles of the reformation, disclaiming all pretensions to infallibility, allows, that, just like individuals, itself is liable to error. “ Though we believe,” says Dr. Marsh, “ that we are right, we admit we are possibly wrong : though we believe others are wrong, we admit that they are possibly right.” Accordingly, in consonance, still farther, with these maxims, it proclaims moreover the emancipation from the control of authority, the sacred rights of private judgment, and the freedom of belief. All this is genuine protestantism—which whoever denies, is not a real protestant. But, now, mark the inconsistencies. For, what, notwithstanding all the above concessions, is still the conduct of the establishment ? It is completely the violation, both of protestant principles, and of its own professions. So far is the church of England from acting like an institution, which owns itself liable to errors, that, on the contrary, it confidently assumes to itself all the

enlightened reader to make his own reflections upon the singular decree of this protestant synod. I shall hasten to complete my explanation of our own tenets.

CHAP. XXXII.

ON THE AUTHORITY OF THE HOLY SEE, AND ON THAT OF THE EPISCOPACY.

It was the will of the Son of God, that his church should be ONE, and established solidly upon the firm basis of *unity*.* For these reasons, and

privileges of infallibility; and so far from conceding in reality, that liberty, which it approves in words, it even punishes the men who use it. It dictates, and prescribes, creeds, and confessions, and articles of faith. It issues laws, and canons, and regulations, the most restrictive and severe. It exacts from its members, oaths and subscriptions, and solemn declarations. It imposes tests, and pains, and penalties. And to complete the climax, it excommunicates, and declares "*accursed*" the disbelievers of its doctrines. Now, what is inconsistency, if this be not? Or, what—if this be not—is the arrogation of the claims of inerrancy? The dissenters complain daily of these awful circumstances. And they complain with reason. "For, if," as Dr. Marsh expresses it, "if the doctrines of the Establishment "*may be wrong*," is it not improper to oblige men to believe, even to *swear*, that they believe them? And if the doctrines of others "*may be right*," is it not unjust to excommunicate them for believing them?" "If, indeed," say the dissenters, "the conduct of the establishment be well founded, then should the whole host of protestantism hasten back, at once, to the pale of popery."

* *John* x. 16. "And other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: them also I must bring; and they shall hear my voice; and there shall be one fold, and one shepherd."

in order to maintain and cement this unity, his wisdom thought proper to institute the supremacy of Saint Peter.* We, therefore, acknowledge this same supremacy, continued and perpetuated in the successors of this prince of the apostles ; paying to them, upon this account, that submission, and obedience, which both the holy councils and the holy fathers have always inculcated as the obligations of the christian faithful.

It is not necessary, that I should here say any thing concerning certain questions, which are sometimes agitated in our schools, although the protestants are for ever citing these, in order to render the papal supremacy odious. These questions are not included among the articles of our faith. What alone is essential here, is simply to acknowledge a Head, established by the wisdom of

Romans xvi. 17. "Now, I beseech you, brethren, to mark them, who cause dissensions, and offences, contrary to the doctrine which you have learned ; and to avoid them."

Ephesians iv. 3, 4, 5. "Careful to keep the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace. One body, and one spirit ; as you are called in one hope of your calling. One Lord ; one faith ; one baptism."

Philippians iii. 15, 16. "Let us, therefore, as many as are perfect, be thus minded. Nevertheless, wherunto we are already arrived, that we be of the same mind ; let us also continue in the same rule."

* *Matthew* xvi. 15, &c. "Jesus saith unto them : But, whom do you say, that I am ? Simon Peter answered, and said : Thou art Christ, the Son of the living God. And Jesus answering, said to him : Blessed art thou, Simon Bar-Jona ; because flesh and blood have not revealed this to thee, but my Father, who is in heaven. And I say unto thee : Thou art Peter ; and upon this rock I will build my church : and the gates of hell

Jesus, in order to conduct his flock in the paths of truth and piety. Indeed, this is a maxim which all those will willingly admit who are the lovers of fraternal concord, or the friends of ecclesiastical unanimity.*

Had the authors of protestantism been the friends of unity, they surely would not, as many of them have done, have abolished the episcopal government—an institution formed by Christ Jesus himself, and which has flourished, incontestibly, from the era of the apostles. Neither would they, if they had loved peace and unanimity, have contemned the authority of the chair of Saint Peter, whose foundation is so clearly proved by the testimony of the sacred scriptures, and whose duration is so evident by the attestation of tradition. They

shall not prevail against it. And I will give thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven ; and whatsoever thou shalt bind upon earth, it shall be bound also in heaven ; and whatsoever thou shalt loose upon earth, it shall be loosed also in heaven."

