

UNIV. OF  
TORONTO  
LIBRARY











R Theol  
M

## REMARKS

ON DOCTOR STRACHAN'S PAMPHLET AGAINST THE CATHOLIC  
DOCTRINE OF THE REAL PRESENCE OF CHRIST'S  
BODY AND BLOOD IN

# THE EUCHARIST:

ADDRESSED BY HIM

TO HIS CONGREGATION OF ST. JAMES' CHURCH, IN  
YORK, UPPER CANADA:

AND OCCASIONED BY THE HONORABLE JOHN ELMSLEY'S PUBLICATION OF THE  
BISHOP OF STRASBOURG'S OBSERVATIONS ON THE SIXTH CHAPTER  
OF ST. JOHN'S GOSPEL.

---

By the Rev. Wm. D. MacDonald, Vicar General,  
KINGSTON.

---

AUDI ALTERAM PARTEM.

371243  
19.9.39

---

KINGSTON:

PRINTED FOR THE AUTHOR, BY JAMES MACFARLANE AND COMPANY.

1834.

1/21

1917

[Faint, illegible text, possibly bleed-through from the reverse side of the page]



## INTRODUCTION.

HAD the polemical pamphlet edited by the Honble. and Venble. Archdeacon of York—D. D. L. L. D. been but the Lucubration of some obscure Commoner; I doubt much if it ever would have elicited the high Encomiums, which certain Journalists have lavished upon it; or even occupied for one moment the attention of the public. But Rank and Title with our gullible English are generally preferred to Talent and Truth. Hence, to Publishers, and those concerned in the Book-making Business; whose interest depends on humouring this JOHN BULL propensity; the works of an Honble. and Venble., of a Right Honble. and Right Revd., of My Lord such a one, or of Sir Somebody, be what they may, are far more prized in general, and more eagerly sought after for publication, as sure to have a more immediate run, than the finest productions of untitled and plebeian Genius.—Our Poet Laureate, Southey, was sensible of this, when in the year 1811, in order to puff off his *Peninsular War*, which he was then composing, he applied through the Spanish Legation for the title of *honorary Member of the royal historical and Academical Society of Madrid*: for the obtaining of which from the prime Minister, Don Eusebio Bardaxi, at the instance of Don Manuel Abellia, then Chief Secretary to the Spanish Embassy at our Court; he made a present to this last, of his lumpish Quarto poems, Maddoc and Don Rodrigo. A Puffer, he knew, in England is sure to gather pelf; be he Clerical, medical, musical, Farcical, or any *cal* you please. Not that I would insinuate from all this, or even imagine for one moment, that the Honble. and Venerable Individual, whose pamphlet we here revise, ever meant his well earned Titles as an offset to his work. But they have certainly in this instance had the usual biassing effect on the undiscerning minds of his rash Panegyrists: else how could they have so lauded to the skies a lucubration, which has nothing in it, original; absolutely nothing to recommend it for either stile or argument, above the sickening religious Tract Effusions, which so inundate every corner of the British Dominions; and all the United States of North America?—We find in it the same ignorant misrepresentation of Catholic Doctrine; the same recklessly unfounded assertions: the same twisting of the Sacred Text from its natural, most obvious and universally established meaning, to make it tally with the preferred conjectures of private interpretation; and suit the Sectarian System adopted by each: the same ignorance of the primitive Church, and of the writings of the holy Fathers: the same vain boastings of irresistible might and triumph, to cover the misgivings of weakness and De-

feat. These are, and have ever been the controversial characteristics of protestant polemics of every denomination: and these are those most consistently displayed in the pamphlet before us edited by the Archdeacon of York. So truly is this the case, that those accustomed to read anti-catholic publications, can, without looking into the pamphlet in question, imagine all the thousand times refuted, trite arguments it contains.

Viewing, as we did, the most sacred Dogma of our holy Religion attacked by a person of such Dignity in Church and State, as the Honble. and Venble. the Archdeacon of York, D. D. L. L. D., and knowing the weight that Rank and title in the minds of the ignorant give to the arguments of persons in an exalted sphere of Life; Seeing also in the public Papers the insult offered to our Catholic Bishop in the present sent him by the Author, of an elegant bound copy of the pamphlet, made to prove him and all those of his Religion *stultified fools*, for believing in a Mystery revealed by the Deity incarnate; and believed by all the Great and Learned in the world for fifteen hundred years before the pretended Reformation; and since, by the far greatest portion of Christians: we took it upon ourselves, (our Bishop being at too great a distance for previous consultation) to repel from Catholics the charge of *stultification*; and shew the public the reasons we have for believing, as spoken, and understood by all Christians for so many ages, the words of the Redeemer. Though the Dignified personage we oppose, is one whom we esteem from acquaintance, our motto is, and ever shall be: AMICTS PLATO; MAGIS AMICA VERITAS.

## REMARKS.

---

BEFORE entering on the subject-matter of the Doctor's pamphlet, we cannot help noticing a remarkable sentence in his introductory Letter addressed to the congregation of St. James in York. It is as follows: "For having known no instance of such conversion in this Province; it seemed scarcely credible that a person, who had been carefully educated to mature age in the Doctrines of the protestant Church, should have suddenly abandoned them, and attached himself to the Roman Catholic persuasion."

Without mentioning, as we could, many instances of persons well known to the Dr. himself, as well as to us, who, "though carefully educated to mature age in the Doctrines of their particular sects," have thought proper to change their Religion: is not the Dr. himself a remarkable instance of the kind? Had he not been "carefully educated to mature age in the Doctrines of Presbyterianism;" when, notwithstanding, "he suddenly abandoned them, and attached himself to the Church of England's persuasion." And who can blame him for having done so, if he can but show that his conduct in that respect was as much influenced by the pure love of truth, and disinterested conviction, as that of the honourable Individual, which he condemns? There is however this well known Difference between the two Conversions in question, that the Hon. John Elmsley, like all those who turn Catholic under the British Sectarian Government, had much to lose in a worldly sense by changing his Creed; whereas the Dr. by doing so, had all to gain. Besides, it was only after his failing to get himself appointed Pastor to a Presbyterian Congregation in another pro-

vince, that he turned round, and sued more successfully for admission into the English Church.

What the Dr. therefore blames in the conduct of his late Parishioner cannot be the mere changing of his Creed; for of this the Dr. himself had set him the Example: besides, *the pure reforming principle* authorizes every one to judge for himself by Scripture, and determine accordingly: for it attaches no absolute, or *infallible* certainty to the particular Doctrines of any of its Churches. The whole sum then of Mr. Elmsley's offence must be, his having left *the many fallible* protestant Churches, for *the one infallible Catholic one*.

It is not however as the Dr. affects to suppose, so rare and *incredible* a thing to see Protestants, "who had been carefully educated to mature age in the Doctrines of the protestant Church, abandoning them suddenly, and attaching themselves to the Roman Catholic persuasion." We could mention many such in the first Ranks of Life, and several to whom the Dr. even in point of Education, might own himself inferior. Need I name the Honble. and Rev. Mr. Spencer, Son of Earl Spencer and Brother to Lord Althorp; late a pastor of the Doctor's own Church; and now a Catholic Clergyman? what worldly honors and emoluments did he not forego to embrace a state so frowned upon in his native Land by the Powers *that be*; and railed against by our abounding Fanatics of every Description? We could name a great many others lately converted to the Catholic Church in the Land itself of the Pharos; several of whom are equally distinguished for their high rank in Life, and Superior Education: but the one just mentioned will, I think, suffice to keep the Honble. John Elmsley in countenance for the wise and independent step he has taken, notwithstanding the blame which the Dr. tries to attach to it.

In the United States of America, where *the Reforming principle* is fully acted up to, namely, the right of every one, without let or hindrance, to judge for himself in matters of Religion: where no Church and State authority obliges all, under the severest penalties and privations, to swear their Be-

lief in its avowedly *fallible* dogmatic Decisions: where no Law-Church, by Statute makes perjured Hypocrites of Sham Believers in its parliamentary Code of Doctrines; but Conviction alone is left to sway the mind; not unnatural and anti-christian Compulsion: in such a Country it is no ways strange that such numberless Conversions to the Catholic Faith are daily and every where made and making; not of the untaught and ignorant only, but of the most learned and talented, virtuous and exemplary. Witness but the other day in New York, on the 8th of January last, the reception into the Catholic Church of Mr. Gardener Jones, Son of the Rev. Mr. Jones, Pastor of the reformed Dutch Church; who declares that he owes his Conversion to the total failure of Dr. Brownlee to parry the solid arguments adduced in Defence of their Church by the Catholic Clergy whom he had solemnly challenged to public Disputation. The Man had absolutely nothing to oppose to them, but the thousand times refuted protestant calumnies and misrepresentations; but ignorant, unfounded and blasphemous surmises; and the most disgusting, foul-mouthed vituperations, all drawn from the well saved old store of anti-catholic Repellants; the fittest ammunition to be used against the Romans.

On the 6th of the same month, the eminently learned Dr. Coleman, a Native of Massachusetts, though educated a Quaker, was baptized, and professed himself a Catholic in St. Mary's Church in Albany.

These are but a few of the numberless instances we could cite of such Conversions in our Neighbourhood: and which, being now made known to the Dr. it can no more seem to him "scarcely credible that a person who had been carefully educated to mature age in the Doctrines of the protestant Church, should have suddenly abandoned them, and attached himself to the Roman Catholic persuasion."

In his Letter to Mr. Elmsley, page 5, the Dr. expresses himself as follows: "I am astonished that the Bishop (of Strasbourgh's) Exposition of the 6th Chapter of St. John,

“ should have made so deep an impression on your mind ; for no  
 “ tenet of the Roman Church appears to me so completely un-  
 “ scriptural, and so extremely pernicious, as that of Transub-  
 “ stantiation ; nor any that has been more triumphantly refuted  
 “ by Protestant Writers. And had I been called upon to point  
 “ out the weakest portion of the Bishop’s Treatise, I should  
 “ have pointed to that, which you have published.”

If this really be the way in which the Dr. views the Texts alluded to in the 6th Chapter of St. John ; we may cease to wonder at the unhappy facility with which every new Teacher can turn the sacred Text from its plainest, original and Catholic meaning, to just what suits his own particular whim and purpose. According to the Dr., the Saviour’s plainest, strongest, and most solemn and repeated affirmation of a thing ; is *the weakest possible proof* that ever he affirmed any such thing!!! This is really worse than the hired Lawyer’s Logic, which can prove that Black is White and White Black in favour of his retaining Clients. The Saviour affirms, verse 52, that *the Bread that he gives us is his flesh for the life of the world*. This, says the Dr., is no proof at all that he affirmed it to be *his flesh*, nor, if so ; is his affirming it to be *his flesh*, any proof that it was *his flesh*. Just as, at the last Supper, when the Saviour, *taking Bread into his hands, blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to his Disciples, saying : take and eat, this is my Body*. Matth. 26. 26. This according to the Dr. is the weakest proof possible that what Christ then gave to his Disciples, was *his Body*. Nay it proves that it was not *his Body*: making the Saviour act as one would in Derision to any hungry suppliant for Bread ; should he take up a Stone and say to the petitioner : *take and eat, this is Bread*. The Stone is here offered as the sign of Bread with just as much propriety as, according to the Dr.; the Bread in the hand of the Saviour was offered as the sign of his Body : that is to say in neither case was that given, which was said to be given. Here is exactly a parallel case. But can any one believe the Saviour to have acted so? No surely ; for when the almighty Father promises

his Children Bread, he will not offer them a *Stone*; or when a *Fish*, he will not give them a *Serpent*. Luke 11. 11. Whatever he promises to give them, he will give them, and just such as he has promised it: for however impossible the fulfilment of his promise may seem to us, we are assured that *with God, no word is impossible*. Luke 1. 37. But, according to the Doctor's interpretation of the Saviour's words, *this is my Body* means, *this is not my Body*, but only *the sign of my Body*. *The Bread that I will give you is my Flesh for the life of the world*; John, 52. means, *the Bread that I will give you, is not my Flesh, but merely Bread, as a sign of my flesh*: and this earthly material sign shall be the heavenly and immortalising food of the world; better than the flesh of the paschal Lamb; far better than even the Manna rained down from Heaven!!! *My flesh is meat indeed; and my Blood is drink indeed*: that is; *my flesh is not meat indeed, nor my Blood drink indeed*.—*Except you eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, you shall not have life in you. He who eateth my flesh and drinketh my Blood, hath everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the last day*. All this, in the Dr's. meaning, signifies that unless *we eat the sign* of the Saviour's flesh, and *drink the sign* of the Saviour's Blood, we shall not have life in us, nor be raised up to eternal life at the last day!!! Yet, the eating of the sign of a thing, (though the expression is rather an odd one) is not the eating of the thing itself, which the Saviour promised to give, with surely more truth than the one offering a Stone to the hungry craver for Bread, and saying to him, *take and eat it, this is Bread*; that is to say, *the sign of Bread*: which Sign, however, I defy him to eat, except, like the Protestant, *with the mouth of faith*. But though Faith may have *ears to hear*, we can hardly conceive her having a *mouth to eat* by; much less *eyes to see* into the impenetrable cloud of God's mysteries revealed. For, as according to the Apostle, Rom. 10. 17. *Faith cometh by the hearing, and hearing by the word of Christ*; so faith is a perfect reliance on the word of Christ for the truth of all that he has revealed; how-

ever inconceivable it may be to us, and utterly incomprehensible. The other senses, *the sight, the touch, the taste, and smell* may be deceived, as they often are; but not so the *hearing* when God has clearly spoken, who can neither deceive, nor be deceived: and therefore did our Saviour, in chiding the Apostle Thomas for his disbelief in the testimony of the other Apostles, as to the truth of his Resurrection, declare: *because thou hast seen me, Thomas, thou hast believed: but, BLESSED ARE THEY WHO HAVE NOT SEEN, AND YET HAVE BELIEVED.* Our faith, or entire Reliance on the word of God, according to St. Paul, remains only during this life, while we continue but *to see, as through a glass darkly*; and *to know but in part*: but in the next life our faith ends in Evidence, when *we shall know, even as we are known*: just as Hope ends in the enjoyment of the good things promised us; and hence the same Apostle concludes thus: *Now there remain Faith, Hope and Charity these three; but the greatest of all is Charity*, 1. Cor. 13, 12. &c. which Charity he declares *shall never fall away*, though all the rest be finally made void, verse 8th. Let me therefore only know what Christ has plainly spoken; and as I own him God, I implicitly believe it. But did he ever make a plainer, stronger or more reiterated Declaration than that *his flesh was meat indeed and that his Blood was Drink indeed.* And when the Jews, like the protestants, *strove among themselves saying: how can this Man give us his flesh to eat*, mark how unequivocally, emphatically, and repeatedly he reasserts the very thing to which they objected: *verily, verily, I say unto you, except you eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood; you shall not have life in you. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my Blood, hath everlasting life, and I will raise him up at the Last Day: for my flesh is meat indeed, and my Blood is Drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my Blood, abideth in me and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and as I live by the Father; so he that eateth me, the same also shall live by me. This is the Bread that came down from Heaven: not as your Fathers did eat*



*Manna and are dead. He that eateth this Bread shall live for ever. These things, adds the Evangelist, he said teaching in the Synagogue at Caphernaum.* This then was his formally inculcated Doctrine, against which the unbelieving Jews, protested, as our unbelieving Sectaries still continue to protest. None but his Apostles, and those who hold by them, can believe in so deep and inscrutable a mystery. Such alone, when asked, like the remaining twelve, if they too would leave their Divine Master, rather than believe that he could give them what he had promised; such alone can say with Peter, *Lord, to whom shall we go? thou hast the words of eternal Life: and we have believed, and have known that thou art Christ, the Son of God.*

The Dr. however thinks to make the Saviour retract all his former asseverations on the subject by this sole sentence spoken by him on the occasion; *it is the Spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I have spoken to you are Spirit and Life.*

Will then the Dr. affirm that *the flesh of Jesus Christ* profiteth us nothing; that flesh, to the eating of which Christ himself annexes eternal life: that flesh in which he paid our ransom, and cancelled, as Man, *the Handwriting which stood against us?* The Saviour then affirmed not this of his own living, life-giving, and now immortal Body; but of a flesh without *spirit or life.* He but refuted thus the gross ideas of his Hearers, who naturally enough supposed him to promise them his flesh devoid of *Spirit and Life*; to be eaten by them like the dead flesh of their Victims. Such a flesh as that could indeed profit them nothing in the Supernatural and Spiritual sense in which he intended giving it.

