

tained of any, depends upon their agreement with the word of God which is a point now to be decided.

Whether either Protestant or Catholic polemics have most indulged in "misrepresentation, calumny and even forgery," is of no sort of consequence to our argument. Our object is to ascertain if possible, who can produce "Thus saith Jehovah," for his peculiar faith, the Protestant, or the Catholic.

Whitaker's remarks may be true as to the conduct of the Protestant enemies of Mary Queen of Scots, in reference to whom he made them, and yet not justly applicable to Protestant writers generally. Whether they are so or not, I do not think it necessary to affirm or deny.

I agree with you as to the awfully serious responsibility of those whose situations give them an extensive influence over public opinion, especially in matters on which human happiness or misery for an eternity depends. I trust I feel in a degree this responsibility; and I endeavour as far as I can to divest myself of every feeling that would prevent my embracing that truth, in favor of whomsoever it might decide, which is founded upon the Word of Him; who is the same yesterday, to-day, and forever.

I shall proceed with extracts from the Catholic at my earliest convenience.

I have the honor to be,

Rev. Sir,

Your humble & obed't

Servant,

EDITOR OF THE GUARDIAN

We can easily perceive from the confused and coarse tirade of the Church of England Sentinel, No. 40, against the Catholic doctrine of the real presence; that the master subject is by far too great for his comprehension to grapple with. Let him keep to his *Children's department*. He will there seem at home among the little ones. We give here for his better information on the subject in question the following extract from that excellent, and admirably well conducted paper, the *Catholic press*.
EDITOR.

The real presence of the body and blood of Christ demonstrated from Scripture, and the unanimous testimony of the ancient Fathers and Doctors of the Catholic Church.

Near three centuries have now elapsed, since those who pretended to reform the Church of Christ began to censure her faith concerning the mystery of the holy Eucharist; and the disputes then commenced have continued to the present day. The Catholic Church believes, that in this mystery—after the words of consecration—are truly, really, and substantially present—the Body and Blood, together with the soul and divinity of Jesus Christ,—under the outward forms or appearances of bread and wine; and that, by virtue of our Saviour's words pronounced by the priest at the Consecration is made a true and real change of one substance into another which we term transub-

stantiation. On the other hand, the adversaries of the Catholic church contend that Christ's body and blood are not truly and really present in the sacrament—in their own substance, but by faith only and in figure; or, according to some—if it be there at all it is accompanied with the substance of bread. Both sides appeal to Scripture; both profess their readiness to stand by what is there defined.

The institution of the Blessed Sacrament is recorded by three different Evangelists, St. Matthew (c. xxvi.) 26.) St. Mark, (c. xiv.) and St. Luke (c. xxii.) In these we may expect to find something decisive. What then did our Saviour institute and give to his apostles at the last supper? For the Sacrament which the faithful receive at this day is the same which the apostles then received, as both Catholics and their adversaries are willing to concede. In the twenty-sixth chapter of St. Matthew we read thus: "Whilst they were at supper Jesus took bread, blessed it, and broke it, and gave it to his disciples, saying; **THIS IS MY BODY**; and taking the chalice he gave thanks & gave it to them, saying; Drink ye all of this. for **THIS IS MY BLOOD** of the New Testament which shall be shed for many unto the remission of sins." St. Mark (c. xiv.) gives our Saviour's words as follows: "This is my Body; this is my Blood of the New Testament which shall be shed for many." And St. Luke to the like import. "This is my Body which is given for you; do this for a commemoration of me; this is the chalice of the New Testament in my Blood which shall be shed for you, (c. xxii.)" St. Paul, in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, (c. xi.) agrees in substance with the Evangelists. How then can our Protestant brethren have the confidence to assert, that the doctrine of transubstantiation is contrary to the plain words of Scripture? Can any thing be more plain, or more expressive of the real presence and transubstantiation than the above texts? Particularly as it is here inculcated, that it was that Body which should be delivered up for them, and that Blood which should "be shed for many to the remission of sins?" Was it not then his true and real body, which was delivered up to death upon the cross? Was it not his true and real Blood which was shed for the remission of sins? Beyond all doubt it was. On the supposition, therefore, that our Blessed Redeemer really did intend to change bread and wine into his body and blood—as Catholics firmly believe he did—could he have expressed himself in more clear terms, than for instance those that follow;—"This is my body which shall be delivered up for you, this is my blood, which shall be shed for the remission of sins." On the contrary, if he had designed to give only an empty figure—excluding the reality of his Body and Blood, this manner of expressing himself would be exceedingly obscure, nay palpably absurd; as will appear in the sequel.

That the expression is very obscure in the Protestant acception, is abundantly demonstrated from the fact that all Christian churches throughout the world actually followed the contrary sense for many ages, and constantly held that these words

implied—not a figurative but the real presence of Christ's Body and Blood in this adorable Sacrament. It is remarkable through the whole series of the gospel, that when our Saviour spoke in parables, any thing obscure, he carefully explained his meaning to the Apostles. "When they were alone, he explained all things" to them, says St. Mark, [c. iv.] Now at the institution of the Blessed Sacrament, every circumstance required that he should express himself in the most intelligible terms, when, in fact, do all prudent men endeavor to explain their mind in the clearest manner possible? Is it not when they are giving their commands of importance? Is it not when they are treating with and taking leave of their dearest friends? Is it not, above all, when they are devising their last will and testament? All these circumstances concur in the institution of the Blessed Sacrament. On this occasion our Lord Jesus Christ commands that a clean oblation be made which the prophet Malachy had foretold;—Do this, saith he, in remembrance of me. (Luke xxii.) He institutes a sacrament, the use of which is to be daily and perpetual in his church; he is taking leave of his friends; I will not now call you servants he says but friends, (John xv.) friends and confidants whom he had appointed to teach all nations his gospel and divine law. In a word he is forming a treaty, a covenant, an alliance which is to last to the end of time, and can any circumstances be conceived to exist, which require greater clearness and accuracy.

Moreover, it is observable, that when our Blessed Saviour designed to confer any very singular favor upon his church, he usually foretold and promised it; that it might more easily find credit when realized. Thus, for instance, he promised the sacrament of Baptism, and the power of forgiving sins; thus, he foretold his passion, his death, his resurrection; thus, in a word, he foretold and promised this inestimable benefit of the holy Eucharist. His words are these, in the sixth chapter of St. John; "The bread which I will give, is **MY FLESH** for the life of the world, the Jews therefore strove amongst themselves, saying: How can this man give us his flesh to eat? Then Jesus said: verily, verily, I say unto you, unless you eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his Blood, you shall not have life in you. Whosoever eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath life everlasting, and I will raise him up at the last day; for **my Flesh is meat and my Blood is drink indeed**; He that eateth my Flesh and drinketh my Blood dwelleth in me, and I in him." From those words of Jesus, "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" It is evident they understood our Saviour's promise was to be fulfilled by really giving them his flesh and blood, and our Lord, instead of explaining, affirms in still more positive terms, that except they eat his flesh and drink his blood, they shall not have life in them; and that his flesh is meat indeed, and his blood is drink indeed. These words were spoken in the presence of his Apostles; so that when he told them at his last supper: "This is my body which shall be given for you; this is my blood