

which agrees with the discourse of the promise, which most certainly speaks only of the reality, and to substitute in its place one of figure, of representation and of absence, which contradicts the promised manducation of this flesh, which is truly meat, and which was to be given for the life of the world? But in place of discoveries, for no new discovery could be made in writings so well understood, and so thoroughly examined before them, they formed their decision upon the same examples, and upon the same grounds, which the reformers had already produced to give credit to their new interpretation.

These examples and these grounds or reasons shall all be discussed in their turns; and in order that you may judge more correctly of the former, we will here produce some principles admitted by all parties. According to the rules of language there are some things established by use, as signs: there are others on the contrary which are not, and which cannot become signs except by a new and primary establishment of them as such. When signs are established by use, we have a right to suppose that they are known as such by those to whom we speak, and if we discover any perplexity in their mind, arising from their being unable to ascertain, not what they are in themselves, but what they signify: then by giving to these signs the names of the things signified, the perplexity ceases, and the meaning of the phrase is clearly understood by every one. Thus, when you show me a collection of pictures, you say: Do you see this portrait? It is the Prince Regent; or it is the Princess Royal. When you direct my observation to geographical maps, you say to me, This is England, This is Scotland. I perfectly understand you, because I know that pictures and maps are established signs; and my only difficulty was to know what they particularly represented. This is not the case with signs that are newly established for the first time. Not being accustomed to regard the thing you have pointed to me as a sign, having been taught to consider it merely according to its natural and essential properties, I cannot understand that which you wish to establish by it, unless you acquaint me with the particular use to which it is destined by you. If you would have me to understand you, you must explain yourself, or let me know that, contrary to the established usage, you have taken it into your head to make a sign of what has hitherto been no such thing. In fact, to return to the portraits and maps we are speaking of, put in my place some un instructed savage, and in vain would you repeat to him: This is the Regent; This is England: he will understand nothing about it, because, in regard to him, these maps and paintings are signs then for the first time established, which you must explain to him before you make use of them.

The principal naturally applies itself to the point in question. It is plain that, before the institution of the Eucharist, it had never been the custom to consider bread as a sign of any thing whatsoever, that it had not been classed among

those objects that are ordinarily considered as signs, but in the number of those which are regarded as peculiar and distinct things. Jesus Christ could not employ it to signify his body, unless he then, for the first time, established bread as a sign; and, in that case, to make himself understood, to speak according to the rules of language and good sense, he must have explained his intention to the apostles, who could not have the least suspicion of it; but this he in no wise did: or at least he must have previously intimated to them that he should on some future occasion make use of bread to give them a sign of his body; and we do not find that he ever announced any such thing, but rather quite the contrary. It is certain, therefore, that he could not have intended to establish bread as the mere figure of his body, by these most positive terms, *this is my body*, without a previous admonition or an actual explanation, because it would have been the first establishment of this sign, and we only then give to signs the names of the things signified, when they have already been regarded as signs. He, who was true man, spoke according to the language of other men: He, who was wisdom itself, could no otherwise express himself but in a wise and rational manner; He, who is truth itself, could never express himself in a manner that was deceitful and calculated to lead into error his disciples, to whom he had said: "The time comes when I will no longer speak to you in parables, but openly:" to whom he then wished to give his last most important instructions: to whom in fact he bequeathed a share in the testament which he instituted for them, on the eve of his separation from them by death.

And if in the course of his ministry Jesus Christ, making use of common metaphors, said to his apostles, *I am the door, I am a vine*; the minds of men were sufficiently prepared for this, and could have found no difficulty but in discovering the immediate purpose, for which he had employed these figurative expressions. It is surprising that any one should have pretended to discover in these expressions any resemblance with the words of the institution, and conclude from these two metaphors that *this is my body* might be explained by *this is the sign of my body*. For 1^o it would be necessary at least to suppose that our Saviour, when he said *I am a door, I am a vine*, meant to say that he was the sign or the figure of a door or of a vine, which is perfectly absurd. When he calls himself a door or a vine, it is not that he is the sign or figure of them, but that he possesses qualities of which a door and a vine presented feeble but sensible images. There is then no parity between these examples: they are two of very different kinds.

2^o Jesus Christ himself explains what he meant to convey under each of these figures. "I am the door. By me if a man enter in, he shall be saved: and he shall go in, and go out, and shall find pastures." And in like manner: "I am the true vine; and my Father is the husbandman. Every branch in me that beareth not fruit, he will take away: and every one that beareth fruit; he will purge it; that it may bring forth more fruit. As the branch can-

not bear fruit of itself, unless it abide in the vine so neither can you, unless you abide in me."

3^o But if men will draw comparisons from these and other such examples, they must do it in a different way; and, instead of saying, *Jesus Christ is the door or the vine, God the Father is the vine-dresser*, which presents reasonable and very intelligible metaphors on account of the explanation that accompanies them, they must change the sentences as follows: *This door or this vine is Jesus Christ, this vine dresser is God the Father*. Then they would have a grammatical resemblance with *this is my body*: but then also, taken in their isolated state and without previous preparations or explanations, as the words *this is my body* are taken, they would be so ridiculous and extravagant that no sensible person would ever advance such propositions.

How often have the ministers brought forward the words of the parable related in St. Matthew, *the seed is the word of God, and the field is the world!* And because it would admit of none but a figurative sense, they would infer that the words of this eucharistic institution must also be susceptible of it. And they see not the enormous difference between them! We must therefore place it before their eyes. Who does not know that a parable is a sort of enigma, in which words are employed to convey a meaning different from that which they seem to present, and in which every person seeks for the meaning concealed under the expressions, because he is well aware that there must be one there, even before he has discovered it? The apostles having in vain endeavoured to penetrate into it, besought our Saviour to inform them: "Explain to us, said they, the parable of the cockle of the field." Jesus seeing that all their anxiety was to know the signification of this parable, answered them very naturally:

"He that soweth the good seed, is the son of man, and the field is the world. And the good seed are the children of the kingdom, and the cockle are the children of the wicked one, and the enemy that sowed them is the devil. But the harvest is the end of the world, and the reapers are the angels." Jesus answered according to the wishes of the apostles: they had asked him merely to know the meaning concealed under the terms which they knew to be but signs, but the signification of which they could not discover. They perfectly understood it, as soon as Jesus Christ had joined to the signs the name of the things signified.

But suppress the parable: imagine Jesus Christ in the open fields with his disciples, and shewing them the reapers at their work. In this case, it is evident that he could not have said to them, *these are angels*, merely to signify that they represented angels. Upon this M. Nicole argues as follows. To say in the explanation of a parable that reapers are angels, is speaking reasonably: but to say out of a parable, and when reapers are not considered as signs, but as men, that they are angels, is a proposition most absurd and contrary to common-sense. Now the proposition *this is my body*, taken in the calvinistic sense, is not like the proposition, *these reapers are angels* considered in a parable, but out of a parable. Then it is not like it, except when it must be considered absurd and contrary to common sense.

To be continued.