

cleansing the minds cometh not from the water, it is all one matter, whether the whole body, or some part thereof, as the head, be washed. It is therefore sufficient, if the signification of spiritual baptism be observed.

That to "baptize" signifieth not to plunge the whole man into the water, it may easily be gathered both of St Mark's and St Luke's gospel, where we read thus: *Reversi a foro non comedunt nisi prius baptizati*; that is: "The Pharisees, when they come home from the market, eat not, except they first be baptized," that is to say, wash their hands. Again: *Mirabatur Phariseus, quod Christus non baptizatus accumbat mensæ*; that is: "The Pharisee marvelled that Christ was not baptized," that is to say, washed not his hands, "before he sat down at the table."

Mark vii.

Luke xi.

Of god-fathers
and god-
mothers.

Father. What thinkest thou of those which promise for the infant in his baptism, whom they call god-fathers and god-mothers? *Son.* The custom is old and ancient in the church of Christ, and hath from time to time been used among the Christians above fourteen hundred years; and it is no less commendable than ancient, if the god-fathers and god-mothers satisfy their promise, and do according as they have said, in bringing up the young infant in the nurture and doctrine of the Lord, in the faith, fear, and love of God, in the obedience of God's holy law, &c. But this I greatly discommend in the church of the papists, that they will by no means suffer the fathers of the infants to be present at the baptism of their children, whom God above all other hath commanded to instruct and to bring up their children in the knowledge of his holy law, and of them will require a strait accmpts concerning the education and bringing up of their young ones. Therefore, as I do not discommend the custom of having god-fathers and god-mothers, which should openly promise for their god-children that they shall mortify the root of sin, which springeth in the bodies, and subdue their lusts under the law of God; again, that they will instruct and bring up their god-children in the faith of Christ; so likewise do I utterly discommend this use, that fathers cannot be suffered to be present at the baptism of their own children, and there also promise, before God and his holy congregation, that they will, unto the uttermost of their power, provide and see that their children shall so be brought up, that even from their cradles they shall drink in the principles of christian religion, and learn to know and serve God, that their whole life may be agreeable to their profession.

Fathersought
to be present
at the baptism
of their chil-
dren.

Eph. vi.

Father. It were good, in my opinion, that the parents should be present at the baptism of their children, and so there promise, and afterward do, as thou hast said. For it should put them well in remembrance of the duty which they owe by the word of God unto their children.

Well, my son, we have now sufficiently conferred of the holy sacrament of baptism, and of the principal things pertaining unto the same. Let us now somewhat talk of the other sacrament, I mean the holy supper of the Lord, otherwise called the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ. *Son.* Let it so be, my most loving and dear father.

OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

Father. Tell me, first of all, what the Lord's supper is. *Son.* After the definition of St Paul, it is the partaking of the body and blood of Christ.

Father. Why, what saith St Paul in this behalf? *Son.* Thus saith he: "Is not the bread which we break the partaking of the body of Christ? And is not the cup of thanksgiving, for the which we give thanks, the partaking of the blood of Christ?"

Father. Let me hear other definitions of the Lord's supper, if thou hast any in store. *Son.* The Lord's supper is an holy and heavenly banquet, in the which the faithful Christians, besides the corporal eating of the bread, and the outward drinking of the wine, do spiritually through faith both eat the body of Christ and drink his blood, unto the confirmation of their faith, the comfort of their conscience, and the salvation of their souls.

What the
Lord's supper
is.

1 Cor. x.

Or thus: The supper of the Lord is a spiritual food, in the which Christ Jesus the Son of God witnesseth that he is the living bread, wherewith our souls are fed John vi. unto everlasting life.

Or on this manner: The supper of the Lord is an holy sacrament instituted of the Lord Jesu, to be a commemoration and a perpetual remembrance of his body-breaking and blood-shedding, yea, of his passion and death on the altar of the cross, that the faithful communicants, eating and receiving those holy mysteries, (I mean the bread and wine sanctified in the body and blood of Christ,) should earnestly set before their eyes the death of Christ and all the benefits which they have received through the same; that is to say, the grace, favour, and mercy of God, remission of sins, quietness of conscience, freedom from the captivity of Satan, from the curse of the law, from the sting of death, and from everlasting damnation, the gift of the Holy Ghost, and assurance of eternal life; and that by this means they should be provoked and stirred up to magnify and praise our heavenly Father, for this his unout-speakable kindness and exceeding great love.

Or on this wise briefly: The supper of the Lord is a memorial of Christ's death.

Father. Who instituted and ordained this holy and heavenly banquet, which is called the supper of the Lord? *Son.* Not angel nor archangel; not king nor patriarch, nor yet mere man; but Christ Jesus the Lord, both God and man, King of kings, and Lord of lords. Who did institute the Lord's supper.

Father. Where redest thou that? *Son.* In the evangelist and in St Paul. Matt. xxvi. Mark xiv. Luke xxii.

Father. Let me hear the words of the institution of the Lord's supper. *Son.* St Paul reciteth them on this manner:

“The Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread; and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take ye, and eat: this is my body, which is broken for you: this do ye in the remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when supper was done, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do, so oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.” 1 Cor. xi.

Father. To what use, or for what purpose did the Lord Christ institute this his holy supper? *Son.* First, that it should be an holy memorial and worthy remembrance of his passion and death, of his body-breaking and blood-shedding, which he suffered on the altar of the cross; where “he offered himself an acceptable oblation and a sweet-smelling sacrifice unto God” the Father, for us and for our sins, that by his temporal death we might be delivered from everlasting death. Why Christ instituted his supper. Eph. v. Rom. iv. 1 Cor. xv. Heb. ii. Hos. xiii.

Father. How provest thou, that Christ ordained this his supper to be a memorial of his death and passion? *Son.* It is evident both by the word of Christ and also of St Paul. For thus saith the Lord Jesu: “This do in the remembrance of me.” And St Paul saith: “So oft as ye shall eat this bread, and drink of this cup, ye shall shew the Lord's death till he come.” Again, in that the Lord's supper is a sacrament, that is to say, a sign of an holy thing (bread is the sign of Christ's body, and the wine is the sign of his blood), it doth sufficiently instruct and teach us, that it was ordained of Christ to be a memorial of his death and passion. For sacraments are instituted unto this end, to put us in remembrance of other things, which are signified by them; as the water of baptism, wherewith the body is outwardly washed, preacheth unto us that our souls are inwardly washed by the blood of Christ, and cleansed and sanctified by the Holy Ghost. Luke xxii. 1 Cor. xi.

Father. Was it of necessity that Christ should die for us? *Son.* Otherwise could we never have been saved. For there was nothing found, neither in heaven nor in earth, of such and so great price, dignity, and worthiness in the sight of God, that could pacify the wrath of God, and satisfy his justice, and pay our ransom for our sins, and so reconcile us to God, and make an everlasting agreement between him and us, but Christ alone, that “Lamb of God,” without spot, “which taketh away the sin of the world.” For all creatures were found spotted in the sight of God, and unapt to accomplish the work of our salvation; so that of necessity the Son of God must by himself alone fulfil this work of our redemption, as it is written: “The blood of The necessity of the death of Christ. Exod. xii. John i. Heb. x.

oxen and of goats cannot take away sins. Wherefore when he (Christ) cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not have; but a body hast thou ordained me. Burnt offerings also for sin hast thou not allowed. Then said I, Lo, I am here. In the beginning of the book it is written of me, that I should do thy will, O God. Above," saith St Paul, "when he saith, Sacrifice and offering and burnt sacrifices and sin offerings thou wouldest not have, neither hast thou allowed them, (which yet are offered by the law); then said he, Lo, I am here to do thy will, O God. He taketh away the first to stablish the latter; by which will we are made holy, even by the offering of the body of Jesu Christ once for all."

Father. Though sufficient dignity, worthiness, and perfection could not be found in the sacrifices of beasts and fowls to pacify the wrath of God kindled against man for sin; was there neither angel nor man in heaven or in earth of such worthiness and integrity, that might perfectly have finished this work of our salvation? *Son.* As concerning men, it is thus written: "There is no difference: all have sinned. There is none righteous, no, not one. All are gone out of the way: they are all unprofitable: there is none that doth good, no, not one." "God hath wrapped all nation in unbelief, that he might have mercy on all." "The scripture hath concluded all things under sin, that the promise by the faith of Jesus Christ should be given unto them that believe." "We are all by nature the children of wrath." "Through the sin of one (Adam) death went over all men; forasmuch as all have sinned." We are all hypocrites, unclean, sheep that run astray, and "all our righteousnesses are as a cloth defiled¹." The perfectest of us all is not able to say, "My heart is clean, and I am free from sin." "There liveth none, even the most righteous, that sinneth not." "No living creature is righteous before the eyes of God." Seeing then that the whole kind of man is unpure, wicked, unrighteous, defiled with sin, estranged from all goodness, and a very lump of lewdness, what can such a monster of wickedness do unto the reconciliation either of himself or of other unto God? "Of the unclean, what can be cleansed?" Who can make him clean that is conceived of unclean seed, but God alone?

And as touching the angels, neither are they so pure in the sight of God, that they were of sufficient worthiness and worthy sufficiency to make an agreement between God and man. For even in them also was there found folly, as Job saith: insomuch that "God spared not the angels that sinned," as St Peter writeth, "but cast them down into hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness (to be punished) to be kept unto judgment." In angels then also was there found imperfection; so that they were no meet mediators between God and man, to set a love-day between them, and to bring them unto an unity.

Who seeth not now then, how necessary the death of Christ was? without the which no reconciliation could have been made between God and man. Yea, not only things in earth, but also things in heaven are made at one with God through the passion and death of Christ, as St Paul testifieth, saying: "God hath restored and made all things perfect by Christ, both the things which are in heaven, and the things which are in earth." Again: "It pleased the Father, that in Christ should all fulness dwell, and by him to reconcile all thing unto himself, and to set at peace by him, through the blood of his cross, both things in heaven and things in earth."

Father. By the death of Christ then are we delivered from our sins, and from the captivity of Satan. *Son.* Yea, verily, Christ was delivered unto the death for our sins. "We are washed, we are made holy, we are justified and made righteous by the name of the Lord Jesu, and through the Spirit of our God." In Christ God made agreement between the world and himself, and imputed not their sins unto them. Yea, "God made Christ, which knew no sin, to be sin for us (that is to say, a sacrifice for sin), that we by his means should be made that righteousness," which before God is allowed. "By Christ we have redemption through his blood, even the forgiveness of sins." By the means of Christ Jesus "we, which were sometime far off, are made nigh by the blood of Christ; for he is our peace; so that now we are not strangers and foreigners, but citizens with the saints, and of the household of God." "Christ loved us, and gave

[¹ Two words are omitted.]

himself for us, an offering and a sweet-smelling sacrifice to God." "We are made holy by the offering of the body of Jesus Christ done once for all;" so that "Christ is able even unto the full to save them which come unto God by him."

Father. And to remember this his passion and death, by the which we have received so many noble and precious benefits, the Lord Christ instituted this holy sacrament, which the apostle calleth "The Lord's Supper." *Son.* Yea, verily. And therefore they, that will worthily and with fruit come unto this holy and heavenly banquet, must diligently consider, remember, and set before the eyes of their mind the passion and death of our Lord and Saviour Christ Jesu, and the merits and benefits thereof; that by this means they may the more earnestly be stirred up both unto thanksgiving, and also unto a continual meditation of a better life.

Father. Is there any other cause, why the Lord Jesu did ordain this his holy supper? *Son.* You have heard the chief and principal cause, which is the remembrance of Christ's death. Another end why this holy banquet was instituted is, that it should be a sign and a token of the unity and concord, of the hearty good will and singular friendship, and of the perfect agreement in doctrine and religion that ought to be among them that profess Christ. And this is that which St Paul writeth: "We, though we be many, yet are one bread and one body; inasmuch as we all are partakers of one bread."

Father. They then, which will approach unto the table of the Lord, ought not only to shew themselves mindful of the Lord's passion and death, but also provide that they bring with them charitable, friendly, and loving hearts toward all men, and minds settled in the truth of God's word, and in the unity of his true religion. *Son.* So is it. For whosoever presume to come unto the table of the Lord with uncharitable hearts, and with minds dissenting from the truth of God's word, and estranged from the unity of God's holy congregation, they shall find nothing there but the wrath and anger of God, the displeasure and vengeance of God, and finally (except repentance conjoined with true faith come) everlasting death and damnation. For this holy table of the Lord abhorreth no sin so greatly as envy, hatred, malice, anger, displeasure, distraction of minds, dissension in religion, &c.

In consideration whereof the ancient fathers of Christ's church in times past were wont to call this holy banquet or supper of the Lord *Agape*², that is to say "love," to put men in remembrance, that none should come unto that heavenly table, where the blessed sacrament of love is ministered and set forth, but such as came with hearts inflamed with true love and unfeigned charity toward all men. They, therefore, which presume otherwise to come, are companions with Judas, into whom Satan entered so soon as he had unreverently and unworthily tasted of these holy mysteries, never forsaking him till he had brought him unto desperation, destruction, and damnation.

Seeing we be members all of one body, and have one head, even the Lord Christ Jesus; seeing also we have all one heavenly Father, one elder brother, one inheritance in the kingdom of heaven; again, seeing we all be baptized with one baptism, and eat of one bread, and drink of one cup; what thing should be of so great force to dissolve this unity, and to break that concord and amity, which we ought continually to have among us, both in doctrine and manners? "In this thing shall all men know," saith Christ, "that ye are my disciples, if one of you love another." And the blessed apostle St Paul exhorteth us, by the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that we "all speak one thing, and that there be no dissension among us, but that we may be an whole body, of one mind, and of one meaning;" yea, and that the same affection may reign in us one toward another, that was in Christ Jesu, so that, "if one member suffer, all should suffer with him; and if one member be had in honour, all members should be glad also," "forasmuch as we be members one of another," and have one head, even the Lord Jesu.

[² Οὐκ ἐξόν ἐστιν χωρὶς τοῦ ἐπισκόπου οὔτε βαπτίζεω οὔτε ἀγάπην ποιεῖν.—Ignat. ad Smyrn. 8. in Patr. Apostol. Oxon. 1838. Tom. II. p. 414. It ought to be observed, that Ignatius is by some

supposed to mean here not the Lord's supper itself, but the *Agape*, or feast of charity which accompanied it; of which our author afterwards makes mention. See below, page 251.]

Father. What other causes are there of the institution of the Lord's supper? *Son.* The Lord Christ ordained this holy supper also, that we, worthily enjoying the same, should the better be confirmed in our faith, and nothing doubt of the promise and good will of God toward us; but faithfully and constantly be persuaded, that whatsoever our heavenly Father hath promised us in Christ, and for Christ's sake, that will he abundantly perform; so that we need not fear the tyranny of Satan, the curse of the law, the horror of death, the dart of desperation, the pains of hell, nor any other thing, whatsoever is most contrary to our health and salvation, which all be taken away by the death of Christ. "If God be on our side," saith St Paul, "who can be against us? which spared not his own Son, but gave him for us all: how can it be, that with him he should not give us all things also?" For who knoweth not, that sacraments are the seals of God, annexed to his most comfortable promises, which he hath most graciously made to all sinners that repent and believe, that through the contemplation and beholding of them, yea, through the enjoying and using of them, their faith may be stirred up, increased, and confirmed?

Again, this holy sacrament was instituted of the Lord Jesu, to preach unto us that his blessed body and his precious blood is the true nourishment of the faithful soul; and that through this meat, which is received by faith, our souls be relieved, comforted, sustained, made strong, joyful, and merry, and preserved unto everlasting life, as Christ himself testifieth, saying: "I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall not hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst." "And this is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, have everlasting life; and I will raise him up at the last day." "Verily, verily, I say unto you, He that putteth his trust in me hath everlasting life." "I am that living bread, which came down from heaven. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever. And the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." "Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life; and I will raise him up at the last day. For my flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live for the Father; even so he that eateth me shall live by the means of me."

Furthermore, another cause of the institution of this heavenly banquet is to move us to be thankful unto our heavenly Father for the death and passion of his Son, and for the inestimable benefits, fruits, and commodities, which we have plentifully obtained by the same, as deliverance from Satan, freedom from the curse of the law, forgiveness of sins, quietness of conscience, the gift of the Holy Ghost, victory against sin, death, and hell, righteousness before God, salvation, and everlasting life. And to this end the ancient fathers of Christ's church called the supper of the Lord *Sacramentum Eucharistiæ*¹, that is to say, the "sacrament of thanksgiving." So likewise read we of the primitive and apostolic church: "All that believed," saith blessed Luke, "continued daily with one accord in the temple, and brake bread from house to house, and did eat their meat together with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God." And St Paul saith: "Is not the cup of thanksgiving, for the which we give thanks, partaking of the blood of Christ?" &c.

Father. Now that thou hast declared unto me, what the Lord's supper is, who did institute it, and for what purpose and end it was ordained and commanded to be frequented and used in the church of Christ, come off, tell me how we ought to prepare ourselves unto the worthy receiving of so worthy and holy mysteries, that we, coming worthily and reverently unto them, may be made partakers of all those heavenly benefits, which Christ hath purchased of God the Father for us by his glorious passion and blessed death. *Son.* This thing is also necessary to be known. And unto this doth the apostle exhort us, saying: "Whosoever shall eat of this bread, or drink of the cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of the bread, and

[¹ This name is found given to the Lord's supper in Justin. See below, page 239, note 2. Other authorities might easily be added.]

Hos. xiii.
1 Cor. xv.
Eph. ii.
Col. ii.
Heb. ii.

Rom. viii.

Rom. iv.

John vi.

Acts ii.

1 Cor. x.

1 Cor. xi.

drink of the cup. For he that eateth or drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh his own damnation; because he maketh no difference of the Lord's body."

The Lord our God can by no means abide that any man should come unto his holy sacraments with unwashed feet, as they use to say; that is, unreverently and unworthily, as we may see also in the old law. Was not this the commandment of God, that when the people of Israel did eat the Lord's passover, otherwise called the paschal lamb (which was the sacrament and figure of the true paschal Lamb, even Christ Jesus, "which taketh away the sin of the world"), they should eat sweet and unleavened bread, and suffer no leaven to be in their houses, nor yet taste of any leavened bread by the space of seven days; and if any did the contrary, that that soul should be plucked out from Israel? Was not Uzza stricken of God even unto the death, because he unworthily touched the ark of the Lord? Was not a certain man taken from the table, bound hand and foot, and cast into utter darkness, where weeping and gnashing of teeth shall be, because he presumed to come unto the marriage of a certain noble king's son without the wedding garment? Did not the devil enter into Judas immediately after he had unworthily received the holy mysteries of the body and blood of Christ? Writeth not St Paul, that the Corinthians were both grievously and diversly plagued of God, because they came unreverently unto the Lord's table? And who doubteth but that even at this present time many plagues are cast upon us for abusing this holy sacrament? It is therefore convenient, that we learn how we may come unto so holy mysteries not unworthily, but worthily, not unto our damnation, but unto our salvation; lest, where we seem to seek remedy and comfort, we find destruction and displeasure.

Father. Well said, my son. Let me therefore now hear, how we ought to prepare ourselves worthily to come unto the table of the Lord, lest, where we seek consolation, we find desolation. *Son.* Whosoever intendeth with fruit to come unto the table of the Lord, and worthily to receive the holy mysteries of the body and blood of our Saviour Christ, he must first of all even from the very heart repent him of his former wicked life, lament earnestly his corrupt manners, abhor his old ungodly conversation, and be heartily sorry that ever he hath committed such wickedness against the Lord his God, and so disobediently transgressed and broken his holy and blessed commandments.

Father. Is this repentance so necessary for the worthy preparation unto the coming to the Lord's table? *Son.* It is so necessary, that whosoever presumeth to come unto the supper of the Lord without this repentance, he shall not only not receive any benefit at the Lord's table, but he also shall be guilty of the body and blood of Christ, and get unto himself everlasting damnation. The unrepentant sinners are meet guests for the table of the devil; but such doth not the Lord admit unto his table, as St Paul saith: "I would not that ye should have fellowship with the devils. Ye cannot drink of the cup of the Lord, and of the cup of the devils. Ye cannot be the partakers of the Lord's table, and of the table of the devils." If any man therefore intendeth to come unto the Lord's table worthily, let him bring repentance with him, yea, and that not feigned, but hearty repentance; as we read of David, Peter, Mary Magdalen, the thief, and such like. For true repentance is an acceptable sacrifice unto God, as David witnesseth: "A sacrifice to God is a troubled spirit; a broken and a contrite heart, O God, shalt thou not despise." And the Lord himself saith by the prophet: "Which of them shall I regard? Even him that is poor, and of a lowly troubled spirit, and standeth in awe of my words." To the penitent and sorrowful-hearted is Christ a Saviour, and not to such as glory and delight in their sin. "Repent," saith the scripture, "for the kingdom of God," that is to say, remission of sins, "is at hand." "Repentance" goeth before, and "remission of sins" followeth; so that without repentance remission of sins is looked for in vain; as Christ saith: "Except ye repent, ye shall all perish." And the apostle saith: "Godly sorrow causeth repentance unto salvation not to be repented of." St Peter also saith: "God resisteth the proud, but he favoureth the humble and lowly."

