as they imagine is abolished and his succeeded in the same room.

[3.] All things considered and compared with that success which truth hath hitherto had by so bitter conflicts with errors in this point, shall I wish that men would more give themselves to meditate with silence what we have by the sacrament, and less to dispute of the manner how? If any man suppose that this were too great stupidity and dulness, let us see whether the Apostles of our Lord themselves have not done the like. It appeareth by many examples that they of their own disposition were very scrupulous and inquisitive, yea in other cases of less importance and less difficulty always apt to move questions. How cometh it to pass that so few words of so high a mystery being uttered, they receive with gladness the gift of Christ and make no show of doubt or scruple? The reason hereof is not dark to them which have any thing at all observed how the powers of the mind are wont to stir when that which we infinitely long for presenteth itself above and besides expectation. Curious and intricate speculations do hinder, they abate, they quench such inflamed motions of delight and joy as divine graces use to raise when extraordinarily they are present. The mind therefore feeling present joy is always marvellous unwilling to admit any other cogitation, and in that case casteth off those disputes whereunto the intellectual part at other times easily draweth.

A manifest effect whereof may be noted if we compare with our Lord’s disciples in the twentieth of John the people that are said in the sixth of John to have gone after him to Capernaum. These leaving him on the one side the sea of Tiberias, and finding him again as soon as themselves by ship were arrived on the contrary side, whither they knew that by ship he came not, and by land the journey was longer than according to the time he could have to travel, as they wondered so they asked also, “Rabbi, when camest thou hither?” The disciples when Christ appeared to them in far more strange and miraculous manner moved no question, but rejoiced greatly in that they saw. For why? The one sort beheld only that in Christ which they knew was more than natural, but yet their affection was not rapt therewith through any great extraordinary gladness, the other when they locked on Christ were not ignorant that they saw the wellspring of their own everlasting felicity; the one because they enjoyed not disputed, the other disputed not because they enjoyed.

[4.] If then the presence of Christ with them did so much move, judge what their thoughts and affections were at the time of this new presentation of Christ not before their eyes but within their souls. They had learned before that his flesh and blood are the true cause of eternal life; that this they are not by the bare force of their own substance, but through the dignity and worth of his Person which offered them up by way of sacrifice for the life of the whole world, and doth make them still effectual thereunto; finally that to us they are life in particular, by being particularly received. Thus much they knew, although as yet they understood not perfectly to what effect or issue the same would come, till at the length being assembled for no other cause which they could imagine but to have eaten the Passover only that Móyses appointeth, when they saw their Lord and Master with hands and eyes lifted up to heaven first bless and consecrate for the endless good of all generations till the world’s end the chosen elements of bread and wine, which elements made for ever the instruments of life by virtue of his divine benediction they being the first that were commanded to receive from him, the first which were warranted by his promise that not only unto them at the present time but to whomsoever they and their successors after them did duly administer the same, those mysteries should serve as conduits of life and conveyances of his body and blood unto them, was it possible they should hear that voice, “Take, eat, this is my body; drink ye all of “this, this is my blood;” possible that doing what was required and believing what was promised, the same should have present effect in them, and not fill them with a kind of fearful admiration at the heaven which they saw in themselves? They had at that time a sea of comfort and joy to wade in, and we by that which they did are taught that this heavenly food is given for the satisfying of our empty souls, and not for the exercising of our curious and subtle wits.

¹ John vi. 25.
If on all sides it be confessed that the grace of Baptism is poured into the soul of man, that by water we receive it although it be neither seated in the water nor the water changed into it, what should induce men to think that the grace of the Eucharist must needs be in the Eucharist before it can be in us that receive it?

The fruit of the Eucharist is the participation of the body and blood of Christ. There is no sentence of Holy Scripture which saith that we cannot by this sacrament be made partakers of his body and blood except they be first contained in the sacrament, or the sacrament converted into them. "This is my body," and "this is my blood," being words of promise, sith we all agree that by the sacrament Christ doth really and truly in us perform his promise, why do we vainly trouble ourselves with so fierce contentions whether by consubstantiation, or else by transubstantiation the sacrament itself be first possessed with Christ, or no? A thing which no way can either further or hinder us howsoever it stand, because our participation of Christ in this sacrament dependeth on the co-operation of his omnipotent power which maketh his body and blood to us 1, whether with change or without alteration of the element such as they imagine we need not greatly to care nor inquire 2.

1 [Chr. Letter, 35. "Instruct us, whether the institution of the sacrament by Christ, bee not the true and right making of it, Christe's body and blood unto us, and upon what ground of Scripture, assuredly it may be proved that the co-operation of his omnipotent power doth make it his body and blood unto us, and in what sense." God by this . . . doctrine did but at the first institute, and doth now no farther meddle with the ministry thereof by assisting it any way to take effect in men's souls through the power of his holy Spirit."

