

De Sacra Eucharistica
Saravia on the Holy Eucharist

[Adrian Saravia, 1530–1612]

The Translation by
George Anthony Denison, M.A.,
Archdeacon of Taunton

London, 1855.

Transcribed by Irene C. Teas
AD 2003

Preface to the Reader

The malice of Satan, the sower of the tares of discord, hath brought to pass that the Sacrament of peace and innermost union, which should knit together the unity of one and the same body all as many as partake thereof, hath become the watchword of a deadly and exterminating war, with no hope, or at best a very slender hope, of reconciliation. All however protest that all their prayers are for concord and peace. And it is easy to understand how great would be the help that such a peace would give to all who profess the faith of Christ, as well in their labours for the glory of God and the edification of the Churches, as for the safety of empires and states. Now there are some doubtless who by their writings encourage us to seek for peace, but no one either pointeth the way whereby it may be attained, or adviseth us of the things which will conduce thereto. And so long as neither party remitteth any thing of its bitterness, and every man is bent upon defending to the utmost the conclusions of himself and of all his followers, there will be no place for peace. Those who cast upon their adversaries all the blame of dissension, and bear them down with charges of heresy and blasphemy, as though they themselves were free from every fault, forget that they too themselves are men, and that the same imputation perchance attacheth to themselves which they condemn in their adversaries. Prejudices on both sides preoccupy men's minds to such an extent, as to render them utterly unfit to look deeply into the truth. And yet the thing itself is not very difficult, if so be a man will only bring to its consideration that simplicity of faith which is necessary for the due apprehension of Divine Mysteries. Wherefore putting aside angry disputation, I shall follow that royal way in which it behoveth the divines

to walk; the way which the word of God teacheth, and which the orthodox Fathers have trodden before us. What I desire above all things to trace are truths received, placed beyond the reach of controversy, and such as no portion of those who dispute upon this matter can presume to deny. I shall say nothing which hath not been said before by writers of the first authority: but if there be any portion of what they have stated which appeareth to me not to have been explained with sufficient distinctness, this I shall more largely unfold.

I shall insist upon three heads only: I. What is the nature of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, and what are its parts. II. What that is which the good and the bad alike receive; and also what that is which the good *only* obtain by faith. III. By what Observances of piety it behoveth the people of Christ to prepare themselves for partaking of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of the Lord.

My own influence and authority is none; I have no reputation either for learning or for virtue with those to whom I principally address myself, whereby to stir and influence their minds; but as we have among us those in whom all things which are lacking in me are most abundant, it is my purpose to provoke them to emulation in their love for the unity of Christ's Church, that so they may never be content to rest until by their own labours they have perfected and brought to the desired end of peace that which hath been touched by me with a less skilful hand.

I have indeed no doubt that what happeneth to other mediators will happen to me, and that I shall incur the displeasure of either party. I know very well that what I now write will not meet with every man's approval: but those who differ I would intreat not to refuse to send to me, after the manner of our fathers, their reasons and arguments in brotherly good-will and love. And if by these means any pernicious error shall be proved against me, I shall not hesitate to retract it, and to take out of the way all that is contrary to the truth. For my part, I believe myself to have followed the word of God, and all the old Fathers of orthodox memory, who governed the Church of God in immediate succession to the Apostles themselves. From their judgment I believe myself to have in nowise departed, no, not one hair's breadth.

It is my earnest desire that as many as shall handle this argument after me should raise no question to disturb the peace concluded in the year 1536 at Wittenburg; or to contradict the Augustan Confession of the chief men of Germany: for thus I believe it will be found possible to blot out all dissension touching the Sacrament, and to unite and harmonise the Churches of Christ which are scattered through Europe as sheep among wolves; that so these may at length be enabled to turn aside from

themselves by mutual succour the violence of the adversary, and to vindicate their own freedom; lest at anytime they be driven to have recourse to Turkish auxiliaries; a step full of the deadliest mischief to the whole Christian world.

In this controversy we must keep clear of the impiety of propositions by which the human nature of Christ is subverted, or His Divine Majesty violated. Those who, in our judgment, think after a somewhat carnal manner touching this Sacrament, affirm that they do not hold the Body of the Lord to have an unlimited extension, and to be by a multiplication of bodies everywhere diffused. We, on our part, deduce such extension and multiplication from the Presence which they assign to the Body and Blood of the Lord in the Eucharist, and we contend that such do follow thereupon. They deny our conclusion in both particulars, and insist simply upon the virtual meaning of the word Body, from which none of its properties can be absent, and which includeth every thing in itself wheresoever it may be. This, on our part, we do not deny, and with them acknowledge the Presence of Christ in the Holy communion. Wherefore then do we dispute so vehemently about a thing which we both confess to be true? For in however many ways we regard the matter, we must needs at length return to the same point, namely, that Christ in His Supper did in truth and reality deliver to His disciples His Body and His Blood. The manner in which this was done is beyond human understanding, and must be left to God. Wherefore let us all speak of the same thing, and let divisions cease amongst us, and let not the Sacrament instituted for the peace and union of the souls of believers be made the watchword of party strife.

A Treatise of The Holy Eucharist

That ancient divine Irenaeus, who lived near the times of the Apostles, teacheth [Book iv. c. 34] that “the Eucharist consisteth of two things, an earthly and a heavenly.” By the earthly thing he understandeth the bread and wine, by the heavenly the Flesh and Blood of the Lord, Who said of Himself, “I am the living bread which came down from heaven; [S. John vi. 51.] if any man eat of this bread he shall live for ever, and the bread which I will give is My Flesh, which I will give for the life of the world.” From that time every orthodox divine hath followed Irenaeus, and the general definition of a Sacrament appeareth to have been derived from him—a visible sign of a sacred thing—a visible form of an invisible Grace. Others define Sacraments to be—certain signs of the good will of God towards us, and testimonies of the remission of sins. Others say that they be—rites and ceremonies by which God attesteth to believers the promises of the Gospel. A Sacrament is also defined to be—an outward sign whereby God sealeth our consciences the promises of His good will towards us, for the purposes of sustaining the weakness of our faith, and whereby we, on our part, testify our piety towards Him, as well before Him and the Angels as before men. A Sacrament may also be said to be—a sacred visible sign of a sacred and heavenly thing, instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, whereby He communicateth Himself and His Gifts to the whole man, that is alike to his body and his soul, and as it were sealeth the gift with a seal.

All these definitions are true, nor have in them any thing alien from the nature of a Sacrament. What, however, is their propriety and fitness, if they be tried by the rules of logic, I will not here discuss: it is sufficient that they be true. But I prefer those of them which so describe to us the nature of a Sacrament itself (however it be that the unbelief of men causeth the contrary effects to follow therefrom), as to make a clear distinction between the Grace of a Sacrament and the causes of the Grace.

Since Sacraments consist by Divine institution of two things, of which the one be visible and earthly, the other invisible and heavenly, he who separateth these parts one from the other destroyeth the Sacrament. For the bread without the Body of Christ is not a Sacrament, nor the Body of Christ without the bread. The Sacrament of the Eucharist may be thus defined; that therein is made under the form of bread and wine the Communion of the Body of our Lord Jesus Christ, once offered for us upon the Altar of the Cross, and of His Blood of the New Testament shed for the remission of sins; and also the commemoration of His Death. We have here, according to Irenaeus, the two parts which make up the whole

nature of the Sacrament, the earthly and the heavenly, namely the bread and wine, together with the Crucified Body of the Lord and His Blood poured out. The third thing which I wish to note is the remission of sins, and eternal life; that is, the virtue of the Sacrament, as distinguished from those two parts of it. For in a Sacrament there be three things to be considered, which be severally to be distinguished. The outward visible sign, and the invisible and heavenly Thing united sacramentally to the sign. The third thing, that which floweth from them, is the benefit of the Sacrament. Concerning those two parts Augustine saith, [Lib. Sent. Prosp. in Mag. Sent. lib. iv. dist. 10] “What we say is this,—what we endeavour by every means to prove is this,—namely, that the Sacrifice of the Church is made up of two things, consisteth of two things, the visible form of the Elements, and the invisible Flesh and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; that is, of the ‘*Sacramentum*,’ and of the ‘*Res Sacramenti*,’ that is, the Body of Christ.” Now, orthodox Divines declare that the virtue of the Sacrament is a different thing from the Sacrament itself; that is, a different thing from those two parts of which the Sacrament is made up. Augustine writeth upon the Gospel of S. John: “For now also, he saith, we receive the spiritual food; but the Sacrament is one thing, the virtue of the Sacrament is another.” The same Father, in the same place: “If any one shall eat of It, he shall not die; but this pertaineth to the virtue of the Sacrament, not to the visible Sacrament.” [Tract 26 upon S. John.] Therefore the Sacrament is to be considered apart by itself, as it consisteth of the visible form of the elements and the invisible Flesh and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ.

The Romanists in this Sacrament take away the bread and wine, and leave us certain empty images of the bread and wine, and without their substance; and they say—what indeed is simple foolishness—that the bread is not bread, and the wine is not wine, against the institution of the Lord, the nature of the things themselves, and the judgment of the old Fathers, who knew nothing of this monstrous existence of accidents without subject. This Sacrament requireth true bread and true wine, not the image of them, just as Baptism requireth true water as its element. Since therefore those parts of the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper be essential thereto; the bread and the Body of Christ, the wine and His Blood, cannot severally be separated from one another, nor if separated can they be understood. If such separation taketh place the whole meaning of a Sacrament is destroyed; for this necessarily consisteth of two things, a visible and an invisible. But since the invisible Grace be twofold, and both its parts be signified respectively under an outward visible form, and be called “*Res Sacramenti*,” it happeneth that they [I.e., the inward part and the Grace.] be easily confused, though one of them be the cause of the

other. And since men be free to accept or to reject the last, the whole Sacrament is not uncommonly taken without the Grace of the Sacrament, which Grace is the answer to the faith of the communicant. And hence hath sprung this deadly controversy about the Presence, or rather about the manner of the Presence, of the Body and Blood in the bread and wine.

Many men discuss the Sacraments of the New Testament as if they were things which had an existence apart from their use, or were things compounded of divers substances, or transformed, either by one substance being really changed into another, or by a kind of transition, the former substance being done away, and another coming into its place. Whereas the truth is, that the conjunction of the parts of the Sacrament is a conjunction of relation, and not of substance; as is the relation of every sign to the thing it signifieth, and of every figure to the thing which is expressed by it in drawing and colours. For the bread, which is made the Sacrament of the Body of Christ, hath a relation to His Body, and the wine to His Blood, by Divine institution, so that he who hath the bread hath certainly and really the Body, and he who hath the wine hath the Blood. Not indeed that these be present absolutely and simply in the same way as the Body and Blood are now circumscribed in one place in heaven, but in a certain figure, by a necessary relation to the Body and Blood, and by Sacramental union therewith. There is one manner of Presence of the Body of Christ in heaven, there is another in the Sacrament.

Now a question is raised concerning the true and real Presence of the Body and Blood of the Lord in this Sacrament. It is said that that Presence cannot be exhibited at the same moment in many places, because this is contrary to the manner and nature of a true body, which is circumscribed locally by its own dimensions; and that if you take these dimensions therefrom, you destroy thereby the nature of a body. Now, the answer to all this is, that it in nowise showeth that He Who is God, and Who created all things from nothing, cannot make Himself Present in His Body in many places, wheresoever He willeth, in a supernatural and heavenly manner. It is true such a thing cannot take place in the order of nature, but only by that Divine Power which overruleth all the order of nature. Divine Mysteries may not be tried by natural laws. They are beyond the reach and grasp of the human understanding. When the Lord appeared in the way to Saul as he went to Damascus, [Acts ix. 5.] He did not leave the place which He filleth in heaven in order to come down to him, nor did anything take place contrary to the words of Peter, "Whom the heaven must receive until the times of restitution of all things." [Acts iii. 21.] The appearances of our Lord on earth after His Ascension were without any local movement of the Body of the Lord; and though the Sacred Scriptures

sometimes speak of God as moving from His place,—Who, since He be Incomprehensible, cannot be moved from His place,—yet the Scriptures say nothing of the Lord moving from His place in those appearances of which I speak. These appearances prove that the Lord, whensoever and wheresoever He willeth, can make Himself Present.

In these thoughts then concerning the Presence of the Body of Christ in many places at the same time, after a manner Divine and Spiritual, Heavenly and Supernatural, without any multiplication or extension of His Body, I see no impiety to rebuke. Besides when a question is raised as to what God can do and what He cannot, I think it impossible for man to assign the limits rightly. But in truth our controversy is not so much touching the power of God, as touching His will, for whatever God willeth that we may not doubt He can; but He doth not will whatsoever He can. When it is clear what the will of God is, we may not discuss His power. Now what the will of God is we shall see presently.

It may be urged by some, that to suppose there to be a necessity of the Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ, argueth rather weakness than power, for that, in the same proportion that efficient causes exercise their efficiency at the greater distance, and have just as much power when absent and remote as they have when present and near at hand, in that proportion they are considered to be of greater efficacy. When, however, they require to be brought nearer to the subject-matter of their operation, and have not the same power in their absence and remoteness as they have when brought near and made actually present, they are of inferior efficacy. Those, then, they say, who do not believe that a Real Presence upon earth of the Body and Blood in the Eucharist is necessary, appear to have a better belief touching the Almighty Power of Christ, than those have who consider Him to be actually present with His Body and His Blood in the Mysteries. And they instance the faith of the Centurion who believed that the Lord, though far away, could restore his servant to health, as being of a far higher kind than the faith of the Nobleman who thought that the Lord must be actually present on the spot, in order to the healing of his son. And the Lord Himself, they add, gave greater proof of the power of His Deity when in His absence He cured the sick by His Word only, than if He had been present in the very same place. They ask, Cannot He Who when upon earth was able to heal diseases though absent in the Body, when set on the Right Hand of the Majesty of God in Heaven, feed our souls with His Flesh and Blood, unless He become locally Present upon earth?

But why, I reply, must he be thought to sin who believeth that the Lord, sitting at the Right Hand of God the Father, truly and really from heaven feedeth us here on earth by the Power of His Deity, with His own

Flesh Crucified and His own Blood poured out: and that for so great end it nothing needeth that he bring, here upon earth, into certain limits of space, His Flesh and His Blood in that very place where they Mysteries be celebrated? And, on the other hand, how doth another sin who believeth the love of Christ the Lord to be so great towards us that He willeth to be Present with His Body in His Mysteries; and in a Divine, Spiritual, Heavenly, and Supernatural Manner, to enter the roof of our mouth, that so His Body Present may fill with His Deity the whole man? If there be any error here, it is a pious error. Is it said that such a thing cannot be done? In my judgment there is no impiety in believing that it can. The impious conclusions which are drawn from hence, concerning the going down into the belly, and into the draught, may be urged against the Papists; but as urged against those who contend for this Presence in the action of the Mystery alone,—that is, while the Mystery is being eaten and drunken,—and into whose belief or thoughts *no other* real, nor *any* local, Presence of the Body hath ever entered, they are but blasphemous calumnies.

In the Mysteries, God hath not taken account so much of His own power as of human infirmity. For who doubteth that God *can* make man to be Born again, and feed him with His Body and His Blood without the intervention of any outward and visible Sacraments? He Who sitteth in the Highest keepeth all things by His own power. It is His gift that whatsoever subsisteth and liveth hath subsistence and life; and yet hath he brought all things which, if He had so willed, He might have perfected of His own immediate power, to their appointed end, through certain means ordained of His own adorable Wisdom. And just as it is His will that we should prolong our material life by earthly meats and drinks, so hath He appointed to nourish our heavenly and spiritual life by heavenly and spiritual meat and drink, that is, by His own Flesh and His own Blood. Now, in order that meat and drink may really nourish, they must be really given and really taken; but that which is not truly present cannot be given and taken to real nourishment and refreshment. However, it is not the Real Presence of this meat and drink, whatever this may be, which is denied by any who have a right understanding in this matter: the only controversy appeareth to be about the manner of the Presence.

Bucer was wont to say that he and his friends did not differ from Luther so much in reality as in the manner of expression: and, indeed, those who call the Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ, heavenly and spiritual, do not appear to differ much from those who call it supernatural and divine. It is surely rather a dispute about words than things. Wherefore it were much to be wished that those who agree in substance, should agree

likewise in expression, and should use those same words which that great servant of God, Martin Luther, useth, rather than the discord should prevail and continue among brethren for a difference of words. Bucer writeth to Michael of Spain in these words: "In all my writings I testify that the chief thing in the Sacred Supper is the Very and Real Exhibition of the Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ. 'Very and Real,' I say, because heavenly and spiritual: nor have I ever attacked anything else than what is called Impanation, and Carnal Manducation: a real and effectual eating I have never denied." The same Bucer saith, in another place: "We deny Transubstantiation: we also deny the Body of Christ to be locally in the bread; as if any one were to suppose that the Body of Christ is contained in the bread, just as wine is contained in a vessel, or fire in a red-hot iron. But both of these things we affirm: 1. That the Body of Christ is Really Present in the Supper; 2. that Christ verily Present feedeth us with His own Very Body and Very Blood."

I pass by those writers who, in their discussions on this matter, have preserved neither reason nor moderation. I purposely omit to notice the virulent abuse and disgraceful disputes of learned men, pressed, on either side, to the terrible scandal of the Church of Christ. I follow those who have been more temperate. I urge only that which ought never to be disturbed or shaken among Christian brethren—I mean the proposition, that the Real and Very Presence of the Body and Blood of the Lord in the Supper is an article of faith. Of what kind that Presence may be, we may not inquire too curiously or too carnally. Let this be enough for believers, that that Presence is supernatural and divine. What if I add to this, that it is heavenly and spiritual? It is not that I wish to detract, in any degree, from the force of the former words, but that I wish to show how close is the affinity between these and the latter words.

In like manner as our heavenly and eternal life is hidden with Christ in God, so is also the meat and drink whereby that life is preserved and nourished. Let it be sufficient, therefore, for us to understand, from the Word of God, that in the Mysteries there be given to our senses seals and testimonies of a Presence of the Body and Blood of the Lord which we cannot understand: and though this Presence be different from that which he hath in heaven after the nature of a true body, even as He had upon earth, it is not therefore none, or only imaginary. The same Lord Who now, by the hands of His ministers, distributeth from heaven His Body and His Blood to His faithful people, in the Last Supper with His own hands gave Himself to His Apostles: and as then the manner of the Presence of His Body, as It lay at the Last Supper, was one, and the manner of His Presence in the Sacrament, and in the mouth of him who ate, was another;

in like manner at this day there is one manner of Presence of the Body of Christ in heaven, there is another in the form of bread and wine; but in both cases it is a real and true manner,—in the one case one, and in the other case another—although there be no difference between That which is given on earth, and That which is, nevertheless, in heaven. When, while yet upon earth, He gave His own Flesh to be eaten by His disciples, He Himself gave, and was given, bare Himself, and was borne; as Augustine well teacheth us in his exposition of 1 Kings c. xxi. v. 13, which appeareth to have been badly rendered, and which he applieth to the Lord by way of allegory. “We understand not,” he saith, “how David is said to be borne of his own hands of himself, according to the letter of this verse; but we find the explication thereof in Christ: for Christ was borne in His own hands when, giving His very Body, He saith, ‘This is My Body;’ for He bare that Body in His own hands.” And he repeateth the same in his second sermon. [Sermon 2 on Psalm xxxiv.] “How,” saith he, “was He borne in His own hands? Because when He took into His own hands His Body and His Blood, which believers know, He Himself bare Himself, after a certain manner, when He said, ‘This is My Body.’”^{*} Now since this judgment, which declareth the Flesh of the Lord to be truly, really, present, and likewise His Blood, in the Supper of the Lord, be the common judgment of all the ancient orthodox Fathers, I am unable to comprehend what reason there can be why we should refuse to think and say alike. It is this belief touching the Holy Eucharist which hath given birth to those remarkable expressions which we find in Chrysostom and others; expressions by which those Fathers were wont to move their hearers to the admiration of so great a mystery. And I find nothing in their words from which we ought to shrink. “O mighty miracle,” saith Chrysostom; “the great goodwill of God towards us. He Who sitteth above with the Father is, as it were, at that hour detained in the hands of all, and giveth Himself to those who desire to surround and embrace Him.”