Father. What followeth? *Son.* Out of this hearty and earnest repentance must

also an humble confession of the repented sins unto God issue; so that we do not dissemble nor cloke our sins, but with all humility and lowliness of heart confess them, and frankly and freely grant that we have most wickedly disobeyed the Lord our God, and transgressed his holy and blessed will.

Confession unto God. *Father.* Is the confession of sins also necessary for them that will worthily come unto the Lord's table? *Son.* Yea, verily.

Father. And doth it profit also unto everlasting life? *Son.* Who doubteth of that? Hear what the psalmograph saith: "I will knowledge my sin, O Lord, unto thee, and mine unrighteousness will I not hide. I said, I will confess my sins unto the Lord; and thou forgavest the wickedness of my sin." Hear also what St John saith: "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us. But if we confess our sins, God is faithful and righteous to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness. If we say we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us." David, guilty both of whoredom and manslaughter, after he had repented him and confessed that he had sinned against the Lord, heard these sweet and comfortable words at the mouth of the prophet Nathan: "The Lord hath put away thy sin: thou shalt not die." The prodigal son, which had riotously and wickedly spent his father's goods, after that he fell to repentance, humbled himself before his father, and confessed his sins, saying, "O father, I have sinned against heaven and in thy sight, and am no more worthy to be called thy son," was clearly forgiven; so that his father had compassion on him, ran unto him, fell on his neck, and kissed him, and caused the best garment to be brought forth and to be put on him, and a ring to be put on his hand, and shoes on his feet, and a fat calf to be killed, that they might eat and make merry, because his son which was dead was alive again, and he that was lost was found again. The poor publican, which was so ashamed of his sins, that he durst not look up unto heaven, but stood afar off, and smote upon his breast, saying, "O God, be merciful to me a sinner," went home to his house more justified than the proud Pharisee for all his glistening works. For Christ "came not to call the righteous," that is to say, such as justify themselves, "but sinners unto repentance." "There is more joy in heaven over one sinner that repenteth, than over ninety and nine just persons that need no repentance."

Father. Is repentance and confession of sins unto God sufficient for the worthy preparation unto the Lord's table? *Son.* That which followeth is so necessary, that without it both repentance and confession profit nothing at all.

Faith. *Father.* What is that? *Son.* Faith.

Father. What is that to say? *Son.* A sure and an undoubted persuasion or belief of heart, that though the sins of them that intend to come unto the Lord's table be never so great and many, yet notwithstanding that they shall be freely and fully forgiven of God the Father for his Son Christ Jesus' sake, for his passion and death, for his blessed body-breaking and precious blood-shedding, for the dignity and worthiness of that one and alone sweet-smelling sacrifice, which he offered once for all, sufficient to the uttermost for the salvation of the whole world, unto God his Father on the cross.

Father. Is this faith necessary to the faithful communicant? *Son.* So necessary, that without it all other preparations are frustrate and vain. For "he that believeth on the Son of God," saith the scripture, "hath everlasting life: but he that believeth not on the Son of God shall not see life, but the wrath of God abideth upon him."

Faith is the wedding-garment, wherewith whosoever is not clad, and yet presumeth to come unto the marriage of the Son of God, he shall be bound hand and foot, and cast into utter darkness, where weeping and gnashing of teeth shall be. And these are they (I speak of the unfaithful), which most unworthily come unto the Lord's table, and are guilty of the body and blood of the Lord; yea, and whatsoever they receive there, they receive it unto the damnation both of their body and soul. Therefore such as intend with fruit to come unto the Lord's table, they may not only bring with them repentance and confession of their sins, but also this faith, wherewith they are most assuredly persuaded that they have obtained full and perfect remission of all their sins through the blood and death of Christ, and that whatsoever Christ

suffered on the altar of the cross, he suffered it altogether for them and for their sins: again, whatsoever he won, got, and purchased by his passion and death, he got it altogether for them and for their salvation; so that whole Christ, with all the benefits, merits, profits, fruits, and commodities, which he obtained of God his Father in his humanity, is altogether theirs, their own, and their right; forasmuch as they believe in Christ, and with strong faith embrace him as their alone perfect and omnisufficient Saviour, as St Paul saith: "Christ is the perfect fulfilling of the law to justify Rom. x. every one that believeth." Again: "Christ is our wisdom, and righteousness, and 1 Cor. i. sanctification, and redemption, that, according as it is written, He that rejoiceth should Jer. ix. rejoice in the Lord." And the prophet saith: "Whosoever believeth on him shall Isai. xxviii. not be confounded."

To stir up and to confirm the faith of the faithful communicants in that behalf, it shall be necessary diligently to weigh, ponder, and consider these sweet and comfortable promises, which are annexed to the holy mysteries of the body and blood of our Saviour Christ; even these: "Which shall be betrayed for you," "which shall be Matt. xxvi. shed for you and for many, unto the remission of sins." For in them doth our greatest consolation and comfort consist, if we believe them. Little doth it profit us to believe that Christ's body was broken, and his blood shed, except we believe that his body was broken and his blood shed for our sins, for our wealth and commodity, for our profit and singular benefit; even as it pleaseth us nothing to believe that Christ was born, except we also believe that he was born for us and for our salvation, as the prophet saith: "A child is born to us, and a son is given to us." For this must Isai. ix. be our faith, belief, and undoubted persuasion, that Christ gave up his body to be crucified, and his blood to be shed, that he might purchase unto us remission and forgiveness of all our sins, the grace, favour, and mercy of God, quietness of conscience, the gift of the Holy Ghost, and in fine, everlasting salvation, as St Paul saith: "God 2 Cor. v. made him to be sin (that is to say, a sacrifice for sin) for us, which knew no sin, that we by his means should be made that righteousness," which before him is allowed. Again: "Christ loved us, and gave himself for us, an offering and a sweet-smelling Eph. v. sacrifice to God."

Father. If the communicants bring with them unto the Lord's table repentance, confession, and faith, is it then sufficient? *Son.* Out of this repentance and faith, whereof I have hitherto spoken, must true, fervent, christian, vehement, and brenning Charity. charity or love toward our neighbour spring; so that we must also diligently consider how the matter standeth between us and our neighbour. For this supper of the Lord, as it abhorreth all sin, so likewise doth it most chiefly detest hatred, malice, envy, rancour, displeasure, and whatsoever is contrary to christian charity and brotherly love; being itself, as we tofore heard, a sacrament of love, unity, and concord.

Father. Is charity and love so necessary also to them that intend worthily to come unto the table of the Lord? *Son.* So necessary, that without it, whatsoever we do at the Lord's table, it turneth unto damnation. To speak with the tongues of men 1 Cor. xiii. and of angels; to prophesy and to understand all secrets and all knowledge; to have all faith, so that we could move mountains out of their places; to bestow all our goods to feed the poor; yea, to give our bodies to be burned; profiteth nothing, without charity and love.

"Every one that loveth," saith St John, "is born of God, and knoweth God. But 1 John iv. he that loveth not knoweth not God; for God is love." "If any man say, I love God, and yet hate his brother, he is a liar. For how can he, that loveth not his brother whom he hath seen, love God whom he hath not seen?" "Every one that 1 John iii. hateth his brother is a manslayer." "In this," saith the Lord Jesu, "shall all men John xiii. know that ye are my disciples, if one of you love another."

Such therefore as intend worthily to approach unto the Lord's table, let them not only consider how the matter standeth between them and God, but also between them and their neighbours. And if they shall find any displeasure among themselves one toward another, let them, before they come unto the Lord's table, seek to be reconciled one to another, according to this commandment of our Lord and Saviour Christ: "If Matt. v. thou offerest thy gift at the altar, and there rememberest that thy brother hath ought

against thee, leave there thine offering before the altar, and go thy way first, and be reconciled to thy brother, and then come and offer thy gift." How greatly those things displease God, although in outward appearance they glister and shine never so holy and virtuous, which come from an hateful and malicious heart, the history of Cain declareth abundantly. "Above all things," saith St Peter, "have fervent charity among you. For charity covereth the multitude of sins." And let this their love be no fleshly nor worldly love, but such love as cometh "out of a pure heart, and of a good conscience, and of faith unfeigned." Such love is the end, that is to say, the fulfilling of the law; as St Paul saith: "He that loveth his neighbour hath fulfilled the law. For these commandments, Thou shalt not commit adultery, Thou shalt not kill, Thou shalt not steal, Thou shalt not bear false witness, Thou shalt not lust, and so forth; if there be any other commandment, it is all comprehended in this saying, namely, Love thy neighbour as thyself. Love hurteth not his neighbour: therefore is love the fulfilling of the law."

Father. If this repentance, confession, faith, and love, whereof thou hast hitherto spoken, be found in the communicants, may they then with a free conscience come unto the Lord's table, as persons not altogether unworthy to be partakers of so holy mysteries? *Son.* Besides these things whereof we have hitherto spoken, it is required of the Lord's guests, that they have within themselves an hearty and unfeigned disposition to lead a better life for ever after, and earnestly to provide, that they fall no more into those sins, wherewith heretofore they have most grievously offended the majesty of God; whereof also they are now greatly ashamed and sore repent them. For without this meditation and earnest study of a new life, I see not what all the aforesaid things profit.

"If any man," saith St Paul, "be in Christ, he is a new creature." Again: "They that are Christ's have crucified the flesh with the affections and lusts." "Bring forth the fruits that belong to repentance," saith St John the Baptist. "For even now is the axe also put unto the root of the trees; so that every tree which bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down and cast into the fire." And Christ said unto the Jews: "If ye were Abraham's children, ye would do the works of Abraham." Even so, if we be God's children, as we profess by our outward coming unto the Lord's supper, we must do the works of God. The works which God requireth of us, are to believe in the name of his only-begotten Son, to love one another, and to walk in a new life. For unto this end hath God the Father by the death of his Son "delivered us from the power of our enemies, that we should serve him in holiness and righteousness all the days of our life." "God hath not called us unto uncleanness, but unto holiness." "We are God's workmanship, created in Christ Jesu unto good works, which God ordained, that we should walk in them." "The grace of God, which bringeth salvation unto all men, hath appeared, teaching us that we should deny ungodliness and worldly lusts, and that we should live soberly and righteously and godly in this present world, looking for that blessed hope and glorious appearing of the great God and of our Saviour Jesu Christ, which gave himself for us, to redeem us from all unrighteousness, and to purge us a peculiar people unto himself, fervently given unto good works." "Christ, which through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, hath purged our conscience from dead works, for to serve the living God."

Father. The faithful communicants then ought to bring with them unto the Lord's table unfeigned repentance, humble confession of their sins unto God, constant faith in the merciful promises of God, fervent charity toward their neighbour, and an hearty disposition unto amendment of life. *Son.* Yea, verily. And all these things ought to brast out into good works, into godliness of life, into a new conversation, into uncorrupt manners; so that from henceforth our life be altered, our conversation be changed, and our manners be framed according to the rule of God's holy word, that ever after we may be "such as no man can complain on, and unfeigned sons of God, without rebuke in the midst of a crooked and perverse nation, shining as lights in the world, and holding fast the word of life." "Let your light so shine before men," saith our Saviour Christ, "that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father which is in heaven." And St Paul saith: "Let ours (that is to say, Christians) learn to excel in good works, as far forth as need requireth, that they be not unfruitful."

Gen. iv.
1 Pet. iv.
1 Tim. i.
Rom. xiii.
Exod. xx.
Deut. v.

Lev. xix.
Matt. xxii.

Disposition
unto amend-
ment of life.

2 Cor. v.
Gal. v.
Matt. iii.

John viii.

John vi.

Luke i.

1 Thess. iv.

Eph. ii.

Tit. ii.

Heb. ix.

Phil. ii.

Matt. v.

Tit. iii.

Father. And must this disposition unto innocency of life continue in them so long as they live? *Son.* They may not only dispose themselves unto good works, but also practise good works diligently all the days of their life, that they be not wording gospellers, but working gospellers; not favourers only, but also followers of God's word. For it is not sufficient to begin well, except we continue well; neither it is sufficient for a while to continue well, except we end well. "He that continueth unto the end Matt. x. shall be saved." "No man that putteth his hand to the plough, and looketh back, is Luke ix. meet for the kingdom of God." "No man is crowned, except he strive lawfully." 2 Tim. ii. "Be faithful unto the death," saith Christ, "and I will give thee the crown of life." Rev. ii. Our Saviour Christ in the gospel commandeth us to "remember Lot's wife;" by the Luke xvii. which he goeth about to put us in remembrance, that it is not sufficient to begin well, except we continue well, and also end well. Lot's wife began well, when she came out of Sodom; but because she continued not well, but, contrary to the commandment of God's angel, looked back again to Sodom, she was punished and turned into a salt Gen. xix. pillar.

The wise men, which came from the east parts to seek Christ, that new-born King Matt. ii. of the Jews, after they had departed from that bloody tyrant king Herod, and had worshipped Christ, were commanded by the angel of God that they should no more return unto king Herod, but go home into your country another way. For all such as have dedicated themselves to God by taking on them the holy sacrament of baptism, and by receiving the holy and blessed mysteries of the body and blood of our Saviour Christ, have openly professed, that from henceforth they will never have to do with the devil, the world, and the flesh, but utterly renounce and forsake them, with all their works, pomps, and vanities, serving their Lord God "in holiness and righteousness Luke i. all the days of their life."

Now, if any fall from this their profession, and join familiarity again with the devil, the world, and the flesh, obeying their lusts, and satisfying their desires, then have they utterly given over God and all godliness; yea, then are they become mockers of God and of his holy mysteries, and get to themselves everlasting damnation. "For 2 Pet. ii. of whom a man is overcome," saith St Peter, "unto the same is he brought in bondage. For if they (after they have escaped from the filthiness of the world, through the knowledge of the Lord and Saviour Jesu Christ) are yet tangled again therein, and overcome, then is the latter end worse with them than the beginning. For it had been better for them not to have known the way of righteousness, than after they have known it to turn from the holy commandment that was given unto them. But the same is happened to them that is used to be spoken by the true proverb, The Prov. xxvi. dog is turned to his vomit again; and the sow that was washed is turned again to her wallowing in the mire." To whom is this saying of the Lord Jesu unknown? "When the unclean spirit is gone out of a man, he walketh through dry places, seeking Luke xi. rest. And when he findeth none, he saith, I will return again unto my house, whence I came out. And when he cometh, he findeth it swept and garnished. Then goeth he and taketh to him seven other spirits worse than himself; and they enter in and dwell there: and the end of that man is worse than the beginning."

Therefore whosoever intendeth to prepare himself worthily unto the Lord's table, Luke xi. let him first of all fall unto hearty repentance; secondly, let him humble himself before the majesty of God by confessing his sins; thirdly, let him stedfastly believe, and be perfectly persuaded, that all his sins are forgiven him of God the Father for Christ's sake; fourthly, let him nourish fervent love in his heart toward his neighbour; fifthly and finally, let him for ever after so dispose himself to walk in a new life, that from henceforth he "have no more to do with the unfruitful works of Eph. v. darkness," but in all points so behave himself as it becometh the professor of godliness.

Father. Hitherto thou hast declared what the Lord's supper is, who did institute it, unto what end it was ordained, and how we ought to prepare ourselves worthily to come unto the Lord's table: I would now gladly hear, if any abuses have crept into the church of Christ concerning the Lord's supper. Have your preacher or catechist opened nothing unto you in this behalf? *Son.* Yes, verily. They have

declared certain notable abuses brought into the church of Christ in times past by antichrist and his adherents.

Certain abuses of the Lord's supper.

Father. Which are they? Let me hear part of them. *Son.* First, whereas the Lord Christ ordained this his holy supper to be received of many, antichrist and his complices, contrary to the institution and commandment of Christ, have made a private breakfast of it; as we may see in the popish mass, where the mumbling massmonger eateth and drinketh all alone, and giveth no man part with him, except this be any part, to bless the people with an empty cup, when he hath drunk up altogether, as the manner is in all the pope's churches at principal and high feasts, as they term them.

The Lord's supper ought not to be private repast, but an holy banquet for many.

Matt. xxvi.
Mark xiv.
Luke xxii.
1 Cor. xi.

Father. Let me hear it proved by the word of God, that the Lord's supper ought not to be a private repast (as the papists abuse it in their masses), but rather a common banquet for many to receive it together. *Son.* The institution itself declareth evidently that it ought to be the food of many together, and not of one alone. For thus read we: "When they were eating, Jesus took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take ye, eat ye: this is my body, which is betrayed for you. And he took the cup, and thanked, and gave it them, saying, Drink ye all of this. For this is my blood (which is of the new testament), that is shed for many for the remission of sins. This do in the remembrance of me."

1 Cor. x.

Here is it evident that Christ did not eat and drink the sacrament of his body and blood alone, nor yet gave it to one of his disciples only; but he distributed it to all his disciples, that they should eat and drink of it together, and not one alone. "Take ye: eat ye." He saith not, Take thou, eat thou alone by thyself. Again: "Drink ye all of this." He saith not, Drink thou alone of this. And the blessed apostle St Paul saith: "Is not the bread which we break (he saith not, which I break) partaking of the body of Christ? Is not the cup of thanksgiving, for the which we gave thanks, (he saith not, I give thanks) partaking of the blood of Christ?" And a little after he saith: "We all are partakers of one bread, and of one cup." Again he saith: "When ye come together into one place, the Lord's supper cannot be eaten. For every one beginneth afore to eat his own supper." Also in the same place he saith: "My brethren, when ye come together to eat (the Lord's supper), tarry one for another. If any man hunger, let him eat at home, that ye come not together unto condemnation." And blessed St Luke, describing the manner and custom of the primitive church, saith: "All that believed kept themselves together, and had all things common, and sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men, as every man had need. And they continued daily with one accord in the temple, and brake bread from house to house, and did eat their meat together with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God." Again: "Upon one of the sabbath days, when the disciples came together for to break bread," &c.

1 Cor. xi.

Acts ii.

Of these authorities of the holy scripture is it evident, that the Lord's supper ought to be the banquet of many together, and not of one alone, as the papists abuse it.

The doctrine of the old fathers concerning the Lord's supper. In Epist. i.

Father. But what is the doctrine of the ancient fathers in this behalf? *Son.* In all points like to the doctrine of the holy scripture. Of the order used in the old Latin church concerning the receiving of the holy communion of the body and blood of the Lord Jesu, Anacletus, bishop of Rome, writeth on this manner: "When the consecration is once done, let all communicate that will not be excommunicate. For so did the apostles ordain, and the holy church of Rome doth still observe and maintain the same¹." Here it is plain, that the manner of the Latin church, otherwise called the west church, was that many, yea "all," saith Anacletus, should eat the Lord's supper together. Again, that all which would not be partakers of the Lord's supper should be excommunicate. He addeth moreover, that it was the ordinance of the apostles, and that the church of Rome did observe, keep, and maintain that ordinance

[¹ Peracta consecratione omnes communicent, qui noluerint ecclesiasticis carere liminibus. Sic enim et apostoli statuerunt, et sancta Romana tenet ecclesia.—Anaclet. Papa, Epist. i. in Decret. Gra-

tiani, Par. 1583. Decr. Tert. Pars, De Consecr. Dist. ii. can. 10. cols. 2363, 4. The decretal epistles ascribed to the early bishops of Rome are not genuine.]

of the apostles; that is to say, that, when the Lord's supper was ministered, not one alone, as the manner is now, but many together were partakers of the same.

Father. The private masses were not then in use, as it seemeth. *Son.* Antichrist and the devil brought in those private, that is to say, thievish masses, many hundred years after, for lucre's sake, as the ancient histories do evidently prove.

The old catholic church of Rome knew no private masses.

Father. But what sayest thou of the Greek church, otherwise called the east church? What order observed they? *Son.* Even the very same that the old Latin or west church observed. For the Greeks even from the apostles' time until these our days have ever observed and kept the order that was used in the primitive church, neither would they at any time receive these private masses into their churches; but whensoever they celebrate the Lord's supper, not one alone (as the use is in the pope's church), but many together are partakers of the same, according to this saying of St Paul: "We all are partakers of one bread, and of one cup."