John xxi. 15, &c. "So, when they had dined, Jesus said to Simon Peter : Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me, more than these ? He saith to him : Yea, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee. He saith to him : Feed my lambs. He saith to him again : Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me ? He saith to him : Yea, Lord, thou knowest that I love thee. He saith to him : Feed my lambs. He saith to him, a third time : Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me ? Peter was grieved, because he said to him, a third time, Lovest thou me ? And said to him : Lord, thou knowest all things ; thou knowest that I love thee. He said to him : Feed my sheep."

* "It is out of love to the reformation," says Bishop Thorndyke, "that I insist on such a principle as may serve to reunite us with the church of Rome ; being well assured that we can never be united with ourselves

would rather—if, happily, they had loved peace—have preserved, with pious care, both the authority of the episcopacy, and the supremacy of the see of St. Peter. For, whilst the former maintains peace in the separate churches, the latter, by being a common centre, maintains it in the catholic universe.

CHAP. XXXIII.

THE CONCLUSION.

SUCH, therefore, is the exposition of our catholic doctrines. In my endeavour to explain them, I have confined myself to our leading tenets ; omit-

otherwise ; and that not only the reformation, but our common christianity will be lost in the divisions, which will never end otherwise." (*On Forbearance.*)

"Whoever knows Grotius," says this great man, "knows that it has always been his wish to see the christian world once more reunited in one and the same body. He once imagined, that this might be begun, at least, by the union of the protestants with one another. But soon he found that this is a thing quite impossible ; not merely on account of the turbulent dispositions of the calvinists, but because the protestants have no common band of unity. For these reasons, not only will the differences among the protestants never be composed, but fresh divisions will arise incessantly. Wherefore, it is now the decided opinion of Grotius, as well as of many others, that the protestants will never be united amongst themselves, unless they be again reunited to the see of Rome. He, therefore, wishes that the rupture should be healed as well as its causes be removed. Among these, the supremacy of the Pope ought not to be reckoned ; for Melancthon himself allows that this supremacy is essential to the maintenance of unity." (*Ad Rivet.*)

ting a few of those questions, which the protestants themselves do not consider sufficiently important to form a reasonable motive for abandoning our communion. I flatter myself, that, should any of our dissenting brethren be induced to examine this little Treatise, with calmness and impartiality, they will be disposed, after they have done so, to think much more favourably of the proofs upon which the faith in our holy religion is established and reposes. They will even, I am convinced, be engaged to own that our disputes might, in general, be terminated very easily by the mere candid exposition of our sentiments. They will acknowledge that our doctrines are holy, and that, even according to their own principles, there is not any one of our tenets that is subversive of the foundations of salvation.

Or should it chance that any one undertakes to publish a reply to this Treatise, let me, in this case, remind him that, in order to do so with any reasonable prospect of success, his plan ought not to be to attempt the refutation of the doctrines which I have stated in it. The reason is, because my design has been very little more than just to propose our sentiments, without entering into the arguments which prove them to be divine. It is true, I have here and there suggested a passing testimony; but it was merely because the knowledge of the leading evidences of certain tenets forms an essential part of their exposition.

I should have deviated, likewise, from the plan of this instruction, had I stopped, in its progress, to examine the various methods which some of our catholic theologians have made use of, either to establish, or to elucidate, the doctrine of the Coun-

cil of Trent ; along with the different consequences, deduced by some writers from it. The method which the protestant ought properly to pursue, who proposes to make any solid objections against this Treatise, is to prove, on the authority of facts, which the church is compelled to own, that I have not exposed our doctrine with fidelity ; or else to show that my explanation of them leaves all the objections of our adversaries still unanswered, and all their disputes unsettled. In short, his plan should be to point out, directly and precisely, what that unholy tenet of our religion is (if there be such) which destroys the foundations of christian faith.

