

be done ; how can this man, say they, give us his flesh to eat ? So that, on the one hand, we cannot doubt but our saviour here intended to explain this mystery of our faith ; and to declare clearly what we are to believe of it : and on the other hand we find, that when he comes to explain it, instead of correcting his doctrine of the real presence by a figurative sense, he repeats the same doctrine again and again in stronger words than before ; nor does he once so much as hint, that it is figuratively to be understood. Now, I appeal to all sincere Protestants, if it be not utterly incredible and impossible, that the Holy Scriptures in every place where this sacrament is spoken of, should teach in plain words, that it is the body and blood of Christ ; (supposing as Protestants do, that it is not really his body and blood) and never once unfold the truth of this mystery, by giving us to understand in words as plain, that it is his body and blood in figure only, supposing that were the true meaning of his words.

Third reason, Because St. Paul too explains this mystery of our faith altogether in favour of those who take our Saviour's words in the literal sense. For, if the question be put, what the eucharist is ? Whether the apostle resolves it for Catholics ; not for the opinion of Protestants. "The cup of blessing (says he), which we bless is not the communion of the blood of Christ ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ ?" 1 Cor. x. 16.

Again if we put the question, Whether the body and blood of Christ are present by faith only to the worthy receiver ? The apostle gives it clearly against the Protestant's opinion : "Wherefore (says he), whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." 1 Cor. xi. 27.

"For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself, not discerning the Lord's body." 1 Cor. xi. 29. Now, according to this doctrine of the apostle it is exceeding plain, that the body and blood of our Lord are truly and really received by the unworthy, as by the worthy communicant, and consequently, truly and really present to all who receive ; and not by faith only, to the worthy receiver : for, if the unworthy do not receive the true body and blood of Christ in this sacrament, how can they be said to be guilty of the body and blood of Christ ? or, not to discern the Lord's body.

Fourth reason, When God, in Holy Scripture, speaks with an express design to make known to us some new institution or command upon which our salvation depends ; or to discover some high mystery of faith, which was entirely new to the world, which was necessary for the world to know

and which could only be known from his words ; then, if ever, we have good reason to believe, the word of God speaks plainly, and ought to be taken in the obvious natural sense of the words : now, here our Saviour spoke those words, This is my body. This is my blood, at the institution of a great sacrament, upon which our salvation depends with an express design to reveal a high mystery of faith which was entirely new to the world ; which was necessary for the world to know ; and which could be known from his disciples only from his words ; we conclude then that his words, upon such an occasion, ought in all reason to be understood in the plain obvious literal sense. Add to these reasons, that the Church of Christ, the Catholic Church, in all ages, has ever expounded these words of our Saviour in the literal sense, and ever condemned those for heretics, who have at any time attempted to wrest them to a figure.

The only reply Protestants can make to this weight of proofs for the real presence and transubstantiation, is from the words of our Saviour, Do this in remembrance of me. From whence they pretend to conclude, that the eucharist is only a sacrament instituted in bread and wine to be taken in remembrance of his death ; and that his body and blood are not really and substantially present in it.

To whom we answer that the words, Do this in remembrance of me, do not furnish the least shadow of a proof against the *real presence*, because the eucharist as it is believed by Catholics, is a much more lively remembrance of Christ, than as it is held by Protestants. For Catholics who hold transubstantiation, and the real presence, and firmly believe that, as often as they partake of this sacrament, they really receive the same body of Christ that was crucified, the same blood of Christ that was shed for their redemption, do certainly with much more lively sentiments of devotion, renew in themselves the remembrance of our Saviour's death and passion, than Protestants can do who believe, that they only receive bread and wine, in their natural substances, in remembrance of him. It is, therefore, very bad and false reasoning, to conclude, that the body and blood of Christ are not really present in the eucharist, from the words,—Do this in remembrance of me, when those words are more clearly consistent with the Catholic belief of the *real presence*, than with the contrary opinion of Protestants.

Is it not enough then to stagger all who are serious among them, when they reflect that the literal obvious plain sense of the word of God is in all the four Gospels, and in St. Paul, full and clear against them in this important controversy ; and more full and clear, for the Catholic's belief of the *real presence*, than any text that can be produced