The Greeks have no private masses.

1 Cor. x.

Father. Canst thou prove this by ancient writers of the Greek church? *Son.* Yea, forsooth, very easily.

Father. Let me hear. *Son.* The ancient Greek writer, Justinus Martyr, hath these words: "After that he which is the ruler (in the ministry) hath given thanks, and all the people hath blessed, they which are called with us deacons, do give to every one of them that are present bread, wine, and water to receive; which with thanksgiving are consecrate; and they also carry it unto them that are absent. And this meat is called with us *Eucharistia*," that is to say, thanksgiving.

In second. Apologia.

And Dionysius Areopagita, in his book *De Ecclesiastica Hierarchia*, sheweth evidently that in his time also the bread and the cup was not received of the minister alone, but that they were distributed to all men; so that many were partakers of those holy mysteries, and not one alone, as it is used in the popish masses³.

Cap. 3. part 2.

St John Chrysostom in a certain homily hath these words: "Forasmuch as it is the dominical supper, that is to say, the Lord's, it ought to be common. For those things that are the Lord's, belong not to this or that servant (only), but they are common to all. That therefore which is the Lord's, even the very same is also common. For if it be thy Lord's, as it is indeed, thou oughtest not to take those things as proper to thee, but to set them forth as the Lord's things commonly to all; for this is the Lord's. But now thou dost not suffer it to be the Lord's, when thou dost not suffer it to be common, but eatest to thyself⁴."

In 1 Cor. cap. xi. Hom. 27.

Clement, bishop of Rome, commandeth that there should so many hosts be offered on the altar, as should suffice the people. He saith not, as should serve the priest alone⁵.

Epist. 2.

Bishop Durande writeth on this manner: "In the primitive church all that were present at the celebration of the masses (he meaneth, the Lord's supper) were wont every day to communicate, because all the apostles did drink of the cup, according to this saying of the Lord, 'Drink ye all of this.' For they offered a great loaf of bread, and sufficient for all; which thing the Grecians are reported to keep at this day⁶."

In Rat. Div. Off. Lib. 4.

Matt. xxvi.

Albertus, in his book *De Missæ Mysteriis*, declareth, that the use in times past

[² Εὐχαριστήσαντος δὲ τοῦ προεστῶτος, καὶ ἐπευφημήσαντος παντὸς τοῦ λαοῦ, οἱ καλούμενοι παρ' ἡμῶν διάκονοι διδόντες ἐκάστῳ τῶν παρόντων μεταλαβεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ εὐχαριστηθέντος ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου καὶ ὕδατος, καὶ τοῖς οὐ παρούσιν ἀποφέρουσι. καὶ ἡ τροφή αὕτη καλεῖται παρ' ἡμῶν εὐχαριστία.—Just. Mart. Op. Par. 1742. Apol. i. p. 83.]

[³ Καὶ τὰς ἱερὰς θεωργίας ὁ Ἱεράρχης ἡνίχας ἱερουργεῖ τὰ θεϊότατα, καὶ ὑπ' ὄψιν ἄγει τὰ ἡμνημένα διὰ τῶν ἱερῶς προκειμένων συμβόλων, καὶ τὰς δωρεὰς τῶν θεωργιῶν ὑποδείξας, εἰς κοινωνίαν αὐτῶν ἱερῶν ἀπόδος τε ἔρχεται, καὶ τοὺς ἄλλους προτρέπεται. μετασχὼν δὲ καὶ μεταδόσθης τῆς θαρραλικῆς κοινωνίας, εἰς εὐχαριστίαν ἱερῶν καταλήγει.—Dionys. Areop. Op. Antv. 1634. De Eccles. Hierarch. cap. iii. 2. Tom. I. p. 284. See also 3. pp. 298, 9. It is hardly necessary to say that the

works which go under the name of the Areopagite are not really his.]

[⁴ Ὅτι τὸ κυριακὸν δεῖπνον, τουτέστι, τὸ δεσποτικόν, ὀφείλει κοινὸν εἶναι. τὰ γὰρ τοῦ δεσπότου οὐχὶ τοῦδε μὲν ἐστὶ τοῦ οἰκέτου, τοῦδε δὲ οὐκ ἐστὶν, ἀλλὰ κοινῆ πάντων. τὸ οὖν κυριακὸν τουτό φησι τὸ κοινόν. εἰ γὰρ τοῦ δεσπότου σου ἐστίν, ὡς περ οὖν καὶ ἐστίν, οὐκ ὀφείλεις ὡς ἴδια ἀποσπᾶν, ἀλλ' ὡς τοῦ Κυρίου καὶ τοῦ δεσπότου ὄντα, κοινῆ πᾶσι προτιθέναι. τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστὶ κυριακόν. νῦν δὲ οὐκ ἀφίης αὐτὸ εἶναι κυριακόν, μὴ ἀφίης εἶναι κοινόν, ἀλλὰ καθ' ἑαυτὸν ἐστιώμενος.—Chrysost. Op. Par. 1718-38. In Epist. i. ad Cor. Hom. xxvii. Tom. X. p. 244.]

[⁵ See below, page 251, note 10.]

[⁶ Ceterum in primitiva ecclesia omnes, qui celebrationi missarum intererant singulis diebus com-

was, that so many as came together in the church should communicate together¹. The ancient Grecians call the Lord's supper *Synaxin*², that is to say, the communion or fellowship of many, or a partaking together of many.

But wherefore do I gather together so many authorities out of the ancient writers, to declare that the massing papists do utterly abuse the Lord's supper, while they make it a private breakfast, admitting no man unto the partaking of those holy mysteries but themselves alone; seeing that even of the very words, which they yet use in their mass, it may easily be gathered, that in times past, before antichrist sat as god in the consciences of men, and with his devilish decrees had driven away God's holy ordinances out of the church, the use and manner was, that many should communicate together with the priest, and not the priest alone? I will rehearse some of the words, as they be mentioned in their mass-book, and as the massmongers in the kingdom of antichrist say them at this present day in their masses. At their post-communion they say thus: *Quod ore sumpsimus, Domine, pura mente capiamus, &c.*³. That is to say: "That which we have taken with the mouth, O Lord, grant that we may receive it with a pure mind, and that it may be made unto us of a temporal gift an everlasting remedy." Again: *Hæc nos communio purget a crimine, et cœlestis remedii faciat esse consortes*⁴. Which is thus Englished: "This communion mought purge us from sin, and make us partakers of the heavenly remedy." And in another place of their mass the massmongers desire God that so many as shall receive the holy body and blood of Christ may be filled with all heavenly blessing and grace⁵.

All these words tofore rehearsed declare evidently, that in times past, before this devilish private mass brast in, the minister and the people together did receive the holy mysteries of the body and blood of Christ, and not the priest alone, as the manner is now in antichrist's kingdom. Neither do we find any mention made of the private mass in the writings of the ancient doctors, before the time of pope Gregory the First. As for the Grecians, the Armenians, the Indians, &c., they know not these private masses, but they use the Lord's supper in their churches, according to the institution of the Lord Jesu; not one alone, but many communicating together, as St Jerome saith: "The Lord's supper ought to be common to all; for he delivered the sacraments to all his disciples that were present equally⁶."

Father. I see now, that the Lord's supper is greatly abused of the papists in their private masses, while, contrary to the institution of Christ, they make that singular and private, which ought to be universal and common. But go forth to rehearse the abuses of the Lord's supper brought in by the papists.

Son. Secondly, the papists greatly abuse, yea, they alter, mangle, and deform the holy institution of the Lord's supper, while they, contrary to the commandment of Christ, take away half the sacrament of the body and blood of our Saviour Christ from the communion of the lay people, ministering the sacrament unto them, not under both kinds, according to the institution of Christ, but under one kind only, contrary to the commandment of Christ.

Father. What meanest thou by that? *Son.* Christ, giving for us and for our salvation not only his blessed body to be crucified, but also his most precious blood to be shed on the altar of the cross, that by this means we might be perfectly made

municare solebant, eo quod apostoli omnes de calice biberunt, Domino dicente, Bibite ex hoc omnes. De consecr. dist. 2. Non iste. Offerebant enim magnum panem, et omnibus sufficientem, quod adhuc Græci servare dicuntur.—Durand. Rat. Div. Offic. Venet. 1609. Lib. iv. cap. liii. 3. fol. 132.]

[¹ Primum enim institutum fuit quod omnes in ecclesia convenientes omni die communicarent.—Albert. Mag. Opus Tripartit. Col. 1503. Summ. de Offic. Missæ, cap. xxi. fol. 39.]

[² ἐνιαύως ἀνηγγέονταί Κοινωνία τε καὶ Σάναξις.—Dionys. Areop. Op. Antv. 1634. De Eccles. Hierarch. cap. iii. 1. Tom. I. p. 282.]

[³ Quod ore sumpsimus, Domine, pura mente capiamus: et de munere temporali fiat nobis re-

medium sempiternum.—Missal. ad Us. ac Consuet. Sarum. Par. 1527. Canon Missæ, fol. 164. 1.]

[⁴ Id. ibid.]

[⁵ Supplices te rogamus, omnipotens Deus: jube hæc perferri per manus sancti angeli tui in sublime altare tuum, in conspectu divinæ majestatis tuæ: ut quotquot ex hac altaris participatione sacrosanctum Filii tui corpus et sanguinem sumpserimus, omni benedictione cœlesti et gratia repleamur.—Id. ibid.]

[⁶ Cæterum dominica cœna omnibus debet esse communis: quia ille omnibus discipulis suis qui aderant, æqualiter tradidit sacramenta.—Hieron. Op. Par. 1693—1706. Comm. in Epist. i. ad Cor. cap. xi. Tom. V. col. 997.]

In 1 Cor. cap. xi.

The second abuse.


whole both in body and soul, willing that a remembrance of this his healthful benefit should for ever after be continued in his church until he return unto the judgment, that the most noble work of our redemption might perpetually remain in our memories, and never be forgotten, and we thereby provoked unto humble and hearty thanksgiving to God the Father for the live-making death of his most dearly-beloved Son, instituted an holy sacrament, which St Paul calleth "the Lord's supper," even the sacrament of ^{1 Cor. xi.} his body and blood, consisting of bread and wine—not of bread only, nor of wine only, but of bread and wine together—and commanded them to be received together of the faithful in the holy action of his supper, the bread to be a memorial of his body-breaking, and the wine a remembrance of his blood-shedding; that we, according to his holy institution eating the bread and drinking the wine, should be admonished and put in remembrance of our perfect salvation concerning both body and soul, gotten by the passion and death, by the body-breaking and blood-shedding of Christ, the Son of God, and the son of Mary the virgin. Now therefore, whereas the papists, contrary both to the institution and commandment of Christ, administer this holy sacrament to their communicants only under one kind, that is to say, the kind of bread, and steal from them the cup of the mystery of Christ's blood, they greatly abuse the Lord's supper; yea, as I said afore, they alter, change, mangle, corrupt, and utterly deform the holy institution of these blessed mysteries; as I may speak nothing of the extreme injury and wrong, of the theft and bribery, yea, of the sacrilege and health-robbing, which these antichrists do and commit against the people of God, contrary to all truth, contrary to all right.

Father. Ought the lay people also to receive the mysteries of the body and blood of Christ under both kinds, no less than the ministers of the church? *Son.* Did not Christ give his body to be crucified and his blood to be shed for the salvation of the layman so well as he did for the minister? Of receiving the sacrament under both kinds.

Father. Who doubteth of that? *Son.* Are not the lay people also members of Christ's church?

Father. I grant. *Son.* And the Lord Jesus instituted his holy supper to be received of his whole church, I mean so many as are able to discern this mystical meat from the common food, and to prepare themselves worthily to come unto it.

Father. I confess. *Son.* With what forehead then, except they have too much rubbed their forehead, and be past all shame, dare they infringe and break both the institution and commandment of Christ, taking most unjustly that from the laity which the Lord Jesus hath most freely given unto them, yea, and hath commanded them so to receive and take it; I mean, not only the bread, but also the cup?

Father. Let me hear where Christ commanded that not only the bread, but also the cup, should be ministered. *Son.* Concerning the bread, which is the mystery of his body, Christ saith: "Take ye, eat ye." And as touching the mystery of his blood Matt. xxvi. he saith: "Drink ye all of this." And in the words of the cup it is to be noted, that Christ hath this word, "all," which he hath not in the words belonging to the  mystery of his body: "Drink ye all of this," saith he, aforeseeing, without doubt, in the Spirit, that there should arise false prophets and false anointed, which presumptuously would deny the mystery of his blood to some certain men, as the papists do to the laity, yea, and to their own priests also, except they sacrifice and be clothed with their missal and mystical, with their histrionical and scenical robes; by this means transgressing the commandment of God for the maintenance of their wicked trifling Matt. xv. tradition. Therefore with express, evident, and plain words Christ saith: "Drink ye Mark vii. all of this." "All," saith he, excepting none. With what therefore imprudently, shall I say, or rather impudency, dare the adversaries of God's truth, against so evident words and express commandment of Christ, take away the holy mystery of the blood of Christ from the lay people? "Drink ye all of this," saith he.

Father. And did the disciples drink of this cup according to the commandment of Christ? *Son.* So testifieth blessed Mark, saying: "They all drank of it." Mark xiv.

Father. But here it is objected, Christ spake these words to his disciples, which were consecrate priests, and not to laymen; and therefore the priests alone ought to receive the cup of the mystery of Christ's blood. *Son.* So likewise spake Christ Objection.

Answer. of the mystery of his body these words only to his disciples: "Take ye, eat ye." Therefore look, with what authority the papists may take away the mystery of the blood of Christ from the laity, with the very same authority may they also take from them the mystery of Christ's body. For he that said, "Take and eat;" the very same said: "Take and drink," "Divide this cup among you."

Luke xxii.

If "take and eat" belong unto the common people, so likewise doth "take and drink" appertain unto the common people. If "take and drink" belong not unto them, neither do "take and eat" appertain unto them. But "take and eat" appertain unto the laity; therefore "take and drink" belong unto them also. For who knoweth not that the apostles of Christ in that holy supper represented the whole church of Christ? and Christ, in delivering unto them the holy mysteries of his body and blood, and commanding them to receive those from time to time, even unto the world's end, in the remembrance of him, of his passion and death, of his body-breaking and blood-shedding, delivered them to his whole church, and gave commandment that his people should from age to age, yea, in every age, use those holy mysteries unto his glorious return unto the judgment, as St Paul saith: "So often as ye shall eat this bread, and drink of this cup, ye shall shew the Lord's death till he come." And thus did both the apostles of Christ, and Christ's primitive church, and all the ancient fathers many hundred years after, understand, take, and use the Lord's supper, as both divine and human letters manifestly declare.

1 Cor. xi.

1 Cor. x.

Are not these the words of blessed St Paul? "Is not the cup of thanksgiving, for the which we give thanks, partaking of the blood of Christ? Is not the bread, which we break, partaking of the body of Christ? Because that we (though we be many) yet are one bread, and one body; inasmuch as we all are partakers of one bread and of one cup." Of whom speaketh the holy apostle here? of consecrate priests, as they term them, or rather of the whole congregation of God? Verily, of the whole congregation of God. And forasmuch as he maketh mention here, not only of the bread, but also of the cup; who seeth not evidently, that in the time of the blessed apostle St Paul all the Christians, so well the temporality as the spirituality, as I may speak after the common manner, received the holy communion of the body and blood of Christ under both kinds, according to the institution and commandment of the Lord Jesu? which thing he declareth afterward manifestly, when he entreateth at large of the Lord's supper, joining ever together the bread and the cup. Are not these his words? "As often as ye shall eat this bread, and drink of this cup." Again: "Whosoever shall eat of this bread, or drink of the cup of the Lord." Item: "Let him eat of the bread, and drink of the cup." And a little after: "He that eateth or drinketh unworthily eateth and drinketh his own damnation."

Here see we that the apostle, entreating of the Lord's supper, joineth always the bread and the cup together, to declare that it cannot be the Lord's supper, except there be distribution both of the bread and of the wine. And hereof may we learn that the Corinthians, which I am sure were not all consecrate priests, but the greatest part of them were lay people, received in the days of St Paul the holy sacrament of the body and blood of Christ under both kinds, and not under the kind of bread alone, as the manner is in the kingdom of the pope. And verily, it is unto me great wonder that ever the pope durst so presumptuously (but what dare not antichrist, having a mouth full of blasphemies even against the Most Highest, and "exalting himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped, so that he doth sit in the temple of God, boasting himself to be God?") alter and change, yea, corrupt and mangle the holy testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, that King of kings and Lord of lords, which he sealed with his most precious blood. "Though it be but a man's testament," saith St Paul, "yet, if it be allowed, no man despiseth it, or addeth any thing thereto." How intolerable then is it for a sinful man to alter and change, to corrupt and mangle the blessed testament of God's only-begotten Son, which he confirmed with his death, and left it unto his church to be kept inviolably or unchangeably, as I may so speak!

Father. And was the receiving of the sacrament of Christ's body and blood under both kinds used in the church of Christ after the apostles' time? *Son.* Yea, many hundred years after the time of the apostles, as we may see in the books of the ancient

Rev. xiii.
2 Thess. ii.

Gal. iii.

writers, wherein we read that both the bread and cup was given not only to the strong in age, but also to the young infants, yea, and that of necessity, as some thought, being moved with this sentence of our Saviour Christ, as it may seem: "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." Notwithstanding, as we may easily gather of the ancient writings, the devil in all ages, from time to time, went about in his members to corrupt and to alter this godly institution of the Lord Jesus, and to take away the mystery of the Lord's blood from the communion of the laity, contrary to the institution of Christ; so greatly in no age ceaseth Satan to obscure the glory of Christ, and to pervert his holy ordinances.

In the time of St Cyprian, that blessed martyr, the like thing was attempted, as it may easily be gathered of these his words: "How do we teach or provoke them to shed their blood in the confession of the name (of Christ), if we do deny them, when they go unto the battle, the blood of Christ? Or how do we make them meet and apt unto the victory of martyrdom, if we do not first admit them that would rightly communicate in the church to drink of the Lord's cup¹?"

The like enterprise was attempted also in the days of these two bishops of Rome, Gelasius the first and Julius the first: but they both manfully resisted this wicked enterprise; so that pope Gelasius commanded that the whole sacrament should be received in both kinds severally, according to the institution of Christ, or else that whosoever would attempt the contrary, taking only the mystery of Christ's body, and abstain from the cup, should be restrained from the whole sacrament. He addeth moreover, that the "division of one and the same mystery cannot be done without great sacrilege²." And the gloss of the aforesaid decree of Gelasius hath these words: "The sacrament is not superfluously received under both kinds. For the kind of bread is referred unto the flesh, and the kind of wine unto the soul; when one³ is the sacrament of the blood, in the which is the seat of the soul. And therefore is the sacrament received under both kinds, that it may be signified that Christ took both, the flesh and the soul, and that the participation of the sacrament is profitable as well for the soul as for the body; so that, if it should be taken only under one kind, it should be signified that it profiteth unto the tuition and preservation of the one only."

And pope Julius commanded that the people should receive the holy communion according to Christ's institution, both the bread and cup, one several from the other⁴, as the apostle saith: "Let a man examine himself, and so eat of that bread and drink of that cup."

Moreover Gelasius, of whom we afore spake, wrote to certain bishops⁵, and commanded all such to be excommunicate and accursed, which receiving the body of Christ abstained from the communion of the cup. Gelasius lived about the year of our Lord four hundred and ninety-two. And Julius lived about the year of our Lord three hundred and thirty-six.

Furthermore, this use of ministering the Lord's supper to the lay people under both kinds, according to the institution of Christ, endured in the church of Christ unto the time of pope Urban the fourth, and long after; which pope Urban lived about the year

[¹ Nam quo modo docemus aut provocamus eos in confessione nominis sanguinem suum fundere, si eis militaturis Christi sanguinem denegamus? aut quo modo ad martyrii poculum idoneos facimus, si non eos prius ad bibendum in ecclesia poculum Domini jure communicationis admittimus?—Cypri. Op. Oxon. 1682. Epist. lvii. ad Cornel. p. 117.]

[² Comperimus autem, quod quidam sumpta tantummodo corporis sacri portione a calice sacri cruoris abstineant. Qui proculdubio (quoniam nescio qua superstitione doceantur obstringi) aut integra sacramenta percipiant, aut ab integris arceantur: quia divisio unius ejusdemque mysterii sine grandi sacrilegio non potest provenire.—Gelas. Papa in Decret. Gratiani, Par. 1533. Decr. Tert. Pars. De Consecr. Dist. ii. can. 12. cols. 2363-6.]