^{*} This is the rendering of the passage, as it stands in the MS. But the rendering of the passage, as it is found in the Benedictine edition fol. Paris, 1681, vol. iv. pt. 1, p. 216, is as follows: “Because when He was about to bestow His very Body and His very Blood, He took into His hands That of Which believers have knowledge, and He bare Himself after a certain manner, when He said, ‘This is My Body.’”

Now, because our carnal sense cannot attain to know *how* this be done, we may not therefore deny that it be really done. How many wonderful things in nature every day meet our eyes, of the causes of which we be altogether ignorant? We see the magnet attract iron to itself, and we wonder greatly; but how it be done we nowise understand. And what shall

I say of the needle of the compass? We behold, and are astonished; further we cannot go. What wonder, then, if, in Divine mysteries, the eyes of our understanding be darkened, and we comprehend not how those things be accomplished, which nevertheless the mysteries do signify and attest unto us. It sufficieth to believe that whatsoever God hath promised is performed by His Divine power. Now God hath declared Himself to be very meat and very drink; wherefore it is to be believed that He giveth Himself to be the food and drink of His people.

But in order to the better understanding of these things, we must observe that the same Body of Christ cometh under consideration in many ways. For such as Christ is signified to us to be in this Sacrament, such also is He exhibited to us; for it is inconceivable that the Mysteries should signify Christ under one aspect to us, and exhibit Him to us under another. First, then, the Lord may be considered under the aspect of this present life, subject to the miseries and calamities of human nature. For example, as the Infant, wailing in the manger; as the Boy, interrogating the doctors in the Temple, and answering them; as wearied with His journey; as hungering and thirsting; lastly, as the Man, offering Himself to His Father upon the altar of the Cross, for the remission of our sins. Then, again, after His Resurrection, the nature of our Lord's Body was different from that which had been Its nature during His life upon earth; for then the Body of the Lord was glorified, and set on the Right Hand of God the Father. We have then to consider under which aspect the bread hath its relation to the Flesh of Christ, and the wine to His Blood, and be exhibited to us in the Sacrament. Now we have said that one part of the Sacrament, without which the Sacrament hath no existence, is the Flesh and Blood of the Lord; and this is a matter beyond the reach of all controversy. But since this Sacrament be a commemoration of the Death and Passion of the Lord, it followeth that the bread be not to be referred to the Flesh '*simpliciter*,' such as the Flesh is now in glory, but such as it was upon the altar of the Cross; and in like manner that the wine be to be referred to the Blood; not that Blood which now is in the glorified Body of the Lord, but that which flowed from the wounds of the Body of the Lord. In any other way, how could that be true which is said, "As often as we eat this bread and drink this cup, we do show forth the Lord's death till He come." Hence Cyprian: [On the Lord's Supper.] "We cling to the Cross, and we suck the Blood, and we press our tongue into the very wounds of our Redeemer." And Isychius: [On Levit. Book i. c. 2.] "His Flesh, which before His Passion was unfit for food (for who then desired to eat the Flesh of the Lord?), after His Passion He made fit for food; for if He had not been crucified, we could not in any wise eat the Sacrifice of His Body. We eat it now,

taking for food the memory of His Passion.” And in another place: [On Levit. Book i. c. 6.] “We must consider the Cross—as it were the vessel wherein the Lord’s Body was laid on the fire—to be nothing injured in its strength by the fire of human sins, and to be that also which made the Flesh of the Lord laid upon it to be fit for the food of man. Unless that Flesh had been laid upon the Cross, we could by no means have received the Body of Christ in a mystery. Be it concluded then, that the Flesh of the Lord was made fit for the food of man, that it might be eaten in so far that It was crucified; and so in reality we eat in a mystery the Flesh of the Lord, His Cross, and His whole Passion.” Chrysostom in another place: [Hom. on 1 Cor. X.] “That which is in the Cup is that which flowed from His side, and we be partakers of it.” And in another place: “The Blood in the Cup is drawn for thy purification from His immaculate side. . . . Consider that health-giving Blood as flowing from His Divine and unpolluted side, and thus taking it, take it with pure lips.” And Augustine saith: [Serm. On Holy Eucharist.] “When the Victim is broken, when the Blood is poured from the Cup into the mouths of the faithful, what else is intended than the sacrifice of the Body of the Lord upon the Cross, and the pouring out of the Blood from His side.” Again: [On Ps. xl.] “The Sacraments of the Church flowed from the side of Christ.” Again: [Ps. liv.] “We who do eat His Body be fed of the Cross of the Lord.” And in another place: “It is therefore a figure, teaching us that we be bidden to communicate the Passion of the Lord, and to hide in our remembrance, lovingly and to our souls’ health, that the Flesh hath been crucified and wounded for us.” And Ambrose: “For as thou hast taken the similitude of His death, so thou drinkest the similitude of His Blood, that there may be no horror of His Blood, and that the price of thy redemption may work in thee.” The same Father Ambrose: “Because we be set free by the death of the Lord, mindful of this, in eating and drinking we signify the Flesh and Blood which have been offered for us.”

Two of the most illustrious writers of our time have noted the same thing in respect of this Sacrament. Calvin, in his Institutions, hath these words: [Book iv. c. 17, sect. 4.] “That which is the chief thing in this Sacrament is not the giving of the Body of Christ unto us ‘simpliciter,’ and without deeper consideration involved therein: we must rather have regard therein to that promise by which He testifieth that His Flesh is truly that food, and His Blood that drink, Whereby we be fed unto life eternal: the promise wherein He affirmeth Himself to be the Bread of life, of Which whoso eateth shall life for ever. The chief thing in this Sacrament is, I say, the sealing and confirming of this promise; and, that it may be effectual to this end, the sending us to the Cross of Christ, where that promise was

verily made good, completed and perfected. For we feed not upon Christ, truly and healthfully, except it be on Christ crucified, in that we apprehend with a lively sense the efficacy of His death.” Wolfgangus Musculus “on the Supper of the Lord” biddeth his readers observe the words which the Lord used when He instituted the Supper. “Let the careful reader observe,” he saith, “that, just as Christ doth not say, ‘This is My Body’ Which shall rise again, Which shall be glorified, and shall sit at the right hand of the Father: but ‘My Body Which is given for you,’ that is, to death; so doth He not say of the Blood, ‘This Cup is the New Testament in My Blood,’ Which shall be spiritualized, and shall be exalted to heavenly places, but, ‘Which is shed for you and for many, for the remission of sins.’ Doth he not speak expressly of His Blood which those wicked men shed when they scourged Him and crucified His Body? Certainly. He doth not speak of His Blood not shed. How do those arguments of spiritualization, whereby our brethren endeavour to show that the Blood of Christ is corporally Present in the Cup, cohere with the words of our Lord?” That the outward signs have a relation to the Flesh and Blood of the Lord, this is certain; but when men do not consider under what conditions this taketh place, and that which is tied to a certain condition be understood absolutely, errors of various kinds are the consequence.

Of this therefore we may not doubt, that the outward signs of the Sacrament do remit us to the Flesh crucified, and to the Blood shed and flowing from the wounds of Christ, and therefore to His Passion and His Death. Otherwise this Sacrament would not be commemoration of the Passion and Death of the Lord, and as it were a certain representation of Him. Romanists have betaken themselves to little purpose to transubstantiation; and to as little purpose have those speculated, who have invented for us a certain strange ubiquity of the Body of Christ, in order to join with the earthly part of the Sacrament that part which is heavenly. For the Flesh of Christ in glory and His Immortal Blood, in that condition wherein They now exist, are not the other part of the Sacrament; that is, They have no relation or analogy to the bread and wine, so as to be able to constitute the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ. For example, an image of Caesar after he had become an old man, representing him as a child, or a boy, or a beardless youth, doth not represent him as he is, but as he was; just so the Sacrament of the Eucharist hath neither representation, nor signification, nor any manner of exhibition of the Body of Christ in Glory, in whatsoever way that Body be regarded, either as united with the external symbols, or as substituted for them. That blessed state of Glory hath nothing in common with the symbols of Christ’s crucified Body and of His Blood poured out; for this

Sacrament hath in it the showing forth of the death of the Lord, not of His Glory and His Resurrection.

When the Lord consecrated the bread and wine into the mystery of His Body and His Blood, He said not, "This is My Body" Which after three days shall rise again, never to die, and to be exalted with great power and glory above all heavens to the right hand of the Majesty of God the Father, (and yet these be certainly the words which must have been used, if the substance of bread and wine were to have been transferred or transmuted into the substance of His glorified Body and Blood for the making of the Sacrament), but the Lord said, "This is My Body which is given for you," and, "This is My Blood which is shed for you." So that the bread hath a necessary relation to the Body of Christ crucified, and the wine to His Blood poured out. And the Lord doth not say of His Flesh absolutely, that It is "The Bread of life," but He addeth the words "which I will give." "The Bread," He saith, "Which I will give is My Flesh, Which I will give for the life of the world." So far then as His Flesh be given for the world, It is the life of the world, but in no other wise: if It had not been given, It would not have been the life of the world; and it is especially to be noted that the Lord saith plainly, touching the mystery of the wine, "this Cup is the New Testament in My Blood, Which is shed for you;" and in SS. Matthew and Mark, "This is My Blood of the New Testament, Which is shed for many for the remission of sins." For it is not called "the New Testament in My Blood," or "My Blood of the New Testament," unless so far as That Blood was shed to be the token and pledge of the covenant of eternal redemption. In the same way Christ is said to be our Passover, because He was slain, and made a sacrifice, and made food for man upon the wood of the Cross. On all sides we be remitted, in the institution of this mystery, to the Blood shed and the Body slain. Now according to the Romanists the wine, or rather the outward form of the wine, hath reference to the Blood, but not to the Body, although without the Body It be not: in like manner the form of bread hath reference to the Flesh, and is the Sacrament of the Flesh, but not of the Blood, although without Its own Blood the Flesh be not: much less then be they Sacraments of His Divinity, although the whole fullness of the Godhead dwelleth in Christ bodily. The like to which I affirm concerning the Glorified Body and Blood. I say that the forms of bread and wine have no relation to these. Sacraments exhibit, and have relation to, that which they signify: now the Sacrament of the Eucharist doth not signify the glorified Body of Christ; it doth not therefore exhibit that Body in that It is glorified, nor hath it relation to It. But we may not, nevertheless, regard that Presence of the Glorified Body which is supernatural and divine, heavenly and spiritual, as

being without efficacy; for this Presence is the cause* of that which the outward visible sign immediately signifieth. Since, therefore, the Sacrament hath the signification of the Death and Passion of our Lord, It giveth to be eaten and drunken, not the Body Glorified, and set on the right hand of the Majesty of God, but Himself suffering and Crucified, with His Blood poured out. From the death of the Lord our salvation and life proceedeth; by the virtue of the Food and that Drink we be to rise again into that life eternal, by the Almighty power of the Word of God, to Which it is easy to join and unite things past and to come. It is for us to believe that this be done for us by things present to us. And this faith which believeth that Christ suffering for us and His Blood flowing from His wounds is united to the sacrament, and exhibited to us, much more truly magnifieth the Almighty power and mercy of God, than a transubstantiation of bread into the Glorified Body, alien from the nature of the Sacrament. For since all our thoughts must be transferred to the Cross and the Death of the Lord, a transubstantiation into the Glorified Body is superfluous and vain, because it addeth nothing to the value of the Sacrament.

* The word “exhibeo” has been rendered throughout the treatise by the English word “exhibit,” except in this place, where such a rendering does not appear admissible. It is obvious to remark that the word “exhibit” as used of Sacraments is technical, and means “apply,” “communicate.”

“How meanest thou” doth one reply: is Christ exhibited in the Sacrament bleeding, and in the last agony, and His Blood bursting forth from His open wounds? Is it meant that every day, up to this hour, so often as the mysteries be celebrated, thou are prepared to place Christ in the same agony which He once suffered?” It nothing needeth. Christ our Lord, a Priest for ever, hath always and everywhere Present in Himself that His eternal sacrifice which He once offered: for since to God nothing is past, nothing absent, the Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ is alway and everywhere Present to God—the Passion of His Son Present to God the Father. I say that sacrifice which He once offered is eternal; it hath not passed away with time, nor hath it become feeble. The Blood hath not dried up in the lapse of ages: all those things be as recent before God as they were at that very moment when Christ suffered them on Mount Calvary. And just as those things be present to God, so be they present and exhibited to us in the Sacrament, and thus the bread of the Eucharist is the Crucified Body of Christ, the wine is the Blood of the Lord shed and flowing from His wounds, in such sort that we do in reality eat His Flesh an drink His Blood. The power of Christ the Lord is not now less in heaven than when He conversed with us on earth, and yet was,

nevertheless, in heaven; and just so now, when He is in heaven, He doth not cease to be on earth. Then He gave to His disciples His Flesh which was to be nailed to the Cross, in that it was to be nailed to the Cross, and in like manner, and, in the same relation, did He give them to drink His Blood which was to be poured out. Wherefore now also hath He power to communicate to the faithful, under the same aspect and relation, His Crucified Flesh to be eaten, and His Blood poured out to be drunken. Our Saviour, Who, after His Resurrection showed Himself and His Body, Which was Spiritual, Glorified, and Immortal, and yet visible and palpable, just as it seemed good unto Him, without the wounds of the Cross, and with the wounds of His hands and side, that He might be seen and handled of them, and especially by Thomas, in compassion to the weakness of their faith—the same Saviour can without doubt give that Body to be eaten, and that Blood to be drunken, under that form and relation wherein He brought life and immortality to us. To believe these things with an unshaken and simple faith is healthful to the soul: further and more curiously to inquire is not safe.

That the chief part in the celebration of the mysteries belongeth to our Lord we all believe, in that Christ is our Mediator, Who as a good Shepherd feedeth His own flock with His own Flesh and Blood. Now this happeneth invisibly by the Almighty power of God; but He hath appointed a visible Minister and visible Sacraments. To no good purpose is the bread believed to be transubstantiated into Christ's Body Glorified and endowed with Immortality; to be carried about in Processions and to be kept in secret places, and to be adored, since it be a Sacrament of His Death, and a Sacrament of His Passion, not of His Glory and His Immortality. Christ our Passover is sacrificed for us: the Lord instituted the bread and the wine to be the Sacrament of that Immolation and eternal Sacrifice. Now there must be an analogy between the mystic signs and the Things themselves of which They be signs, otherwise they could not bear the names of the Things themselves, nor in any wise be said to be that which They be. Augustine saith: [Ep. 23 (in Benedict. ed. ep. 98).] "Was not Christ once sacrificed in Himself, and yet is it said that in the Sacrament He is sacrificed not only at every solemnization of the Passover, but every day in the face of the people? Well, he doth not answer falsely, who shall be asked this question, and shall answer that He *is so* sacrificed. For if Sacraments had not a certain similitude to those things of which they be Sacraments, they would not be Sacraments at all. But it is to this likeness to things themselves that for the most part they owe their names. After certain manner then the Sacrament of the Body of Christ is the Body of Christ, the Sacrament of the Blood of Christ is the Blood of Christ." Be it

understood, as I have set down above—the crucified Body, and the Blood poured out on the Cross. From these passages of the Fathers, and very many others of the like kind, it plainly appeareth that one part of the Eucharist, I mean the spiritual and heavenly part, is not *any* Body of the Lord, but the bleeding and sacrificed Body: and in the same way of the Blood; it is plain that it is not *any* Blood that is to be understood, but so far only as it is the Blood of the New Testament shed for the remission of sins. The analogy of which I speak conveyeth the true account of a Sacrament, and causeth that two very different things make one Sacrament.

The sacramental union of the two parts, namely of the bread and the Flesh crucified, of the wine and the Blood poured out, is compared by the Fathers with the personal union of the two natures in Christ. And just as, by virtue of that intimate personal union of those two natures, there ariseth an interchange and communion of their natural properties, and God is truly said to be Man, and in like manner Man is truly said to be God; so, by virtue of the sacramental conjunction, the bred is said to be the Flesh of Christ, and the Flesh of Christ is said to be bread. For just as the Person of Christ consisteth of God and Man, that is, of the Divine and human nature, so the Sacrament of the Eucharist consisteth of the Flesh of the Lord and of bread, of the Blood and wine; because everything which, being compounded of divers things, becometh one by union or conjunction, containeth within itself the nature and truth of those things whereof it is compounded. The names of both parts be interchanged and imparted mutually. Now as Augustine saith: “The sacrifice of the Church is made up of the sacrament, and the Thing of the Sacrament” that is, the Body and Blood of Christ. When therefore the Fathers desired to teach us, against Eutyches and Nestorius, by a familiar illustration that in Christ one and the same Person hath two natures, without any confusion or intermixture thereof, they were wont to adduce the mystery of the Flesh and Blood of Christ, in which the natures of those things of which the Sacrament consisteth being severally preserved unimpaired, their properties be interchanged. The orthodox disputant, Theodoretus useth the following argument against Eranistes: “If then the Divine mysteries represent the Body which truly is, therefore the Body of the Lord is still His Body, not changed into the nature of His Divinity, but filled with Divine glory.” Eranist: “Your mentin of the Divine mysteries hath come in very seasonably; for from this very thing I will prove to you that the Body of the Lord be changed into another nature. Answer therefore the questions I now put.” Orthodox: “I will answer.” Eranist: What call you the oblation before the invocation of the Priest, &c., and how callest thou It after It be

sanctified?” Orthodox: “The Body of Christ and the Blood of Christ.” Eranist: “Just therefore as the symbols of the Body and Blood of the Lord be one thing before the invocation of the priest, but, after the invocation, be changed and become another Thing, so also the Body of the Lord, after His taking up into heaven, is changed into a Divine Essence.” Orthodox: “Thou are caught in thine own net; for the mystic signs, after they be sanctified, depart not from their own nature; since they remain in their former substance, and figure, and form, and may be seen and touched as before. But they be understood to be those Things which They have been made to be, and They be believed so to be; and They be adored, as being Things which be the Things which They be believed to be.” They be understood, he saith, to be the Things which They be made to be, namely the Body and Blood of Christ. He addeth “They be believed and be adored,” by virtue of the unity of the Sacrament, which consisteth not only of bread and wine, but of the Flesh and Blood of our Lord, in Which the fullness of the Godhead dwelleth bodily: for therein is His Flesh truly Food, and His Blood is truly Drink; for unless the Flesh of the Lord were Personally united to the Godhead, It would not be truly the Bread of life.

Pope Gelasius also, writing of the two natures in Christ, expressly affirmeth that in the Sacrament of the Eucharist the substance and nature of the bread remaineth. “The Sacraments which we receive of the Body and Blood of Christ be doubtless a Divine thing, because we be thereby made partakers of the Divine nature; and yet the substance of nature of the bread and wine doth not cease to be; and doubtless again when the mysteries be celebrated, there be celebrated therein the representation and similitude of the Body and Blood of Christ;” but since sometimes the Fathers say that the bread and wine pass into another substance, this Father teacheth in what sense this must be understood by adding further:—“We have therefore shown very plainly that we must believe this to be in Christ Himself, which we proves to be in that which is the figure of Him, and so do celebrate and take it. For we profess that the outward signs do pass into the Divine substance, by the operation of the Holy Spirit: and yet do they remain in their own proper nature: and even so, in respect of that cardinal mystery, of which they do truly represent unto us the efficacy and the virtue, they do demonstrate unto us, by the fact that the parts of which it be composed remain in their own proper nature, that one Christ remaineth—one, because entire and very Christ.”

