

Father. Some affirm that the disciples had received both bread and wine, before Christ had recited the words of consecration, as they call them: and then must it needs follow, that those elements of bread and wine, which the disciples had already received, were not transubstantiated, nor turned into the natural body and blood of Christ; except the adversaries will say that Christ did consecrate and transubstantiate them after they were received of the disciples.

Son. Of the mystery of Christ's blood it is plain and evident, by the words of blessed St Mark, that the disciples received it before the words of consecration were pronounced. For thus writeth he: "He took the cup, and when he had given thanks, he took it to them; and they all drank of it. And he said unto them, This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many. Verily I say unto you, I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine, until that day that I drink it new in the kingdom of God." And the same may also be thought of the mystery of Christ's body, I mean, that they did eat the mystery of Christ's body before the words of consecration, as they call them, were pronounced. But howsoever it was, they cannot stablish nor ground their doctrine of transubstantiation by the word of God, as we have sufficiently tofore heard.

Father. Do not the ancient writers and doctors of Christ's church teach and allow this doctrine of transubstantiation? *Son.* Nothing less. For they did never so much as once dream of it, but always taught the contrary, as we may see in their books which yet remain.

Father. Let me hear some authorities alleged out of the ancient writers concerning this matter. *Son.* First of all Origen, that ancient writer in the Greek church, cometh and offereth himself unto us as an enemy of this wicked doctrine of transubstantiation, whose words these are: "If any thing enter into the mouth, it goeth away into the belly, and is avoided into the draught; yea, and that meat which is sanctified by the word of God and prayer, concerning the matter thereof, it goeth away into the belly, and is avoided into the draught. But for the prayer which is added unto it, for the proportion of the faith, it is made profitable, making the mind able to perceive and see that which is profitable. For it is not the material substance of bread, [but the word which is spoken upon it, that is profitable to the man that eateth it not unworthily. And this I mean of the typical and symbolical body⁴."

Here Origen affirmeth plainly, that in the Lord's supper the bread, which he calleth the typical and symbolical, that is to say, the figurative and the sacramental body of Christ, remaineth, yea, and that after it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer; and that the material substance thereof is received, digested, and avoided, as the material substance of other bread and meat is; which could not be, if there were no material substance of bread at all remaining. Who seeth not now, how directly Origen confoundeth, yea, condemneth the fantastical doctrine of the papists, concerning that monster of transubstantiation, which deny any substance of bread to remain in the sacrament?

That golden-mouthed doctor, St John Chrysostom, cometh next in order, and saith: "Before the bread be hallowed, we call it bread; but, the grace of God sanctifying it by the means of the priest, it is delivered now from the name of bread, and esteemed worthy to be called Christ's body, although the nature of the bread tarry in it still⁵."

Here the holy doctor saith plainly, that the nature of bread remain still in the

[⁴ Εἰ δὲ πᾶν τὸ εἰσπορευόμενον εἰς τὸ στόμα, εἰς κοιλίαν χωρεῖ, καὶ εἰς ἀφεδρώνα ἐκβάλλεται, καὶ τὸ ἀγιαζόμενον βρώμα διὰ λόγου Θεοῦ καὶ ἐντεύξεως κατ' αὐτὸ μὲν τὸ ὕλικόν εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν χωρεῖ, καὶ εἰς ἀφεδρώνα ἐκβάλλεται· κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἐπιγενομένην αὐτῷ εὐχήν, κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως, ἀφέλιμον γίνεται, καὶ τῆς τοῦ νοῦ αἰτίου διαβλήψεως, ὀρώντος ἐπὶ τὸ ὠφέλοῦν· καὶ οὐχ ἡ ὕλη τοῦ ἄρτου, ἀλλ' ὁ ἐπ' αὐτῷ εἰρημένος λόγος ἐστὶν ὁ ὠφελῶν τὸν μὴ ἀναξίως τοῦ Κυρίου ἐσθίσοντα αὐτόν, καὶ ταῦτα μὲν περὶ τοῦ τυπικοῦ καὶ συμβολικοῦ σώματος.—Origen. Op. Par. 1733—59.

Comm. in Matt. Tom. xi. cap. xv. Tom. III. pp. 499, 500.]

[⁵ Sicut enim antequam sanctificetur panis, panem nominamus; divina autem illum sanctificante gratia, mediante sacerdote, liberatus est quidem ab appellatione panis, dignus autem habitus Dominici corporis appellatione, etiamsi natura panis in ipso permansit, et non duo corpora, sed unum corpus Filii prædicamus.—Chrysost. Op. Par. 1718—38. Epist. ad Cæsar. Monach. Tom. III. p. 744. The genuineness of this epistle has been, but without sufficient ground, impugned.]

Whether the old doctors taught transubstantiation.

In Matt. cap. xv.

Ad Cæsar. Monach.

Lord's supper, although it be called Christ's body. If the nature of bread remain still, where is then the popish transubstantiation become? O too much vain and false doctrine!

Theodoretus, an eloquent and great learned man, writeth on this manner: "He that called his natural body corn and bread, and also named himself a vine-tree, even the same hath honoured the symbols (that is, the sacramental signs) which are seen, with the names of his body and blood; not changing indeed the nature itself, but adding grace to the nature¹." Again he saith: "Neither do the mystical signs after the consecration depart from their nature. For they abide still in their former substance, both in figure and form, and may be both seen and touched even as before²." What can be spoken more plainly against the doctrine of the popish transubstantiation? If the nature and substance of bread remain still after the consecration, who seeth not how falsely the papists lie, which affirm that the substance of bread in the sacrament abide not, but is altered and changed into the substance of the natural body of Christ?

Divers other Greek writers might here be alleged for the confirmation of our doctrine against the papists' monstrous and misshapen child transubstantiation, begotten and born at Rome; but let these suffice for this present. Only this one thing I will add, that the Greeks with all the east church could never be allured, moved, enticed, and brought to receive this doctrine of transubstantiation, being so lewd, unsavoury, unreasonable, monstrous, wicked, worthy to be laughed at, and so utterly estranged from the writings both of the apostles and of the ancient fathers, although divers ways and at divers times attempted of the subtle and wily papists. For at a certain council holden at Florence under Eugenius the fourth, bishop of Rome, about the year of our Lord a thousand four hundred thirty and one, the pope with his adherents sought all means possible to bring the Greeks and all the east church to confess with the church of Rome the doctrine of transubstantiation, and that after the words of consecration the substance of bread and wine is turned into the substance of the natural body and blood of Christ, no bread nor wine remaining, but only the accidents of bread and wine: notwithstanding, the Greeks utterly refused it, and would by no means receive, admit, approve, and allow such and so new and strange doctrine, brought in of late without the authority of the holy scriptures, and hitherto unknown in those churches which were founded and edified by the apostles and by the fathers of the primitive church; insomuch that, in the letters of mutual consent concerning the proceeding of the Holy Ghost, made between the Greek and Latin churches, the Greeks above all things did most earnestly take heed, and gave diligent warning, that there should be no mention made in those letters of any agreement or consent between them and the Romanists in the late-invented doctrine of transubstantiation³.

Father. This declareth evidently that transubstantiation is but a new invention, and unknown of the best and purest churches; and therefore right well worthy to be banished out of all churches. *Son.* It is truth.

