

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_churchman\\_os.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

THE  
CHURCHMAN

---

FEBRUARY, 1894.

---

ART. I.—SURVIVAL OF ANCIENT HERESIES IN  
MODERN ROMANISM.

PART II.

THE EUTYCHIANISM OF TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

THE doctrine of Eutyches, which was condemned by the Council of Chalcedon, was the too natural sequence of the heresy of Nestorius and a kind of rebound of popular feeling from one extreme of theological error to another. In the fruitless and dangerous attempt to define in unscriptural language the union of the two natures in Christ, the one error involved a division, and the other a confusion of those natures. Against the Eutychian heresy, now represented and carried on by the Monophysite churches of Alexandria and Antioch, that clause of the so-called Athanasian Creed is directed, "One, not by confusion of substance, but by unity of Person." Now, it was a favourite argument of the Eutychians that the change effected in the human nature of Christ by its union with the Divine nature had a clear illustration in the Eucharist, where they alleged that a similar change of substance took place, a change resembling that of transubstantiation. Theodorit, to whose testimony we have already referred on the *dulia* and *latria* controversy, has supplied us with the argument of the Eutychians and its refutation by the Catholics in three dialogues supposed to be carried on between a Eutychian and a Catholic (Eranistes and Orthodoxus). The former asserts: "As the symbols of the Lord's body and blood are different before the invocation of the priest, but after the invocation are changed (*μεταβάλλεται*) and become another thing, so the Lord's body after the ascension was changed into the Divine substance." To this the Orthodox person replies: "You are caught in your own net. For the mystical symbols do not depart from their nature after the sanctification, but remain in their former substance and form, and can be seen and touched

as before."<sup>1</sup> Eranistes then raises the objection that they have nevertheless, changed their former name and appellation, to which the Orthodox disputant replies: "It is not only called the 'body,' but the 'bread of life.'"

The same Eutychian argument and the same reply were put forth in the Western Church at a somewhat later date, when Pope Gelasius wrote the memorable passage which has been one of the most effective historical documents against transubstantiation in every subsequent age.<sup>2</sup>

"Without doubt" (he writes) "the Sacraments of the body and blood of Christ which we receive are a Divine thing, by reason of which and through which we become partakers of the Divine nature. And yet it ceases not to be the substance or nature of the bread and wine. And assuredly the image and likeness of the body and blood of Christ is celebrated in the action of the mysteries. This gives us a sufficient proof that we are to think of our Lord Christ Himself in the same sense as that in which we profess, celebrate, and receive His image; that as in this, they (the elements) pass into a Divine substance through the operation of the Holy Spirit, and yet remain in their own proper nature, in like manner in that chief mystery itself, whose efficiency and virtue the Sacraments truly represent, while the elements of which it consists properly remain, the one Christ remains in truth and integrity." In the same sense and by means of the same comparison all the orthodox writers against the Eutychian heresy illustrate the union of the two natures in Christ, and prove that transubstantiation is simply the principle of Eutychianism applied to the Sacrament, and that the ancient Church would have rejected it as involving the confusion of the two natures in Christ. For it annihilates the natural substance of the bread and wine and substitutes for it the corporal presence of Christ.

Berengarius and the early denouncers of the doctrine of the material change in the Sacrament saw clearly its danger in connection with the mystery of the Incarnation. "The Word made flesh" (he writes) "took up what He was not before, and did not lose what He was, and thus the consecrated bread upon the altar loses its worthlessness, loses its inefficacy, but does not lose the properties of its nature, which nature is divinely increased thereby in dignity and efficacy."<sup>3</sup> In another place he writes: "As the person of Christ consisted of a

<sup>1</sup> This last sentence proves that Theodorit did not conceive the possibility of a miracle being wrought unless it was testified by the senses.

<sup>2</sup> *Liber de duabus nat. in Christo.*

<sup>3</sup> *De S. Coena adv. Lanfr.*, p. 98 (Berl., 1834).

Divine and human nature, so the sacrifice of Christ is of a visible and invisible thing, a sign and a thing signified (*sacramento et re sacramenti*)."<sup>1</sup>

If the Roman controversialists were to interpret the passage "the Word was made flesh" (John i. 14), on the same principle as that on which they interpret "This is My body," they would at once adopt the creed of the Monophysites, who might reasonably charge them with inconsistency in failing to carry out their first principles.

