

incongruity of language, such as would deprive Christ of all future human confidence in the expression of His thoughts; and convert the language of the Testament into an unmeaning or incongruous symbol. If, then, your meaning be correct, it follows of course that that mode of expression must be just which describes a man as 'eating a spirit, eating an image, drinking a metaphor, eating an allegory, and drinking a shadow.'

Now, sir, if all this language be perfectly just, and the ideas congruously expressed, it follows of course, that all the other cognate words of 'the verb to eat,' can be similarly used with equal justness and equal correctness: hence, sir, we can employ with equal truth the words 'to wash a spirit, to weigh a spirit, to bleed a spirit, to boil a spirit, to roast a spirit, to salt a spirit,' as well as we can say 'to eat a spirit.' The words are decidedly of the same cognate character, and if one of them can be used with precision so can all the others. Then it is perfectly correct to say 'to wash an image, to bake a metaphor, to boil an allegory, to salt a trope, to eat a shadow, to wash a shadow, to bake a shadow.' And then, again, sir, it will follow that the image of a thing can justify the soul. And again, sir, you represent Christ as swearing by two oaths that these are his words and that this is his meaning.

You have, therefore, adopted the most incongruous and ridiculous form of words, such as no rational human being has been ever known to use; you have, in the face of heaven and earth, translated the word 'flesh' into 'spirit, image, shadow, metaphor;' and you have done all this, forsooth, because you could not understand how 'he could give us his flesh to eat.' But if you will reflect on the crib, on next Christmas night, and ask how can a trembling, poor, naked, abandoned child be the eternal, consubstantial Word, the King of Kings, your common sense will be shocked till you see the Heavens opened and hear the angelic choirs rend the blue vault of His father's skies, saying 'it is He.' Our doctrine is just the same kind of a mystery, and while we are astounded at the statement contained in the words, we at the same time hear him re-assert it over and over again, and we bow and believe. And could no more consent to believe the absurd, the ridiculous, the incongruous, the newly-invented meaning of your altered text, than I could consent to believe our Lord to be an idiot or a maniac. You, therefore, perceive, sir, how absurd is novelty, how ridiculous is heresy.

In order to see more fully the consistent language of our Lord, I shall again quote some texts from St. Matthew, chapter 26:—

V. 26.—And whilst they were at supper, Jesus took bread and blessed and broke, and gave to his disciples, and said, 'take ye and eat,' this is body.

V. 27.—And taking the chalice he gave thanks, and gave to them, saying, 'drink ye all of this.'

V. 28.—For this is my blood of the New Testament, which shall be shed for many, for the remission of sins.

Now, sir, according to your assumed meaning, Christ said, 'this is my body,' meaning that this is my spirit. Now, sir, since the invention, improvement, and perfection of human language, have you ever seen, read, or heard of any human being in any age or any country, use the word 'body' to mean 'spirit.' It is precisely the very opposite, and cannot by the rules of language be employed even as a metaphor as there cannot be any resemblance between two things which are metaphysically opposite. And when we come to apply your meaning to v. 28, it is hard to say whether one feels a greater amount of ridicule, or pity, or contempt for the teachers of a doctrine which would go to say 'that the blood of a spirit was shed, the blood of a metaphor shed, the blood of a shadow shed, the blood of an image shed, the blood of faith shed, the blood of a memorial shed!' Now, sir, in your own language, do you see how ridiculous is error, how absurd is human novelty in revelation?

I shall, in conclusion, quote by your own standard of the Bible, and the criticism of language, some texts on the subject from St. Paul to the Corinthians, chapter the eleventh, of the first epistle:—

V. 23.—For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered to you, that the Lord Jesus the night in which he was betrayed took bread.

V. 24.—And giving thanks, broke and said take ye and eat, this is my body which shall be delivered for you; do this, in commemoration of me.

V. 25.—In like manner, also, the chalice after he had supped, saying, this chalice is the New Testament in my blood: this do ye as often as you shall drink for the commemoration of me.

V. 27.—Wherefore whosoever shall eat this bread or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and of the blood of the Lord.