But no, says the Dr. I will not believe, what it were the height of absurdity to suppose for a moment, that the Saviour, (though Almighty) could really give us, what he so formally has promised us; *his very flesh to eat, and his very Blood to drink:* assuring us so positively that *his flesh is meat indeed; and his Blood Drink indeed.* The Dr. therefore takes his

Stand, not with St. Peter and the Apostles of our Lord; but with the unbelieving Jews, who said, on hearing all that the Saviour had taught on this important Subject: *this is a hard saying, and who can hear it? How can this man give us his flesh to eat? and going back who walked no more with him.*

In vain did he say to them: *murmur not among yourselves; no one can come to me, except the Father, who has sent me, draw him.* In vain did he remind them that we are not, on such a sublime mystery, the stupendous work of Omnipotence, *to be taught of Man*; nor to build our faith in it on our own weak reasonings and human conjecture; for, *it is written, said he, in the Prophets, they shall all be taught of God.* In vain also did he tell them that he was that teaching God, whom they were bound to hear; who, as he had come down from Heaven, should be one day seen ascending up thither again. They would not be *taught of God*; nor *bring into captivity their understanding in obedience to Christ.* 2 Cor. 10. 5. *For the sensual man perceiveth not the things that are of the Spirit of God; for it is folly to him, and he cannot understand.* 1 Cor. 12. *For who has known the mind of the Lord, that he may instruct him; but we have known the mind of Christ.* 1 Cor. 2. *My speech, says St. Paul, whose words we are quoting, and my preaching, was not in the persuasive words of human Wisdom, but in the showing of the Spirit and power; that your faith might not stand on the wisdom of men, but on the power of God.....But we speak the wisdom of God in a mystery.....But, as it is written: the Eye hath not seen, nor ear heard, neither hath it entered into the heart of Man, what things God hath prepared for them that love him.—Ibid.*

The Dr. in his Letter addressed generally to his parishioners, page 6, expresses himself thus: “the tenets held by the “Roman Catholic Church, and in which she differs from THE “TRULY CATHOLIC CHURCH OF ENGLAND”!!! *The truly catholic Church of England!!!* Why, the Church of England is, as its title implies, the Church but of a particular kingdom and its dependencies. How can it then be *the truly*

*catholic or universal Church*; for that is the meaning of the word *Catholic*? Now let the Dr. name a Country under the heavens, where the name of Christ is known: where the Catholic Religion, the Religion I mean in union with *the See of Rome*, is not known; and where all of that Religion, are not of one faith in every Iota and tittle; Let him next name the age since our Saviour's time, when this Religion, in union with the See of Rome, has ceased to exist. Could the act of a lustful and murderous tyrant, like King Henry the eighth, abolish it? or the Decrees of a Baby king Edward; or those of the Tigress Elizabeth, annihilate that Church; or all the horrible penal Statutes of the British protestant parliamentary Code? No; in the very Country, where these persecuting Statutes and Fiend-like cruel enactments, were enforced; The Catholic Religion, even in the British Dominions, compared separately with the Religion of the State, and with every other particular sect, is still the Dominant Religion in point of numbers. And can the Dr. have the unblushing assurance to call his *Church of England* THE TRULY CATHOLIC CHURCH? *Go and teach all Nations*, said the Saviour to his pastors. Where did the Saviour say to them; go and teach England; Scotland, or any other particular Nation? Yet, according to the Dr., England is the privileged Nation, to which alone the true faith by act of Parliament is propounded and promulgated. Not so, says the presbyterian; for Scotland is the choice spot on the surface of this Earth, to which by act of the same parliament, and within its own Boundaries, the Church of Christ is confined. Woe's me, what then is to become of the rest of the Christian world, the great bulk of mankind all buried in the damnable errors of popery! was ever a delusion equal to this? But though it is the interest of those, whose *living* depends on the keeping up of the Delusion, to prolong it as much as possible; why should the disinterested public delight in being so imposed upon?

The Dr. speaks of ascribing *infallibility to the pope*. No Catholic ascribes infallibility to him, but in as far as he speaks

the unanimous Doctrines and Decisions of the Church and her pastors. *Transubstantiation* we have already noticed, and shall further discuss. *Auricular confession*, which is recommended in the Drs. own Church, we need not rest upon. *The invocation of Saints* in Heaven is as innocent we presume, as the invocation of Saints on Earth. The *adoration of the cross*, the Drs. own good sense and candour will allow that it is all but a *make-weight* in his argument: for he surely does not believe, that we are such sheer clodpates as to worship *the graven thing*. As for *the worship of Relics*, &c. &c., which he accounts so criminal, I do not think he himself would have blamed the first Christians for keeping with endearing regard *the Handkerchiefs and aprons, that had touched the Body of Saint Paul, which cured all Diseases and cast out Devils*, Acts, 19, 12. Nor the prophet Elisha for carefully keeping the Miracle working mantle of Elias. I think he might even keep with affection and some reverence the hair, the writings, the pictures, and any such memorials of his parents or beloved and respected Friends; without being accounted for all that an Idolater, or one guilty of anti-scriptural or anti-Biblical transgression. And as for the Bodies of our Departed Friends, we carefully deposit and keep them, if we can, in Family Vaults or Tombs, with something like a religious veneration. And why may not the Catholic Church keep in like manner, and with still more Veneration, the Sacred Remains of her Distinguished Saints? Abraham kept thus the Body of his beloved Sarah. So did the Israelites carry with them the Bones of Joseph during their pilgrimage of forty years in the Wilderness. Other sacred things have been kept by the command of God himself as holy signs and memorials: such as Aaron's Rod; the pot of Manna, &c. so that neither the Drs. *marked Dissent* from such practices and opinions; nor *the grounds upon which his Church* rejects them; are quite so Scriptural, and *founded on truth and the Bible*, as he would have his parishioners and the Public to suppose.

“I must acknowledge, says the Dr., that I was not a little

“astonished that he, (Mr. Elmsley,) should have embraced at once the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, which protestants justly consider the most incredible of any held by the Church of Rome: a Doctrine, as we shall prove, unknown to the primitive Church; and without the slightest countenance from Scripture.” Can the Dr. think his hearers so very ignorant, as to take for Gospel this most unwarranted assertion, so confidently palmed upon them? At any rate we shall undertake to prove to every Candid and unbiassed Reader of these remarks, how vain the Doctor’s promise is to prove that the Doctrine of Transubstantiation “was unknown to the primitive Church and without the slightest countenance from Scripture.” But in the mean time we would ask him what *able Divines are those both ancient and modern*, (besides those at all times accounted as heretics,) “who are of opinion that the 6th Chapter of St. John has no reference to the Lord’s Supper; and is opposed to the Doctrine of a real *physical* presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist?” Let him cite from these Divines *ancient* or *modern*, and we shall then know how to deal with them; for it were vain to grasp at things which have no tangible shape or form. We can observe however the intention in adding the word *physical* to the *real presence*; which seems no other than to lower in the Reader’s imagination the dignity of the Catholic Sacrament; which is a *real but Supernatural presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist*. Let the Dr. keep the word *physical* for the Description of his own protestant Sacrament; which, if any thing *real*, is altogether *physical*; or purely *Natural*; being absolutely nothing but mere Bread and Wine.

Can any thing be more pitifully ridiculous than the incongruous and self contradicting Definition which the Dr. gives page 7, of the protestant *Real presence*, in contradistinction to the Catholic *real presence* of Christ’s Body and Blood in the Eucharist. “The Catholic, says he, maintains in contradiction to Reason, Scripture, antiquity and the evidence of the senses,

“ that the Substance of the Bread and wine is changed into the  
 “ very Substance of Christ’s personal Body and Blood : But  
 “ the Church of England believes that **THE BREAD AND WINE**  
 “ **BECOME HOLY, AND THE SPIRITUAL BODY AND BLOOD OF**  
 “ **CHRIST** ; and therefore the Real presence, which she main-  
 “ tains is Spiritual, not carnal. For Christ’s Body is in Hea-  
 “ ven, not to return, till he come with his mighty Angels to  
 “ judge the world.” Were it not for the concluding clause,  
 the Doctor’s Definition of the Eucharist might pass current  
 among Catholics : for they also believe that *the Bread and*  
*wine become holy, and the Spiritual Body and Blood of Christ,*  
*for they are now Spiritual ; and that therefore the real pre-*  
*sence which they maintain, is spiritual, not carnal.*—But lo  
 and behold ! In the next breath he tells us that Christ’s Body,  
 now a Spiritual Body, is in Heaven ; and cannot return, till the  
 last Day, when he comes to judge the world.—Who told him that  
 it cannot return ? Did he read that any where in Scripture ? Let  
 him shew the text that declares it. On the contrary, St. Paul as-  
 sures us that by him, last of all, Jesus Christ was seen, as really  
 as he had been seen by the other Apostles ; and this after Christ’s  
 ascension into Heaven. 1 Cor. 15. 8. Was he not Christ on  
 Earth, when he appeared to Paul on the Road to Damascus ;  
 and declared himself to be Jesus of Nazareth, whom Paul perse-  
 cuted ? Now Jesus of Nazareth was not only God, but *Man* ;  
 and, if it was true what he said, he was there as *Man*, as well  
 as God, and therefore with his whole humanity. But the Doc-  
 tor’s Difficulty is how to conceive it possible that Christ’s hu-  
 manity should be at once in Heaven, seated at the right hand  
 of God the Father, and on earth at the same time. Does the  
 Dr. know the qualities of a Spiritual Body, for such is now the  
 Body of Christ. It is no more, since his Resurrection, a natural  
 one, for no Body in its natural State could have entered the  
 Room, where the Disciples were met, *the Doors being shut*  
*for fear of the Jews* ; and given itself to be seen and felt by  
 all present ; then vanished from their sight ? A Spirit can be  
 in many places at once ; for God, who is a pure Spirit, is every

where. Can the Dr. say that God cannot communicate to a Spirit what is noways incompatible with the nature of one, the power of being present in more places than one at a time? And if to a Spirit, why not also to a Spiritual Body; that is to a Body, to which he has imparted the qualities of a Spirit?—“How then, (continues the Dr.) to adopt the Language of the “most eminent Prelates of our Church, can his Body be supposed to come down to twenty thousand different Churches? “and be divided, chewed, swallowed and digested?” As to the idea of dividing, chewing, swallowing and digesting it, that is an idea worthy of the unbelieving and gross minded Jews of Caphernaum. His Body is a living and impassible one, though, to try our faith, the form assumed remains. But as to his being present at the same time in a thousand or a million of places in a visible but mystical form, we have an example of that in what the Dr. and his Hearers will not deny; the Descent of the Holy Ghost at Pentecost. He communicated himself to all and every one separately under the visible form of fiery tongues. Every one present received him under the form of a cloven tongue of fire. How many tongues were there? Perhaps some hundreds; as there might have been millions. How many Holy Ghosts? Only one. Each then present received him at the same time under the mystical visible form: and yet he was but one among all. Will then the Dr. say that Jesus Christ, God equal with the Holy Ghost, could not assume what form he pleases, and communicate himself at once under that form, to as many as he pleases, and as often as he pleases? Will he say that a pure Spirit can render himself visibly present in any form, as the Angels have often done, as well as the Holy Ghost; but that Jesus Christ, having a Spiritual Body, cannot render himself visibly present under what form he chooses to assume? But the simultaneous presence of the Saviour in so many millions of places, is what seems impossible to the Dr. Well then, let us argue the subject philosophically. The Dr. will own that matter is Divisible *in infinitum*: for the least portion of matter can evidently be divided by a proper

Agent into as many parts as the greatest. So can, as evidently, the least portion of time : and that which seems to us *instantaneous* may be but an infinitely diminished space of time ; for who shall calculate the movements of a Spirit, while the imagination is lost in contemplating even those of the heavenly Bodies ? Who can say what is possible to God ? The more a thing seems impossible to us, according to our limited ideas and comprehension ; the more our belief in it, when evidently revealed by God, is an homage paid to the divine veracity. And hence, as the first Sin in Man was a distrust in God's word ; so the first return to him is our implicit reliance on his word ; for evils are always cured by their opposites. Therefore did God found his Religion upon mysteries inexplicable. For who can say that God cannot reveal to the Creature what the Creature cannot fully comprehend ? Is it for us to sound with our atom line and plummet the unfathomable Depths of Omnipotence and Omniscience ? Or to decide, as Judges, what we are to believe or disbelieve of God's most evident Revelations.

In the Doctor's Communion Sermon, which helps so to eke out his half Dollar Pamphlet ; we cannot help observing the flip-pant manner in which he tells us page 10, that St. John "wrote " his Gospel long after the others ; and *rather to supply what " was wanting*, than to repeat what was already written : " omitting the institution of the Eucharist, " as a thing perfectly " understood by the Church."—In the first place St. John, according to his own testimony, which is better than the Doctor's, did not *supply all that was wanting in the other Sacred writers* ; for, speaking of his own Gospel, he says : *Many other Signs also did Jesus, in the sight of his Disciples, which are not written in this Book.* John 20. 30. And again :—*But there are also many other things, which Jesus did ; which, if they were written every one, the world itself, I believe, would not be able to contain the Books that should be written.* Ibid. ch. 21. v. 25.

In the second place ; who told Dr. Strachan that St. John omitted in his Gospel the institution of the Eucharist, *as a*



*thing perfectly understood by the Church*, since related by the other three Evangelists, and by St. Paul; and not rather, (as is understood by deeper Divines than the Dr. seems to be,) because in his 6th Chapter he had more fully than any one, already detailed the Saviour's Doctrine on that head: affording us thus an additional proof that the Doctrine of the *Real* not *ideal* presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Eucharist, is the only true, and Scriptural one.

We shall leave here the Dr. to descant at large in his Sermon on the transcendent excellence of his protestant Sacrament; and to make, if he can, of a mole-hill a mountain; for it is, after all, he says, but *Bread and Wine*; a mere Type or Figure of the Body and Blood of Christ; not surely however, such a perfect one as that of the Jewish paschal Lamb; representing him the innocent Lamb of God; by its innocence, its Death, the protective efficacy of its Blood sprinkled on the Door posts, to turn aside the Destroying Angel, and the eating of its Flesh by those for whom it was slain. This the Dr. must own, was a figure of what was to be fulfilled in the Saviour's Institute; the Institute of him who said he came, *not to abolish but to fulfil the Law*: and who thus solemnly adds: *Amen, I say unto you, till Heaven and Earth pass, one jot or tittle of the Law shall not pass, till all be fulfilled.* Matth. 5. 17. 18. The figurative Death of the paschal Lamb was fulfilled, not by the *figurative* but by the real Death of the Saviour; and shall not the *figurative* eating of the *real* flesh of the paschal Lamb, prescribed by the Law, be also fulfilled by the eating of the real flesh of the Lamb of God? Else, how can it be said with truth that *not one jot or tittle of the Law shall pass, till all be fulfilled*?

The Dr. must remember *the Broth-Kirk* in Aberdeen, a broken branch of his own former presbyterian one, where the Congregation preferred holding their Sacrament under the comfortable form of Lamb's flesh and Mutton Soup as an exacter Type of the Saviour's flesh, the flesh of the Lamb that was slain for our sins, than any *Bread or wine* could be. They concluded, I should think, with more consistency than the Dr. and his

Adopted Church; who own, and at the same time deny, *the real presence* of our Lord's Body in the Sacrament; that, if *the Figure only* is to be continued in the Lord's Supper; the more exact the Figure, the more perfect the Sacrament.