[³ Qu. wine?—Nec superflue sumitur sub utraque

specie. Nam species panis ad carnem, et species vini ad animam refertur, cum vinum sit sacramentum sanguinis, in quo est sedes animæ. ideoque sumitur sub utraque specie, ut significetur quod utrumque Christus assumpsit, et carnem et animam; et quod tam animæ quam corporis participatio valeat, unde si sub una tantum specie sumeretur, ad tuitionem alterius tantum valere significaretur.—Ibid.]

[⁴ Illud vero, quod pro complemento communionis intactam tradunt eucharistiam populis, nec hoc prolatum ex evangelio testimonium recipit, ubi apostolis corpus suum et sanguinem commendavit. Seorsum enim panis, et seorsum calicis, commendatio memoratur.—Jul. Papa in eod. can. 7. cols. 2361, 2.]

[⁵ The canon quoted above was addressed by Gelasius: Majorico et Joanni episcopis.]

John vi.

Ad Cornel. Epist. 2.

De Consecr. Dist. 2. Can. Comperimus.

Ibidem.

De Consecr. Dist. 2. Can. Cum omne.

1 Cor. xi.

of our Lord one thousand two hundred and sixty-three. In his days lived Thomas de Aquino, the black friar, which died about the year of our Lord one thousand two hundred and seventy-four. In his writings it evidently appeareth, that in his time both kinds of the sacrament were delivered to the lay people at the ministration of the Lord's supper, according to the institution of Christ; and he rendereth a reason and sheweth a cause, why the sacrament ought to be received under both kinds. These are his words: "Though whole Christ be under both kinds, yet is he not given in vain under both kinds: for this is the true use of the sacrament, that the body of Christ be exhibited and given apart to the faithful for meat, and the blood for drink. For the body (of Christ) is given for the salvation of the body, and the blood (of Christ) for the salvation of the soul¹."

3 Par. q. 80.
Art. 12.

In 1 Cor.
cap. xi.

The like words hath St Ambrose: "That we receive," saith he, "availeth unto the tuition of body and soul; for the flesh of Christ is offered for the salvation of the body, and the blood (of Christ) for our soul, as Moses prefigured: The flesh, saith he, is offered for your body, the blood for the soul²."

The council
of Constance.

And this use of receiving the holy sacrament under both kinds continued in the church unto the council of Constance, which was holden and kept in the year of our Lord one thousand four hundred and fifteen; in the which council and thirteenth session it was decreed, that from that time forward the cup of the mystery of Christ's blood should no more be given to the laity, but that the lewd people should hold themselves content with one kind, and half of the sacrament, and think that they, so communicating after the determination of our mother holy church like obedient children, did receive enough for their salvation; forasmuch as under the kind of bread both the body and blood of Christ is contained³.

Here drove antichrist, with his wicked tradition, Christ and his holy ordinance out of place; so that now whosoever shall presume to teach that the faithful ought to communicate under both kinds, according to Christ's institution, he himself is an heretic, and his doctrine plain heresy. And thus from that wicked council hitherto (in the which council most unjustly that most famous clerk John Wickliffe, our countryman, was condemned for an heretic, and the two godly learned men, Johannes Husse and Hieronymus de Praga, were most cruelly murdered and brent of the bloody papists, notwithstanding the emperor's safe conduct, for denying the popish article of transubstantiation, and for maintaining the receiving of the sacrament under both kinds, according to the doctrine of Christ), contrary to the practice of the primitive church, and contrary to the teaching of the ancient doctors, the cup of the mystery of Christ's blood hath been taken away in the kingdom of the pope from the communion of the laity. Notwithstanding this may we evidently see, that for the space of fourteen hundred years and fifteen after Christ the use was from time to time, that the lay people received the sacrament under both kinds, according to Christ's ordinance; so that this order of communicating the laity under one kind, as the custom is now under the pope's kingdom, hath only endured in the church an hundred years and forty-five in this year of our Lord one thousand five hundred and sixty. Who seeth not now, how this tradition is no less new than wicked? new, because it is lately invented and brought

[¹ Ad primum ergo dicendum, quod quamvis totus Christus sit sub utraque specie, non tamen frustra. Nam primo, &c.....Secundo, hoc est conveniens usui hujus sacramenti, ut seorsum exhibeatur fidelibus corpus Christi in cibum et sanguis in potum. Tertio, quantum ad effectum, secundum quod supra dictum est, quod corpus exhibetur pro salute corporis, et sanguis pro salute animæ.—Thom. Aquinat. Op. Venet. 1595. Summ. Theol. Tert. Pars. Quæst. lxxvi. Art. 2. Tom. XII. fol. 245, 6. See also Quæst. lxxx. Art. 12. fol. 267.]

[² In cujus typum nos calicem mysticum sanguinis ad tuitionem corporis et animæ nostræ percipimus.....Caro enim Salvatoris pro salute corporis, sanguis vero pro anima nostra effusus est, sicut prius præfiguratum fuerat a Moysse; sic enim ait: Caro pro corpore vestro offertur, sanguis vero pro anima.—

Ambros. Op. Par. 1686-90. Comm. in Epist. ad Cor. prim. cap. xi. 26. Tom. II. Appendix, col. 149.]

[³ Et sicut hæc consuetudo ad evitandum aliqua pericula et scandala est rationabiliter introducta, quod licet in primitiva ecclesia hujusmodi sacramentum reciperetur a fidelibus sub utraque specie, postea a conficientibus sub utraque, et a laicis tantummodo sub specie panis suscipiatur; cum firmissime credendum sit, et nullatenus dubitandum, integrum Christi corpus et sanguinem tam sub specie panis, quam sub specie vini veraciter contineri. Unde cum hujusmodi consuetudo ab ecclesia et sanctis patribus rationabiliter introducta et diutissime observata sit, habenda est pro lege, quam non licet reprobare, aut sine ecclesiæ auctoritate pro libito mutare.—Concil. Constant. in Concil. Stud. Lábbei. Lut. Par. 1671-2. Sess. xiii. Tom. XII. col. 100.]

into the church; wicked, forasmuch as it fighteth with the ordinance of God, which to violate and to break is more than double wickedness.

Moreover, who knoweth [not] that the churches of the Greeks, of the Ethiopes, of the Rutenes⁴, of the Bohems, &c. (as histories make mention) have unto this day always observed and kept the ancient and apostolic manner of receiving the sacrament under both kinds, according to the institution and ordinance of the Lord Christ, and by no means would obey the new and wicked decree of the bishop of Rome in this behalf? All the reformed churches throughout Europe also, even so many as have shaken off the cruel and heavy yoke of antichrist in this our age, have utterly rejected and cast away this wicked decree of the pope, and receive now generally the Lord's supper, according to the appointment of Christ, under both kinds. This thing also is not to be passed over with silence, that in a certain general council holden at Basil, after that wicked council tofore gathered at Constance, it was concluded, that according to Christ's institution the lay people also should receive the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ under both kinds⁵. And this decree was not only established by the authority of the emperor Sigismund, with the consent of the other nobles and learned men; but also confirmed, approved, and allowed by pope Eugenius the fourth, about the year of our Lord one thousand four hundred and thirty-six. I speak nothing of the council Toletane, in the which we may easily see, that at that time also the lay people used the sacrament under both kinds⁶.

But wherefore do I tarry so long in setting forth so clear a matter, seeing this one sentence of Chrysostom, which I shall now recite, may seem abundantly to declare what is to be thought in this behalf? "Not as in the old law," saith he, "the priest did eat part and the people part; but one body and one cup is set forth to all. Those things which belong unto the eucharist (that is to say, the Lord's supper) are common all between the priest and the people⁷."

In 2 Cor.
cap. xviii.
Hom. 18.

In the canon of the popish mass also we may plainly perceive, that before the private mass took place, the people did receive the sacrament with the minister, yea, and that under both kinds⁸.

Father. Great abuses, I see right well, have of late years brast into the church of Christ, and specially about the Lord's supper. But, my dear son, if there be any other notable abuses behind concerning the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, let me hear them also.

Son. Thirdly, the papists greatly abuse the supper of the Lord, while they make it of a commemorative sacrifice, or a sacrifice of thanksgiving, a sacrifice propitiatory, expiatory, satisfactory, &c.

The third
abuse.

[⁴ Probably the Russians. Illyricus Flac. con. Prim. Petr. et Paul. cap. vi. p. 48. 1667. Quin ne Græcæ quidem ecclesiæ, Asiaticæ, Rudenicæ, Moscoviticæ, Valachicæ, et aliæ, quæ vicinæ sunt, etiam hodierna die, Papam audiunt.]

[⁵ It appears to have been a modified consent that the council of Basil gave to the Bohemian petition on communion under both kinds. The following are the words of the decree: Decernit et declarat eadem sancta synodus, quod fideles laici sive clerici communicantes, et non conficientes, non adstringuntur ex præcepto Domini ad suscipiendum sub utraque specie, panis scilicet et vini, sacramentum eucharistiæ sacramentum. Sed ecclesia quæ regitur Spiritu veritatis secum manente in æternum, et cum qua Christus manet usque ad consummationem sæculi, (sicut ait divina scriptura,) ordinare habet, quomodo ipsis non conficientibus ministretur, prout pro reverentia ipsius sacramenti et salute fidelium viderit expedire. Sive autem sub una specie, sive sub duplici quis communicet, secundum ordinationem seu observantiam ecclesiæ, proficit digne communicantibus ad salutem.—Concil. Basil. Sess. xxx. in Concil. Stud. Labbei. Tom. XII. cols. 600, 1. But Bellarmine is obliged to admit that a consent was given: Concessit eam facultatem (teste Ænea Sylvio in historia Bohemica, cap. 52.)

cum ea conditione, ut crederent communionem sub una esse licitam, et proinde non esse contra jus divinum.—Bellarm. Op. Col. Agrip. 1617—20. De Sacram. Euchar. Lib. iv. cap. xxvi. Tom. III. col. 768.]

[⁶ The eleventh council of Toledo, held A. D. 675, is in all probability meant. Solet enim humana naturæ infirmitas, in ipso mortis exitu prægravata, tanto siccitatis pondere deprimi, ut nullis ciborum illationibus refici; sed vix tantumdem illati delectetur poculi gratia sustentari. Quod etiam in multorum exitu vidimus, qui optatum suis votis sacræ communionis expetentes viaticum, collatam sibi a sacerdote eucharistiam rejecerunt; non quod infidelitate hoc agerent, sed quod præter dominici calicis haustum, traditam sibi non possent eucharistiam deglutire.—Concil. Tolet. xi. in Concil. Stud. Labbei. cap. xi. Tom. VI. col. 552.]

[⁷ Ἔστι δὲ ὕπου οὐδὲ διέστηκεν ὁ ἱερεὺς τοῦ ἀρχομένου σίου, ὅταν ἀπολαύειν δέη τῶν φρικτῶν ἀνοστήριων. ὁμοίως γὰρ πάντες ἀξιούμεθα τῶν αὐτῶν. οὐ καθάπερ ἐπὶ τῆς παλαιᾶς, τὰ μὲν ὁ ἱερεὺς ἤσθιε, τὰ δὲ ὁ ἀρχόμενος. καὶ θέμις οὐκ ἦν τῷ λαῷ μετέχειν ὡν μετέχειν ὁ ἱερεὺς. ἀλλ' ὅτι νῦν ἄλλα πᾶσιν ἐν σωμᾶ πρόκειται, καὶ ποτήριον ἔν.—Chrysost. Op. Par. 1718—38. In Epist. ii. ad Cor. Hom. xviii. Tom. X. p. 568.]

[⁸ See before, p. 240, notes 3, 5.]

Against the
sacrifice of
the mass.

Luke xxii.

Father. What meanest thou by that? *Son.* It is not unknown to the godly learned, that the Lord Jesus instituted the holy mysteries of his body and blood to this end, that they should be a memorial of his body-breaking and blood-shedding, of his passion and death, which he suffered on the altar of the cross for our redemption, as these his words evidently prove: "Take ye, eat ye: this is my body which is broken for you: do this in the remembrance of me." Again: "Drink ye all of this: this cup is a new testament in my blood. Do this, so oft as ye shall drink it, in the remembrance of me." So likewise saith the holy apostle: "So oft as ye shall eat this bread, and drink of the cup, ye shall shew the Lord's death till he come." But the papists cannot be content with this doctrine, that the supper of the Lord (which they more gladly term "the mass"), should be a memorial or remembrance of that sacrifice which Christ himself offered on the cross; but they will have it the self-same sacrifice, of the same virtue, strength, efficacy, might, and power, to save the souls both of the quick and dead.

O blasphem-
ous doctrine!

Father. How can that be? *Son.* They say that they offer up Christ the Son of God unto his heavenly Father, for a sacrifice both for the sins of the quick and of the dead.

Eph. v.

Heb. ix.

Isai. liii.

Isai. xiv.

2 Thess. ii.

Isai. xi.

Father. Is it so? *Son.* Nothing less. For the holy scripture declareth plainly in many places, that not another, but Christ himself offered himself a sacrifice unto God his Father to appease his wrath kindled against mankind through sin; and that, by the virtue of that his one and alone sacrifice God is at peace with man, favoureth, and loveth man, and accepteth man for righteous in his sight. St Paul hath these words: "Christ loved us, and gave up himself for us an oblation and sweet-smelling sacrifice to God." Again: "Christ through the everlasting Spirit offered himself undefiled unto God." Also in another place: "Christ did that, when he offered himself." And the prophet saith: "He offered up himself, because it was his pleasure." And although the papists have shewed themselves very arrogant and proud in matters of salvation; yet in this one point, that they will take upon them to offer Christ in their masses to be a propitiatory sacrifice unto God the Father for the sins of the quick and of the dead, they shew themselves to be more proud than Lucifer, as they say, or than that most proud king, which said in his heart: "I will climb up into heaven, and exalt my throne above, beside the stars of God. I will sit also upon the holy mount toward the north. I will climb up above the clouds, and will be like the Highest of all." And verily this is "that man of sin, the son of perdition, which is an adversary, and is exalted above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he doth sit in the temple of God, boasting himself to be God: whom the Lord shall consume with the spirit of his mouth, and shall destroy with the appearance of his coming."

For what other thing is it, to presume for to offer Christ, than the massing papists to make themselves equal in dignity with Christ; yea, than to excel Christ in dignity? For he that offereth sacrifice unto God is greater and of more dignity before God than the sacrifice that is offered (for for the offerer's sake is the offering accepted of God, and not contrariwise): it therefore followeth that the massing papists, presuming to offer Christ for a sacrifice, are greater and of more dignity before God than Christ the Son of God. O intolerable pride!

Gen. iv.

Gen. viii.

Gen. xxii.

Isai. xiv.

Who knoweth not that Habel was greater and of more dignity before God than the firstlings of his sheep, which he offered for a sacrifice? To whom also is it unknown, that Noah was more acceptable unto God, and of greater dignity before him, than all the clean beasts and clean fowls that he offered for a sacrifice? Was not Abraham of more excellency before God than the ram which he offered up for a sacrifice? The sacrificer is greater than the sacrifice. Who seeth not then, that the mass-mongers sacrificing Christ are greater and of more worthiness before God than Christ, whom they offer? Is not this to be like the Highest of all?

Heb. ix.

Rom. vi.

But if there be none other remedy, but that the massing priests will sacrifice Christ in their masses, and so obtain remission of sins unto them for whom they offer; then doth it also follow that they must needs murder, kill, and slay Christ, and shed Christ's blood. For "without shedding of blood," saith the apostle, "there is no remission of sins." But what read we in St Paul? "Christ," saith he, "being raised from death, dieth no more. Death hath no more power over him. For as

touching that he died, he died as concerning sin once; and as touching that he liveth, he liveth unto God." If Christ dieth no more, then is he sacrificed no more. If he be sacrificed no more, then obtain the papists no remission of sins, either for the quick or for the dead, by the virtue of their popish mass, though they make it a sacrifice never so much propitiatory, expiatory, satisfactory, &c. But these massing papists are those "false prophets and false teachers," "which deny the Lord that bought them," ^{2 Pet. ii.} and bring upon themselves swift damnation; and many follow their damnable ways, by whom the way of truth is evil spoken of, and through covetousness with feigned words they make merchandise of their captives; whose judgment is not far off, and their damnation sleepeth not."

Moreover, this doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass is plainly injurious to the blood of Christ, obscureth the price of Christ's death, and disannulleth the virtue of Christ's sacrifice, which he offered on the altar of the cross for our sins, and maketh Christ no perfect Saviour and Redeemer. For if any of our sins be put away through the sacrifice of the popish mass, then was not our redemption perfect in the death of Christ, neither were all our sins washed away by the blood of Christ. But if all our sins be put away by the death of Christ, according to the doctrine of Christ and of his apostles, then is their doctrine of the missal sacrifice vain, false, wicked, and worthy to be hissed out of the church of Christ; seeing it so greatly embaseth the dignity of the sacrifice of Christ's death, and plucked away our trust and confidence from the merits of Christ's passion and death unto the trifling traditions and devilish doctrines of men. For to stablish a new sacrifice to take away sin is nothing else than to affirm and grant that the old sacrifice (I mean the death of Christ) is either of no force, or else it is imperfect. For if the death of Christ be of full force, and sufficiently perfect, yea, and to the uttermost able to take away the sins of the whole world (as it is indeed,) what need we the missal sacrifice, lately brought in by the devil and antichrist?

The missal sacrifice is injurious to the blood of Christ.

Father. Christ then offered himself a sacrifice to God the Father for our sins. *Son.* Yea, verily. He was both the offerer and the offering, the sacrificer and the sacrifice. For there was found neither patriarch nor prophet, neither priest nor Levite, neither angel nor archangel, neither any other creature in heaven or earth, that was of sufficient dignity to offer this our sacrifice, I mean the Lord Jesus. Much less are the filthy and ungodly papists, whose life is full of all uncleanness, and whose doctrine swimmeth with divers errors and heresies, meet men to offer up the Son of God a sacrifice for sin to the heavenly Father. And therefore "Christ offered him- ^{Eph. v.} self a sweet-smelling sacrifice to God the Father."

Father. And was this his one sacrifice, which he offered on the altar of the cross, sufficient for the sins of the whole world, once offered, so that it needeth no more to be reiterated or offered again, being and remaining of sufficient force for ever and ever to purge the wickednesses of the people? *Son.* Christ is an everlasting priest; and as his priesthood is everlasting, so likewise is his sacrifice everlasting, I mean it endureth for ever in full virtue and perfect strength to put away at all times all the sins of all people that do unfeignedly repent and believe: so that it needeth not for any imbecillity, weakness, or imperfection to be repeated or offered again, as the papists presume, being of itself most perfect and most full for the abolishing of sin even unto the uttermost; yea, and that even to the world's end, when sin shall altogether cease, as the apostle saith: "Jesus Christ yesterday and to-day, and the same continueth ^{Heb. xiii.} for ever. Be not carried about with divers and strange learning."

The omnissufficiency of Christ's sacrifice.

Father. Let me hear it proved by the word of God, that that one and alone sacrifice, which Christ himself offered once for all on the altar of the cross, is sufficient without any repetition or offering again to put away the sins of the world; so that we may be thoroughly persuaded that the sacrifice of the popish mass, whereof the papists do so greatly brag, and wherewith they have almost seduced the whole world, and too much bleared the eyes of the simple and ignorant, is vain and wicked. *Son.* St Paul saith: "Jesus was a stablisher of a better testament. For among them many ^{Heb. vii.} were made priests, because they were not suffered to endure by the reason of death. But this man (Christ), because he endureth for ever, hath an everlasting priesthood. Wherefore he is able also ever to save them to the uttermost that come unto God by

him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for us. For such an high priest became us to have, which is holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners, made higher than heaven; which needeth not daily, as yonder high priests, to offer up sacrifice, first for his own sins, and then for the people's sins: for that he did once, when he offered up himself."

Heb. ix.

Again: "Christ, being an high priest of good things to come, came by a greater and more perfect tabernacle, not made with hands, that is to say, not of this building; neither by the blood of goats and calves, but by his own blood, he entered in once into the holy place, and found everlasting redemption." And a little after: "Christ is not entered into the holy places that are made with hands, (which are similitudes of true things;) but he is entered into the very heaven, for to appear now in the sight of God for us: not to offer himself often, as the high priest entereth into the holy place every year with strange blood; for then must he have often suffered since the world began. But now, in the end of the world, hath he appeared once to put sin to flight by the offering up of himself. And as it was appointed unto all men that they shall once die, and then cometh the judgment; even so Christ was once offered to take away the sins of many; and unto them that look for him shall he appear again without sin unto salvation."

Heb. x.