Father. But what say the ancient fathers of the Latin church? Do they allow this doctrine of transubstantiation? *Son.* Nothing less. For this matter was also

[¹ See below, page 288, note 6, where this passage is more fully given.]

[² Οὐδὲ γὰρ μετὰ τὸν ἀγιασμὸν τὰ μυστικά σύμβολα τῆς οὐκείας ἐξίσταται φύσεως. μένει γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς προτέρας οὐσίας, καὶ τοῦ σχήματος, καὶ τοῦ εἶδους, καὶ ὁρατὰ ἐστὶ, καὶ ἀπτά, οἷα καὶ πρότερον ἦν.—Theodoret. Op. Lut. Par. 1642-84. Inconfus. Dial. II. Tom. IV. p. 85.]

[³ Ceterum concilio huic objicimus generale et œcumenicum concilium Florentiæ habitum sub Eugenio quarto Pontifice Romano, qui ibi interfuit: et aderat una imperator Græcorum, cum Patriarcha Constantinopolitano et multis episcopis orientalibus. In quo concilio Græca Latine est conjuncta, et consenserunt in dissidio de Spiritu Sancto. Atque in gestis illius concilii videre licet, posteaquam inter orientales et Latinos convenisset de quibusdam articulis,

voluisse papam ulterius progredi, et illos adigere ad transubstantiationem tractandam, et recipiendam ut Latini sentiebant. Ibi Græci reluctati sunt, et de ea re agere noluerunt, neque perpelli ullis argumentis potuerunt, ut de ea consensus iniretur. Cumque unionis literæ essent formandæ et publicandæ, prorsus caverunt, ut hujus rei nulla mentio fieret; quod et observatum est, ut patet in bulla Eugenii, quæ incipit, Exultent cœli, et lætetur terra.—Loc. Com. Pet. Mart. Heid. 1613. Class. IV. cap. x. 59. pp. 867, 8. See also Concil. Flor. in Concil. Stud. Labbei. Lut. Par. 1671—2. Tom. XIII. cols. 491, &c.; and Covell, Account of the Greek Church, Camb. 1722. chap. v. pp. 138-9. The full history of this council may be seen in Vera Hist. Union. non Veræ, sive Conc. Flor. Narr. per Sylv. Sguropulum, a Creyghton. Hagæ-Com. 1660.]

unknown to them, as we may see in their writings. Ireneus, that learned and ancient father, saith thus: "The bread wherein we give thanks, which is of the earth, receiving the calling of God, is now no common bread, but the eucharist," that is to say, the bread of thanksgiving, "consisting of two things, earthly and heavenly⁴." Again he saith: "When the cup mingled and the bread broken receive the word of God, it is made the eucharist (or sacrament) of the body and blood of Christ, of which the substance of our flesh is stayed and increased⁵." Here saith Ireneus plainly, that the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ consisteth of two things, one heavenly and the other earthly. What is this earthly thing, but very bread? Which thing he declareth manifestly, in that he saith, it is of the earth, and nourisheth our bodies, as other bread doth. If the bread of thanksgiving be an earthly thing, and feedeth our bodies no less than all other bread doth which we use, who seeth not then that the substance of bread remaineth? except peradventure the papists will say, that we be fed with the accidents of bread, which is a thing impossible and against both nature and reason. If bread remain, where is then their transubstantiation?

St Cyprian, that old doctor and blessed martyr, saith: "The Lord calleth the bread, being compact together of many corns, his body; and he nameth the wine, being pressed out of many grapes, and made into wine, his blood⁶." Again he saith: "The hallowed bread entered into the wicked mouth⁷." Item: "Drink sanctified into the blood of Christ brast out of the defiled bowels⁸." Here St Cyprian openly affirmeth that that which Christ called his body was very bread, even such bread as is made of corn: again, that that which he named his blood was very wine, even such wine as is pressed out of many grapes. What can be spoken more plainly against the wicked doctrine of transubstantiation?

Moreover Gelasius, a bishop of Rome—of Rome, I say, but yet before Rome was infected with the pestiferous breath of that most poisonous old serpent, the father of all errors and lies—writeth of the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ against the heretic Eutyches on this wise: "The sacrament of the body and blood of Christ which we receive is a godly thing, for the which also through the same we are made partakers of the divine nature; and yet nevertheless the substance or nature of bread and wine do not cease or depart and go away⁹." Can any thing be spoken more plainly against the error of the popish transubstantiation, than this which a bishop of Rome writeth? Would God all his successors had walked in the same simplicity of God's Spirit, and had with no less dexterity and uprightness¹⁰ handled the holy scriptures! Then should never so many pestilent errors and heresies have crept into the church. For what can any man say more to overthrow the doctrine of the papistical transubstantiation, than this bishop of Rome uttereth? which with most manifest words affirmeth, that in the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ the substance of bread and wine remaineth, and goeth not away. If the substance of bread and wine remain, and do not depart, where is then transubstantiation become?

Again, St Austin, one of the best writers among the doctors of Christ's church, saith thus: "That which ye have seen is the bread and the cup, which also your

[⁴ Ὡς γὰρ ἀπὸ γῆς ἄρτος προσλαμβανόμενος τῆν ἐκκλησίαν τοῦ Θεοῦ, οὐκέτι κοινὸς ἄρτος ἐστίν, ἀλλ' εὐχαριστία, ἐκ δύο πραγμάτων συνεστηκυῖα, ἐπιγείου τε καὶ οὐρανοῦ.—Iren. Cont. Hær. Lib. Quinque. Par. 1710. Lib. iv. cap. xviii. 5. p. 251.]

[⁵ Ὅποτε οὖν καὶ τὸ κεκραμένον ποτήριον, καὶ ὁ γεγραμὸς ἄρτος ἐπίδραται τὸν λόγον τοῦ Θεοῦ, καὶ γίνεται ἡ εὐχαριστία σῶμα Χριστοῦ, ἐκ τούτων δὲ αὐξεῖ καὶ συνίσταται ἡ τῆς σαρκὸς ἡμῶν ὑπόστασις.—Id. Lib. v. cap. ii. 3. p. 294.]

[⁶ Nam quando Dominus corpus suum panem vocat de multorum granorum adunatione congestum; populum nostrum, quem portabat, indicat adunatum: et quando sanguinem suum vinum appellat, de botris atque acinis plurimis expressum atque in unum coactum; gregem item nostrum significat, commixtione adunatæ multitudinis copulatum.—Cypr. Op. Oxon. 682. Epist. lxxix. ad Magn. p. 182.]

[⁷ Necdum Judas ad veterem vitam pertinens,

diabolo invadente et occupante animum ejus egregi cogebatur; sed ubi sacrum cibum mens perfida tetigit, et sceleratum os panis sanctificatus intravit, parricidialis animus vim tanti sacramenti non sustinens, quasi palea de area exsufflatus, et præceps cucurrit ad conditionem et pretium, ad desperationem et laqueum.—Id. De Cœn. Dom. (Arnold. Abbat. Bonavall.) Appendix, p. 39.]

[⁸ Sanctificatus in Domini sanguine potus, de pollutis visceribus erupit.—Id. de Laps. p. 132.]