While wading through the Doctor's plethoric, but nerveless and bombastic harangue on all the wonders discoverable in his symbolic eating and drinking of mere Bread and Wine; we cannot leave unnoticed his random and gratuitous Stricture passed on the Roman Good old Mother Church. "She, says he, page 21, by giving a new sense to Christ's expressions, *this is my Body; this is my Blood*; (we shall soon show it to be a very old sense;) has given rise to the afflicting and portentous error of Transubstantiation; by which, the true meaning &c. &c. has been covered with mystery; which has made it in the Church of Rome the most perplexed and mystical of all the Ceremonies that have ever darkened the imaginations, or *lessened the mutual good will of the human Race?* But most fortunately that Church stands almost singular in her erroneous apprehension of this ordinance," &c. Now this is, like all the Drs. other arguments, sheer unproved gratuitous assertion. But let him not so far forget himself for his own Credit, if any credit he can claim, as to affirm that it was *the Catho'ic Church* by her Doctrine; and not *the Protestant* in the most extensive sense of the term, that lessened the mutual good will of the Human Race. Can he then really be so ignorant of History, as not to know that it was Luther and his followers of every description that broke the peaceful harmony of the Christian world, and *lessened the mutual good will of the human Race*. In what Country did protestantism ever get a footing, where, in order to get itself established on the ruins of Catholicity, it did not stir up Civil war; and drench the soil with Christian Blood? the History of the Anabaptists in Germany; the Sacramentarians in Switzerland; the Hugonots in France; the *Gueux* in Holland; the Covenanters in Scotland; the Cromwellians in England; &c. &c. &c. confirms this truth.—It rose a many headed mon-

ster, the protestant Reformation, like a deadly Hydra, hissing, howling and roaring for its prey. And in its frantic and fearful ragings, tearing even its own Carcass to pieces, and preying upon itself. I need say nothing of our protestant penal Code, than which there never was any thing in the world more monstrously cruel, unjust, anti-christian and barbarous. "But, says the Dr. "most fortunately that Church, (the Catholic) stands almost singular in her erroneous apprehension of this ordinance." The people of God as we read in the Bible, were destined always to stand singular and alone. *This people, says the prophet, shall dwell alone; and shall not be reckoned among the nations.* Numbers 23. 9.—*Israel, or the people of God, says also Moses, shall dwell in safety and alone; that is, the church shall remain secure, under the protection of her Divine founder; but never associated with false Religions.* Deut. 33. 28. Could she enter into fellowship with any such, she would no longer be the Church of God. For St. Paul exhorting the Faithful, says: *Bear not the Yoke together with unbelievers: for what participation hath justice with injustice? Or what fellowship hath Light with Darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? Or what part hath the faithful with the unbeliever?* &c. 2 Cor. 6, 14, 15. Our Saviour besides has said: *there shall be but One Fold, and one Shepherd,* John 10, and also: *He who is not with me, is against me; and he, who gathereth not with me, Scattereth.* Luke 11, 23. And St. Paul proclaims *one Lord, one faith, one Baptism,* Ephes. 4, 5. And declares that *without faith (that is, the true faith,) it is impossible to please God.* Heb. 11. 6. That which Christ himself had previously affirmed, *he who believes not shall be condemned.* Mark, 16. 16. But according to him, what are we to believe? Most evidently the testimony of that Church, which he commands us to hear, under pain of being accounted as *Heathens and publicans,* Matthew, 18. 17. But that Church is not the Church of England, of Scotland, of Luther, Calvin, John Wesley, or any Mortal: for such existed not at the time. The only Church therefore of which he spoke was

the first one, which he said he had founded *on the Rock*; and *against which* he assured us, *the Gates of Hell*, that is, the Heresies conducting-astray, thither, *shall never prevail*. Matth. 16. 18. Now I will ask the Dr. which was the first Christian Church; the Church of Rome, or the Church of Queen Elizabeth?—

After drawing out a long and wordy and variously imagined panegyric on the wonderfully simple act of eating and drinking a little *Bread and wine* in memory of Christ; this most simple act, the Dr. declares, *is the most solemn act of religious worship, in which a christian can engage*, page 30. Why then is not this act more frequently repeated in the Doctor's Church? Why not at least every Sunday, as was the case with the first Christians? Why not even imitate in this the Catholic Church; who, in fulfilment of Malachy's prophecy, Ch. 1. v. 10. repeats daily on Millions of Altars a more Divine and Solemn act of religious Worship, than that most simple and solemn one of the protestant Church; by offering up in every place that commemorative *Sacrifice* of Christ's Death; and that *clean oblation*, so unequivocally predicted to the Jews, as follows: *I have no pleasure in you, saith the Lord of Hosts; and I will not receive a Gift at your hand: for from the rising of the Sun to the going down thereof, great is my name among the Gentiles: and in every place there is SACRIFICE; and there is offered to my name A CLEAN OBLATION; for my name is great among the Gentiles, saith the Lord of Hosts.*—Is the protestant communion rite celebrated *in every place*? If not, it cannot be *the Sacrifice* and *clean oblation*, spoken of in this prophecy. That it is not so celebrated, the Dr. himself must own. But where is the place on all the surface of this Globe, where the name of *the Lord of Hosts*; the name of God made Man; the name of Jesus Christ; in which, while the Jews were rejected, the Gentiles are all called to him: where, I say, is that spot on earth, where the name of Christ has been heard, and where the Catholic Church is not to be found daily offering up to God her Eucharistic *sacrifice and clean oblation*?

The Dr. next page 34, inculcates strongly to his people frequent communion; and endeavours to do away with that check, which the terrific words of St. Paul put against the approach to the Sacrament of the unrepenting sinner; with a gloss upon the alarming text, not unworthy of the boldest Reformers. "Some, says he, are perhaps deterred, from the striking observation of Saint Paul, that *he who eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh Damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's Body*. Now, by DAMNATION (continues the Dr.) is not here meant, as many suppose, *everlasting Destruction*; but the immediate Disapprobation, the Displeasure of the Most High; which Displeasure is manifested, as the Apostle states, by visiting unworthy Communicants with temporal Judgments, in order to their final Salvation. At the same time it were to be wished that the word *Damnation* had been rendered *Condemnation*, as it ought to have been; and as it actually has been in a subsequent Verse of the same Chapter."

How much the man would wish, notwithstanding all the Saintly Cant that follows, to bring in all kinds of Fish into his Net, without casting out any! But why labour so hard and awkwardly to do that, which his Church has long since Done in a Sovereign Degree? For, notwithstanding all the wonderful qualities, which he ascribes to his Sacrament, she has declared it to be, what he too proclaims it, nothing, absolutely nothing more but the bare Elements of *Bread and wine*. Why then should any tremble to approach and eat that, in which no one can *Discern the Body of the Lord*? unless, as the Dr. says, *symbolically*. And if I am guilty only of a *symbolical* offence, I can only incur a *symbolical Damnation*; or, (though the Difference seems more in the sound than in the sense,) just as the Dr. would have it, a *symbolical condemnation*. Nor would it seem quite just that I should be *really* so *Damned*, or *condemned*, Soul and Body, (for, in spite of the Doctor's accommodating Gloss, those finally *damned* or *condemned* by God, are, in the opinion of all Christians, lost for-

ever) I say it could hardly seem just that I should be *really* so *Damned*, or *condemned* for eating with only *the mouth of Faith*, a mere earthly *Symbol*; imagining it to be, what it really, or substantially is not, the *Body and Blood of Christ*. As I eat therefore *figuratively*, if I eat thus unworthily, I can be condemned only *figuratively*, not in reality.

So the Doctor's hearers of all Descriptions may go unalarmed to their Sacrament; without any fear of *being*, as the Apostle says, *guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord*: for where these *really* are not, they cannot really be profaned.

We now enter upon the Doctor's weak, frothy and Tyro-like polemical Essay; in which he promised to prove, page 7th, that "the Catholic Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, was unknown to the primitive Church; and without the slightest countenance from Scripture: And that, as to the 6th Chapter of St. John, many able Divines, both ancient and modern, are of opinion that it has no reference to the Lord's Supper; and is directly opposed to the Doctrine of a real (we reject the word *physical* for reasons already given) presence of the *Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist*." Let us now see how he proves all that; and makes good his pledge so solemnly given.—Does he quote from the works of the Fathers, or his *able Divines both ancient and modern*, to shew that they taught a Doctrine contrary to that of *Transubstantiation*? No; he merely mentions, page 42, the Liturgy attributed to St. James the Brother of our Lord; which he says, (and what is very true,) agrees with all the other ancient Liturgies.—He then names Paschasius, as the first proposer of the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*; Raban, Archbishop of Mentz, as one who opposed the innovation with determined hostility; and Scotus, who wrote against it, and "whose work, he says, circulated through Christendom, more than two hundred years, without incurring the Charge of Heresy, or experiencing any mark of reprobation from Pope, Council, Clergy or Laity.—Bertram too, he affirms, wrote a Book, on the *Body and Blood of the Lord in answer to the interpretation of Paschasius*; which

“was widely disseminated through the Christian world, and  
 “was never condemned for Heresy. Many other eminent Men  
 “he adds, wrote and contended against this novel Doctrine;  
 “whose names in a brief review like this need not be mention-  
 “ed,” &c.

This is all the authorities the Dr. produces, without citing a single sentence of their writings to prove from their own words the truth of his gratuitous assertions.

But though our answer be as brief as his review, we shall not be so niggard of quotation from the most ancient and unexceptionable authorities; shewing what the Doctrine of the Church has ever and uniformly been on the subject in question from the earliest ages.

And first, as to the Liturgy of St. James, the first mentioned authority quoted by the Dr. against Transubstantiation; we read in it, after the words of Christ: *this is my Body, which is broken and given for you: this is my Blood of the New Testament, which is shed, and given for you and for many for the remission of Sins.* “Send down, O Lord, thy most  
 “holy Spirit upon us, and upon these holy Gifts here set  
 “before thee; that, by his holy, good and glorious presence, he  
 “may Sanctify, AND MAKE THIS BREAD THE BODY OF THY  
 “CHRIST; AND THIS CUP, THE PRECIOUS BLOOD OF THY  
 “CHRIST.”

Is there any thing in this against the Doctrine of Transubstantiation? Let the Dr. quote to us from his Liturgy if he can, any passage militating against it. We would advise him however, ere he ventures again before the public, to read the Bishop of Strasbourgh’s work, *the Amicable Discussion* on the Eucharist; from which Mr. Elmsley has extracted his pamphlet; but particularly that part of the work, which treats of *the Discipline of Secrecy*; and then let him meet that Catholic prelate as a fair antagonist decked out in all his protestant panoply, page 48. Paschasius, Abbot of Corbey, was, the Dr. says, according to Cardinal Bellarmine, “the first who wrote in  
 “express terms upon the Subject, that is to say upon transub-

“stantiation.” Now this is all sheer fudge. Bellarmine never wrote any such thing. Let the Dr. else quote the passage that proves he did. As true is his assertion that Raban, Arch Bishop of Mentz, ever opposed the Doctrine of Transubstantiation; he who even wrote a Treatise in defence of it. With equal truth does he affirm, *ibid.* that Scotus’s writings “circulated through Christendom more than two hundred years without incurring the Charge of Heresy; or experiencing any mark of Reprobation from Pope, Council, Clergy or Laity.” Whereas his writings were condemned in no less than three separate Councils immediately after they appeared. Could the Dr. have really meant to deceive? If not, he proves himself to be extremely ill informed on matters of Church History.—The Book ascribed to *Bertram*, who is otherwise called *Ratram*, a priest and monk of Corbey, was always considered by the best Critics as a copy of the condemned work of John Scotus; whence Berengarius drew his heretical notions, concerning the Eucharist. And these are the Authorities which the Dr. cites in favour of his Symbolical Sacrament!! We shall by and by cite a few weightier authorities in favour of the Real presence, or Transubstantiation; and against the Doctor’s Doctrine of bare *Bread and wine*: merely observing that of all his adduced figurative expressions, he should have dropped that one which Zuinglius says was suggested to him by a nondescript Spirit, *black or white he could not tell which.* *ATER AN ALBUS FUERIT, NIHIL MEMINI*; since it proves no more than that the Israelites were to eat the pasch standing, with their loins girt, and their Staves in their hands, ready to depart; for as the Lord was to pass, it was *the Passage of the Lord*; not the Lamb, for that was not the passage of the Lord. We cannot however pass over the following false assertion, page 54; borrowed by the Dr. from the Rev. Hartwell Horne; “In the Syriac, as well as the Hebrew and Chaldee Languages, there is no word which expresses to *signify, represent* or *denote.* Hence it is, says the Dr., that we find the Expression *it is* so frequently used for *represents, denotes, or signifies.*” Now this is demonstrated to



be false by the Rev. Nic: Wiseman, in his learned Dissertations, on Syriac Literature, intermixed with Extracts from valuable MSS. in that Language never before published. Dr. Wiseman shews that Horne is either ignorant of the Syriac Language; or that he has knowingly asserted of it what is untrue, and has misled his Readers. He shews that the Syriac abounds with words that express the *idea of Figure*: and, in proof of this, he gives a List of words meaning a Figure to the amount of upwards of forty, arranged in Alphabetical order. These words are taken from the works of those writers, whom the Syrians esteem as their Classical and Standard Authors; and he proves that the meaning he attaches to them is the true one by appropriate citations from the above mentioned Authors; some of whose writings exist only in MSS. in the Vatican Library.

Page 56. The Dr. says a Man cannot believe a Miracle, without relying upon his senses. True, unless God should tell him that on a particular occasion his senses are deceived. But on the subject of the Eucharist, he has warned us that *the Bread which he was to give, was his flesh for the life of the world. Take and eat, said he; this which I hold in my hand, is my Body. Drink ye all of this, for this is my Blood, the very Blood about to be shed for the remission of sins.* After this Declaration of the Omnipotent what have the senses to plead? *Faith comes by the hearing, and hearing by the word of Christ.* This is, or ought to be all-sufficient to the Christian.

If, says the Dr. page 56, "ten millions of Christians are communicating at the same time, there may be in different parts of the world the same number of perfect Christs."—As an answer I need only say, what I have already said; that if ten millions were to receive the Holy Ghost under the visible form of the Dove, or of cloven tongues of fire; there must be, according to the Dr., the same number of Holy Ghosts!!!

Page 57. "Revelation, says the Dr. is built on the testimony of the senses." Now I say it is not built on the evidence of the senses; for how are the fundamental articles of

Christianity built on the senses; the Trinity for instance; the Divinity of the Saviour, who showed himself a suffering Mortal; or the Mystery of the Incarnation? The Resurrection of the Dead; the truth of Heaven, of Hell, of every thing revealed concerning the Eternal World? And, if our Saviour granted to Thomas the proof he required, he told him: *Blessed are they, who have not seen and have believed.* Reason, however, together with the senses, is every thing with the Dr.: and God must not pretend to command his belief in any of his Revelations, but what he can Scan with his Reason and Senses; and perfectly understand. And this Man pretends to be a Christian Divine!!!

“Transubstantiation, says he, if true, must be a miracle,” &c. It is no Miracle; for a miracle is a visible deviation from the ordinary course of Nature. But Transubstantiation is not visible. A Miracle serves to prove a divine truth, or a true Mission from God: whereas Transubstantiation is not intended to prove aught, except our perfect reliance on God’s word; and is itself proved by the visible miracles which the Saviour wrought; and which, with every other evidence, proved him to be God.

Page 58, 59. “The happy moment may arrive, says the “Dr. when the ignorant man, *in the use of his Senses*, will apply himself to this false Doctrine; and cast off the spiritual “oppression, which insists on its right to stultify him.”—Alas! we poor, ignorant, *stultified* Papists! There is no man among us, not all the world over, nor ever was, who can compare with the Venerable, as he is stiled, the Archdeacon of York, in Upper Canada, for Wisdom, Learning, ecclesiastical knowledge, &c. &c. Well: *there is more hope for a fool*, says Solomon, *than for one, who is wise in his own Conceit*: and therefore do we pronounce the Archdeacon incurable.