APPENDIX.

SOME ACCOUNT OF THE CONFERENCE OF BOSSUET WITH MONS. CLAUDE.

[Extract from Mr. Butler's Life of Bossuet.]

THE account which Bossuet has given of this conference is extremely interesting. It turned on some points of the most important of all the articles in dispute between Roman Catholics and Protestants,—the authority, by which Jesus Christ directed Christians to be governed in the disputes which he foresaw would arise on his doctrine. All Roman Catholics, and all the Protestants of the old school assert, that these disputes should be decided by the church. But, when churches themselves are divided, the question must be, which of them is to be obeyed? The Roman Catholic says, it is that church, which existed before all other churches, and from which all churches, not in union with her, have separated. This description, they assert, applies to the Roman Catholic church, and to no other. She therefore, in their opinion, is the mistress and judge of controversies. Her authority, the separatists from her deny. And the dispute on this point is the most important of all their differences, as the decision of it involves the decision of every other article in dispute between them.

M. Claude, the antagonist of Bossuet in this conference, enjoyed the highest reputation in his party. Bossuet speaks of his learning, polite manners, and mildness, in high terms of praise. He mentions, that, throughout the conference, M. Claude listened with patience; expressed himself with clearness and force; pressed his own objections with precision; and never eluded an objection made to him, which admitted of an answer.

The conference was held at the request of Mademoiselle de Duras, a niece of the great Turenne. Several Huguenots of distinction assisted at it; the Countess

de Lorges, a sister of Mademoiselle de Duras, was the only Roman Catholic present.

On the day preceding the conference, Bossuet, by the desire of Mademoiselle de Duras, waited on her, and explained to her what he understood by the words, "Catholic Church," which he foresaw would frequently occur in the conference. He explained to her, that, in his controversy with M. Claude, he should not appropriate these words to the Roman Catholic church, but use them to denote generally what both M. Claude and he admitted,—an external and visible society, which professed to believe the doctrine of Jesus Christ, and to govern itself by his word. That, to found this society, the Son of God issued from his eternal Father; that, while he was on earth, he gathered round him certain men, who acknowledged him for their master; that, in subsequent times, the faithful aggregated themselves to that society, and formed, what is called in the Apostles' Creed, the Catholic, or Universal church:—that, sometimes surrounded by infidels, sometimes torn into pieces by heretics, there had not, from the first moment of her divine origination, been one instant of time, in which she had not possessed the faith, the doctrine, and the sacraments, of Christ; or in which she had not been protected by him, or had not been visible, as the meridian sun, to all on earth: had there been but a single instant, in which she ceased to profess the faith or possess the sacraments of Christ, it would necessarily follow that the promises of Christ, to teach her all truth, to be with her to the end of the world, and to prevent the powers of hell from prevailing against her, would have failed. That there is such a church, M. Claude admits. But it cannot, says Bossuet, be the church of M. Claude—"the reformed church, to justify her separation from the Roman Catholic church, must either charge the Son of God with a breach of his promise, or show the other great and visible church, in which the true faith has been uninterruptedly preserved. To assert the former, would be blasphemy; to assert the latter, would be to deny historical evidence. When the

church of the Reformers first separated from the one, the holy, the Roman Catholic church, their church, by their own confession, did not enter into communion with a single Christian church in the whole world."

On the day after this conversation took place, Mademoiselle de Duras called on Bossuet, in company with M. de Coton, a Huguenot minister of distinction, personally known to Bossuet, and esteemed by him. By her desire, Bossuet repeated to him what he had mentioned to her on the preceding day. M. Coton objected to Bossuet, the promises of God to the Jews, and the frequent revolts of the general body, both of the people of Israel, and the people of Judah, from the true worship: and concluded from it, that there might be a temporary interruption of the church of God, without a breach of the divine promise. To this Bossuet replied, that it was evident from Scripture, that, though a great, or even the greater part of the chosen people had apostatised, still the true worship of God never was extinguished, never ceased to be gloriously discernible either in Israel, or Judah; that, in the times of their greatest apostasies, the true worship was retained by a great portion of the people of each kingdom; and that each of them had a regular succession of prophets; so that the inspired writers (Paral. xxxvi. 5. Jo. xi. 7. xxv. 1. 4.) scrupled not to say, that, every morning and night, the Almighty Word arose, and warned the chosen seed, by the mouths of his prophets, against the surrounding idolatry. "These prophets," continued Bossuet, "were themselves a part of the people of God; they kept the people to their duty; and preserved a large part of them from corruption: and thus, though a frightful portion of them, and perhaps even the mass of them, fell into idolatry, there were always among them, those, who preserved pure, and visible to all, the deposit of the true worship." "To them," Bossuet said, "Ezekiel (xliv. 13,) alluded, when he mentioned the Priests and Levites, who, when the children of Israel went astray, always observed the ceremonies of the sanctuary; served