We cannot but see, if we will not refuse to see it, that these Fathers had no thought about transubstantiation: and when they say that sacraments pass into a Divine substance, they add, nevertheless, that these retain their own proper nature; and Gelasius repeateth this in a marked manner, and

presseth it upon us, as doth also Theodoretus; and indeed unless they had made the above addition, their arguments against Eutyches would have been nothing worth. Eutyches contended that the human nature of Christ had so passed into His Divine nature as to cease to be human. Now the force of their argument lieth in this one thing—that just as the bread and wine become Divine Things by consecration, but remain nevertheless what they were before—that is, bread and wine in their nature and properties, in like manner in Christ man became God in such sort as to retain His human nature whole and perfect. Now, if their error had been the same with the error of the Romanists at this day, the Fathers would never have been able to draw an argument against Eutyches from the mysteries of the Eucharist. Nothing indeed could have been alleged more apposite for the confirmation of his heresy. One heresy would have proved another. In either case alike the affirmation is that there is a transition into another substance, the former substance ceasing to be. But it was a fixed principle with the Fathers that the bread and wine after consecration retain their first nature, and that by consecration they be deprived of no portion of their former nature: and in Christ they held there to be two natures, so united in one Person that one took nothing from the other which is proper to it. And just as the bread is said to be the Flesh of Christ, and the Flesh of Christ bread, the wine Blood, and the Blood wine, so is it said of Christ, God is Man, and Man God: God is born of the Virgin; a Virgin hath brought forth God: God hath suffered, and hath shed His Blood. And in like manner, in virtue of the sacramental union, we are said to eat the Flesh of Christ, and to drink His Blood, so often as we do take the bread and wine of the Eucharist. For to those who take the Sacrament the bread is Flesh, and the wine is Blood, in virtue of the sacramental union.

Hence it is that in ancient writers there occur continually such expressions as the following;—That the Body of Christ is touched, bruised with the teeth, broken; and that the tongues of the faithful have on them the marks of His Blood. As saith Chrysostom: [Hom 24, on 1 Cor. x.] “Wherefore doth he add, ‘Which we break’? We may see this breaking in the Eucharist, though we see nothing of it on the Cross, but the very contrary, for ‘a bone of Him, saith He, ‘shall not be broken;’ but what He suffered not upon the Cross, that He suffereth in the oblation, and for thy sake endureth to be broken that He may satisfy all.” And in another place: “The tongue is reddened with this marvelous Blood.”

The well known recantation of Berengarius is a proof that at the time when he was forced to recant, this doctrine was in full force in the Church of Rome; for since the bread be the Flesh of Christ, and the wine His Blood sacramentally, that which is properly an accident of bread, namely

the being broken by the teeth, and that which is properly an accident of wine, namely that it tingeth with its own colour the tongue and the mouth of those who drink it, these things be rightly predicated of the Body and Blood of the Lord, in the Sacrament, because they mystic bread, in virtue of its Sacramental union with the Flesh of Christ, is Flesh to all who eat It, and the wine is Blood to all who drink It.

The recantation of Berengarius is as follows: [Council of Rome, 1078.] “I, Berengarius, unworthy that I am, anathematize all manner of heresy, and above all that by which I have hitherto been disgraced, and which attempteth to establish that the bread and wine which be placed upon the altar, be only the outward sacrament, and not the true Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that they cannot be subject to the senses, nor be handled, nor broken by the hands of the Priests, or be crushed by the teeth of the faithful, except so far only as they be the outward sacrament. I consent to the teaching of the Holy Roman Church. I make this profession of my faith—that the bread and wine which be placed upon the Altar be not only the outward sacrament, but also the true Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and, as subject to the senses, be handled and broken by the hands of the Priests, and crushed by the teeth of the faithful, not only in the outward sacrament, but in their vary reality, &c.” Now what Berengarius saith here may appear not a little paradoxical, but, if we will consider the common use of language, the thing is clear enough. Whensoever we speak absolutely of anything which consisteth of many parts, and constituteth one whole, we assign to the whole the actions and passions of the parts. When I say of a man that he laugheth, heareth, and speaketh, I say it absolutely of the whole man, although those actions be properly confined to certain parts: for whosoever laugheth, heareth, and speaketh, laugheth, heareth, and speaketh in his whole person, because all other parts of his body laugh, hear, and speak through that part of it which hath the peculiar function of laughing, hearing, or speaking. So it is that that which is done respect of a part, of, as is said, *?ata t?* be spoken indefinitely of the whole Sacrament. When the bread is broken, which is only one part of the Sacrament, it is said without limitation that the Sacrament is broken; and therefore too is this said of That Part which be not broken at all, because a breaking hath taken place in that part which admitteth of breaking: and so again He is broken, Who all the time remaineth unbroken; He is eaten and crushed with the teeth, Who is never consumed.

The Romanists of these days are at great pains to explain away this recantation of Berengarius, because the substance of bread and wine being destroyed, according to the figment of transubstantiation, which they have

invented since his time, they cannot understand in what way it can be said truly, and without falling into that yet greater error, which appeareth to be recalled thereby, [The allusion here is doubtless to the error of the Capernaïtes. S. John vi. 52. (Note by Translator.)] that the Body of Christ be subject to the senses, and be handled by the hands of the Priests. The error of Berengarius, which some of these days have reproduced, was this—that the Sacrament is composed simply of the part which signifieth:—he took no account whatsoever of That Part which be invisible, and by which the Sacrament subsisteth, namely, the very Body and the very Blood of the Lord. And so, when he cometh to recant, he confesseth that, after consecration, the invisible Part of the Sacrament be present, namely, the body and Blood of the Lord: and he saith that That Part be handled by the hands of the Priests, and crushed by the teeth, because this be what taketh place visibly; and this ancient and customary way of speaking was in common use with the Fathers in all their disputations touching the Sacrament of the Lord's Body. For there is nothing in the recantation of Berengrius which is not found in the old orthodox doctors and we may see it in Chrysostom on S. Matthew almost in the same words: [Hom. 83.] “O how many are ever saying, How I wish I could behold His Form, His Face, His raiment, His sandals. Well then thou seest Himself, thou touchest Himself, thou eatest Himself: dost thou desire to behold His raiment? He verily giveth Himself into thy hands, so that thou mayest not only see Him, but also touch Him, and have Him within thee.”

In the days of Berengarius the tenet of transubstantiation, and of empty forms without any subsisting subject matter, had as yet made no way. Had it been otherwise, he must have employed a different formula of recantation, namely, the formula of transubstantiation, i.e. of empty forms without substance; the denial of which by implication is clearly comprised in his affirmation that all that was contained in the Sacrament was the signification of the Body and Blood of the Lord.

But, in order to a clearer view of the whole matter, it will be convenient that we draw from the Word of God what be the proper manner of speaking touching Sacraments, and what be the nature of Sacraments. And if it shall appear that ancient divines have, in disputing upon the Mysteries, turned aside from the rule of speaking set out in the sacred Scriptures, let their failing make us the more cautious. But if it shall appear that they have kept the words in which the Holy Ghost teacheth, let us not be ashamed to follow our Fathers, and, as we hold their faith, so to keep their words. I will instance the ark of the Testimony, the Sacrament of the Israelites of old, and those things which be said concerning it,

because of their close affinity to the Sacrament of the Eucharist. The Ark then was the testimony and sign of the Presence and Propitiation of God in the midst of His people, just as, among the people of Christ, the bread and wine is the testimony of the Presence of Christ, and of the Eternal Sacrifice which he once offered for us upon the Altar of the Cross. It was the will of God to testify to His people, by the Sacrament of the Ark, that He presided in the midst of them, and was close at hand to help them in every danger, and that He would be merciful to their sins. To appear in the place where the Ark was was to appear before God. When the Ark was moved from its place, God was thought Himself to move. When the camp of the children of Israel was removed, and the Priests took up the Ark, Moses said, [Num. x. 35.] “Rise us, Lord, and let Thine enemies be scattered, and let them that hate Thee flee before Thee;” and when it rested, he said, “Return, O Lord, unto the ten thousand thousands of Israel.” When the Ark was carried into the Temple, the Levites sung of it: [Ps. xxiv. 8, 9, 10.] “Lift up our heads, O ye gates, and be ye lift up, ye everlasting doors, and the King of Glory shall come in.” Now what is here said about “coming in,” pertaineth to the Ark, for God cannot be moved from His place; but they address the Ark as though it were the King of Glory, when they ask, “Who is the King of Glory? even the Lord, strong and mighty, the Lord mighty in battle.” Scripture speaketh as though they had carried God Himself in their journeys together with the Ark, and that this be the received manner of speaking touching the Sacraments of God, as well because of the unfailing character of the Presence, as because of the Presence Itself, no theologian can deny. In the same way God is said to sit between the Cherubim—He Whose throne is heaven, and Whose footstool is the earth [Ps. lxxx.]—“Shine forth, Thou Who sittest above the Cherubim.” And again: “Jehovah sitteth above the Cherubim, let the earth be moved.” [Ps. xvix.] Need I add more? God testified to His people that He was merciful to them, and that He was their Saviour, and therefore the seat which the Cherubim guarded was called the Propitiatory. God was ever the true Immanuel unto His people.

Circumcision is called a Covenant of God, where God said “My Covenant shall be in your flesh.” [Gen. xvii. 13.] In that place the Sign is indicated by the name of the thing signified, and it is just the same as if God had said, the sign of My Covenant shall be in your flesh. Our Lord used the same manner of speech when He called the bread, the Sacrament of His Body, His Body, and the wine, the Sacrament of His Blood, His Blood. This is the true interpretation of the ancient orthodox divines, and they everywhere keep close to this manner of speaking. It is not that they believe that the bread was the Body of Christ Itself, or the wine the Blood

of Christ Itself. They used a manner of speech familiar to all, not for the purpose of overthrowing the nature of a Sacrament, or of taking away from It the heavenly and invisible Part by which a Sacrament consisteth, but that they might set forth This Part better and more effectually. And in this they followed the guidance of the Holy Spirit. Everywhere in the Word of God, wheresoever anything be said about the Sacraments, and the parts of a Sacrament, it is plain from the examples adduced, that the Sign be taken for the Thing signified, and the Thing signified for the sign, and that there be a mutual interchange of expression. Wheresoever one be understood for the other, as either a part for the whole, or a whole for the part, I will allow that there is a synecdoche or metaphor, but not so as to imply that the essential parts of the Sacraments, the heavenly and the earthly, be separated from one another. Where it is said, “My Covenant shall be in your flesh,” I admit the interpretation which affirmeth that ‘Covenant’ is there taken for the sign of the Covenant, but I understand that the sign be necessarily joined with the Covenant itself. And the words of God which follow immediately, “for a perpetual Covenant,” show plainly that the thing is so. If it were not, Circumcision would not have the name of God’s Covenant. And in the Gospels, where the Lord saith, “This is My Body,” I reject not the interpretation of the ancient orthodox, who say, that the Lord called a figure of His Body, His Body, but I deny constantly that the Lord intended to signify thereby that He gave the simple figure of His Body and His Blood: or that the orthodox Fathers so understood Him. These words of Christ, “Take eat, this is My Body,”—words of Him Who had before affirmed His Flesh to be meat indeed, and His Blood to be drink indeed,—are far too emphatic to admit of the interpretation that He gave the bread without His Body, and the wine without His Blood. The bread without the Crucified Flesh of Christ is no Sacrament, nor the wine without His Blood poured out. The same thing I observe touching Circumcision: it was not a Sacrament without God’s Covenant. Now that the Covenant hath passed away, it is no longer a Sacrament to the Jews, any more than to the Mahometans. Now, since Scripture everywhere employeth a figurative manner of speech, and ancient Divines have followed this manner, in order to the better expression of the nature of Sacraments, and of what be contained in them, it behoveth a later age not to be wiser than their fathers. They hesitated not at all to call the Sacrament of the Body of Christ, the Body of Christ, and the Sacrament of His Blood, His Blood. Wherefore, then, do we shrink from using the same manner of speech, and from confessing, when the bread of the Eucharist be delivered unto us is the Body of Christ; and in like manner, when the wine be given unto us, that what is really given is

the Blood of Christ. These things be done in a figure: no wonder, then, if the speech be figurative, but it is that which hath in very deed a reality of its own.

In like manner as in Israel of old time, the Ark of the Covenant was made the seat of God, the Propitiatory, and the throne of the King of Glory; just as Circumcision was made the Covenant of God in the flesh of Abraham and his seed—whosoever they were, bad and good alike—for such was the will, and such the command of God; just so the bread becometh the Flesh of Christ, and the wine the New Testament in His Blood. Take away the command and promise of God, and what was the Ark but a framework of wood and gold? And what of old would Circumcision have been but a vain superstition, as it is at this day to the Mahomtans and the Jews? The Word of God, that is, the command and the institution of God, was added to the visible element, and it became a Sacrament of invisible Grace. The Word departing, all things become empty which before were marvelously filled, and the objects of the truest worship. Who could ever say of the Ark of the Old Testament wheresoever it was, that there the Propitiatory was not; the throne of the Divine Majesty: that God Himself sat not above the Cherubim, and that he who stood before the Ark did not stand before the Face of God? And who shall dare to say, that when the Lord saith, in the New Testament, of the bread, “This is My Body,” of the wine, “This is My Blood,” that it be not the Body, that it be not the Blood of Christ, that it be not the New Testament in His Blood? What did our Lord will that we should think—what that we should believe, when He gave these names to the bread and wine? For although the substance of the bread and wine be not changed, and that remain bread which was bread before, and in like manner the wine, yet have they that, which before they had not, that they can be the food of man unto life eternal. Now, since this be the property of that Flesh *only* which was sacrificed for us, and of that Blood which was shed for us, it would not have been assigned to bread and wine, did not these, together with the Flesh and Blood of the Lord, make up one Sacrament. The Fathers, marveling at this so great change of the bread and wine, clothed it with all the magnificence that language can bestow.

Now the change that happeneth to the bread and wine is doubtless great; but it is a mistake to make that a change of substance, which is one of quality. For when the bread, which before was common bread, becometh the Sacred Body of Christ, and the wine becometh His Blood, things earthly become Things heavenly; and yet not naturally, but Sacramentally. There is, however, a difference to be observed here, in that the Ark and Circumcision were permanently and perpetually Sacraments,

the bread and wine cease to be Sacraments with the use thereof: just as Baptism also. And herein is that wonderful and Divine change of the bread and wine, of which the Fathers speak in language so magnificent. And indeed with good reason; for the dignity of the Thing can by no words of man be worthily extolled, nor the power of God be adequately unfolded to human sense. Who but God could make Circumcision to be God's Covenant,—could bestow upon the Ark of the Covenant the honour and reverence due to the Divine Presence, and make it to be the Propitiatory, and the throne of God, so that whosoever stood before the Ark was adjudged to stand before God, and whoever did injury to It, did injury to God? And, in the New Testament, whence cometh that virtue of the water, that when it toucheth the body, it washeth the soul? whence cometh it that the bread hath the weight and the image of the Crucified Body of Christ, and the wine of the Blood poured out,—Things which be the nourishment of man unto eternal life? None but God can change earthly things to heavenly. “These be not,” saith Chrysostom, [Hom. 89 (82) on Matt.] “the works of human operation. What once He did at that Supper, now doth He carry on by perpetual operation; now doth He Himself complete. We stand as those who serve and wait; but He Who sanctifieth and changeth these things is Himself.” He meaneth here “changeth” human things into Divine. And Augustine: [Prosp. Lib. Sent.] “We say that that be the Body and Blood of Christ, which taken from among the fruits of the earth, and consecrated by mystic prayer, we receive, in due order, to our spiritual health, for the memory of the Passion of the Lord for us. Now, since it be through man's hand that what we thus take be brought to its outward form, it requireth the invisible operation of the Spirit of God in order to its sanctification and its becoming so great a Sacrament: for it requireth the invisible operation of the Spirit of God in order to its sanctification and its becoming so great a Sacrament: for it is God Who worketh all thee things which are done in this matter by man's bodily act.” Neither our faith nor piety causeth that the Divine Mysteries be either Mysteries, or Things holy. In like manner the disbelief of men doth nothing impair the dignity of the Sacrament, and make it to be not that to all men which God hath appointed It to be, or that It be in anywise less holy. But it is faith which maketh us partakers of the holiness and Grace which the Sacraments contain; and of this benefit unbelief depriveth him who eateth and drinketh, and maketh him guilty of the Body and Blood of Christ Which he trampleth under foot; but it doth not take away the essence of a Sacrament. For a Sacrament, by whomsoever it be taken, remaineth that Thing which It is, namely a Sacred Thing, consisting of a thing earthly and a Thing heavenly.

Ambrose speaketh on this matter in exalted language; when in one of his treatises he saith: [De iis qui mysteriis initiantur, c. 9.] “How great examples do we adduce to prove that this be not what nature hath made it to be, but what the Blessing hath consecrated it into. And that the power of the Blessing be greater even than the power of nature, because by the Blessing nature itself be changed, &c.” He proveth through the whole of this chapter that the Almighty power of God maketh Sacraments to be that which they signify, and to confer that which they promise.

Now the Romanists abuse this passage grievously to the proof of transubstantiation; for the change of nature which Ambrose here toucheth is, not a change of one substance into another but, a change of accident, which, according to Divine ordinance, cometh upon the bread and wine. If there were no other change of nature save that whereby one substance passeth into another substance, their argument would have weight; but since the nature of things admitteth of innumerable changes, the substance remaining the same, what the argument proposeth to conclude is not concluded thereby. Nor doth the example of the rod of Moses, which was changed into another substance, I mean that of the serpent, avail them anything: for Ambrose only concludeth from thence that He, Who was able to do this by His Word, can so work in the bread and wine that these, remaining what they were, become Sacramentally His Body and His Blood, which before they were not. Ambrose shall be his own interpreter. In a passage in his books on the Sacraments he thus treateth of this matter: “Wherefore if there be such power in the Word of the Lord Jesus that things should begin to be that which they were not, how much more efficacious is that Word in making things to be what they were, and nevertheless to be changed into other things, &c.” He meaneth that they be bread and wine, which they were before, and yet be changed into something else, which they were not before, namely, into the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of the Lord. A little after he saith: [Book iv. cap. 4.] “Wherefore, to make answer to your inquiry, it was not the Body of Christ before consecration, but I tell you that, after consecration, It is the Body of Christ.” But some one will say, thou hast contradicted Ambrose by thine own interpretation above given, in which thou saidst that what he understood by change into another thing was the change of the bread into the Sacrament of the Body and Blood, whereas Ambrose affirmeth expressly that the change which taketh place by consecration is a change into the Body and Blood itself. Now it is something more to be changed into the Body of Christ than to be changed into the Sacrament of the Body of Christ: for that The Bread by consecration becometh the Sacrament of the Body of Christ no one I apprehend may deny, but to be changed into

the Body of Christ seemeth to be something more than this. Thus far the objector. But the truth, that, with the Fathers of the early Church, these expressions do nothing differ from each other: to be made the Sacrament of the Body of Christ, and to be made the Body of Christ, is with them the same thing. The Bread cannot become the Sacrament of the Body of Christ, unless it become the Body of Christ. “When the Lord made The Bread to be the Sacrament of His Body, He said not of The Bread, This is the Sacrament of My Body, but ‘This is My Body,’ for He made The Bread to be Sacramentally His Body, to teach us to take greater account of the Thing signified than of the sign.” [Theod. Dialog.] For it is the Lord’s will that we fix our minds chiefly upon this, that these things have their being rather by His Grace than by their own nature.

And lest any one should suppose that Ambrose affirmeth any manner of transubstantiation, or of consubstantiation, he useth the following clear illustration: “Thou thyself,” he saith, “wert the old man; after thou wert consecrated, thou didst begin to be a new creature,” &c. “Now no man in his senses will say that this taketh place by transubstantiation of our nature into another nature, but by that emendation which taketh place by Grace, and by the preaching of the Gospel, which is ‘the power of God unto salvation unto every soul that believeth.’” [On the Sacraments, bk. iv. c. 4.] After that therefore Ambrose hath shown by a multitude of examples that the power of God prevaileth over the common order of natural things, he concludeth thus: “Thou hast learned that of the bread the Body is made, and that wine and water are poured into the Cup; but it becometh blood by the consecrating power of the heavenly Word. Wilt thou say then—I see not the appearance of Blood therein?—Well, but it hath the likeness of it. For as thou hast taken to thyself the similitude of the Death of Christ, even so also dost thou drink the likeness of His Blood, that there may be no horror in thee of the Blood, and the price of thy redemption may work within thee.”