The Dr. ends by declaring what he could not believe: so did the Jews at Caphernaum, John 6.—He says, the Church of Rome holds to *the Letter which killeth*: the Church of England to *the spirit, which giveth life.*—I always understood that

the protestant adhered to *the Letter* exclusively. Else, whose spirit does he follow? Why, his own, and only his own: for *the dead Letter of the Scripture*, as interpreted by himself, is his only Rule of Faith. No other authority on Earth is to control him; in spite of what the Dr. advances, page 44, that "without the Testimony of the Church, it is impossible to prove the Canon of the New Testament; or to establish the authority of the Books it contains," &c. Why, Man; this is real downright Popery.

O Doctor, Doctor! Is this at last the splendid proof afforded us of your depth in Divinity; your logical skill in reasoning; your acquaintance with Ecclesiastical History; and, (considering your far famed grammatical acumen,) your elegant stile as an English Classical Writer? Yet in truth we must declare that your present polemical Essay claims, in manner as well as matter, the nearest possible kindred with the every-day drivelling Lucubrations of our ignorant, anti-catholic, Tract-peddling Scribblers.

In the third and last part of the Doctor's pamphlet, page 64. How has the Dr. discovered, contrary to the current opinion of the Fathers, and ancient ascetical writers, that the Saviour's allegorical speech to the Samaritan woman at the Well; as well as that of Wisdom, Prov. 9, did not allude to the soul refreshing and sustaining effects of the Eucharistic Mystery? for surely he and his prophets could speak allegorically of that which he was one day to give us in reality.

Page 65. The Saviour says to his Apostles, or Pastors, collectively taken; *to you it is given to understand the Mysteries of the Kingdom of God; but to the rest in parables; that seeing, they may not see; and hearing they may not understand.* Does not this show that they who will not hear those, whom Christ has sent to *teach all Nations; as the Father had sent himself;* and whom he therefore commands us to hear, as we would *himself*, Luke 10. 16. Does it not show that such seeing, shall not see; and hearing shall not understand. Hence we need not wonder at the Doctor's own blind-

ness and *stultification*; since he derives not his religious instructions from the lawful successors of those to whom Christ promised the right understanding of his revealed Mysteries.

Page 66 and 67. "The Saviour, says the Dr. rectifying the mistake of the Jews, tells them that it was not Moses, but God, who gave them the Manna, but that he now gave them the true Bread from Heaven; of which, the Manna was but a type, or Figure; for *the Bread of God is he, who cometh down from Heaven, and giveth his Life for the World.*" So the Manna then, according to the Dr. was a miraculous 'Type of a Type!!! the 'Type of the protestant's poor drop and crumb!!! And the Saviour by declaring himself to be *the Bread of God, the Bread of life, the living and life-giving Bread, the true Bread that cometh down from Heaven and giveth his life for the World,* proves that he is nothing of the kind; for that all these fine speeches and promises point only at the Baker's loaf and the Vintner's Drug.

Page 69. "There is one thing, says the Dr. which the Saviour never fails to demand; and that is, faith in his testimony and words." But what great faith is necessary to believe that Bread is Bread and Wine Wine?

Page 74. All Jargon. Page 76. The Jews strove among themselves saying: *how can this Man give us his flesh to eat.* "This oral manducation of his very flesh, says the Dr. they deemed monstrous and absurd." They are deemed so too by Protestants.—"But continues he, these gross conceptions, which our Lord hastens to rectify, have been adopted by the Roman Catholic Church; and yet they loudly exclaim against those who cleave to the Truth." The Catholic Church never adopted the gross conceptions of the Caphernaïtes. Her ideas on the Sacrament, as to its Dignity, sanctity and saving efficacy, are as far above them, and above those of the protestant Church, as the Heavens are above the Earth; and the word of the Creator is above that of the Creature. But protestants join with the Caphernaïtes, in exclaiming *this is a hard saying, and who can hear it;* and go back and walk no more with him.

Page 77. Melchisadeck is a type of the Saviour, and according to the Dr. the Saviour is but a Type of Melchisadeck; if he gives nothing better than Melchisadeck gave, which was just only Bread and Wine. O Dr. thou art indeed but a typical Dr.!

Page 78. We admit that the Bread and Wine offered by Melchisadeck was a typical Sacrifice; and hence that the Eucharistic Sacrifice of Jesus Christ, was not a typical, but a real one; the very thing itself prefigured taking place of the Figure: as was to be the case with all the other legal shadows and typical Resemblances.

Page 79. "Had the primitive Church believed or suspected the real presence of Christ's true Body and Blood in the Sacrament; they never would have thought, (in the Doctor's opinion) of praying for the sanctification of the Elements of Bread and Wine, as is expressed in all the Liturgies." O Dr. thou art *the Blind Man leading the Blind*.—So no prayer in such supposition: no pre-sanctifying Blessing is to be invoked upon the Elements offered up (as was usual in every sacrifice) and about to be changed by the Omnipotent word. Did not the Saviour himself at the last supper, take the Elements into his sacred hands; and, looking up to Heaven, first bless them; and giving them to his Apostles, desired them to do just what he had done: that is, look up to heaven and invoke thence that transmutating blessing upon them, which makes them what Christ said they were, when he gave them; and would be, when his lawfully ordained pastors did, as he commanded them to do, that is, just what he himself had done?

Page 80. But I can perceive that what puzzles the Dr. is, because after the consecration it is often still called Bread. Yes; but it is as frequently called *flesh* and the Body of our Lord. It is stiled Bread, 1st. because it retains the external form and qualities of Bread. If it did not, it would be a miracle, to confirm, not a mystery to try our faith in the words of Christ. 2d. Because it is a figure as well as a reality. It is a figure of the food of the Soul, as Bread is of the food of the Body. But it

is as our Lord himself declares it; *the living Bread which came down from Heaven; his very flesh, and that meat indeed*; which he has given for the *Life of the World*. The same may be said of the Cup, or his Blood, *the very Blood* which he said at his last supper *was about to be shed for the remission of sins*. Is the protestant Sacrament this?

IBID. "*The Bread and Wine quickened by the Spirit, who is the giver of Life:*" and yet the mere earthy, inanimate Elements of Bread and wine!! who ever heard such contradictory stuff? How very credulous are the incredulous? *They who strain at a Gnat often swallow a Camel.*

Page 81. *The Doctrine of Transubstantiation, a New Doctrine!!!* with what calm effrontery does the Man advance; ignorantly, we presume, the most notorious and palpable untruths, as we shall prove by and by! His quotations from St. Ignatius could not be better chosen against himself. *I delight not, says the Saint, in Corruptible food; nor in the entertainments of this world: The Bread of God is what I covet: Heavenly Bread—Bread of Life; namely, THE FLESH of Jesus Christ the Son of God: and I am athirst for the Drink of God, namely, HIS BLOOD; which is a feast of Love, that faileth not, and life everlasting.*

Page 82. In the testimonies of Saint Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, Origen, St. Augustine, Gelasius, and Facundus, without dwelling on their allegorical allusions to the mystery, which they studiously concealed from the knowledge of the pagan public, and all who were not the Initiated: we shall afford from the same authors the most indubitable evidence that they held the same Doctrine of the real presence and transubstantiation, which is held at the present day by the Catholic Church.

Page 85. Had the Saviour but retracted his saying that *his flesh was meat indeed; and his Blood Drink indeed*; and told them, as the protestants affirm, that his flesh *was not meat indeed*; nor his Blood *drink indeed*; but that he meant only that they should eat mere Bread as a memorial of his Body;

and mere wine as a memorial of his Blood: would his Disciples, who otherwise believed in him, have so finally left him? I put this query to the Common Sense of any one. Yet surely the Saviour, who came to seek and to save all who were lost, would not have allowed his Disciples to leave him in a mistake: and all, who he knew would afterwards take his words in their strict literal sense, to go headlong into error; without vouchsafing one single clear expression to undeceive them?

Page 87. "Christianity, says the Dr. is a Spiritual worship." But is the mere Bread and wine a Spiritual worship?

Page 88. The Jews said: *this is a hard saying; and who can hear it? How can this Man give us his flesh to eat?* Suppose the Saviour had then said to them, you mistake my meaning, I neither give you my real flesh to eat, nor my real Blood to Drink, I only propose to you, a figure and memorial of these, that is, *mere Bread and wine*: the Delusion would at once have been removed; and they would have remained with him; seeing nothing at all repugnant to their feelings and understanding in his Doctrine. But did he retract any of his strong asseverations on the Subject? Not one word did he vouchsafe to undeceive them, if they were deceived: but he allows them to go; and asks also his Apostles if they too would go from him, rather than believe that he could give what he had promised to give.

And here, at last, we have dragged ourselves through the tawdry, trailing, tautological trash of argument adduced by the Dr.: and come at last to the demonstrative proof from the writings of the most ancient Fathers that the Doctrine of the real presence, taught by the Catholic Church at the present Day, is the same as was universally taught, and all along from the time of the Apostles.

But first we must say a few words on the origin of the protestant Doctrine of the *symbolical presence* of Christ's Body and Blood in the Sacrament. According to Melancton, one of the first Reformers, it originated with that brutal Fellow, as he calls him; Carlostadius; who broached it out of pure hatred to

Luther: For the great patriarch and Father of the Reformation, Luther himself, stuck firmly to the Doctrine of *the real presence*. The Sacramentarian warfare commenced in Germany at the Black Bear public house, where Luther was lodging, between him and his fellow Reformer, Carlostadius, who had broached Dr. Strachan's *symbolical real presenee*. (What an idea!) The battle began by a haughty Defiance given by Luther to Carlostadius, to write against him on the real presence; at the same time flinging to him, as an earnest of the polemical contest, a florin of Gold, which Carlostadius pocketed. They then shook hands; drank to each other's health and success in a Bumper of Beer, and parted, with the most fixed Determination to oppose each other in their respective views of this hitherto dread and adorable Mystery. Zuinglius in Switzerland adopts next the *symbolical* system, followed and improved upon by Calvin in Geneva, whence it was imported into England, and, like an unclean Leaven, to please the taste of all parties, was mixed up in the thirty-nine Articles. Yet, "happy," says the protestant Bishop Bancroft, in reference to this same Calvinistic derivation of Doctrine; and very different from our Anglo-Calvinistic Archdeacon of York: "a thousand times happy our Island, had neither English or Scot ever put foot in Geneva; had they never become acquainted with a single individual of the Genevese Doctors." See his survey of pretended holy Discipline.

The war of the Sacrament being once declared among the Reformers, became the source of deadly strife, Duplicity, Stratagem and intrigue among the Belligerents. In vain did Bucer by tricks and evasions, and even Melancton, succeed in maintaining for a time a false and feverish Truce between the parties. But art so gross could not long continue to deceive them. All compromise was found to be hollow and hopeless; and, at last, the three great Eucharistic factions, the Lutheran, Calvinistic and Zuinglian, all broke loose in their respective Directions of Heresy: each Branch again subdividing itself into new factious Distinctions under the Countless names of



*Panarii, Accidentarii, Corporarii, Anabonarii, Tropistæ, Metamorphistæ, Iscariotistæ, Schwefkfeldims, &c. &c. &c.*, till, to such an extent did the caprice of private judgment carry its freaks on this *one* solemn subject, that an author of Bellarmine's time counted no less than two hundred different opinions on the words of our Saviour, *This is my Body*. (See Travels of an Irish Gentleman in quest of Religion.) Thus the protestants, in attempting to escape *the hard saying*, which offended the Caphernaïtes, found themselves unable to agree on any other explanation. Hence the duplicity of the Language in which it is expressed in most of the protestant Formularies—particularly in that of the Church of England.

It would make a Book of no small Dimensions, to detail all the furious Contests, the tricks and trimmings on this sole subject by the first Reformers. Let us close the subject then with the promised authorities which confirm the Eucharistic Doctrine of the Catholic Church.

And first I would ask Dr. Strachan, if, as he says, page 45, 47, the Doctrine of Transubstantiation was first established in the thirteenth Century by pope Innocent the third; how did it happen that Berengarius was condemned for writing against it nearly two hundred years before? How did it also happen that his much lauded *Scotus Erigenus* had written against it in the reign of Charles the Bald, about two hundred years prior to Berengarius; and was therefore, as I said, condemned in three successive Councils; particularly in that of Quercy, ann. 849; together with Felix of Urgel; Claudius of Turin; and Gotescale, the inventor of the presbyterian predestination? Nor did Paschasius write his Treatise in defence of Transubstantiation, till Scotus had attacked that universally established Doctrine. And though the Dr. unblushingly affirms, page 48, that the work of Scotus "circulated through Christendom "more than two hundred years, without incurring the charge "of Heresy; or experiencing any mark of reprobation from "Pope, Council, Clergy or Laity;" his work was written against by Florus, the Deacon of Lyons, and a learned profes-

sor, author of additions to Bede's Martyrology, as well as by Paschasius; and he himself, expelled France by Charles the Bald, in consequence of an order from Pope Nicholas the first. See T. 15, Bibl. Patr. And Baluze T. 2. Agobard, Append. Again I ask how, if "the honour of establishing the Doctrine of Transubstantiation in 1215, belongs to Innocent the third;" as the Doctor affirms, page 49; how does it happen that the schismatical Greeks held it before their separation from the Latin Church in the ninth Century; as they still hold it to the present Day? How comes it that the Paulician Heresy of the 7th Century rejected Transubstantiation, if transubstantiation was not taught in the Church before the 9th, nor established in it before the 13th Century? How was it that the Manichæans rejected this Doctrine in the 3d Century? And, approaching nearer still to the pure fountain of Christian Faith, how is it that the Gnostic Heretics denied it in the very first age of the Church? These Heretics professed to believe in Jesus Christ and his Doctrine propounded by *their private Judgment*. They held that Jesus Christ suffered only in *appearance*; and that it was not his *real Flesh*, but a *fantastical Body* (something like our Doctor's *Symbolical one* in the Protestant Sacrament) which suffered and bled on the cross. It seems that they also had an unaccountable aversion to the Doctrine of the real presence of Jesus Christ in the Eucharist; and this too, if we believe Doctor Strachan, 1200 years before that Doctrine was established. Saint Ignatius says of them in the very first Century: *They abstain from the Eucharist and from prayer, because they do not acknowledge the Eucharist to be THE FLESH OF OUR SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST, WHICH SUFFERED FOR OUR SINS; AND WHICH THE FATHER BY HIS GOODNESS RESUSCITATED.* (Ep. ad Smyrn. p. 36. Tom. 2. P. P. Apost. Amstolodami 1721.) Here the Father makes the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ in the Eucharist to be identically the same which suffered on the Cross, and arose from the Dead. Jesus Christ himself had equally identified his Flesh and Blood under both forms: under the form of Bread,

*this, said he, is my Body, WHICH is given for you ; and under the form of Wine, this is my Blood of the New Testament, WHICH shall be shed for many.* It was not *Bread* that was given, nor *Wine* that was shed for many. Now these Gnostics would not have abstained from the Protestant Eucharist of mere *Bread and Wine*. There is nothing in it, that could have offended them. But they were offended at the Catholic Doctrine of the Real Presence of the flesh of Christ in the Sacrament. It clashed with their Heresy, and therefore they abstained from it. It is known, however, to every one acquainted with ecclesiastical History, that Carlostadius, in rejecting the Doctrine of the real presence, only renewed the error of the DOCTORÆ and other Branches of the Gnostic Heresy, broached and branded in the Apostolic age itself. To this Heresy we are indebted for the evidence thus furnished of the primitive Belief of the Real presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Mystery of the Eucharist. *There must be Heresies, said the Apostle, that they also who are approved among you, may be made manifest.* 1 Cor. 11. 19.