Once again he saith: "By the will of (Christ) we are made holy, even by the offering of the body of Jesu Christ once for all. And every priest (he speaketh of the priests of the old law) is ready daily ministering, and offering oftentimes one manner of oblation, which can never take away sins. But this man (Christ), after he hath offered one sacrifice for sins, is set down for ever on the right hand of God, and from henceforth tarrieth till his foes be made his footstool. For with one offering hath he made perfect for ever them that are sanctified."

1 Pet. ii.

Hereto belongeth the saying of St Peter: "Christ his own self bare our sins in his body on the tree, that we, being delivered from sin, should live unto righteousness."

Rev. i.

St John also saith: "Christ loved us, and washed us from our sins in his own blood, and made us kings and priests unto God his Father." And God the Father himself

Isai. liii.

saith by the prophet: "For the wickedness of my people have I stricken him," which indeed had deserved the punishment, as St Paul saith: "God spared not his own Son,

Rom. viii.

but gave him (unto the death) for us all." Again: "Christ died for our sins." Item: "By Christ we have redemption through his blood, even remission of sins." And

Rom. iv.

Eph. i.

Isai. liii.

the prophet saith: "He only (Christ) hath taken on him our infirmities, and borne our pains. He was wounded for our offences, and smitten for our wickedness. For the chastisement of our peace was laid upon him; and with his stripes are we healed. As for us, we have gone all astray (like sheep); every one hath turned his own way: but the Lord hath heaped together upon him the iniquity of us all." "Yet hath it pleased the Lord thus to burst him with plagues, and to smite him with infirmities, that, when he had made his soul an offering for sin, he might see long-lasting seed." Again: "He shall justify the multitude, for he shall bear away their sins." Item: "He hath taken away the sins of the multitude, and made intercession for the misdoers." And Christ himself saith by the prophet: "I have trodden down the wine-press myself alone, and of all people there is not one with me."

Isai. lxiii.

All these sentences aforesaid do evidently declare, that by that one and alone sacrifice, which Christ, that high and everlasting Bishop, offered once for all upon the altar of the cross, we are made righteous, holy, pure, and perfect; so that, after that one and alone sacrifice done by Christ on the tree, no sacrifice, no offering for sin remain to be offered for the sins of the people, of any person either in heaven or in earth, all sins being already taken away by that one sacrifice of Christ: so far is it off that we have need of that missal sacrifice whereof the massing papists, "whose God the belly is," do so greatly brag; wherein also they stoutly affirm that they offer for a propitiatory sacrifice unto God the Father, for the sins of the quick and of the dead, the Son of God, Christ Jesus the Lord; when as tofore we have abundantly heard that Christ (and not any other) offered himself on the altar of the cross, "a sweet-smelling sacrifice unto God his Father" for the sins of the whole world, yea, and that once for all; so that with that one and alone oblation, without any repetition or renewing of the same, all that are sanctified are made perfect for ever and ever.

Phil. iii.

And this is that which the Lord Jesus, hanging on the cross, said a little before his death. "It is finished:" as though he should say, "Whatsoever is necessary for the salvation of man is perfectly, and even unto the uttermost, and at the full, accomplished and fulfilled in this one and alone sacrifice of my body, which I now offer unto my heavenly Father here hanging upon the cross." John xix.

For upon the cross, and not upon the popish altar, was Christ Jesus offered, and there abundantly he finished the work of our redemption, as the apostle saith: "Now by the means of Christ Jesu ye which sometime were far off were made nigh by the blood of Christ; for he is our peace, which hath made of both one, and hath broken down the wall that was a stop between us, and hath also put away through his flesh the cause of hatred, even the law of commandments contained in the law written, for to make of twain one new man in himself, so making peace, and to reconcile both unto God in one body through the cross, and slew hatred thereby, and came and preached peace to you that were afar off, and to them that were nigh. For through him we both (Jew and gentile) have an entrance in one Spirit unto the Father." Eph. ii. Again: "It pleased the Father that in him (Christ) should all fulness dwell, and by him to reconcile all thing unto himself, and to set at peace by him through the blood of his cross both things in heaven and things in earth." Col. i. St Peter also saith: "Christ his own self bare our sins in his body on the tree, that we being delivered from sin should live unto righteousness: by whose stripes ye were healed." 1 Pet. ii.

Father. What shall we then say to the ancient fathers of Christ's church, which in many places call the supper of the Lord a sacrifice? *Son.* "Even as images are wont to be called (as St Austin saith) by the names of those things whereof they are images, as when we behold a table or wall painted we say, That is Cicero, that is Sallustius¹;" so likewise, forasmuch as the celebration of the Lord's supper is a certain representative image of the passion of Christ, which is the alone true sacrifice, therefore the holy fathers many times call the Lord's supper a sacrifice. Now, if the Lord's supper be not properly a sacrifice, but only a memorial of the true sacrifice, which is the passion and death of Christ; how can the massing papists brag that their mass (in the which many things are done contrary to the institution of Christ) is a propitiatory, satisfactory, and expiatory sacrifice for the sins of the quick and of the dead?

Father. How provest thou that this was the meaning of the fathers? *Son.* St John Chrysostom saith: "Do we not offer every day? We offer indeed, but yet that we do is unto the remembrance of his death, &c. This that we do is done in the remembrance of that which was done. 'This do ye,' saith he, 'in the remembrance of me.' Not another sacrifice, as the bishop did, but the self-same do we alway; yea, rather we work a remembrance of the sacrifice²." In Heb. Hom. 17. Luke xxii.

The very same words in effect hath St Ambrose. "In Christ," saith he, "a sacrifice was once offered, mighty enough unto everlasting salvation. What do we then? Do not we also offer every day? Yea, but unto the remembrance of his death³." In Heb.

St Austin also saith: "The flesh and blood of this sacrifice before the coming of Christ was promised by the sacrifices of similitudes: in the passion of Christ it was performed by the self truth: after the ascension of Christ it is celebrated by the sacrament of remembrance⁴." Contra Faustum, Lib. xx. cap. 21.

[¹ ...omnes fere imagines earum rerum quarum imagines sunt, appellari nominibus solent....velut cum intuentes tabulam aut parietem, dicimus, Ille Cicero est, ille Sallustius.—August. Op. Par. 1679-1700. De Div. Quæst. ad Simplic. Lib. ii. Quæst. iv. 2. Tom. VI. col. 116.]

[² Τί οὖν; ἡμεῖς καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν οὐ προσφέρομεν; προσφέρομεν μὲν, ἀλλ' ἀνάμνησιν ποιούμενοι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ τοῦτο εἰς ἀνάμνησιν γίνεται τοῦ τότε γενομένου. τοῦτο γὰρ ποιεῖτέ, φησιν, εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν. οὐκ ἄλλην θυσίαν, καθάπερ ὁ ἀρχιερεὺς τότε, ἀλλὰ τὴν αὐτὴν αἰετι ποιούμεν' μᾶλλον δὲ ἀνάμνησιν ἐργαζόμεθα θυσίας.—Chrysost. Op. Par. 1718-38. In Epist. ad

Hebr. cap. x. Hom. xvii. Tom. XII. pp. 168, 9.]

[³ In Christo autem e contrario semel oblata est hostia potens ad salutem sempiternam. Quid ergo nos? nonne per singulos dies offerimus? Offerimus quidem, sed recordationem facientes mortis ejus.—Ambros. Op. Par. 1614. Comm. in Epist. ad Heb. cap. x. Tom. III. col. 651.]

[⁴ Hujus sacrificii caro et sanguis ante adventum Christi per victimas similitudinum promittebatur: in passione Christi per ipsam veritatem reddebatur: post ascensum Christi per sacramentum memorie celebratur.—August. Op. Cont. Faust. Lib. xx. cap. xxi. Tom. VIII. col. 348.]

In Senten. Prosper hath these words: "The heavenly bread, which is the flesh of Christ, after his manner is called the body of Christ, when it is in very deed the sacrament or holy sign of the body of Christ; and that immolation or offering of the flesh, which is done with the hands of the priest, is the passion, death, and crucifying of Christ, not in the truth of the thing, but in a signifying mystery¹."

Lib. Sent. iv.
Dist. 13.

Petrus Lombardus, the master of the sentences, writeth on this manner: "That which is offered and consecrated of the priest is called a sacrifice and an offering, because it is a remembrance and representation of the true sacrifice and of the holy offering done on the altar of the cross. And Christ was once offered on the cross, and there he was offered in himself; but he is daily offered in the sacrament, because in the sacrament a remembrance is made of that which was once done²."

In Heb.

And the ordinary gloss hath these words: "In the altar there is no reiteration or doing again of (Christ's) sacrifice; but there is made a daily remembrance of one sacrifice once done on the cross, according to the saying of Christ, 'Do this in the remembrance of me'³."

Luke xxii.

But wherefore do I tarry so long in gathering together the testimonies of the old fathers, seeing we find these words written in the pope's old law, "Christ was once offered in himself; and yet is he daily offered in the sacrament?" Upon these words thus saith the gloss: "He is offered, that is to say, the offering of him is represented, and there is made a memory of the passion of Christ⁴."

De Consecr.
Dist. 2.

Again: "Because we fall daily, Christ mystically is offered up for us daily; and the passion of Christ is set forth in a mystery." Now saith the gloss: "The offering up of Christ done for us is represented in the sacrament of his body and blood⁵."

And Thomas Aquinas himself calleth the sacrifice of the mass a memorial of the Lord's passion⁶.

The death of
Christ is the
alone sacri-
fice for sin.

Father. Thou hast sufficiently proved both by the scriptures and by the ancient fathers, that there is but one sacrifice which purchaseth remission of sins for all faithful penitent sinners, which is the death of Christ, once for all offered of Christ himself on the altar of the cross; whose virtue, power, and strength is so great and in all points perfect, that it needeth no more to be offered, being of itself for ever sufficient to put away the sins of the whole world: again, that the Lord's supper, although an holy institution or ordinance of Christ, is not a sacrifice to put away sin, but a memorial of that one and alone true sacrifice, which Christ himself offered on the cross for the abolishing of the world's sin: and hereof thou hast also sufficiently proved

[¹ Sicut ergo coelestis panis, qui vere Christi caro est, suo modo vocatur corpus Christi, cum revera sit sacramentum corporis Christi, illius videlicet, quod visibile, palpabile, mortale, in cruce est suspensum, vocaturque ipsa immolatio carnis, quæ sacerdotis manibus fit, Christi passio, mors, crucifixio, non rei veritate, sed significante mysterio; sic sacramentum fidei, quod baptismus intelligitur, fides est.—Id. in Lib. Sent. Prosp. in Decret. Gratiani. Par. 1583. Decr. Tert. Pars. De Consecr. Dist. ii. can. 48. cols. 2387, 8.]

[² Ad hoc breviter dici potest, illud quod offertur et consecratur a sacerdote vocari sacrificium et oblationem: quia memoria est et repræsentatio veri sacrificii, et sanctæ immolationis factæ in ara crucis. Et semel Christus mortuus in cruce est, ibique immolatus est in semetipso: quotidie autem immolatur in sacramento, quia in sacramento recordatio fit illius, quod factum est semel.—Pet. Lomb. Lib. Sentent. Col. Agrip. 1576. Lib. iv. Dist. xii. fol. 357.]

[³ This is the comment of Nic. de Lyra: Sed adhuc diceret: sacramentum altaris quotidie offertur in ecclesia. ergo, &c. Dicendum quod non est ibi sacrificii reiteration: sed unius sacrificii in cruce oblatis quotidiana commemoratio. propter hoc dicitur Luca xxii. b. Hoc facite in meam commemorationem.—Bibl. cum Gloss. Ord. et Expos. Nic. de Lyra.

Basil. 1502. Ad Heb. cap. x. Sext. Pars. fol. 152. The ordinary gloss conveys the same sense; but the expressions are somewhat different: Et si nos quotidie offerimus, recordatio mortis ejus est; et hæc hostia una est. non multæ: quia semel tantum oblata est. ... Quod nos agimus recordatio sacrificii est. Id. ibid.]

[⁴ Semel immolatus est Christus in semetipso, et tamen quotidie immolatur in sacramento.—Lib. Sent. Prosp. in Decret. Gratiani, Decr. Tert. Pars. De Consecr. Dist. ii. can. 52. cols. 2389, 90. On this the gloss is: *Immolatur*: id est, ejus immolatio repræsentatur, et fit memoria passionis.—Ibid. col. 2390.]

[⁵ Et ideo, quia quotidie labimur, quotidie Christus pro nobis mystice immolatur: et passio Christi in mysterio traditur.—Paschas. in Lib. de Corp. et Sang. Christ. in eod. can. 71. cols. 2403, 4. The gloss is: *Immolatur*: Christi immolatio facta pro nobis in sacramento corporis et sanguinis ejus repræsentatur.—Ibid. col. 2404.]

[⁶ in sacramento eucharistiæ commemoratur mors Christi, in quantum ipse Christus passus exhibetur nobis.—Thom. Aquinat. Op. Venet. 1595. Summ. Theol. Tert. Pars. Quæst. lxxi. Art. 9. Tom. XII. fol. 210, 2.]

that the mass, which is but the invention of man, and containeth in it many absurdities, abuses, and errors, is no propitiatory, expiatory, or satisfactory sacrifice, as the adversaries brag, to put away the sins of the quick and of the dead, or, as some write, necessary *ad salutem*. *Son*. It is truth.

Father. Remain there yet any other abuses of the Lord's supper undeclared?

Son. Fourthly, the papists have greatly abused the Lord's supper, while they, contrary to the institution of Christ and the practice of the primitive church, reserve the sacramental bread, and keep it in boxes and pixes, and hang it up, yea, and so long reserve it, that it corrupt, putrify, waxeth mould, stinketh, is eaten of worms, so that they are compelled to burn it according to their decree.

The fourth abuse.

Against the popish reservation of the sacramental bread.

Father. Is it not lawful by the word of God to reserve the sacramental bread?

Son. Christ, in delivering the bread to his disciples, said: "Take ye, eat ye." He said not, Take ye, reserve ye. The sacrament was instituted of Christ to be received, and not to be reserved; to be eaten, and not to be hanged up with a rope; to be meat of the faithful, and not to be devoured of worms. They therefore, that reserve the sacramental bread after the Lord's supper be done, enterprise that which is not found in the word of God.

Father. Was it not used in the primitive church to reserve the sacramental bread?

Son. No. The primitive, which is the apostolic church, walked in the steps of Christ, and observed that which their Lord and Master commanded. And what if some, (I know not with what spirit provoked,) kept of that mystical bread, certain years after the apostles' time, and reserved it in their chests or coffers at home, (I cannot tell for what purpose,) as the nature of man is always more bent unto superstition and counterfeit worshipping of God than unto the simplicity of God's holy ordinance? Their error ought to be no precedent to the true Christians, whose delight is to hear the voice of their Shepherd, and whose only study is to walk in the holy ways of their Lord God.

Father. What was the use among the old churches? *Son*. In the primitive church, if any of the bread or of the wine remained after the Lord's supper was ended, the communicants making a common feast together did either eat and drink it up themselves, or else they gave it to the poor; as it may be truly gathered of these authorities of the ancient fathers.

St Jerome saith: "After the communion, whatsoever things were remaining unto them of the sacrifices, even there in the church they, eating the common supper together, consumed and spent them⁷."

1 Cor. xi.

Of this common supper or banquet writeth both Chrysostom⁸ and Tertullian⁹.

The old bishop Clement saith also: "Verily, so many sacrifices shall be offered on the altar as ought to suffice the people. If there remain any, let them not be reserved till to-morrow, but with the fear and trembling of the clerks let them be spent¹⁰."

Epist. 2.

Origen also saith: "The bread which the Lord gave to his disciples and said, 'Take and eat,' he deferred not, neither commanded he that it should be kept till to-morrow¹¹."

In Levit. Hom. 5. c. 7.

[⁷ ...et post communionem quæcumque eis de sacrificiis superfuissent, illic in ecclesia communem cœnam comedentes, pariter consumebant.—Hieron. Op. Par. 1693-1706. Comm. in Epist. i. ad Cor. cap. xi. Tom. V. col. 998.]

[⁸ Καὶ ἐπειδὴν συνέβαινε τοὺς μὲν πένητας εἶναι, τοὺς δὲ πλουτίους, τὰ μὲν ἑαυτῶν οὐ κατετίθεντο πάντα εἰς μέσον, κοινὰς δὲ ἐπιούνητο τὰς τραπέζας ἐν ἡμέραις νενομισμέναις, ὡς εἰκόσ, καὶ τῆς συνάξεως ἀπαρισθείσης μετὰ τῆν μυστηρίων κοινωνίαν, ἐπὶ κοινῆν πάντες ἦσαν εὐωχίαν, τῶν μὲν πλουτούντων φερόντων τὰ ἐδέσματα, τῶν δὲ πενομένων καὶ οὐδὲν ἐχόντων ὑπ' αὐτῶν καλουμένων, καὶ κοινῆ πάντων ἐστιωμένων. ἀλλ' ὑπέρων καὶ τοῦτο διεφθάρη τὸ ἔθος.—Chrysost. Op. Par. 1718-38. In Epist. i. ad Cor. Hom. xxvii. Tom. X. p. 240.]

[⁹ Cœna nostra de nomine rationem sui ostendit. Id vocatur quod dilectio penes Græcos. Quantis-

cunque sumptibus constet, lucrum est pietatis nomine facere sumptum. siquidem inopes quosque refrigerio isto juvamus, non qua penes vos parasi affectant ad gloriam famulandæ libertatis sub auctoramento ventris inter contumelias saginandi; sed qua penes Deum major est contemplatio medicorium.—Tertull. Op. Lut. 1641. Apologet. 39. pp. 35, 6.]

[¹⁰ Certe tanta in altario holocausta offerantur, quanta populo sufficere debeant. Quod si remanserint, in crastinum non reserventur, sed cum timore et tremore, clericorum diligentia consumantur.—Clement. Papæ I. Epist. ii. ad Jacob. in Epist. Decret. Sum. Pont. Rom. 1591. Tom. I. p. 16.]

[¹¹ Nam et Dominus panem, quem discipulis dabat, et dicebat eis, Accipite et manducate, non distulit, nec servari jussit in crastinum.—Orig. Op. Par. 1733-59. In Levit. Hom. v. 8. Tom. II. p. 211.]

De Trinit.
Lib. iii. c. 10.

And St Austin saith: "The bread appointed for this purpose is consumed and spent in receiving the sacrament¹."

Lib. iv. c. 36.

Evagrius, in his Ecclesiastical History, declareth that "the old custom was, when much of the holy parcels of the undefiled body of Christ our God remained, the young children, which were wont to go to school, were called for to eat them²."

In Levit.

In the time of Origen and Hesychius (as their commentaries testify) the bread that remained after the communion was wont to be brent³.

Contra Nice-
tam.

And a certain man called Humbertus writeth on this manner: "We read not that the Lord himself did deliver to his disciples an unperfect, but a perfect commemoration, the bread being blessed, and straightways broken and distributed. For he did not only bless it, and so reserved it to be broken till to-morrow; neither did he break it only, and keep it in store; but he distributed it straightways so soon as it was broken. In consideration whereof blessed Alexander, the martyr and fifth⁴ pope from the apostle Peter, putting the passion of the Lord in the canon of the mass, saith: 'So oft as ye shall do this,' that is to say, bless, break, and distribute, 'ye shall do it in the remembrance of me.' For every one of these three done without the residue, that is to say, either the blessing without the breaking and distribution, or the breaking without the blessing and distribution, representeth not a perfect remembrance of Christ, as neither do the distribution without blessing and breaking⁵."

Dist. 2. de
Consec.
John vi.

Paschasius also hath these words: "Christ, willing to set forth the fruit of this sacrament, said: 'He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, he shall live for ever.'" And afterward: "Christ willing that his disciples should be made partakers of the fruit of this sacrament, after he had consecrated his body, he stood not still in the consecration, neither gave it he to his disciples, that they should reserve and keep it honourably; but he gave it them for that purpose for the which he did institute it, saying, 'Take ye, and eat⁶.'"

Of these authorities, gathered out of the writings of the ancient fathers, it is evident that the church of Christ, when it was most pure, and most diligently walked in the steps of the doctrine of Christ and of his apostles, knew no reservation of the Lord's bread, as it is now used in the church of the pope. Neither is this use of reserving and keeping, of boxing and pixing, of hiding and closing the sacramental

[¹ ... panis ad hoc factus in accipiendo sacramento consumitur.—August. Op. Par. 1679-1700. De Trin. Lib. iii. 19. Tom. VIII. col. 803.]

