

are not to believe this uniform testimony of our senses, what becomes of all the miracles of Christ? and, consequently, of all his revelation, which he attested by those miracles? Were all his miracles mere appearances, like that of bread in the sacrament?"

To this argument, which, as here applied, is but a sophism, I answer—The impressions made on our senses, even when they are uniform, are not, of themselves, evidences of the true state, or even the existence of bodies: for the same impressions are often produced, without that existence; as in visions, in dreams, in lunacy. We believe them, however, and ought to believe them, unless when reason, as in the cases I have just mentioned, or as in the present case, God cautions us against that belief. The Protestant Bishop Berkeley, has fully proved, that our senses are not demonstrative of the existence of bodies. We would believe them only on the principle, that God would not allow their uniform deception, without enabling us to detect it. Hence the apostles believed the miracles of Christ, on the testimony of their senses; because, so far from cautioning them against that testimony, he, on the contrary confirmed it by his own divine word, when walking on the sea, and appearing after his resurrection, he told them, that what they saw was not as they supposed, a spectre, but a reality. If then that same omnipotent Son of God, after having proved his divinity to their senses by innumerable miracles, were to tell them, that in one particular instance, they were not to trust to their senses—that what uniformly appeared to be bread, was not bread but his body—would they be authorized to set up their senses against his Almighty word? Or would their belief of that word be a contradiction, and not rather a confirmation of all his previous miracles.

Thus, my brethren, you see how ridiculous the sophism of our opponents is; as ridiculous, indeed, as their comparisons of a stick taken for a town, and a man for a mountain; just as if Christ could have a motive for making such silly changes; although, if he had made them, we should still believe his word, and not our senses. Thus you see that the testimony of Christ is superior to that of our senses; and that, so far from invalidating his miracles, the Catholic doctrine confirms them. For, would the apostles have believed his word: "This is my body," if he had not already attested his infallible truth by undoubted miracles?

Moreover, reason and experience tell us, that, if we wish to know the true state of objects, we must employ all our senses in their investigation. Let us do so with the sacrament. Our sight, taste, &c. represent it as bread. But there is our sense of hearing too. What does that tell us? Why; we hear Jesus saying: "This is my body." Our hearing, therefore, which conveys to us his divine word, prevents the error into which our other senses would lead us. Besides we do not know, whether the first elements of matter are compounds or simples. If the latter, as Leibnitz maintains, a body can be reduced even to no space, without annihilation; and if the former, it can be compressed

into the smallest, as well as dilated into the largest. But the fact is, in the adorable Eucharist, there is not even a false appearance. The senses are not at all deceived, there is the colour, the size, the taste, and all the other sensible qualities and effects of bread and wine. Now, if the Son of God, when he instituted this holy sacrament, intended not to exist in it without these qualities; if he gave up his body and blood to be eaten and drunken; if for this purpose they must have the above qualities; if they cannot be present at the divine banquet without them, if in the literal meaning of the words, he said: "This is my body—This is my blood." who shall dare to give him the lie? Who shall dare to set up, not his corporal senses, (for they are not deceived,) but the false conclusion of his own proud and ignorant mind, against the word of Omnipotence? Who in fact, shall dare to say, it was impossible for Christ to make his body and blood exist with all these qualities?

Nothing is impossible to God, but what involves a self-destroying contradiction. He could not, for instance, make his body be, and not be, in the sacrament, at the same time. This absurdity attaches, not to the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation, but to the doctrine, if it deserves that name, of the Church of England, in the days of Elizabeth and James the First, and which doctrine is still to be found in the Protestant catechisms; namely: that the sacrament is truly and really bread, and truly and really the body of Christ, at one and the same time. If it be bread, it cannot be the body; and if it be the body, it cannot be bread. This, as it involves, a self-destroying contradiction is impossible even to God. Indeed, the absurdity was so evident, that the Anglicans have subsequently run off into the mere figurative sense of Calvin. Similar was that other absurdity of theirs—that what was the body in the mouth of one receiver, was bread in the mouth of another. A body is matter; and its existence cannot depend on the thoughts, or "faith," as they are pleased to call it, of either receiver. It must be there, or it must not; there is no medium; unless they choose to give to the whim of every individual mortal, that power of changing substances, which they refuse to an immortal God. But this reverie, too, they have given up, not for the Catholic reality, but for the visionary emblem of the Geneva school. These, indeed, are self-destroying contradictions, and absurd impossibilities. But, where is the contradiction or impossibility for God, to clothe, in the sacrament, with sensible qualities, that body, which, during his life, was clothed with mortal—in his transfiguration, with glorious—and after his resurrection, with immortal qualities? The difference between the mortal and immortal state, is far greater, than between the mortal and sacramental. Yet, even our own bodies shall be raised to that immortal state; a state, so far superior to the present, that St. Paul does not hesitate to call it *spiritual*; although, in it, our bodies shall still continue *real*. In this sense the eucharist, also, is sometimes styled the *spiritual* body of Christ; because, though still *real*, it is not in its mortal state, but in that state, which he chose,

in order to render it fit to be eaten. This state which I call sacramental, is far inferior to the immortal state, already assumed by Jesus: &c. which latter state, even we shall enjoy after our resurrection. The resurrection, therefore, is a greater miracle, than transubstantiation; and shall we deny the latter, while we admit the former?

The question of possibility, therefore, I trust, I have completely set at rest. Not only the believers of scripture, but the believers of a God, must confess that he can transubstantiate, if he please. The next, and though vast in its demonstration, the only remaining question is—Has he done so? But, this is so clear from that sole, that infallible means, which we have, of ascertaining past events, namely, history; under which term comes the scripture itself, as a part of history; that no one, who admits the possibility, can, with the least claim to common sense, deny the fact. For this reason, have I been diffuse on the former; for I am convinced, that the understandings of the Christian people would never have been insulted by all the idle quibbles of sectaries, about the meaning of the most precise and positive words, which ever fell from the lips of Jesus—about the most clearly, most universally, and most repeatedly expressed belief of the Christian Church in all ages—if these sectaries did not, at bottom, though ashamed to profess it, blasphemously reject the Omnipotence of their Saviour. On to-morrow then, (Friday) I shall prove the fact from Scripture; and refute the objections of its scriptural opponents.

#### ORIGINAL.

#### THE BIBLE! THE BIBLE! AND NOTHING BUT THE BIBLE.

THE BIBLE, as trimmed by Protestant Editors to meet the reforming spirit of the times; and dedicated in the most fulsome strain of flattery to James the First of England, *the pedant King*, by a set of time-serving hirelings, appointed to new model it, and fit it for being decreed the standard one of the Parliamentary Religion: THE BIBLE, which, styles, in its prefatory adulation to Royalty, the infamous Queen Bess, that murderess and Harlot, *the bright occidental star; at whose setting he, the dogmatic Sovereign, rose like the sun in his strength, to dispel the thick and palpable clouds of darkness, which overshadowed the land*: THE BIBLE, so absurdly proclaimed by a fallible King and Parliament to be an *infallibly* true translation from the Hebrew original; with which neither of the vouching parties were at all acquainted: this corrupted English BIBLE, in which the truly learned point out numberless errors, intentionally, as well as ignorantly made; in selecting from the many uncouth translations which were in circulation at the time: THIS BIBLE is hawked about all over the world, and pressed even on the wondering foreigner, as the only genuine code of scripture in existence; and all who refuse to receive it as such, are at once denounced as downright infidels, by a hungry crew of anglo-evangelical marauders; religious freebooters, and strolling gossellers; whom want or wadlones has taught to raise the wind.