To the same cause are we indebted for another brilliant, but apparently accidental Testimony in the Second Century. St. Irenæus, who was trained in the Doctrine of the Redeemer, by St. Polycarp, the Disciple of St. John, uses *the Real presence* of Christ in the Eucharist as an argument against other Heretics of his time who denied the Resurrection of the Flesh. He compares it with the manner in which the *Vine* and the *Wheat* are propagated to furnish the matter of the Eucharist before the Consecration. "*And as, says he, a Section of the Vine laid in the Earth, produces fruit in due Season ; and in like manner the Grain of Corn is multiplied, by the Blessing of God ; which afterwards is used for the Benefit of Man ; and receiving on it THE WORD OF GOD, BECOMES THE EUCHARIST, WHICH IS THE BODY AND BLOOD OF CHRIST. So our Bodies, nourished by that Eucharist, and then laid in the Earth, and dissolved in it, shall in due time rise again.* Iren. adversus Hærit. L. 5. C. 11. P. 395. 397. 399.

Tertullian in like manner says : *our flesh is fed with the Body and Blood of Christ ; that the Soul may be nourished with God.* (De Resurrectione Carnis, Cap. 8. p. 569.)

In the third Century, Origen, speaking of the Doctrine of the Church, says ; *in former times Baptism was obscurely represented in the cloud and in the Sea : but now Regeneration is in kind ; in Water and the Holy Ghost.—Then, obscurely, Manna was the food : but now in kind, the Flesh of the Word of God is the true Food ; even as he said, MY FLESH IS MEAT INDEED, AND MY BLOOD IS DRINK INDEED.* (Hom. 7. in Num. Tom. 2. p. 290.)

In the fourth Century, among a Host of others, take St. Cyril of Jerusalem. *The Bread and Wine, says he, which, before the Invocation of the adorable Trinity, were nothing but Bread and Wine ; BECOME after this Invocation, the Body and Blood of Christ.* (Catech. Mystag. L. N. 4. p. 281.) See the Rev. J. Hughes' Letters to Beckenridge.

“When it behoved them, who had known by miracles the Divine virtue and power of the Saviour, to receive his word willingly, and to ask the explanation of any thing that appeared difficult, they do quite the reverse : *How can this Man give us his flesh to eat ?*” They, not without great impiety, cry aloud of God ; nor does it occur to their mind that *nothing is impossible with God.* For since they were sensual, they could not (as Paul says) understand spiritual things : but so great a mystery seems to them an absurdity. Let us, however, take occasion of great profit from the sins of others ; and putting firm faith in the mysteries, let us never, in matters so sublime, either think or utter that : How ? For this is a Jewish word, and the cause of great punishment. Therefore, even Nicodemus, when he said : *How can these things be done ?* justly heard in reply : *Art thou a master in Israel, and knowest not these things ?* Instructed then, as we have said, by the fault of others, when God operates, let us not ask, *how ?* but let us leave to Him alone the way and the knowledge of his own work. For as, though no one knows

" what the nature of God is, man is justified by faith, believing  
 " that God is the rewarder of them who seek him; so though  
 " he be ignorant of the manner of the divine works; yet since  
 " he holds by faith that God can do all things, he will obtain no  
 " inconsiderable rewards of his virtue. Thus indeed the Lord  
 " himself, by the Prophet Isaiah, exhorts us: " For my thoughts  
 " are not your thoughts: nor your ways my ways, saith the  
 " Lord. For as the heavens are exalted above the earth, so are  
 " my ways exalted above your ways, and my thoughts above  
 " your thoughts." Shall not he who excels in wisdom and pow-  
 " er from God, operate so marvellously that the manner of his  
 " works surpass our conception? Do you not see what me-  
 " chanics often perform? The things which they relate seem  
 " sometimes incredible; yet we easily believe that such things  
 " may be done by them, after we have seen similar things which  
 " they have done. How then shall they be deemed unworthy  
 " of the greatest punishments, who so despise the Author of all  
 " things, as to ask how he can effect his works, whilst they  
 " know him to be the giver of all wisdom, and the Scripture  
 " has taught us that he can do all things? If, indeed, you, O  
 " Jew, even now cry out, how? I also, in imitation of your folly,  
 " will willingly ask, *how* you went forth from Egypt? *how* was  
 " the rod of Moses turned into a serpent? *how* was his hand,  
 " covered with leprosy, in a moment restored to its former state?  
 " *how* did the waters become blood? *how* did your fathers  
 " escape through the midst of the seas, as on dry land? *how*  
 " was the bitterness of the waters changed to sweetness by  
 " means of the wood? *how* did fountains of waters flow from  
 " the rock? *how* did the Jordan stand still? *how* did the im-  
 " pregnable Jerico fall on a mere shout? There are numberless  
 " instances, wherein if you ask, how? it will be necessary for  
 " you to overthrow all Scripture, and to reject with scorn the  
 " doctrine of the Prophets, and the writings of Moses himself.  
 " Wherefore it behoved you rather to believe Christ, and if  
 " any thing appeared difficult, to seek for him humbly, than  
 " to shout like drunken men: *How can this man give us his*

"*flesh to eat?* Do you not see that in saying this, great arrogance is manifested by the expression?"—*St. Cyril Alex. in Ev. Joan. l. 4. c. 13.*

Justin, in his Apology to Antoninus, 150 years after the birth of Christ, says: *This food we call the Eucharist; of which they alone are allowed to partake, who believe the Doctrines taught by us; and have been regenerated by Water for the remission of Sin; and who live as Christ ordained. For we do not take these gifts as common Bread and common Drink; but as Jesus Christ our Saviour, made Man by the Word of God, took flesh and Blood for our Salvation: in like manner we have been taught that the food, which has been blessed by the prayer of the words which he Spoke, and by which our flesh and Blood in the Change are nourished, BECOMES THE FLESH AND BLOOD OF THAT JESUS INCARNATE.*

Saint Ambrose, in his Book of Mysteries, after explaining the ancient Types of the Eucharist, as the Sacrifice of Melchisedech; the Manna, and the Water out of the Rock; adds as follows: *You will say, perhaps, I see something else: how can I be sure that I receive the Body of Christ? Prove that it is not what hath been formed by Nature, but what the Benediction hath consecrated; and that the Benediction is more powerful than Nature, because it changes even Nature itself.* He then urges the example of *the Rod of Moses changed into a Serpent*, and several other Miracles; and lastly *the Incarnation*, which mystery he compares to that of the Eucharist. *A Virgin*, says he, *brought forth. This is contrary to the order of Nature.—The body which we consecrate came forth of a Virgin. Why do you seek for the order of Nature in the Body of Jesus Christ; since Jesus Christ was born of a Virgin against the order of Nature? Jesus Christ had real flesh, which was fastened to the Cross and laid in the Sepulchre. So the Eucharist is the true Sacrament of his flesh. Christ himself assures us of it. THIS IS, says he, MY BODY. Before the Benediction of these heavenly words, it is of another nature: after the Consecration, IT IS THE BODY. If Man's*

*Benediction has been capable of changing the Nature of things ; w'at shall we say of THE DIVINE CONSECRATION, wherein the very works of our Saviour himse'l operate? The Word of Jesus Christ coul't make that out of nothing, which was not: Can it not change that, which is, into what it was not?—Is this Protestant Doctrine? The Saint then recommends to the New Believers to keep the Mysteries secret.*

In the fifth Century, St. Chrysostom, shewing how much the Christian Priesthood and Sacrifice of the New Law surpassed, in tremendous Dignity, the Jewish Priesthood and Sacrifice of the Old Law, a mere Shadow of ours ; speaks as follows : *when you behold the Lord himself lying the victim on the Altar, and offered ; and the priest attending and praying over the Sacrifice purpled w'ih his precious Blood ; do you seem to remain among Men ; or not rather to be translated to Heaven? O wonderful prodigy! O Excess of divine Mercy! He, who is seated above at the right hand of the Father, is in that hour held by all in their hands, and given himself to be touched and received! Figure to yourself Elias before the Altar praying alone ; the Multitude standing around him in Silence and trembling ; and the fire falling from Heaven, and consuming the Sacrifice. What is now done is far more extraordinary, more awful and more astonishing. The Priest is here standing and calls down from Heaven, not Fire, but the Holy Ghost. He prays a long time, not that a flame may be kindled ; but that Grace may touch the Sacrifice ; and that the hearts of all who partake of it, may be PURGED BY the same. (De Sacerd. l. 3. c. 5. p. 335.*

Again : “What graces, says he, is it not in our power to receive by touching and receiving his whole Body! What if you hear not his voice? You see him laid. He has given us himself to eat ; and has set himself in the state of a Victim sacrificed for us.” (Hom. 50. p. 517.) And Hom. 82. p. 787 he writes thus :—“How many now say they wish to see his Shape ; his Garments! You desire to see his Garments ; but he gives you himself not only to be seen, but to be

“touched; to be eaten; to be received within you. That  
 “what Beam of the Sun ought not that hand to be more pure,  
 “which divides this flesh? That mouth, which is filled with  
 “this Spiritual Fire? That tongue, which is purpled with this  
 “adorable Blood. The Angels beholding it tremble, and dare  
 “not look thereon through awe and fear; and on account  
 “of the rays which dart from that, wherewith we are nourish-  
 “ed; with which we are mingled, being made one Body, one  
 “flesh with Christ. What Shepherd ever fed his Sheep with  
 “his own Limbs? Nay, many Mothers give their Children to  
 “other Nurses: whereas he feeds us with his own Blood,”  
 &c. (Hom. 82. p. 787.

What numberless other passages could I not cite from the writings of this illustrious Father and Oracle of the Church, in proof of this same Doctrine of the Real presence of Christ's Body and Blood in the Sacrament; or Transubstantiation; and to shew, in Contradiction to Dr. Strachan's ignorant assertion, page 92. 93. that “the whole of the Discourse at Caphernaum is “in direct opposition to transubstantiation; a doctrine, he says, “unknown to the primitive Church, and which receives no “Countenance from any of the Fathers:” whereas this Father reasons from that very Discourse in favour of Transubstantiation.

“Let us,” says the same holy Father, “believe God in all “things; and gainsay him not; although what he says appears “to be contrary to the testimony of our Eyes and our Reason. “Let the authority of his Word supersede the testimony of “our eyes and our Reason. Since therefore his Word said: “*this is my Body*; let us rest satisfied and believe. Let us “behold it with the eyes of Faith.” [Hom. 4. in Joan.]

In answer to the Dr. denying to Jesus Christ the possibility of being present in more places than one at a time; and even of being at all here on Earth *as Man*; (see page 7. and page 56.) hear what the holy Doctor says: “We always offer the “same holy Victim; not as in the old Law, sometimes one, “and sometimes another: but here it is always the same: for



“ which reason there is but one sacrifice. For if the diversity of places in which the Sacrifice is offered, multiplied the Sacrifice ; we should have to allow that there were many Christs. But there is but one Christ, who is *entire here* and *entire there* ; possessing still but one Body ; for which reason there is but one Sacrifice.” (Hom. in Epist. ad Hebr.)

“ You not only see the same Body that was seen by the Magi,” says the same holy Father ; “ but you are acquainted with its virtue,” &c.

St. Gaudentius of Brescia, in the year 306, spoke in the same strain to the newly Baptized. “ In the Shadows and figures of the ancient Pasch, not one Lamb, but many were slain ; for each house had its Sacrifice ; because one Victim could not suffice for all the people ; and also because this Mystery was a mere Figure, and not the Reality, but only the Image and Representation of the thing Signified. But now that the Figure has ceased, the One that died for all, immolated in the Mystery of Bread and Wine, gives Life *through all the Churches* ; and being Consecrated, Sanctifies those who Consecrate. *This is the flesh of the Lamb : this is his Blood.* For the living Bread that came down from Heaven, said : *the Bread that I will give you, is my flesh for the life of the World.* His Blood is rightly expressed by the species of Wine ; because, when he says in the Gospel : *I am the true Vine* ; he sufficiently declares that the Wine, which is offered in the figure of his passion, is *his Blood*. . . . . He, who is the Creator and Lord of all things ; and who produces Bread from the Earth ; *of the Bread makes his own proper Body* : (for he is able, and he has promised to do it.) And he, who changed Water into Wine, *now changes Wine into his Blood.*” (Treatise on the Nature of the Sacraments.)

“ What you receive is *the Body* of him, who is the living and heavenly Bread : and *the Blood* of him, who is the Sacred Vine. And we know that when he presented to his Disciples the consecrated Bread and Wine, he said : *This is*

“*my Body: This is my Blood.* Let us therefore believe him, whose faith we profess: *for Truth cannot lie.*” *ibid.*

“This inestimable Gift is the true inheritance of his New Testament, which he left us on the very night of his passion, as the pledge of his presence. It is the Viaticum, with which we are fed and fortified in the pilgrimage of this life, until we arrive at Heaven, and the full and unveiled enjoyment of him; who, when on Earth proclaimed to us: *Unless you eat my Flesh and drink my Blood, you shall not have life in you.*”—*ibid.* Is there no allusion here to the Saviour’s Discourse at Caphernaum, Dr.?

St. Augustine, instructing his Neophytes, says: “The Bread that you behold on the Altar, being consecrated by the Word of God, is *the Body of Jesus Christ.* This Chalice, or rather that which is in the Chalice, being sanctified by the Word of God, is *the Blood of Christ.* (Serm. 83.)

“Receive,” says the same Father, “in the Bread what was fastened to the Cross: receive in the Chalice, what issued from the side of Jesus Christ: for he will receive Death and not life who shall believe that Truth is capable of a falsehood.” [Serm. Cit. ab. Alger.]

St. Gregory of Nyssa declares “that the Bread is but Bread, at first, but that no sooner is it consecrated by the Mystical Prayer, than it is called, and actually is, the Body of Jesus Christ.” [Serm. de Bapt. Chr.]

“By virtue of the Benediction the Nature of *visible things is changed into his Body.* . . . and so I now Believe that the Bread Sanctified by the Word of God, is *transformed and changed into the Body of Christ.*” [Idem. Orat. Catech. c. 37.] Is not this the Doctrine of transubstantiation?

Hesychius:—“The Sanctification of the Mystic Sacrifice, *the change and transformation* of Sensible into Spiritual things, must be attributed to him, who is the true Priest.” [Comment. on Leviticus.]

In the Sixth Century, St. Cæsarius, of Arles: “It is the invisible Priest, who by the secret virtue of his Divine word,

“changes visible Creatures into the *Substance of his Body and Blood.*” Now, is not the change of one substance into another properly called *Transubstantiation* ?

“As then,” continues the same Father, “by a simple word God in an instant formed out of nothing the height of the Heavens; the Depth of the Sea; and the wide extension of the Earth: so likewise in the Spiritual Sacraments, by a power equally great, the Virtue of his Word is instantly followed by the effect.”

St. Eusabius of Emessa: “the invisible Sacrifice *converts* by a word pregnant with a Secret power, visible Creatures into *the Substance of his Body and Blood.*—And what is there wonderful in his being able to *change* by his word the things, which he was able to create by his word? On the contrary, one would imagine it to be less wonderful for him to change into something more excellent that which he had created out of nothing.” [Serm. ad Cat.] Is not this the Doctrine of Transubstantiation?

St. Ephrem: “That which the Son of God Jesus Christ, our Saviour, has done for us, baffles language and surpasses imagination; since, notwithstanding our fleshy composition, he feeds us with Spirit and with fire; giving us *his Body to eat, and his Blood to Drink.*”

St. Hilary: “Let us hold to what is written. Jesus Christ leaves no room to doubt of the Reality of his flesh and Blood, since the Declaration of our Lord and of our faith asserts it to be his flesh indeed, and his Blood indeed.” [Lib. 8. de Trin.]

St. Ephrem: “Participate in the immaculate Body and Blood of the Lord with a firm faith; resting assured that you receive the Lamb whole and entire.” [Against Curiosity in Searching into the Divine Nature.]