2 [Chr. Letter, 34. "In which words you seem to make light of the doctrine of Transubstantiation, as a matter not to be stoode upon or to be contended for, cared for or enquired into: which maketh us to marvell how our Church and Reverend Fathers have all this time passed been deceived. What should it be to firme it to bee a thing contrarie to the playne words of Scripture, overturning the nature of the Sacrament; to call it monstrous doctrine, why so manie reverend Fathers, as Cranmer, Ridley, Hooper, Latimer, Rogers, Bradford, &c. have given their lives in witness against it, if it bee a thing that neither furthereth nor hindreth, a thing not to bee cared by, nor enquired after? Not to be stood upon or contended for by them, because it is not a thing necessary, although because it is false, as long as they doe persist to maintaine and urge it, there is no man so grosse as to thinke in this case we may neglect it. Against them it is therefore said,
[7.] Take therefore that wherein all agree, and then consider by itself what cause why the rest in question should not rather be left as superfluous than urged as necessary. It is on all sides plainly confessed, first that this sacrament is a true and a real participation of Christ, who thereby imparteth himself even his whole entire Person as a mystical Head unto every soul that receiveth him, and that every such receiver doth thereby incorporate or unite himself unto Christ as a mystical member of him, yea of them also whom he acknowledgeth to be his own; secondly that to whom the person of Christ is thus communicated, to them he giveth by the same sacrament his Holy Spirit to sanctify them as it sanctifieth him which is their head; thirdly that what merit, force or virtue soever there is in his sacrificed body and blood, can prove nor be forced by any

They ought not to stand in it as in a matter of faith, nor to make so high acompt of it, inasmuch as the Scripture doth only teach the Sacrament, and neither the one nor the other way of preparation thereunto. It sufficed to be believed this, and by determining the manner how God bringeth it to passe, to have intangled themselves with opinions so strange, so impossible to be proved true. They should have considered in this particular Sacrament that which Bellarmine acknowledgeth of Sacraments in general. It is a matter of faith to believe that sacraments are instruments whereby God worketh grace in the souls of men, but the manner how he doth it is not a matter of faith. Again, p. 33. "Thou seeest popish doctrine doth hold that priests by words of consecration make the real, my whole discourse is to shew that God by the Sacrament maketh the mystical body of Christ: and that seing in this "point as well Lutherans as Papists agree with us, which only point conteneth the benefit wee have of the Sacrament, it is but needles and unprofitable for them to stand, the one upon consubstantiation, and upon transubstantiation the other, which doctrines they neither

we freely, fully and wholly have it by this sacrament; fourthly that the effect thereof in us is a real transmutation of our souls and bodies from sin to righteousness, from death and corruption to immortality and life; fifthly that because the sacrament being of itself but a corruptible and earthly creature must needs be thought an unlikely instrument to work so admirable effects in man, we are therefore to rest ourselves altogether upon the strength of his glorious power who is able and will bring to pass that the bread and cup which he giveth us shall be truly the thing he promiseth.

[8.] It seemeth therefore much amiss that against them whom they term Sacramentaries so many invective discourses are made all running upon two points, that the Eucharist is not a bare sign or figure only, and that the efficacy of his body and blood is not all we receive in this sacrament. For no man having read their books and writings which are thus traduced can be ignorant that both these assertions they plainly confess to be most true. They do not so interpret the words of Christ as if the name of his body did import but the figure of his body, and to be were only to signify his blood. They grant that these holy mysteries received in due manner do instrumentally both make us partakers of the grace of that body and blood which were given for the life of the world, and besides also impart unto us even in true and real though mystical manner the very Person of our Lord himself, whole, perfect, and entire, as hath been shewed.

[9.] Now whereas all three opinions do thus far accord in one, that strong conceit which two of the three have embraced as touching a literal, corporal and oral manudication of the very substance of his flesh and blood is surely an opinion no where delivered in Holy Scripture, whereby they should think themselves bound to believe it, and (to speak with the softest terms we can use) greatly prejudiced in that when some others did so conceive of eating his flesh, our Saviour to abate that error in them gave them directly to understand how his flesh so eaten could profit them nothing, because the words which he spake were spirit, that is to say, they had a

---

reference to a mystical participation, which mystical participation giveth life. Wherein there is small appearance of likelihood that his meaning should be only to make them Marcionites by inversion, and to teach them that as Marcion did think Christ seemed to be a man but was not, so they contrariwise should believe that Christ in truth would so give them as they thought his flesh to eat, but yet lest the horror thereof should offend them, he would not seem to do that he did.

[10.] When they which have this opinion of Christ in that blessed sacrament go about to explain themselves, and to open after what manner things are brought to pass, the one sort lay the union of Christ’s deity with his manhood as their first foundation and ground; from thence they infer a power which the body of Christ hath thereby to present itself in all places; out of which ubiquity of his body they gather the presence thereof with that sanctified bread and wine of our Lord’s table; the conjunction of his body and blood with those elements they use as an argument to shew how the bread may as well in that respect be his body because his body is therewith joined, as the Son of God may be named man by reason that God and man in the person of Christ are united; so they add also the words of Christ commanding us to eat must needs import that as he hath coupled the substance of his flesh and the substance of bread together, so we together should receive both.  