#### THE NESTORIANISM OF THE DOCTRINE AND DEVOTION OF THE "SACRED HEART."

The worship of the Heart of Jesus as distinct from His humanity and separated from the other members of His sacred body, founded on the sensuous visions of a diseased and epileptic nun, was at first rejected by the theologians of the Roman Church, as a revival of the heresies of Eutyches and Nestorius in a seductive and most perilous form. The arguments adduced against the devotion by Pope Benedict XIV. when he was "Promotor Fidei," are complete and unanswerable, and the plea of the Cardiologists was twice rejected by the Congregation of Rites, and would have been undoubtedly prohibited by Pope Clement XIV. had he lived to complete his warfare with the Jesuits. It was well described as the revival of the errors of Nestorius and Eutyches, "*sotto il velame di una dolce e facile divozione, ma falsa ed erronea.*" Its dangers were ably exposed by Bishop Ricci of Pistoja, by Bishop Pannilini of Chiusi, by the "dissertations of the Advocate Blasi, and the luminous writings of Father Giorgi, Master of the Sacred Palace." These proved to demonstration that the practice of this devotion, whatever care was taken to prevent it, betrayed the worshipper into the danger of Nestorianism, in which unhappily it frequently resulted."<sup>2</sup> Its moral dangers were fatally and conspicuously revealed in the convents of the Dominicans at Prato, where the horrible disclosures made by the Tuscan Government in the examination of the sisters Buonamici and Spighi, led to the transmission of the case to the supreme authorities at Vienna. None of the proofs of the inevitable Nestorianism of Cardiolatry is more complete than that which is given by Bishop Pannilini in his Pastoral addressed to the Clergy of Chiusi and Pienza, and incorporated in the Acts of the Assembly of Bishops at Florence in 1787.

"The devotion of the Sacred Heart," writes the Bishop,

<sup>1</sup> De S. Cœna adv. Lanfr., p. 283 (Berl., 1834).

<sup>2</sup> Vie de Ricci, tom. i., p. 66.

“regarded as a symbol, is not necessary, and, moreover, not expedient, and the devotion of the carnal (or fleshly) heart, is in its nature erroneous, and conduces to the Nestorian heresy. The Roman Inquisition itself has made it a duty to exact from all the heart-worshipping writers a protest, in order to be sure that they do not in that devotion regard the heart as more than a symbol. . . . I will only give here a brief analysis of the Catholic doctrine. Adoration is due only to a person—*Adoratio debetur hypostasi*. The Humanity of Christ is not His Person, so that to the Humanity alone you ought not to give the true worship of *latría* or adoration. Father Berruyer laid down two propositions on the adoration of the Humanity of Christ; the eighth and the ninth of which are proscribed by the Sorbonne as “rash, erroneous, superstitious, scandalous, subversive of the worship and religion of Christ, and fomenting the heresies of the Arians and Socinians.” Both of these declare that the human nature in Christ is to be worshipped in itself directly and immediately (*in recto*), and with the worship of *latría*.”

Against this error the Bishop asserts the rule of antiquity, that the humanity cannot in itself and through its union with the Divine Person become the object of the worship of *latría*, which is due only to God. In the words of the Sorbonne censure: “*Ex fide consequens est sanctissimæ Christi humanitati prout unitæ substantialiter personæ uni divinæ, non deberi in se directè et in recto adorationem latriæ.*” Otherwise the Nestorian error would inevitably follow, of two persons in Christ, every time this adoration proper to the Divine Word is offered to the human nature *in se directè et in recto*.”