Since all our life dependeth on the Passion and Death of our Saviour, His Flesh and His Blood, and, yet more, His Death, are imparted unto us, under the similitude of food and drink. Now though it be true that images and similitudes of things be often similitudes and images of things absent, and of those which do no longer subsist, I do not understand Ambrose to have intended to signify that the similitudes *only* of the Things, without the Things themselves, be exhibited to us in the Sacrament; for from this point the Fathers never swerved, that the Sacraments of Christ exhibit those Things which they signify. The manner thereof is ineffable, but it is true and infallible. Chrysostom on S. Matthew on this special point: [Hom. 83.] “Since therefore He hath said, ‘This is My Body,’ let there be no

place left within us for any manner of doubt; let us believe, and with the eyes of our understanding see It clearly. For Christ hath given nothing to us which is, in Itself, subject to sense; but He hath given It through that which is subject to sense; all the Things which He hath given being, in Themselves, not subject to sense. Thus in Baptism, through the water, which is a thing subject to sense, the Gift is bestowed: but that which is perfected in the water, I mean Regeneration and Renovation, is a Thing to be apprehended of the mind.” When we take the Sacraments, the Body and Blood of Christ is given to us by things subject to sense, the bread and the wine; but this could never truly be said to be done, were not heavenly Things united to outward signs to the making of one Sacrament.

II. In these days a dispute hath arisen among divines touching the wicked; in what manner these can be said to eat the Flesh and to drink the Blood of the Lord; when our Lord saith, “Whoso eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood hath eternal life,” and these do eat and drink judgment and condemnation to themselves. Now we read in the Holy Scripture of three kinds of eating of the Body of Christ. 1. The Capernaïtic and Cyclopiā; such as that was which the Jews had in their minds when the Lord said, “Verily verily I say unto you, except ye eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His Blood, ye have no life in you.” The Lord was here teaching them the necessity of that Spiritual eating which taketh place by faith; they understood Him to speak of a carnal eating. There is therefore also a certain Spiritual eating of the Flesh of the Lord. There is, further again, the third kind, according to the institution of the Lord, the one of which we are now treating—the Sacramental eating—and it is the office of faith to make this latter the cause of the former. The good and the bad alike eat Sacramentally with their mouths the Body of Christ and drink His Blood; but the good alone do this Spiritually. Now to eat the Body of Christ Sacramentally and to drink His Blood, is to receive the Sacrament of His Body and Blood; that is, the bread and the Body of Christ, the wine and the Blood of Christ. For in no other way are the bread and the wine Sacraments. And he who thinketh it possible that the outward signs can be partaken of apart from those Things signified, which are a necessary part of the Sacrament, divideth, or rather dissolveth, the Sacrament. For the outward symbols be only one part of the Sacrament. The attempt to elude this argument *per synecdochen* hath been the parent of man a grievous and unhappy controversy amongst us. Now all these things which I lay down touching the Spiritual eating and the Capernaïtic, be the truths of Scripture, not can they be denied by those who hold the true doctrine of the Sacraments. So Augustine teacheth upon S. John: “He is therefore that

Bread which came down from heaven, that if any one shall eat of It he shall not die. But this is spoken of what pertaineth to the virtue of the Sacrament, not of what pertaineth to the visible Sacrament.” And in the same treatise: “And therefore he who doth not dwell in Christ, and in whom Christ doth not dwell, doubtless neither eateth Spiritually His Flesh, nor drinketh His Blood, although carnally and visibly he press with his teeth the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ.”*

* [Long footnote: Tract 26. Article XXIX was finally made one of the Thirty-Nine Articles in 1571. Within thirty years from that date we find Saravia, with a full and accurate knowledge of all the controversies of the time, adducing the very passage of S. Augustine, which forms the substance of Article XXIX, not in proof that the wicked *do not* receive the inward part, or Thing signified of the Sacrament, the Body and Blood of Christ, but in proof that the wicked *do* receive It. He does not so much as hint that any other interpretation of the passage in question was current at the time, or even admissible.]

[Continuing the previous paragraph:] So far as I know, no theologian at any time hath denied that the Sacrament of the Body of Christ be received carnally and visibly even by the wicked. Now that Sacrament is the bread and the Body, and the wine and the Blood. He who receiveth only the bread, receiveth no Sacrament; for either the Sacrament is received whole and perfect, or not at all. Augustine: [Against the Donatists, bk. iii. c. 15.] “Sacraments, however, if they be the same, are everywhere whole and perfect, although their meaning be depraved, and the handling of them be various and discordant.” For it is not more contrary to reason that the flesh of Christ be eaten Sacramentally, and His Blood drunken by hypocrites, than that it should have been possible that God should have been touched and kissed by the wicked, whensoever they either kissed or touched Christ, without any profit—to their own damnation. Augustine on Baptism, against the Donatists: [Bk. iii. 21.] Nor doth it make any difference, when the question is touching the perfectness and holiness of the Sacrament, what be the belief and what the faith of the man who receiveth the Sacrament. It maketh indeed, all the difference in respect of the way of Salvation, but in respect of the question, what a Sacrament is, it maketh no difference at all. For it may happen that a man may have the Sacrament in its completeness, and a perverted faith, just as it may happen that a man may hold all the words of the Creed, and yet hold no right belief.” Although it be true that the Flesh of Christ the Lord, from the personal union of His humanity with His Deity, hath every healthful and life-giving power, and far greater power than it is possible to suppose to exist in any creature, in such sort as to give health and life by His slightest

touch; yet no effect of this wonderful power ensued, except only in those whom He willed to be healed and restored to life; because the Flesh of Christ hath Its own proper effect, not by way of any natural necessity, but by the action of His own free will. When He was pressed by the crowd, no one had any benefit from His touch, except that one woman who touched the hem of the garment of the Lord in faith.

And those considerations which are adduced from the 6th of S. John to prove that the wicked neither eat the Flesh of Christ, nor drink His Blood, are foreign to the purpose; because the Lord in that place is not speaking about the Sacramental eating, but about Spiritual eating, which hath to do with the Virtue of the Sacrament and Sacramental Grace. For this is ever to be firmly kept in mind, that the Sacrament consisteth of two things, which, being in the Sacrament, may no more be separated one from the other, than the personal union of the two Natures in Christ may be dissolved. Whence it followeth, evidently, that the whole Sacrament be received by hypocrites no less than by the good; so that whosoever receiveth the visible part of the Sacrament, receiveth alike the invisible part: of which two parts the whole Sacrament be composed.

If any man still resisteth our argument, and saith that Sacraments be indeed the images of heavenly things, but that, just as a thing may be regarded as the image of another thing, which latter thing be not present, in like manner also the Sacrament may be regarded as the image of a heavenly Thing which be absent, my answer is this: Although it be true that there be in the Mysteries a certain similitude of Divine things, yet that similitude doth not make the whole Sacrament; because a Sacrament hath not necessarily two parts,—one earthly, the other heavenly: while images, whether in painting or sculpture, consist not of those very things of which they be images. In the picture of Caesar there is nothing of Caesar, for the representation of Caesar is not compounded from the painting and Caesar himself, as the Sacrament is compounded from the bread and the Flesh of Christ. And, moreover, that analogy which the Sacraments have to heavenly Things, hath its source, not in the nature of the things themselves but, in the Divine institution, which maketh things earthly and visible to be like unto Things heavenly. Bread hath no analogy, of its own nature, to the Flesh of Christ, any more than an apple, or any other esculent: nor wine to His Blood, any more than milk, or anything else that can be drunken. But when it seemed good to the Lord to feed us with His Flesh and His Blood, then He gave to bread and wine the likeness of His Flesh and Blood. But since He did not give to bread and wine the essential properties of His Flesh and His Blood, He united His Flesh and Blood with them Sacramentally, that they might become Divine Food and Heavenly Drink,

and might communicate a Blessed Immortality to Christ's faithful people. And just as the Flesh and Blood of Christ have this their life-giving power from that Godhead wherewith they be personally united, so the Sacraments of bread and wine receive from the Flesh and Blood Itself, the dignity of the Body and the Blood. Finally, Sacraments be not only representations, but they be also testimonies and signs which testify that Things Divine and Heavenly be celebrated on earth, be given to, and be received by, those who be initiated into the Mysteries. Whence, I think, it clearly followeth that the Very Body and the Very Blood of Christ be given to, and be partaken of, by hypocrites. I care nothing or the disputes of Divines crying aloud that the words of our Saviour teach the contrary of this, when He saith, "Who eateth My Flesh and drinketh My Blood hath eternal life." For it is as clear as the light, that in those words the Lord is not speaking of the Sacramental eating, but of that eathing which taketh place by faith; unless indeed any one be prepared to contend that it is not possible that the Flesh of the Lord can be eaten and His Blood drunken Sacramentally, except by him who doth this by faith also, and Spiritually. But this position is false. Augustine speaking on the words of our Lord answereth fully this objection. He doth by no means think that it followeth, that whoso eateth in the Sacrament the Flesh of Christ and drinketh His Blood, hath Christ dwelling in him and eternal life; for his words are these: [Sermon 11.]

"Whether, then, may we understand those also to be included here, of whom the Apostle saith that they eat and drink damnation to themselves, when they eat the Very Flesh and drink the Very Blood? What, did Judas, he who sold his Master . . . dwell in Christ and Christ in him? and many others too, who either eat that Flesh and drink that Blood with a feigned heart; or, who, when they have eaten and drunken It, become apostates from the faith, whether at all do these dwell in Christ, and Christ in them? And yet there is a certain manner of eating that Flesh and of drinking that Blood, after which manner he who shall have eaten and drunken dwelleth in Christ and Christ in him. It is not therefore every manner, in which any one eateth the Flesh of Christ and drinketh His Blood, which maketh that man to dwell in Christ, and Christ in him." From these words of S. Augustine three things clearly appear: First, that there is more than one way of eating the Flesh of Christ, and of drinking His Blood. To this teaching we heartily assent, for it is the teaching of Christ Himself. The second thing is, that the words of our Lord which He spake in Capernaum, do not touch at all the manner of eating the Flesh and drinking the Blood of the Lord, which we have spoken of as the Sacramental eating, but that Spiritual eating by a living faith, whereby it is effected that a man dwell in

Christ, and have Christ dwelling in him. Lastly, that there be many who, as Judas did, eat and drink the Flesh and Blood of the Lord with a feigned heart. The opinion of Cyprian touching Sacraments is this, [On the Supper of the Lord.] that they can never be without their proper virtue. His words are as follows: “Sacraments, indeed, cannot be without their proper virtue, nor in anywise doth the Divine Majesty absent Himself from the Mysteries. But although the Sacraments allow themselves to be taken and handled by the wicked, those whose unbelief or unworthiness be offensive to the Holiness of the Sacraments, cannot be partakers of their Spiritual life. And, therefore, to some these Gifts are a savour of life unto life, and others the savour of death unto death.” The Divine Majesty, he saith, in no wise absenteth Himself from the Mysteries, and therefore it is that the Mysteries cannot be without their proper virtue: to some unto life, to others unto death.

The Word of God teacheth us plainly, that the Sacraments, in their outward and visible use, have always been common to the good and bad alike.*

* [Long footnote referred to with Latin text: That by “*Externa Saramenta*” the author does not mean the outward arts, or signs only of the Sacraments, as separated from the inward parts, or Things signified, is plain at once from the context, as from his entire argument. “*Externa Sacramenta*” means the whole Sacrament, as complete in both its parts, the outward, and the inward, and as given in and by the outward visible sign. Compare [other Latin portions] (Note by Translator.)]

[Continuing the previous paragraph:] “I would not have you ignorant,” saith Paul, “how that all our Fathers were under the cloud, and that all passed through the sea, and were all Baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea, and did all eat the same Spiritual meat, and did all drink the same Spiritual drink.” In that he saith “all” expressly, he excludeth no one. What Paul saith here of all the people of Israel is to be said and understood of all Christians, after their manner; i.e., that all be Baptized in Christ, in His Blood. And in like manner of those who be partakers of the Eucharist, all eat the same Spiritual Meat, and all drink the same Spiritual Drink. Now it is certain that it hath not happened, and doth not happen, to all, to do this unto salvation. That all the Baptized obtain remission of their sins, or that all who communicate in the Mysteries of the Lord’s Supper, eat with faith the Flesh and drink the Blood of the Lord, may not be affirmed. When the Apostle saith, “with many of them God was not well pleased,” he warneth us Christians that the same thing be of customary application to ourselves, and that some eat and drink unto life, and some unto death the same Spiritual food, namely, the Flesh and Blood of Christ. for surely

it is not more strange, under the New Covenant in Christ, that bad Christians eat the same Spiritual food, and drink the same Spiritual drink, together with the good, than that the Israelites should have done so under the Old Covenant in Moses. And just as neither any impiety on the part of the minister, nor on the part of him who communicateth in the Sacraments, can take away that relation which, by Divine ordinance, the earthly part hath to the heavenly, so neither can such things destroy the union of the parts. Wherefore, the Sacrament remaineth whole and perfect in those parts whereof It consisteth. For the bread and wine of the Lord's upper be a manifest sign of a heavenly thing to the wicked as to the good; as is also Baptism: for just as all who be Baptized with water do not receive the Gift of Regeneration to the making them to be new creatures, yet to they, nevertheless, receive true and perfect Baptism, which consisteth of a visible thing and an invisible Thing; in that they be dipped in the Blood of Christ; in like manner do those who eat and drink unworthily partake of the Supper of the Lord, true and complete in all Its parts.

The Ark of the Covenant was nothing less the Ark of the Covenant and the testimony of Divine Propitiation when it was in the Temple of Dagon, than when it was in the Holiest of Holies, in the Tabernacle, or the Temple. It was everywhere the same Sacrament; in no part It suffered loss. And, in my judgment, it appeareth nothing more strange that the Flesh of Christ be verily eaten in the Sacrament by the wicked, than that the Ark of God was handled and borne by the wicked sons of Eli, or carried into the Temple of Dagon by the Philistines, and there set side by side with the Idol: or, again, than that the Son of God was kissed by the traitor Judas, and nailed to the Cross by sinners.

Divines agree that a Sacrament is, as it were the Word, made visible; wherefore, no man ought to wonder if It cometh under the same conditions as the Word of God. Now, the same preaching of the Gospel, of which Paul saith, that "It is the Power of God unto Salvation to every one that believeth," is heard by the wicked and despisers of God, by the good and faithful, alike. But since in those who believe not It doth not work unto Salvation It doth not therefore cease to be that Gospel which It is in Its own nature. No man can say that the Gospel hath not been heard by the unbeliever, though the same hath not received It into his heart by faith. The Minister of the Gospel is to both alike the Minister of the Spirit and Life, not of the letter and death; although in the unbelieving, nothing worketh save the letter. What we be bound to look to, if we would come to a right understanding, is the nature itself of the thing before us, not the wickedness and evil dealings of men. Now the Law demandeth of man absolute righteousness, the Gospel bringeth the glad tidings of the grace

and mercy of God to all who repent. The Law threateneth death: the Gospel offereth life. The belief or the unbelief of those who hear, changeth the nature neither of the one nor of the other. That the same Doctrine of the Gospel be not heard with equal profit by all, this happeneth by the fault of those who hear, not of the Gospel itself. The same minister of the Word of God declareth the same thing to al. Paul writeth [2 Cor. ii. 15.] to the Corinthians, of the preaching of the Gospel: “For we are a sweet savour of Christ in them that are saved, and in them that perish: to the one we are the savour of death unto death, and to the other the savour of life unto life.” What a wonder then that the Sacrament—in which, as it were, in the Word made visible, the Body and Blood of Christ be borne to, and placed in, the hands and the mouths of the wicked—should have no better effect than the Word of God when taken in by the ear of the unbeliever? This is certain: “Whosoever shall eat this Bread and drink this Cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord;” because he doth not “discern the Lord’s Body.” Augustine saith: [In Prosp. Book of Sentences.] “For as Judas, to whom the Lord gave the sop, allowed the devil to enter into him, not by receiving what was bad, but by receiving what he received badly; just so, any one taking the Sacrament of the Lord unworthily, doth not, because he is himself evil, make the Sacrament evil, nor can it be said that because he doth not receive unto salvation, that therefore he hath received nothing; for the Sacrament was nevertheless the Body of the Lord and the Blood of the Lord, even to those of whom the Apostle said, ‘He who eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself.’” The very reason for which they be held to eat and to drink unworthily, who do not first approve themselves to God, and so eat and drink their own condemnation, appeareth to me to remove every possible ground of controversy upon the matter: for the cause assigned is this: that they *discern not the Lord’s Body*. Whence I consider the inference to be rightly drawn, that the Body of the Lord had been given Sacramentally to these very persons, together with the bread. Augustine hath indicated that this is the true conclusion: in our days there are not a few who deny it. They take refuge in a figure, and under this they contend that the bare bread be signified by the name of the Body. I allow the figure, but I deny that bare bread can retain the name of the Body. The name of the Body is not given to the bread, except so far as it be the Sacrament of the Body; and it is enough for me, that they who differ from me in this matter, cannot possibly deny this. For, in my judgment, this is a certain and established principle of the Faith, that the bread without the Flesh of Christ is not the Sacrament of the Flesh of Christ; therefore they who discern not that bread, do dishonour to the Lord’s Body.

It were equally contrary to reason to say that the same Sacramental bread given, be to some the Body of the Lord, and to others not the Body of the Lord, as if any one were to say of good and bad Christians Baptized at the same moment, in the same water, and by the hands of the same Minister, that the one be dipped in the Blood of Christ, and the other not. And to say of the Ark of the Covenant that it was not the Testimony, and the Propitiatory; and that God did not sit above the Cherubim, just as much in the Temple of Dagon as in the Holy of Holies: and that the reprobate Israelites were not baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea together with the good, and that they did not eat the same Spiritual meat and did not drink the same Spiritual drink. These outward Sacraments were always like unto themselves, and the same, although they produced diverse effects, and brought health to one, destruction to the other. Hence then we gather that the Body of the Lord be given to the wicked in the Sacrament, and be partaken of, so far as It can be partaken of visibly and, so to speak, Sacramentally, by man in this life. I say that the same Sacrament, the whole Sacrament, robbed of no part of itself, is in the mouth of all, good and bad; the same outward thing equally sacred and Divine in all cases is, together with the inward and Heavenly Thing, that is, the Flesh and Blood of Christ, given to, and received by, the good and the bad alike. [2 Sam. vi.] From the same Ark came the smiting of Ussah and the blessing of Obed-Edom, and of his whole family. The same Lord avenged the rashness of Ussah, Who was graciously pleased to recompense the piety of Obed-Edom.