[⁹ Certe sacramenta quæ sumimus corporis et sanguinis Christi, divina res est, propter quod et per eadem divinæ efficacum consortes naturæ, et tamen esse non desinit substantia vel natura panis et vini.—Gelas. Episc. Rom. adv. Eutychem et Nestor. in Mag. Biblioth. Vet. Patr. Col. Agrip. 1618—22. Tom. V. Pars III. p. 671.]

[¹⁰ The folio reads *unrightness*.]

In Sentent.
Prosperi.

eyes do shew you. But that faith requireth to be instructed, the bread is the body of Christ, and the cup his blood.¹ Again he saith: "The sacrifice of the church consisteth of two things, of the visible kind of the element, and of the invisible flesh and blood of our Lord Jesu Christ, both of the sacrament, and of the thing signified by the sacrament; even as the person of Christ consisteth of God and man, forasmuch as he is very God and very man. For every thing containeth in it the very nature of those things whereof it consisteth. Now the sacrifice of the church consisteth of two things, of the sacrament, and of the thing thereby signified, that is to say, the body of Christ. Therefore there is both the sacrament, and the thing of the sacrament, which is Christ's body.²" St Austin saith here plainly, that that which we see at the Lord's table with our corporal eyes is bread; and that, as the person of Christ consisteth of two natures, that is to say, of his manhood and of his Godhead; even so the sacrament consisteth of two natures, of the elements of bread and wine, and of the body and blood of Christ. If the elements of bread and wine remain, if that which we see with our eyes be bread, who then perceiveth not evidently the manifest error of the popish transubstantiation, and that whatsoever the papists teach in this behalf is plain falsehood and lies?

Bertramme, a great learned man, among many other, hath these words, writing of the Lord's supper: "As touching the substance of the creatures" (he speaketh of the mysteries of Christ's body and blood), "look what they were before the consecration, even the very same do they remain still afterward. Bread and wine were they before; in the which kind also, being now consecrate, they are seen to continue and remain³." What can be spoken more plainly against the popish transubstantiation, than to affirm that bread and wine do remain and continue in the sacrament, not only before the consecration, but also after the consecration?

Many more, yea, almost infinite authorities might be gathered out of the books of the godly ancient learned writers, which do manifestly impugn and condemn this wicked error of the papistical transubstantiation; but these tofore alleged may seem to any indifferent person abundantly to suffice. And wherefore should I labour so greatly with the testimonies of the best and most ancient writers to subvert and overthrow this monstrous transubstantiation, seeing that the papists themselves in their popish mass call the sacrament "bread," yea, and that after the consecration⁴? Neither is this to be passed over with silence, that certain among the papists themselves could very hardly brook and digest this strange doctrine of so monstrous transubstantiation.

For that subtle doctor, Joannes Scotus, otherwise called Duns, one of the subtlest disputers and chief champions among the papists, freely confesseth that the article of transubstantiation is neither expressed in the creed of the apostles, nor yet in the other ancient and old creeds; but now in these latter times declared, set forth, defined, and determined of the church (he speaketh of the Romish synagogue) under pope Innocentius the third, in the council Latronense, in the year of our Lord one thousand two hundred and fifteen. And he saith moreover, that "the words of the scripture might be expounded more easily and more plainly without transubstantiation; but the church did choose this sense (which is more hard), being moved thereto (as it seemeth) chiefly because that of the sacraments men ought to hold as the holy church of Rome holdeth;

In Sentent.
dist. xi. lib. iv.
quest. 3.

[¹ Quod ergo videtis, panis est et calix; quod vobis etiam oculi vestri renuntiant: quod autem fides vestra postulat instruenda, panis est corpus Christi, calix sanguis Christi.—August. Op. Par. 1679—1700. Serm. cclxxii. ad Infant. Tom. V. cols. 1103, 4.]

[² Hoc est quod dicimus: hoc modis omnibus approbare contendimus, sacrificium scilicet ecclesie duobus confici, duobus constare, visibili elementorum specie, et invisibili Domini nostri Jesu Christi carne et sanguine, sacramento, et re sacramenti, id est corpore Christi, sicut Christi persona constat et conficitur Deo et homine; cum ipse Christus verus sit Deus, et verus homo: quia omnis res illarum rerum naturam et veritatem in se continet, ex quibus conficitur. Conficitur autem sacrificium ecclesie sa-

cramento et re sacramenti, id est corpore Christi. Est igitur sacramentum et res sacramenti, id est corpus Christi.—Id. in Lib. Sent. Prosp. in Decret. Gratiani. Par. 1583. Decr. Tert. Pars. De Consecr. Dist. ii. can. 48. cols. 2387, 8.]

[³ Nam secundum creaturarum substantiam, quod fuerunt ante consecrationem, hoc et postea consistunt. Panis et vinum prius extitere, in qua etiam specie jam consecrata permanere videntur.—Ratramn. Lib. De Corp. et Sang. Dom. Oxon. 1838. cap. liv. p. 27.]

[⁴ Hic quinque cruces fiant...Quarta super panem tantum. (This is after the consecration.) Missal. ad Us. et Consuet. Sarum. Par. 1527. Canon Miss. fols. 158, 9.]

but it holdeth that bread is transubstantiated or turned into the body, and wine into the blood of Christ, as it is shewed⁵.”

Furthermore, Gabriel Biel, one of the chief captains among the school writers, agreeth with Duns, speaking on this manner: “It is to be noted that, although it be plainly taught in the scripture that the body of Christ is truly contained and received of the faithful under the kinds of bread and wine, yet, how the body of Christ is there, whether by conversion of any thing into it, or without conversion the body is there with the bread, both the substance and accidents of bread remaining there still, it is not found expressed in the canon of the bible. Notwithstanding, forasmuch as of the sacraments men must hold as the holy church of Rome holdeth, as it is written, *De hæreticis, Ad abolendam*; and that church holdeth and hath determined that the bread is transubstantiated into the body of Christ, and the wine into his blood; therefore is this opinion received of all catholics, that the substance of bread remaineth not, but really and truly is turned, transubstantiated, and changed into the substance of the body of Christ⁶.”

Again, Comeracensis, a school writer, affirmeth plainly, that it is more probable and more to be allowed, yea, and more agreeable to the truth of God's word, to grant that in the eucharist, that is to say, in the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, there remain very bread and very wine, and not the accidents alone, than otherwise, if the church (he meaneth the Romish church) had not determined the contrary⁷.

Who seeth not now evidently, that the doctrine of transubstantiation is new and lately sprung up, not taught in the holy scriptures, unknown to the ancient fathers, not heard of in the godly old councils, lately thrust into the church of Christ of the Romish bishop and of his adherents by violence and tyranny, and now defended and maintained still of the papists, not with the holy scriptures and ancient authorities, but with fire and fagot, sword and halter?

Notwithstanding the papists themselves, namely, such as had any judgment at all, grant and confess, that it is more easy, more plain, more probable, more to be allowed, yea, and more agreeable to the truth of God's word, to affirm and believe that the substance of bread and wine remaineth in the sacrament, than otherwise, if the church of Rome had not determined the contrary; from whose trifling traditions to dissent they thought it more than double wickedness.