“This” (continues the Bishop), “is a most certain truth. The object of our direct worship cannot be any other than a person. Therefore it cannot be the humanity, far less the heart, which forms a part of it. The adoration given to Christ ought to be one and entire—the adoration can only be due to a person—the person is not the humanity. The worship of *latría* cannot be given to the whole or to a part of the humanity, but to the Divine Person. The worship ought not to reflect back upon its object, but to be given directly to the object.<sup>1</sup> This is what our faith teaches us. To give to a portion of the humanity, or to the whole of it, the adoration due to the Divine Person, is precisely the error of Nestorius and Berruyer, which has been anathematized by the Church.”<sup>2</sup>

Theodotus of Ancyra, in the Council of Ephesus, has wisely cautioned us against dividing the two natures of Christ, even

<sup>1</sup> Il culto non deve ridondare nel *supposto*, ma deve darsi al *sopposto*.

<sup>2</sup> Atti dell' Assemblea, tom. iv., pp. 648-651.

in thought or idea. "That which is united" (he writes) "is no longer called two, but one. Divide them only in your mind and contemplate each apart, and you dissolve this unity. For it is impossible to preserve the unity and to contemplate both apart. For that which is united is made indissolubly one, and is no longer two. But you say, 'I only divide them in mind.' By this very mental act you dissolve their unity. . . . Deserting, therefore, the arguments of mere reason, receive the faith, and confess the one Lord Jesus Christ both God and man, neither divided by sense or word or reasoning."

The argument of Cardinal Manning<sup>1</sup> in defence of Cardiolatry, involves such inevitable Nestorianism that it divides the two natures not only in mind, but in substance, treating the human nature of Christ as separated from the Divine, and even dividing that again by treating the heart of Christ as a distinct Personality to be addressed and worshipped as such—an idolatrous worship which the censors of the Sorbonne would have denounced as even more gross and indefensible than the theses of Berruyer.

#### THE PELAGIANISM OF MODERN ROMANISM.

From the day when the Jesuit Lainez entered the Council of Trent, and by his fatal influence involved it in the errors of Pelagius, that heresy, against which the whole of the Augustinian theology of the middle-ages was a continual protest, has reigned in the Church of Rome through the subtle influence of the unscrupulous Order of which Lainez was the second General. He did not, however, succeed in corrupting the ancient doctrine without encountering a vigorous opposition from the advocates of the older faith. Cardinals Pole and Contarini had at an earlier period, and Cardinal Seripandi to the very latest, resisted the new theology on the doctrines of grace.

The Legates of the Council (both of them afterwards Popes) reminded the Fathers, in their opening admonition on the doctrine of Justification, of the danger of their being drawn into Pelagianism through their indiscreet opposition to the truths, as well as errors, which they found in the writings of Luther. Albertus Pighius they alleged as an instance, who, "endeavouring to refute all the teaching of Luther on Original Sin, had fallen very near to the Pelagian error."<sup>2</sup>

Cardinal Seripandi, the noble vindicator of the ancient doctrines of grace, who died in the Council, and to the last protested against the Pelagianism which he saw threatening it, made an eloquent address on the subject in the General

---

<sup>1</sup> "Glories of the Sacred Heart" (London, 1877).

<sup>2</sup> Le Plat Mon. Conc. Trid., tom. iii., p. 481.

Congregation of October 8th, 1546. He contended that the Fathers ought to be most vigilant against the danger of condemning the Catholic divines in their eagerness to condemn Luther and his followers, and among them Cardinals Contarini and Ægidius of Viterbo, who seemed to be condemned by the Article on Justification, and with them Pighius and many more. The testimony of Seripandi was sufficient proof that a departure was being entered upon from the older doctrine of the Church, and we shall see presently that this parting of the ways has led the Roman Church into the most pronounced Pelagianism.

The Council in its final decrees and chapters on Justification appears in some degree to halt between two opinions, or at least to betray the conflicting influences of the two parties it sought to reconcile. Let us compare the statement in chap. xvi. with Canon XXXII.:

"So great is the goodness of God towards mankind that He wishes those things which are His own gifts to be their merits" (chap. xvi.).

"If anyone say that without the grace of the Holy Spirit preventing him and aiding him man can believe, hope, love, or repent as he ought to obtain the grace of justification, let him be anathema" (Can. III.).

"If anyone say that the good works of a justified man are so the gifts of God as not to be also the good merits of the justified person . . . and do not deserve the increase of grace and eternal life . . . let him be anathema" (Can. XXXII.).