[² Ἔθος παλαιὸν βούλεται ἀπὸ τὴν βασιλεύσανταν, ὅτ' ἂν πολὺ τι χρῆμα τῶν ἁγίων μερίδων τοῦ ἀχράντου σώματος Χριστοῦ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἡμῶν ἐναπομείνοι, παῖδας ἀφθόρου μεταπέμτους γίγνεσθαι παρὰ τῶν ἐς χαμαιδιδασκάλου φοιτῶντων, καὶ ταῦτα κατεσθίειν.—Evagr. Schol. in Hist. Eccles. Script. Amst. 1695-1700. Lib. iv. cap. xxxvi. pp. 410, 11.]

[³ Sed hoc quod reliquum est de carnibus et panibus, in igne incendi præcepit. Quod nunc videmus etiam sensibilibiter in ecclesia fieri, ignique tradi quæcunque remanere contigerit inconsumpta, non omnino ea quæ una die, vel duabus, aut multis servata sunt: sicut enim apparet, non hoc legislator præcepit: sed quod reliquum est, incendi jubet.—Isych. Presb. Hieros. in Levit. Basil. 1527. Lib. II. in cap. viii. fol. 49, 2.....quod idem habes in Origene super Leviticum, licet idem sit liber qui duobus ascribitur.—Loc. Com. Pet. Mart. Heid. 1613. Class. iv. cap. x. 51. p. 862.]

[⁴ A correction is here made from the passage as given below of Humbert. The folio reads *master and first*.]

[⁵ Nempe hic, in panis fractione et communicatione, non nisi perfectam actionem missæ debemus accipere; quemadmodum et ipsum Dominum legimus non imperfectam, sed perfectam commemora-

tionem suis discipulis tradidisse, in pane a se benedicto et mox fracto atque distributo. Non enim benedixit tantum et servavit frangendum in crastinum, nec fregit tantum et reposuit, sed fractum statim distribuit. Unde B. Alexander martyr et papa V. ab apostolo Petro, passionem Domini inserens Canonis Missæ, non ait, Hoc quotiescunque feceritis; sed, 'Hæc quotiescunque feceritis, id est, benedixeritis, fregeritis et distribueritis, 'in mei memoriam facietis:' quia quodlibet horum trium, si sine reliquis fiat, scilicet, benedictio sine distributione, aut fractio sine benedictione et distributione, perfectam Christi memoriam non repræsentant, sicut distributio nulla sine benedictione et fractione.—Humbert. cont. Nicet. in Mag. Biblioth. Vet. Patr. Col. Agrip. 1618-22. Tom. XI. p. 333.]

[⁶ Ad idem Paschasius canone immediate præcedente: Hinc frequenter Christus volens exprimere fructum hujus sacramenti dixit: Qui manducat carnem meam et bibit sanguinem meum habet vitam eternam. Manducatio et potio hujus sacramenti est usus. Hinc et volens discipulos suos Christus fructus hujus sacramenti participes fieri, postquam corpus suum consecravit, non sisebat in consecratione. Neque dedit discipulis ut ipsum honorifice conservarent: sed dedit in sui usum dicens, Accipite et manducate.—Gab. Biel. Canon. Missæ Expos. Basil. 1515. Lect. xxxvi. fol. 83. 2. This passage does not appear in Gratian in the canon named.]

bread, so greatly old. Verily it was the invention of pope Innocent the third, about the year of our Lord one thousand two hundred and fifteen⁷.

Father. God give us all grace to use Christ's holy sacraments aright, and according to his institution! *Son.* Amen.

Father. Is there any other abuse that hath crept into the church concerning the Lord's supper?

Son. Fifthly, the papists greatly abused the Lord's supper, while they made of it a gazing-stock, by carrying it about in public processions, or by heaving and lifting it up above their heads to make it a spectacle to the people; by this means provoking them unto the worshipping of it, and so to fall unto idolatry, unto the great danger of their soul health. For this sacrament was not ordained of the Lord Jesu to be carried about like a puppet, as the manner is in the pope's wicked kingdom, nor to be made an heave-offering, as the papists use in their masses; but to be meat unto the faithful, to be broken and eaten in the remembrance of Christ's passion and death, as Erasmus Roterodamus very godly writeth: "Christ," saith he, "is in that sacrament, under this manner of meat and drink, that he should be received with high purity of mind; not that he should be shewed abroad, or carried about in plays and common pageants, or that he should be carried about the fields on horseback. This was not the manner of the primitive church, but in this thing the foolish affections of the multitude hath been too much served and obeyed⁸". Neither is this custom so greatly old, but brought in, as it may appear, of pope Honorius the third, about the year of our Lord one thousand two hundred and twenty-two⁹.

Sixthly, this was also a great abuse among the papists, that the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ was always ministered to the common people in a strange and unknown tongue, which the simple and rude common people understood not, and so were not edified, neither received they any profit by the words that were spoken, although never so good and godly.

Father. Was this also an abuse? *Son.* Yea, verily, and a great abuse, and directly contrary both to the doctrine of Christ, and the ancient practice of Christ's church.

Father. How provest thou that? *Son.* St Paul saith: "Brethren, if I come unto you speaking with tongues, what shall I profit you, except I speak to you either by revelation, or by knowledge, or by prophesying, or by doctrine? Moreover, when things without life give sound (whether it be a pipe or an harp) except they make a distinction in the sounds, how shall it be known what is piped or harped? For if the trump give an uncertain voice, who shall prepare himself to the war? Even so likewise when ye speak with tongues, except ye speak words that have signification, how shall it be understand what is spoken? For ye shall but speak in the air." And a little after he saith: "When thou blessest with the spirit (that is to say, givest thanks in a strange tongue), how shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned say Amen at thy giving of thanks, seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest? Thou verily givest thanks well; but the other is not edified, &c. I had rather in the congregation to speak five words with my understanding to the

The fifth
abuse.

In Lib. de
Amab. Conc.

The sixth
abuse.

All things
ought in
churches to
be spoken in
that tongue
which the
common peo-
ple under-
stand.

1 Cor. xiv.

[⁷ Statuimus, ut in cunctis ecclesiis chrisma et eucharistia sub fideli custodia clavibus adhibitibus conserventur; ne possit ad illa temeraria manus extendi, ad aliqua horribilia vel nefaria exercenda.—Concil. Lat. iv. cap. xx. in Concil. Stud. Labbei. Lut. Par. 1671-2. Tom. XI. Pars 1. col. 172.]

[⁸ Quamquam Christus in eo sacramento est sub ratione cibi ac potus, ut summa cum animi puritate sumatur, non ut ostentetur, aut in ludis publicisque pompis circumferatur, aut in equo circum arva vehatur. Id nequaquam est veteris exempli, sed in hoc multitudinis affectui plus satis indultum est.—Des. Erasm. Op. Lugd. Bat. 1703—6. De Amab. Eccles. Concord. Enarr. Psalm. lxxxiii. Tom. V. cols. 503, 4.]

[⁹ Ne propter incuriam sacerdotum divina indignatio gravior exardescat, districtè percipiendò mandamus, quatenus a sacerdotibus eucharistia, in loco

singulari, mundo, et signato semper honorifice collocata, devote, ac fideliter conservetur. Sacerdos vero quilibet frequenter doceat plebem suam, ut cum in celebratione missarum elevatur hostia salutaris, se reverenter inclinet, idem faciens, cum eam defert presbyter ad infirmum. Quam in decenti habitu, superposito mundo velamine, ferat, et referat manifeste ac honorifice ante pectus, cum omni reverentia et timore, semper lumine præcedente, cum sit candor lucis æternæ: ut ex hoc apud omnes fides et devotio augeatur. Prælati autem hujusmodi mandati graviter punire non differant transgressores, si et ipsi divinam et nostram volunt effugere ultionem.—Hon. III. in Decretal. Greg. IX. Taurin. 1621. Lib. III. De Celebr. Missar. Tit. lxi. col. 1378. See also Const. Ric. Episc. Sar. (temp. Hon. III.) in Concil. Stud. Labbei. cap. xxxix. Tom. XI. col. 259.]

information of other, than ten thousand words with the tongue." Again he saith: "If when all the congregation is come together, and all speak with tongues, there come in they that are unlearned, or they which believe not, will they not say that ye are out of your wits? But and if all prophesy, and there come in one that believeth not, or one unlearned, he is rebuked of all men, and is judged of every man; and so are the secrets of his heart opened, and so falleth he down on his face and worshippeth God, and saith that God is in you of a truth, &c. Let all things be done unto edifying. If any man speak with tongue, let it be by two, or at the most by three, and that by course, and let another interpret it. But if there be no interpreter, let him keep silence in the congregation, and let him speak to himself and to God."

Who seeth not evidently by these words of the holy apostle, that whatsoever things be spoken in the congregation, whether it be in praying or in preaching, all things ought to be uttered in that language which the people understand, and that all things ought to be done unto edifying? which thing cannot be brought to pass if the administration of God's mysteries be done in a foreign and strange tongue, as the papists do in all their churches. The papists therefore have greatly abused themselves in the administration of God's holy mysteries, while they have uttered all things to the people in such a tongue as they understand not.

Father. Was the use in the church of Christ also after the apostles' time, that all things both in preaching and praying should be done in that speech which the common people understood? *Son.* Yea, forsooth, many hundred years after, till that antichrist, the bishop of Rome, sitting now in the consciences of men, and calling himself "Christ's vicar," "Peter's successor," and "supreme head of the universal church of Christ," devised and commanded the contrary; so that so many as submitted their necks to the tyranny of that Romish bishop from that time forward were compelled to use the Roman, that is to say, the Latin tongue in all their divine service, as they use to call it, contrary to the doctrine of God, and contrary to the practice of Christ's ancient church, yea, and that without all edifying or profit.

Father. And was this Romish order universally received of all Christians throughout all Christendom? *Son.* Nothing less. For many christian nations even unto this day would never obey the tyranny of that Romish bishop, nor knowledge him to be "Christ's vicar," "Peter's successor," "supreme head of the universal church of Christ," &c., nor yet to have any more power than any other ordinary bishop hath; but whatsoever authority or jurisdiction he challengeth more and obtaineth, they¹ affirm it to be false and usurped, yea, and contrary to the word of God and the doctrine of the ancient fathers of Christ's church.

Therefore, as the Jews from the beginning used no strange tongue in their temples, neither yet do at this present, but their own language, that is to say, the Hebrew tongue; so likewise, even from the beginning of Christ's profession, the Greeks, the Indians, the Armenians, the Illyricks, the Slavones, the Moscovites, the Liburnians, with divers other, have ever used their own country speech in the celebration of God's mysteries, and not a strange tongue (as the manner is in the pope's church), which they understand not. Whosoever hath travailed either in the reading of histories or of ancient writers, he right well knoweth these things to be true which I now speak.

Father. I grant, my son. But let me hear an authority or two out of the old writers, which testify this thing to be true. *Son.* St Ambrose saith: "If ye come together to edify the congregation, those things ought to be spoken which the hearers may understand. For what doth it profit that any man speak with a tongue which he alone knoweth, that he which beareth may have no profit? Therefore he ought to hold his peace in the congregation, that they may speak which may profit the hearers²."

St John Chrysostom saith: "If I shall not speak that which may plainly and easily be understand of you, but only shall shew myself to be endued with the gift

[¹ Folio, *there.*]

[² Si utique ad ædificandam ecclesiam convenitis, ea debent dici, quæ intelligant audientes. Nam quid prodest ut quis lingua loquatur, quam solus scit; ut qui audit, nihil proficiat? Ideo ta-

cere debet in ecclesia, ut ii loquantur, qui prosint audientibus.—Ambros. Op. Par. 1686—90. Comm. in Epist. ad Cor. prim. cap. xiv. 17. Tom. II. Appendix, col. 157.]

In 1 Cor. cap. xiv.

In 1 Cor. cap. xiv. Hom. 53.

of tongues, I believe ye shall go away receiving no fruit of those things which ye understand not. For what profit can there be of a voice not understand³?"

Cassiodorus saith: "The speech is unprofitably uttered that is not understand. Not only singing, but also understanding, we ought to give thanks. For no man doth any thing wisely that he understandeth not⁴."

Haymo also saith: "Your speech ought to be understand, that the soldier may prepare himself unto the spiritual battle of Christ⁵." In 1 Cor. cap. xiv.

To whom is the godly law of the emperor Justinian unknown, in the which he commandeth that all bishops and priests, both in the time of divine service, and also in the ministration of the holy sacraments, should with so open and clear voice utter all things in the tongue which the people understand, that the hearers may thereby be the better edified, and also be the more fervently stirred up unto devotion and praying unto God⁶?

Many authorities out of the old writers might here be alleged to declare, that all things spoken in the church, both in preaching and praying, ought to be uttered in that tongue which the people understand; but let these for this present suffice.

Father. Contented, my child. But remaineth there yet any other abuse in the administration of the Lord's supper brought in by that bishop of Rome?

Son. Seventhly, this also is a great abuse in the pope's church, that the papists at the celebration of the Lord's supper do not only suffer the communicants to be present at the participation of those holy mysteries of the body and blood of Christ, (which ought of right so to be,) but also they admit other not communicating to be present, only idle gazers and vain beholders of those things, whereof they will not be partakers; whereas of right they ought to be excluded, put out, and utterly banished from that company in the time of that holy action. The seventh abuse.
None ought to be present at the ministration of the Lord's supper, but the communicants only.

Father. Why, is it lawful for other to be present at the ministration of the Lord's supper which are not communicants? *Son.* No, verily.

Father. Why so?

Son. First, we read not that any were present at the table, when the Lord Jesus instituted and delivered the blessed sacraments of his body and blood, but only his disciples, which all were communicants; to declare unto us, that none should be present at that holy action, but such only as be partakers of those holy mysteries.

Secondly, we read that the ancient fathers of Christ's church would by no means suffer that any should be present at the ministration of the Lord's supper, but such only as would communicate. The other were commanded to depart, and by no means to remain among those that came unto that holy and heavenly banquet.

Father. How provest thou that? *Son.* Micrologus, in the book *de Ecclesiasticis observationibus*, hath these words: "It is to be known according to the use of the ancient fathers, that the communicants alone were wont to be present at the divine mysteries. In consideration whereof before the oblation (he meaneth the receiving of Cap. xxvi.

[³ Ὁ δὲ λέγει τοῦτό ἐστιν, ἐὰν μὴ τι εἶπω δυνάμενον ὑμῖν εὐληπτον γενέσθαι, καὶ δυνάμενον εἶναι σαφές, ἀλλ' ἐπιδείξομαι μόνον, ὅτι γλωττῶν ἔχω χάρισμα, γλωττῶν ἂν ἀκούσαντες, οὐδὲν κερδάναντες ἀπελευθεσθε. πῶς γὰρ ἀπὸ φωνῆς, ἧς οὐ συνίετε;—Chrysost. Op. Par. 1718—38. In Epist. i. ad Cor. Hom. xxxv. Tom. X. p. 323.]

[⁴ Adjecit, Psallite sapienter; ut non solum cantantes, sed intelligentes psallere debeamus. Nemo enim sapienter quicquam facit quod non intelligit.—Cassiodor. Op. Rotom. 1679. Expos. in Psal. xlv. v. 7. Tom. II. p. 157.]

[⁵ Vester autem sermo intelligi debet, ut possit ad spiritale bellum Christi se miles præparare.—Haymo in Div. Paul. Epist. Interp. 1528. Ad Cor. i. cap. xiv. fol. A. v.]

[⁶ Ad hæc jubemus, ut omnes episcopi pariter et presbyteri non tacito modo, sed clara voce, quæ a fideli populo exaudiatur, sacram oblationem et preces in sancto baptisinate adhibitas celebrent, quo majore exinde compunctione in depromendis

Domini Dei laudibus audientium animi efferantur. Ita enim et divus apostolus docet, dicens in prima ad Corinthios epistola: Enimvero si solummodo benedicas spiritu, quomodo is qui privati locum implet, dicet ad gratiarum actionem tuam Deo ipsum Amen; quandoquidem quid dicas, non videt? Tu quidem pulchre gratias agis, alter autem non ædificatur. Et rursus in epistola ad Romanos sic inquit: Corde quidem creditur ad justitiam, ore autem fit confessio ad salutem. His igitur de causis convenit, ut inter ceteras preces et ea quæ in sancta oblatione dicuntur, clara voce a religiosissimis episcopis et presbyteris Domino nostro Jesu Christo Deo nostro cum Patre et sancto Spiritu proferantur: scituris religiosissimis sacerdotibus, quod si quid horum neglexerint, et in horrodo judicio magni Dei et Servatoris nostri Jesu Christi de his rationem reddent, neque nos hæc cognoscentes conquiescemus, relinquemusque inulta.—Justin. Princ. Novell. Constit. Basil. 1561. Const. cxxxvii. (al. cxliii.) pp. 409, 10.]

the sacrament), according to the canons, both they which were called *Catechumeni*, that is to say, persons newly instructed or trained up in the principles of christian religion, and also *Pœnitentes*, that is, such as for their looseness of life were not yet meet to be admitted unto the participation of those holy mysteries, were commanded to go out, so that it was not lawful for them there to remain¹."

St Gregory also bishop of Rome testifieth, that "this was the manner in times past, that whensoever the holy communion of the body and blood of Christ should be ministered, the deacon turned him to the people, and cried out on this sort: *Si quis non communicat, exeat*. That is to say: 'If any do not communicate, let him go out.' For in this respect is the communion called *Missa*, because all such are to be sent out by the deacon, which are not partakers of the sacrifice or of the holy communion," &c. And in another place he declareth, that when the gospel was once read, the deacon came and openly commanded all such to depart as had not prepared themselves to be partakers of the holy communion. For it was not lawful for such to be present at the celebration of those holy mysteries. Again he saith: "Except such as do not communicate be commanded to go out at the voice of the deacon, according to the custom and manner of our ancestors, the service or office, which commonly is called *Missa*, cannot truly and perfectly be done." Once again he saith: "The exorcist must cast out devils, and say unto the people, that all such as will not communicate must depart and go away²."

And Dionysius Areopagita writeth, that after the gospel was once read, all that did not communicate were put out of the church, and by no means suffered to see those holy mysteries, nor to be present at the ministration of the same³.

Moreover, in the liturgy of the Ethiopes, we read thus: "So soon as the gospel is ended, the deacon saith: 'All ye that will not receive the sacrament or eucharist, get ye out.' And again after the creed is sung, the deacon saith: 'Ye that will not communicate, depart and go your way; but ye that will communicate, embrace and kiss one another⁴.'"

In the liturgy of the Armenians we find these words: "The deacon a little before the preface saith: 'They that are not worthy to communicate and to be partakers of this holy oblation of God, let them go out and stand before the church door, and there pray⁵.'"

And in the liturgy of St John Chrysostom we read that, when the communicants prepared themselves unto the Lord's table, the archdeacon commanded the deacon that stood without, to shut the chancel doors, that none might there remain but the communicants only⁶.

[¹ Sciendum est autem, juxta antiquos patres, quod soli communicantes divinis mysteriis interesse consueverunt, unde et ante oblationem juxta canones jubebantur exire catechumeni, et pœnitentes, videlicet qui nondum se paraverunt ad communicandum.—Microlog. de Eccles. Observat. in Mag. Biblioth. Vet. Patr. Col. Agrip. 1618—22. cap. li. Tom. XI. p. 392.]

[² The substance of these references may be found as follows. Expositor Ord. Rom. B. Gregorius papa testatur, moris fuisse diacono proclamare: Si quis non communicat, exeat; et propter hoc certe dicitur Missa, quando mittendi sunt foras per diaconum, qui non participant sacrificio vel communione sancta.—Cassandr. Op. Par. 1616. Liturg. cap. xvii. pp. 35, 6.—Iterum admonentur ab archidiacono his verbis Catechumeni recedant: Si quis catechumenus est, recedat. Omnes catechumeni exeant foras.—Ord. Rom. r. in Mus. Ital. a Mabill. Lut. Par. 1687-9. Tom. II. p. 24. See also viii. p. 81.—Exorcistam oportet ejicere dæmones, et dicere populo qui non communicat, ut det locum.—Ord. Rom. De Offic. Div. De Exorcist. in Max. Biblioth. Vet. Patr. Lugd. 1677. Tom. XIII. col. 703.]

[³ Ἐξῆς δὲ, διὰ τῶν λειτουργιῶν ἢ τῶν ἀγιογράφων δέλτων ἀνάγνωσις ἀκολούθως γίνεται καὶ μετὰ ταύτας, ἕξω γίνονται τῆς ἱερᾶς περιοχῆς

οἱ κατηχούμενοι, καὶ πρὸς αὐτοῖς οἱ ἐνεργούμενοι, καὶ οἱ ἐν μετανοίᾳ ὄντες, μένουσι δὲ οἱ τῆς τῶν θεῶν ἐποφίας καὶ κοινωνίας ἄξιοι.—Dionys. Areop. Op. Antv. 1634. De Eccles. Hierarch. cap. iii. 2. Tom. I. p. 284.]

