

work of reason. He says, that Paul and Peter and John, and the other Apostles, would not have consumed their lives and finally sacrificed them in testifying to a falsehood. This inference is an act of reason. Faith in the New Testament, then, is built on reason. And if it were not, it would be mere credulity.

In the second place, we must use reason in finding out what the Bible teaches. All sects do this, even those who disclaim reason most vehemently. All sects use it till it begins to press upon their peculiar doctrines, and then they discard it. The Catholic uses it. He reads in the New Testament where Christ calls himself a "vine." Is he to receive this literally or figuratively? If he is not allowed to use reason, he must believe that Christ was literally a *vine*, that he was planted in the earth and had roots and branches; and the only reason he can give why he does not so receive it is, that it is not reasonable to believe that this was Christ's meaning. Upon the strength of reason he rejects the literal meaning. But when he comes to the passage, "This is my body," he refuses to use his reason, and says that this assertion must be interpreted literally, and he must believe that it was the real flesh of Christ. The Trinitarian Protestant insists on using his reason in the same way, in this case, that the Catholic did in regard to the assertion of Christ that he was a vine. He judges that it is more reasonable to believe that Christ meant to say, that the bread represented his body, as his body was present unbroken and unchanged.

But there is a limit to *his* application of reason to the interpretation of Scripture, as well as to the Catholic's. Christ said, on a certain occasion, — "I and the Father are one." He insists that this passage must be interpreted