

and me; for with great anxiety did I examine this point, and labour with all my force to get clear of the difficulties, because by this means I knew very well, I should terribly incommode the Papists. But I find I am caught, without hopes of escaping for the texts of the Gospel are so clear, as not to be susceptible of misconstruction." Later Reformers were not so scrupulous, but soon got over the difficulty by cutting the Gordian knot.

This, indeed, is an easy way to get over all the difficulties we meet in the Gospel, a way pretty generally followed by the philosophers of the day. But, dear sir I hope you will not accuse us of superstition for taking a safer way, that of simply believing even where we cannot understand. How! believing the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, in believing that we receive the flesh and blood of Christ, in believing that we receive Christ himself in believing that the substance of the bread and wine is changed into the substance of the flesh and blood of Christ; so far from being guilty of superstition we have the satisfaction to know, that we believe precisely what Christ commands us to believe; what almost all Christendom, these eighteen hundred years always did believe; and what at present, by far the greatest part of the Christian World, above one hundred and thirty millions, including the Greek Church, do believe.

I will suppose for a while, sir, that I am wavering, perplexed, uncertain what to believe, on the subject of the Eucharist, and that I apply to you as a minister of Christ, in order to have my doubts resolved; my difficulties removed, and certainty fixed in my mind, what would you tell me, what security could you offer, in order to induce me to reject the tremendous weight of authority, which undoubtedly favours the Catholic doctrine of the Eucharist, and to persuade me that I ought to believe there is nothing in the Sacrament but bread and wine?

You will appeal to my senses, my eyes, my taste, &c. I confess, indeed, sir, that the senses of my body discover nothing in the Sacrament but bread and wine, and that I do not see, nor taste the flesh and blood of Christ. But, sir, Christ tells me, Blessed are they that have not seen and have believed." John. xx. 29.

I would then incline to say with St. Thomas of Aquinas,

In touch, taste, sight, although deceived we be  
The word of God is quite enough for me;  
What God declares is true, I must believe;  
The word of Truth itself cannot deceive.

With nearly all Christendom, for eighteen centuries, I will sooner believe the testimony of my divine Saviour, than the testimony of my senses; to speak more correctly, I am obliged to disbelieve the testimony of my senses, for you know, sir, that what we perceive of any thing, by our senses, is not the substance of the thing itself, but mere accidents, such as form, colour, taste, size. Now, it is very evident that God, to whom nothing is impossible, may very easily change the substance of a thing, and yet continue the accidents, or cause it to make upon my senses the same impression which it did before. This is precisely what Catholics believe of the Eucharist.

Good God! shall we say that Christ has no other way to make his word good, and to give us his flesh and blood, than to reach them to us in their natural form and appearance? Humanity shudders at the thought, and common sense naturally suggests the reason, why that sacred food of our souls is given us under the form of the most simple food of the body. You will tell me, perhaps, that according to our doctrines, the body of Christ must be present in a great many places at the same time, which is impossible.

In answer to this objection, I refer you to the system of the most celebrated protestant philosopher; Mr. Leibnitz, who, besides many others,

from the most generally acknowledged principles of metaphysics, and from observations made in natural philosophy, clearly shows, that this seeming mystery, the existence of the same body in many places, cannot be proved impossible. But, sir, admitting it to be impossible for a body in its present corruptible state, can the same be said of a glorified body, which St. Paul calls, "a spiritual body?" Can it be said especially of the glorified body of Christ? Pray, sir, do you know anything at all about the nature of glorified bodies? I must confess I do not; and whilst we are totally ignorant about the nature of a glorified or spiritual body, it appears to me vain, to form any opinion about what is possible or impossible for such a body. When I see the glorified body of Christ, passing through a door that was shut, John xx. 19; I am willing to believe, that the same body may be present, in thousands and millions of places at once; I am willing to believe, that that same body may feed my soul, and yet continue glorious in Heaven; if such is the will of God, although I cannot comprehend, far less explain, how it can be.

Archbishop Cranmer owns, that Christ may be in the bread and wine, as also in the doors that were shut. Answ. to Gardiner and Smyth, page 454.

John Fox says, that Christ abiding in Heaven is not let, but he may be in the sacrament also. Acts and Modum, page 998.

Melancthon says, "I had rather die than affirm, that Christ's body can be but in one place."

