

**OBSERVATIONS ON THE REV. DR
WISEMAN'S REPLY TO DR
TURTON'S ROMAN CATHOLIC
DOCTRINE OF THE EUCHARIST
CONSIDERED**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649542680

Observations on the Rev. Dr Wiseman's Reply to Dr Turton's Roman Catholic Doctrine of the Eucharist Considered by Thomas Turton

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

THOMAS TURTON

**OBSERVATIONS ON THE REV. DR
WISEMAN'S REPLY TO DR
TURTON'S ROMAN CATHOLIC
DOCTRINE OF THE
EUCHARIST CONSIDERED**

OBSERVATIONS

ON THE

REV. DR WISEMAN'S REPLY

TO

DR TURTON'S

*ROMAN CATHOLIC DOCTRINE OF THE EUCHARIST
CONSIDERED.*

By THOMAS TURTON, D.D.

REGIUS PROFESSOR OF DIVINITY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE,
AND
DEAN OF PETERBOROUGH.

CAMBRIDGE:

PRINTED BY JOHN W. PARKER, UNIVERSITY PRINTER.

FOR J. & J. J. DEIGHTON, CAMBRIDGE;

AND

JOHN W. PARKER, LONDON.

M.DCCCXXXIX.

1024.



1

CONTENTS.

SECTION I.

MODE OF CONTROVERSY.

	PAGE
THE author's apology	1
Dr Wiseman's complaints :	
(1) Harsh language	2
(2) Exaggeration	11
(3) Learning under-rated	12
Estius—Maldonatus, &c.	16
Dr Wiseman's test applied to his own Lectures	18
The author's purpose	20

SECTION II.

STRUCTURE OF THE SIXTH CHAPTER OF ST JOHN.

Importance of Dr Wiseman's division	22
Reasons for the division :	
(1) Inference from <i>Verity, verity</i>	28
(2) Identical expressions differently applied	30
(3) Poetical parallelisms	32
Matt. xxiv. 43. similar to John vi. 48	33
Maldonatus, Cornelius à Lapide, Calmet	49

SECTION III.

HERMENEUTICAL PRINCIPLES—COUNCIL OF TRENT.

Transition from a word or phrase to an entire discourse	53
Motives of the Council of Trent	56
Different views of John vi.	64

SECTION IV.

CHANGE OF SUBJECT IN THE SIXTH CHAPTER OF ST JOHN.

Dr Wiseman's objections to the author's statements :	
(1) Not <i>idea</i> but <i>word</i>	67
(2) Could not possibly misunderstand	70
Reason for change of subject :	
First, God the giver ; then, Christ	74
Falsification of Dr Wiseman's words	77
Misrepresentation of his sentiments	80

SECTION V.

JEWISH PREJUDICES, AND MODES OF INTERPRETING OUR
LORD'S DISCOURSES.

	PAGE
Mr Burke's maxim	84
Our Lord's meaning <i>wrongly</i> understood :	
(1) John iii. 3—8: Nicodemus	92
(2) Matt. xvi. 6: Leaven of the Pharisees	96
People of Capernaum	101
Our Lord's meaning <i>rightly</i> understood :	
Matt. ix. 2—6: <i>Thy sins be forgiven thee</i>	105
Adverse instances :	
(1) John ii. 18—22: <i>Destroy this temple</i>	112
(2) John iv. 10—15: <i>The woman of Samaria</i>	118

SECTION VI.

OUR LORD'S ANSWER TO THE JEWS, AND HIS CONDUCT TO
HIS DISCIPLES.

The case of Tittmann	122
The case of Mr Faber	136
Interpretation of John vi. 55: <i>meat indeed</i>	142
Interpretation of John vi. 60: <i>hard saying</i>	145
Divines sanctioning the author's views :	
(1) Doddridge	148
(2) Tittmann	149
(3) Dr Lingard	150
The case of Estius, resumed from p. 16	151
Dr Wiseman's authorities examined :	
(1) Maldonatus	154
(2) Cornelius à Lapide	156
(3) Calmet	158
Roman Catholic authorities opposed to Dr Wiseman :	
(1) Glossæ Ordinaria	158
(2) Nicolas de Lyræ	159
(3) Erasmus, Cajetan, Titelman, Tolet, &c.	160
Estius finally resumed—conclusion	161

SECTION I.

MODE OF CONTROVERSY.

1. Two chapters of Dr Wiseman's *Reply* are occupied by a review of "the style and manner" of the strictures, which have been published, on his *Lectures on the Eucharist*. In the first of those chapters, the learned writer more especially remonstrates against the harsh terms employed by myself, in my *Roman Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist considered*. Now, far from being attached to the language of reproof, I for my own part sincerely lament that Dr Wiseman should have had any reason to complain of such language; and I entreat that whatever phrase or sentence can be justly deemed unwarrantable may be considered as withdrawn. Comments indeed, stronger than the occasion requires, undoubtedly tend to weaken the effects of argument; and whether Dr Wiseman is right or wrong in the opinion, which he seems to hold (p. 18), that such is the result in my own case—I certainly shall not permit another edition of the work in question to appear, presenting expressions which are likely to have that tendency.

It was not till very near the close of the year 1836, that I became acquainted with Dr Wiseman's volume on the Eucharist. Not being then aware that anything had been written, or was designed to be written, in the way of remarks upon that production—and thinking that some remarks upon it were required—I determined to put down what occurred to me, as well as the little leisure, which I could command, would allow. And thus, amidst the distractions of business—and, I may add, during a protracted illness—the work was sent to the printer in portions as it was written, and was finally published about Easter 1837. This statement will in some measure account for the existence of a volume less courteous in tone, and more diffuse in style, than I trust it would have been, under less unfavourable circumstances. Unaccustomed to disguise my sentiments, I fairly mention what has struck me, on looking through the book for the first time since it appeared—that is, after an interval of more than two years. On this subject I will only add, that the acknowledgment now offered would have been the same, whatever might have been the occasion of examining my treatise on the Eucharist.

2. After the statement just made on my own behalf, it is but right to observe, with regard to Dr Wiseman, that, even when argument is quite

out of the question, there is often great difficulty in dealing with his positions. For example: In his *Reply* (p. 6), he mentions the *Protestant Journal*—a publication entirely unknown to me—in which, as he informs us, some one, when commenting on his Lectures, “*weeps at his wickedness*”—asserting that “there is no mistaking the *infernal* spirit of these passages”—that “there is an *infernal* spirit, which struggles with every effort of which the man was capable, to make sceptics, or infidels, since he could not make them Romanists.” Dr Wiseman then affirms that, “throughout Dr Turton’s book, a similar form of objection prevails;” and proceeds to give, as an instance, a remark of mine—which, after transcribing the sentence that called it forth, I shall adduce. In the Lectures on the Eucharist (p. 86), I found the following passage, relating to the latter part of our Lord’s discourse to the Jews, in the sixth chapter of St John’s Gospel:

“Our Saviour’s object in his discourses to the Jews, was to gain them over to the doctrines of Christianity; and he, therefore, must be supposed to propose those doctrines in the manner most likely to gain their attention, and conciliate their esteem. *At least, it is repugnant to suppose him selecting the most revolting images, wherein to clothe his dogmas, disguising his most amiable institutions under the semblance of things the most wicked and abominable in the opinion of his hearers, and inculcating his most saving and most beautiful principles, by the most impious and horrible illustrations.*”