

is effected, to be satisfied with saying with us (and assuredly they would be satisfied with it) that this manner is incomprehensible and inexplicable: and yet such, as that by a secret and admirable change of the bread it becomes the body of Jesus Christ: and we must also entreat the Protestants, to whom that might appear a novelty, to make no scruple in saying, after the example of the first reformers, that the bread is the body of Jesus Christ, and the wine his blood, because these propositions were formerly so universal that scarcely can an ancient writer be found who has not made use of them."

The same pious and learned Abbe expresses himself elsewhere in these terms: "I say that the body of Jesus Christ is precisely and substantially the same upon the altar, as in heaven and upon the cross, but that it is there in a different manner. It was on the cross in a natural and bloody manner; it is in heaven in a visible and glorious manner; whereas on the altar it is in an invisible, unbloody and accessible manner: but it is always the same only. I acknowledge therefore with the Fathers of the eastern and western churches, the real change operated in the Eucharist, expressed by the words transmutation, transelementation, transubstantiation; which signifies that after the words of our Saviour have been pronounced, there is found truly on the altar, by virtue of the union with the sensible species, what was not there before, I mean the person of Jesus Christ."

Such is the explanation given by a profound theologian attached to the confession of Augsburg who had no intention of giving offence on the subject of the Eucharist. He thought, and with great reason according to what we have brought forward that the change of the substance accorded with the ancient principles of Lutheranism laid down at the diet in the solemn confession of its belief. Would to God that those who at the present day belong to the same communion would regulate their sentiments according to the same principles with the learned and virtuous Molanus! We might then entertain greater hopes of the union so much to be desired by the upright and well disposed of both parties.

In addition to these favorable sentiments of the Lutherans and Calvinists, we have some testimonies of your own countrymen in our favor. Bishop Forbes acknowledges the possibility of transubstantiation in the following terms; "There is too much temerity and danger in the assertion of many Protestants who refuse to God the power of transubstantiating bread into the body of Christ. Every one allows it is true, that what implies contradiction cannot be done. But as no individual person knows with certainty the essence of each thing, and in consequence what does or does not imply contradiction it is an evident temerity for any one whomsoever to place bounds to the power of God. I approve of the opinion of the theologians of Wittemburg, who are not afraid to avow that God has power to change the bread and wine into the body and blood of Jesus Christ."

Thornike allows of the change, and tells us in plain terms that "the elements are really changed

from ordinary bread and wine, into the body of Jesus Christ, mysteriously present, as in a sacrament; and this by virtue of the consecration, and in no wise by the faith of the receiver."

Bishop Montague declares that the change is produced by the consecration of the elements. In support of this assertion, he cites passages from St. Cyril of Jerusalem, from the liturgy of St. Basil, from St. Cyprian and St. Ambrose: he renders the expressions employed by these Fathers, by the words *transmutation* and *transelementation*. Still after having confessed the change produced by the consecration, after asserting that it was recognized by the primitive Church, he changes sides and concludes by declaring against transubstantiation.*

Samuel Parker, bishop of Oxford, defends and proves it, as follows: "In the first place then it is evident to all men, that are but ordinarily conversant in ecclesiastical learning, that the ancient Fathers, from age to age asserted the *real and substantial* presence in very high and expressive terms. The Greeks styled it, *ΜΕΤΑΒΟΛΗ, ΜΕΤΑΡΡΗΘΗΙΣΙΣ, ΜΕΤΑΣΚΕΥΑΣΜΟΣ, ΜΕΤΑΠΟΙΗΣΙΣ, ΜΕΤΑΣΤΟΙΧΕΙΩΣΙΣ*. And the Latines agreeable with the Greeks, *Conversion, Transmutation, Transformation, Transfiguration, Transelementation*, and at length *Transubstantiation*: By all which they expressed nothing more nor less than the *real and substantial Presence* in the Eucharist." The Bishop of Oxford was well aware that transubstantiation not only supposes the real presence but is actually the foundation of it, since, by virtue of the words, the substance of the body of Jesus Christ could not be found in the Eucharist, unless it had taken the place of the substance of the bread. Thus far proceeded the old Church of England, which as it was banished, so it was restored with the crown. But by the reason of the interval of twenty years between the rebellion and restitution there arose a new generation of divines that knew not Joseph. In short, if they own a *real Presence*, we see from the premises how little the controversie is between that and *Transubstantiation*, as it is truly and ingeniously understood by all the reformed Churches. If they do not, they disown the doctrine both of the Church of England and the Church Catholick, and then if they own only a *figurative Presence* (and it is plain they own no other) they stand condemned of Heresie by almost all the Churches in the christian world: and if this be the thing pretended to be set up (as it certainly is by the authors and contrivers of it) by renouncing *Transubstantiation*, then the result and bottom of the law is under this pretence to bring a new *Heresie by law* into the Church of England."