[⁵ Respondeo, quod communiter tenetur, quod nec panis manet.....nec annihilatur, vel resolvitur in materiam primam.....sed convertitur in corpus Christi.....Principaliter autem videtur movere, quod de sacramentis tenendum est, sicut tenet sancta Romana ecclesia, sicut habetur Extrâ de hæreticis, *Ad abolendam*. Nunc autem ipsa tenet panem transubstantiari in corpus, et vinum in sanguinem, sicut manifeste habetur Extrâ de Sum. Trinit. et fide, cap. Firmiter credimus, §. Una vero.....dicendum quod ecclesia declaravit istum intellectum esse de veritate fidei in illo symbolo edito sub Innocent. III. in Concilio Lateranensi. Firmiter credimus, &c. sicut allegatum est superius; ubi explicite ponitur veritas aliquorum credendorum, magis explicite quam habebatur in symbolo apostolorum, vel Athanasii, vel Niceni. Et breviter, quidquid ibi dicitur esse credendum, tenendum est esse de substantia fidei: et hoc post istam declarationem solemnem factam ab ecclesia. Et si quæras quare voluit ecclesia eligere istum intellectum ita difficilem hujus articuli, cum verba scripturæ possent salvari secundum intellectum facilem, et veriolem secundum apparentiam de hoc articulo: dico, &c.—Joan. Duns Scot. Op. Lugd. 1639. In Lib. iv. Sentent. Dist. xi. Quæst. 3. Tom. VIII. pp. 616, 18, 19. See also Tom. XI. Pars II. p. 670.]

[⁶ Circa quod notandum quod quamvis expresse tradatur in scriptura, quod corpus Christi veraciter sub speciebus panis continetur et a fidelibus sumitur: ut patuit lectione præcedente: tamen quomodo

ibi sit Christi corpus, an per conversionem alicujus in ipsum, an sine conversione incipiat esse corpus Christi cum pane, manentibus substantia et accidentibus panis: non invenitur expressum in canone bibliæ. Unde de hoc antiquitus fuerunt diversæ opiniones.....Sed nunc opinio tertia ab omnibus doctoribus catholicis acceptatur: scilicet quod substantia panis non manet: sed realiter veraciter in substantiam corporis Christi convertitur, transubstantiatur seu commutatur. Tum quia de sacramentis tenendum est sicut tenet sancta Romana ecclesia: ut habetur de hæreticis *Ad abolendam*. Nunc autem ipsa tenet et determinavit panem transubstantiari in corpus Christi et vinum in sanguinem.—Gab. Biel. Canon. Missæ Expos. Basil. 1515. Lect. xl. fol. 94. 2.]

[⁷ Tertia opinio fuit quod substantia panis remanet: et hoc potest dupliciter imaginari.....quicquid tamen sit de hoc, patet quod ille modus est possibilis, nec repugnat rationi nec auctoritati bibliæ. imo est facilius ad intelligendum, &c. Quarta opinio communior est, quod substantia panis non remanet sed simpliciter desinit esse. Cujus possibilitas patet, quia non est Deo impossibile quod illa substantia subito desinat esse: quamvis non esset possibile creata virtute. Et licet ita esse non sequatur evidenter ex scriptura, nec etiam videre meo ex determinatione ecclesiæ; quia tamen magis favet ei, et communi opinionii sanctorum et doctorum; ideo teneo eam.—Quæst. Pet. de Alliaco Card. Camerac. sup. Lib. Sentent. Par. Lib. iv. Quæst. vi. Art. 2. fol. 265.]

But how can this their doctrine of transubstantiation stand with this saying of St Austin? "The word cometh unto the element, and thereof is made a sacrament!"

Every sacrament consisteth of the word and of the element.

Here learn we of St Austin, that every sacrament doth consist of two things, that is to say, of the word and of the element. Now is the Lord's supper a sacrament: it followeth therefore that it consisteth of the word and of the element. The word of this sacrament is this: "Take, eat: this is my body, which is betrayed for you. Do this in the remembrance of me." Now must this word have his element, which indeed is bread, and not the accidents of bread, as the papists teach. Again, the word of the other part of the sacrament is this: "Take, drink of this, all ye. This cup is a new testament in my blood," &c. Now must this word also have his element, which indeed is wine, and not the accidents of wine, as the papists hold. And who knoweth not that an element is a thing, that is to say, a substance, and not the accident of a thing? Who perceiveth not now that the papists, teaching this doctrine of transubstantiation, do utterly corrupt and destroy the sacrament, and make it no sacrament in deed; forasmuch as they take away the element, which is bread and wine, from the word? He that would take away water from the sacrament of baptism, which is the element of that sacrament, should he leave baptism a perfect sacrament? Even so in like manner he, that goeth about to pluck from the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ the substance of bread and wine, destroyeth utterly the aforesaid sacrament, and, to say the truth, maketh it no sacrament. We may therefore conclude truly and justly, that the doctrine of transubstantiation, as I said before, is a papistical, wicked, and devilish error.

The doctrine of transubstantiation destroyeth the sacrament of Christ's body and blood.

Father. God root out all errors once out of his church, that we may walk only in the truth of his holy word! *Son.* Amen. I nothing doubt of this matter. For this prophecy of the Lord Jesu shall unfeignedly be fulfilled, yea, and that shortly: "Every plant that my heavenly Father hath not planted shall be plucked up by the roots."

Matt. xv.

Father. What is the second error? *Son.* The second error is the doctrine of the papists concerning the corporal presence of Christ in the sacrament, as he was born of Mary the virgin, and hanged on the cross.

Of the corporal presence of Christ in the sacrament.

Father. This must needs follow of the doctrine of transubstantiation. For if the substance of bread and wine be turned into the substance of the natural body and blood of Christ, then must this doctrine also be true, that Christ is in the sacrament really, naturally, substantially, corporally, &c.; yea, that the sacrament is the true, real, natural, corporal, and substantial body of Christ. *Son.* You say truth. But as the doctrine of transubstantiation is vain and false, as we have even now heard both by the holy scriptures, and also by the authorities of the ancient fathers; so likewise the doctrine of Christ's corporal presence in the sacrament [is] most vain, false, and erroneous.

Father. In that the papists say it is the very same body, that was born of Mary the virgin and hanged on the cross, methink they greatly overshoot themselves. For who knoweth not that the body of Christ, which he received of Mary the virgin, and died for us on the altar of the cross, was a mortal body? But that body is now become immortal, uncorruptible, glorious, &c. If they then deliver that self-same body, as it was born of Mary the virgin and hanged on the cross, to the communicants, so followeth it that they deliver a mortal body; and by this means should it come to pass that Christ hath two bodies, one mortal here in earth at the distribution of the sacrament, and another immortal in heaven, sitting on the right hand of God the Father. *Son.* The papists mean, that in the sacrament is contained the very self-same body, that was born of Mary the virgin and died for us on the altar of the cross, the qualities only changed, as mortality into immortality, corruption into uncorruption, &c.

