## TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

REV. FATHER MOLPHY DEALS WITH OBJECTIONS TO THAT DOCTRINE.

An immense concourse of people assembled in the R. C. Church on Sunday evening March 9th to hear Rev. Father Molphy deal with the above subject. The church was very crowded, and many had to go away, unable to gain admission. The following is THE SERMON.

"My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed."-St. John, vi., 57.

MY DEAR FRIENDS,-The overwhelming mass of matter with which I was honored in the Dispatch of the past two weeks, would have tried a man of much stronger nerve than myself; but let me assure you, my dear friends, that, whilst wading kneedeep through the shapeless bank of mud, which for six weeks Mr. Andrews has been so industriously piling up, I could not refrain from picturing to myself the smile of self-complacency that passed over his countenance on the consummation of so noble (?) a work. "Parturiunt montes, nacitur ridiculus

The mountains labor with main and might;
A ridiculous mouse is brought to light.

Mr. Andrews persists in trying to force upon the public the belief that I have been the originator of this controversy. Now, the facts are that the editor of the *Dispatch* having published a sermon from nearly all the ministers of the town, called upon me in order to procure a sermon from me. I willingly gave him the first sermon I then me. I willingly gave him the first sermon I then had prepared, never imagining that my words would be made the object of fierce attack and unwould be made the object of fierce attack and unscrupulous misrepresentation. Discourses were printed that had been pronounced in almost every church in Strathroy without exciting any comment or attracting any special attention. Now, why Mr. Andrews should unprovokingly assail the doctrine contained in my instruction is yet to be explained. He himself admits that he attacked it; as he described to the contained of the contained clares "in an independent discourse in which the arguments contained in my sermon were met and many additional ones presented showing why the doctrines I preached should not be received as of doctrines I preached should not be received as of Scriptural authority." He takes advantage of this circumstance to attack the teaching of the Catholic Church, thus wounding the feelings of his fellow-citizens who wish to live at peace with all men. Whether in so doing he has sought notoriety more than truth : whether in his first onslaught he thankthan truth; whether in his list obstaught he thank-ed God for being drawn into this controversy, let the public judge. The man who strikes the first blow is amenable before the law, and in this case Mr. A. is the culprit, for having attacked the docpulpit and in the press the simple instruction I gave to my own people on the doctrine and teaching of our own Church. When the ministers of every church in town can without let or hindrance proclaim the peculiar doctrines of their respective creeds, why should Mr. A. presume to deprive me of the same liberty, or why should he call me an assailant or accuse me of secking notoriety when he himself puts me on the defence by openly attack-

In reference to the Syriac question Mr. A. accuses me of not having given the proper translation for the Latin sentence "Illud vero stantes super pedes suos significat menniai fas esse." I suppose by this means he endeavors to make a point against my knowledge of Latin, with which from boyhood I have been familiar. I quoted the above passage from St. Ephraem, merely to show that the Syriac language had words having the meaning to "reprelanguage had words having the meaning to "repre-sent," and hence translated only as much of the text as was necessary for this phrpose. Will Mr. Andrews say that it was necessary for this object to translate "stantes super pedes suos?" The referransate states super fectors substitute from the reference I gave in my letter was to my second quotation from St. Ephraem, "Incensum manipulo impositum tochoea) designabat commixtionem divinitatis cum ejus humanitate," which I translated, "The ed on the maniple REPRESENT the mixture of His divinity and humanity,"-T. I. p. 238 a. Mr. Andrews by writing to his friends in Toronto will find that all my quotations are correct, and by asking the assistance of some of the school teachers in town he will find that my translations

I shall now proceed to dissect this formidable do cument. I shall treat first the objections from Holy Scripture. Secondly, Objections from reason. Thirdly, I will review the pretended testimonies adduced from the Fathers of the Church against Transubstantiation.

HOLY SCRIPTURE

First then let us examine the objections from

Holy Scripture.