V. 28.—But let a man prove himself: and so let him eat of that bread and drink of the chalice.

V. 29.—For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily eateth and drinketh damnation to himself: not discerning the body of the Lord.

You see, sir, in these texts, that St. Paul keeps up the same consistency of word and idea as our Lord: and that he asserts his having received the above communication, not from the Apostles, but from the lips of Christ himself after His resurrection, in order to stamp that communication with an importance beyond anything he had to tell them. Here St. Paul clearly speaks of the guilt of the body and blood of Christ. Now, sir, be candid with me, has any man in any age or any country ever heard of 'spilling the blood of a spirit, murdering bread and wine, killing a metaphor, shedding the blood of bread and wine, killing a shadow, bleeding an allegory, taking the life of a trope, and murdering a shadow. But above all, can you have the cool hardihood to preach, before an assembly of rational beings, that Christ

would pronounce a double damnation against a man for not 'discerning a body in a spirit, a body in a metaphor, a body in faith, a body in a shadow, a body in bread and wine?'—that is, he has pronounced double damnation on a man for not discerning what cannot be discerned, for not discerning an absurdity, an incongruity, an impossibility:—that is, he damns a man in double torments for not seeing a part greater than the whole, for not seeing a square as a circle, for not seeing the color of white as black. What Christian acquainted with the life of Christ could seriously believe that his last will (which David foretold, in reference to Melchisedech, and which he himself foretold in his disputation with the Capharnaïtes) contained the bequest of metaphors, figures, and shadows, to feed and nourish and strengthen the life of the soul! This is Theology with a vengeance! May God, Almighty God, forgive you sir, for teaching such insanity to your poor dupes; and may He in His grace open your eyes, and the eyes of the poor creatures who are doomed to listen to such absurd and ridiculous and degrading doctrines as England and Scotland have adopted since the days of Luther and John Knox.

Your Church has never ceased to publish through the world her great respect for the Scriptures, and to express her horror at any robbery, as she calls it, of the Word of God. Will you, then, tell me why you have, with such palpable shamelessness, mistranslated, subtracted, and added to the most important passages of both the Old and the New Testament. I shall, therefore, select one text in reference to the present subject, namely, the 26th verse of the 26th chapter of St. Matthew. As it happens that I have not a Greek Testament with me, I must quote from memory; and as your journals here have no Greek type, I must write in the English character. You will, of course, supply the long vowels where they occur. Your Greek original of the text alluded to is:—*Esthionton de auton. Labon o Iesous, ton arton, Kai eulogesas, eklase, Kai edidou tois mathetais, Kai eipe: Labete, phagete, touto esti To soma mou.*

Your translation of this text, taken from an edition in 1846, printed by Mr. Spottiswoode, Fleet Street, London, is—'And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and blessed it, and broke it, and gave it to his disciples,' &c. Here you introduce the pronoun 'it' three times, in order to carry the antecedent 'bread,' as it were, through the whole text, and therefore show that it was this said bread that the Apostles eat. Now the pronoun 'it' is not found in the original, and thus the Protestant Church, with a palpable and shameful interpolation, corrupted the Greek text in order to make out a lie to meet their absurd doctrine on this vital point. I have taken the trouble of comparing with the original text the gospel of St. John, the epistles of St. Paul to the Corinthians and to the Hebrews, and I have found one hundred and eighty-four texts mistranslated, being either interpolations or new meanings opposed to the philology, the genius, and the received construction of the Greek language.

There are upwards of sixteen hundred errors in translations and additions, or subtractions or interpolations, in your Bible. The Protestant church can lie in print as well as in speech—the pen can lie as well as the tongue. I freely admit the honor and truth of their clergy in social intercourse. There is, however, no lie however dishonorable, no misstatement however discreditable, to which they will not stoop in matters of Catholicity. I should be sorry to say one word hurtful to you personally, as I can have no cause to do so; and as I can have no feeling towards you but those of respect—yet, considering the shameful forgery of the Protestant Bible—I would prefer that a Catholic should read the worst books of immorality than this forgery in God's Word—this slander of Christ. Old age can check immorality; but the forgeries of God's Book—the lies told of Christ—the wicked perversion of the inspired volume—the base substitution of words—the flagrant robbery of the text of life—are so many hideous crimes of Protestantism, that in vengeance of such blasphemous interpolation, the curse of all crimes, and of all errors, and of naked infidelity, seems to be inflicted on your entire nation.