Father. And is Christ in the sacrament with his glorified and immortal body, as he is in heaven? *Son.* Nothing less. For that manifestly fighteth with the truth of Christ's body, and plainly stablisheth the heresy of the Marcionites. It is proper to

[¹ August. Op. Par. 1679—1700. In Johan. | col. 703. See Vol. I. page 12, note 1.]
Evang. cap. xv. Tractat. lxxx. 3. Tom. III. Pars II. |

God alone to be in all or in divers places at once; which property no creature hath, no, not angel. Therefore, forasmuch as the body of Christ, although immortal and glorified, is, remaineth, and abideth still a creature, and is not swallowed up, as I may so speak, of the divine nature, but, being joined to the divine nature, abideth still a creature, and very man; it therefore followeth most certainly that Christ's body, taken up into heaven, neither is, neither can be, both in heaven and in earth at once.

And we are taught in the articles of the Christian faith, and throughout the whole bible, that as Christ is ascended into heaven, so likewise shall he there remain, as concerning his corporal presence, unto the day of judgment, as St Peter saith: "Jesus Christ must receive heaven, until the time that all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began, be restored again." Acts iii. And the angels said to the apostles at Christ's ascension: "Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? This Jesus, which is taken up from you into heaven, shall so come even as ye have seen him go into heaven." Acts i. And St Paul, entreating of the sacrament, saith: "As often as ye shall eat this bread, and drink of this cup, ye shall shew the Lord's death till he come." I Cor. xi. In this one sentence of the holy apostle it manifestly appeareth, that Christ is not corporally in the sacrament, as the papists teach. For he commandeth us to eat and drink those holy mysteries in remembrance of the Lord's death till he come, meaning, unto the judgment: whereby we may plainly learn that Christ is not there corporally, really, substantially, naturally, &c., as the adversaries teach, but in heaven only, and there shall remain in the glory of his Father, until that great and fearful day of judgment come. And in the mean season, as often as we shall be partakers of that holy bread and cup, we shall call to remembrance the death of the Lord Christ, and all the benefits that we have received thereby, and give most humble thanks for the same to God the Father.

Father. Is this then a true doctrine, that Christ is corporally in heaven only, and in none other place? *Son.* Yea, verily.

Father. Let me hear it proved by the word of God. *Son.* Our Saviour Christ himself saith: "Ye have the poor always with you; but me shall ye not have always." Matt. xxvi. "I go to prepare a place for you. And if I go to prepare a place for you, I will come again and receive you even unto myself, that where I am, there ye may be also." John xiv. "If ye loved me, ye would rejoice, because I said, I go unto the Father." John xvi. "Now I go my way to him that sent me, and none of you asketh me whither I go. But because I have said such things unto you, your hearts are full of sorrow. Nevertheless I tell you the truth: it is expedient for you that I go away. For if I go not away, the Comforter will not come unto you. But if I depart, I will send him unto you." "I went out from the Father, and came into the world: again, I leave the world, and go to the Father." St Mark saith: "When the Lord had spoken unto them, he was received into heaven, and is set down on the right hand of God." Mark xvi. Blessed Luke saith: "It came to pass, as Christ blessed them, he departed from them, and was carried up into heaven." Rom. viii. St Paul saith: "It is Christ which died, yea, rather which is risen again, which is also on the right hand of God." Eph. i. "God the Father raised Christ from the dead, and set him on his right hand in heavenly things, above all rule, power, and might, and dominion, and above all names that are named, not in this world only, but also in the world to come." Eph. iv. "Christ is gone up on high, and hath led captivity captive, and hath given gifts unto men." Col. iii. If ye be risen again with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth on the right hand of God." "Whosoever Christ, which is our life, shall appear, then shall you also appear with him in glory." Heb. x. "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 foot-stool." St Peter saith: "Jesus Christ is on the right hand of God, and is gone into heaven, angels, power, and might subdued unto him." I Pet. iii.

All these scriptures, with divers other, evidently declare that Christ corporally dwelled only in heaven. Heaven is his resting-place concerning his body, and shall be until he come unto the judgment.

Father. Christ's body then is not in every pix, and in every altar, and in every massmonger's hands, as the papists hold? *Son.* No, verily. As touching his bodily

presence, Christ is in heaven, yea, in heaven only. Of them which teach us the contrary Christ biddeth us take heed, saying: "If any man say unto you, Lo, here is Christ, or there is Christ; believe it not. For there shall arise false anointed, and false teachers, and shall shew great miracles and wonders; insomuch that, if it were possible, the very elect should be deceived. Behold, I have told you afore. Wherefore if they say unto you, Behold, he is in the desert; go not ye forth: behold, he is in the secret places; believe it not. For as the lightning cometh out of the east, and appeareth unto the west; so shall the coming of the Son of man be."

Matt. xxiv. *Father.* How then are these sentences to be understood? "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them." Again: "Behold, I am with you continually, until the end of the world." *Son.* These sentences and such like are to be understood not of Christ's corporal, but of his spiritual presence. For Christ, in that he is man, abideth only in heaven; but in that he is God, he is everywhere, at all times present with his church by his almighty power and heavenly Spirit; as Christ, when he should with his body ascend into the kingdom of his Father, promised that he would "not leave his disciples succourless," but that he would "send unto them another Comforter, which should abide with them for ever, even the Spirit of truth," &c.

Father. Thou holdest then that Christ, as concerning his bodily presence, is only in heaven; but, as touching his godly presence, he is everywhere. *Son.* So am I taught by the word of God, as you have heard.

Father. Yea, but what say the ancient fathers of Christ's church? Do they also affirm this thing? *Son.* Most constantly, yea, and that with one voice.

Father. Let me hear some of their sayings. For it delighteth me greatly to hear the doctrine and consent of the ancient fathers, that we boldly say: Our doctrine is both grounded of the word of God, and also confirmed of the old writers. *Son.* To recite all the authorities of all the ancient fathers that make for our purpose, I mean, that evidently declare that Christ in his corporal substance is only in heaven, and not in the sacrament, as the papists teach, were an infinite labour. But I will rehearse so many as may seem for this present to suffice.

Father. Agreed.

Son. First of all I will allege the mind of the ancient writer Origen. Upon Matthew he hath these words: "Let us first of all inquire of his journey to a strange country, namely because it seemeth to be contrary to that which he promiseth of himself to his disciples, saying: 'Where two or three be gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.' Again: 'Behold, I am with you continually, even unto the end of the world.' And also contrary to that which John Baptist speaketh of him, shewing that he is in every place, on this manner: 'In the midst of you standeth he whom ye know not. He it is that cometh after me.' Therefore will some man say, If he stand even in the midst of them that know him not; if, where-soever two or three be gathered together in his name, he be among them; if, so long as the disciples live, he be with them even unto the world's end; how then is he set forth in this parable to take his journey into a far country? Entreating of this matter, we ought to consider that which Paul speaketh of himself: 'I verily, absent in body, but present in spirit, have determined already (as though I were present), concerning him that hath done this deed, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, when ye are gathered together, and my spirit with you, with the power of the Lord Jesus Christ, to deliver him unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus.' If that he be ever present with all his, how do his parables bring him in to be gone into a far country? Thus may this question be answered. He that saith unto his disciples, 'Behold, I am with you unto the end of the world;' and again, 'Where two or three be gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them;' and he also, that standeth in the midst of them that know him not, is the only-begotten Son of God, God the Word, and Wisdom, and Righteousness, and Truth, which is not inclosed about with any bodily compass.

