

ed His Blood in wine, who then (under the Old Law) *prefigured* wine in his Blood." Is not this an exactly similar passage to the one objected, though it is quite evident that the meaning of Tertullian is, not that our Saviour prefigured wine in his blood, i. e. made his Blood a figure of wine, in the Old Law, but that he made wine under the old dispensation, a Figure of His Blood in the New?

But let us continue to its close, the objected passage which we have quoted at length in the beginning of this article. *Figura autem non fuisset, nisi veritatis esset corpus.* But it (the Bread) would not have been a Figure, unless the Body were a true and real Body." Here we have Tertullian's meaning beyond all doubt. His avowed object throughout the Book is to prove against Marcion that Christ did not destroy the old Law, but that all its Figures were truly and really accomplished in him. Hence taking it for granted that Bread in the Old Law was a Figure of Christ's Body in the New (as he shews a little after by a quotation from Jeremias) he very properly reasons that unless Christ's Body were now a *True Body*, Bread would not have been a Figure of it in the Old Law. For, the figure, sign or resemblance of any thing which had no real existence, would be an absurdity. The very tenses in which the verbs are written *Fuisset*, applied to the Figure, and *Esset* to the Real Body prove clearly that Tertullian referred the words *figura corporis mei* to the Bread in the Old Law, and not to his Eucharistic Body in the New.

This interpretation is still further confirmed by the subsequent passages of the writer in question:

"Cur panem Corpus suum appellat, et non magis peponem, quem Marcion cordis locohabuit, non intelligens veterem fuisse istam figuram Corporis Christi, dicentis per Hieremiam. Venite concipiamus lignum in PANEM ejus, scilicet crucem in Corpus ejus. Itaque illuminator antiquitatum (Christus) quid tunc voluerit significasse panem, satis declaravit, Corpus suum vocans panem. Tertullian here declares that Christ calls his Body, Bread and not a *Cucumber*, or any other sort of food, because Bread was an ancient Figure of Christ's Body, as we read in Jeremias "Come let us cast wood on his bread," that is, the Cross on His Body, and in calling Bread his Body He the expounder of the ancient law, sufficiently declared what he wished Bread to signify in those days of old." Therefore, Christ did not institute in the Eucharist the figure of his Body, but he accomplished the figures of the old law by changing bread into his body. For the bread and wine offered by Melchisedech, the manna, the bread that came down from heaven, as well as the Show Bread in the temple, and the Bread with which Elias was miraculously fed in the wilderness were all figures of Christ's Body in the Eucharist. But, if in this Sacrament Christ has left us only mere Bread, in what would the substance and reality of the New Law, be superior to the figure and shadow of the Old?

For further elucidation, though we hardly think it necessary we add another sentence from the context. Tertullian explaining the prophecy of Jacob (Genes. 49.) writes thus

"Lavabo in vino stolam suam, et in sanguine uxoris pallium suum. Stola Carnem demonstrat, et Vinum Sanguinem. Haec et nunc SANGUINEM suum in vino CONSECRAVIT, qui tunc vinum in sanguine figuravit.

Thus as in Jeremias, Bread prefigured the Body of the Lord, which is the food of the faithful, so in the prophecy of Jacob, wine prefigured His blood which is their drink. Christ therefore in order to illustrate and accomplish those figures delivered his

Body under the appearance of Bread, and his Blood under the appearance of wine. But if he had not given us his real body and his real blood, he would neither have fulfilled, nor explained, the prophecies and figures, and moreover Tertullian would have failed in his argument against Marcion.

The Centurions of Magdeburg admit that Tertullian is an advocate for the Real Presence, and if the correspondent or the people of the Times who have lately entered into a holy league with the Guardian, have any respect for the opinion or Latin scholarship of Jack of Geneva, we can inform them that Calvin, though the mortal enemy of the Real Presence, admits the grammatical and logical accuracy of the mode in which we have explained the objected passage.

Having said so much in answer to this objection, we now proceed to prove to the Layman and the Times that they cannot claim Tertullian as the champion of a figurative presence in the Eucharist. We will best do this by some quotations on that subject, which, to save time and space, we will give in his own words, as this dry controversy can have little interest for those who are not "fond of" or at least do not understand the Latin language.

In lib. 2 ad Uxorem Tertullian exhorts Catholic females not to marry Pagan husbands, and amongst other arguments deduces one from the Catholic practice of receiving the Eucharist.

"Non sciet maritus quid secreto ante omnem cibum gustes. et si sciverit, panem, non illum credit esse qui dicitur." This passage also proves that the Eucharist was received in those days fasting according to the present universal custom of the Catholic Church.

"Calicis, aut panis etiam nostri aliquid decuti in terram, anxie patimur." Lib de Corona milit.

"Caro abluatur (in Baptism) ut anima emaculetur; caro inungitur (in confirmation) ut anima consecretur; caro corpore et sanguine Christi vestitur (in the Eucharist) ut anima de Deo sanguinetur."

Was ever clearer testimony than this?

In his Book de Idololatria, censuring certain persons who promoted Idol makers to the priesthood or to deaconship, he exclaims.

"Proh scelus! semel Judei Christo manus intulerant; isti quondam Corpus ejus inaccessunt. O manus praevidendae!"

In his poetical Book against Marcion, the very objected passage is thus given by Tertullian:

"Acceptum panem pariter vitisque liquorem
Corpus aut sanguisque meus qui funditur hic est
Pro vobis; fieri semper quod postea jussit;
Quave creatura panem vinumque putat,
Esse suum Corpus cum Sanguine. Lib. v. adv Marc.

In the last chapter of his Book on Prayer he says, "quod statuo solvenda sit accepto Corpore Domini. Ergo devotum Deo obsequium Eucharistia resolvit, an magis Deo obligat? Nonne solemnior erit statio tua, si et ad aram Dei steteris? Accepto corpore Domini et reservato, utrumque saluum est, et participatio mysterii et excusatio officii."

One more and we will have done.

"Atque ita exinde ornate domum corporis vestitur." Lib de Pudicitia.

So far for the objection from Tertullian, which ought certainly to have been considered a forlorn hope when it was abandoned by Calvin.

The objector has made some allusion to the Greek Testament which we do not fully understand, though the Catholic doctrine has as little to fear on this ground, as from the Latin of Tertullian. He talks of the *original*. We hope he does not mean to assert that Christ spoke Greek at the last supper. He ought to know before he presumes to meddle with such subjects, that according to the general consent of Biblical scholars, our Saviour spoke in Syro-Chaldaic, and that it was in that language the words of the Institution were pronounced. It is true that many Protestant writers including Adam Clarke, Horne, &c., endeavored to elude the force of the words *This is my body*, by asserting that in the Syro-Chaldaic there was no verb signifying *to represent*, and that hence our Lord was obliged to use the verb *is*, for *signifies*, *represents* or *denotes*, and that it is in this