I have already shown that the Jews understood the words of promise, as contained in the vi. chapter of St. John, in a literal sense. But the mystery was above their comprehension; it appeared to them absoletely impracticable; and because it was not clearly explained to them how the thing was to be accomplished, neither the one nor the other would believe it; "Many, therefore, of His own disciples hearing it, said, this saying is hard, and who can hear it," verse 61. But we are now told by our opponent that our Lord developed the whole system, and completely unravelled the mystery when He said "It is the spirit that quickeneth the flesh profiteth nothing, the words that I have spoken to you, are spirit and life." And is it then to be deduced from these words that the flesh of Jesus Christ can profit us nothing ?—will it be con-tended that the flesh He took for our salvation, that flesh that was "bruised for our injunities"-that flesh in which He mercifully vouchsafed to suffer for us, and without which He could not have sufferof or us—will it be contended, I ask again, that that sacred flesh united to the divinity, "profitch nothing?" The supposition would itself be impious, the assertion diabolical and blasphemous, and assuredly such cannot be the fair interpretation of the passage. The most learned and judicious com-mentations on the Scriptures teach that our Saviour does not in this passage speak at all of His own flesh; they observe that uniformly throughout the chapter where he does allude to it, He particularizes it by the adjuncts either "My flesh, or the flesh of the Son of Man." "The bread that I will ness of the Son of Mar. give is my flesh, except you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink His blood. My flesh is meat indeed, and My blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood " and so forth:—where as here He speaks abstractedly and indefinitely of the flesh, and contrasts it moreover with "the spirit And in similar passages of Holy Scripture who spirit and the flesh are put in contrast with each other, the latter is usually understood to signify the passions and the fallen state of our nature, or the light of human reason unassisted by the Spirit of inquiry of our Blessed Lord as to who the Apostles believed that He was; and had told Him, "Thou art Christ the son of the living God." Our Lord and covering by text from Scripture that reexplainted the responsibility replied, "Blessed art thou Simon Barding delivers of unassisted reason, "because flesh and blood," evidently meaning the powers of unassisted reason, "because flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father who is in Heaven." And accordingly the probable meaning of the passage before us will be—it is only signify that His legacy is not to be understood in blood in the storage of the blood and blood of selfs clarks. It is therefore the teaching of the Catholic Church that in Transubstantiation the properties of bread and proving by text from Scripture that reexplainted the storage of the blood in the storage of the blood in the storage of the blood in the storage of the blood is the catholic Church that in Transubstantiation the properties of bread and proving by text from Scripture that rice storage of the blood is the catholic Church that in Transubstantiation the properties of bread and wine are not changed, hence Mr. A.'s object has and proving by text from Scripture that rice storage of the blood, and blood of selfs clarks. immediately replied, "Blessed art thou Simon Bar-Jona, because flesh and blood," evidently meaning