“We must consider,” says St. Gregory of Nyssa, “how it can be that this Single Body, being distributed to thousands of the Faithful, should be found whole and entire in each person who receives it; and still remain whole and entire in itself.

“The power of the Word, who, as Man, was nourished with Bread, rendered the Bread that he eat, his holy Body. In like manner the Bread is Sanctified by the Word of God and prayer; not passing into the Body of the Word by eating and drinking: but being instantly changed into the Body of the Word, according to what he said: *this is my Body.*” [Cat. Serm. ch. 37.]

St. Augustine, explaining the Psalm 33d, in which it is said, according to the Septuagint that David *was carried in his own hands*; expresses himself as follows: “Who can comprehend, my Brethren, how such a thing can be performed by a Man? Who is it that holds himself in his hands? A Man may indeed be held in the hands of another; but never in his own. We cannot therefore discover how this can be understood of David in a literal sense; but can easily see how it can be understood of Christ *according to the Letter: for Christ bore himself in his own hands*, when giving himself to us, he said: *this is my Body*; for he then bore that Body in his own hands.” [Hom. 83. on St. Mat.]

“Jesus Christ,” says St. Chrysostom, “himself drank from his Chalice; lest his apostles hearing his words, should say within themselves: do we then drink his Blood and eat his flesh? and be troubled at the thought. For, when he spoke of these Mysteries, many were scandalized.” This shews that the Bishop of Strasbourg was not the first to understand the Saviour’s Discourse at Caphernaum as spoken concerning the Eucharist.—“To prevent this trouble,” continues the Saint, “and to remove all uneasiness from their minds in their participation of the Mysteries, he set the first example; and this was the reason why *he drank his own Blood.*” [Epist. ad Hedib.]

St. Jerom in the same sense declares: “Moses gave us not the true Bread: but our Lord Jesus did. He invites us to the feast, and is himself our meat. He eats with us, and we receive and eat him.”

“We must then believe that Jesus Christ put himself into

“his mouth,” exclaims J. J. Rousseau in a tone of triumph against the Mystery of the Eucharist; as if he had discovered something as original as sarcastic. He must have known full well (and so should our Dr. who joins in his infidel sneer, page 5,) that Venerable Antiquity had thought of this long before his time; and that this most just consequence, incomprehensible though it be to human Intellect, had in noways shaken the reliance due to the word of a God Man in the mind of the great Arch Bishop of Constantinople; of the learned Solitary of Bethlem; and of all the most enlightened Characters of the primitive ages.—Amic. Disc.

Neither is the adoration of the Sacrament of so late a date as the Doctor, page 46, 47, would insinuate.—“Approach the Chalice,” says St. Cyril of Jerusalem; “not stretching out your hands, but bending towards the Earth in a posture of Adoration, to pay your homage.” [Const. Ap. l. 2.]

St. Ambrose: “We must say, that his footstool is the Earth; and by the Earth we must understand the flesh of Christ; which to this day *we adore in the holy Mysteries*; and which the Apostles *adored* formerly in his person.” [Catech. 4. Myst.]

St. Augustine: “No one eating this flesh, without first adoring it.” [De Spirit. Sanct. L. 3.] &c. &c.

St. Chrysostom: “*The Magi formerly testified their respect* to this divine Body, when lying in the Crib. These Gentiles adored him with respectful fear and profound veneration. You behold it, not in the Crib, but on the Altar: not in the arms of a Woman, but in the hands of the Priest; and under the wings of the Holy Ghost, who descends with powerful influence upon the Oblations.—Let us therefore excite ourselves—and with reverential awe, let us surpass even the Magi in the marks of our Veneration of the Body of Christ.” [Hom. on 1. Cor.]

And after all this, and a thousand times more which we could cite to the same purpose, down to the unhappy period of the protestant Reformation; what must we think of the knowledge

or honesty of Dr. Strachan, when he repeatedly affirms in his Pamphlet that the Catholic Doctrine of the Real Presence, is a "Doctrine unknown to the primitive Church; and without "the slightest Countenance from Scripture." [See page 7. 45. 47. 48. 49. 63. 84.] Certainly he must be either extremely ignorant of Ecclesiastical History, all his knowledge of which he seems to have derived from the wide circulating religious Tract matter: or he must presume a great deal on the ignorance of his Hearers and the Canadian Public. And not, it appears, without reason; as we find his drawling, dull, monotonous, unscholar-like Lucubration extolled to the skies as a learned, elegant, *Gentlemanlike*, and irrefutable performance, by several of our Wisdom-Vending Journalists in these Provinces.

"And here, [in the Doctor's own modest words, page 87,] "standing, as we do, on the Vantage Ground, and with such "accumulation of proofs in favour of the Sense which we give "to our Saviour's Discourse, the Apostles, the Fathers, &c., "it is rather too much for *Doctor Strachan*, to call upon us to "give up our dearest hopes, because we do not adopt his "symbolical interpretation." In concluding our remarks on the Doctor's Pamphlet, we would recommend him and his Hearers to consult, for their better information on so momentous a subject, the Second Volume of the Bishop of Strasbourg's Work, *the Amicable Discussion*; from which the Hon'ble John Elmsley's Pamphlet was extracted.

## ON THE REAL PRESENCE, OR TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

The worship shewn by Roman Catholics to the sacrament of the altar, is blamed as idolatrous, from a misconception of the genuine principles and real intentions of the worshippers; for it is surely according to the intention of the worshipper that one is to judge of the nature of the worship itself; and when it is evident that there is no intention to worship the creature, but only the Creator; the one true and living God; how can such worship be construed into idolatry? It is very well known by all who have chosen to make themselves acquainted with the real belief of Catholics, that by all the honors they pay to the sacrament, they intend merely to worship Jesus Christ, whom they suppose really present in its stead, and under its form. Should they in this supposition be mistaken, their homage is never directed to the elements of bread and wine, which they believe no longer there; but to him, who, they think has assumed their form. In the Church of England one kneels to receive the bare elements: and why may not one do so as innocently in the Church of Rome, to receive what he considers as his Saviour really present? Indeed, were this doctrine as idolatrous, absurd and unscriptural, as many suppose it; could it be thought that such a vast proportion of the most learned in the universe would glory in professing it as one of the articles of their faith?

Were a Catholic, who should be heard upon the subject, to assign his reasons for such a belief, he would simply state that he sees nothing absurd in supposing it possible for God to change one substance into another, or even destroy, what he has created out of nothing. We ourselves, all living creatures, and even the plants of the earth, have received from God the power of changing, though in a natural way, one substance into another. My meat and drink I *transubstantiate*, if I may use the expression; changing it slowly by digestion into my flesh and blood; and rise gradually from a puny infant into the per-

fect and full-grown man.—And shall God himself not have the power, if he pleases, in a supernatural way, to change in a moment the elements of bread and wine into his flesh and blood as man; or to substitute himself in person in their stead, and under their form? Such an idea of the Omnipotent and all-disposing power of God it is not unbecoming the creature to have of the Creator. The more wonderful and incomprehensible it is, the more it is a proper object of our faith; and the greater homage is done to the divine veracity, by implicitly believing it on the word of God. The Trinity, the most fundamental article of the Christian's faith, is fully as inexplicable a mystery; as well as the incarnation of the Son of God, and even the resurrection of the dead, which we all believe. Whatever is contrary to reason must be absurd; but what is above reason may be believed, provided we have sufficient authority for believing it. And this authority the Catholic thinks he has for believing in the Real Presence in the express declaration of Jesus Christ himself at his last supper to his disciples; and in that which he had made before while preaching in the synagogue at Caphernaum, when he suffered many of his followers to leave him, because they thought what he had spoken *a hard saying*, and would not believe it. *John vi. 27.*

Indeed, as to scripture-authority for this doctrine, I am apt to think that there is no article whatever of the Christian's belief so clearly, so strongly, and so repeatedly inculcated in holy writ, as this one of the Real Presence. It would seem as if our Lord, foreseeing the great opposition this doctrine would meet with in after ages, had judged it necessary to be the more clear and explicit on this head.—The words at the institution of this sacrament are the most plain and unequivocal possible. *While they were at supper, Jesus took bread and blessed it and brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying; take 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 OF THE NEW TESTAMENT, which shall be shed for many, for the remission of sins. Matt. xxvi. 26, 27, 28.*



Much I know, has been written and said by Protestants in order to force a meaning on these words different from what they naturally imply.—But it is somewhat strange that they who pretend to regulate their faith on all occasions by the letter of the law, and not by any one's interpretation; depart in this instance so far from their professed rule of faith as to receive a hundred different whimsical interpretations, rather than abide by the simple, plain, and obvious meaning of the text. *This is my body which is given for you.* Then it was his body, and no more bread; unless we say that he could not make it what he affirmed it to be. *This is my blood of the New Testament, which shall be shed for many for the remission of sins.* Then, if he spoke truth, it was his blood, and not wine, which was never shed for the remission of sins.—Why thus seek to force a fanciful meaning on that which is so clearly, positively, and unfiguratively spoken?

If we wish the meaning further explained, let us hear how our Saviour himself explains it, *John vi. 27.* After giving a most striking proof of his omnipotence by feeding five thousand persons in the desert with only five barley loaves and two fishes; affording thereby also a most sensible figure of the manner in which he reproduces in the hands of his pastors the bread of life, which he was going to describe: when the people after seeking him every where in order to make him their king, had at last found and saluted him; he prepares them for the stupendous doctrine he was about to disclose, by exhorting them *to seek not the bread that perisheth, but that which endureth unto life everlasting*; and by shewing the necessity of believing in him. They ask him therefore what wonder he wrought to confirm their belief; mentioning, as a motive for their belief in Moses, the prodigy of the manna in the desert; of which their forefathers had eaten. Upon this he tells them that Moses had not given them bread from heaven, (for the manna had only descended from the clouds, and was merely a figure of what he was about to reveal) *but my Father, says he, gives you true bread from heaven; for the bread of God is he, who descend-*

ed from heaven, and giveth his life for the world. As yet they did not well comprehend him, and therefore they said: *Lord, give us always this bread.* Then Jesus says to them: *I am the bread of life: he, who comes to me shall not be hungry, and he, who believes in me, shall never thirst.* Then he complains of their unbelief: tells them that they, whom the Father gives him, will come to him; and that he will not cast them away, nor lose any of them; but that he will raise them up at the last day. In fine, he assures them that it is the will of his Father, that all who see him and believe in him, should have eternal life, and be raised up at the last day.

Why so much preliminary exhortation to belief; unless the doctrines, he was going to broach, required a more than ordinary degree of faith? In fact, the Jews already began to murmur at his having said that he was *the living bread that came down from heaven*: and considering only his earthly extraction, they said *how can this man tell us that he came down from heaven?* Then Jesus answered and said: *Murmur not among yourselves; no man can come to me, except the Father, who has sent me, draw him, and I will raise him up at the last day.* Once more he insists on their implicit faith, and again renews the promise of eternal life to those, who believe in him. At last, he reveals in the clearest, most explicit, and intelligible manner this important and wonderful doctrine, for the hearing of which he had previously taken such pains to prepare them.

*I am, says he, the bread of life. Your fathers did eat manna in the desert, and are dead. This is the bread that came down from heaven; that, if any one eat of it, he may not die. I am the living bread, who came down from heaven. If any one eat of this bread he shall live for ever; and the bread that I will give is my flesh for the life of the world. The Jews therefore strove among themselves, saying, how can this man give us his flesh to eat?*

Now, at length, they had caught his meaning: and Jesus, who could not be ignorant of the sense in which they understood him, and which was evidently the literal one; confirms

them in it by still more plain, emphatical and pointed declarations on the subject. For taking up his asseveration at the very difficulty or objection they had started; and adverting to their own very words, he says in the most solemn manner: *Verily, verily I say unto you; unless you eat the flesh of the son of Man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you. He who eats my flesh, and drinks my blood hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed; and my blood is drink indeed. He who eats my flesh and drinks my blood, abides in me, and I in him.*

This is pretty clear, I should think, and more satisfactory on the subject in question, than all the expositions of all the reformers of his doctrine ever since his time. Nor did the Jews indeed mistake him; nor was he ignorant that they understood him in the literal sense. Yet so far is he from wishing them to conceive it, as Protestants do, in a merely figurative sense; that he affirms his doctrine to be as necessarily true in the literal sense which had so offended them, as that the living Father had sent him, and that he lived by the Father. *As the Father, says he, has sent me; and as I live by the Father; so he who eateth me, the same also shall live by me.* No declaration ever before or since made to man could be more awful, solemn and positive than this. Yet all this is not enough. He returns to what he had affirmed from the beginning: shews the excellence of this heavenly bread above that of its figure, the manna, which only prolonged a little the life of the body, while that which he had promised to give, was intended as the living and life-giving food of the soul; and he concludes by resuming, and putting into one short sentence, his whole doctrine on this head. *This is the bread of life which came down from heaven. Not as your fathers did eat manna and are dead. He who eateth this bread, shall live for ever.* This, adds the evangelist, *he spoke, teaching in the synagogue at Caphernaum:* which circumstance proves that he wished this doctrine to be considered by the Jews, as a most essentially important one, which he had so formally taught in their synagogue.

*Many therefore of his disciples, continues the same evangelist, hearing this, said, this is a hard saying, and who can hear it?* But in what was this a hard saying, if he meant it only, as Protestants would have it to be understood? Was there any thing hard, especially to a Jew, who was so accustomed to figurative eating and drinking, to suppose that bread might be eaten in memory of his body, which was broken, and wine drunk, in memory of his blood which was shed for the remission of sins? And if he really meant it to be understood only in this sense, why did he not undeceive his hearers, who, he knew, murmured at his words, only because they took them in their plainest and most obvious meaning? He undoubtedly would have done so, had they implied any other sense, than the one they naturally conveyed. Yet instead of doing so, and in order to leave no doubt but that they were meant in the very sense, in which they were taken; we read as follows: *But Jesus knowing within himself that his disciples murmured at this, said unto them: doth this offend you? What if you shall see the Son of Man ascend up where he was before?* Putting them in mind that he was God who spoke, who had descended from heaven, and would ascend up thither again: and that therefore they ought to believe what seemed so hard to them, because it was he who affirmed it. *It is written, said he, in the Prophets, they shall all be taught of God,* John 6. 45. Those taught of man, cannot soar beyond the narrow sphere of human conception: while those *taught of God* can take his infallible word for their security; well knowing that he can do infinitely more than they can comprehend. He sets them right as to the mistaken notion they had concerning the eating of his body; which they very naturally, but erroneously supposed intended for their bodily food like the *dead flesh* of their victims: whereas it was meant as the spiritual and *living food* of the soul. *It is the Spirit, said he, that quickens: the flesh profiteth nothing. The words, that I have spoken to you, are spirit and life. But there are some of you, added he, who believe not; for Jesus knew from the beginning who they were*

*who did not believe, and who he was, who would betray him ; and he said : therefore did I say unto you that no one can come to me, unless it be given him by my Father.* That is evidently the grace to believe the doctrine which he had just taught ; and in that very sense, which had so offended them. *From that time, it is added, many of his disciples went back, and walked no more with him.* Yet he allowed them to go away, without undeceiving them, if they were deceived ; and without softening a single expression, or giving the least hint of a different meaning, than the one they had conceived. Nay, he even asks his Apostles if they also choose rather to leave him than believe. But Simon Peter answers him in their name, and in the name of all who should believe after him ; *Lord to whom shall we go ? Thou hast the words of eternal life ; and we have believed and have known that thou art Christ the Son of the living God.*

I must own it seems to me evident, after considering attentively the whole context of this chapter, that our Saviour meant all he said in the strictest literal sense. Had he intended it to have been understood in a figurative one, can we suppose that he who came to instruct the ignorant, and to seek and to save those who were lost ; would have suffered his hearers and disciples to have abandoned him from a mistake into which his own very words had so naturally led them ; without vouchsafing to drop a single expression that might reclaim them ? He likewise foresaw the many millions, who would afterwards take this same doctrine literally as he had spoken it ; and whose mistake also, if there were any in believing it so, he would have prevented by an explanation.

