

Moreover, our Saviour knew that the apostles would not speak of figure either in their writings or in their discourses: that upon the faith of their word written and unwritten, the christians would enter into the sense of the reality: he knew also that in the course of ages a time would come when a great number would rise up against this hitherto universal doctrine: he saw the actual separation that this produced or at least strengthened; he heard the quarrels and disputes which so miserably divide us: he heard some bring forward reason and the senses against his words, maintain that the Eucharistic bread could be nothing but the figure of his body, others, establishing themselves upon these same words, maintain that it was his true and real body: and in spite of this foreknowledge, in spite of the different interpretations he hears given to his expressions, and of all the evils derived from them, he permits that all the sacred writers whom he inspires should always speak of *his body* and never of the figure of his body. Can any thing be so strange and incomprehensible as this conduct of our Saviour? Where could be his goodness, his justice, and his tenderness for his church? and would he not have led us himself astray, if these words, *flesh meat indeed, blood drink indeed, body, blood of Jesus Christ*, which we read in his Testament, were only to express error, while the words *sign and figure*, which are read no where, were alone to open to us the true sense of the revelation?

I remark another singularity quite as striking in your teachers. One of the principles they are for ever bringing forward, and the one on which the reformation has been erected, is that we cannot be obliged to believe or practise any thing but what is contained in the scriptures or clearly deduced therefrom. We have just seen that there does not exist a single passage in the holy scriptures, which even authorizes the figure, far from demonstrating it: it cannot therefore be deduced from it; much less can it be read there: for the word figure is no where read with the Eucharist. St. John, in the discourse of the promise, always announces a real manducation, flesh to be eaten that was meat indeed, blood to be drunk that was drink indeed, the flesh which was to be delivered, the blood which was to be shed: the three evangelists relating the fulfilment of the promise, speak of the body that is delivered, of the blood that is shed, St. Paul repeats the same words, according to the immediate revelation he had received from our Saviour. The word figure is no where heard: but every thing reechoes with the words, *body of Jesus Christ, blood of Jesus Christ*: it is Jesus Christ whom we receive, his body of which we participate: it is of his body and blood we render ourselves guilty by an unworthy participation. What therefore becomes now of the grand principle of your reformation? and by what forgetfulness or rather by what a contradiction do your reformers persist so obstinately in rejecting the body and the blood, of which the scripture is always speaking, to admit a sign, a figure; which is no where to be found therein?

Thanks to divine Providence, the doctrine of the reality has been preserved and always defended in the most considerable society of protestantism. Luther, which it acknowledges as its head, and from whom it boasts to derive its name, never shewed to greater advantage the strength of mind and vehemence of language which he joined to a turbulent and impetuous temper, than in the defence of the literal sense against the new sacramentarians. He could not help paying a tribute of honor to himself on this score, with a modesty of which you shall be the judge: "The papists themselves are obliged to give me the praise of having defended better than they the doctrine of the literal sense. And I am certain were they all melted up together, they would not be able to support it as forcibly as I do." Luther was mistaken, as we shall see in the following article: it is certain, however, that he remained constantly attached to the literal sense, and that the sacramentarians, unable to soften the inflexibility of his principles, have often been constrained to come nearer to them and to affect his language in the agreements they attempted to make with him at Wittenberg and at Smalkald.*

But I will now present you with a confession of faith that shall exceedingly surprise you: you are about to hear the Calvinists express themselves as forcibly as the Lutherans and the Catholics on the real presence: and one might take them to be zealous defenders of it, if we knew nothing of their variations. Beza and Farel, were charged by the reformed Churches of France to carry it to Worms, where the states of the confession of Augsburg were assembled. It is there said, "that

