

THE CROSS.



NEW

SERIES

VOL. 3.

No. 13.

God forbid that I should glory, save in the Cross of our Lord Jesus Christ; by whom the world is Crucified to me, and I to the world.—St. Paul, Gal. vi. 14.

HALIFAX, MARCH 27, 1847.

CALENDAR.

- MARCH 28—Sunday—Palm Sunday.
 29—Monday—Monday in Holy Week.
 30—Tuesday—Tuesday in Holy Week.
 31—Wednesday—Spy Wednesday.
 APRIL 1—Thursday—Holy Thursday, 1 class.
 2—Friday—Good Friday, 1 class.
 3—Saturday—Holy Saturday, 1 class.

“POPERY AND ITS ORGAN.”

TERTULLIAN—AND THE PROTESTANT RULE OF FAITH.

Under this complimentary title, the *Times* has copied a letter from its *alter ego* the *Standard*, in which an objection is pompously introduced from Tertullian against the Real Presence. We quoted this great scholar, amongst a host of early Christian writers, as an advocate of Catholic doctrine on the Eucharist. The correspondent of the *Times* and *Standard* who subscribes himself a *Layman*! calls upon us to reconcile a passage in Tertullian with our favorite interpretation of the words of Institution, *Hoc est Corpus meum*. Not that a Layman attaches any importance to the opinions of Tertullian, for he says, in a previous part of his letter: “It is of little consequence to me what Augustine or a whole host of fathers or bishops may have taught (what a modest opinion of his own powers!) or what may be the traditions of the Church (does he keep the Sabbath on Sunday, instead of the scriptural day!) my hopes depend upon the words of sacred writ.” We will not stop to ask him now, from whom he has received that sacred writ, or how has he known it to be sacred, or even authentic! though we defy him to answer those questions on his own principles; but we proceed to notice his objection. He says, as we are fond of Latin, he gives us the original. We feel much obliged for his courtesy; but we would be much more thankful if he had given the *whole* of the original passage and not a garbled extract.

“Acceptum panem et distributum discipulis, corpus suum illum fecit, Hoc est corpus meum dicendo, id est figura corporis mei. Figura autem non fuisset, nisi veritatis esset corpus.”

This is from Tertullian's Fourth Book against Marcion, and we have supplied in capitals, the important portion of the context which has been omitted by the Layman. We hope this mutilation was not wilful, and indeed it is probable enough that he has quoted the passage from some more dishonest writer against Popery. We will, however, give him the full benefit of the original, and any school-boy who understands Latin, will easily comprehend the weakness of this much vaunted objection.

We maintain that the whole passage is clearly in favour of our doctrine—that any seeming objection it contains, is removed by the context itself—that other passages in this very work as well as the object which the writer had in view, corroborate this assertion:—and finally that if there could be any doubt of Tertullian's opinion on the Eucharist, from the peculiar construction of this passage, it vanishes before many other clear testimonies from his various works. Let us now examine the text “That Bread which he received and distributed to his Disciples, He made His Body, saying, This is my Body.” Does not this first part of the text clearly indicate the doctrine of the Real Presence? Christ, according to Tertullian, made the Bread which he took into his hands, and distributed to his disciples, His Body. So far there can be no doubt of his meaning.

Now comes the force of the objection. *Id est figura Corporis mei*. That is, the figure of my Body. This does not mean that the Eucharistic Bread was the figure of the Lord's Body, but that that Bread which in the Old Law was a Figure, is now changed into the True Body of Christ. Hence, the words *figura corporis mei* are not to be referred to *corpus meum*, which precede, but to the pronoun *Hoc*, so that the sense would run thus: Having received the Bread he made it his body saying, This, that is, the Bread, which was formerly the figure of my Body, is now my real Body. Tertullian is remarkable for similar constructions of his sentences. We shall give a very plain one from the context. In proving that the Blood of Christ was formerly prefigured by wine “vino antiquitus figuratum Christi sanguinem” he continues in this manner “Ita et nunc sanguinem suum in vino consecravit, qui tunc vinum in sanguine figuratum.” So He now (i. e. in the new Testament) consecrat-