It is remarkable that St. John, who is the only one of the evangelists that relates this occurrence of our Saviour with the Jews at Caphernaum ; and describes so minutely this doctrine, which the Lord taught in their synagogue ; is likewise the only one who omits mentioning in his gospel, when describing every other event that took place at the last supper, the most important circumstance of all ; namely, that of the institution of the

blessed Sacrament. This omission seems evidently intended as a hint to the reader to look back to our Saviour's dogma and promise of the bread of life, which he alone had already so amply detailed ; which dogma and promise were known by all the faithful to have been first verified and realized at the last supper.

---

Protestants consider their Sacrament of the Lord's Supper to be *mere Bread and Wine*, as only a Figure of Christ's Body and Blood.

Is this then, will they say, the promised fulfilment of all the ancient figures ; the Paschal Lamb ; the wondrous manna, and all the unbloody sacrifices ; particularly that of Melchisedeh ? Do all these mystical types and shadows point but at the baker's loaf, and wine merchant's cheapest beverage ? Is this the marriage banquet of *the King's son* to which we are all so formally invited ! Matt. 22, 2. This the sumptuous feast prepared for us by Wisdom herself ? Prov. 9. Has she then no better fare to treat us with, after all her preparations, than a mere earthy crust, and the simple juice of the grape ? un-sanctified, but as our ordinary meals are, with the sinner's suppliant benediction ; not consecrated and changed by the omnipotent word of God pronounced over them by his appointed organs, the lawful successors of those, whom he commanded to do just what he himself, the incarnate Deity had done ; that is, to make these elements what he then, with truth declared them to be, his very body, about to be bruised and broken for us ; and his very blood, about to be shed for the remission of our sins ? Is all, what Wisdom divine bids so pressingly her guests to eat, but a niggard morsel and scanty sip of those corruptible elements, intended only for the short support of our mortal bodies ? O, no : her's is a food divine ; a sweet, a nourishing, an immortalizing repast for our better half, the soul. Her table is that *spread for us against those who afflict us* : Ps. 22. 5. on which is displayed Messiah's best and most beauteous

gift ; *the wheat of the chosen ones ; and the wine germinating virgins.* Zach. 9. 27. Still in her house, the Saviour's Church, built, not on sand, but on the rock ; Matth. 7. 24. ibid. 16. 18. and reared and resting on her seven pillars, the sacraments ; *she immolates her victims ; mixes her wine ; sets forth her table ; and sends her maids to invite to the tower, and to the walls of her city ;* not the worldly wise and great ; but *whosoever is a little one, says she, let him come to me : and to the unwise, that is, to those simple enough to believe on her word alone, all she tells them concerning her wondrous feast ; to those therefore accounted fools, by the incredulous, for not relying on their own erroneous judgments, rather than on her infallible declaration ; to these unwise she says : come, eat of my bread, and drink of the wine, which I have mixed for you. Leave off childishness ; and live ; and walk in the ways of prudence.*—Prov. 9.

If we wish to be more particularly informed as to the nature of Wisdom's Banquet ; let us hear herself, in her visible shape assumed, explain it, as she does, in the clearest terms imaginable ; for her banquet is no other than the Saviour's feast ; which he describes to us, as follows :—

*“I am, says he, the living bread, that came down from heaven : if any man eat of this bread, he shall live forever ; and the bread that I will give, is my flesh for the life of the world. Amen, amen, I say unto you ; unless you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood ; you shall not have life in you. For my flesh is meat indeed ; and my blood is drink indeed. He who eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, abideth in me, and I in him. As the living Father has sent me ; and as I live by the Father ; so he that eateth me, the same also shall live by me. This is the bread that came down from heaven : not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead : he that eateth this bread, shall live forever.—These things he said, teaching in the synagogue at Capernaum.* John vi. 32, &c.

The promise of this *living and life-giving bread ;* he veri-

hed at his last supper : when, after eating with his apostles the figurative paschal lamb ; he concluded the mystic feast by fulfilling the figure ; giving to them himself, the true paschal lamb, the divine food and nourishment of their souls : and desiring them, the pastors of his church, to do the same ; even that, which he himself had just done ; that is to change the elements by the all efficient word of him, who created them, into his living body and blood, and distribute them, as such, to the rest of the faithful. For, *taking the bread, he blessed it, and broke it, and gave it to them, saying : take 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 of the New Testament, which shall be shed for many, for the remission of sins.—Matt. xxvi. 26.*

*Take and eat ; this is my body,* says Jesus Christ. *It is not your body,* says the Protestant, but only common bread, *taken and eaten as a figure of your body :—Drink ye all of this,* says the Saviour ; *for this is my blood of the New Testament, which shall be shed for many, for the remission of sins.—It is not your blood of the New Testament,* says the Protestant, *but merely wine, which was never shed for the remission of sins.—* Can any two declarations be more opposite and contradictory than these ? God's *affirmation* is here again met, as in paradise, by the devil's *negation*. Where in all scripture does the Protestant find this *negative* sense of the Saviour's plain *affirmative* declaration ? In the concluding words of the institution, whispers the father of *negatives*, to all who give ear to him. You will find, says he, (the lying fiend) who durst quote Scripture to tempt even the Saviour, that in these words—*Do this in memory of me,* the *negation* is contained of the Saviour's *affirmation* : for, if what he gave was himself ; how can he be a memorial of himself ?—Why may not a prince, for instance, represent, together with his chosen fellow actors in the drama, his former exploits and achievements for his people ! And would this be less a memorial of himself, as he formerly was, for the good of his people, because he himself was there, the



chief character in the commemorative exhibition? Now this is just what takes place in the Eucharistic mystery ; for in it is represented, not what Jesus Christ now is, immortal, glorious and impassable ; but what he once condescended to become for our sake : a suffering, bruised, and dying mortal ; our propitiatory, long prefigured victim slain ; by the eating of which, as the Apostle testifies, *we shew forth the death of our Lord, till he comes.*—1 Cor. xi. 26.

*I came not, says our Saviour, to abolish, but to fulfil the law. Amen, I say unto you, till heaven and earth pass away, one jot or tittle of the law shall not pass, till all be fulfilled :—*Matt v. 17, &c., that is, till all the typical and figurative allusions in the Old Law find their exact accomplishment and complete realization in the New. But if what he called *his body*, was not his body, but only bread, as a figure of his body ; and if what he called *his blood*, the very blood which at his Last Supper he was about to *shed for the remission of sins*, was not his blood, but only wine, which was never shed for the remission of sins ; then the figure was not fulfilled, but continued : or rather a comparatively mean and insignificant figure was substituted to an august, expressive and appropriate one. For who will compare with all the pompous sacrifices of old ; with the Paschal Lamb, or the miraculous Manna, a little common bread and wine, handed round, to be just only tasted? Can this, even as a figure, much less as the fulfilment of one and all, be considered in any sense equal to the Paschal Lamb alone ; which, for its innocence, meekness, dumb and uncomplaining patience under the very hands of its slayers ; so fitly represented the meek and innocent Lamb of God ; who, according to the prophecy of Isaias, *was led like a sheep to the slaughter ; and as a dumb lamb before his shearers, who opened not his mouth :—*Is. 53, 7. To the lamb whose blood, like the Saviour's, when shed, became the sign of salvation to the people of God ; turning aside from their doors on which it was sprinkled, the death-dealing visitation of the destroying angel!—to the lamb in the figure as really eaten as slain ; and

therefore to be as really eaten as slain, in the exact fulfilment of the figure ; that of which we are repeatedly assured by the Saviour's most plain and positive declarations on the subject ?

*It is a hard saying*, said the Jews, *and who can hear it ?* *It is a hard saying*, say the Protestants, *and who can believe it ?* It is indeed a hard saying : and none can hear and believe it, but they, who, according to Saint Paul, *bring into Captivity their understanding, in obedience to Christ* :—2 Cor. x. 5. None but wisdom's *little ones* ; her reputed *unwise* for so readily believing on her sole word, what surpasses so the understanding of man.

*It is written in the prophets*, said the Saviour when inculcating this stupendous doctrine, *they shall all be taught of God* :—John vi. 45. Potestants, however, on this head prefer being *taught of man*, who can judge of nothing, but as he thinks he spies it, in the dim glimmer of his natural, and but conjectural knowledge ; and will credit nothing, but what his glow-worm light of reason enables him to perceive : who would sound with his atom-line and plummet the unfathomable depths of wisdom infinite ; and determine with his mite of intellect the possible extent of the operations of Omnipotence. How then can such, as are *taught of man*, ever hear and believe a doctrine so far exceeding all human understanding ; and utterly incredible, were we not certain that he was God himself incarnate, the most holy one, and true, who taught it ?

They on the contrary, who are *taught of God*, can take his word for their security ; well knowing that he can do infinitely more than they can comprehend : that he who created all things out of nothing, can change them, when he pleases, into whatever he pleases. They see him daily working wonders in the administration of the universe, which shew that nothing is impossible to him. And can they rationally doubt his power to fulfil his own most solemnly repeated promises ? If asked by him, therefore, as the Apostles were, if they too, like the rest, would leave him, rather than believe that he could give them his real flesh to eat ; what answer could we make, but that

which Saint Peter made in their name, and in the name of all the true believers; *Lord*, said he, *to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life: and we have believed and have known that thou art Christ, the Son of the living God.*—John vi. 69.

The unbelief of Protestants in a mystery so clearly revealed by him whom they acknowledge to be God, is the more unaccountable; as they have in all nature, and even in themselves, the constant and most striking proof of his power to work the very change in question. For, do they not behold him, in the vegetable, as well as the animal species of every denomination, *transubstantiating* one substance into another? Do they not behold him, even in themselves, *transubstantiating* their meat and drink into their very flesh and blood? Let them tell me else from what other source does the diminutive infant derive its increasing bulk; till it has grown up into the full sized perfect man? And can they then deem it absurd to believe, on his own formal and repeated asseveration that he can do for himself in a *supernatural* and *instantaneous* manner, what he does in a *slow* and *natural* manner for all? The first and last of his public miracles was *transubstantiation*; the first, a visible one, that of water into wine at the marriage feast of Cana in Galilee:—John 2—the last, a still greater, but invisible one, to be credited on his word, that of bread and wine into his body and blood, at the mystical marriage feast of himself, the celestial *bridegroom*, *the king's son*, to which all are invited,—Matth. 22. 2. But this, the last and greatest of all his wonders wrought, he intended as the chief trial, and object of our faith. Wherefore, resting it on the evidence of all his other miracles, he denies it that of all the senses, but the *hearing*. *Faith then*, says the Apostle, *cometh by the hearing; and hearing by the word of Christ.*—Rom. 10, 17.—And can we distrust his word, so clearly, frequently and emphatically announced? Can we refuse our entire reliance on that word, to the truth of which all nature has borne such miraculous testimony? The winds and the waves were seen subject at his call; and the inhabitants of the deep crowded instantly where he willed them.

The watery element grows firm under his steps. The vegetating productions are blasted by his frown. Diseases, defects and debilities of every kind vanish at his word. The blind see ; the deaf hear ; the sick are restored to perfect health ; the lepers are cleansed ; the devils fly at his rebuke ; even death and the grave, at his summons, yield up instantly their dead : the very inmost thoughts of the human heart are known to him, as soon as formed. In a word, the whole of nature owns him, though disguised in human form, her Almighty Maker and sovereign Lord.

If we see him not now performing such miracles, we behold him daily working in the administration of this universe other wonders as astonishingly great. For instance, to give life is a far greater act of Omnipotence, than to restore it : and this we see him do daily, by calling into existence millions of creatures, and giving them a life and a being, which they never had before. He re-produces with increase the seed in the ground to feed his needful creatures ; as he reproduced the loaves and fishes in the desert to feed his fasting followers ; and can he not as easily reproduce in its very distribution, by the hands of his Pastors, *the bread of life*, which he promised to give us ? It was from this very miracle, a most stupendous one certainly, that he took occasion to challenge the belief of the multitude, who had witnessed it, in his power to furnish them with a far more wonderful and exquisite repast ; not an earthly one, for the short support of the body ; but a heavenly and life-giving one, for the nourishment of the soul : a food, as he affirms, far excelling even the miraculous manna of the Israelites ; and infinitely surpassing the Protestant's poor drop and crumb.

It was our original distrust in the word of God, and our guilty wish for forbidden knowledge, that wrought all our woe in Paradise ; by making us the willing dupes of the deceiving fiend. The reparation therefore of our fault is our entire reliance on the word of God, without coveting to know and understand more of his mysteries than he has been pleased for the present to reveal. As a trial therefore of our faith in his word,

he has grounded his whole religion on mysteries inexplicable; several of which are admitted by Protestants as articles of their faith; such as the unity and trinity of the Godhead; the incarnation of the eternal son; the resurrection of the dead, &c. And, while they admit these, as essential truths revealed to us by the deity; can they reject, though more explicitly, repeatedly, and emphatically revealed and taught by the same authority, the Eucharistic mystery, on the sole plea of its incomprehensibility?

Yet in the whole of nature, which is that single object which man, in his present state, does fully comprehend? Are we not every where surrounded with mysteries inexplicable? Are we not, in every sense, a perfect mystery even to ourselves? And shall we doubt the clear declaration of God, because to us its verification is quite incomprehensible?

The Eucharistic mystery is, if you please, the hardest to be understood. It is, if I may call it so, *the mystery of mysteries*; and the one by which our trust in the divine word is put to the severest test. But then it is, on this account the clearest and most fully revealed of any; not only by the Saviour's solemn, plain and positive declarations on the subject; but by all the, else unmeaning, legal sacrifices, types and figures; the whole of which but pointed at this mystery; and found in it their full accomplishment.

Our belief in this mystery, from our total reliance on the word of God, is the ample amends made to him for our original distrust in his word: and as we fell from him by disbelief; we are restored to him in this mystery, and united with him in the closest manner; in reward of our perfect faith. Our bane is thus changed into our bliss: and *the tree of death*, with its forbidden fruit, converted into *the tree of life*; the fruit of which, we are now commanded to eat as the sovereign antidote against the threatened death; for on the tree of the cross that body hung, and that blood was shed, to the eating or drinking of which is promised eternal life.—John 6, as above.

Still, to those *not taught of God*, but of man, how incredible

and absurd must seem so deep a mystery! And hence do we see all the sectaries, though they affect to cling to the letter of the scripture; racking their brains, and risking every conjecture, rather than take the Saviour's words in their plain, unfigurative and literal meaning. They believe his declaration only in as far as they think they understand it. Where then is the merit of their faith, if they believe nothing of the word of God, but what they comprehend? Strange presumption in such short-sighted and ignorant worms, to set themselves thus to judge how far the evident disclosures of Omniscience are admissible; rejecting of them, as absurd and impossible, whatever comes not within the narrow sphere of their intellect.—*Faith*, says St. Paul, *cometh by the hearing*:—Rom. x. 17. *It stands not on the wisdom of men, but on the power of God.* 1 Cor. ii. 5. *We speak*, continues he, *the wisdom of God in a mystery; a wisdom which is hidden; which God ordained before the world unto our glory; which none of the princes of this world knew.—But to us God has revealed them by his spirit: for the spirit searcheth all things even the deep things of God. For what man knoweth the things of a man, but the spirit of a man that is in him? so, the things also that are of God, no man knoweth, but the Spirit of God. Now we have received, not the spirit of this world, but the spirit that is of God; that we may know the things that are given us from God: which things also we speak not in the learned words of human wisdom; but in the doctrine of the spirit, comparing spiritual things with spiritual. But the sensual man perceiveth not the things that are of the spirit of God; for it is folly to him; and he cannot understand, because it is spiritually examined. But the spiritual man judgeth all things, and he himself is judged by no man: for who has known the mind of the Lord, that he may instruct him? But we have the mind of Christ.—*  
*Ibid.*

Those therefore *taught of God*, and who thus *have the mind of Christ*; can see in this Eucharistic mystery a doctrine worthy of that God, who with his word created all things out of

nothing: and in our belief in a mystery so inexplicable, an act of homage paid to his veracity proportionably great; while those *taught of man, who perceiveth not the things that are of the spirit, see nothing in it, but folly, because they cannot understand.*

Yet in all this prodigy of love to man, there is nothing too much for him to accomplish, who could stoop so from his sovereign height to the extreme lowness and utter abjection of our fallen and wretched condition: could even assume our suffering and mortal humanity; and in it, *as a worm and no man; the reproach of man, and the outcast of the people.*—Ps. xxi. 6.—bear the expiatory punishment of our guilt, in order to save us from destruction. It is not too much for him, who could make himself our brother, to vouchsafe so to dwell in the midst of us; disguised, indeed, to try our faith; and muffled up in the sacramental veils; but in that very same, though now glorified and impassible humanity, which he disdained not to take upon himself for our sake. Here he stands between us and the just wrath of his heavenly Father; pleading, *our high priest according to the order of Melchisadech*, a merciful respite for sinners; and preserving thus our sin-polluted world from destruction: as Moses, interposing himself between the angry Deity and the guilty Israelites, prevented their threatened extermination: and as Aaron, the High Priest, hastening forth with his censor and holy fire, stayed the havoc made in the camp by the destroying Angel.—Num. 14.—*Ibid.* 16, 48.

