

REAL PRESENCE.

We give an extract from the letter of the Carlisle correspondent of the Churchman, from which it will be seen what a waste of reasoning, and proof, and language is made about the Real Presence. If there is no more change of the bread and wine in the Eucharist, than there is of water, in baptism, it is plainly wrong to say that it is the Body and Blood of Christ. The whole tenor of the extract leads to a different conclusion, and the reader is surely surprised to find the Real Presence denied after his faith in it has been excited by solemn appeals to Scripture. Probably the writer aims at conceiving and expressing the very Mystery proposed by the church—but because he rejects Transubstantiation, which does not imply a mere mode of the presence, he loses the truth which he attempts to lay hold of, and finds mere elements, where Christ gives His Body and Blood.—*C. Her.*

"This life is of course to be sustained from the same source when it came, i. e., from the Body of Christ. Accordingly St. Paul says, that 'the Bread' which in the Holy Eucharist is broken, 'is the communion of (i. e., it communicates) the Body of Christ.' The cup of blessing is the communion of the Blood of Christ. Our Lord said, of the Bread which He took and blessed, and brake, and gave—'This is My Body which is given for you.' He had said before—'My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed.' He that eateth My flesh, and drinketh My blood, dwelleth in Me and I in him. I am the living Bread which came down from Heaven; and the Bread which I will give, is My flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.' The promise here made directed His hearers to something as yet future, and the subsequent institution of the Eucharist exactly corresponded with the words of the promise.

Calling to mind now the two great principles of our faith, which I have been discussing, you must see that to all these awful words of our Blessed Lord 'figures' is simply to deny them. To say they are 'rhetoric' is to profane and blaspheme them. The church has ever understood them in their obvious, literal sense, and as asserting realities. The analogy of the whole faith requires that they should be so understood. The sacrament of Baptism is a witness to their literal import, for what is said in Scripture of each sacrament, implies what is said of the other. 'There are,' therefore, 'three that bear witness on earth: the Spirit, the Water, and the Blood; and these three agree in one.' 'And this is the witness' they bear, 'that God hath given unto us Eternal Life and this Life is in His Son.'

When the mind has once apprehended all these developments of the Mystery of the Incarnation which are mentioned in Scripture, and has submitted in faith, to those Divine announcements which declare the nature of the church, what is called the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist presents no difficulty whatever, nay, it is demanded. The church being a spiritual kingdom, is independent of all conditions of material existence; so also

did our Lord prove His Body could be, after his Resurrection (See John xx. 10, 26; Luke xxiv. 31.) Hence, when we affirm that Christ is present in the Eucharist, we do not mean that His Body occupies a given space. By saying that He is present wherever the Eucharist is celebrated, we do not mean that His Body is everywhere. We do not with the Lutherans affirm the ubiquity of Christ's Body, because all questions of locality touching this subject, are impertinent and absurd. Neither do we with the church of Rome so define the mode of the Presence as to say, that the consecrated elements no longer retain their natural substance. These no more cease to be bread and wine, than the water of Holy Baptism ceases to be water, and it is not more necessary (though Roman Catholics profess to think differently) to suppose that one is so changed, than that the other is; for both sacraments convey a similar, though not the same gift; one gives alliance with, the other continual supplies of life from the Body of Christ.

From the Brighton Herald.
TORY RELIGION.

The principles of Toryism are very favourable to religion? Granted: but then it must be a religion which bows to lay authority, and succumbs, in faith, discipline, and morality, to the dictum of the State. Thus Toryism is favourable to that form of religion which "bluff Harry" brought into existence, and to which the contemptible pedant, James I., gave the finishing touch. This church, distinguished from all that ever existed, as the State church consents that all her bishops shall be appointed by the State; that all her clergy shall preach, pray, and live according to the will of the State; that no prayer shall be uttered, psalm sung, or sermon preached, but on the authority and under the sanction of the State, and such censor, as it appoints. To this church—professing, observe at the same time, to be "not of this world,"—the State has been very kind and indulgent. It is the pet lamb of the State, which has filled her with good things, sent those who dissent from an union of Church and State empty away. Let not one expect to be received at Court who refuses to be a slave of the State; but the Noble Earl of Aberdeen has adopted a course which has rendered that Church also now a mere State engine; and henceforth Presbyterian ministers will be smiled on at court, provided they are intrusivists—that is, men whom the State has thrust into churches in spite of the people whilst on all free Church ministers the Ministers of State will look down as rebels in heart and traitors at core. The great fault of the Church of Rome has often been that it would not succumb to temporal power. During the revolution in France an attempt was made to convert the clergy into State pensioners. It was resisted; thousands of the clergy were massacred in consequence; others fled to perish in other countries, and some were base enough to become "constitutional priests," but they ceased to be Christian pastors, and never possessed the confidence or respect of the people. Napoleon

endeavoured to extort some concession, inimical to the church from poor old Pius VII. The brave old man resisted the conqueror of Europe when all other powers except England bowed before his footstool. He was dragged, like a felon from his domestics, treated with great cruelty; his life endangered, his person maltreated; but death itself had no terrors for Pius VII.; he set at defiance—like so many of his predecessors—it and his persecutor—and eventually triumphed.