You see, Sir, that if the doctrine of the real presence has found in your country a great number of defenders, that of transubstantiation has also had

*From all appearance he would have returned to it. This learned man thought almost in every thing with the Catholic Church, to which, it is said, he would have united himself, if his death which happened in 1641, had not prevented him from executing this resolution. Four years later, the same cause unfortunately upset the same project of a character still more celebrated for his learning and genius. Grotius, on quitting Paris, confided to his learned and worthy friend M. Bignon, that on his return from Sweden, where he was going to settle his affairs, he would give himself exclusively up to the affair of his salvation, and would unite himself to the Catholic Church. He was returning and had already reached Rostock, when he was seized with a sickness which deprived him of life, the Church of a valuable conquest, and the world of a memorable example. The fact is positively asserted by M. Arquand, who had it from M. Bignon himself. "We know that Father Petrus, upon hearing of his death, celebrated mass for the repose of his soul."

its distinguished advocates. You have seen them among the Lutherans, who in general are now become its declared enemies; moreover, (what indeed you yourself must be convinced of even at the present day, the persons most attached to the confession of Augsburg and to their first reformer may still, without injury to their principles, enter completely into the catholic doctrine of the Eucharist, after the example of the pious and learned Hilarian, the Abbe of Lokkum. You have heard the Lutherans prove with us to the Calvinists that it was impossible to admit the figurative sense, and not hold to the literal sense, and the Calvinists joining us afterwards, in proving like us to the Lutherans that the literal sense ought no less necessarily to conduct them to the change of the substance. Thus you have seen them alternately ranged under the catholic standard, victoriously attacking one another with the arms they borrowed from us and the Church triumphing in turns from the blows and the defeats they mutually inflicted upon each other.

I will here spare you the detail of the grammatical cavils invented by the Calvinists to authorize the figurative sense against the change of substance. I know what hickering they have borrowed from the rules of grammar which have been as incorrectly forged as applied by them to each of the words *this is my body*. I know also that they are not worth the trouble of being refuted, after having been so completely refuted by M. Nicole, with that depth, correctness and clearness which distinguish that great controvertist. They easily vanish when brought in contact with the examples, of which the holy scripture furnishes us with the idea & the subject. Could not Moses have said: *This rod is a serpent, this water is blood*? Could not Jesus Christ, at the marriage feast at Cana, have equally said: *This water is wine*? and when rising to life Lazarus or the only son of the widow of Naim, *this dead person is living*? Would not all these propositions have been true to the letter in spite of the pretended rules of grammar? and would the reformed ever succeed in demonstrating to us their incorrectness by saying that if it is a rod, it is not really a serpent; if it is water, it is not really blood or wine? if they are dead they are not in reality living? Why persist obstinately in not seeing, and not acknowledging that in the mouth of God, or by his order these propositions operate what they declare? The Almighty commands, and nature instantly obeys:—Jesus Christ commands, and the grave gives back its prey, and death releases its victim: He speaks, and the water has changed its substance into that of wine, and the bread its substance into that of his body.

But if instead of the bread which we perceive, it is the substance of the body that we must believe, our senses will have deceived us, you will say, and their testimony, on which reposes the certainty of the facts in the Gospel, will then be shaken. No Sir, our senses do not deceive us here, for they do not pronounce sentence, they simply report; and their report is true in the Eucharist. They tell us that they there find the taste, the colour, the appearance of bread, all which is there in effect. It is the mind which, from the report of the senses, judges and pronounces: at the sight of the species it would naturally and with reason conclude, that the substance of bread is also. there, if on this particular occasion, it had not been admonished to check its natural propensity and to reform its judgment. After the instructions of Jesus Christ, the apostles must have judged, and all of us after them not from what they saw, but from what they had heard. This is the exception, it is the only one. Except in this instance, and whenever there is no reason from distance or malady for mistrusting our senses, we ought confidently to rely upon them, remembering that our Saviour has himself appeared to them in testimony of his resurrection. "See