After this nature of his divinity he is not departed into another country; but he is gone away after the dispensation of the body which he took, after the which also he

Christ in his manhood is in one place only at one time; but in his Godhead he is in all places at one time.

John xiv.

In Matt. cap. xxiii. Hom. 33.

Matt. xviii.

Matt. xxviii.

John i.

Matt. xviii.

Matt. xxviii.

1 Cor. v.

Matt. xviii. Matt. xxviii.

John i.

was troubled, and became heavy, saying, 'Now is my soul troubled;' and again: John xii. 'My soul is heavy unto the death.' And speaking these things, we divide not his Matt. xxvi. humanity (for St John writeth, 'Every spirit that divideth Jesus is not of God'),¹ John iv. but we reserve to both his natures their own properties!'

Of these words of the ancient writer Origen we plainly are taught, that the Lord Christ, as touching his divinity, is present at all times and in every place, neither can he be comprehended in any one several place only; but as concerning his humanity, or bodily presence, he is not in all places, neither is he here with us on the earth, but he is gone hence into a far country, that is to say, into heaven. If Christ's body be not here on earth, but is gone hence and estranged from us, with what forehead dare the papists affirm that they have him inclosed in a wafer cake, break him with their fingers, and tear him with their teeth? Can one and the same thing be both absent and present at one time and in one place? A monstrous doctrine!

Father. Do any other of the ancient fathers agree with Origen in this behalf? *Son.* All, without exception. For Cyrillus, a Greek writer, also agreeth with Origen in all points, saying: "Although Christ took away from hence the presence of his body, yet In Joan. Lib. vi. cap. 4. in the majesty of his godhead he is ever here, as he promised to his disciples at his departure, saying: 'Behold, I am with you continually, even unto the world's end².'" Matt. xxviii. Here have we plainly also of Cyrillus, that Christ, as concerning his bodily presence, is not here among us; but, as touching his godhead, he is never away from us, but remaineth with us continually.

I will now recite unto you some of the ancient Latin writers, that by this means you may hear and understand, what time³ concord and perfect amity hath from the beginning continued in the church of Christ in all ages and in all places concerning the truth of God's religion, till this monstrous beast of many heads, (I mean papism,) in the which be more than an hundred sects, brast in and overflowed the world. And forasmuch as by the judgment of all godly learned men St Austin is the best and most sincere expositor of the holy scripture among the ancient writers, I will first of all declare his mind in this behalf.

"As concerning his divine majesty, as concerning his providence, as concerning his In Joan. Tract. 1. infallible and invisible grace," saith St Augustine, "these words be fulfilled which he spake: 'Behold, I am with you unto the world's end.' But as concerning the flesh Matt. xxviii. which he took in his incarnation, as concerning that which was born of the virgin, as concerning that which was apprehended by the Jews and crucified upon a tree, and

[¹ Ergo primum quæramus de peregrinatione ipsius, maxime quia peregrinationi ejus videtur esse contrarium quod ipse de se discipulis suis promittit, dicens: Ubi fuerint duo vel tres congregati in nomine meo, ibi sum in medio eorum. Item illud: Ecce ego vobiscum sum omnibus diebus, usque ad consummationem sæculi. Et quod Baptista dicit de eo, ubique eum esse demonstrans, ita: In medio autem vestrum stat quem vos nescitis; ipse est qui post me venit. Propterea dicit aliquis: Si in medio etiam nescientium se stat; si ubicumque duo vel tres congregati fuerint in nomine ejus, inter eos habetur; si per omnes dies vitæ discipulorum cum eis est usque ad consummationem sæculi; quomodo in ista parabola proponitur peregrinans? Tractantes autem assumere debemus et illud quod Paulus ait de se: Ego autem absens corpore, præsens autem spiritu, jam judicavi ut præsens, congregatis vobis et meo spiritu cum virtute Domini Jesu, eum qui talis est tradere Satanæ in interitum carnis, ut spiritus ejus salvus sit in die Domini nostri Jesu Christi. Si enim virtus Jesu congregatur cum his qui congregantur in nomine ejus, non peregrinatur a suis, sed semper præsto est eis. Quod si semper omnibus suis est præsens, quomodo introducunt eum parabolæ ejus peregrinantem? Vide si possumus solvere hoc modo quod quæritur. Qui enim dicit discipulis suis, Ecce

ego vobiscum sum usque ad consummationem sæculi; et item, Ubi fuerint duo vel tres congregati in nomine meo, et ego sum in medio eorum, et cætera; et qui in medio etiam nescientium se consistit, Unigenitus Dei est, Deus Verbum, et sapientia, et justitia, et veritas, qui non est corporeo ambitu circumclusus. Secundum hanc divinitatis suæ naturam non peregrinatur, sed peregrinatur secundum dispensationem corporis quod suscepit; secundum quod et turbatus est, et tristis factus est, dicens, Nunc anima mea turbatur; et iterum: Tristis est anima mea usque ad mortem. Hæc autem dicentes non solvimus suscepti corporis hominem, cum sit scriptum apud Joannem: Omnis spiritus qui solvit Jesum, non est ex Deo; sed unicuique substantiæ proprietatem servamus.—Orig. Op. Par. 1733—59. In Matt. Comm. Ser. 65. Tom. III. pp. 882, 3.]

[² Denique quum de se dixit, Me autem non semper habebitis, loquebatur Dominus de præsentia corporis sui. Nam secundum majestatem suam, secundum providentiam, secundum ineffabilem et invisibilem divinitatis gratiam, impletur quod ab eo dictum est: Ecce ego vobiscum sum omnibus diebus usque ad consummationem sæculi.—Cyril. Alex. Op. Lat. Par. 1604—5. In Joan. Evang. Lib. viii. cap. vii. Tom. I. p. 597.]

[³ Folio, *time*. Probably, *true*.]

taken down from the cross, lapped in linen clothes, and buried, and rose again, and appeared after his resurrection; as concerning the flesh, he said: 'You shall not ever have me with you.' Wherefore seeing that, as concerning his flesh, he was conversant with his disciples forty days, and they accompanying, seeing, and following him, he went up into heaven, both he is not here (for he sitteth on the right hand of his Father); and yet he is here, for he departed not hence as concerning the presence of his divine majesty. As touching the presence of his majesty, we have Christ ever with us; but as concerning the presence of his flesh, he said truly to his disciples: 'Ye shall not ever have me with you.' For as concerning the presence of his flesh, the church had Christ but a few days; but now it holdeth him fast by faith, it seeth not him with eyes¹." Again he saith: "How shall I lay hand on him being absent, or seeing he is gone? How shall I put my hand into heaven, that I may lay hand on him sitting there? Send thy faith, and thou hast laid hand on him. Thy fathers have laid hand on him in the flesh; but lay thou hand on him with thy heart. For Christ, although he be absent, yet is he present: except he were present, we could not lay hand on him. But because that is true which he saith, 'Behold, I am with you continually unto the world's end'; he is both gone away, and he is also here: he is both gone again, and yet hath he not forsaken us. He hath carried away his body into heaven, yet notwithstanding he hath not taken away his majesty from the world²."