the Spirit of God that can quicken your understandings to believe in the mysteries of faith. Your own unassisted reason will avail you nothing—"the words that I have spoken to you are spirit and life"—they are not mere questions of human science, to be learned or discovered by human talent or human industry—they are heavenly—they have reference to a higher world—"they are spirit and life"—and it is only by the guidance and the influence of the Holy Spirit, and by submission to its guidance and its influence that you will be enabled to receive and believe them: "It is the spirit quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing, the words that have spoken are spirit and life." Again, if such were not the correct interpretation of the passage, and if, as our opponent contends, it was meant by our Lord to explain away all difficulty, and determine to His expressions a figurative interpretation, how comes to explain away all difficulty, and determine to His expressions a figurative interpretation, how comes it that His meaning was not so undersood by His disciples and accepted by them as a fair and satisfactory explanation? For it was not until after this, it is worthy of note, it was not until after our Lord had used this expression that, as the Evangelist observes, "many of the disciples went back, and walked no more with Him." It appears then from the context of the chapter and the obvious meaning of the words contained in it, that our Lord did clearly promise that He would give to His followers. His own most sacred flesh to eat. "The whole mul." clearly promise that He would give to His followers His own most sacred flesh to eat. The whole multitude that heard Him understood the promise literally; the expressions that are used fully justify the literal interpretation and common rules of language will not authorize any other. Would our blessed Lord, who had descended from heaven to lead man from sin, and who was about to offer Himself upon the area for many relegantion, would He suffer the cross for man's redemption, would He suffer those persons to depart, believing that He spoke of a reality, and not explain to them their error, if, indeed, it were an error? Would He have suffered them to fall into error when He could so easily correct it? I ask any reasonable man, had not the people of Caperanum, in whose vernacular language (Syriae) our Lord then spoke, a better opportunity of knowing the meaning of the words of our Saviour on this occasion, than we who live at the distance of nearly nineteen hundred years? When our Lord declared, "The bread that I will give is my flesh for the life of the world," they understood our Lord to speak of real flesh and real blood; and accordingly they "walked no more with Him." What more easy for Him than to say, if that were his meaning, that He did not intend to give them his real flesh and real blood, but only spoke in a figurative sense. But Christ made no such correction. If it were not His real body and blood of which Christ then spoke, He led those people into error, but that supposition is manifest blasphemy. Our op-ponent next endeavors to establish a parallel be-tween the doctrine of Real Presence and Baptism, and compares the answer of Nicodemus "How can a man be born again" to the objection of the Jews "How can this Man give us his flesh to cat." Whenever our Blessed Redeemer made a revelation of an article of faith, He does not speak in figures, and whenever His doctrine was misunderstood by His hearers he always explains away the difficulty. In the care of the Blessed Eucharist the Jews understood that the substance He was to give was His flesh and blood, and Christ did not correct them as I have already shown, but in the case of Nicodemus have already shown, but in the case of Nicodemus, our Blessed Lord explains away His difficulty as is evident from our Lord's answer, part of which Mr. Andrews carefully leaves out. Does Mr. A. intend to misrepresent the word of God? I quote the whole, and you will see the value of Mr. A.'s argument:—"Jesus said Amen,—Amen, I say to them, except a man be born again, he cannot see the Kingdom of God. Nicodemus saith to Him:—"How can a man be born when he is old? can he enter the second time his mother's womb, and be born the second time his mother's womb, and be born the second time his mother's womb, and be born again? Jesus answered:—Amen, I say to thee unless a man be born again of vater and the Holy Ghost he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God," St. John iii. 3, 4, 5. Mr. A. urged that because in the Holy Scripture the bread and wine are called bread and wine after the consecration, therefore no change has taken place. I answered this objection in my last, and that my answer was good is shown from the fact that instead of refuting it Mr. Andrews misrepresents it. Is this honesty? Is this course of action necessary for the defence of the truth for which Mr. A, believes he was sent? I stated in my last that "it is by no means unfrequent in Scripture language." pearances; or wherever a change has taken place, to call them by the names by which they were characterized before." The words in italies were carefully left out by my opponent. The above statement I proved in my sermon by numerous quotations from Scrip-ture, and I call on Mr. Andrews to show that my proofs were not valid, before he can with any reason urge the objection. Mr. A. next laborously en-deavors to establish a figurative interpretation for the words of the institution "This is my body, this is my blood." I showed in my last sermon that the words of Christ in instituting the Blessed Eucharist cannot be taken in a figurative sense. I said "that in a figure of this kind there must be obvious conna a figure of this kind there must be obvious connection between the sign and the thing signified," and that in the Blessed Eucharist there is no such connection. This Mr. A. grants. I stated besides that the bread was never received by any people or any nation as the representation of the human body, neither did Christ institute it as a sign of His This Mr. Andrews is forced to admit. body. This Mr. Andrews is forced to admit. where then, I ask, is the figure, in our Lord's words? If Christ gave not His real body, but a morsel of bread to His Apostles, when He said:—"This is my body," it follows that He calls a morsel of bread His body, which cannot be maintained without making Christ guilty of an absurdity. Nothing can be more absurd than to hold a morsel of bread in a man's hands and point to it, saying:-"This is th living body of a man:" it is contrary to the common laws of speech to call one thing by name of another with which it has no resemblance or connections and that too without giving the persons to whom it was spoken the least intimation to lead them to the true meaning of such an extraordinary mode of speech. A respectable man would be ashamed on a serious occasion to use a deceitful way of speaking, so as to call a thing by a name it was never known by before. It is, therefore, jucredible that Christ should use this deceitful way of speaking on the most solemn occasion, that is, when He was fulfilling the types and figures of the old law, declaring His last will and testament, and instituting the most venerable sacrament of the New Law. Now, although some phrases of Holy Scriptures are to be explained in a figurative sense, yet the general rule, admitted even by Protestants, is, that the literal sense of God's word is not to be changed and a figurative sense introduced, without evident reasons, and an absolute necessity for so doing. What then are the reasons given by our adversary to show that the words of institution are to be taken in a figura-I will examine them in detail. first I beg to call your attention to a gross misrepre-

sentation of my words on the part of our Methodist

parson. He makes me give as a reason why Christ's words cannot be taken figuratively "that they are

ciple of the Saintly! Wesley, My argument was: After

admitting that Christ spoke figuratively sometimes and proving by text from Scripture that He explained

words of institution, and he was then making His last will and bequeathing them that legacy which He had promised His disciples to be meat in-