For 300 years attempts were made in England and Ireland to root out Popery. Here it was cut down root and branch, till scarcely the trunk of the once magnificent tree could be recognized; but, strange to say, in Ireland persecution seemed to give it new life; though, as Popery never would bow to temporal authority in spiritual matters—as it never would consent to receive its formulary from the State, its Bishops from the Crown, nor its creed from a Cabinet Council, it has always been abhorred by Toryism—not for its creed—not for its worship, discipline, or doctrine (for Toryism is fond of them,) but because the Catholic clergy would not receive their power from the State. A new scheme is now hatching, by which it is hoped that the obstinacy of the priests may be overcome. It is about to be proposed that Catholic priests shall be made stipendiaries, and converted into gentlemen; it is hoped that a way will be found ultimately to bring the Irish Catholic clergy under the State yoke, and then Toryism will be just as favourable to Popery as to Church of Englandism, or to Presbyterianism, or, as it is in the East, to Hindooism, or Mahomedism, or any other "ism." All that Toryism desires is, that the Ministers of every religion should give their consciences into the keeping of the Prime Minister of the State.

ENGLAND'S CONVERSION.

We extract from the Tablet some sensible remarks on the means of effecting the conversion of England. The writer has caught the true spirit of the church, and looks where pride disdains to look, to the poor, as the special instruments of Providence for the spread of religion. Yet the learned men of Oxford may also contribute largely to the same end—and have already done much.—*C. Her.*

We have no hesitation in avowing our belief that the true crisis of the present 'religious movement' does not lie at Oxford, and that Oxford is not the gate at which Catholicism will ever enter into this kingdom. We are far, indeed, from thinking that some accessions to the truth may not come—as some have come—from that renowned University. But we have no more look for the conversion of Protestant England through Oxford, than half a dozen Priestly converts in Pagan Rome would have made us look to the Capitol as the main hope of infant Christianity. We believe that all these notions are nothing better than gross prevarications, which blind people's eyes to the real state of things in England. Now, as in old times, the kingdom of God cometh not with observation, and is not to be looked for among the rich

and learned. Few, as then, the hopes of Christendom are to be raked out of the gutters and kennels, the garrets and cellars, where misery hides itself from the eye of insulting happiness; are to be gathered from the poor and outcast; from the guideless, discontented, dissatisfied pauper, far more than from those whom fullness hath rendered dull, and whose souls are hardened by prosperity. It is as true now as it was in the time of Lactantius, that "More among the poor believe the Word of God than among the rich, who are bound down by many impediments, and are chained fast slaves to covetousness and other passions."

But is this the theory of the present time? Are we laboring for the rich, or for the poor? We regret bitterly to express our belief that in almost everything around us we may trace the footprints of that false Oxford imagination, that a great stroke of spiritual traffic is to be done with the better educated; and that in order to attract their regards and lure them towards us, the interests of the poor—(nay, even of our own poor)—may be profitably postponed for a time. Depend upon it, all this is bad generalship, and we fear a great deal of it comes from the practice of nourishing hopes that God will draw over to us this great country wholesale, and save us the trouble of converting it in detail.

LOSSES and GAINS.

The accession of converts is gratifying; but whether we gain more than we lose may be a matter of doubt. It cannot indeed be questioned for a moment, that a far larger number embrace the Catholic faith in adult age, with evidences of deep conviction, and a desire to secure their salvation, than abandon the faith with similar indications of sincerity. The case is rare, of any well-instructed Catholic who forsakes his religion in circumstances which do not make it sufficiently manifest that he is actuated by mere human interests and influences; but a vast number are lost to the church by intermarriage, by orphanage, by the want of religious aid, by interest, by indifference and neglect. In cases of mixed marriages, the Catholic party, male or female, when truly pious, generally succeeds in drawing the partner to the faith. But there are numerous cases wherein no effort is made to enlighten the consort, and no care is taken of the religious education of the children, whence there are, in the Episcopal ministry, and among the preachers of the other sex, persons, one of whose parents was Catholic. How many poor orphans are likewise thrown on the world, and trained in all the bigotry of Protestant masters and mistresses, and who thus become inveterate enemies of the faith of their parents. The children of intemperate parents, or of those whose poverty is great, are often placed in similar situations, and under like influences acquire the same hatred of Catholicity.—The ignorance of many parents puts it beyond their power to communicate to their children the convictions of their own minds; and where the opportunities of religious instruction is not otherwise afforded, the children are apt to imbibe the