I am sensible, sir, that human reason once seated on the tribunal, to judge of the truth or falsehood of revealed mysteries, and guided only by itself, will find a great many more objections. But, sir, as the raging waves, after having beaten against the majestic rock, which rises from the bottom of the sea, return in harmless froth; so likewise will all the weak productions of human reason, when beating against the majestic fabric which Christ has raised.

I beg leave here to quote the testimony of three celebrated Protestants Divines, in favor of the Catholic doctrine.

"The adoration of the Eucharist (says Mr. Thorndike) was the practice of the ancient and true Church, before receiving." Epil. L. iii. c. 30. And I, (says the Protestant Bishop Andrews,) with St. Ambrose, adore the flesh of Christ in the mysteries." Andrews to Bel. chap. 8. "The external adoration of Christ in the Eucharist (says the Protestant Bishop Forbes) is the practice of sounder Protestants, and to deny such adoration is a monstrous error of rigid Protestants."—Forbes de Euchar. L. 2.

You will object perhaps to the following words of Christ: "It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing; the words that I have spoken to you, are spirit and life." John vi. 4.

St. Augustine explains these words in his 27th Treatise on St. John.

"What means the flesh profits nothing?—It profits nothing, as they understood it; for they understood flesh as it is torn to pieces in a dead body, or sold in the shambles; and not as it is animated by the Spirit. Wherefore it is said, *the flesh profiteth nothing*, in the same manner as it is said, *knowledge puffeth up*." 1 Cor. viii. 1. "Must we then fly from knowledge? God forbid: What then means knowledge puffeth up? That is, if it be all

one, without charity; therefore the apostle added, but charity edifieth. Join therefore charity to knowledge, and knowledge will be profitable, not by itself, but thro' charity; so here also *the flesh profiteth nothing*, viz. the flesh alone: let the spirit be joined with the flesh, as charity is to be joined with knowledge, and then it profits much. For it the flesh profiteth nothing, the word (Christ) would not have been made flesh, that he might dwell in us." So far St. Aug.

Besides flesh and blood is often mentioned in scripture for the corruption of our nature, as when it is said, "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God." 1 Cor. xv. 30. and, "flesh and blood hath not revealed it unto thee" Matt. xvi. 17. And in this sense, the flesh profiteth nothing, but it is the spirit and grace of God that quickeneth and giveth life to our souls.

God forbid that we should say the flesh of Christ profits nothing—this would be a blasphemy; and it is evident, that Christ asserting that flesh profits nothing, did not mean his flesh, for this would be contradicting his own assertion, "my flesh is meat indeed."

Our doctrine on the Eucharist is further confirmed by the ancient figures or types of that sacrament; they were manifold. I shall only notice three of them viz. the Paschal Lamb, the Blood of the Testament, and the Manna. 1. The Paschal Lamb. That this was a figure of Christ, the Lamb of God, is acknowledged on all hands. The Paschal Lamb was killed at the going out of the land of Egypt, on the journey to the land of promise.

The Lamb of God is killed, and we are delivered from a more than Egyptian darkness, and introduced into the road to the real land of promise.

The Paschal Lamb is eaten. Exod. xii. 8; so likewise must the Lamb of God be eaten to accomplish the figure. The Paschal Lamb had no blemish. Exod. xii. 5; the Lamb of God is pure and immaculate by excellence. The blood of the Paschal Lamb was a sign of salvation. Exod. xii. 13; the blood of the Lamb of God is salvation itself.

The sacrament of the Eucharist was instituted by our Saviour, immediately after eating the Paschal Lamb with his disciples; the figure was then accomplished, and the substance substituted to the figure.

2. The blood of the Testament, the blood of victims solemnly sacrificed to God, was a figure of the blood of Christ in the sacrament, appears evident from the words of Christ, in administering that sacred blood.

Moses said to the people, "This is the blood of the testament, which God hath enjoined to you." Exod. xxiv. and Heb. ix.

Jesus Christ said to his disciples, "This is my blood of the new testament." &c. Matt. xxvi. 28.

3. That Manna was a figure of the sacraments of the flesh and blood of Christ, appears from John vi. 58. "Your Fathers did eat Manna, and are dead; he that eateth of this bread shall live for ever." Likewise from 1 Cor. x. 3.