Without doubt Mr. Andrews is a faithful dis-

the plain sense of the terms He makes use of."
Mark another for the "preacher of the truth of God as found in His holy word." Now for Mr. A.'s reasons that the words of institution are to be taken reasons that the words of institution are to be taken in a figurative sense. The first passage which I will notice, and which Mr. Andrews urges as a set off against the words of institution, is from Exodus XII., 11, where the Paschal lamb is itself called the hase or passover of the Lord, whereas it was only the victim of the passover. But the want of parity will be found to result from several considerations. In the first place it will not be denied by Hebrew scholars that such an ellipsis, or omission of a word s perfectly consistent with the idiom of the language; secondly, the context would sufficiently ex-plain the difficulty, if any in reality existed, for in verses the 26th and 27th we read: "And when your children shall say to you, what is the meaning of this service, you shall say to them, it is the victim of the passover of the Lord, when He passed over of the passover of the Lord, when He passed over the houses of the children of Israel in Egypt, strik-ing the Egyptians and saving our houses;" and thirdly, my brethren, its meaning has never been mistaken, nor did any one ever pretend to discover any parity between it and the words of institution any parity between it and the words of institution before Zuinglius, a reformer in the 16th century, who states that the resemblance was pointed out to him by a phantom that appeared to him in the night: but whether that phantom was white or black, he tells us that he does not know. The same black, he tells us that he does not know. The same may be said of the text from Genesis: "The three branches are three days," and from Sam., I Chron., (Catholic Bible: II Kings XXIII., 17 and Paralipomenor XI., 19.,) the context of all these passages explains the meaning and clearly shows that no parity exists between them and the words of the institution of the Blessed Sacrament. As to the words of the institution themselves, they are like other words, and facts of our Lord related differently by the several Evangelists, but the clear explanatory words of one make obvious to every understanding words of one make obvious to every understanding what might seem ambigious in the other. Thus St Luke saying, "this cup is the New Testament in my blood" is made clear by the words of St. Mathew, "this is the blood of the New Testament which As to Mr. Andrews' profane play on the words will be shed for many for the remission of sine."

As to Mr. Andrews' profane play on the words will or testament, which he declares could not be proved or probated before a county judge, the allusion borders so closely on blasphemy that I will not attempt to bandy expressions with him on so august and solemn a subject. This recalls to my mind what a friend of mine passing through Germany witnessed in a certain town in Westphalia. He saw a very life-like representation on canvass of Martin ther, John Calvin and our Blessed Lord; under Martin Litther was written, "This contains my body; under John Calvin, "This is the figure of my body," and under our Blessed Lord, "This is my body," The on-lookers are left to decide which of

the three is most worthy of belief. OBJECTIONS FROM REASON.