[11.] Touching the sentence of antiquity in this cause, first forasmuch as they knew that the force of this sacrament doth necessarily presuppose the verity of Christ’s body and blood, they used oftentimes the same as an argument to prove that Christ hath as truly the substance of man as of God, because here we receive Christ and those graces which flow from him in that he is man. So that if he have no such being, neither can the sacrament have any such meaning as we all confess it hath. Thus Tertullian1, thus Ireney2, thus Theodoret3 disputeth.

Again as evident it is how they teach that Christ is personally there present, yea present whole, albeit a part of Christ be corporally absent from thence; that Christ4 assisting this heavenly banquet with his personal and true presence5 doth by his own divine power add to the natural substance thereof supernatural efficacy, which6 addition to the nature of those consecrated elements changeth them and maketh them that

1 “Acceptum panem et distribuendum discipulis corpus suum illum fecit; hoc est corpus meum,” etc. Tertull. de Curt. cap. 4. 2 “Secundum hanc (is to say if it should be true which heretics have taught denying that Christ took upon him the very nature of man)” etc. Iren. lib. v. cap. 2. [p. 395.] 3 Ei toisws twv othdwv sumpow evntinw eltw tw bva mnwtrw, swma drw evtw kai twv twn dptwv tw sumpw, ouc eis bthwv fwnw metablhten allw twv bwa bswth kanlth Theod. Aevogwv. [Diag. i. i. p. 125.] 4 “Sacrimenta quidem quantum in se est sine propria virtute esse non possunt, nec ullo modo se absentat majestas mysterioris.” Cypr. (i.e. Arnold.) de Cor. cap. 7. [p. 41. ad calc. ed. Fell.] cf. p. 251, note. 5 “Sacrimento visibili ineffabile liter divina se infudit essentia, ut esset religioni circa sacramenta devotio.” Idem cap. 6. 6 “Invisibilis ascendens visibiles creaturas in substantiam corporis et sanguinis sui verbo suo secreta profecto praebuit, ut vertit... In spiritualibus sacramentis verbi precipit v. iustus et rei servit effectus.” Euseb. Epist. Hom. 5. de Pasch. [p. 300. par. i. t. 6] V. Bickohl, Patr. Col. 4 [Eran.] Tiv sumpwla tov dtypstikov swmpw to evntos evntos allwv mn tw v. htrwv evntelwsew, metat de twv evntilwv metafublhten kai ezcw swnwth [Orth.] Allo ouc oikai evzwstwv phwnw. Mewu gwr eti twv prwterwv oikai kai twv zmwomwv kai twv ezmwv, kai drwta evtw kai allw omw kai prwterwv, nekai de ezi evntelw, kai evstewtw, kai proswpwtw twv evntelwv eti evnto de ezi evntelw. Theod. [Diag. ii. p. 126.] Ex quo a Domino “dictum est, Hoc facite in mea commemoratione,” Hec est caro mea, et Hic est sanguis meus, substituentes his verbis et huc “ide actum est, panis iste super substantialis et calix benedictione sollemni sacratas ad totius hominis vitam salutemque prout.” Cypr. (= Arnold.) de Cor. cap. 3. “Im mortalitatis alimonia datur, a commensibus cibus differentis, corporalis substantia reitrens speciem sed virtutis divinae invisibili essentiae, ut probans adesse presentiam.” Ibid. cap. 2. p. 39.
plainly hold but this mystical communion cannot easily be thought to have meant any other change of sacramental elements than that which the same spiritual communion did require them to hold.

[12.] These things considered, how should that mind which loving truth and seeking comfort out of holy mysteries hath not perhaps the leisure, perhaps not the wit nor capacity to tread out so endless mazes, as the intricate disputes of this cause have led men into, how should a virtuously disposed mind better resolve with itself than thus? “Variety of judgments and arguments argueth obscurity in those things wherewith they differ. But that which all parts receive for truth, that which every one having sifted is by no one denied or doubted of, must needs be matter of infallible certainty. Whereas therefore there are but three exposi-
tions made of ‘this is my body,’ the first, ‘this is in itself before participation really and truly the natural substance of my body by reason of the coexistence which my omnipotent body hath with the sanctified element of bread,’ which is the Lutherans’ interpretation; the second, ‘this is itself and before participation the very true and natural substance of my body, by force of that Deity which with the words of consecration abolisheth the substance of bread and substituteth in the place thereof my Body,’ which is the popish construction; the last, ‘this hallowed food, through concurrence of divine power, is in verity and truth, unto faithful receivers, instrumentally a cause of that mystical participation, whereby as I make myself wholly theirs, so I give them in hand an actual possession of all such saving grace as my sacrificed body can yield, and as their souls do presently need, this is to them and in them my body:’ of these three rehearsed interpretations the last hath in it nothing but what the rest do all approve and acknowledge to be most true, nothing but that which the words of Christ are on all sides confessed to enforce, nothing but that which the Church of God hath always thought necessary, nothing but that which alone is sufficient for every Christian man to believe concerning the use and force of this sacrament, finally nothing but that wherewith the writings of all antiquity are consonant and all Christian confessions agreeable. And as truth in what kind soever is