We cannot be surprised to find that in the face of inconsistent statements like these, which might be readily multiplied, the doctrines of grace remain still without clear definition in the Roman Church, and that the numerous meetings of the Congregations *de Auxiliis Gratiæ* have never yet come to a satisfactory result either to Jesuits or Dominicans. The latter cling tenaciously to the doctrine of Aquinas, which is directly opposed to that of the Jesuits, as the learned historian of the Congregations, Serry, has distinctly proved, and consequently to the teaching of Loyola himself, who made Aquinas his infallible guide. Unfortunately for the better cause, Clement XI., in his ill-omened Bull "Unigenitus," completed the fatal triumph of Jesuit theology, and from 1713 until now that theology has crushed out the Augustinian doctrine, which was the rule of mediæval divinity, and substituted for it a pure and uncompromising Pelagianism. In that too famous Bull the Pontiff condemns as heretical the following propositions, hitherto considered the first principles of the doctrines of grace:

- I. The grace of Jesus Christ is the effectual principle of every good thing.
- II. It is necessary for the performance of every good action.
- III. Without it we can do nothing.

These, with a number of their consequences and corollaries, given in the very words of St. Augustine and Prosper Aquitaine, are condemned by the Pope as heretical, the contrary doctrines being inferred as orthodox, which represent the teaching of Pelagius and of the modern Jesuits. The older doctrine rests upon the infallible words of Christ: "Without Me ye can do nothing"; and those of St. Paul: "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me"; and has thus been beautifully expounded by St. Augustine: "The first man was created good, but did not good. He wished to desert Him by whom he was made. God permitted him, as though He said, 'Let him desert Me, and he will discover himself, and prove his misery; for he can do nothing without Me.'"

In the doctrine of the Jesuits, interpreted by their advocate Lessius, "Grace is like an instrument which the free-will can use or not, as it likes. The whole influx of grace in working, and all its efficiency, is in the power of free-will, and depends on its application and co-operation."<sup>1</sup> Free-will is here supposed to be absolutely independent of grace, and to use it as an instrument. This involves an absolute denial of prevenient grace enabling the will, and is a direct reproduction of the doctrine of Pelagius, who held that grace only assisted, but did not precede, free-will. St. Augustine affirms, therefore: "Spiritum sanctum non solum esse adiutorem (quod Pelagiani dogmati suo sufficere existimant) verum etiam largitorem dicimus virtutis, quod isti negant."<sup>2</sup> It is difficult to reconcile these words even with the ambiguous language of the Council of Trent, but absolutely impossible to reconcile them with the more modern doctrine of Rome, as illustrated in the Bull "Unigenitus."

#### THE DONATISM OF THE PAPACY.

The schism of the Donatists, which severed into two violent and irreconcilable parties the purest of the Churches of Christendom, and survived until the fatal hour when both the schismatic Church and the great Church of Tertullian, Arnobius, St. Cyprian, and St. Augustine fell together during the terrible irruptions of the Vandals, arose out of an incident of a most trifling nature, but one which too clearly indicates

---

<sup>1</sup> De Gratiâ et Libero Arbitrio.

<sup>2</sup> Contra duas Pelag. Epist., l. iii., c. 4.

the evils which a superstitious usage may bring upon the Christian Church. A wealthy Carthaginian woman, by name Lucilla, had introduced in the reception of the Sacrament the habit of kissing a bone of a martyr, to which she attached a superstitious value. This brought her into controversy, and finally into serious collision, with the Bishop of Carthage, Cæcilianus, and ripened into a schism, in which Bishop was set against Bishop and altar against altar. We are here sadly reminded of the fatal influence of women in the history of the Roman Pontificate, by whom Popes were elected and the episcopate degraded—of the lives of Theodora and Marozia, not to speak of the still nearer scandal of Donna Olimpia Maidalchini Pamfili in the days of Pope Innocent X.

