

to make: which is that, if they still pretend to have the fathers on their side, you will require them to produce those writings, in which the fathers were bound to explain themselves clearly and distinctly. Insist upon their bringing forward the instructions delivered to the neophytes between their baptism and communion. Tell them that this is what they are bound to do for you. For, most undoubtedly, then was the time to explain in what the mysteries precisely consisted; then must the development have been made, of what they were to know and what they were to profess. Consequently, it is from these dogmatical and elementary documents that we now learn to a certainty what the prelates taught, what they had learned from their predecessors, and their predecessors from the apostles. Of this you cannot be too frequently reminded. Let your ministers produce, if they can, one single dogmatical instruction of the above description, in which it is declared to the neophytes, before their admission to the communion, that the communion is received "kneeling for the avoiding all such profanation and disorder as might otherwise ensue; for a signification of our humble and grateful acknowledgment of the benefits of Christ therein given: that no adoration is intended or ought to be done, either unto the body of Christ, or the sacramental bread or wine, for that the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances and may not be adored, and the natural body and blood of our Saviour is in heaven and not here; it being against the truth of Christ's natural body to be at one time in more places than one." Where will they find that such language was ever employed to the newly baptized? The opposite is the fact: in the most distinct terms, it is the adoration of Jesus Christ present in an ineffable manner by a change of nature in the gifts offered: it is the same body that was born of a virgin, the same blood that was shed upon the cross, to which we are bound to pay upon the altar, a still more profound adoration than the magi paid to him in the crib; no one receives them without having first adored them, and so far is it from being sinful to adore him, that we should sin by not adoring him.

This you have seen—you have heard the catechetical instructions given to the neophytes.—Others than these I know not of. Were there such, or could additional ones be discovered, they would not be found to contain the doctrine of your church. For it is impossible that they should have believed and taught at the same time the figure and the reality; the change and not the change of substance; impossible they should have taught that the heavenly and eucharistic bread must be adored, and that this adoration would be idolatry.

I leave you, Sir, to reflect soberly and candidly on what you have learnt respecting the important question that fills the last five letters. When you have done this, I must request your attention to a proof of a totally different character. Putting a-

* The words and sense of the declaration, concluding your liturgy, are at shocking variance with all the ancient liturgies.

side all discussion of texts and monuments, I undertake to prove that the doctrine of the Catholic church on the Eucharist necessarily goes back to the apostles. The argument will be somewhat abstract and metaphysical: I do not however believe it to be above the reach of ordinary capacities: it must in my opinion, suffice to convince every reasonable mind. We will then, for a moment forget all that we have discovered from scripture, the secret discipline, the liturgies and testimonies of the fathers, and, in place of authority, we will listen to reason alone. I start with you from a fact, and I say: At whatever point of time you may choose to fix upon, at the precise time, if you please, that we are now discussing this question, millions of persons, differing in climate, customs, nations, governments, prejudices and religious communions, all agree, not only in believing in the change of substance and the adoration in the Eucharist, but in believing in them as dogmas believed and taught in all preceding ages. The above proposition demands your most serious attention: re-peruse it, before you proceed further. You have read the most authentic testimonies on the belief of the Greek and Oriental churches. You know that upon these dogmas, they are perfectly in accordance with the Latin Churches—it is certain that they, like ourselves, believe in these doctrines, as having been invariably believed by preceding generations. This being established, I pass on: and I maintain that from this fact we of necessity have a right to infer nothing less than the apostolicity of these dogmas. In fact, although it be customary to divide the generations of men, and count four of them to a century, it is evident notwithstanding that they are neither distinctly separated nor independent of each other, but greatly intermixed, and linked one within another, so that a very considerable proportion of persons existing in any given generation, belong also to the one preceding. Whence it follows that a very considerable proportion of persons existing at any given epoch, are perfectly acquainted with what was believed and taught in the preceding generation, particularly when the dogmas are of great importance, connected with daily and general observance, and requiring of each individual the most sacred acts of religion, as is the case with the dogmas of the Eucharist.

If such doctrines are not to be traced to the Apostles, there must have been some later period, when for the first time, they sprang to light, and were taught and believed in the world. But at this Epoch, when for the first time, mention was made of it, a very great proportion of persons then living, knew for certain that not a word had been said about it the day before, neither had it been mentioned in the preceding generation; they knew perfectly, for example, that instead of the reality, nothing more than the figure had been recognized; instead of the change of substance, nothing but bread and wine; instead of adoration, nothing more than a recollection of spirit. Well then! Sir, supposing that I admit, what nevertheless is inadmissible, that these same persons consented to pass from the figure to the reality, from the

substance of the bread to that of the body, from recollection to adoration, they must have gone over to say the least, to what they considered a novel opinion and a novel practice, but in substituting them from the opinion and practice with which they had till then been acquainted, it is utterly impossible that they should have adopted them as having been held and taught during the preceding generation—the contrary would be notoriously manifest to all; the falsity of the fact too evident to admit such a persuasion. It is contrary to nature that so great a proportion of mankind should spontaneously or from persuasion, with one impulse, unite in admitting as true, what they all positively knew to be false. I cannot conceive a man to exist so much the victim of folly as to propose to his fellow creature to believe that as the doctrine and faith of the year before, which he knows, which they all know, was no such thing: and were an individual sound enough to venture upon such an experiment, the nature of things and good sense alike forbid us to suppose that success would crown his enterprise. And yet if our dogmas on the Eucharist were not derived from the Apostles, it would inevitably follow, that in some intermediate generation, men began to hold them, as the belief of their predecessors, although most notoriously they had never been so. There is an absurdity in this hypothesis which is quite repugnant to our moral constitution. Consequently it is proved that these doctrines are apostolical, by the naked and single fact that so many persons of the present day believe them, as having been believed and taught in the preceding generations, and reaching from our age to that of the apostles inclusively.

We are at length arrived at the termination of this protracted dissertation, upon which I entered to justify the decrees of the church upon the Eucharist, and in reply to the difficulties proposed by you. Our investigation has entirely turned upon the simple question of fact, whether the catholic dogmas were revealed by Jesus Christ. We have alternately examined the scripture and tradition, the channels through which revelation is transmitted to us; from each of these we have been supplied with clear and abundant proofs of the catholic doctrine: in each we have discovered that the real presence and the change of bread and wine into the body and blood of Jesus Christ were certainly revealed by our Lord. You can no longer entertain any reasonable doubt concerning the truth of this fact. You must now come to a determination: you can no longer be permitted to waver and hesitate: your own reason will rise up in judgment against you, if you delay for a moment to pay to Christ that adoration, which his divine presence in the sacrament of his altars imperatively requires.

To this you will reply: "The consequence you draw is just, it is inevitable: yet notwithstanding, this simultaneous presence in many places, this change of substance, without any external indication of the same, and while even the appearances remain afterwards the same as before! how can I submit to this, how can I believe it?" If you must be enabled to conceive and understand, before you