

which shall be shed for you;" they could not reasonably understand it in any other sense than as he had promised; namely, as his real flesh and blood, which he had told both them and the Jews, were meat and drink indeed.

Again; would our Redeemer, who came to die for all mankind, and who commanded his followers to avoid, with all possible care, even the least occasion of scandal, would he, if he had spoken only of figurative eating and drinking of his flesh and blood, have neglected to explain himself, when he saw not only the Jews, but even some of his disciples, so far shocked at this, his promise, as even to forsake him? How much less, when he fore-saw that his whole visible church upon earth would be involved, on that supposition, during many ages, in so gross an error and so serious an inconvenience? This cannot be admitted on any prudential grounds whatever.

In vain would Protestants contend—that it is a usual thing in Scripture, and common in discourse, to give to the sign the name of the thing signified. For when a thing neither naturally represents another, nor is known to be used as the representation of another, it is contrary to all laws of discourse, and highly absurd, to give it the name of what you intended it to signify, without first preparing the minds of the hearers. This would evidently be the case in the present instance, as the fact of the whole church of Christ for ages being led astray by the supposed omission, plainly demonstrates.

But some may still object—although we should suppose our blessed Saviour to be truly present in the sacrament, what need of allowing transubstantiation, or a change of bread & wine into his body and blood? May not his words signify, that his body and blood are given in and with the bread and wine, agreeably to Luther's doctrine! To this I answer—If our Lord had intended to give us his body and blood in or with the bread and wine, he should have said—Here is my body, in this is my blood. Whereas he did say—This is my body—words which could not by any means be verified, without a substantial change of the bread into his body. When he changed water into wine at the marriage feast of Cana, had he said this is wine, would not these words evidently have implied a substantial change of what was in the vessels into wine? The present case is exactly similar.

It is also objected, that St. Paul calls the sacrament, after consecration, bread. (1 Cor. xi.) and consequently excludes all idea of a change. This argument is but very weak; first, because the Scripture sometimes calls things after their change by the name which they had before, though it positively affirms them to have been substantially changed. Thus, though the water was changed into wine at Cana, the Evangelist calls it water made wine, (John ii. 9.) Thus again, (Exod. ii.) that Aaron's and the magicians, rods were changed into serpents: yet after the change, it calls them rods: *Aaron's rod devoured the magicians, rods.* The Scripture also frequently gives a thing the name of what it resembles. For instance, angels

are called men in the sixteenth chapter of St. Mark; the fourteenth chapter of St. Luke, and in various other passages of Scripture, because they appeared under the disguise of men. It ought not, therefore, to seem extraordinary if St. Paul calls the sacrament bread; since it has still the outward appearance of bread, and was in reality bread before the all-powerful hand of God had wrought the change.

Hitherto a short statement of scriptural authority relative to the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation and the real presence, has been given; it remains that we briefly examine the sentiments of the primitive fathers and doctors of the church on this subject. In the second age, St. Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, a disciple of the Apostles who suffered martyrdom about the year 107, and certainly could not but know the meaning of their doctrine; in his epistle to the Christians of Smyrna, calls the Eucharist "the flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ, which suffered for our sins, and which the Father raised by his bounty." In the same age St. Justin, martyr, in his apology to the heathen emperor for the Christian religion, affirms, "That as our Saviour Jesus Christ was himself by the word made flesh, and took for our salvation both flesh and blood; so we are taught, that the Eucharist is the flesh and blood of the same Jesus incarnate." (Apol. 2 ad Antonin.) Would any man possessed of common understanding, write thus to a heathen, if he understood the words of Christ in a figurative sense? Contemporary with Justin, though somewhat younger, St. Irenæus, in his fifth book against heresies, speaking of the bread and wine, says; "by the word of God they are made the Eucharist, which is the Body and blood of Christ."