You seem to smile in what you are pleased to call 'indignant sarcasm,' against the follies, 'the nonsense,' of Transubstantiation. If, sir, you have any sympathy to spare, may I beg you will reserve it all for yourself, in order to console yourself in the midst of the indignant sarcasm to which your clear acquaintance with this question will expose you even before your friends. Transubstantiation—though a stupendous and mysterious fact, and beyond the power of men—is yet, sir, a very common occurrence with God, and indeed may be called one of the most general laws of nature, and may be seen amongst the very first evidences of His omnipotent will towards the race of men on earth.

Firstly, then, he created man by changing 'the slime of the earth' into the flesh and bones of Adam in his first official act of Transubstantiation, that is, by the word of God on matter. His second official act, of changing the boney rib of Adam into the flesh and blood of Eve, was also Transubstantiation by the word of God the Father on one. The first official act of Christ, on entering on the three years of his mission, was performed when he changed water into wine at the wedding of Cana by the word of Christ on water. The food, sir, (that is, the bread and wine) which you and all men may have eaten on this day, has been changed into flesh and blood on your own person, and on the persons of all men, by the word of God on the vital action of the stomach. The universal crop of wood and grasses, and flowers and vegetables, and human and animal food, which the earth annually produces, is an annual evidence of Transubstantiation by the Word of

God the Father on the productive energy of the entire earth. The hat on your head, the silk in your cravat, the linen on your back, the cloth of your wearing apparel, the wool or cotton in your stockings, the leather in your boots, the Whitehaven coals in your grates, the gas in your lamps, the bread; the butter, the cream, the sugar, the tea leaf on your breakfast table, the mutton, the beef, the bacon, the fowl, the wine, the brandy, the ale on your dinner table; in short almost every object the eye beholds on earth is one vast aggregate of evidence of Transubstantiation by the Word of God on matter. Even the paper of your spurious Bible, the leather on the back, the Indian ink, are such evidences of Transubstantiation that one can scarcely conceive how you could read that very Bible without being burned with scalding shame at the stark-naked nonsense and incongruous manism you have written to me on the subject. God has supplied us, during four thousand years, with this mighty, universal, constant evidence, in order to prepare us for the more mighty, infinitely more stupendous evidence of the same principle in new law by the power and the word of Christ. The Father has given life and preserved life in all living things on earth by this principle of nature, in order to make us behold the uniformity of action in the Trinity when Christ at his coming will give life to the soul and preserve it in grace on the self-same principle 'the bread that I will give is my flesh for the life of the world.'

You will reply to me and say, that while God has done all I have said, yet that man could not do it. You mistake: a man could do it, when commanded to do so, by the Word of God. Moses changed a rod into a serpent, and changed a serpent into a rod: he changed the waters of the river Nile into blood, and the same river of blood into water, by the Word of God on his lips. And do you not think, sir, even in your common sense, that a man in the new law could do the same thing as a man in the old law, if he were commanded to do so. The Word of God will certainly have the same power in every place, in every age, and in every man on whom that word will descend. Now, sir, you have seen in St. Paul to the Corinthians the text where St. Paul, in an ecstasy of astonishment, told them that he heard from the lips of Christ how he changed bread and wine into his body and blood; and concluded by also informing them, that, in the same breath, Christ had ordered the Apostles, by two distinct commands, to mark its importance, to 'do the same' in remembrance of him. And lest it should occur to your common sense that the Apostles had not the power to execute the command, will you hear, sir, the words of Christ to them. 'All power is given to me in Heaven and on earth: receive ye, therefore, the Holy Ghost.'—This text, therefore, gives not only the gifts of the Holy Ghost, but the third person of the Trinity himself, as an official resident, with the apostles and their successors, in order to communicate the permanent power under debate. Thus, sir, between the clear texts of St. John, St. Matthew, and St. Paul, and the nature of the case, and the general fact of Transubstantiation, and the double command, and the permanent official presence of the Holy Ghost, equal to the Father and the Son, I think, sir, your common sense must yield at length, and acknowledge with candor, that our case is complete, our warrant of office in this great act most decided, and, of course, the efficient exercise of our power beyond the reach of civil or contradiction.