Objections from reason are again urged against our doctrine. In my last sermon I showed clearly that the mystery of the Incarnation was perfectly parallel with the mystery of Transubstantiation. Mr. Andrews admits the Incarnation because God has revealed it, and for the same reason he must has revealed it, and for the same reason he must admit Transubstantiation. I proved from Scripture that Christ manifested the will to change bread and wine into His own sacred flesh and blood, and unless His power to do so be denied, the doctrine cannot be rejected. Mr. Andrews quotes the evidences of the senses against Transubstantiation. But even if that doctrine contradicted the senses, he should re-cellent that the sense have nothing to day with the collect that the senses have nothing to do with the apprehending of a mystery. He tries to show that the senses testify that Christ was God, but he failed the senses testify that Christ was God, but he failed in the attempt, because Christ spoke with authority, says our opponent, because He knew the thoughts of men even afar, because He wrought miracles, therefore He was God. Oh! profound argument; Oh! noble logician. Could not God give these povers to man? Did not Peter know the thoughts of Annanias and Saphira—did not he and the other Apostles speak with authority—did they not perform miracles? Where then is your proof from the evidence of the senses that Christ was God? St. Paul says: "Faith then cometh by hearing, and evidence of some of the senses, though we are told that "faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of Christ." We find that St. Paul here excludes all the senses as judges of mysteries, save the sense of hearing alone. If, therefore, the mysteries? In my last I gave several examples where the senses deceived. The woman at the sepulchre saw two men at the tomb, and yet the Scripture tell us that they were angels, and Jo seeing an angel mistook him for a man. Here the senses contradict themselves. Again if you immerse a straight stick in the water, your senses tell you it is crooked. In natural things it is very common to see the senses contradicted, for it is not the business of the senses to pronounce judgment according to the principles of philosophy; they are to convey the impression made upon them to the mind —to relate merely what appears to them. In respect to the angel and stick they merely relate to the mind what appears to them as facts. When a man beholds the blessed Eucharist, I grant the senses contradicts his faith. But to the senses we oppose the express promise of Christ, as a higher evidence, and believe with St. Paul that "faith cometh by hearing," and that our Blessed Lord bequeathed to man as a test of His love a mysterious legacy. Therefore, as Mr. Andrews urges the testimony of the senses against Transubstantitation, it remains for him to show, either that Transubstantiation is for no sense is allowed to judge of mysteries, but the sense of hearing. Christ said "This is my body." The apostles heard the words pronounced and their sense of hearing was their only judge. We have it upon their testimony, that Christ spoke these words, consequently our faith must come from hearing. How does Mr. Andrews prove the Incarnation? It contradicts all the senses, save that of hearing. that be the case, if angels be taken for men, and that the senses are thus led astray, it is absurd to say that a mystery is not to be believed, because it contradicts some of the senses. Mr. A. again returns to the stories about poison and the intoxicating properties of wine even after consecration. vif Mr. A. were acquainted with the doctrine of Catholic Church on this matter, he would not exhibit his ignorance by returning to them. The doctrine of the Church may be simply stated thus both substance and properties, before consecration, are the substance and properties of bread and properties of bread and wine: at the time of consecration Transub stantation takes place, the substance being converted into the substance of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, the properties however still continuing as before the properties of bread and wine, and afterwards, so long as these properties so continue, so long does the substance continue to be the substance of the body and blood of Jesus Christ. the substance of the body and blood of Jesus Chirch It is therefore the teaching of the Catholic Church that in Transubstantiation the properties of bread and wine are not changed, hence Mr. A.'s object has

humble the proud idol of our own judgment to His holy word, "and captivate our understandings in obedience to him;" hence our Lord says to St Thomas, "Blessed are they who have not seen and have believed." Jno. xxii. 29.

The Rev. gentleman says in regard to the Fathers of the Church that I accused him wrongfully when I stated that he told us "the Fathers did not believe in the Real Presence." I did not suppose that he would day the fathers had not suppose that he would deny the clear meaning of his own words, so I gave them synoptically. If, however, he did not mean to say that the Fathers did not believe in Transubstantiation, why continue to quote them-even in his next sermon—against the doctrine? By his denial of this meaning of his words, all quota his denial of this meaning of his words, all quota-tions from the Fathers are as harmless as a volley of blank carridge. blank cartridges sent against an imaginary enemy by our brave volunteers is one of their sham battles. By this denial he acknowledges virtually that he quotes the Fathers merely to make a false impression! And, indeed, if any one supposes that the Fathers were dubious about the doctrine of Transubstantiation, he is egregiously mistaken. But before entering upon further proof of this point, let us examine whether Mr. A. said or not that "the Fathers did not believe in the Real Presence." In my former lecture, I gave, for brevity's sake, a synopsis of his statement. I will now give his own words.

First he said, on Dr. Clarke's authority, "the
Syrian Church on the Malabar coast never did hold

doctrine of Transubstantiation till year 1559, when the influence of the agents of the Church of Rome induced them to accept their dogmas." Certainly an ordinary reader would infer from this that the Syriac Fathers who would lived before A. D. 1559 "did not hold Transubstan-titation." As in eating a whole cranberry pie, you must eat some cranberries, I confess I thought that the assertion, that "the Syraic Church did not hold Transubstantitation until 1559," implied that the Fathers of the Syriac Church, who were the leading historians, teachers and learned elege of the Church historians, teachers and learned clergy of the Church did not hold it either! As regards the other Fathers, my assailant continued immediately after his "It is the usual way of Scripture to assertion: This the usual way of Scripture to call things of a Sacramental nature by the names of those things of which they are the representation. So circumcision is called the covenant, &c. And after the same manner is the bread in the sacrament Christ's body. This is, as circumcision was the covenant, and the lamb the Passover, by significacovenant, and the lamb the Passover, by significa-tion and representation, by type and figure. And so the elements are called by THE FATHERS." Then, as instances he names Origen, Eusebius and Augustine. If this does not mean that the Fathers Augustine. If this does not mean that the Fathers held the doctrine of Mr. Andrews, that is, the doctrine of the real absence of our Lord, as against the Catholic doctrine of His Real Presence, we may as well throw our English grammer at once into the Sydenham river. It is a sorry subterfuge, when a bold assertion has been refuted, to deny meaning of words in order to make a seeming point against an adversary. However, be it so. Let us admit that the gentleman did not assert that the Fathers disbelieved in Transubstantitation. Then