[⁴ Diaconus. Orate pro pace perfecta, et amica salutatione apostolica. Amplectimini invicem: Qui non communicatis, exite: qui communicatis, amplectimini invicem in plenitudine cordis vestri: qui communicaturus est custodiat se a malo.—Lit. Com. Æthiop. in Liturg. Orient. Coll. Stud. Eus. Renaudot. Par. 1716. Tom. I. p. 513. This is what was uttered after the creed. Of the warning after the gospel, Renaudot says in his note: Quod in versione Latina statim post recitationem evangelii legitur. Exite foras qui non vultis accipere sacramentum, sive eucharistiam: iite catechumeni, non legitur in editione Æthiopica.—p. 531.]

[⁵ Diaconus monet, 'Salutate invicem in osculo sancto. Qui non sunt digni communicare hanc oblationem Dei, exeant foras ante fores ecclesiæ, et ibi orent.—Ord. Cel. Myst. ex Lit. Armen. in Cassandr. Op. Liturg. cap. xii. p. 30.]

[⁶ Καὶ ὁ διάκονος περιπτύσσεται τὸ ᾠράριον αὐτοῦ, καὶ προσκνυεῖ τρίς, καὶ ἐπισυνάπτει ἐκφώνως. Τὰς θύρας, τὰς θύρας, ἐν σοφίᾳ πρόσχωμεν.

In Expos.
Ord. Rom.

Lib. i. de Ord.
Rom.

Lib. de Divin.
Off. sec. Ord.
Rom. de Off.
Exorcistæ.

In Liturg.
Chrysost.

And in a certain homily he hath these words: "Whosoever is not partaker of the mysteries, he standeth by impudent and lewd. Therefore they that are in sin are first cast out. For even as it is not lawful for them to approach and to draw nigh unto the table, where their master sit, which have offended him, and to be present among the servitors, but is driven out from among them; so likewise is it in this place, while the oblation is offered, while Christ that Lamb of the Lord is offered up for a sacrifice⁷." Again he saith: "When the mysteries be once done, thou mayest come and see; but, so long as the mysteries be in hand, get thee hence: for thou hast nothing here to do⁸."

Hom. 3. ad
Ephes.
Ad Pop.
Antioch.
Hom. 61.

Father. I perceive now right well that the papists, suffering other to be present at the ministration of the holy communion of the body and blood of our Lord and Saviour Christ Jesu, which do not communicate, nor be partakers of those blessed mysteries, err greatly from the ways and usages of the ancient christian churches. *Son.* You say truth.

Father. Is there any other abuse behind, crept into the church of Christ, concerning the holy supper of the Lord?

Son. This is another great abuse, that, whereas the Lord Christ Jesus would have the holy communion of his blessed body and precious blood to be oftentimes received of the faithful for a remembrance of his death and passion, and for the worthy, diligent, and earnest consideration of his inestimable benefits, which we have obtained of God the Father through the same his passion and death; the custom in the pope's church is, that the people receive that sacrament usually but once in the year, that is to say, at Easter, and that but under one kind and manner, contrary to the institution of Christ; so that by this means the commandment of Christ is broken, the sacrament is neglected, the death of Christ is not earnestly remembered, the people become unthankful, dissolution of life brasteth in, vice increaseth, virtue decreaseth.

The eighth
abuse.

Father. Is it the will of Christ that the faithful should oftentimes come unto those holy mysteries? *Son.* Who doubteth of that? To what end was the Lord's supper instituted, but that it should be frequented and used? To what end doth God give his commandment, but that it should be put in execution and practice? Is not this the commandment of Christ concerning his holy supper in the use of the same? "This do ye in the remembrance of me." Are not these the words of blessed St Paul? "The Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread; and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take ye, and eat: this is my body, which is broken for you: this do ye in the remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when supper was done, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood. This do, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye shall eat this bread, and drink of this cup, ye shall shew the Lord's death till he come."

Luke xxii.

1 Cor. xi.

Here hear we both the commandment to receive, and also mention made of the often receiving. How is this put in practice in the pope's church, where the people receive the Lord's supper but once in a year? "As often," saith Christ. "As often," saith St Paul. But "as seldom," saith antichrist. They take away from the people the mysteries of Christ's body and blood, and feed them with holy bread and holy water, beggarly ceremonies of their own invention.

Father. Was the use in the time of the apostles to come often unto the Lord's tables? *Son.* Yea, verily. For thus read we in the Acts of the Apostles: "They that gladly received his (Peter's) preaching, were baptized; and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand souls. And they continued in the apostles'

Acts ii.

—Div. Miss. S. Joan. Chrysost. in Rit. Græc. Op. Jac. Goar. Lut. Par. 1647. p. 75. See Goar's note, p. 134. Further remarks on the custom may be found in Renaudot, Tom. II. pp. 71, 601.]

[⁷ Πᾶς γὰρ ὁ μὴ μετέχων τῶν μυστηρίων, ἀνάσχυτος καὶ Ἰταμῶς ἐσθηκῶς. διὰ τοῦτο πρότεροι ἐκβάλλονται οἱ ἐν ἀμαρτήμασι. καθάπερ γὰρ ἐπὶ τραπέζης παραγενομένου τοῦ δεσπότου οὐ δεῖ τοὺς προσκεκροκότας τῶν οἰκετῶν παρεῖναι, ἀλλ' ἐκποδῶν γίνονται· οὕτω δὴ καὶ ἐν ταῦτα, ἀκφερομένης τῆς θυσίας, καὶ τοῦ Χριστοῦ τεθυμένου, καὶ τοῦ

προβάτου τοῦ δεσποτικοῦ.—Chrysost. Op. Par. 1718—38. In Epist. ad Ephes. cap. i. Hom. iii. Tom. XI. p. 23. A part of the homily numbered in the Latin editions Ad Pop. Ant. lxi. is found as just quoted among those on Ephesians. See Catalogus prefixed by Fronto Ducaeus to his edition of Chrysostom. Par. 1621—24.]

[⁸ Ἐξέστι μετὰ ταῦτα προσελθεῖν, καὶ ἰδεῖν ὕταν μέντοι παρῆ, ἀπιθι. οὐκ ἔξεστι σοι μάλλον, ἢ τῷ κατηχουμένῳ.—Id. ibid. p. 24.]

doctrine and fellowship, and in breaking of bread, and in prayers." Again: "All that believed kept themselves together, and had all things common, and sold their possessions and goods, and parted them to all men, as every man had need. And they continued daily with one accord in the temple, and brake bread from house to house, and did eat their meat together with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God," &c. Here hear we of daily continuance of breaking bread, whereby is understand the Lord's supper; and not of coming unto the Lord's tables once in the year, as the manner is in the pope's kingdom.

Father. And what was the use in the primitive church after the apostles' time? Came the Christians then also often unto the Lord's table? *Son.* That is not to be doubted. For Guilhelmus Durandus saith, that in the primitive church all that were present at the celebration of the Lord's supper were wont every day to communicate¹.

And Platina, in his book of the lives of the Romish bishop[s], writeth that Anacletus bishop of Rome made a decree, that the Christians should receive the eucharist, that is to say, the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, every day, and that those which would not communicate should be excommunicate².

And many years after, as we may perceive by reading the ancient writers, this often receiving of the sacrament continued in the church of Christ. For in the time of St Augustine, as he himself writeth, some did communicate every day; some but certain days in the week; some only upon the Saturday and Sunday; some not at all but only upon the Sunday³.

So likewise was the custom in the days of St Hierome⁴.

And St Augustine hath a notable sentence in this behalf, which is this: "Daily to receive the communion of the eucharist I neither commend nor discommend; notwithstanding I would wish and exhort men to communicate every Sunday⁵."

In the time of St John Chrysostom also the Lord's supper was greatly frequented.

Among the Grecians, even at this present day, if any man absent himself from the Lord's table by the space of fourteen days (except he can render a reasonable cause of his absence), he is excommunicate, and put from the company of the faithful⁶.

In all those mighty, large, and populous kingdoms which are under that most puissant king, Precious John⁷, the holy communion of the body and blood of the Lord hath been from the beginning daily ministered to the people, and yet is at this present day, as histories make mention.

Moreover, unto the often receiving of the holy mysteries of Christ's body and blood all the ancient writers do diligently exhort. But blessed Ignatius hath these words:

"Make haste oftentimes to come unto the eucharist and glory of God. For when this thing is busily done, the powers of Satan are expelled⁸."

St John Chrysostom saith: "He that hath a pure conscience ought every day to come unto the communion⁹." This aforesaid doctor in divers places of his writings

[¹ See before, page 239, note 6.]

[² Omnibus quoque fidelibus præcepit, ut peracta consecratione communicarent; qui vero nolent, e sacris ædibus eliminarentur.—Plat. De Vit. Pont. Rom. Col. 1568. Anacletus I. p. 15. See also before, page 238, note 1.]

[³ Alii quotidie communicant corpori et sanguini Domini, alii certis diebus accipiunt: alibi nullus dies prætermittitur, quo non offeratur, alibi sabbato tantum et dominico, alibi tantum dominico.—August. Op. Par. 1679—1700. Ad Inquis. Januar. Lib. I. Epist. liv. 2. Tom. II. col. 124. Hujus rei sacramentum, id est, unitatis corporis et sanguinis Christi, alicubi quotidie, alicubi certis intervallis dierum in dominica mensa præparatur, et de mensa dominica sumitur.—Id. in Johan. Evang. cap. vi. Tractat. xxvii. 15. Tom. III. Pars II. col. 500.]

[⁴ De sabbatho quod quæris, utrum jejunandum sit; et de eucharistia, an accipienda quotidie, quod Romana ecclesia et Hispania observare perhibentur, scripsit quidem et Hippolytus vir disertissimus.—Hieron. Op. Par. 1693—1706, Epist. lii. ad Lucin.

Tom. IV. Pars II. col. 579.]

[⁵ Quotidie eucharistia communionem percipere nec laudo nec vitupero. Omnibus tamen dominicis diebus communicandum suadeo et hortor, si tamen mens in affectu peccandi non sit.—August. Op. De Eccles. Dogm. cap. xxiii. Tom. VIII. Appendix, col. 78. This treatise is certainly not Augustine's: it is usually attributed to Gennadius.]

[⁶ Apud Græcos quoque, illi qui duas dominicas vel tres sine communione transierint, excommunicari dicuntur.—Wal. Strab. in Mag. Biblioth. Vet. Patr. Col. Agrip. 1618—22. De Reb. Eccles. cap. xx. Tom. IX. Pars I. p. 956.]

[⁷ Prester John, as he was usually called; the sovereign of Abyssinia.]

[⁸ Σπουδαίετε οὖν πυκνότερον συνέρχεσθαι εἰς εὐχαριστίαν Θεοῦ καὶ εἰς δόξαν ὅτ' ἂν γὰρ πυκνῶς ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ γίνεσθε, καθαιρούνται αἱ δυνάμεις τοῦ Σατανᾶ.—Ignat. Epist. ad Ephes. cap. xiii. in Patr. Apost. Oxon. 1838. Tom. II. p. 284.]

[⁹ Καὶ καθάπερ τὸν οὐδὲν ἐαντῶ συνειδότα φαῦλον καθ' ἑκάστην δεῖ προσιέναι τὴν ἡμέραν οὕτω

In Rat. Div. Off. lib. iv.

Ad Janua. epist. 2. In Joan. cap. vi. Trac.

In epist. ad Lucian. De Eccle. Dog. cap. 53.

In Epist. ad Ephes.

In Orat. de B. Philologo.

both sharply and grievously reproveth his audients for their slack coming unto the Lord's table, and exhorteth them many times in the year, yea, daily (if they have pure minds) to come unto the holy communion¹⁰.

Hom. 61. ad Pop. Antioch.

Theophylact also admonisheth us that we should not come this or that day unto the holy mysteries of the body and blood of Christ, but at all times, whensoever we find ourselves pure and worthy¹¹.

In 1 Cor. cap. xi.

St Ambrose, speaking of the Lord's supper, saith: "Receive (the Lord's bread) daily, which may profit thee daily. So live that thou mayest deserve to receive it daily¹²," &c. Again: "If so oftentimes as the blood of Christ is shed it is shed unto the remission of sins, I ought to receive it alway, that my sins may alway be forgiven me. I that alway sin ought alway to have the medicine¹³." The medicine, saith he, is the heavenly and worshipful sacrament.

Lib. v. de Sacra. cap. 4.

Lib. iv. de Sacra. cap. 6.

Hereto appertaineth the saying of St Bernard: "He that hath a wound seeketh a medicine: we have a wound while we are under sin; the medicine is the sacrament: daily receive, daily thou shalt be healed¹⁴."

St Hierome also saith: "Would God we were able at all times to receive the eucharist without the condemnation of ourselves and without a pricking conscience, and to hear the psalmist saying, 'Taste and see how sweet the Lord is¹⁵.'"

Ad Lucin.

Psal. xxxiv.

Many other histories and authorities might here be alleged to declare, that when the church of Christ was most pure, the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ was most often received of the Christians; again, that we, which at this time live and profess Christ, ought to frequent the holy sacrament, and oftentimes to be partakers of those holy mysteries, lest that we, abstaining from so wholesome medicine, acquire and get to ourselves wounds incurable. Who seeth not then, what and how great an abuse this is in the pope's church, the lay people commonly to receive the Lord's supper but once in the year, yea, and that under one kind, contrary to the institution of Christ? I greatly marvel that the papists observe not so much as the decree of their father the pope! For pope Fabian made a decree, and gave out a commandment, that all men should at the least thrice in the year receive the holy communion; that is to say, at Easter, and at Whitsuntide, and at Christmas¹⁶. The very same thing was enacted in the council Agathense, of the which we read on this manner: "The secular people which do not communicate at Christmas, Easter, and Whitsuntide, let them not be counted catholics, nor taken among the catholics¹⁷."

De Consec. dist. 2.

Lib. Concil.

Thus see we, that the papists in abusing the supper of the Lord are utterly fallen

τὸν ἐν ἀμαρτήμασι προκατελιγμένον, καὶ μὴ μετανοῦντα, οὐδὲ ἐν ἑορτῇ προσιέναι ἀσφαλές.—Chrysost. Op. Par. 1718—38. De B. Philogon. cont. Anom. Hom. vi. Tom. I. p. 499.]

[¹⁰ Μετὰ ταύτης [καβαρότητος] αἰεὶ πρόσθι, χωρὶς ταύτης μηδέποτε... ὡς τῆς συνηθείας, ὡς τῆς προλήψεως, εἰκὴ θυσία καθημερινή, εἰκὴ παρεστήκαμεν τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ, οὐδεὶς ὁ μετέχων... σκόπει, παρακαλῶ τράπεζα πάρεστι βασιλική, ἀγγελιοδικοῦνται τῇ τραπέζῃ, αὐτὸς πάρεστιν ὁ βασιλεὺς, καὶ σὺ ἕστηκας χασμάμενος; ἄντιπαρὰ σοὶ τὰ ἱμάτια, καὶ οὐδεὶς σοὶ λόγος; ἀλλὰ καθαρὰ ἐστίν; οὐκὼν ἀνάπεσον, καὶ μέτεχε.—Id. In Epist. ad Ephes. cap. i. Hom. iii. Tom. XI. pp. 22, 3.]

[¹¹ Δίκαιον οὖν τῷ συνειδίῳ σου, καὶ οὕτω πρόσθι, μὴ ὕταν ἑορτῇ ἤ, ἀλλ' ὕταν καθαρὸν σεαυτὸν καὶ ἄξιον εὐρύς.—Theophyl. Op. Venet. 1754—63. Comm. in 1. Epist. ad Cor. cap. xi. 28. Tom. II. p. 192.]

[¹² Accipe quotidie, quod quotidie tibi prosit. Sic vive, ut quotidie merearis accipere.—Ambros. Op. 1686—90. De Sacram. Lib. v. cap. iv. 25. Tom. II. col. 378. It is very doubtful whether this be a genuine work of Ambrose. See Cave's Script. Eccles. Hist. Lit. Oxon. 1740—3. Tom. I. p. 263.]

[¹³ Si quotiescumque effunditur sanguis, in remissionem peccatorum funditur, debeo illum semper

accipere, ut semper mihi peccata dimittantur. Qui semper pecco, semper debeo habere medicinam.—Id. Ibid. Lib. iv. cap. vi. 28. col. 372.]

[¹⁴ The precise words have not been discovered; but the idea is not unfrequent in the works ascribed to this father. See especially Bernard. Op. Par. 1690. De Excell. Sanctiss. Sacram. Serm. (it is uncertain who the author of the treatise is) 10. Vol. II. Tom. v. col. 672; and Guerr. Abbat. De Res. Dom. Serm. ii. 4. Tom. vi. col. 1001.]

[¹⁵ Atque utinam omni tempore jejunare possimus.....eucharistiam quoque absque condemnatione nostri, et pungentis conscientia, semper accipere, et psalmistam audire, dicentem: Gustate et videte, quoniam suavis est Dominus.—Hieron. Op. Epist. lii. ad Lucin. Tom. IV. Pars II. col. 579.]

[¹⁶ Etsi non frequentius, saltem in anno ter laici homines communicent (nisi forte quis majoribus quibuslibet criminibus impediatur) in pascha videlicet, et pentecoste, et natali Domini.—Fabian. in Decret. Gratiani, Par. 1583. Decr. Tert. Pars, De Consecr. Dist. ii. can. 16. cols. 2367, 8.]

[¹⁷ Sæculares, qui in natali Domini, pascha, et pentecoste non communicaverint, catholici non credantur, nec inter catholicos habeantur.—Ex Concil. Agathens. can. 18, in eod. can. 19. ibid. See also Concil. Stud. Labbei. Par. 1671—2. Tom. IV. col. 1386.]

from their own law and decrees, while they commonly minister the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ to the laity but once in the year; whereas the commandment of Christ, the practice of the apostolic and primitive church, the use of those churches which until this day have continued in the doctrine of the apostles, the doctrine of the ancient fathers, and the best reformed churches in these our days, teach the contrary.

Father. There have been (it cannot be denied) great abuses, and yet are in the pope's church, concerning the supper of the Lord; and this rare and seldom coming of the common people unto the receiving of the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ is not one of the lessest. But notwithstanding, because the people should not be altogether without some outward thing to put them in remembrance of the body-breaking and blood-shedding of Christ, the papists have brought into the church two ceremonies, that is to say, holy bread and holy water; and they every Sunday minister them to the common people, instead of the honourable sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, by giving them the bread to eat, and by casting the water on their faces. *Son.* It may justly be said unto them as Christ answered the Pharisees and scribes: "Well prophesied Esaias of you, O ye hypocrites, as it is written, This people honoureth me with their lips, but their heart is far from me; howbeit in vain do they serve me, teaching the doctrines and commandments of men. For ye lay the commandment of God apart, and observe the constitutions of men, &c. Ye cast away the commandment of God to maintain your own traditions."

Father. Besides these abuses, have there not also crept in certain errors into the church of Christ about the matter of the Lord's supper, through the ungodly doctrine of the papists? *Son.* Yes, verily, divers, but three principally.

Father. Which are they? *Son.* The first is the doctrine of transubstantiation. The second is the doctrine of the corporal presence of Christ in the sacrament, as he hanged on the cross. The third is, that the godless and wicked people, receiving the sacrament, eat and drink the body and blood of Christ no less than the godly and the faithful people.

Father. Why, what thinkest thou of transubstantiation? *Son.* I think it to be a papistical, wicked, and devilish error.

Father. Why dost thou call it a papistical error? *Son.* Because it was thrust into the church of Christ through the violent tyranny and tyrannical violence of the pope, and made of full force with the articles of the christian belief.

Father. What pope brought it in? *Son.* Pope Innocent the third.

Father. Where? *Son.* At Rome, in a certain council called Concilium Latronense, in the which were gathered together wonderful swarms of smeared, spiritual, shorling¹ sorcerers, to the number of twelve hundred and odd; whereof the greatest part were monks, friars, canons, and such other idle monsters, which "devour widows' houses, under the pretence of long prayer," which "have an outward appearance of godly living, but have denied the power thereof," which "think lucre godliness," which also, being damnable sects, "deny the Lord that bought them;" forasmuch as they are the "enemies of the cross of Christ, and have the belly for their god."

Father. At what time came transubstantiation into the church? *Son.* Pope Innocent the third, with his adherents, hatched this cockatrice's egg, (I mean the horrible monster of transubstantiation,) in the year of our Lord one thousand two hundred and fifteen, while he sat in the chair not of Moses, but of pestilence.