But you will say, that such a fact has never occurred in the new law. This is a mistake; it happened in the Incarnation. When the archangel (a creature) announced to Mary the will of God, who sent him to wait on her, and to tell her that she would bring forth a son; 'she replied, how can it be, as I know not man;' he resumed, 'it will be done by the power and operation of the Holy Ghost.' Here, sir, is a position which might be argued as a clear case of Transubstantiation, in the very first act of the new law: namely, the blood of Mary, the relative of Adam the criminal, changed into a human body for the second person of the Trinity by the power of the Holy Ghost. Thus, sir, if the redemption and the perfection of fallen men commenced by an act of Transubstantiation in the Incarnation, why not continue the same principle amongst all future men by the power and operation of the same Holy Ghost.

But you will certainly re-assert, as you have done in your illogical, intemperate, un-theological letter to me, that a thing must be always essentially what it appears to be. You are generally right, sir, in the laws of nature; but in the laws of grace, the senses must be silent, even under your most favorable position, whenever the Word of God makes the statement. Thus the dove which alighted on the shoulder of Christ at the Jordan, had all the appearance of a dove to the sense of seeing; and that sense was not deceived, because its domain is entirely confined to appearances. But, sir, it was not a dove; it was the Holy Ghost under the appearance of a dove, to point out the spotlessness of Christ. Again, the twelve tongues on fire, which descended on the Apostles, were not tongues nor fire, but 'the form of tongues on fire;' but they were really the Holy Ghost, in order to express the new burning zeal and the gift of languages given to the Apostles. Will you say why cannot Christ appear under the appearance of bread, the form of wine, as well as the Holy Ghost under the appearance of a dove and tongues and fire, in order to point out how he feeds the soul, and thus carry out the promise He has made when He said 'the bread that I will give is my flesh for the life of the world.'

Why do you not tell your congregation at Whitehaven not to believe that 'the dove or the fiery tongues' were the Holy Ghost? You are bound to do so in your system of the infallibility of your Protestant eyesight. You ought to tell them that you consider the testimony of the senses as the testimony of God, and therefore the eye is right!! You ought also to inform them, when you are alone in your drawing-room, and can neither see, smell, hear, taste, or

feel the air, that, therefore, there is no air in Whitehaven. Tell them also that as the eyes of the Jews did not see the Godhead in Christ, that therefore he was not God. Tell them also that as he appeared a criminal, it must therefore be a fact, (founded on the senses and God) that he was a malefactor. Tell them also that the ascension of our Lord is a mere fable, because from the laws of gravitation (to which the senses bear unerring testimony) no body can ascend upwards composed of flesh and bone, as His was.—'The senses are God's own law, and he cannot contradict himself.' Tell them, also, that as fire cannot burn a man's thoughts, that therefore it cannot reach the soul; that the senses tell you fire can only reach matter, and consequently (you have the testimony of the senses and God) that there is at present no hell, as the body has not yet risen. Do, sir, tell the world all this Whitehaven theology, and let nothing be believed, unless it is as palpable as a railroad, and can be seen working like a steam engine! You also ask how can His body be present on our altar unseen?—And when I reply—'by the sacramental mode,' you cannot comprehend me, and you have recourse to your 'indignant sarcasm.' Now, sir, as you are perfectly acquainted with the coals of Whitehaven, will you be pleased to see it—hard coal—going into the furnace of a gasometer; see it very soon bituminous, tarry, liquid coal under the action of the furnace; see it again the gasometer gaseous coal; and see it again burning in your jets flaming coal—that is to say, in the furnace, impalpable in the gasometer—that is to say again, invisible in the tubes, and visible at the jets—that is to say again, darkness in the tubes and light in the lamps. Will you kindly tell us how can the same thing be palpably and impalpable, visible and invisible, darkness and light? Now, sir, if all these modes—apparently contradictory and even contrary—belong even to the ordinary forms of matter, will you tell us why cannot Christ assume any bulk, or any form, in any mode of existence He pleases, and still be the same, selfsame Christ, but in a new mode of existence? This, sir, is the case on our altar. It was the case when, after His resurrection, he entered the closed doors, and stood in the midst of the apostles.