Of the doctrines of Donatism we know but little, but of its cruelties and bitter intolerance in practice we gather much from the pages of Optatus of Milevis, the Catholic historian. It claimed as belonging to itself alone the name of Catholic, as the Roman Church does now. It persecuted all who refused to join it with a bitterness and cruelty which was worthy of the Roman Inquisition in the days of its greatest power. But the point in which it most closely resembled the modern Papacy is thus described by the historian we have already cited: "To such a degree was the heart of Donatus exalted, that he seemed to himself to be no longer a man, but a god. By the people he was rarely called a bishop, but Donatus of Carthage. And he well deserved to be called and denounced as Prince of Tyre—that is, of Carthage—because he was the chief of bishops, inasmuch as he had more power in him than the rest. And as he would have nothing human in him, he lifted up his heart, not as the heart of a man, but as the heart of God desiring to be something more than the rest of mankind, to whom God addresses the word, 'Thou saidst, I am a god.' And though he did not actually say this, nevertheless he suffered and allowed this word to be accomplished. He lifted up his heart so as to think no man to be compared with him, and in the swelling of his pride seemed to be almost loftier than himself; for whatever is beyond humanity is Divine. Finally, when the Bishops desired to converse with this deity, he exacted so great a reverence from them that they had no less fear of him than of God."<sup>1</sup>

We seem to see in these words a picture of an African Papacy bearing a painful and humiliating resemblance to the still more powerful and extended Papacy of Rome. The likeness at some points is almost startling. The secular title claimed by Donatus anticipates the heathen title of Pontifex

---

<sup>1</sup> Optat. de Schism. Donat., l. iii.

Maximus claimed by the Popes. The abject servitude of the Donatist Bishops reminds us of that of the Bishops of the Church of Rome. The claims to represent the Deity survive still in the "plenitudo potestatis" of the Papacy—its irreflexibility, its infallibility, its claim to a universal dominion; and though the Popes, like Donatus, "may not actually say this" of themselves, they suffer it to be said, and encourage and allow an adoration and adulation so gross and idolatrous as to prove their spiritual relationship to its earlier claimant.<sup>1</sup>

#### THE MONTANISM OF MODERN ROMANISM.

None of the ancient heresies has bequeathed to the mediæval and modern Church of Rome so rich a heritage as Montanism, in which the otherwise illustrious Tertullian and a Bishop of Rome in his day were so strangely entangled. Montanus and his followers were the first to bring into the Church a new rule of faith and new doctrines founded on visions and revelations, forming a kind of supplement to the perfect and final revelation of God in the Scriptures. Asserting for himself the possession of the Holy Spirit in a manner so far exceeding the measure of that supreme gift bestowed on an ordinary Christian, as to make some believe that he actually claimed to be a second Paraclete, he associated himself with two fanatical claimants of prophetic powers, Priscilla and Maximilla, and on the ground of their visions and prophecies produced a succession of doctrines which stand in strange contrast to the simple truths of the Gospel. Ecstasies and prophetic visions and utterances, formed the characteristic features of this new faith of which Tertullian himself became the apostle. The extraordinary resemblance which subsists between Montanism and the worship of the "Sacred Heart" in its origin, its history, its spirit and aims, has been already pointed out by the writer of these lines in a special treatise,<sup>2</sup> but it bears a like similitude to the earlier revelations and rhapsodies of St. Bridget, St. Catherine of Siena, St. Mary Magdalen de Pazzi, St. Theresa, and a countless number of visionaries, upon whose revelations the entire fabric of Mariolatry is built up. In vain the great divines of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries endeavoured to stem this tide of new revelations and prophecies. The court of Rome invariably encouraged and at last authorized them, and the stream flows on still with an irresistible current. Though the prophecies have often contradicted one another, and still

<sup>1</sup> See (as a single instance) the horribly blasphemous addresses which Innocent X. received on his coronation without a word of protest.

<sup>2</sup> "The Doctrine and Devotion of the Sacred Heart" (London, R.T.S.).

oftener failed in their fulfilment, the faith or credulity of their devotees has never been shaken. Thus the revelation of St. Catherine of Siena opposed itself bodily to that of St. Bridget, while another of the prophecies of St. Catherine was so disastrous in its results that the Pope himself, who had acted upon it, bitterly regretted his credulity in his last moments.<sup>1</sup> But what limit is there to human credulity, or to resolute fanaticism? The whole of the relative and creature worship of Rome has grown up from such visionary disclosures, with which it disgraces and discredits the great historical religion of Christ.