Yes, he still deigns to dwell in the midst of his followers here on earth. His love for us, which knows no bounds, will not suffer him to be absent from the darling objects of his care and concern. *My delight*, says he, *is to be with the children of men*; Prov. viii. 31—and *where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.* Matt. xviii. 20.

No bars or doors can now exclude his presence. In the midst of his Disciples, though closetted up for fear of the Jews, he suddenly stood; and gave his wounds to be felt by his

doubting Apostle; chiding him at the same time in the gentlest manner for his incredulity. *Because thou hast seen me, Thomas, said he, thou hast believed; but blessed are they, who have not seen, and yet have believed.* John xx. 29.

*I will not leave you orphans, said he, to his dear afflicted followers, who thought they were going to lose him. I will come to you again. Yet a little while, and the world sees me no more, but you see me, because I live; and you shall live. In that day you shall know that I am in my Father; and you in me; and I in you. He who hath my commandments, and keepeth them; he it is who loveth me: and he who loveth me, shall be loved by my Father; and I will love him, and MANIFEST MYSELF TO HIM.*

*Judas, not the Iscariot, saith to him: Lord! how is it that THOU WILT MANIFEST THYSELF TO US, AND NOT TO THE WORLD? Jesus answered and said to him: if any one love me, HE WILL KEEP MY WORD; and my Father will love him: and we will come to him, and make our abode with him.—He, who loveth me not, KEEPETH NOT MY WORDS.—John xiv. 18. &c.*

What then is *that word* of his, the keeping of which he says will *manifest* him to his followers? What, but *that word* which he so plainly spoke to his apostles at his last supper with them: *the transubstantiating word* which made what he then gave them, as truly as he spoke it, his very body to eat; and his very blood to drink; *that word* which he had so fully explained, and so forcibly inculcated to the multitude, when *teaching in the synagogue at Capharnaum*: John 6, 59—*that word*, which then so shocked the Jews; which now so shocks the Protestants, Freethinkers, Deists, and all unbelievers; who refusing to be *taught of God*, prefer grounding their faith on mere human conjecture; yet *that very word* which *manifests* him to all those *who keep it*; and who recognize their Lord under the disguise, which he assured them he would henceforth assume. These still see him, while *the world sees him no more*. He lives in them, and they in him. *On such he daily showers down*



*his hidden manna* : Apoc. 2, 17,—and bids them feast and grow immortal by feeding on the fruit of *the tree of life*.

Such require not the aid of the senses to confirm their faith in his word and promises. They seek not, like Thomas, to see and feel the print of the nails in his hands and feet ; nor the mark of the spear in his wounded side, in order to prove his presence and identity. They rest their faith, as he enjoins, on the testimony of his other disciples ; on the unerring declaration of his Church, which he commands us all so peremptorily and unreservedly *to hear* :—Matt. 18, 17. encouraged, as we are so to do, by his assuring us that *blessed are they, who have not seen, and yet have believed*.

But wisdom invites her guests *to drink of her wine*, as well as *to eat of her bread* : and the Saviour, at the institution of this sacrament, desired all present *to drink*, as well as *to eat*. How then in the Catholic Church, can the Laity, who are deprived of the cup, be considered as receiving the sacrament entire ; and as it was enjoined to be taken ?

If this Sacrament really is, what the Saviour declared it to be ; and strange that so many calling themselves Christians should deny it to be so : then it is evident that by *only eating*, we receive as much as we do by *both eating and drinking*. For we receive Christ entire under either form. He cannot be received by halves, or divided. His body which we receive under the form of bread, is not a dead but a living body : *for Christ once dead, dies now no more : Death has now no more power over him*. Rom. 6. 9. Now a living body cannot be without its blood ; nor a living blood without its body ; nor both without their soul : all which constitute the humanity : and with the Saviour's humanity is ever inseparably joined his divinity. In receiving therefore under either form ; we receive him whole, as well as under both ; we receive him undivided, as indivisible, God and man, the second person of the adorable Trinity : and what more can any one desire ? Hence, *to the sole eating*, eternal life is as fully, and formally promised, as to both *the eating and drinking*. Nay it is more frequently

promised to *the sole eating*; John. 6. as the bread, or *manna* form, being the easiest procured and the fittest for preservation; was intended for the general reception of the faithful. This form was therefore particularly prefigured in the old law, by the manna, the loaves of proposition and shew bread; and more especially by *the wafers of fine flour*, kept with such reverence in the Jewish Tabernacle: the emblem of the Christian one. Lev. 9. 12.

The Holy Ghost descended in two visible forms: in that of a dove on the Saviour, and in that of fiery tongues on the apostles and first Christians. Would any one say that he was not as much the Holy Ghost, under either form, as under both forms together?

The Saviour then being equally present under either form as under both, the Church, in order to facilitate the approach of her children to a sacrament declared to be so necessary for the life of the soul; dispenses with the cup; and administers this sacrament under the sole form of bread, not only to the Laity, but also to those of the clergy, who being unavoidably prevented by sickness, or otherwise from celebrating mass, may wish to communicate. For, were it deemed necessary, as in the Protestant sects, that all should receive under both kinds; the difficulty, and sometimes even the impossibility of procuring a sufficiency of wine for the occasion, would prevent what is so desirable, the frequent devout communion of the faithful: and often prove an insuperable bar to our compliance with the Saviour's mandatory injunction. Nay, in some far remote and uncultivated regions, into which may have penetrated that faith, which was ordered to be preached *to every creature*; it might be found impossible at any time to furnish *the wine species* to all the believers. These then, if, as Protestants maintain, that species were indispensably required for the integrity of the sacrament, would remain deprived of their soul sustaining food; the real *Manna and true bread from Heaven*; without which they would faint and die in the wilderness; nor ever reach the promised land.—No: what God declares to be so necessary for all, he has not placed beyond the reach of any:

nor would he have so strictly enjoined what so often might be found impracticable.

Besides the general communion under *the liquid form* might endanger the spilling of *the holy of holies*: or, when tasted, and breathed upon by *the many*; or sipped by the ulcerous lips of the diseased; it might become an object of natural disgust, and, in this, and in many other cases, be left unconsumed; or, finally, while it is handed round to the expecting multitude, it might be wholly exhausted before reaching the last of them. To prevent therefore all such risks, improprieties and disappointments, which would necessarily be multiplied with the increase of her family, the Church, though in her infant state she occasionally allowed the cup to all; and gave it at one time, to distinguish her children from certain heretics, who refused it, deeming wine the production of an evil principle; has since her universal propagation, thought proper to withhold it; sanctioned as her conduct is in this particular by the Saviour's formal declaration, that *he who eats this bread shall live for ever*. John 6. 58.

It remains now to be shewn why the Clergy celebrating Mass must receive the communion under both kinds.

The reason of this is that they, in the persons of their predecessors the Apostles, were commanded by Jesus Christ to do, just what he himself had done; that is, to consecrate the elements under both kinds; changing them by his omnipotent word into what he said they were, *his very body given for us; and his very blood, shed for the remission of our sins*. But this is the act, not of the people, but of the Priesthood, to whom alone the Saviour's mandate was given; for none but his priests, the Apostles, were present at the time to receive it. This is the unbloody sacrifice of our *High Priest*, Jesus Christ; who was declared *to be a priest*, not for once in a bloody, but *forever* in an unbloody manner; that is, *according to the order of Melchisadech, who offered up bread and wine*. His Priests therefore, like those of old, to whom in the realization of the ancient figures, they have succeeded, were thus empowered to consecrate by his omnipotent word; to of-

fer up ; to divide ; and, taking to themselves, the first appointed share ; to distribute among the faithful, not now the figurative, but the long expected, and many ways prefigured propitiatory victim. See, in particular, Malachy. 1, 11.

Though the sacrament then, as we have shewn, is complete under either form ; the sacrifice requires both forms for its perfection : because it is a mystical exhibition of the death of Christ ; in which his blood is represented as poured out for us, from his apparently lifeless, bruised and wounded body ; and, besides the many other pointed allusions to the great bloody sacrifice, which the mass commemorates ; the very *ablusive* wine and water, which, at the end of the communion, are drained with the remains of the sacramental blood, remind us of the all purifying stream, which, at the conclusion of Christ's bloody sacrifice on the cross, was seen mixed with blood flowing from his wounded side. *Thus according to St. Paul, is shewn forth the death of our Lord till he come.* 1. Cor. 11, 26.

Such is the inestimable pledge of love, which the Saviour gave his followers, before leaving them. For, *knowing* says the beloved disciple, *that his hour was come that he should pass out of this world to the Father ; having loved his own, who were in the world, he loved them to the end.* John, 13, 1. He therefore bequeaths to them in this wonderful sacrifice and sacrament, like a dying father, *his all* : that humanity, which he had assumed for their sake, inseparably united with his divinity : and, since its resurrection from the grave, immortal glorious, and impassable. Such is the rich and everlasting portion secured to them by his last will and testament ; so solemnly made on the eve of his passion. In this sense also does he verify his parting promise to them before his ascension into Heaven : *Lo : I am with you at all times, even to the end of the world.* Matt. 28, 20.

To the Testimonies of the early Fathers of the Church above cited in favour of the Catholic Doctrine of TRANSUBSTANTIATION; we cannot help adding that of St. Eutyches, Patriarch of Constantinople; explaining by a natural similitude the most inconceivable part of the Eucharistic Mystery; that is, the simultaneous presence of *the Word Divine Incarnate*, or the one whole Christ, God and Man, in so many places all over the world.—“As the Voice, says he, which proceeds from one Man; and to which the air responds, is whole and entire in his mouth; and penetrates whole and entire into the Ears of them who hear it; so that one receives neither more nor less than another; because, though the voice is a Body, being nothing else than agitated air; it is, in such manner one and indivisible, as that all equally hear it, although there should be an audience of ten thousand persons: so, no one ought to doubt that, *after the mysterious Consecration, and the holy Fraction, the incorruptible, holy, immortal and life-giving Blood of the Lord, being formed by Virtue of the Sacrifice in the Consecrated Species*, impresses all its Virtue in each of those who receive it; and is found whole and entire in them all; as in the Case in the Example which we have adduced.” See Annals. B. III. page 333. Paris Edit.—This Father lived in the Sixth Century.

---

We conclude, for the present, with the following Remarks on God’s Immensity and Omnipotence; calculated, we presume, to shew the possibility of a Mystery so impenetrably deep, yet so clearly revealed.

From the highest to the lowest; from Infinitude to Infinitude, God ascends, or descends.—Need we wonder then that He, THE GREATEST, should, in assuming our Nature, become as THE LEAST? That THE ETERNAL, as God, should be born, as Man, A CHILD OF TIME? THE MIGHTIEST OF ALL A HELP-

LESS BABE?—THE SOURCE SUPREME OF BLISS, THE MOST SUFFERING OF MORTALS?—THE RICHEST GIVER OF ALL GOOD GIFTS, THE POOREST AND MOST DESTITUTE OF BEINGS?—THE MOST MAJESTIC AND BEAUTIFUL, THE MOST DISFIGURED AND DEBASED?—Nay, THE HOLIEST OF HOLIES, THE MOST OPPRESSED WITH GUILT? EVEN WISDOM INFINITE DISGUISED AS A FOOL? and LIFE ITSELF ETERNAL EVEN STOOPING UNTO DEATH?

Need those then wonder, who are Christians, and believe all this; that he, who from the immense love he bore us, could stoop so low to raise up, and exalt our fallen and degraded Race; who made us all his Kindred by taking upon himself our Humanity; should still make himself in the Sacrament of the altar as the meanest atom; and, in appearance, all but nothing for our sake?

He, the Wisdom of the Most High, had said before, at the Creation of this World, *my delight is to be with the Children of Men.* Prov. 8. 6. 31. He repeated the same Declaration in his human Nature assumed; when he assured his Followers that *where two or three were gathered together in his name, there he would be in the midst of them.* Matt. 18. 20. Not, merely, *as God*, for that would have been affirming nothing but what reason shews must ever be the case: but *as Man*; the Jesus of Nazareth who addressed St. Paul on the road to Damascus. Acts. 9. 5. *Lo!* said he again to his Disciples, *I am with you at all times*, even to the end of the world. Matt. 28. 20. In his human Nature, therefore, and *as Man*, he is still with those, *who are gathered together in his name*; not with those gathered together in the name of a Luther, *Lutherans*; in the name of a Calvin, *Calvinists*; in the name of a Wesley, *Wesleyans*; nor in the name of any sinful and erroneous Mortal: but with the sole members of his own *Catholic Church*; who are gathered together in no name under the Heavens, but the name of Him, her divine and only Founder.

Yet, lest this greatest trial of our reliance on his word, though so clearly, emphatically and repeatedly expressed, should prove

too much for our acquiescent Reason ; he shews us in Nature a proof of its possibility in those numberless diminutive but animated objects of every shape and hue ; which, but for the Microscope, were imperceptible : yet to which he has adapted an Instinct and Organs as various and perfect, as to the largest and most imposing forms. The truth is, Size and Space are nothing to facilitate or impede the Operations of the Deity ; nor indeed of any Spiritual Agent whatever. The intensity of being may exist, as Reason shews, in whatever way, space or form the Almighty chooses.

As a further illustration of the possibility of the real, though simultaneous presence of Christ's Body and Blood in many places ; we submit to the Reader's consideration the following observation :

The seed of a Tree will in due time produce a Tree : and that Tree will produce numberless seeds : and these again numberless Trees, so as to cover at last with Forests the whole world. Now, though in the present order of Nature, time is required, and the succession of Seasons to effect all this : will any one deny to the Almighty, who with an act of his will, created all things out of nothing, the power of realizing all this in a moment ? And was it not just such a wonder as this that he wrought, when with *five Barley Loaves and two Fishes*, he fed *five thousand* of his Creatures, who had followed him into the wilderness, and were hungry : and after all had eaten, and were satisfied, twelve baskets remained full of the fragments left ? He did not on this occasion create new Loaves and Fishes ; otherwise it would not have been true that he fed the multitude with only *five Loaves and two Fishes*. But, as in a natural way, he reproduces with increase from the seed, that which is sown ; so did he, in a supernatural way, reproduce in the hands of his Apostles the Loaves and Fishes which he had given them to distribute. In the same manner, and with equal ease, does he still reproduce in the hands of his Pastors, their lawful successors, the Bread of Life, the heavenly Manna, the Soul-sustaining food of the earthly pilgrim on his journey through the

wilderness of this world towards the Land of promise : that living and life-giving repast which he said he would give us ; and our belief in which he took occasion to require and inculcate from the evidence of the stupendous miracle which he had recently wrought. John. 6.

























































































