the Lord, and appeared before him, to offer him victims."

Here the conversation with M. Coton finished.—While they waited the arrival of M. Claude, to open the conference, Bossuet took occasion to mention to Mademoiselle de Duras, that, in the course of the proposed conference, he would prove, to her satisfaction, three things;—the first, that the Huguenots acted as if they believed that the authority of their church was infallible; the second, that, though they acted in this manner, it was a maxim among them, that every individual, however ignorant, was obliged to believe he understood the Scriptures better than all the rest of the church. This seemed to surprise her much. He proceeded to mention to her the third, which she thought was still more strange; that it was an article of the Huguenot creed, that there was a period of time, during which a Christian was obliged to doubt whether the Scripture were inspired by God; whether the Gospel were a truth, or a fable; and whether Jesus Christ were an impostor, or the teacher of salvation. He undertook to force M. Claude to confess all this; or to convince her that all of it was an evident and direct consequence of his principles.

After this, they were informed that M. Claude was come; and the conference began. We can only pretend to present the reader with a short outline of it; but we can confidently assure him, that, if he takes an interest in such polemic discussions, he will be abundantly gratified by perusing the whole of the account given of it by Bossuet. M. Claude's account of it has not fallen into the hands of the writer.

Bossuet began the conference, by asking, "if it were not among the Articles of the Reformed Church of France, that disputes on faith should be determined, if possible, by the consistory; that, if they were not determined by the consistory, they should be determined by the provincial synod; that, if they were not determined by the provincial synod, they should be determined by the holy national assembly; and that those,

who refused to acquiesce in the determination of the national assembly, were to be declared out of the pale of the church, and excommunicated." He further asked, "if the circular letter of the reformed churches, when they sent their deputies to the national assembly, were not expressed in the following words: We promise, before God to submit to all that shall be resolved in your holy assembly; convinced, as we are, that God will preside over it, and guide you by his Holy Spirit, into all truth and equity, by the rule of his word." Bossuet concluded by observing, that by this, the reformed church *appeared* to act as if they acknowledged the infallibility of the national assembly. This was the first of the three points, which he had undertaken to Mademoiselle de Duras, to bring M. Claude to confess,

The facts, mentioned by Bossuet, were candidly admitted by M. Claude: but he denied the conclusion which Bossuet drew from them; and, in a speech of some length, which Bossuet praises for its neatness and method, explained the nature of the arrangements, mentioned by Bossuet. He said that the different assemblies, mentioned by Bossuet, had different degrees of jurisdiction; but that, in all of them, it was a jurisdiction of discipline; and that the intrinsic value of the truth of their decisions, and even of the decision of the national assembly, depended solely on their conformity to the word of God: and thus, according to M. Claude, an ultimate power of enforcing discipline, but no infallibility in doctrine, was vested by them in the national assembly. A discussion then took place, between Bossuet and M. Claude, to bring this to issue, and every word of it is highly interesting. At the end of it, Bossuet observed to M. Claude, that, if he understood him rightly, both the intermediate submission, required to the consistory, and provincial synod, and the ultimate submission, required to the national assembly, were conditional; or, in other words, that a conscientious submission could only be required, if the party thought their determinations were conformable to the word of God. To this M. Claude assented. "Then," said Bossuet,