I am totally absolved of answering his misquotations However, my dear friends, having thus shown the radical inconsistency of our adversary's arguments from the Fathers, I will, as a superabundance nents from the rathers, I will, as a superabundance of proof, examine in detail the arguments he has founded upon their writings. Mr. Andrews belittles the value of Patristic evidence. Lest he may again say "his sermon contains" nothing of the kind, I will cite his words:—"I am not bound by the utterances of the Fathers, for I do not receive for doctrine the traditions of men." However, he adds, "yet I would certainly listen most respectfully to their opinions, and then compare them with God's word." The early Fathers are the witnesses to the substantiation in their day, it follows that Transubstantiation was not an invention of the 12th and 13th century as Protestant controversialists are so fond of asserting. It follows that Transubstantiation was the doctrine of the pure cludes all the senses as Juoges of the sense of hearing alone. If, therefore, the senses be not constituted as the proper judges of nysteries to pronouuce upon their truth, then all objections from that source fall to the ground. But, urges our opponent, Christ appealed to the senses of His hearers. This of course I do not deny, but to their senses only in things sensible, not in mysteries, their senses only in things sensible, not in mysteries their senses only in things sensible, not in mysteries and confessors of the faith who laid down, or were ready to lay down, their lives for the faith in all its integrity, we would have a universal faith in all its integrity, we would have a universal and indignant protest against the introduction of an idolatrous novelty, as Protestants are so fond of calling the doctrine of the Real Presence. heroes of the early church were not slow in condemning Gnosticism, Marcionism, Arianism, Nestorianism &c. but where are their protests against the Real Presence? They are nowhere to be found, because the Real Presence was always believed by the Church as Christ Himself taught it to the Apostles, the Apostles to the Clements, to Justin, to Ignatius, to Polycarp and others. Are we not bound then to accept their evidence? If not, the sacred Scriptures themselves are justly repudiated by the followers of Voltaire and Paine, men, who admitted not the christian religion and who made it their object to eap ridicule upon the teachings of the Bible. This the very argument which the latter made use of to invalidate the claim of the Bible to be the work of the Apostles. Open the pages of Paley's Evidences of Christianity, or of Stow's History of the Books of the Bible, or of any other Protestant work which treats of the evidences of the authority and inspiration of the New Testament. You will find that these evidences rest upon the authority of these holy Christian writers whom Mr. Andrews virtually says he will not believe if they teach Transubstantia-tion. (How does Mr. A. establish the inspiration of the New Testament. What evidence has he that it is the Word of God? I doubt—indeed I am quite sure that he cannot prove that the New Testament is the inspired Word of God. Where then is his As a matter of fact they do teach this doctrine. I already advanced proof enough from them to show unmistakably their belief. I will add here some more testimonies from some of them which will make the matter still more clear but before doing so I will remove the log which Mr. Andrews will remove the log which Mr. raises over of the passages w raises over of the passages which I quoted. He raises a quibble on the words of St. Ambrose, because that saint does not put the word real before flesh, and say that it is Christ's real flesh. When we go to a shoemaker to buy shoes, is it customary for us to ask for real shoes? or are we not content to ask for shoes simply? yet we would scarcely think ourselves fairly treated if the shoemaker would charge us full price for the shoes while he would only let us take their pictures in a looking glass or their shadow on the wall. However, though it was not necessary for our Blessed Lord to say, "this is my real body, this is my real blood," in order to convey the meaning this is my body, this is my blood," still there is not wanting a passage in the Holy Scripture in which the reality is thus proclaimed, for among the passages which I quoted in my first sermon we find: "For my flesh is meat INDEED and my blood is drink INDEED." "Caro enim mea vere est cibus; My flesh is meat, i. e., food, INDEED, that is in truth, in reality, not in