Their arguments are of little value who contend that the Flesh and the Blood of Christ be in the Sacrament of the Eucharist by signification only. The Holiness of the Sacrament is not made by signification. The sign itself testifieth the Holy Presence of the Thing signified. He who taketh away that Presence, taketh away together with It the Holiness of the Sacrament. I know of no single orthodox divine who hath denied that the Sacrament when partaken of by the hypocrite by Holy. Now I ask, whence cometh that Holiness? When the Lord, appearing in the burning bush, bade Moses loose the shoes from off his feet, for that the place whereon he stood was Holy ground, it was the Presence of Jehovah Himself which made that place Holy; it was not the first. When God delivered the Law upon Mount Sinai, it was by His own especial Presence that He made Holy the whole mountain, so that no one could draw near to the mountain without danger of life. Now, although we be “not come to the mount which might be touched, and the illimitable fire, and the darkness, and the tempest, and the sound of the trumpet—and so terrible was the sight that Moses said, I exceedingly fear and quake—but have come to the Mount Zion, to Jesus,

the Mediator of the New Covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, which speaketh better things than that of Abel;” [Heb. xii. 22.] though all this be true of us, the Lord is not therefore to be believed to be the less Present in the Sacraments of the New Testament, because He exhibiteth Himself to us therein more compassionately, than in old time to our fathers in the burning bush, in Mount Sinai, and in the Sanctuary of the Tabernacle in which the Ark was placed. Now it was not the signs of God’s mercy, but the Presence of God Himself which caused the Majesty and Holiness of that place [Ex. xxiii.] except the High Priest, who was first hallowed for that express purpose, and that once only in the year, with Blood. In like manner, in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, it is not the signification alone of the Body and Blood of our Saviour which sanctifieth the Sacrament, but the real Presence of Himself. For there is no less a Presence of God our Saviour in the Bread and Wine, no less a Grace, no less a Holiness, than there was in old time in the Ark of the Covenant, in the burning bush, on Mount Sinai, in the Sanctuary. In all which God attested His Presence by visible testimonies: wherefore that Presence is to be worshipped by us in all reverence and in all piety. The impiety of those who handle the Sacraments wickedly, whether in giving or in taking them, doth not take away from the Sacraments their Holiness. Augustine saith very well upon this matter: [Against Letter of Pet.] “Remember therefore that the manners of wicked men have no power to harm the Sacraments of God; to cause them either not to be at all, or to be less Holy; but that they harm the wicked men themselves in that they have these Sacraments for a testimony of their damnation, not for a help to Holiness.” What we read too in the Apostle Paul establisheth this our judgment: [1 Cor. x. 16.] “The Cup of Blessing which we bless, is it not the Communion of the Blood of Christ? The Bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ? for we being many, are one Bread and one Body, for we are all partakers of That One Bread.” Paul speaketh these words without limit, for he addresseth them to those who eat and drink damnation to themselves, although these be not one Body with the good; for he hath regard to that which they ought to be, not to that which they are. The Grace of the Sacrament of which the good only be partakers, this doth not restrict to them the receiving of the entire Sacrament; for thus, as we have said before, Sacraments would be Sacraments to the good only. Augustine saith upon this point: [On 1 Epist. John. Tract 3.] “Many who are not of us receive the Sacraments together with us; receive together with us Baptism; receive together with us That of Which believers have knowledge; the Blessing; the Eucharist, and whatsoever there be in the holy Sacraments: they receive together with us the Communion of the Altar itself; and yet

are they not of us.” See how the most learned of all the ancient Fathers, Augustine, saith: “Whatsoever there be in the Sacraments, those receive who are not of us.” Now this cannot be understood to be said of the Virtue and Grace of the Sacrament; for no man in his sense hath ever affirmed that the bad receive this; but it is to be understood of the Flesh and Blood of the Lord, without which the bread and the wine cannot be understood to be Sacraments at all. The account of this Sacrament is one with that of the Sacrament of Baptism: one who receiveth Baptism without true faith can yet not be said to have received nothing, although he hath not received the Grace of the New Birth. For in that case, if the wicked man receive nothing except the water, and he be afterwards converted to the true faith, he would have to be Baptized a second time; but because the Baptism received in his person be an entire and indelible Sacrament, for that reason it is not afterwards repeated. For such repetition cannot be separated from injury one to that former Sacrament, as if it were none at all. In a word, no theologian denieth that the wicked receive the Sacrament of the Eucharist: wherefore they receive whatever appertaineth, so to speak, to the essence of a Sacrament; and to use the words of S. Augustine, “Whatever there be in the holy Sacraments;” that is, whatever be required to make the outward element to be a Sacrament.

There is a distinction very common in men’s mouths in these our days, for which S. Augustine is quoted; the distinction between “The Bread, The Lord,” and “the bread of the Lord;” and that some eat “The Bread, the Lord,” others only “the bread of the Lord.” Now this distinction doth not go to prove at all that both parts of the Sacrament, that is, the bread and the Body, the wine and the Blood, be not received Sacramentally in the Sacrament by hypocrites. S. Augustine hath no where any understanding touching the Bread of the Lord’s Supper in that sense in which these words be cited against us. It will be plain to any attentive reader that a perverted meaning had been drawn from these words of Augustine,—a meaning conceived to be his according to the predisposition of the minds of those who believe that the Body of Christ can in no wise be received in the Sacrament by the wicked.

The first thing to remark is, that the words of the Prophet which be quoted by the Lord, and be expounded by S. Augustine, are to be understood touching the familiar daily living of Christ with His disciples; and that the Lord had not reference to what He was Himself about to do in that Supper, but to this, that, throughout all the time of His conversation with His disciples, Judas, together with the other Apostles, had been His own familiar companion. Now, seeing that such companionship as this, even with barbarous people, hath always had great power to draw close the

bonds of love, our Lord here complaineth, in respect thereof, of the ingratitude of His betrayer. The other disciples had received, from that companionship of daily life, daily increase of faith, and love for the Lord; but the stony heart of Judas could not be moved to love the Lord by the power of kindly companionship and conversation. And because to love the Lord Jesus and to believe in Him be Spiritually to eat the Lord, Augustine saith that the believing and loving Apostles, in the companionship of their daily life, ate "The Bread, The Lord;" but that Judas ate only "the Bread," that is, the food, "of the Lord;" for he tasted not how sweet the Lord is.

When our Lord said to the people of Capernaum, before the Institution of the Sacrament, "Labour not for the meat that perisheth, but for That which endureth unto eternal life;" that is, Eat Me, Which am the Bread of Life, Who am come down from heaven, as He saith shortly after; He was encouraging them to that eating which taketh place by faith, and of which the true disciples of Christ had already become partakers through faith. For since the people of Capernaum had eaten "the bread of the Lord," as Judas had done himself, but not "The Bread, The Lord," He inviteth them, even in the use of their common food, to that eating which doth not only consist in the celebration of the Mysteries of the Bread and Wine, (for these, at that time, had not received their Institution,) but to that which may take place through faith in any receiving of God's blessings by Grace. For the Lord taught them that there be a certain Food unto eternal Life, Which he who feedeth upon shall never die; and that That Food is to be laboured after first of all things, and that It may be found even in the partaking of common food, if this be received through faith, with thanksgiving. Every table that be spread for us, every manner of bodily food maketh believers to be mindful of the Eternal Table and the Bread of Heaven; that so, whensoever we feed upon the bread that perisheth, we may eat, in like manner as they were bidden to eat, the Lord, the Living Bread. Who can tell of how great sweetness the Apostles were partakers in that daily conversation and eating together with the Lord, when they looked upon the aspect and the countenance of That Man Whom so many Kings and so many Prophets had desired to see and hear. Judas (rather of the nature of a wild beast than of a man, and as if he had been born of a tigress,) was nothing moved by the kindness of his Lord. Silver was sweeter to him than his Lord. Wherefore, indeed, he was used to eat "the bread of the Lord," together with the other Apostles, in that daily companionship; but "The Bread, The Lord" Which is eaten through faith, This he never ate. Hence Augustine saith: "He is not of them, who so ate His bread that he lifted up his heel against Him. They ate 'The Bread, the Lord:' he 'the bread of the Lord.' For, saith the Apostle, 'He who eateth

unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself.” Now, it may appear that Augustine, by citing these words of Paul, confirmeth their opinion who contend that the expressions of Augustine, “The Bread, The Lord,” and “the bread of the Lord,” are to be understood of a diverse Sacramental eating. But, for my part, I think it of n force that there be in this place a certain allusion to those words of S. Paul, as it was natural there should be, having regard to the likeness of the two things under consideration. Because he who eateth even common bread without faith cannot be said not to sin, and in some wise even “eateth damnation to himself,” just as he doth who receiveth unworthily the Sacrament and the difference between the two be only a difference of a greater or a lesser sin. If, however, any one be disposed not to admit this exposition of Augustine’s meaning, simply, as I have put it, and shall contend that both kinds of bread are to be understood, namely the Eucharistic Bread and common bread, because Judas was partaker of both, I shall no object; but what I cannot grant is this, that Augustine intended to say, when he used the words “bread of the Lord,” that Judas received *only* the sacramental bread, without the Body of the Lord; because, in many places he affirmeth expressly that Judas ate the Body, and drank the Blood of the Lord, together with the other Apostles. The distinction which he doth establish in those words is that between the inward and Spiritual eating of the believing Apostles, and the outward, and only Sacramental, eating of the traitor Judas. In the Tract on John vi. we read as follows: “Was the sop which was given to Judas by the Lord, *bad*? God forbid that we should say so! No physician would give poison. *The* Physician gave health; but, by receiving badly, the receiver received unto his destruction.” The same Father speaketh even more plainly in his Treatise against Fulgentius the Donatist: “For both Judas the betrayer received the good Body, and Simon Magus received the good Baptism, of Christ; but because they used not a good Thing well, they were destroyed in their wickedness for using It ill. Baptism is a good Thing the Blood and Body of Christ are good Things; the Law is good; but, it is added, ‘if a man use it lawfully.’” Now, S. Augustine could not signify more plainly than he hath done in this place, and in many others, that Judas ate the Body and Blood of the Lord. Our adversaries are in the same error in which the Donatists were; and at this day there be many Anabaptists who do not believe that perfect Sacraments be either given to, or be taken by, the unfaithful. Now, whatsoever S. Augustine disputeth against the Donatists touching the Sacraments, the same confuteth their error who contend that the wicked receive nothing but bread in the Eucharist, and nothing but water in Baptism.

I press this matter at greater length, that all may better understand the Dignity of this Sacrament, and reverence Its Holiness; for this be so great that it suffereth no diminution where the Sacrament be either administered or received by unworthy men: and, on the other hand, admitteth no increase through the piety either of him who ministereth, or of him who communicateth. The Bread was the Sacrament of the Body of the Lord, and The Wine was the Blood of the New Testament, to Judas the betrayer, as to the other Apostles. This we have read above in Augustine. For it was said by the Saviour Himself, nothing less to Judas than to the other Apostles, “This is My Body,” and “This is My Blood.” Nor doth it do any greater violence to our reason, that Judas should have eaten Sacramentally that Body which was given to the Apostles, than that his feet too should have been washed by the Lord, and that he should have been allowed to kiss His Sacred Face, at the moment when he betrayed his Lord to the soldiers, and the tribunes, and the magistrates of the Jews. If these things were not so, then all that we read in the Fathers of reproof of the wicked who eat and drink unworthily the Flesh and Blood of the Lord, would have nothing whereon to rest. Theodoret in 1 Cor. x.: “The expression ‘shall be guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord’ meaneth this, that just as Judas betrayed Him, and the Jews on their part insulted Him, and heaped reproaches and abuse upon Him, so do they do Him dishonour and have Him in scorn, who take His most Holy Body with unclean hands, and put It into a polluted and unhallowed mouth.” And Chrysostom upon the Epistle to the Ephesians: [Serm. 3] “In what guise wilt thou appear before the tribunal of Christ, who darest to touch the Body of the Lord with unclean hands and lips? Thou who wouldst not presume to kiss an earthly King with thy fetid mouth, dost thou kiss the King of Heaven with thy filthy soul?” The same Father saith in another place: [Hom. 24 on 1 Cor. x.] “If, therefore, no man would rashly touch the raiment of a mortal King, how shall we receive the pure and sinless Body of the Lord of all, That Body which is the partaker of His Divine Nature, That Body through which we are and live, That Body through which the gates of hell are broken, and the gates of heaven set open,—how, I say, shall we, in receiving It, do unto It so great dishonour?” Now, all these manners of speaking would be wholly out of place, if there were no Sacramental participation of the Body and Blood of Christ, common alike to the good and the bad. And it is an ill conclusion, in my judgment, which denieth simply that ungodly men and hypocrites eat the Flesh and drink the Blood of the Lord, because they do not this Spiritually and in the singleness of faith. If there were but this one way only of eating the Flesh of the Lord, and of drinking His Blood, and that other way—the way, I mean, of eating

His Flesh and drinking His Blood Sacramentally—had not been instituted by the Lord, the theory intended in their argument would doubtless be true; but we have demonstrated above from Augustine, that there be more ways than one of eating the Body of the Lord, and drinking the Blood; and while they be truly said not to eat His Flesh Spiritually, and drink His Blood, who do not dwell in Christ and Christ in them, that man doth err who changeth his ground from the Spiritual, to the Sacramental, eating of the Flesh, and denieth that this too be possible to the ungodly; for he argueth from one thing to another thing, when the nature of the two be not the same.

The godly consent in this matter with the Fathers of the Early Church, of those servants of God, whom God hath raised up in these latter days, to restore the purity of the Doctrine of Christ, hath been my reason for dwelling at some greater length upon this portion of my argument. Martin Bucer, as I have noted above, hath often testified to the whole world in his writings, that he is of one mind with Luther touching the Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist. They differ, indeed, in the manner of the expression thereof: they in no wise differ touching the thing which they express. To make this the clearer, I will here subjoin the Articles to which Martin Bucer with his friends, and Martin Luther with his friends, alike subscribed their names, on that occasion when proposals for concord upon this matter were commenced at Wittenburg. Touching this, we read as follows in the proceedings with the followers of Zuinglius:

“We understand Martin Bucer to declare after the manner following, the judgment of himself and of the others, who, together with him, had assembled out of the cities, touching the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ.

“I. They confess, according to the words of Irenaeus, that there be in this Sacrament two things—a heavenly and an earthly. They hold, therefore, and teach that, together with The Bread and Wine, there be Verily and Essentially Present the Body and the Blood of Christ; and while they reject transubstantiation, and hold that the Body of Christ be not included in The Bread locally, or, in any other way, be corporally united with The Bread, apart from the taking of the Sacrament, yet they do hold and confess, that by Sacramental union, The Bread is the Body of Christ; that is, they hold and believe that, together with The Bread given, there be Present and be Verily given the Body of Christ. For, apart from the use and the taking of the Sacrament, when the bread be put aside and reserved in monstrances, or be carried about in processions, and held up to

the sight of the people, as it is in the Church of Rome, they do not hold the Body of Christ to be Present.

“II. They hold that the Institution of the Sacrament made by Christ hath its own efficacy in the Church of Christ; and doth not depend either upon the worthiness or unworthiness of the minister who giveth the Sacrament, or of him who receiveth It. Wherefore, as Paul saith that even the unworthy eat the Sacrament, so do they hold that the Body and Blood of Christ is Verily exhibited even to the unworthy, and that the unworthy Verily receive It, whensoever the Institution and Command of Christ the Lord be observed. But that all such receive unto condemnation, as Paul saith, because they abuse the Sacrament, in that they receive It without true repentance and without faith. For the Sacrament was Instituted to this end, that men should testify that the Grace and benefits of Christ be applied to those who take It; and that those be Verily engrafted into the Body of Christ, and be washed with His Blood, who do truly repent and amend, and have their consolation by faith in Christ.

“Now, since few of our friends have come together at this time, and it be necessary to refer this matter to other preachers of the Word and to others in authority, on both sides, we are unable finally to conclude this our agreement, until such time as we have so referred it. But seeing that all who be present here, confess that they be of one mind, and that their desire is, upon all points of faith to teach that which is set out in the Confession and Apology of the Evangelical Princes, we most earnestly desire and pray that in universal agreement may be established; and if the others on either side shall show that the present Article of Faith hath their assent, we do nothing doubt but that a firm and lasting peace will be established amongst us.

“Wolfgangus Capito,	Mattheus Aulberus,
Martinus Bucerus,	Johannes Schradinus,
Martinus Frechtus,	Martinus Lutherus,
Jacobus Ottherus,	Caspar Cruciger,
Gervasius Scholasticus,	Johannes Bugenhagius,
Johannes Bernardi,	Philippus Melancthon,
Bonifacius Lycosthenes,	Justus Menius,
Wolfgangus Musculus,	Fridericus Myconius.”
Martinus Germani,	

I know not what that may have been which stopped the way of a peace so holy, so useful, so necessary to the Churches of Christ. I know not who they were who have hindered that peace. Assuredly shall they give account unto God of this their sin. “Woe unto the world because of

offences!” For my part, I would have all that swept away which hath at any time been alleged against the proposed peace: I would have all such allegations tested by the above Articles. As for those teachers who set themselves against this pacification of the Church, they are to be regarded in no other light than as schismatics, who make a sport of fomenting and encouraging the disagreements of the Churches, and who would rather see heaven and earth in one common ruin, than depart so much as one hair’s breadth from their own private interpretation.

After this proposal for pacification, Martin Bucer of pious memory was nothing ashamed to retract in his “Enarrations upon the Four Evangelists,” whatsoever had fallen from him upon this matter, in the heat of discussion, against the judgment of Luther. I have thought it well to set down here his own words, as they are found in his letter to the Reverend Father in God, Edward Fox, Bishop of Hereford:

“I will now proceed to make some brief answer to those who are opposed to any such retraction on my part, or who go so far as to assign untrue grounds thereof.

“Their chief complaint is this, that, to please men, I have forsaken a system clear and safe, and have embraced one filled with obscurity and uncertainty in respect of the Sacred Ministry, and especially in respect of the Sacraments: a system which, if some were to say what is in their mind, they would call ungodly.

“My answer is this; that the Scripture of God alone containeth within Itself, and imparteth to us, the light of true understanding, and of a true assurance in respect of all such matters. For the wisdom of the flesh hath no power to attain unto these Mysteries of the Kingdom of God. We shall therefore speak most clearly and most plainly, and with the greatest assurance, touching these matters of Faith, when we speak after the rule and fashion of the Scriptures.

“Now, in Scripture, the Lord saith expressly that ‘His Gospel is Power unto Salvation to every one that believeth;’ that Baptism is the ‘Washing of Regeneration;’ that the Eucharist is ‘the Communion of His Body and His Blood;’ that His ministers ‘bind and loose,’ ‘retain and remit sins’. Wherefore hen are we not to say even the same? The Lord when He Instituted the Sacred Supper, and gave to His disciples Bread and Wine, said, ‘Take, eat and drink: This is My Body, This is My Blood.’ Whosoever considereth by faith these Words of The Lord, doth he not perceive very clearly that The Lord hath not given bread and wine only, but, together with Bread and Wine, His Body and His Blood,—That Body and That Blood which He offered for us upon the Cross: that is, hath given His Living Self, Verily, and therefore Substantially. His very Self, I say,

not any sign in His place; for this adverb ‘Substantially,’ wherewith some are without cause offended, conveyeth thus much.

“Now if The Lord be Present to us in our observance of His Super, and giveth Himself to us as Verily as He gave Himself to the Apostles, wherefore are we not to believe and to affirm with Paul, ‘The Bread which we too break, the Cup for which we too give thanks, is the Communion, not of bread and wine only but, of the Very Body and Blood of The Lord?’ And since the Holy Eucharist be This, it requireth that It be administered in the Church, even as The Lord hath Instituted It.

“Who is there that believeth the Words of Christ, and can think or say anything else but this; that, through all time, whensoever the Holy Eucharist be celebrated according to the Institution of The Lord, together with the Bread and Wine, the Very Body and Blood of The Lord be given and exhibited to all who do take this Sacrament. For what may the minister of Christ do herein other than that which The Lord hath bidden him to do? Now since God cannot deceive, and since He ratifieth the action of His Church, which resteth upon His own institution, who my doubt that al those who do so far believe that they reject not the Words and the Institution of The Lord, and do not in anywise deprave or pervert the meaning of those Words, do take unto themselves the Sacrament; the Sacrament whole and entire; even although, not discerning the Body and the Blood of The Lord, they do, at the very same time, make themselves to be ‘guilty of the Body and Blood of The Lord,’ and so enjoy not ‘unto Life’ the Life-giving Food, through it be ‘unto Life’ that all these Things be exhibited unto them. Œcolampadius, we know, hath not scrupled to say: ‘He who believeth, even with a dead faith, that Christ The Son of God, and of Mary, hath died for our Reconciliation, and restoration unto Life, and who testifieth that he believeth This by his use of the Sacrament, to that man assuredly the Very Body of Christ is Present in the Sacrament. For even this man putteth away the carnal sense, although he attaineth not unto the Grace and Virtue of the Sacrament.’ Thus far Œcolampadius.