“the profession of submission might be equivalently couched in these words: I swear to submit to what you shall decide, if I shall think your decision is conformable to the word of God. What does this really amount to?” A short silence ensued. Bossuet renewed the conference, by saying,—“You believe, that an individual may call in question the sentence of your church, even when your church pronounces in the last resort.” “No, Sir,” answered M. Claude, “it should not be said, that an individual can lawfully doubt in such a case, as there is every appearance that the judgment of the church will be right.” “To say that there is an *appearance*,” Bossuet replied, “is to say that there is a doubt.” “But,” answered M. Claude, “there is more than an appearance. Jesus Christ has himself promised, that those, who truly seek him, shall find him. Now, it should be *presumed*, in favour of the assemblies, that they seek him truly, and will, therefore, be certain of finding him. To be sure, if it should appear that there are cabals, or any other suspicious circumstances, in the national synod, the confidence in it might be lessened, or absolutely withdrawn.” “Then, let us leave these factions and cabals,” said Bossuet, “out of the question. Let us suppose that there is no faction, no cabal, nothing improper; and that every thing passes in perfect order; must its decision be received without examination?” M. Claude admitted that the right of examination existed. “Then,” said Bossuet, “you admit, that every individual, whoever he be, may believe, and even ought to believe, that it may happen to him to understand the word of God better than the national assembly; and even better than a council assembled, from the four quarters of the world. For, on what can this right, or duty, of examination be founded, but because the individual may justly conceive that he himself understands the word of God better than those whose decision he has a right to examine?”

This was the second point, which Bossuet had promised Mademoiselle de Duras to make M. Claude admit.

Bossuet now considered that he had set M. Claude between the horns of a perfect dilemma. If M. Claude contended for the duty of submission to the sentence of the national assembly, under pain of excommunication, Bossuet opposed to him his acknowledgment of the right of individuals to try the propriety of that sentence by their private judgments; if M. Claude admitted this right of private judgment in an individual, Bossuet opposed to him the assembly's right to excommunicate him for exercising it. Contending for the former, M. Claude admitted the first; contending for the latter, M. Claude admitted the second of the positions, which Bossuet had promised Mademoiselle de Duras to make him confess.

The conference, however, proceeded. "Surely," said Bossuet, "this right of individual examination, which you recognize in each individual, must be accompanied with the highest individual presumption." "That by no means follows," replied M. Claude. "When the synagogue declared that Jesus Christ was not the Messiah promised by the prophets, and condemned him to death, would not an individual, who believed him to be the true Christ, have judged better than the synagogue? Could you accuse such an individual of *presumptuously* believing that he understood the Scriptures better than all the synagogue?"

A more able reply than this of M. Claude cannot be conceived. It produced a great effect on all the persons present. Bossuet informs us, in his relation of the conference, that this effect of it was observed by him: that, though he himself was fully aware of the answer, which he ought to give to it, he was afraid that he might not express it properly; and that he therefore made a silent prayer to God, that he would inspire him to express it in such terms as would remove the impression made by M. Claude on the minds of the audience. After a moment's silence, he addressed M. Claude in these words: "You say that my assertion, that the individual, who sets up his own private opinion, in opposition to that of the whole church, must be guilty of intoler-

able presumption, fixes the charge of equal presumption on those who believed in Jesus Christ, in opposition to the sentence of the synagogue, which had pronounced him guilty of blasphemy. Most certainly my assertion proves nothing of the kind. When an individual *now* sets up his own private opinion in opposition to that of the whole church, he sets it up against the highest authority on earth, as the earth contains no authority, to which an appeal from that authority can be made. But, when the synagogue condemned Jesus Christ, there was on earth a much higher authority than the synagogue; to that authority the individual, who reprobated the proceedings of the synagogue, might appeal. Truth herself *then* visibly existed among men,—the Messiah, the eternal Son of God,—He, to whom a voice from above had rendered testimony, by proclaiming before the whole people that he was the well-beloved Son of God,—He, who restored the dead to life, gave sight to the blind, and did so many miracles, that the Jews themselves confessed no man had done the like before him; He, the Jesus himself, then existed among men, and was the visible external authority, to whom there was a lawful appeal from the synagogue. His authority was infallible. I hear you say that it was a contested authority. I know that it was contested; but, as a Christian, *you* are bound to say that no individual could reasonably, or conscientiously, contest it. It was not therefore presumption; it was duty to disobey the synagogue, and to believe in Christ. Bring back to me Jesus Christ in person; bring him teaching, preaching, and working miracles, and I no longer want the church. But don't take the church from me, unless you give me Jesus Christ in person. You say you have his word. Yes, certainly! we have his holy, adorable word. But, what is to be done with those who understand it in a wrong sense? Jesus Christ is not present in person to set them right; they must, therefore, obey the church. Before Jesus Christ appeared among the Jews, they were bound to obey the synagogue: when the synagogue failed, Jesus Christ came among men to teach