figure. "Et sanguis meus vere est potus;" and my blood is drink INDEED, that is in truth—vere—in blood is drink INDELD, that is in truth—vere—in reality, not in figure (St. John vi.); and there are passages in the writings of the Fathers also where the reality is expressed in a similar manner; as in the passage from St. Maruthus, which I have already the passage from St. Maruthus, which I have already quoted, and in which the reality is plainly affirmed, and the figurative sense positively spoken of to be rejected. St. Maruthus says: "Now, as we approach the body and blood and receive the same upon our hands, we believe that we embrace the body and the flesh of His flesh and the bone of His bones and the flesh of His flesh and the bone of His bones as it is written; for Christ does not call it a figure and appearance, but He said, this is really my body, and this is my blood."—Comm. in Evang. T. i Bibl. Orient. pa. 179-80. By the way, I hope Mr. A. will be now satisfied with my quotation when I give chapter and verse of my reference. St. Ambrose speaks of the true and real flesh of our Lord when he says "this (the Blessel England) is truly and the says "this (the Blessel England) is truly and the says "this (the Blessel England) is truly and the says "this (the Blessel England) is truly and the says "this (the Blessel England) is truly and the says "this (the Blessel England) is truly and the says "this of the Blessel England). he says, "this (the Blessed Eucharist) is truly or really the sacrament of His flesh." The word sacrament does not mean a figure here, as Rev. Mr. Andrews would make us believe. It means "an external act of Christ's institution, which gives grace." This is always the meaning of this word when Christian writers use it of the seven outward actions of the New Law which by Christ's institution confer grace, and the Blessed Euchanist is one of these. That the New Law which by Christ's institution confer grace, and the Blessed Eucharist is one of these. That St. Ambrose spoke here of the Real Presence of Christ is evident by the comparison which he makes use of, "as the true (real if Mr. A. wishes) Har. A. wishes) flesh of Christ was crucified and was buried, this ALSO is truly (really) the sacrament of His flesh." I quoted, however, the whole context of this passage from St. Ambrose, which clearly shows that this is his meaning. He declares that as the order of nature is not followed in the Incarnation, neither are wetter expect it in the blessed Frankeit. we to expect it in the blessed Eucharist; and it is after this comparison that he says as in the Incarnation Christ's real body suffered, so also the Blessed Eucharist is really the sacrament of this blood. It is therefore clear that St. Ambrose does not teach (as the rev. gentleman says he does) "precisely what the Protestant Churches teach to day." Let me give a few more extracts from the writings of this great luminary of the Church of God. They will make manifest the duplicity of any one who will attempt to press him in to the Protestant camp. "Perhaps thou wilt say, 'I see a different camp. testant camp. "Perhaps thou wilt say, 'I see a different thing; how is it that you assert to me that I shall receive the body of Christ?" "Aliud video, shall receive the body of Christ?" "Aliud video, quomodo tu mihi asseris quod Christi corpus accipiam?" It remains for us to prove this also. How many examples shall we use? Let us prove that this is not what nature formed, but what the benediction has consecrated, and that the force of the benediction is created, and that penediction is greater than the force of nature, bebecame a serpent. (Here St. Ambrose relates many other miracles performed by Moses and Elias.) Now, if a human benediction availed so much to Now, if a human benediction availed so much to change nature, what shall we say concerning the Divine consecration itself, where the very words of the Lord and Saviour operate? For this sacrament which thou receivest is effected by the word of Christ. (Nam Sacramentum istud quod accipis, Christi sermone conficitur.) Now if the word of Elias so availed as to draw down fire from heaven, shall not the word of Christ be of avail to change the natures of the elements? Concerning the the natures of the elements? Concerning the works of the whole world, you have read that, He spoke and they were made; he commanded, and they were created; the word, therefore, of Christ, which could out of nothing make that which was not, cannot it change those things which are into that which they were not? For to give new na-