To indicate a few of the doctrinal and ritual observances which have their origin from visions and dreams, we have these among many others:

I. The feast of the "Corpus Christi" arising out of the vision of the nun Juliana.

II. The devotion of the Sacred Heart arising out of the fanatical ecstasies of Margaret Mary Alacoque.

III. The Feast of St. Mary de Mercede, resting on a vision of Raymond de Pennafort.

IV. The Feast of St. Mary de Monte Carmelo, from the visions of Simon Stock.

V. The Praemonstratensian Order, founded on a vision of St. Norbert.

VI. The doctrine of the "Immaculate Conception," which had its chief confirmation from the revelation of St. Bridget; while those of St. Hildegarde and of the Abbot Joachim formed the spiritual food of the mediæval laity, by whom the Divine revelation of the Scriptures was too little known.

VII. The doctrine of Purgatory rests wholly upon visions, as may be proved from the Dialogues of Gregory the Great, from Bede, and from many other mediæval testimonies.

We might multiply this list from the inexhaustible store of legends and visions which the Church of Rome has either authorized or tacitly permitted, but this may suffice to show that she has incorporated in her very composite system the principal feature of Montanism, and mixed up "cunningly devised fables" with the eternal truths of the Gospel.

This fatal error was denounced by Cardinal Cajetan in the Council of Lateran under Leo X., who writes of the conflicting visions of St. Bridget and St. Catherine of Siena:

"New revelations contrary to so many saints and ancient doctors, would seem to the wise to bring into the Church an angel of Satan transformed into an angel of light—fancies and figments. These, then, with the so-called miracles which are

<sup>1</sup> Gerson de Exam. Doctr. Consid. III.

alleged in this cause, are rather for old women than for the holy Synod. Wherefore I do not think them worthy to be mentioned."<sup>1</sup>

In proof of the Montanistic tendency of Romanism it may be added that the Roman controversialists, and notably the Jesuit Gretser, derive arguments for many of their doctrines and observances from the Montanistic writings of Tertullian. This has been largely proved in the "*Arbor hæreticæ consanguinitatis*," of Dr. Daniel Cramer, of Stettin, published at Strasburg in 1623.

#### ON THE COLLYRIDIAN HERESY AS REPRESENTED IN MODERN ROMANISM.

Among the heresies associated with the life of the Blessed Virgin, and arising out of errors connected with it, St. Epiphanius has described to us two forms of error—one, the denial of her perpetual virginity, the other, the ascription to her of worship. Against the latter heresy he inveighs with great force, even in his description of the former one. In this we may notice a remarkable suppression of the truth in Cardinal Newman's work "On Development." The true translation of the passage he quotes (p. 407), which is given by the learned Petavius, runs thus :

"*Revera tamen à Maria Virgine vita ipsa est in mundum introducta ut viventem pariat et viventium Maria sit Mater. Quo circa viventium Mater adumbrata similitudine (δι' ἀνύγατος) Maria dicitur*"—which Newman translates: "From Mary was life itself brought into the world, that Mary *might bear things living*, and might become Mother of living things." The last sentence, which describes the *viventium Mater* as said metaphorically, he omits altogether, turning "a living one" (Christ) into "living things," suppressing also the reason of this expression, which is given a few sentences after, "*Maria vitæ causam præbuit per quam vita est nobis producta*"—which explains "*ut viventem pariat*."—I ventured to remonstrate with him on this *suppressio veri* and on his turning *viventem pariat* into "might bear things living," which almost gave her a creative power. He strove to defend his position, but (with the greatest authority of his own or any other Church, on the meaning of Epiphanius, directly opposing him) explanation was difficult, if not impossible. It is in this treatise (Haer. 78) that the most signal denunciation in all antiquity of the worship of the Virgin occurs, which runs thus :

"We find that some have actually advanced to such a pitch

---

<sup>1</sup> De Concept. B. Virginis, c. v. (Opusc. Lugd., 1568, p. 141).