*These agreements, in which sincerity had less to do than policy, could not be of long duration, and Luther again commenced with increased fury his old abusive attacks upon them. He treated them in his *Short Confession of Faith* "as fools, blasphemers, a worthless tribe, damned wretches, for whom it was not lawful to pray." He there protested that "he would have no communication with them either by letter, by words, or by works, if they did not acknowledge that the Eucharistic bread was the true natural body of our Lord.—It is as indifferent to me (said he again), whether I am praised or blamed by the fanatic Zuinglians or other such people, as it is to be praised or blamed by the Turk, the Pope or by all the devils; for being near unto death, I am desirous of carrying this glory and this testimony to the tribunal of Jesus Christ, that I have with my whole heart condemned Carlostadius, Zuinglius, Ecolampadius, and other fanatical enemies of the sacrament, together with all their disciples who are at Zurich: and every day in our discourses do we condemn their heresy full of blasphemies and impostures." Upon this the Swiss warmly retorted. They issued out against him a manifesto, in which they told him in plain terms, "that he was nothing but an old fool: that men must be as mad as himself to endure his angry effusions; that he dishonoured his old age: that he rendered himself contemptible by his violent conduct: and that he ought to be ashamed to fill his books with so much abusive language and so many devils." Indeed Luther had taken care to put the devil within and without, above and below before and behind the Zuinglians, by inventing new phrases to penetrate them with demons, and repeating this odious word till men were filled with horror, as Bossuet observes on this passage.

in the Lord's Supper are received not only the benefits of Jesus Christ, but his substance even and his own flesh: that the body of the Son of God is not proposed to use in it in figure only and by signification symbolically as a memorial of Jesus Christ absent, but that he is truly and really made present; with the symbols, which are not simple signs. And if we add (said they,) that the manner in which this body is given to us is symbolical and sacramental, it is not that it is merely figurative, but because, under the species of visible things, God offers us, gives us, and makes present for us, together with the symbols, that which is there signified to us. This we say, in order that it may appear that we retain in the Lord's Supper the presence of the true body and blood of Jesus Christ, and that if there remain any dispute, it will no longer refer to any thing but the manner." Let people hold to this declaration and disputes would easily be terminated. But why should I thus accumulate foreign authorities, while I can shew the same doctrines to have been supported in your country, by the most distinguished members of your Church, particularly in the reigns of Elizabeth, James, and Charles I. ? "You and I," said Bishop Ridley, in the reign of Edward IV. to the catholics, "agree in this, that in the sacrament is the very true and natural body and blood of Jesus Christ, even that which was born of the Virgin Mary, which ascended into heaven, which sits on the right hand of God the Father, &c. we only differ in the way and manner of being there."

Hooker, in his *Ecclesiastical Polity*, says that they, who in his time, held different opinions respecting the sacrament were still found to accord in one: for "They grant (says he), that these holy mysteries received in due manner, do instrumentally both make us partakers of the grace of that body and blood, which were given for the life of the world: and besides also impart unto us, even in a true and real, though mystical manner, the very person of our Lord himself, whole perfect, & entire."

"We believe, no less than you, in a true and real presence," said James I. and Bishop Andrews. The same was said by Casaubon in his letter written by order of the Kings to the Cardinal du Peron.

We will now hear Bishop Montague on this subject. The contents of Chapter XXX. of his appeal are as follows. "A real presence maintained by us. The difference betwixt us, and the Popish writers is only about the *Modus*, the manner of Christ's presence in the Blessed Sacrament. A agreement likely to be made, but for the factious and unquiet spirits on both sides. Beati Pacifici." In the body of the chapter is the following passage. "Concerning this point I said, and say so still, that if men were disposed, as they ought, unto peace, there need be no difference. And I added a reason, which I repeat again here; the disagreement is only in *De modo presentia* (the manner of the presence.) The thing is yielded to on either side, that there is in the holy Eucharist a real presence.

Another of your Bishops exclaims: "God forbid we should deny, that the flesh and blood of Christ, are truly present, and truly received of the faithful at the Lord's table. It is the doctrine that we teach others, and comfort ourselves withall."

"In the explication of this question and the manner of the real presence it is much insisted upon, that it be inquired, whether, when we say that we believe Christ's body to be really in the sacrament, we mean that body, that flesh that was born of the Virgin Mary, that was crucified, dead and buried. I answer that I know none else that he hath or had: there is but one body of Christ natural & glorified: but he that says that body is glorified which was crucified, says it is the same body, but not after the same manner: and so it is in the Sacrament: we eat and drink the body and blood of Christ that was