In the third age, St. Cyprian, in his sermon of the Lord's Supper, says;—"The bread which our Lord gave to his disciples, being changed—not in shape but in substance—by the omnipotency of the word, is made flesh." He likewise says that in the Eucharist "we eat the body of Christ, and drink his blood." (Lib. de orat. Dom.) About the same time, the learned Origen tells us, (Hom 7, in Lev. it.) "that in the Old law, the manna was a figurative food, but now the flesh of God, the Son made man, is meat in reality, as he himself says—my flesh is meat indeed." And their contemporary—though a little older than the two last mentioned fathers—Tertullian, says; [1. 4. cont. Marcion. c. 40.] "The bread which Christ took at his last supper, and distributed to his disciples, he changed into his body."

In the fourth age after St. Basil, St. Gregory Nazianzen, St. Gregory Nyssen, St. Ephrem, St. James of Nisibis, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, &c. the great St. Chrysostom delivers—if possible, in still clearer terms—the doctrine of the Catholic church upon the point in question. "Let us always," says he, "believe Almighty God; nor contradict Him, though what he says, seemed contradictory to our reason and sense. His word cannot deceive us; our senses are easily mistaken: His words never err; our senses frequently beguile us: since therefore, He says—this is my body; let us rest convinced it is so. He who did these things at his last supper, still continues to do the same: wo-

are only his ministers: it is he who sanctifies it; it is He who changes these things." [Hom. 83. in Matt.] St. Chrysostom's words are equally plain in numerous passages of his excellent works, "How many now exclaim, Oh! that I could see him in his natural state, or his apparel only! you desire to see his apparel; whereas, he gives you himself not to be seen only, but to be embraced by you, to be eaten, to be received within you—Oh! how pure ought not that tongue to be, which is purpled with his adorable blood?" [Hom. 87. p. 787. t. 7. ed. Ben.] Can any thing be stronger or more decisive in favor of the Catholic doctrine?

St. Ambrose, another great doctor and father of the same age, writes thus, [Lib. de his qui Mysteriis initiantur, c. ix.] "Perhaps you will say, I see quite another thing; how can you assure me that I receive the body of Christ?—If the words of Elias were powerful enough to command fire from heaven, shall not the words of Christ be able to change the nature of the elements? You have read of the whole creation—*He said and they were made he commanded and they were created.* Cannot then the word of Christ which made out of nothing that which was not, change those things which are, into what they were not."

## BIBLICAL NOTICES AND EXPLANATIONS.

Continued.

## THE THIRD BOOK OF KINGS.

Chapter 18 Verse 31. *And he took twelve stones, according to the number of the tribes of Jacob, &c.* The twelve patriarchs were, as we observed before, the carnal fathers of the people of God; the twelve apostles are their spiritual fathers; On these last, as on twelve stones, is built the altar of the Lord, the church of Christ; in which supreme worship is offered in sacrifice to the deity. On the former was built the synagogue, the temporal figure of Messiah's church.

Verse 33. *And laid it on the wood.* The victim to be offered, was, like the Saviour, (whom every victim in some sense or other represented,) laid upon the wood. He was laid upon the wood of the cross.

Verse 34. The four buckets of water, represent the purifying water of baptism imparted to mankind in all the four quarters of the globe. The water was thrice poured out; because poured out in the name of the most blessed trinity,—when all the water is poured out; when all, in every quarter of this world, that are to be saved, are finally baptized: when the number of the elect is completed: when the trench round about the altar is filled with water; then will descend the final all consuming fire; and all at last shall know that the Lord is God: v. 39, and the wicked shall be destroyed, like the priests of Baal.

Verses 43, 41. We find here again the number seven used in its mystical sense.

Chapter 19—verse 8. *In the strength of that food, &c.* This bread, with which Elias was fed in the wilderness, was a figure of the bread of life, which we receive in the blessed sacrament; by the strength of which we are to be supported on our journey through the wilderness of this world, till we come to the true mountain of God, and his vision in a happy eternity. D. B.

Verse 10. *I alone am left.* Viz. of the prophets in the kingdom of Israel; or of the ten tribes: for in the kingdom of Juda religion was at that time in a very flourishing state under the kings Asa and Josaphat. And even in Israel there remained several prophets, though not then known to Elias. See ch. 22, 19, 23, 35—*Ibid.*

Verse 11. *A great strong wind before the Lord, overthrowing the mountains, and breaking the rocks to pieces, &c.* This wind is the preaching of the