them all truth ; and they were bound to obey his voice. When he returned to his Father, he left us his church, and we are bound to obey her voice. There is not,—no, there is not on earth, any visible higher authority, to which you can appeal from her.

This, according to Bossuet's account, set Claude within a second dilemma : if he said that the sentence of the national assembly was not to be questioned, Bossuet proved his assertion to Mademoiselle de Duras, that the Huguenots acted as if they believed the authority of their church was infallible ; if he said the sentence of the national assembly might be questioned, Bossuet's assertion, that it was a maxim of the Huguenot church, that every individual might believe, that he understood the Scriptures better than the highest authority in his communion, was equally proved. With much apparent reluctance, M. Claude veered to the latter position ; and thus Bossuet professes to have performed his second promise to Mademoiselle de Duras.

We now come to the last of the three points, which Bossuet had promised Mademoiselle de Duras, to make M. Claude confess ; and which appeared to her the strangest of the three ; that, " in the opinion of Huguenots, there is a period, during which a *Christian* is under a necessity of doubting, whether the Bible be inspired by God ; whether the Gospel be truth, or a fable ; and whether Jesus Christ were a teacher of truth, or an impostor." Bossuet opened the discussion of this point by asking M. Claude, " if a Christian, when he has the Gospel put, for the first time into his hands, must necessarily doubt, whether it be divinely inspired, before he can make an act of faith of its being the word of God." M. Claude replied, that, " in such a situation, a Christian does not doubt but is ignorant, whether the Gospel is divinely inspired. And permit me," he said to Bossuet, " to put the same question to you, substituting, in my question, the church, whenever, in yours, you introduce the Gospel. I therefore ask you, in my turn, whether a Christian, who has the authority of the church, for the first time, proposed to him, must not,

before he makes an act of faith of it, necessarily doubt, and examine the grounds of that authority? You see that the question forces each of us into the same difficulties; whatever you say on the subject, in reference to the Gospel, I shall say upon it, in reference to the church."

The disputants were now fairly at issue on two points; the first, whether, in respect to the Gospel, M. Claude, by acknowledging the right of previous examination, admitted, that, while that examination lasted, a *Christian* must necessarily doubt that the Scripture was the word of God; the second, whether, in respect to the church, the same arguments should not force a similar confession from Bossuet. They were distinct points, and Bossuet appears to have been anxious to keep them distinct.

"I perceive," he said to M. Claude, "the tendency of your expressions. Whether you will argue, or will have a right to argue, from my doctrine, respecting a Christian's faith in the church, as I shall argue from your doctrine respecting a Christian's faith in the Gospel, we shall quickly see. For the present, let us stick to the fact. I aver, that, according to the principles of your church, there is a moment, (I mean the period of examination) in which a Christian (*I don't speak of an Infidel*) must doubt of the Gospel, and of Christ." "I have said," M. Claude answered, "that he is ignorant; he does not doubt." "Can he then," said Bossuet, "when the Gospel is thus, for the first time, presented to him, make an act of divine faith, that the book presented to him is the word of God?" "He cannot," answered M. Claude; "he can only believe it out of deference to the authority of his parents, or of some other person. He is a catechumen." "No," said Bossuet, "he is not a catechumen; he is a Christian; he has been baptized, and the alliance, which baptism externally sealed on him, has been internally sealed on his heart by the Holy Ghost." "On that point," said M. Claude, "there are two opinions;" but M. Claude ingenuously added, "I admit it." "Then," said Bossuet,

“it follows, that, in virtue of the faith infused into him in his baptism, a Christian, who has attained the use of reason, is qualified to make an act of faith, when it is presented to him. I therefore ask you, whether, before he has examined the Gospel, a Christian can make this act of faith—‘I believe the Scripture to be the word of God, as I believe God to exist.’” M. Claude said that, after the Christian had read the Scripture, he believed it to be the word of God by divine faith; but that, until he had read it, he could not be led to this conclusion by human reasoning only. “But human reason,” said Bossuet, “is always fallible, and therefore always doubtful. And thus, according to your principles, there is a moment, (that of examination) during which *the Christian* necessarily doubts, or, if you prefer the expression, is ignorant of what you call the fundamental article of faith,—that the Scripture is the word of God, and therefore, during the whole time of examination, is an infidel.”

