

do these ministers account for the fact, that in no one passage of any inspired document is the peculiar doctrine set forth as a motive to kindle a love of Jesus, or as an evidence of His love? How do they account for the fact that in no inspired writing is the doctrine even noticed at all? That fact is not the less a fact because St. Paul, for a special purpose, related to his Corinthian converts what he had "received of the Lord." His language is substantially what the three Evangelists have written of our Lord's words in question, but he has not given any direct explanation of their meaning. The sacred rite had been perverted by treating it as a common meal. To the offenders &c. Paul attributes a negative transgression. His words are "What shall I say to you? Shall I praise you in this? I praise you not." But, assuming the doctrine of a real presence to have had *in his judgment* a Divine foundation, the offence censured was a heinous crime, and it should have been stigmatised as such.

In another place St. Paul has written "yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet henceforth *know we him no more*" Nothing qualifies this, and on no occasion of his addressing his converts does inspiration appear to have suggested to him that our Lord, though no longer known in the flesh, *is in any peculiar sense known to him who in the communions of the body and of the blood of Christ. "eats his body," or "drinks his blood."*

St. Peter writes of Jesus thus, "Who is gone into Heaven, and *is on the right hand of God*" Not a word is added by that Apostle, there or elsewhere, to intimate his belief of a personal presence in any sense or under any circumstances of his Lord on Earth.

Would not this silence of the inspired writers, especially that of those whose minds were brought to the very subject of Christ's absence from this world, in relation to his former presence in it, on the supposition that the doctrine is true, be utterly inexplicable? There would be no conceivable motive that could have swayed the Apostles' minds to suppress mention of the doctrine, if of God. That it never occurred to them, or that it was never suggested to them when they wrote, is, on the hypothesis of its truth, absolutely inadmissible in idea.

But, with regard to St. Paul, the question, whether or not he considered the peculiar doctrine to be of God, does not rest on an inference from silence or on negative testimony. *It is certain that he did not recognise it as such.* To Him the mode of the institution was a subject of special revelation. *That he relates in 1 Cor. xi. v. 23. 24. 25. And then he adds, "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do shew the Lord's death till he come."* The language of this verse may be a part of the revelation or the words of the Apostle. Assume it to be the latter, as it probably is. Speaking of *the consecrated elements*, he calls the bread "*bread*," without any allusion to our *Lord's body*; and he declares the institution to be *commemorative*. No language of his can be cited from any writing of his to shew that he regarded the institution in any other