Hereto agreeth the saying of St Hierome: "Wherefore said the Lord after his resurrection unto his disciples, 'Behold, I am with you unto the end of the world;' and now he saith, 'You shall not have me always'? Methink that in this place he speaketh of his corporal presence, that he shall not be with them after his resurrection, as he is now, living with them familiarly; which thing the apostle considering saith: 'Although we have known Christ after the flesh, now yet henceforth know we him so no more³.'"

Likewise saith St Ambrose: "O Lord Jesu, we ought not to seek thee upon the earth, nor in the earth, nor after the flesh, if we will find thee. For 'we know now Christ no more after the flesh.' Stephen sought thee not upon the earth, which saw thee standing on the right hand of God: but Mary, which sought thee on the earth, could not touch thee. Stephen touched thee, because he sought thee in heaven⁴."

And St Gregory writeth thus: "Christ is not here by the presence of his flesh, and yet is he absent nowhere by the presence of his majesty⁵." Again he saith: "The Word

[¹ Nam secundum majestatem suam, secundum providentiam, secundum ineffabilem et invisibilem gratiam, impletur quod ab eo dictum est, Ecce ego vobiscum sum usque in consummationem sæculi. Secundum carnem vero quam Verbum assumpsit, secundum id quod de virgine natus est, secundum id quod a Judæis prehensus est, quod ligno confixus, quod de cruce depositus, quod linteis involutus, quod in sepulchro conditus, quod in resurrectione manifestatus, non semper habebitis vobiscum. Quare? Quoniam conversatus est secundum corporis præsentiam quadraginta diebus cum discipulis suis, et eis deducitibus videndo, non sequendo, adscendit in cælum, et non est hic. Ibi est enim, sedet ad dexteram Patris: et hic est, non enim recessit præsentia majestatis. Aliter: Secundum præsentiam majestatis semper habemus Christum: secundum præsentiam carnis, recte dictum est discipulis, Me autem non semper habebitis. Habuit enim illum ecclesia secundum præsentiam carnis paucis diebus: modo fide tenet, oculis non videt.—August. Op. Par. 1679—1700. In Johan. Evang. cap. xii. Tractat. l. 13. Tom. III. Pars II. col. 634.]

[² Quomodo tenebo absentem? Quomodo in cælum manum mittam, ut ibi sedentem teneam? Fidem mitte, et tenuisti. Parentes tui tenuerunt carne, tu tene corde: quoniam Christus absens etiam præsens est. Nisi præsens esset, a nobis ipsis teneri

non posset. Sed quoniam verum est quod ait, Ecce ego vobiscum sum usque ad consummationem sæculi: et abiit, et hic est; et rediit, et nos non deserit: corpus enim suum intulit cælo, majestatem non abstulit mundo.—Id. ibid. 4. cols. 630, l.]

[³ Alia oboritur quæstio, quare Dominus post resurrectionem dixerit ad discipulos, Ecce ego vobiscum sum usque ad consummationem mundi; et nunc loquatur, Me autem non semper habebitis. Sed mihi videtur in hoc loco de præsentia dicere corporali: quod nequaquam cum eis ita futurus sit post resurrectionem, quomodo nunc in omni convictu et familiaritate. Cujus rei memor apostolus ait: Et si noveramus Jesum Christum secundum carnem, sed nunc jam non novimus eum.—Hieron. Op. Par. 1693—1706. Comm. Lib. IV. in Matt. cap. xxvi. Tom. IV. Pars I. col. 126.]

[⁴ Ergo non supra terram, nec in terra, nec secundum carnem te quærere debemus, si volumus invenire; nunc enim secundum carnem jam non novimus Christum. Denique Stephanus non supra terram quæsivit, qui stantem te ad dexteram Dei vidit: Maria autem quia quærebat in terra, tangere non potuit. Stephanus tetigit, quia quæsivit in cælo.—Ambros. Op. Par. 1686—90. Expos. Evang. sec. Luc. Lib. x. 160. Tom. I. col. 1538.]

[⁵ Surrexit, non est hic. Non est hic, dicitur, per præsentiam carnis, qui tamen nusquam deerit per

Matt. xxvi.

Note.

Matt. xxviii.

In Matt. cap. xxvi.

2 Cor. v.

In Luc. Lib. x. cap. 24. 2 Cor. v.

Acts vii.

In Hom. Pasch. In Hom. Pentecost.

incarnate both tarrieth and goeth away: he goeth away in his body, but he tarrieth in his godhead⁶.”

Likewise saith Beda: “He (Christ), being God and man, was taken up in his humanity, which he took of the earth; but, as concerning his divinity, he abideth still with his saints on the earth, wherewith he filleth earth and heaven⁷.” Also in another place he saith: “He, after his resurrection going up into heaven, forsook them corporally, which notwithstanding never failed them concerning the presence of his divine majesty⁸.”

Moreover Vigilius, that blessed bishop and holy martyr, writing against Eutyches, that heretic, which denied the humanity of Christ, hath these words: “Christ said to his disciples: ‘If ye loved me, ye would rejoice; for I go unto my Father.’ And again he said: ‘It is expedient for you that I go; for if I go not, the Comforter shall not come to you.’ And yet surely the eternal Word of God, the Virtue of God, the Wisdom of God, was ever with his Father and in his Father, yea, even at the same time when he was with us and in us. For when he did mercifully dwell in this world, he left not his habitation or dwelling in heaven; for he is every where whole with his Father, equal in divinity, whom no place can contain. For the Son filleth all things, and there is no place that lacketh the presence of his divinity. From whence then and whither did he say that he would go? Or how did he say that he went to his Father, from whom doubtless he never departed? But that was to go to the Father and to depart from us, even to take from this world that nature which he received of us. Thou seest therefore, that it was the property of that nature to be taken away and to go from us, which in the end of the world shall be rendered again to us, as the angels witnessed, saying: ‘This Jesus, which is taken from you, shall come again, like as you saw him going up into heaven.’ For look upon the miracle, look upon the mystery of both the natures. The Son of God, as concerning his humanity, went from us: as concerning his divinity, he said unto us, ‘Behold, I am with you all the days unto the world’s end.’” And a little after he saith: “He is both with us, and he is not with us. For those whom he left, and went from them, as concerning his humanity, those he left not, nor forsook them not, as touching his divinity. For as touching the form of a servant (which he took away from us into heaven), he is absent from us; but by the form of God (which goeth not from us), he is present with us in earth; and nevertheless, both present and absent, he is all one Christ⁹.”

And a certain bishop called Justus Orgelitanus, writing upon Salomon’s ballads, bringeth in Christ speaking to the faithful soul on this manner: “Desire thou not to

præsentiam majestatis.—Gregor. Magni Papæ I. Op. Par. 1705. In Evang. Lib. II. Hom. XXI. Die Sanct. Pasch. Tom. I. col. 1527.]

[⁶ Sed Verbum incarnatum et manet et recedit: recedit corpore, manet divinitate.—Id. Lib. II. Hom. XXX. Die Sanct. Pentecost. col. 1576.]

[⁷ Quia enim ipse Deus et homo est, assumptus est in cœlum humanitate, quam de terra susceperat: manet cum sanctis in terra divinitate, qua terram pariter implet et cœlum.—Ven. Bed. Op. Col. Agrip. 1612. Hom. Fer. Sext. Pasch. Tom. VII. col. 14.]