In this manner, Bossuet professes to have performed his third promise to Mademoiselle de Duras: it remained for him to defend himself against M. Claude's intimation, that, in maintaining a Christian's obligation to believe, with divine faith, the authority of the church, it would be necessary for Bossuet to admit that he must previously examine the point, as he must doubt it during the continuance of such an examination, and be therefore, during the whole of that period, an infidel.

“No such consequence attends the Roman Catholic doctrine,” said Bossuet. “The first instant after a Roman Catholic, or *any Christian*, comes to the use of reason, he may make this act of divine faith,—I believe the church. I entreat you to observe, that I am speaking of a baptized person, of a Christian, not of an infidel. In virtue of his baptism, the Christian has the habit of true faith, and therefore believes, when he attains the use of reason, in God the Father, in God the Son, in God the Holy Ghost, and in the holy Catholic church. The Apostles' creed contains all these articles; and the

Apostles' creed is not a set of conclusions, to which a child arrives by examination ; but a declaration of the faith, infused into him at his baptism by the Holy Ghost. Against this, the infidel may argue consistently with his tenets ; a Christian cannot. Thus the doctrine of Roman Catholics is wholly free from the difficulty you have intimated. All Roman Catholics, all Christians, except Protestants, believe the divine authority of the church to be an article of faith, infused by the Holy Ghost into every Christian at his baptism. Now, it is a tenet of the church, that the Scripture is the word of God. Thus, from the first instant of their reason, the Roman Catholics believe their church, and the tenets of their church ; so that, as there never is a moment, in which a Roman Catholic doubts of the church, there never is a moment in which he doubts of the divine inspiration of the Scripture, which is a tenet of his church. But you, who deny the authority of the church, are driven to the terrible inconvenience of being obliged to admit, that there is a period, during which it is in the necessity of things, that *the Christian* doubts, or, if you prefer the expression, is without the belief of this fundamental article of faith,—the divine inspiration of the Scripture."

This was strong reasoning ; but M. Claude rallied. " This way of reasoning," he shrewdly observed, " must make every person decide in favour of his own church. The Greeks, Arminians, Æthiopians, even we, whom you think so much in the wrong, are baptized ; by your account, therefore, all of us actually have the true faith, the true Scriptures, and the true interpretation of them."

Bossuet's acknowledgment of the force of this argument, and of the great impression, which it made on the persons present at the conference, should be mentioned in his own words : " A more fortible objection than M. Claude's could not be urged. The answer to it immediately occurred to me, but I was apprehensive of not expressing it in a manner to make it fully understood. I trembled as I spoke ; for I thought the salvation of a

soul was at stake ; and I offered a prayer to God, that, as he made the truth known to me, he would furnish me with words that would enable me to present it, in its full light, to my hearers. My dispute was with a man who listened patiently, expressed himself with clearness and strength, and was able to avail himself of any thing which the least want of precision opened to attack."

Such were Bossuet's feelings, as he himself has expressed them, on M. Claude's observation. The reader, probably, is curious to see how he delivered himself from the consequences to which it seemed to lead. He remarked to M. Claude, that the reformed church was to be distinguished from the Greek, and from all the other churches which he had mentioned ; as the members of all those churches professed both to receive, *at their baptism*, the faith of the *true church*, and to believe, with divine faith, at their first use of reason, her divine authority ; so that, in their own opinion, there never was a moment in which the members of those churches were without faith in the *true church*, or faith in her authority, or faith in her Scriptures : while, on the other hand, M. Claude, and all the communicants with his church, admitted it to be an article of their doctrine, that, during all the period which preceded, or was employed in examination, they had not faith in the true church, in her authority, or in her Scriptures ; and thus, as to the point immediately under discussion, all those churches might be cited against M. Claude.