of madness in the things relating to the holy ever-Virgin, that they would obtrude her upon us as a Deity, and talk of her as though they were stupefied and maddened. For they say, that there are some silly women in Arabia, who came thither from Thrace, who have invented a new doctrine, offering a cake and having services in her name and honour." After much more to the same purpose, he adds: "It is a sin to honour the saints above measure; their Lord ought rather to be honoured. For Mary is not God, nor did she receive a body from heaven, but was born of the union of her father and mother, according to the dispensation of promise, as was Isaac." Here he gives an absolute denial to the figment of the Immaculate Conception, one of the popular grounds of the extravagant devotions of modern Mariolatry. But the most remarkable passage occurs in his description of the sect itself, which he names Collyridian, from the cake they offer to the Virgin (*κολλυρίς*). He writes:

"The body of Mary, in truth, was holy, but she is not God. She remained a virgin, and is to be honoured, but is not proposed to us as an object of worship, but as worshipping Him who was born of her flesh, and descended from the bosom of the Father. Hence the Holy Gospel has cautioned us in the words of Christ Himself, saying, 'Woman, what have I to do with thee? Mine hour is not yet come.' Where He calls her 'woman,' lest anyone should think that she has a higher nature: as though he prophesied against the schisms and heresies which were coming upon the Church, in order that no one with too excessive admiration of the saint should fall into that heresy."

That these words condemn by an almost prophetic anticipation the idolatrous worship of the Virgin in our day, must appear to every ingenuous mind. An earlier prophet had already sufficiently condemned it. The words of Jeremiah, which denounce the worship of the Queen of Heaven (xliv. 25, 26), tell with irresistible force against the same worship under Christianity, and against the worship of the Mother of the Gods, which it superseded. Let the closing injunction of St. Epiphanius ever be the guide of our worship:

"Let Mary be honoured, but the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost worshipped. Let no one adore Mary, for to no man, not to say woman, is the mystery of worship to be rendered—for such an ascription of glory belongs not even to angels."

It appears strange that a worship which in the fifth century should have been deemed puerile and almost ridiculous, should flourish in the nineteenth, to the fatal diminution and dishonour of the one living and true God. It would seem to be a part

of the mystery of iniquity of the latter days, a presage of the "perilous times" which were foreseen in the earliest age of the Church.

#### CONCLUSION.

Many more might be added to these proofs of the survival of ancient heresies in that Church which brands with the mark of heresy every other Church in the world. Well might we say of her, in the words of our Lord, "With what measure ye mete, it shall be measured unto you again." For we are able to cast back the charge of heresy upon herself, and to bring against her the more serious charge of the worship of saints and images, of relics and shrines, involving the most subtle and the most seductive forms of idolatry. It would be a false delicacy and unworthy of the sincerity of a Christian either to dissemble or to mitigate this serious charge. We are bound to follow St. Athanasius, and to confess that in all this relative and inferior worship the first principle of Arianism is clearly disclosed, while in the extreme practices of Mariolatry it has reached its greatest, though hardly its final, development. It remains to be seen what new doctrine of necessary belief the Papal autocracy will impose upon its subjects in order to draw them still farther from the lines of the earlier Church and the articles of her universal creed. That creed has already been superseded by the larger creed of Pius IV., whose additions neutralize and even destroy its most fundamental articles; while the creed of Pius has been in its turn supplanted by the creed of the Vatican Council and the illimitable code of the Bullarium Magnum. One result we may well foresee, for it is an obvious as well as a deplorable one, that the farther the Church of Christ recedes from her exclusive worship of God, the more impossible will it be for her to carry on her great work of conversion both among heathens and Mohammedans. For the religion of the Prophet had this great and distinctive merit, that it was the protest against the forms of idolatry he had witnessed, not only among his own people, but among the degenerate Christians of the East, in that season of darkness and spiritual death, when the introduction of image-worship had disgraced the name of Christianity, and given it the worst characteristic of the faiths it had in its better days supplanted. To the fatal divisions of worship in the darkness of the Middle Ages may be traced the divisions of Churches which render Christianity so unsuccessful in her work of evangelizing the world. Nor can this work be ever carried on without bitter conflicts and fruitless labours, until the day when on earth, as in heaven, "the Lord alone shall be exalted, and the idols He shall utterly abolish."

ROBERT C. JENKINS.