“‘Even this man,’ he saith, ‘putteth away the carnal sense;’ that is, he embraceth not only that which appeareth to the eyes, which his hand toucheth and his mouth taketh; but he hath respect also to That Which the Words of God do promise and offer. Now in words like these what is there that is dark, what is there that doth violence to the sound understanding at least of him that believeth? For since we be careful expressly to declare that we affirm no natural union of Christ with the Bread, no local inclusion, no abiding continuance of Him apart from the use of the Sacrament; since we leave Christ in His Heavenly Glory, and in no respect bring Him down to the relations of this mortal life, but confess that it be

by faith only that He be discerned to be Present here; since, finally, we be most careful throughout to press the point, that those who take the Sacrament without true faith in Christ, do take condemnation unto themselves, what, I ask, do we affirm which detracteth either from the truth of the human nature in Christ, or from His state in Glory, or lastly, from a true and firm faith and confidence in Him? If there be carnally-minded men who contend that the understanding cannot embrace any Presence of The Lord unless it be that which, as it were, bringeth Christ down from heaven, and includeth Him locally in the Bread, or which after any other manner thrusteth Him down from His Heavenly Glory into the estate of this mortal life, what hath the Church of Christ to do therewith? Wherefore be the word of The Holy Ghost to be amended after the rule of these men? What reason do these things supply to make us deny that Christ doth Verily Present Himself to us in the Sacred Supper, and doth manifest Himself to be eaten of us therein? Is it not rather for us to teach men so to think of the Heavenly Glory of Christ, as of That Which eye cannot behold, nor ear hear, or our heart understand? And to think of the Sacred Supper as of an action and a matter of faith, the great matter of the New Testament, The Mystery of The Kingdom of Heaven, in no wise circumscribed within the limits of predicaments, or of any laws of our reason? Wherefore we must put aside in this matter all thoughts touching change of Substance, or inclusion within the bounds of space, and every accident of this mortal life; and with a simple faith must believe The Lord, when He biddeth us take in the Sacred Supper His Body and His Blood; we must believe the Apostle, when he affirmeth that this morsel of Bread broken, and this drop of Wine is the Communion of the Body and Blood of The Lord, given unto us for this special purpose, that The Lord Jesus may more and more Live in us and we in Him; that by faith in Him we may be strengthened, and have our desire of Him more inflamed. If, however, we be negligent thus to embrace Him, yet will He remain true Himself, and will at all times make good unto us and exhibit unto us by words and symbols that which He promiseth. Abide we therefore in this clearness of light, in this full assurance of the Word of Christ; and be we careful never to introduce for ourselves, nor to admit when introduced by others, the darkness and uncertainty of human reason. Do we not understand this, that to live the Life of God is the property of Christ Alone, and that He Alone imparteth this Life unto us, and imparteth it after that manner which He hath Himself Instituted? Since therefore it hath so pleased our Lord to appoint that, together with the Bread and Wine in the Sacred Eucharist, He exhibiteth to us the Very Presence of Himself, because the Very Communion of Himself, just as He exhibiteth

Regeneration in Baptism, let us embrace Him in this Sacrament also Verily Present unto us, in singleness of faith, in thankfulness, and in piety. ‘Truth’ saith, ‘take ye.’ Wherefore He giveth That Which He biddeth us to take at His hand, for Christ deceiveth not. Now He biddeth us take at His hand His Body Which is given for us, His Blood Which is shed for us: these Things therefore are What He giveth us: these Things are What we receive at His hand, and not, for These, signs only, bread and wine. Now if Christ giveth unto us by these His Body and His Blood, and we receive these Things at His hand, wherefore doubt we to acknowledge and confess that these Things be Present unto us, and that we have Christ Himself Present—All Christ—Very God and Very Man—although it be true that it be faith only which discerneth and knoweth of His Presence, not our sense, nor our reason. The Presence of The Holy Ghost was made manifest to S. John descending upon Christ in the form of a dove. In that place the Evangelist writeth that The Holy Ghost descended upon The Lord in the form of a dove, and was beholden of S. John under that form; and yet there belongeth unto The Holy Spirit no change of place; nor did the eyes of John reach unto The Holy Spirit in His own Essence. Wherefore then needeth it, when we affirm, according to the Word of The Lord, that The Body and Blood of The Lord is exhibited unto us in the Bread and Wine, or together with the Bread and Wine—that it be a necessary consequence of such affirmation on our part that that followeth immediately which either diminisheth the truth of the human nature in Christ, or detracteth from His state of Glory; depressing it once more, as it is said, into the condition of this corruptible life, a condition subject to change of place, or necessary union with perishable things. Christ left this world; He departed unto The Father, into the heavens—that is, He hath betaken Himself to that state of Glory in which He is Verily Present to us, Perfect God and Perfect Man; but He is Present after a heavenly manner, after no manner of natural conjunction with the things present unto us; after a manner I say which faith apprehendeth, but not sense or reason.

“Against these our conclusions objections be taken by some from the language of the Fathers,—and especially S. Augustine,—who, in after times, call the Bread the sign of the Body of The Lord, and who make the Thing signified of this Sacrament to be the communion of the Sign itself, and that Incorporation with The Lord by which He Liveth in us and we in Him: who affirm further that no one truly eateth the Body and drinketh the Blood of The Lord, except that man who dwelleth in The Lord and hath The Lord dwelling in him. The Fathers write to this purpose, and of all of them S. Augustine writeth most plainly: and wherefore not? for what other thing can they make the Bread and Wine to be than signs of the Body and

Blood of The Lord; and wherefore, in treating of this Sacrament, are they not especially to indicate that Incorporation with Christ, for the sake of Which everything be spoken and done which is spoken and done in the Sacred Supper?

“For the whole use of the Sacraments hath been ordained for this purpose, that we be Incorporated with Christ, and day by day make profit and increase of this our Communion with Him. But where, I ask, do the holy Fathers make the Sacramental signs to be signs of Christ absent, or where do they say that the Communion of Christ, and the increase of Him, be exhibited to us in this Sacrament under the condition that He be absent from us therein? The holy Fathers use the expression ‘signs,’ ‘Sacramental signs,’ but they understand thereby signs that do exhibit: signs by which That Which they do signify be brought before us, and, as it were, be given into our hands. Now, such a sign as this, the laying on of hands was not, nor the breathing upon the disciples; by which signs, nevertheless, The Lord manifested His Blessing, and The Holy Ghost. The chief reason wherefore The Lord exhibiteth Himself to us in the Supper, the holy Fathers truly teach us to be, that we may have therein the Communion of His Nature, of His Life. They do also affirm constantly that it is to the end that He may by virtue of this very Communion Live in us, and Incorporate us with Himself, that we do receive in the Sacred Supper the Flesh and the Blood of The Lord, and that in the Sacred Supper He doth Verily exhibit Himself unto us. Since, therefore, The Lord Himself saith, ‘Take, eat, This is My Body,’ not, This is My Spirit, My Virtue; and since Paul saith, ‘The Bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of The Lord,’ not the Communion of His Spirit, of His Virtue; since, again, every Church from the very time of the Apostles, down to our own days, believeth and teacheth the same thing, wherefore are not we also to believe and to confess simply, that in the Eucharist there be two things,—the One Heavenly, the Very Body and Blood of The Lord, The Lord Himself,—the other earthly, the Bread and Wine, which be not here given as bare signs of Christ absent, but be signs together with which is brought before us, is given unto us, and is partaken of by us, the Body and Blood of The Lord, The Lord Himself.

“S. Augustine writeth thus: ‘After a certain manner, the Sacrament of the Body of Christ is the Body of Christ; the Sacrament of the Blood of Christ is the Blood of Christ.’ But after what manner? Doth he mean that the Sacrament signifieth only the Body and the Blood in the absence of The Lord? We may not say this; for the same Father writeth in many places that the Body and Blood of The Lord be worshipped and be received in the visible signs. Wherefore, although this holy Father

understandeth that truly to eat the Body of The Lord, be That Eating Which is of a living faith, even as he writeth that the other Apostles ate ‘The Bread, The Lord,’ but Judas, ‘the bread of The Lord, against The Lord;’ yet, in how many places doth he affirm, that even those do partake of the Body and Blood of The Lord, and not of bare signs only, who do yet partake of that Body and Blood only so far as the Sacrament conveyeth them, or in the Sacrament. How often doth he write that even Judas himself received the Body and Blood of The Lord? No one therefore can say on the authority of the holy Fathers, that, in the Sacred Supper, Christ be absent, or that bare symbols only be given therein.

“A further objection is made, that, moved by the desire of conciliation, I do make little account of many of the Churches; and that I do lay down the Doctrine, which I here confess to be the Doctrine of the Sacraments, unadvisedly and unseasonably, as respecteth other men. But, indeed, I do not make little account of any of the Churches; nor, again, do I desire to prescribe a law for any man. And surely it is neither inadvisable nor unseasonable to embrace with thankfulness the prospect of concord among the Churches in the sincere and settled confession of the Truth of Christ.

“For six full years have I laboured unceasingly that there might be an agreement among the Churches in a profession of Faith, at once simple, and resting plainly upon the Scriptures, and in a Confession touching the Sacred Ministry, the Word and Sacraments. And I have busied myself to so great an extent, in visiting the Churches,—in appealing to those who have been called, as I have myself, to the administration of the Mysteries,—in inviting them to conference,—in urging them by my writings both private and public, as well in the Latin as in my native tongue, that I should justly incur the reproach of having acted deceitfully towards the brethren and the Churches, if, at a time when God hath vouchsafed unto us to come together in the terms of that Confession which indeed almost every Church had some time ago made to be its own, I should hesitate to embrace this general consent, and to commend it unto all men. We say that we expect, every moment of our lives, The Lord, The Judge. We cannot then, to please men, shrink from promoting, according to our power, the purity of the Doctrine of Christ, and that peace which is so necessary unto the Churches: putting aside, so far aw we may, whatsoever offences we may seem to have cast in the way of any man. Socrates is dear; but Truth be dearer far. So say we; for all things the Church is the most precious.

“Indeed, the Doctrine of the Sacraments, and the Eucharist Itself, as we receive It, hath nothing which Zuinglius did not allow before his death, and which Œcolampadius hath not approved. For even Zuinglius accepted

our Confession of Faith addressed to Caesar, and the Apology of Ecolampadius, in which is found every thing that we now write and teach upon this matter; although it be true that he expressed his fear that it lay open in some respects to other men's injurious interpretation; and, for that reason, judged it to be scarcely safe to admit it without qualification. But no man can deny, who hath read the last Dialogue of Ecolampadius upon this controversy, that what I have written here and in my Retractions on this matter, is in accordance with his judgment thereupon. In that Dialogue, he maketh for himself a certain plenary confession of the Presence of Christ in the Supper, and testifieth that there be but the two points following, which he denieth to be true: First, that the Body of The Lord be united, together with the Bread, into the same substance, such substance being the natural substance of the Bread, or that it be locally included in the Bread. The other point, that the taking of the Sacrament be unto Salvation, even though that taking be without living faith. For the sum of the matter upon which he at that time felt a difficulty was this, that he supposed that in the writings of Luther there was laid down, to use his own expression, a certain consubstantiation of the Body of The Lord with the Bread, and the inclusion of the same in the Bread: whence it appeared to follow that, whosoever be partakers of the Sacrament, be made partakers of the Grace thereof, although they partake without a living faith. For Ecolampadius, in the beginning of his Dialogue, where he setteth out the state of the controversy, hath the words following.

“‘The dispute,’ he saith, ‘is rather concerning the manner of the Presence of the Absence, than concerning the Presence of the Absence itself: for there be no man so foolish as to affirm that the Body of Christ is either Present or Absent after every manner.’ And when the other person in the Dialogue maketh answer, ‘It doth not yet appear in what your difference consisteth.’ Ecolampadius replieth further, ‘Some say that the Bread of The Lord's Supper is in such sort the Very Body of Christ, that whosoever be fed therewith, whether he be godly or ungodly, doth not only eat the Bread and the Sacrament, but also, after a bodily manner, doth eat the Body of Christ, and cause It to pass into the belly. Now, on our part, we deny this altogether, we deny that an outward element is, in anywise exalted to so high honour, that the Creature, Whish is the highest of all creatures, uniteth Itself therewith into one substance, and this the natural substance of the element itself; of that It be contained therein by way of natural inclusion, so that, through the element, as through a means and channel, that Grace be transfused Which the Holy Spirit Himself granteth to the believing, and that, by the contact or taste thereof, even the ungodly do touch and taste the Very Body of Christ, or become partakers

of His Grace. Thou seest now what our difference is, and how far each fashioneth and applieth the words of Christ and of the Fathers according to his own judgment.’ Thus far Œcolampadius. It were much to be wished that whosoever they be who do discuss this matter, would carefully consider this Dialogue; they would perceive that this writer hath not affirmed his belief of The Lord’s Supper to be a belief of the presence of bare symbols only, but that he too hath expressed his belief of the Substantial Presence of The Lord. May the Lord grant that we ever have regard unto Him, and not unto ourselves, and that we be as zealous seekers after the Truth as we be eager to claim to ourselves this title.

“So far, however, it is well: for those Churches which appear in an especial manner to follow the teaching of Zuinglius and Œcolampadius, do now for some time past expressly confess that Sacraments be not only tokens of Christian fellowship, but that they be also pledges of Grace, and that, after their own manner, they do exhibit That of Which they be signs. Further, that they do this by the Virtue of Operation of The Lord; and, as plainly, by the Ministry of the Church. Wherefore we have an excellent hope, notwithstanding that some do make complaint in their ill-considered zeal, and other do make false charges in the perverseness of their mind, that all who teach, as we do, that Christ our Lord is Justification and Life, will show to the world the happy sight of agreement upon that Verity of The Lord Which we confess and maintain: having regard especially to this, that there be nothing in anywise in this our Confession which is not wholly agreeable to all Scripture, and which doth, in any particular, offend against the Human Nature in Christ, against His Glory, and singleness of faith in Him.

“There is this yet further which troubleth many. They augur that some of those who have followed Luther will be overmuch elated by this our submission and our retraction of what we have written aforetime; and they add that these men, having handled many things with little purity of faith, and having besides, charged us with much that is false, will not only be nothing moved by my course to confess their wrong, but will the rather be more confirmed in their wrong. Now, I admit that there have been, and are at this time, certain who call themselves disciples of Luther, who have, nevertheless, been adversaries, and are still; and this after a fashion little convenient. I allow, further, that they have assailed us, and do yet assail us, for offences of which our conscience doth not accuse us before God. I allow, in the last place, that, in treating of the Sacred Mysteries, they have oftentimes set out propositions in such kind that there be not a few of them which it were far better that we lacked, seeing that, having them, we must needs blame. But what, I ask, must we do with these men? We have found

that, by contention and striving against them, we do only make double mischief; and there is some hope that they will be more disposed to be softened by our moderation and submission, than if we were to wage with them an endless controversy.

“I have thus, in good faith, here and in other places, set forth how it hath happened that I have been drawn into this strife upon the Sacraments; how I have behaved myself therein; and what that is which, throughout the whole discussion, I have had in view; that now, as from the very first, there might be peace between myself and the great Doctors of the Church of Christ. Now, if those who have, up tot his time, assailed me with false accusations, be not moved by what I now say, to exercise towards me that which becometh charity, and to lay aside the harshness which they have displayed against me throughout this controversy, The Lord regard it; let themselves see to it. I have nothing more that I can do in their behalf. For my part I must follow those things which my duty teacheth, whatever be the purpose of other men. But, it may be, God will grant me to overcome their evil with good, whosoever they be.

“The last thing which disturbeth some is this: they doubt not that many will be offended, in that I be found to be so little consistent with myself. Now, since the one thing in which it behoveth to be consistent, be this, that day by day more fully we teach and preach Christ, it may not be that we pause to consider the offence of these men; lest haply we strive not, as we ought day by day, to unfold the Mysteries of God in all their certainty and in all their fullness,—to consummate the concord of the Churches,—and to embrace with all our strength the peace now tendered unto us by the goodness of Christ. How kindly hath Christ dealt with us! He Who hath given unto us, and will give unto the end, to persevere in this faith, that He is our Only Saviour, and that all Words and Pledges Which He hath enjoined to us, bring with them unto us the Communion of Himself, and therein the perfection of our Salvation. Now since The Lord hath further vouchsafed unto me to have at this day a more solid understanding of certain passages of Scripture than in my former life, wherefore am I not freely to give unto my brethren that which I have so freely received of God’s bounty: wherefore am I not, in all singleness of heart, to preach the goodness of The Lord? What inconsistency is there that a man should make progress in the knowledge of Salvation; and who, either in earlier days or in these days, hath ever been much in the study of the Scriptures, and hath not found it to be true in respect of this study also, that the day which hath gone is taught of that which followeth. Assuredly were there in us at this day the same reverence for the Sacred Scriptures which was

found in S. Augustine, we should see, even in these our times, many more books of Retractations given to the world.

“In sum, I pray those of the brethren who grieve to apprehend with me, that there be some who are offended with this my course, under whatever aspect they regard it, to admonish the offended that they bear with me, and be patient, till they have a full cognisance of the whole matter. If they will do this, doubtless the offence will cease.

“We know that we must follow The Lord, neither turning aside nor looking back, wheresoever He calleth us; whether this be done with man’s offence or with man’s liking. But, as I am bounden, so do I desire and will care with all my power, that I give no offence to any man, and no occasion of blaming the Ministry of Christ. God vouchsafe to me and to all men to attain unto this great end, unto His Glory. Amen.”

Bucer saith many other things, in his Retractation, of what he had advanced against the judgment of Luther, touching the Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Eucharist, which I would have quoted in this place, had I not been afraid of overburdening the reader. First, he testifieth Luther’s judgment to be right touching the Presence of the Body and Blood of The Lord in the Bread and Wine, and that he did not himself dissent from that judgment, but that, from the outset, Luther had not been rightly apprehended by himself, Œcolampadius, and by some other theologians. Next he affirmeth that Œcolampadius and Zuinglius do not deny the Very and Real Presence of the Body and Blood in the Eucharist. The reader may find more to the same purpose in this passage of Bucer’s works; but upon this head I think I have now said enough.

III. What be the Fruit and the Grace of this Sacrament, of which Fruit and Grace the godly only are partakers, not “ex opere operato,” as the Schoolmen do vainly talk, but by virtue of faith: and that in the same proportion that the faith of those who communicate in the celebration of the Mysteries be greater, the Grace whereof they are partakers be greater also, I now proceed to consider.

I will begin with the causes of the Institution of the Sacraments. Now all theologians agree in saying that Sacraments have been Instituted of God for two principal causes, and this unto the end of man’s Salvation; for God Himself hath no need thereof.

The first cause is the constitution of our nature, which consisteth of Body and Soul. God willeth to fill both parts of our nature with the Grace of His Divine Power; and while we live here to seal that Grace unto us with Seals of His own making. If we were only Spirit, Spiritual and

Heavenly Things would be made over unto us nakedly, wrapped in no clothing of the body. It is the condition of our nature which requireth Sacraments subject to our sense. Chrysostom upon S. Matthew saith thus: “If thou wert without the body, He would have given unto thee the Gifts themselves nakedly, and in no relation to the body: but since in thee the soul is united to the body, the Gifts are given unto thee to be apprehended of thee by means of things subjects of sense.”

Accordingly, we read that in the first state of our first parents, God gave unto them the Tree of Life. By this they were reminded continually that the life which they enjoyed was the Gift of God, and that they could not abide in that life without His Grace. Further still, that Tree contained in itself the promise also of a coming to a better Immortality. Man earthy, and of *this* nature, was afterward to be wholly changed by the Operation of God’s Grace into a Divine and Heavenly Being. And of this God vouchsafed examples in Enos and Elias, whom He took while yet alive unto Himself from their life here, and bestowed upon them a blessed Immortality: and this without the death of the body. Which same thing would have been the lot of Adam and his posterity, had he abided in that innocence wherein he was created. Of This the Tree of Life was a Sacrament and a Pledge.

As God gave unto Adam the Tree of Life, so hath He given unto us the Bread of Life. Sacraments of diverse nature are convenient unto diverse times and circumstances. The fruit of trees was the natural food of our first parents—our food is bread—and since Adam, in the earliest perfection of his nature, required Sacraments, much more is it impossible, in this our depravation and extreme infirmity of nature, that we should be able to dispense therewith. Straightway upon the fall of the race of man, we read of altars and of victims, of animals clean and unclean. I pass by in this place the number and variety of the victims under the Old Law. I pass by the rites and ceremonies whereby the promises of God were signified unto the faithful. It will be sufficient to have adverted to them to show that no outward worship or observance of God hath ever existed without ceremonies and Sacraments.

For the second of the two causes of the Institution of Sacraments noted above, is the outward worship of God, apart from which no religious observance of God can long have place among men.