After this preliminary observation, Bossuet proceeded to consider M. Claude's assertion, that, as the members of all those churches, and also the members of the Huguenot churches, were baptized, it necessarily followed from Bossuet's own doctrine, that they continued, while they were members of the church in which they were baptized, to possess the true faith, the true Scriptures, and the true interpretation of them. This brought the disputants to immediate issue. Bossuet replied, that, when a person is baptized, the Holy Ghost confers on him, without regard to the faith of the person, who

baptizes him, or the church, in which he is baptized, the faith of the church mentioned in the Apostles' creed; the faith of the holy Catholic church: that the baptized person continues a member of that true church, till the example of his parents, or some other circumstance, seduces him from it. "Thus," said Bossuet, "the members of the churches, which have been mentioned, and the members of your church, are in error, not on account of an erroneous faith, which they received in baptism, but because they have abandoned the true faith,—the faith of the holy Catholic church, which they received in baptism."

This was Bossuet's reply to his adversary's attack: and the conference now drew to its conclusion.*

* I have already stated the result of the important discussion. Mademoiselle de Duras, in the course of a few weeks, renounced the protestant religion. She made her public abjuration of it, in the hands of Bossuet, in the presence of an assembly of many of the most distinguished personages in Paris, in the church of the Doctrine Chretienne.

In consequence of certain misrepresentations, relating to the conference, Bossuet was induced, ere long, to publish an account of the whole transaction, in a small volume, entitled, "Conference avec M. Claude." This, too, is a work, which, like his Exposition, produced a very great sensation in France; and contributed powerfully to bring about the conversion of a multitude of learned and well informed members of the reformed churches. It is, indeed, an instrument which well deserves the attention of every Protestant, to whom the security of his salvation is an object of solicitude and interest; as, in fact, it merits also the serious study of all those to whom polemical discussions are the subjects either of satisfaction, or of curiosity.

THE END.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
CHAP. I. General Plan of the Instruction,	3
II. The Catholic believes, according to the acknowledgment of the Protestants, all the fundamental articles of Christianity,	5
III. God alone is properly the end of religious worship,	9
IV. On the Invocation of the Saints,	12
V. On Images,	20
VI. On Relics,	24
VII. On Justification,	27
VIII. On the Merit of Good Works,	30
IX. On Satisfaction,	36
X. On Indulgences,	40
XI. On Purgatory,	42
XII. Reflections on the preceding chapters,	44
XIII. On the Sacraments,	46
XIV. On Baptism,	48
XV. On Confirmation,	49
XVI. On Penance and Sacramental Confession,	50
XVII. On Extreme Unction,	53
XVIII. On Matrimony,	54
XIX. On Holy Order,	55
XX. On the Real Presence, &c.	57
XXI. On the words, "Do this for a Commemoration of me,"	64
XXII. On the Protestant Doctrines respecting the Holy Eucharist,	68
XXIII. On Transubstantiation,	81
XXIV. On the Adoration of the Eucharist,	84

	PAGE.
CHAP. XXV. On the Sacrifice of the Mass,	86
XXVI. On the objections made to the Sacrifice of the Mass, derived from the Epistle to the Hebrews,	93
XXVII. Reflections on the foregoing Doctrine,	97
XXVIII. On Communion under both kinds, . . .	102
XXIX. On Scripture and Tradition,	106
XXX. On the Authority of the Church,	109
XXXI. On the Protestant opinions respecting the authority of the Church,	114
XXXII. On the authority of the Holy See, and on that of the Episcopacy,	122
XXXIII. The Conclusion,	125
<i>Appendix</i> , containing an Account of the Conference of Bossuet with M. Claude,	129

62 67 5
HS



3 2044 019 873 314

This book should be returned to the Library on or before the last date stamped below.

A fine is incurred by retaining it beyond the specified time.

Please return promptly.

~~CANCELLED~~
OCT 27 1975 ILL

4927546

MAY 12 '76 ILL

~~CANCELLED~~
MAY 23 1976 ILL

WIDENED
MAR SEP 12 019 1996
CANCELLED