mana Febr

tures to things is not less than to change their natures."—De Mysteriis, init chap. 9. tures."—De Mysteriis, init chap. 9.
Mr. Andrews endeavors also to weaken the force of St. Augustine's assertion. St. Augustine says:
"You ought to understand what you have received, what you are about to receive, and what you ought to receive every day. The bread which you behold on the altar, sanctified by the word of God, is the body of Christ. That cup—that which the cup contains—sanctified by the word of God, is the blood of Christ. By these the Lord was willing to set forth His body and blood which was shed for Paul says: "Faith then cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of Christ." I call upon Mr. Andrews to prove that Transubstantiation is not a mystery. I call on him to show that we are not to believe the doctrine because it appears opposed to the evidence of some of the senses, though we are told that the church believed Transubstantial the state of the blood of Christ. By these the Lord was willing to set forth His body and blood, which was shed for us for the remission of sins." Mr. Andrews tells us that because St. Augustine does not say here that the doctrine because it appears opposed to the evidence of some of the senses, though we are told the doctrine because it appears opposed to the exclusion of the early Fathers are the witnesses to the teaching of the early Church. They are the historians who attest the doctrines of the church at a time when even Protestants claim that the Church was believe the doctrine because it appears opposed to the early Church. They are the historians who attest the doctrines of the church at a time when even Protestants claim that the Church was prove that Transubstantiation is not a mystery. I call on him to show that we are not to believe the doctrine because it appears opposed to the even Protestants claim that the Church was prove the control of the church at a time when even Protestants claim that the church at a time when even Protestants claim that the universal church state is the blood of Christ. By these the Lord was willing to set forth His body and blood, which was shed for us for the remission of sins." Mr. Andrews tells us that because St. Augustine does not say here that the church at a time when even Protestants claim that the Church was proved the section of sins." Mr. Andrews tells us that because it appears opposed to the early Church. They are the historian as who attent the doctrine at time to set forth His body and blood, which was shed for us for the church at a time to set for the remission of sins." Mr. Andrews tells us that because St. Augustine d enumerated by every writer on the subject. times the Fathers and liturgies assert that the change takes place; sometimes they refer to the ex-istence of bread before consecration; sometimes to the presence of our Lord after consecration, and sometimes they mention all these circumstances. It is a mere quibble to play upon the silence of the Christian Fathers on some one of the particular circumstances. cumstances in a particular passage, for these circumstances mutually imply one another in view of the doctrine which all believed, the doctrine of Transubstantiation as Catholics believe it to-day. The other quotations from St. Augustine, which I adduced, Mr. Andrews has not even attempted to explain away. It shows that great Doctor's belief in the Real Presence, and it shows that Mr. A.'s interpretation of the former passage is but a misrepresenta-tion of that learned and plain speaking Father's words. St. Augustine thus explicitly remarks: "When committing to us His body He saith 'Theis is my body,' Christ held Himself in His own hands—He my body, 'Christ held Himself in His own hands—He bore that body in His hands.' I could quote many other passages from St. Augustine to show that his belief was unmistakable in the Real Presence, but I quoted also do not wish to make this too long. I quoted also from Origen the following passages: "You that have been accustomed to be present at the Divine Mysteries, know when you receive the body of the Lord, with what care and veneration you preserve it, lest any particle of it fall to the ground or be lost. it, lest any particle of it fall to the ground of And you think yourselves guilty, and with reason, if it should so happen through your negligence." And again: "In former times, Baptism was obscurely represented in the clouds and in the sea; but now regeneration is in kind, in water and the Holy Spirit. Then, obscurely manna was the food; but now in kind, the flesh of the word of God is true food—even as He said: 'My flesh is meat indeed, and the blood is drink indeed." I selected these passages because the rev. gentleman claimed him as teaching the Protestant doctrine. He now him as teaching the Protestant doctrine. He now repudiates Origen's evidence on the plea that he was "hardly a good authority surely." Origen was a vigorous and original writer, and he fell into certain abstruse errors on the orign of the soul, on the relation between Christ's divinity and lumanity, and other metaphysical subjects. He erred, but he and other metaphysical subjects. He erred, but he does not seem to have been an intentional or pertinacious heretic. He is not numbered among the saints of the Church, probably on this account. However, when he attests the plain and well-known doctrine of the Church on an unmistakeable point, his testimony is very valuable, more particularly on account of the early period of his writings, A. D. 212. His testimony in favor of the Real is most clear, and the only way my antagonist can evade it is by calling him a heretic, even though himself was the first to quote him. Here is what Origen elsewhere says: In Hom. 5, De puero Centurionis. "When you partake of the sacred food, and this heavanly banquet, when you receive the bread of life and the cup of salvation, you cat and drink the body and blood of the Lord, and then indeed doth the Lord enter under your roof. With the humility of the centurion say thus from your heart, "Lord I am not worthy thou should enter

But the Rev. Mr. Andrews claims to have found in Origen the doctrine of the REAL about

Continued on 2nd page.