Now it was not fitting that the ceremonies whereby God was to be worshiped, should be made to depend upon the choice and will of man. It was necessary that they should be prescribed of God, as well for the sake of avoiding error therein, as that in their observance there might be room for the virtuous exercise of obedience; a thing which in all His worship

God especially requireth. There is no majesty in the inventions of man which is worthy of God, nor in observances which are fashioned after man's own will is there any obedience. Wherefore it is that by the use of Sacraments ordained of God Himself, we do fitly recall and cherish the thankful remembrance of His benefits; we do testify our piety towards Him, and do ask of Him in prayer those things which we lack and whereof we have need. Now the benefits of God towards us are without umber; of all of them, that is the greatest, for that He willed for our sakes to shed His Blood; to suffer a most cruel and a most shameful death, the death of the Cross; and for that He hath made that Death to be the Food and the Drink of Life, that so His faithful people may be fed by His Flesh and Blood unto Life eternal.

But, some one will say, since it behoveth that our meditation upon those things which the Lord suffered in the Flesh be perpetual, of what purpose is it to appoint stated times thereunto? For it is not only when we be partakers of the Sacraments that we partake of the Flesh and Blood of The Lord, but so often as we be joined unto Christ by a true faith: for The Lord saith, "He that believeth in Me hath eternal Life," and He pronounceth Himself that this Life cannot belong to any one who eateth not His Flesh and drinketh not His Blood. For so often as the faithful believe by faith that they be Redeemed by the Passion and Death of The Lord, and that they be buried with Him and dead unto sin, so often do they eat the Bread of Life. It is faith that maketh us to be partakers of Christ. In what then consisteth the use of the Sacraments, since it be allowed that that use doth not only nothing profit if faith be wanting, but doth also greatly harm; and since also, apart from the use of the Sacrament, faith alone obtaineth its own appointed fruit?—I answer thus:

The Virtue of the Sacrament is this, that by its means thou mayest have in thy body that which by faith is received in the soul. It is not our souls only that The Lord will raise up again, through the pains He suffered and the Death of His own Body, but it is our bodies also. For saith Paul, "Ye are bought with a great price; glorify and bear about God in your body." For The Lord bought with His Blood not our souls only, but our bodies also. For the sake of the body there have been instituted Sacraments of a bodily nature, that The Lord might through their means introduce Himself even into our bodies, and thus we might glorify, and bear about God in our body. Our bodies are members of Christ, and temples of The Holy Ghost: and just as the soul hath eternal Life from the Flesh and the Blood of Christ, so also hath the body. It is an ill conclusion which affirmeth that the Flesh of Christ is the Spiritual food of the soul only; for it is the Spiritual food of the whole man, that is, of soul and body alike. When The

Lord saith He is “the Bread of Life,” He hath respect to the future Resurrection of bodies. “Whoso eateth My Flesh,” He saith, “and drinketh My Blood, hath eternal Life, and I will raise him up at the last day.” No reason can be assigned wherefore it be more fitting that the soul be fed upon the Crucified Flesh of Christ, unto the attainment of Immortality, than that the body be so fed; because the whole man is nourished unto eternal Life by the Flesh and Blood of Christ. For it is from no other source than from the Flesh of The Lord that there will flow the blessed Immortality of our bodies. Wherefore it is nothing harder to believe that the faithful eat the Flesh of Christ and drink His Blood with the mouth of the body, than it is to believe that they be Baptized, in the entire body, in the Blood of Christ. Augustine allegeth against an adversary of the Law and Prophets as follows: “We receive with faithful heart and faithful mouth the Mediator between God and Man, the Man Christ Jesus, Who giveth us His Flesh to eat and His Blood to drink.” And Gregory the Great saith plainly that the faithful drink the Blood of The Lord with the mouth of the body and with the mouth of the heart, in that passage where he saith: “Ye have now learned what is the Blood of The Lamb, not by hearing, but by drinking. For That Blood is stricken upon either door-post, when it be taken in no only with the mouth of the body, but also with the mouth of the heart.”

There be some however who deny, but not as I think rightly, that the Body and Blood of Christ be eaten and drunken with the mouth of the body. Now Irenaeus disputing against certain heretics, who denied that our Flesh was capable of Immortality, affirmeth openly that our Flesh groweth and is nourished by the Flesh and Blood of The Lord unto Lie eternal. “Since therefore,” he saith, “the Cup of wine mixed with water, and the Bread broken receiveth upon it the Word of God, and so becometh the Eucharist of the Body and Blood of Christ, by which Body and Blood the substance of our Flesh groweth and consisteth, how do they deny that our Flesh be capable of the Gift of God, Who is eternal Life, Which Life be nourished by the Blood and Body of Christ? For seeing it be said that ‘we are members of His Body, of His Flesh, and of His Bones,’ these words are not said of a spiritual and invisible man, for a Spirit hath neither bones nor flesh, but are spoken of that constitution which is according to the natural man, which consisteth of flesh; and nerves, and bones, and which is nourished by the Cup, Which is His Blood, and groweth of the Bread, Which is His Body.” The same Father in another place, disputing against the same heretics, putteth this question: “How then is it that they affirm again that that which is nourished by the Body and Blood of The Lord passeth away into corruption, and doth not partake of Life?” Now

that the substance of our body be nourished, and grow out of, the Body and Blood of Christ, is something greater than the simple receiving of those things by the mouth of the body. Wherefore, it appeareth that Irenaeus in those words intended to signify that the Efficacy of the Sacrament is to be extended to our bodies just as to our souls: now this could not be unless our Flesh were fed in the body as in the soul with the Flesh and Blood of The Lord.

It may be still that men given to argument will contend that this testimony of Irenaeus is not to be understood simply, and that a figure lieth under the manner of speech: they will say that it is absurd and false that the substance of our flesh groweth and is nourished by the Body and Blood of Christ. I too admit the figure, and I say that it is because of the Sacramental union and the analogy of the actions of the figure itself and the Thing intended thereby that what is the property of the Flesh and Blood of The Lord be assigned to bread and wine, and that on the other hand, what is the property of bread and wine be assigned to the Body and Blood: for that which bread and wine supply to the natural man, this the Body and Blood of The Lord supply to the body and soul of the Christian man. And it would appear evident that Irenaeus could never have used this manner of speech had he not believed that the faithful be fed as well in the body as in the soul with the Flesh and the Blood of The Lord.

Just as this our natural life be nourished and prolonged from day to day by food and drink, after the same manner that Divine and Spiritual Life which is of God and is hid in Christ, hath its own Spiritual Food and Drink. And just as in our generation and natural birth the whole man is generated and is born of his mother, compounded of soul and body, in like manner also the whole man, soul and body, is Born Again of The Spirit. Now the Spiritual Life pertaineth not only to the soul, but also to the body. Wherefore I do constantly affirm that through the mouth of the body we be fed by faith Spiritually with the Body and Blood of Christ, just as we be fed in our soul. Justification by faith and Sanctification pertaineth to the whole man, and to all his parts. But the effects of Spiritual and Sacramental eating, just as of Baptism, are remission of sins, newness of life; in the present life the increase of all the virtues of the Christian life, and finally the Resurrection from the dead to that Immortal Life Which the Lord shall bestow at the last day as well on the bodies as on the souls of His faithful people. The same thing that the Heavenly Food and Drink worketh in our souls, that very thing it worketh also in our bodies. The whole Spiritual man, he who is born of The Spirit, is fed of that Food and Drink. Now the Spiritual man consisteth of body and soul. Wherefore he is fed through the mouth of the body, in the Sacrament, after a Spiritual

manner, with Heavenly Bread given unto him, as he is fed in his soul. By the New Birth the natural or animal man is divided in himself against himself into the Flesh and into the Spirit, Which war with one another and “are contrary the one to the other.” “The Flesh lusteth against the Spirit and the Spirit against the Flesh.” [Gal. v. 17.] The readiness of the Spirit suffereth great let and hindrance from the Flesh, so that it cannot alway do the god It would. Now in this struggle, unless our Spiritual man be stayed and supported, in that part of itself which is the weaker, by the Eating of the Flesh of The Lord and by the Drinking of His Blood, it will speedily succumb. Wherefore, in my judgment, the postulate laid down by many theologians cannot be maintained. I mean the following: “The body is not capable of receiving Spiritual Food and Drink.” And the same may be said of that other also: “It is not possible for the body to eat Spiritually the Flesh and to drink the Blood of The Lord, any more than it is possible for the soul to eat and drink these corporally.” There is here a seeming precision or argument, which, nevertheless, as applied to the matter in hand, is in my judgment foolishness, and of no weight whatsoever. It affirmeth this: “Since the Body be Spiritual Food, and therefore appertaineth to the soul, It may not be eaten with the mouth of the body.” I say this postulate is wholly false; because That Spiritual Food be not confined only to the soul, but be extended to the whole Spiritual man, who, so long as he liveth here, consisteth of soul and body. And whence, I would ask, shall this our animal body be changed into a Spiritual Body, if it hath not been made partaker in this life of The Spiritual Good and Drink? All the promises of the eternal and heavenly Life have their application not only to the soul, but also to the body. That we are Baptized, this equally Sanctifieth and Spiritually Regenerateth the body as the soul. And the same thing is to be said of the Sacrament of The Lord’s Supper, and of the Flesh and Blood of The Lord. I mean this,—that by Them are Fed and quickened unto Life—unto Life eternal—not our souls only, but our bodies also.

After all, to say that Sacraments cannot be received Spiritually in the body, or by the mouth of the body, is but a new Theology. That our bodies shall rise again to blessed Immortality, this shall be by the power of the life-giving Flesh of Christ Spiritually eaten. For except our Flesh shall have eaten the Flesh of Christ, and drunken His Blood, it may never obtain eternal Life. The resurrection of the bodies of God’s elect to blessed Immortality, is the Grace and Benefit of the Flesh of our Lord Jesus Christ eaten in this life, and of His Blood drunken. Away then from Christian ears such words as these, “the Christian cannot eat with the mouth of the body the Flesh of Christ Spiritually, and drink His Blood.” Now if any one

were to say that “body of sin,” or, that “flesh and blood” cannot eat Spiritually the Flesh of Christ, in that these are things which are not fitted either to believe or to possess the Kingdom of God, I would allow that that man might appear to have advanced somewhat to the purpose. As Scripture useth to speak, it is the Spirit and the Flesh that are opposed the one to the other, it is not the body and the soul. We read in John, “that which is born of the Flesh is Flesh, and that which is born of The Spirit is Spirit.” And in the Epistle to the Galatians: “The Flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the Flesh.” Now in these places, and in many others, the Flesh is not taken for the body, and the Spirit for the soul, but for the whole man, corrupted as well in soul as in body, for both alike are bound under the same penalty of sin. Now of that of which the corruption is one and the same, the Regeneration and Sanctification is one and the same. If the soul be holy, the body also is holy. And it is mere foolishness to oppose adversely the body to the Spirit, when we know that The Holy Spirit inhabiteth the body as His own temple.

It doth by no means do away with the blot of this error to say that the benefit of the Spiritual eating of the soul floweth from thence into the body—just as if it were not the truth that our bodies become partakers of the Spiritual and Heavenly Life by way of immediate consequence upon the Spiritual eating of the Flesh of Christ with the mouth of the body—in that the soul be first gifted with that Life, and hath the office of transmitting It afterwards to the body. The Holy Ghost, Who dwelleth in the bodies of the faithful, is not so little busied in His office that He worketh nothing in them immediately at such time as they eat and drink with the mouth of the body the Sacraments of the Flesh and Blood of The Lord, and that what taketh place in the mouth of the body doth not also take place Spiritually in the whole body. That which Paul wrote about the Israelites to the Corinthians, he intendeth us to understand of all Christians: “All,” he saith, “ate the same Spiritual Food; all drank the same Spiritual Drink.” Now the Apostle understood the Israelites to have eaten and drunken with the mouth of the body that Spiritual Food and Drink. And this eating and drinking was common to all alike. The difference between the good and the bad, the believing and the unbelieving, is this,—that the first ate and drank with the mouth of the body, and also Spiritually by faith, but the last only with the mouth of the body, and without faith. In the New Testament all Christians, good and bad alike, are said to be Baptized with the same Baptism; al to eat the same Spiritual Food, and all to drink the same Spiritual Drink, which cannot be in any other way but by the body and the mouth of the body. The difference which is to be understood is this,—that the godly are

Baptized not only in their body, but also in their soul, Spiritually, by faith; but the ungodly are Baptized carnally only. And in the Supper of the Lord the same difference holds,—that some eat and drink Spiritually and by faith, others only with the mouth of the body without faith. Such arguing as this would have no force with Paul—“This Food and Drink be Spiritual, therefore it cannot be eaten and drunken with the mouth of the body.” For all the Sacraments, as well of the Old as of the New Testament, be Spiritual Things, Which the godly use well by faith, and the ungodly use badly, not having faith.

It doth no violence to our reason that the body act Spiritually and by faith, or that the soul eat with the mouth of they body, or do any other act after a bodily manner. For the soul directeth all the actions of the body, so that it be truly said of it that it heareth and seeth, eateth and drinketh in the body, and together with its own body. In like manner, fornication and gluttony and the sin of drunkenness are offences committed corporally in the body, by the soul.

Blasphemies, perjuries, false witness, cursings, revilings, and calumnies, these things be done in the body, and by the mouth of the body, but they be done by the soul. In like manner there be numberless good actions which be of a Spiritual nature, but be done after a bodily manner in the body, by the soul: for example, the giving of alms, the confessing God, the communicating the Sacraments. Now, although these things be done Spiritually, it is plain that they be done also corporally, by the soul which governeth the actions. Wherefore there be no cause why that which is said to be done Spiritually by faith, be referred to the soul only of the faithful man, and not to the body also, as if it were the soul alone which doth Spiritual actions, and not the body together with it. It is with the mouth of the body that Spiritually and by faith we pray to God: it is with the mouth of the body that we praise God: it is with the mouth of the body that we give thanks to God. Wherefore, then, may it not be that with the mouth of the body we Spiritually eat and drink in the Mysteries the Flesh and the Blood of The Lord. The Martyrs with the mouth of the body confessed The Lord: and testified their faith in Him by enduring divers bodily punishment: they counted it nothing that their bodies were tortured and their blood poured out for the love of Christ; and who then shall dare to say that such as these were not fitted, before they came to suffer, to partake Spiritually and with the mouth of the body, of the Flesh and Blood of The Lord, Which was to strengthen them unto all suffering? It is out of the eating of the Flesh and the drinking of the Blood of Christ, that there cometh alike strength of body wherewith to endure torments for the Name of Christ, and fortitude of soul. The Spirit of the Regenerated man is ready

and prepared for all things, oftentimes even in the greatest weakness of the Flesh. And this hath no stay nor strengthening, except from the Flesh of Christ eaten, and His Blood drunken: wherefore, These are set forth in bodily Sacraments, that They may be received by the mouth of the body. Cyprian, upon the Nativity of Christ, saith thus: "It is out of the Flesh of Christ that strength is restored to our Flesh in its weakness,—to our Flesh which had fainted through the infection of the primitive taint of original sin: and the Communication of the Sacraments, by which we be united to the Untainted Nature of His Body, doth so mightily strengthen us, that we do gain a victory over the world, the Devil, and ourselves; and fasten ourselves upon the Life-giving Mysteries, and tasting Them Sacramentally, we be One Flesh and One Spirit." In like manner as God is The Creator of the body and the soul, so is He The Redeemer of both. He Who redeemed the body by His Death, just as He redeemed the soul, feedeth also the body as He feedeth the soul, with His own Flesh and His own Blood unto Life eternal. Now, since this cannot be except Spiritually, even as doth the soul. And although Sacraments be made by Divine Institution to be Things Divine and Heavenly, yet hath The Lord made our bodies to be capable of receiving Them, since He hath Instituted Sacraments under a bodily form. It is nothing necessary for me here to repeat the testimonies of the Fathers, in which they make profession of their faith that the Flesh of Christ be eaten with the mouth of the body, and that the mouths of His faithful people be reddened with His Blood. We must therefore be careful to affirm that a bodily and a Spiritual eating are not things contrary the one to the other; just as bodily and Spiritual food are not contrary the one to the other: for they consist together. The Bread of The Lord, which is seen, touched, and eaten on the Table of The Lord, is bodily Food, and also Spiritual, because That which is given thereby is a Thing Invisible, and Heavenly, and Spiritual; and since our body be no less capable of receiving the Grace Thereof than our soul, the Sacrament is compounded of a thing bodily and a Thing Spiritual. Now, this could not be if these were thins contrary the one to the other. Thus, then, they who be truly faithful eat Spiritually the Flesh of Christ, and drink His Blood, with the mouth of the body and of the heart; but hypocrites eat the Sacrament carnally only, with the mouth of the body.

Now, in saying this, I have, neither here nor in any other place, any thought either of transubstantiation or of consubstantiation. All I do is this: I refuse to separate the parts whereof the Mysteries consist, for these I believe to be united together in a bond which may not be severed. When the Lord fashioned this Sacrament out of things bodily and earthly, He willed that we should with all diligence recall and cherish the thankful

memory of this so mighty a Benefit, and should take It more and more day by day into our souls. And to the intent that these bodily and earthy things might the more prevail with us, He made part of the Mysteries to be the Presence of His Flesh and Blood, saying, “This is My Body: this is My Blood;” lest it should be believed that there is therein only a certain commemoration of Him absent, and not a Real Exhibition of Him. Doubtless it be the remembrance of His Death and Passion past which is celebrated by us, but it is not the remembrance of Christ absent, for He is ever with us “even unto the end of the world.”

Thou wilt say, How can this be? Would that such questions as this were never put, and that we were content to embrace by faith that which we are taught in the Word of God! For my part, I have no other answer to make thereto than that which has been made before by others, godly and learned men, and that answer is, that it is done in that Heavenly, Supernatural, and Spiritual manner,—a manner, I say, of God’s own making—whereby the Lord adapteth us as it were into the Very Substance of the members of His own Body, that we may be made One Body together with Him, and may be Bone of His Bone and Flesh of His Flesh. And just as these things are apprehended and believed Spiritually, so are they perfected Spiritually in the godly; and although, in hypocrites, unbelief frustrateth the Effect of the Sacrament, and they who do not “discern The Lord’s Body,” eat and drink damnation unto themselves,” nevertheless the Sacrament alway retaineth its two parts, namely, the earthly and the Heavenly, the visible and the Invisible.

The spirit of the Regenerated man hath doubtless a certain propension of its own towards Heavenly and Divine Things, but so long, nevertheless, as it liveth here, it is weighed down by the infirmity and the burden of its own flesh. Wherefore our slackness and sloth is quickened by the admonishing of the Sacred Signs, and by these, as it were by a ladder, we climb to heaven, until we come unto Him Who bowed Himself to come down unto us in the flesh, and Who, day by day, offereth and imparteth to us His Grace in the visible elements. Now, how full of health and Life is the Flesh of Christ Which was Crucified, and His Blood Which was shed for us, we may learn at large from the Sixth Chapter of the Gospel of John. The Flesh Crucified containeth the whole sum of our Salvation. Wherefore God hath given unto us His Flesh for Food, and His Blood for Drink, as being The defence against all ill, and, in the end, against Death itself. And that there might be no shrinking of our sense, or any horror, as it were, of the eating of human flesh, He hath consecrated the Bread and Wine, that these may be to us His Flesh and His Blood. Beyond all controversy this pertaineth to the Sacrament, that Christ The Lord willeth thereby to signify

unto us that He uniteth us with Himself in union so intimate and near, that we be One with Him,—Flesh of His Flesh, and Bone of His Bones: to the end that the Church be even nearer unto Him than was Eve at any time unto Adam himself. Well then may every Christian say, with Moses, “What nation is there so great, who hath God so nigh unto them, as The Lord our God is in all things that we call upon Him for?”