I am now done with this mere cursory view of this question, with one additional remark on the words you have used, namely, 'that we create our Creator.'—This phrase does not become you; and your bigotry will gain notoriety by this phrase, at the expense of your education as a theologian. You are clearly, palpably ignorant of our doctrine, and it is distressing to reflect how a gentleman could not have honor to spare the Catholics, and discretion to spare himself, by publicly writing on a subject which decidedly you have never studied as a scholar. No, sir, we do not create our Creator! Hear me. We just do what we are commanded to do; hence, when He took bread and changed it into His body, He commanded us to do the same, and we believe we do change it into His body. In like manner he changed the wine into His blood. But He has not said 'this is my Divinity, do this,' and therefore do not do that; and hence you malign and calumniate when you say 'we create our Creator.' Our office is changing the bread and wine into the Humanity, not the Divinity, of Christ; but as the Humanity is now, since the Resurrection, essentially united with the Divinity, therefore, wherever the Humanity is present, there also must be the Divinity, not by our creation, as you are pleased to write to your dupes at Whitehaven, but by the essential concomitance of the two Natures of Christ, which, since his Resurrection, can never be separated, standing before God for ever as the living triumph of his mission and the eternal pledge and security of man's unchanging Justification.

I have the honor to be, reverend sir,

Your obedient servant,
D. W. CAHILL.

P.S.—You cannot retort on me, and against my belief of the Eucharist, the same cognate words which I have applied to your new interpretation. This retort would only prove that my belief may subject the Host to be profaned. I admit it may be profaned by sinners, but adored by all the good. But even so, that profanation since the Resurrection cannot be accompanied with shame, or sorrow, or agony. And when the infidel asks you, can you believe in a God who was mocked, blindfolded, spat on in the hall of Pilate, flogged naked at a pillar, crucified between two thieves, and his blood spilled and profaned; will you say, sir, what is your reply? You admit the whole charge and answer, that these facts, so far from destroying your belief, only confirm it, and prove beyond all other facts that he was the Saviour. If your reply, therefore, to the infidel be valuable and invincible, the same reply from me to you must be equally valuable and invincible. If his retort on you would be foolish in Christian faith, yours would be equally foolish against me. You cannot make an argument serve two opposite points. An argument cannot be used pro and con. If your retort against me possess force, the infidel triumphs over you. Therefore, I admit that the sacred Host may be profaned by sinners; and if everything in faith must be rejected which is or may be profaned, you must on this principle reject the Father, the Son, the Holy Ghost, and grace and faith, and the entire Christian law. All the objection you can raise to our doctrine is that it exposes Christ to be sacramentally profaned—a fact which he once bore in his natural form. What happened once can never, therefore, be deemed absurd, or incongruous; whereas our objection to your interpretation is that it stands before the mind, if I may so speak, an evident absurdity—a plain impossibility. Our doctrine may, therefore, end in the profanation of Christ from sinners—a position which I presume you frequently put forth before your congregation; but our creed can never be charged with a metaphysical absurdity.

IRISH INTELLIGENCE.

CATHOLICISM IN OUGHTERARD.—We are happy to learn, from a highly respected correspondent, that nothing can be more satisfactory, under the peculiar circumstances of this locality, than the state and progress of religion throughout it. Considerable number of the perverts have returned, and despite all the efforts of the proselytisers are remaining faithful. The clergy are now laboriously occupied in conducting "stations," at which there are frequently as many as forty communicants. Our correspondent attributes the happy progress of religion to the confidence in the Blessed Mother of God, which is now strong and universal among the Catholics of the parish.—*Dublin Telegraph.*