Father. This doctrine then of transubstantiation is but new. *Son.* New indeed, and as I may so speak, yesterday's doctrine.

Father. And doth pope Innocent make this his new doctrine of equal authority with the articles of the christian faith? *Son.* Yea, as we may see in his devilish decree².

[¹ Shorling: a sheep that has been shorn; here, shaveling.]

[² Una vero est fidelium universalis ecclesia, extra quam nullus omnino salvatur. In qua idem ipse sacerdos et sacrificium Jesus Christus, cujus corpus et sanguis in sacramento altaris sub speciebus panis et vini veraciter continentur, transsubstantiatis

pane in corpus, et vino in sanguinem potestate divina, ut ad perficiendum mysterium unitatis accipiamus ipsi de suo, quod accepit ipse de nostro.—Innocent. III. Op. Col. 1575. Concil. Lat. Decr. De Trin. cap. i. Tom. I. p. 461. See also Concil. Stud. Labbei. Lut. Par. 1671—2. Tom. XI. Pars i. col. 143.]

Matt. xv.
Mark vii.
Isai. xxix.

Errors crept
into the
church about
the Lord's
supper.

Of transub-
stantiation.

Matt. xxiii.
2 Tim. iii.
1 Tim. vi.
2 Pet. ii.
Phil. iii.

De summa
Trinitate, cap.
Firmiter.

Father. Why callest thou this doctrine of transubstantiation a wicked error? *Son.* Because it is not grounded upon the word of God, but rather it is contrary to the word of God. For whereas the holy scripture calleth the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, bread and wine, this doctrine of transubstantiation teacheth plainly that there is neither bread nor wine; which are two such repugnancies and contraries, as darkness is not more contrary to light, nor death to life. And as the holy scripture affirmeth bread and wine to remain in the sacrament, so likewise do all the ancient writers and old doctors of Christ's church; so that this doctrine of transubstantiation is no less contrary to the teaching of the holy scripture and of the godly fathers, than it is new.

And St Ambrose saith: "We lawfully condemn all new things which Christ hath not taught; for to the faithful Christ is the way. If Christ therefore have not taught that thing which we teach, even we ourselves also judge and recount it detestable." Again he saith: "Whatsoever is not of the apostles, it is full of wickedness."^{Tract. 4. de Virg.}

St Hierome saith: "That is the doctrine of the Holy Ghost, which is set forth in the canonical letters; against the which doctrine if councils establish any thing, I judge it unlawful and wicked."^{In Epist. ad Galat.}

Panormitanus also saith: "We ought more to believe a simple layman alleging the holy scripture than an whole council" (without the scripture). Once again he saith: "More credit is to be given to such one as is perfectly learned in holy letters, and bringeth for him universal authority, than to a general council." Item: "In matters concerning faith, the word even of one private man is more to be regarded than the saying of the pope, if he be moved with better authorities of the new and old testament than the pope."^{De Elect. cap. Significasti.}

"It is needful," saith Origen, "that we call the holy scriptures in to witness. For our devices and expositions without these witnesses are not to be believed."^{In Hiero.}

St Cyprian saith: "Adulterous and whorish is it, ungodly is it, yea, plain sacrilege and God-robbing is it, whatsoever is appointed through the madness of man, that God's ordinance should be violated and broken."^{Ad Felicem, Epist. 8.}

For the authority of the holy scripture is greater than all the perspicacity or quick sight of man's wit⁸, as St Augustine saith.

Father. But wherefore dost thou call the doctrine of transubstantiation a devilish error? *Son.* Because the devil, "which is a liar and the father of all lies," first of all invented this prodigious monster of transubstantiation, to corrupt the true doctrine of the Lord's supper left unto us in the holy scriptures and in the godly monuments of the ancient fathers, and breathed it into the breast of his chaplain, pope Innocent^{John viii.}

[³ Nos enim nova omnia, quæ Christus non docuit, jure damnamus; quia fidelibus via Christus est. Si igitur Christus non docuit quod docemus, etiam nos id detestabile judicamus.—Ambros. Op. Par. 1686—90. De Virgin. Lib. cap. vi. 28. Tom. II. col. 220.]

[⁴ Spiritus sancti doctrina est, quæ libris canonicis est prodita: contra quam, si quid statuatur concilia, nefas duco.—Hieron. in Epist. ad Gal. in Catal. Test. Verit. Genev. 1608. col. 201. In Jerome's works the editor has not succeeded in discovering the passage.]

[⁵ Uni fideli privato, si meliorem scripturæ auctoritatem aut rationem habeat, plus credendum est, quam toti concilio vel papæ.—Panorm. in Catal. Test. col. 1889. This sentence does not seem to be in Panormitan's work in the chapter mentioned.]

Perhaps the following is the second passage intended: ...Puto tamen quod si papa moveretur melioribus rationibus et auctoritatibus quam concilium, quod standum esset sententiæ suæ; nam et concilium potest errare.—Panorm. (N. de Tudesch.) sup. Decretal. Lib. Venet. Nur. et Basil. 1476-8. Lib. i. Tit. vi. Tom. I. fol. k. 2.

Nam in concernentibus fidem etiam dictum unius

privati esset præferendum dicto papæ, si ille moveretur melioribus auctoritatibus novi et veteris testamenti quam papa.—Id. ibid.]

[⁶ Μάρτυρας δεῖ λαβεῖν τὰς γραφάς. ἀμάρτυροι γὰρ αἱ ἐπιβολαὶ ἡμῶν καὶ αἱ ἐξηγήσεις ἀπιστοὶ εἰσιν.—Orig. Op. Par. 1733—59. In Jer. Hom. i. Tom. III. p. 129.]

[⁷ Adulterum est, impium est, sacrilegum est, quodcunque humano furore instituitur, ut dispositio divina violetur.—Cyp. Op. Oxon. 1682. Epist. xliiii. p. 83.]

[⁸ Passages to the effect of that cited in the text are very frequent in the voluminous works of Augustine; so that it is difficult to decide, when no reference is given, which precisely the author had in his mind. The following contains the substance of his quotation: Sed si divinarum scripturarum, earum scilicet quæ canonicæ in ecclesia nominantur, perspicua firmatur auctoritate, sine ulla dubitatione credendum est. Aliis vero testibus vel testimoniis, quibus aliquid credendum esse suadetur, tibi credere vel non credere liceat, quantum ea momenti ad faciendum fidem vel habere vel non habere perpendis.—August. Op. Par. 1679—1700. Lib. ad Paulin. seu Epist. clxvii. 4. Tom. II. col. 475.]

the third, which, being conceived with this most ungracious monster, was delivered thereof at the council Latronense; at the birth whereof were present more than a thousand papists, which gave this monster this monstrous name, "transubstantiation."

Father. What meanest thou by this word "transubstantiation?" *Son.* A conversion or changing of a thing from his own natural substance unto the substance of another creature, as if chalk should be changed into cheese, or a fox into a friar.

Father. Is the like thing found in the sacrament of Christ's body and blood? *Son.* So say the papists.

Father. What say they? *Son.* Thus say they, that by the virtue of these five words, *Hoc est enim corpus meum*, "this is my body," they at their masses convert and turn the substance of bread into the substance of the natural body of Christ: again, that by the virtue of those words, *Hic est enim calix sanguinis mei*, &c. "this is the cup or chalice of my blood," &c., the substance of wine is turned into the substance of that very blood of Christ which he shed for our sake on the altar of the cross; so that now there remaineth no more bread or wine, but the very natural, real, and substantial body and blood of Christ, which he received of the holy virgin Mary.

Father. Whatsoever the papists for their belly's sake prattle in this behalf, I am sure reason saith that there remaineth both bread and wine. For after the words of consecration, as they term them, we see, feel, taste, smell, savour, and receive both bread and wine. Yea, the bread after the consecration, if it be long kept, will mould, and stink, and breed full of worms: the wine also will lose her taste and colour, and wax sour and pale, as experience hath sufficiently taught. In consideration whereof, as I have heard, it is agreed among the papists, and set forth in their doctrine, that if the body of Christ (so term they the sacramental bread) should chance through the negligence of the priest to corrupt and putrify, a fire should be made, in the which that corrupt and rotten stuff should be consumed unto ashes, and the ashes to be reposed in the sacrary among the other reliques: again, that if the blood of Christ should fall upon the ground, the priest should lick it up with his tongue, and scrape the place where the blood fell, and the scrapings gathered together, burn them in the fire, and the ashes thereof also laid up among the reliques; and that the priest for this his negligence should do penance by the space of forty days: when who knoweth not that the true body of Christ is immortal, uncorruptible, and can by no means be any more subject to mortality or corruption? so far is it off that it can be consumed with fire and brent unto ashes, as St Paul saith: "Christ being raised from death dieth no more: death hath no more power over him. For as touching that he died, he died concerning sin once: and as touching that he liveth, he liveth unto God."

Son. Not only reason, but also the word of God and the ancient fathers of Christ's church, affirm both bread and wine to remain in the sacrament, and by no means know or grant any such monstrous transubstantiation as the papists feign.

Father. First tell me what the holy scripture saith in this behalf. *Son.* Christ, in the institution of the holy sacrament of his blessed body and precious blood, as both the evangelists and also St Paul testify, "took bread and gave thanks, brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said, Take, eat: this is my body which is betrayed for you. Do this in the remembrance of me." Now, who seeth not evidently that that which Christ took was very bread? That which he took he also brake. And that which he took and brake, he gave to his disciples. And of that which he took, brake, and gave to his disciples, he said, "Take, eat: this is my body which is betrayed for you." Here is it manifest and plain, that Christ both took, brake, and gave bread to his disciples, and they did eat of it, remaining still bread in substance, without any alteration or changing; and called the bread his body, as the manner of the scripture is to call the signs by the names of the things signified, that the things which the signs represent may the more stedfast remain and abide in the minds of the faithful receivers. If the substance of bread remain, where is then their transubstantiation?

Father. The papists grant that that was bread which Christ took into his hands; but they utterly deny that that was bread which he brake and delivered to his disciples.

What this word "transubstantiation" meaneth.

Reason denieth the doctrine of transubstantiation.



Rom. vi.

The old fathers never knew the popish doctrine of transubstantiation.

Matt. xxvi.
Mark xiv.
Luke xxii.
1 Cor. xi.

Note well.

Son. What was it then? *Father.* Christ's very natural body, say they, as it was born of Mary the virgin, and hanged on the cross.

Son. How became it the natural body of Christ? *Father.* Through the virtue and power of certain words which Christ spake.

Son. Which are they? *Father.* The papists are not yet fully agreed among themselves in this matter.

Son. It is a common thing for liars to vary in their tales, and one to tell one thing, and another another thing¹. But what say they? *Father.* Some affirm that Christ had consecrate the bread, and made it his body, with certain words which are not mentioned in the scripture, before he delivered the sacrament to his disciples, and said, "Take, eat; this is my body." For how could he have delivered his body to be eaten, if it had not been his body afore? Or how could he have said, "Take, eat; this is my body," if it had not been his body before he spake?

Son. At what time should Christ have spoken these words, wherewith he made the bread his body? *Father.* When he blessed or gave thanks, as they say. *Son.* But the words of Christ's blessing or thanksgiving are not contained in the word of God: it therefore followeth, that we have not the words of consecration which Christ used: it followeth also that these words, whereunto the papists stick with tooth and nail, *Hoc est enim corpus meum*, are not the very right words of the consecration; and therefore brag they of their transubstantiation in vain.

Father. Some say that Christ in his blessing or thanksgiving rehearsed these words, *Hoc est enim corpus meum*, first secretly and privately to himself, and so consecrated the bread and made it his body; and afterward, when he brake it and delivered it to his disciples, commanding them to take and eat, he openly pronounced those words again to his disciples, (I mean, *Hoc est enim corpus meum*.) both to certify them of the presence of his body, and also to declare unto them what words they also should afterward use in the consecration of the bread. *Son.* This thing is sooner said than proved. For whatsoever they speak in this behalf, it cometh out of their own idle brain, and not out of the word of God: and St Hierome saith, "That which hath not authority of the scriptures is despised with the same facility or easiness wherewith it is proved"².

Innocentius.
Comestor.
Thomas.

In Matt.
xxiii.

[¹ *Benedixit.* Cum ad prolationem verborum istorum, Hoc est corpus meum, Hic est sanguis meus, sacerdos conficiat, credibile judicatur, quod et Christus eadem verba dicendo confecit. Porro quidam dixerunt, quod Christus confecit, cum benedixit, literam construentes hoc ordine: Accipite panem, benedixit, subaudiendum est, 'dicens, Hoc est corpus meum,' et tunc fregit, et dedit, et ait: Accipite et comedite, et iteravit: Hoc est corpus meum. Prius ergo protulit illa verba, ut eis vim conficiendi tribueret: deinde protulit eadem, ut apostolos formam conficiendi doceret. Alii vero dixerunt, quod et sacramentum confecit, et formam instituit post benedictionem, cum dixit, Hoc est corpus meum; intelligentes illam benedictionem fuisse vel aliquod signum quod super panem impressit, vel aliquod verbum, quod super panem expressit. Quibus illud videtur obistere, quod prius fregit, quam dixerit, Hoc est corpus meum. Nec etiam est credibile, quod prius dederit quam confecerit. Sane dici potest, quod Christus virtute divina confecit; et postea formam expressit, sub qua posteri benedicent. Ipse namque per se virtute propria benedixit: nos autem ex illa virtute, quam indidit verbis.—Innocent. III. Op. Col. 1575. Myst. Miss. Lib. iv. cap. vi. Tom. I. p. 377.

Et nota quod in canone cum proferuntur hæc verba, Hoc est corpus meum, Hic est sanguis meus, ex virtute horum verborum fit transubstantiatio. Unde credibile est, cum Dominus eadem verba dixit, mutasse panem et vinum in carnem et sanguinem, et tunc eandem vim contulit Dominus verbis illis in posterum. Et propterea sic construenda est litera. Benedixit: subaudi: dicens, Hoc est corpus meum.

Et tunc fregit et dedit discipulis suis: et ait, Comedite. Et iteravit: Hoc est corpus meum. Vel forte tunc benedixit benedictione nobis non tradita: sed post ad institutionem apostolorum vis benedicendi tradita est a Domino verbis istis, Hoc est corpus meum.—Hist. Scolast. Pet. Comest. Par. 1513. Hist. Evang. cap. clii. fol. 237.

Quidam enim dixerunt, quod Christus, qui habebat potestatem excellentiæ in sacramentis, absque omni forma virtute divina confecit, et postea verba protulit, sub quibus alii deinceps consecrabant.....alii dicunt, quod confecit quidem sub aliqua forma verborum, non autem sub his, sed sub aliis verbis ignotis.....alii dicunt, quod confecit sub eisdem verbis, sed ea bis protulit, primo tacite, cum benedixit; secundo aperte, cum distribuit, ut formam consecrandi aliis traderet.....alii dicunt, et melius, quod Christus ea semel tantum protulit, et eis semel prolatis consecravit, et formam consecrandi dedit. hoc enim participium, *dicens*, non importat concomitantiam solum ad hoc verbum, *dedit*; sed ad hoc cum aliis prædictis, ut sit sensus, Dum benedixit, et fregit, et dedit discipulis, hæc verba protulit, Accipite, &c. Vel secundum quosdam, evangelista non observat ordinem verborum quo a Domino fuerunt prolata. ordo enim fuit talis: Accipite panem, et benedixit, dicens, Accipite, &c.—Thom. Aquin. Op. Venet. 1595. In Lib. Sentent. iv. Dist. viii. Quæst. ii. Art. 1. Tom. VII. fol. 42. See also Tert. Pars Summ. Theol. Quæst. lxxv. Art. 7. Tom. XII. fols. 243, 4.]

[² Hoc quia de scripturis non habet auctoritatem, eadem facilitate contemnitur, qua probatur.—Hieron. Op. 1693—1706. Comm. Lib. iv. in Matt. cap. xxiv. Tom. IV. Pars 1. col. 112.]

In Titum. Again: "Without authority of the scriptures, garrulity or prattling and vain jangling hath no faith, or is not to be credited¹." This dream, therefore, of the papists is of no force to prove their prodigious transubstantiation.

Father. Some say that Christ made the bread his body by rehearsing these words, *Hoc est enim corpus meum*, once for all; yea, and that with a clear, evident, and open voice; and yet so that neither this word *hoc*, nor this word *est*, nor this word *enim*, nor this word *corpus*, nor yet this syllable *me*, doth much in the matter; but this last syllable *um* maketh up all the market, in the which, say they, all the virtue of the consecration dependeth and resteth; so that, *um* being once pronounced, the matter is full finished, the bread is dispatched, a transubstantiation is made, the substance of bread is turned into the substance of Christ's corporal, real, substantial, and natural body²; so that, although that was bread which Christ took in his hands, yet that which he brake and delivered to his disciples was not bread, say they, but the very natural body of Christ, and is now handled of the priest's hands, broken, and torn on pieces with the teeth of the faithful, according to the doctrine of pope Nicolas the second³.

Son. That it was very bread which Christ brake, the order of the text doth most evidently declare. But that bread remaineth in the action of the Lord's supper not only before, but also after the consecration, as they term it, St Paul proveth manifestly by these his words: "The bread which we break," saith he, "is it not the communion," that is to say, the partaking, "of the body of Christ?" Here the holy apostle calleth the mystery of Christ's body "bread," and saith, "that we break bread;"

1 Cor. x. meaning that in the Lord's supper we both break and eat bread. The blessed apostle knew nothing of this prodigious monster, "transubstantiation," which the papists, more than a thousand years after, brought forth, and delivered it to the church of Christ; and therefore he termeth bread, bread; yea, and that after it is made the mystery of Christ's body. Likewise in another place, where he entreateth largely of the sacrament of the

1 Cor. xi. body and blood of Christ, he calleth after the words of consecration the mystery of Christ's body "bread," three times; which thing he would never have done, if he had known that there had been any transubstantiation after the words of consecration, I mean, changing of the substance of bread into the substance of the natural body of Christ. But not only St Paul, but blessed Luke also termeth the mystery of the Lord's body "bread," whensoever he maketh mention of the supper of the Lord in his chronicle of the apostles' acts.

Acts ii. xx. Now, as touching the wine, it is most manifest also that there is no transubstantiation, (I mean, changing of the substance of wine into the substance of the natural blood of Christ,) by the virtue of these words, *Hic est enim calix sanguinis mei*, &c. For Christ himself, after the words of consecration, as I may speak after the accustomed manner, called the mystery of his blood "the fruit of the vine-tree." Now, who knoweth not, that not the blood of Christ, but wine, is the fruit of the vine? If the mystery, therefore, of Christ's blood be the fruit of the vine-tree, then is it not the natural blood of Christ, as the papists teach, but natural wine. And here falleth down to the ground, yea, even unto hell, from whence it first of all came, the wicked doctrine of transubstantiation. For we have learned of the very words of Christ and of St Paul, and likewise of blessed Luke, that there is transubstantiation neither in the bread nor yet in the wine.

Matt. xxvi.

[¹ Et quidem sine scripturarum auctoritate garulitas non haberet fidem, nisi viderentur perversam doctrinam etiam divinis testimoniis roborare.—Id. Comm. in Epist. ad Tit. cap. i. col. 420.]

[² See Decret. Gratiani, Par. 1583. Decr. Tert. Pars, De Consecr. Gloss. in Dist. ii. can. 40. col. 2381. *Significatur*, et licet verba successive proferrantur; non tamen successive consecratio fit: sed in uno instanti corruptum panis, scilicet in ultimo instanti prolationis verborum: et licet panis sit corpus compositum, momentanea est tamen ejus corruptio.]

[³ Berengarius was compelled to recant before a council held at Rome (A. D. 1059) under Nicolas II. In his abjuration we find: Ego Berengarius.....

profiteor de sacramento dominicæ mensæ eam fidem me tenere, quam dominus et venerabilis papa Nicolaus, et hæc sancta synodus auctoritate evangelica et apostolica tenendam tradidit, mihique firmavit: scilicet panem et vinum, quæ in altari ponuntur, post consecrationem non solum sacramentum, sed etiam verum corpus et sanguinem Domini nostri Jesu Christi esse: et sensualiter, non solum sacramento, sed in veritate, manibus sacerdotum tractari, et frangi, et fidelium dentibus atteri.—Concil. Rom. in Concil. Stud. Labbei. Lut. Par. 1671—2. Tom. IX. col. 1101. See also Pet. Lombard. Lib. Sentent. Col. Agrip. 1576. Lib. iv. Dist. xii. fol. 356.]