Many and great were the testimonies of the mercy of God with His people of old, but those which The Lord hath given to us, though they be few in number, are far more excellent. Circumcision, the Ark of the Covenant, the observances of the Passover, the Priests and the Levites, the Sabbaths, the New Moons, and array of Victims, were, as it were, only certain shadows of those Divine Things which we have in all their fullest abundance in Christ. Now, all those things were perishable, and had no free and certain course, in that they were subject to innumerable chances. But the Things which the have been given unto us are all Eternal and Heavenly. Things which the laver of Baptism, which the Bread and Wine do in such sort contain, that, if these be lacking, and faith be there, we have the other still. The Mysteries have been Instituted in these external and visible things, to the intent, that, if they be present, they may help us unto Heavenly Things; not that, if they be absent, they may deprive us Thereof. And they have been Instituted too in things which may easily be provided at any place and time. The Covenant, the Temple, the Ark, the Victims, the Priests, are now al free: they are nothing hindered in their course; they are subject to no change or chance. In the Blood of Christ we have The Eternal Covenant and The Eternal Sacrifice. He is Himself The Temple, Himself The Altar, Himself The Victim, Himself The “Priest for ever after the Order of Melchisedec.” No one can hinder These Things; no chance, no calamity can deprive us Thereof. Our New Moons, our Sabbaths, are not of some few days, but of all days. Our Passover Christ is sacrificed for us in any place and at any time. Day by day may we banquet and keep the feast, provided only that this be done “not with the old leaven, nor with the leaven of malice and wickedness, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.”

God hath given Sacraments of His Grace to His people of the New Testament, by so much the more excellent and the more full of Majesty, by how much the New Testament excelleth the Old. In the place of the Ark of the Covenant, we have Very Christ Himself; in Him god is ever Present with us by a far more excellent way than, of old, above the Ark to the people of Israel. “For it pleased the Father that in Him should dwell all the fullness of the Godhead bodily; [Colos. ii. 9; 2 Cor. v. 19.] for God was in Christ, reconciling the world unto Himself,” which cannot be said

of the Ark; and Christ Himself is in the Sacraments, and therein Imparteth Himself to us. Hardly could He come nearer unto us than He hath come, in that, made Man, He hath bowed Himself to become the Food of Life eternal. In the place of the Propitiatory, we have The Propitiator; and therefore The Propitiation Itself, Which was only shadowed out in the Ark. The Israelites had the Ark of The Old Covenant; we have The Blood Itself of the New Testament. The Mysteries of Bread and Wine contain and exhibit all These Things, and by Their means are we made partakers of the Divine Nature. What further thing, then, is there, which can be imagined to be among the treasures of heavenly things, which hath not been given unto us in Christ, and with Christ Himself doth not give us in the Sacrament of His Body and His Blood? Just as Christ The Lord embraceth all Things in Himself in a far more excellent way than could be worthily expressed by any shadows, so doth He communicate all Things to us in a manner ineffable in the Sacrament of His Body and His Blood.

There is set before us the Table of the Supreme majesty of God The Father, and The Son, and The Holy Ghost; and to sit at this Table is a thing of so great dignity, that there be no room for any desire of greater honour. Assuredly, it is far above our mortality, that here upon earth we be admitted to the Angels' Table. What is there that mortal man can ask for more? The dignity of a royal table is in high estimation with men; to that table no one is admitted except he be a King: but the banquet set out thereon is far beneath the Royal state. There is nothing there which can be deemed of equal honour with the King himself. But, behold, on the Table of the Lord there is nothing set out Which is less than The King Himself. He Himself deigneth to Feed His guests with His own Flesh and His own Blood; because there is no food, no drink, which hath greater sweetness, and because, in that He is Infinite, though He is Fed upon, He is not consumed. Now, whosoever doth not discern These Things, according to his own measure, how great They be, must needs eat and drink unworthily. For we may not stay our thoughts upon that which is outward, the Bread and Wine: it is convenient that with the eye of faith we penetrate to the other part of this Mystery, which is not beholden by the eye of the body. Take we away, then, the veil of Bread and Wine, and we shall behold the whole Passion of The Lord; we shall behold Christ, The King of heaven and earth, contending with the pains of Death and Hell; we shall behold His Blood flowing from His wounds down His whole Body; we shall behold The Eternal High Priest offering Himself in Sacrifice to God The Father, for the remission of sins! "Ah!" wilt thou say, "what do I hear? I thought that we were invited to a joyful and pleasant banquet; but the things I hear now are very hard and sad, and full of bitterness,—things

from the remembrance of which the mind shrinketh, and of which the commemoration is but, as it were, a renewal of our sorrow." I answer, thou apprehendest this matter ill. Once, indeed, all these things were hard, and bitter, and sad to Christ; but to thee every one of them is filled with sweetness. Is there anything that is more sweet than the love of God? And who is there who shall have had it given him to taste howsoever little of the sweetness of this love, who will say that he hath ever tasted anything more sweet? Chrysostom to the people of Antioch saith thus: [Hom. 60.] "Where is the shepherd who feedeth his sheep with his own blood? But why do I speak of shepherds? There are many mothers who, when the pains of childbirth are past, give their children into other hands to nurse. This he willed not; for He Himself Feedeth us with His own Blood, and by all things joineth us closely unto Himself." The same Father on John: [Hom. 54.] "Christ, that He might show His desire towards us, not only permitteth Himself to be seen of those who desire Him, but to be touched, and to be eaten of them, and to have their very teeth fastened in His Flesh, and that all should be filled with their desire of Himself.... Oftentimes parents have given their children to be nourished by other hands. I nourish them, saith He, with My own Flesh; I show Myself to them; I am favourable to all; I give unto all the Best Hope of Things to come." This Love of Christ is thus perfect and complete in all its parts, as well towards The Father as towards us; and it is so exceeding great, that no love can surpass it. And though His Majesty were so high, yet was His humility so deep, and His abasement of Himself so entire in His purpose of obedience, that He obtained the pardon of the sins of the whole world, filed with a marvelous astonishment even the Angels of light, and put to shame the pride of the devil. Before Him let all this world's pride learn to blush, and every swelling and haughtiness of the should be laid low. It cannot be but that whosoever shall eat this Flesh of Christ, thus humbled and thus abased, the same must be humble and abased in himself. If in former times he hath been used to proud thoughts, here will they cease and vanish as smoke vanisheth.

I know not what more to say of This Food. I behold in It, as it were in the very fountain of Life, all manner of virtues. The soul fortified by so mighty protection of God will ever be the same, and will remain like unto itself, alike in adversity and in prosperity; no prosperity will elate that soul, no adversity will cast it down. "If God be for us, who shall be against us?" "The Great God is within me," she said. Even with a better right shall the Christian dare to say this, so often as he partaketh of the Sacrament, and in his whole man is filled with God; in his soul and in his body, with his eyes, with his hands, with his mouth: the whole man holdeth all The

Son of God, and hath Him, as he himself is had of Him. He Who redeemed the whole man, Feedeth also the whole man with His Flesh and Blood, and filleth the whole man with His Deity; for we are the temple of God, and members of our Lord Jesus Christ; and just as the Israelites bore about with them in their flesh the Covenant of God, even so do Christians hold in their hands The Covenant of God, and with their mouth receive It all into themselves.

We know well how great the difference be between the body and the shadow. Now the Fathers of old used the Sacraments of the Old Testament with the deepest reverence; and it was thought worthy of immediate death not to pay to them their due honour. The Lord slew fifty thousand and seventy of the men of Bethshemesh, because they had dealt with the Ark without due reverence. I need not enlarge in this place upon the case of Uzzah, and of the Philistines, whom the anger of God visited in like manner. Of how much heavier punishment shall he be thought worthy who doth dishonour to The Blood of the New Testament! For God hath Himself Instituted all Mysteries for His New People, to testify His love towards us, and to make manifestation of His Grace: whosoever, therefore, dareth to violate the Mysteries, or to handle Them as though they were things that may be despised, that man exceedeth in impiety the thankless Jews, and herein all the people who worship false gods; for he despiseth, in an excess of wickedness, the Grace of God, and therein God Himself. Wherefore S. Paul solemnly admonished the Corinthians, that every one who would eat This Bread and drink This Cup, examine himself. It was the neglect of this duty by the Corinthians which had caused many of them to be afflicted with divers diseases sent by God, and to be punished even unto the death of the body. "Wherefore," saith he, "let a man first examine himself, and so let him eat of That Bread, and drink of That Cup."

Now the first part of such examination is an inquiry by every man into his faith, that he may see whether he be in the faith. "Prove your own selves," saith Paul; "know ye not your own selves, how that Jesus Christ is in you?" This then is the first thing of all. Next we must look to those things which accompany faith; namely, to repentance and the hatred of sin. Now our Lord too here in like manner hath given us a sign, whereby we may know whether we be of the number of His disciples, in that He saith, "by this shall all men know that ye are My disciples, if ye have love one to another." And afterward His disciple John testifieth: "We know that we have passed from Death unto Life, because we love the brethren." It is no little assurance unto us that we are loved of God, if we do love one another in sincerity. Love begetteth love, fire is kindled by fire. No one can love in sincerity either his God or his neighbour, unless God Himself

hath first made him to be worthy of His own love. Now God regardeth the love of the brethren as so great a thing, that He preferreth it even to the oblation of the Altar, in that He commandeth the man who approacheth the Altar of God to make offering of his gift, not to draw near if he shall remember that his brother hath aught against him, but first to go and be reconciled unto his brother, and then to come and offer his gift. For whatever that gift may be, The Lord declareth that it will not be acceptable unto God until good-will be restored between brethren. So long indeed as enmity abideth, so long as the sense of injury burneth in the breast, no gift can be offered to God which is well pleasing to Him, for God willeth to have love and mercy before sacrifice.

There is another part of our examination, and that not the least, which hath to do with the greatness and excellency of the Things Which The Lord offereth to us in His Supper.

Whosoever then thou art who receivest the morsel of Bread when The Lord Himself saith to thee "This is My Body," be careful that thou make answer by faith, "Amen." Beware lest thy thought hurry thee away to other things, so that thou sayest in thy heart, It is not The Body, it is but bread, it is but a certain figure of The Body. For thoughts of this kind draw aside the minds of the faithful from the reverence that is due to so great a Thing. When the sense of thy bodily nature telleth thee that what thou receivest is bread, no one of the orthodox will gainsay this: but, remember, by That Bread Christ, The Paschal Lamb, sacrificed on the Cross, is given unto thee. It is then bread which thou dost receive, but when thou addest to "bread" the word "only," thou dost err as greatly as it is possible for man to err. For thou dost unmake the Sacrament, because bread alone is not the Sacrament. Again, no one denieth that it be the figure of the Body; but it is one which hath the weight of the Thing Present; for no other account of the Sacrament can consist with the Grace of a sacrament of the new Testament which is offered to all, and bestowed upon the faithful. And unless The Lord had given That Thing Which the Sacrament signifieth, and of Which it is a sign and figure, He never would have called It His Body and His Blood. After the like manner, when thou receivest the Cup, thou mayest nothing doubt that thou holdest in thy hands the new Testament in the Blood of Christ, or, The Very Blood of the New Testament. For thee be the Very Words of Christ, and it is for al the faithful to answer thereto, "Amen," because he hath said it, Who can do what He hath said. Whensoever therefore thou takest the Sacrament, beware that thou turn not thy thought away from the Thing signified, and transfer it to aught else. For it is for this very cause that thou mayest always have thine eyes fixed upon them as beholding in them the Things

themselves, it is for this very cause that they have the names of the Things Themselves given unto them.

It hath been one unhappy consequence of the many errors concerning the Sacrament of the Eucharist, that men have departed from that ancient manner of speaking of the Sacraments which belongeth as well to the Word of God as to the old Fathers: it hath been again a consequence of this that many in my judgment draw near to the Communion of the Body and Blood of The Lord without that reverence, I would rather say without that piety, which so great a Thing requireth, and which God's faithful people, aided by God's Grace, should ever manifest. Now besides that inward examination of the soul which I have touched upon above, there is required an outward holiness of the body and an outward reverence. There belongeth to the pleasures of the body a certain incontinence which defileth the body by the contact. Such things are for example gluttony, and drunkenness, and the excessive use of the marriage bed. The Blessing of wedlock and the Grace of God covereth, but doth not take away the uncomeliness. The Fathers of the Old Testament, when summoned to receive the law, are bidden to sanctify themselves and to come not near their wives. The Priest of God would not have judged it possible for David to eat the Shewbread had he not solemnly declared that he himself and his companions were clean, and had not come near women. So long as the Priest ministered at the Altar, they came not near their wives: and Paul instructeth us that the first Christian husbands and wives by mutual consent accustomed themselves to abstain, that they might give themselves unto prayer. The marriage bed of Christians is undefiled if it be used temperately: but there is a certain intemperance if a man do not abstain at such time as a fast is proclaimed, or men be called unto prayer in any special way, or in any other sort God hath to be worshipped by any manner of extraordinary observance. We man not reckon among the ceremonies of the Law which have been done away, *all* things which pertain to the sanctification of our bodies. There are many things, indeed, which were once wrapped in the shadows of the Law which have a close respect to good and true morality, and which are to be diligently preserved now that the shadows have been swept away; and although there be no exact precept upon this matter, I think it not difficult to understand what that is which becometh the godly and the faithful. Now the Nature of the Thing Itself telleth us that a certain singular and extraordinary holiness of the body becometh those who are about to celebrate the Mysteries of the Death and Passion of Christ. The reason why the Romanists have imposed upon their Priests a perpetual celibacy is this, because they judge it to be their office to make public prayer every day, and to offer sacrifice for the

people; that is, that it is their office to celebrate the Mystery of the Holy Communion: just as though the Priests of the Christians were able to give up their whole time to sacred things without any intermission, and at all times to retain the same ardent and steady faith. If there be any such, let them use the great Gift of God; no man forbiddeth them: but meantime, it behoveth to consider and consult for human infirmity; that infirmity which is our common nature. It had been possible to make courses of Priests of the Church of Christ as in old time of the Priests of Israel, and thus they might have cared for their wives and families. It is mere tyranny to load the consciences of men with more than God hath commanded.

There is a wide difference between occasional abstinence and a perpetual celibacy. Many things happen in our common life, as well private as public, which separate men from their wives for a time, and force them to abstain. Wherefore there can surely be nothing grievous to a pious mind, that a man come not near his wife, for one or more days, when he be either about to administer or to receive the Holy Mysteries. But I lay no snare for any man's conscience; I prescribe no law' I do not conceal from myself that it is impenitence towards God *only* which maketh man unworthy to partake of the Body and Blood of The Lord; and unless it be that, either an excess of wickedness and the stain of a former evil life, whereby the fellowship of the Church is offended, or the censure of the Church be actual impediments, I would not forbid any man the Table of The Lord; but neither can I advise him to draw near, unless he bring with him also purity of body. I know that that particular preparation which was required for hearing the first promulgation of the Law on Mount Sinai, be not required for the preaching and the hearing of the Gospel. But I am not concerned to insist here upon any absolute necessity in this matter. I speak only of that which is honest and comely; and I exhort and admonish the godly to the use of those things which I think to be godly and fitting for Christian men. I exhort and admonish that we be holy before God, in soul and body both, so often as we draw near to receive the Body and Blood of The Lord. God, Who is the Creator and the Saviour of both parts of man, is to be worshipped and adored by both parts alike.

There is a fear in these our days, which there has been at no other previous time: men are afraid of the adoration of the Bread, if the Eucharist be taken on our bended knees; and it is contended that Sacraments be not to be adored. Whence proceedeth this fear? Who is there that ever hath taught that the Bread of the Eucharist is to be worshipped? Why, the Romanists themselves, although they worship the Bread, do not teach that it is the Bread which is to be worshipped. So far

from it, they are especially careful that the bread be not displayed until it be consecrated, lest haply it be worshipped in ignorance by the unlearned and vulgar among the people. But so soon as the bread hath been consecrated by the Priest, by which act of Consecration they consider that the substance of bread hath been removed, or hath passed into the Substance of the Body of Christ, then they consider that It is not bread that is worshipped, but Christ Himself; and they deem that they may safely propose It as an object of worship to all men. Nevertheless, they are still careful to admonish the people, that it is not those outward forms which are to be worshipped, which they call accidents without subject-matter, but that That is to be worshipped Which is hidden under these visible forms.

The German theologians, who affirm that the Very Body of Christ is either in the Bread, or under the form of Bread, or together with the Bread, have in no place said that the Bread is to be worshipped, nor have I ever heard that any theologian hath so taught, or have I found such to be their teaching myself; unless, perhaps, a man may be found to go so far as to say that Christ taketh upon Himself the nature of bread, as He hath taken upon Himself the nature of our Flesh. I ask then again, Whence cometh this fear of worshipping? Is it that it be desired to avoid the habit of worship in the taking of the Holy Communion? For my part, I think that what hath to be feared is much rather this,—that a man should not worship That Which is there and then made Present for the worship of the faithful. When we hear some men say that Sacraments are not to be worshipped, this is to be understood of the outward symbols, which are things created; if it were not so, the water of Baptism ought to be worshipped. But although no man hath ever taught that the water of Baptism ought to be worshipped, yet hath there never been any godly man Baptized in full age, who, at the time that he was dipped in the water, hath not worshipped. For the act of faith, the very giving of thanks, are worship and adoration of God; and without these no Sacrament is taken worthily.

However, in these times, there are many who, for the sake of avoiding the worship of the Bread, prefer to sit at The Lord's Table, although this be done without any authority of example of the orthodox who have come before us. Nevertheless, it is accounted a point of reformation, because in the act of sitting no manner of worship is brought before us. For my part, I do doubt exceedingly whether that hath any claim to be counted among points of reformation, of which there be no example in former times. And what is this new superstition which hath come over the minds of Christian men, so that they will rather testify by their sitting at The Lord's Table, that they do not worship that which no one hath ever said ought to be worshipped, than confess by the bending of the knees that they do worship

That, of Which, at that time, first of all things, all the orthodox have judged that It ought to be worshipped. We read, doubtless, that in the feasts of Christian love, which the Fathers called *Agapae*, and which were used to be joined to the Celebration of the Mysteries, the Christians in early times sat at the Table; but this was done in respect of the feast, not in respect of the Mystery, and not for any purpose of avoiding worship in that giving of thanks. And it appeareth probable, also, that the early Christians, during a certain time of the year,—the time between Easter and Pentecost, when they did not worship on their knees,—partook of the Sacred Mysteries standing upon their feet, but still not without worship of our Lord Jesus Christ, as well in the act of receiving the Mysteries Itself, as before and after that act.

So great indeed is the Majesty of this Sacrament, that if any man consider by faith What That is Which he holdeth in his hands, when he taketh the Bread of the Cup, and raiseth It to his mouth; if he consider that It is the Flesh Crucified of Christ his Lord, and the Blood of the New Testament shed, and therefore the New Testament itself, shall not that man be so moved in his soul with awe and wonder that such things should be, as to prostrate himself in his whole man before the Throne of God's Grace? What! do we fear to worship here on our knees, lest we seem to worship the material bread, and shall we not rather fear lest by sitting at The Lord's Table, we seem not to worship Christ The Bread of Life? That great Doctor Augustine [On Ps. xcvi.] thought far otherwise. "No one," he saith, "eateth That Flesh unless first he hath worshipped It." For my part I am persuaded that wheresoever the true Doctrine of the Sacraments prevailleth, there is no room to apprehend any excess of reverence, whether it be the inward reverence of the soul, or the outward reverence of the body. We nowhere read that our Lord is believed to have given the Mysteries of His Body and His Blood to His disciples, sitting at the Table of the Last Supper. It is true that pictures do so represent it, but the Holy Scriptures do not. For after The Lord had upped, He changed a certain ancient rite of the Jewish people, and consecrated it into the Mystery of His Body and His Blood. Now, Scripture saith that this was done either standing or lying at the table, not sitting at the table.

I have thus much, then, to say to those who feel it to be a burden on their consciences to receive on their bended knees the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of The Lord, though this be the received manner of the Church in which they live. For those Churches which have decided in favour of sitting at the Table of the Lord, I do not greatly concern myself to argue against this their custom, provided that they bring unto it that faith and piety which the Majesty of so great a Mystery requireth.

Here then I make an end; and from those things which I have propounded in this Treatise, I leave it to be further inquired into and collected by godly meditation, What be the Mystery of the Body and Blood of The Lord,—What be the Parts of Which It be composed,—What that be which It Effecteth and Worketh in the faithful,—and with how great piety it behoveth all men to receive It.

The End