[⁸ Verum quia ille post resurrectionem ascendens in cœlum eos corporaliter deseruit, quibus tamen divina præsentia majestatis nunquam abfuit, recte de hoc paraclete, id est, Spiritu sancto subjungit: Ut maneat vobiscum in æternum.—Id. Hom. in Fest. Sanct. Pentecost. col. 38.]

[⁹ Ait namque discipulis suis, Si diligeretis me, gauderetis, quia vado ad Patrem, quia Pater major me est. Et iterum: Expedi vobis ut ego eam. Si enim ego non abiero, Paracletus ad vos non veniet. Et certe Verbum Dei, Virtus Dei, Sapientia Dei, semper apud Patrem et in Patre fuit, etiam quando in nobis nobiscum fuit. Neque enim cum terrena misericorditer incoluit, de cœlesti habitatione recessit. Cum Patre enim ubique est totus pari divinitate,

quem nullus continet locus. Plena sunt quippe omnia Filio, nec est aliquis locus divinitatis ejus præsentia vacuus. Unde ergo et quo se iturum dicit, aut quomodo se ad Patrem perreiturum adserat, a quo sine dubio nunquam recessit? Sed hoc erat ire ad Patrem et recedere a nobis, auferre de hoc mundo naturam, quam susceperat ex nobis. Vides ergo eadem naturæ proprium fuisse ut auferretur et abiret a nobis, quæ in fine temporum reddenda est nobis, secundum attestantium vocem angelorum, Hic Jesus qui receptus est a vobis, sic veniet, quemadmodum vidistis eum euntem in cœlum. Nam vide miraculum, vide utriusque proprietatis mysterium: Dei Filius secundum humanitatem suam recessit a nobis, secundum divinitatem suam ait nobis, Ecce ego vobiscum sum omnibus diebus usque ad consummationem sæculi. Si nobiscum est, quomodo ait, Venient dies quando desideretis diem unum Filii hominis, et non videbitis? Sed et nobiscum est, et non est nobiscum; quia quos reliquit et a quibus discessit humanitate sua, non reliquit nec deseruit divinitate sua. Per formam enim servi, quam abstulit a nobis in cœlum, absens est nobis: per formam Dei, quæ non recedit a nobis, in terris præsens est nobis; tamen et præsens et absens ipse unus idemque est nobis.—Vigil. adv. Eutyech. in Cassandr. Op. Par. 1616. Lib. I. p. 518.]

see me always in the body, whom thou seest better in the spirit through faith. For to this end went I up into heaven, that thou shouldest see me no more compassed in a place; which notwithstanding do so replenish and fill all things with the presence of my divinity, that I am in every place, and contain all things, and am contained of no place¹.”

Breath should fail me, if I should go forth to recite the sayings of all the ancient Greek and Latin writers, which most constantly affirm, that as the Lord Christ, in that he is God, is every where and filleth all places at all times; so likewise, in that he is man, he is only in heaven, and in no place else, where he shall remain until the day of judgment, according to the scriptures. Now if this doctrine be true and certain, as it is most true and most certain, then is the doctrine of the papists most false and most vain, which teach the contrary, being through the spirit of error deceived themselves, and also deceiving other.

Father. The papists deny not, that the natural body of Christ is in heaven; but they say moreover, that as he is in heaven, so likewise is he on earth in the sacrament, although invisibly; insomuch that, whensoever the bread and wine be once consecrate, there straightways, under the accidents of bread and wine, the real, corporal, natural, and substantial body of Christ is contained, even the very self-same body that was born of Mary the virgin, and died on the cross. They add moreover, that, look in how many thousand thousand places the sacrament is, in so many thousand thousand places is the natural body of Christ. *Son.* O monstrous doctrine! What any other thing is it thus to teach, than to affirm, with the old heretics, that Christ had no true, but a fantastical body; no natural, but a celestial body; or, as some later heretics have taught, that the body of Christ is now not only glorified, but also deified, and swallowed up of the divine nature, insomuch that, wheresoever the deity of Christ is, there is also his humanity? O wicked and most detestable doctrine! Is this any other thing than to destroy and utterly to make nothing the humanity of Christ?

Father. There is, they say, great difference between the mortal and immortal, the passible and unpassible, the humbled and glorified body of Christ. *Son.* I grant. For the glorified body of Christ, which is now in heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God, is immortal, and delivered from all mortal qualities, 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.” Notwithstanding, though the qualities of mortality be changed, yet the very same substance and nature of Christ’s body remaineth still, and is not altered nor changed; so that, as in his mortality his body was local, and occupied a place, and was not in all places at once, but at one time in one only place; so likewise now, in his immortality, his body is local, and occupieth a place, even heaven, and is not in all places at once, as some hold.

Father. Prove me by the word of God, that the body of Christ, although glorified and immortal, is not in divers places at once. *Son.* The angel of God said to certain women which came to anoint the body of Jesus: “I know that ye seek Jesus, which was crucified. He is risen. He is not here. Behold the place where they laid him.” “He goeth before you into Galilee: there shall ye see him, as he told you.”

Of these words of the angel it is plain and evident, that as tofore the mortal and humbled, so likewise now the immortal and glorified body of Christ can be but in one place at once. For if the body of Christ, now clad with immortality and uncorruption, might have been in all places at one time, then had not the angel spoken truly when he said: “He is not here,” &c. St Peter saith plainly, that “Christ must receive heaven, until the time that all things which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets, since the world began, be restored again.” And all the holy scriptures openly testify that Christ, as concerning his corporal presence, is

[¹ Non me semper in corpore conspiciendum requiras, quem Spiritu per fidem melius cernis. Idcirco etenim in cœlos ascendi, ut non semper localis tibi appaream qui sic omnia (divinitatis meæ præsen-

tia) repleo, ut ubique adsim, cunctaque contineam et a nullo loco continear.—Just. Orgel. in Cant. Explic. 137. in Mag. Biblioth. Vet. Patr. Col. Agrip. 1618—22. Tom. VI. Pars I. p. 515.]

in heaven only, and that there he shall remain in the glory of his Father, till he come again to judge the quick and the dead; neither read we in all the bible, that Christ since the time of his ascension hath occupied with his body any other place than heaven. Moreover, doth not Christ plainly forbid us to believe such, which teach us that Christ is in this place, and that place; in the wilderness, and in secret places, &c.? as some say that his body is in all places, wheresoever his godhead is; some again affirm that Christ's natural body is in the pix, is between the priest's hands at mass, is eaten of the mouse, rat, cat, dog, &c. This monstrous kind of doctrine the holy scripture knoweth not, neither was it ever taught of the ancient fathers of Christ's church; but it is a new doctrine, crept into the church of Christ through the subtilty of Satan, and maintained by the cruel tyranny of antichrist and his adherents.

Father. Let me then hear also, what the doctrine of the old doctors and holy fathers is in this behalf. Teach they also, that the natural body of Christ, although immortal and glorified, is only in heaven, and occupieth one place only at one time? *Son.* Yea, verily. For the holy fathers of Christ's church, led with the Spirit of Christ, could teach nothing, but that which is agreeable to the doctrine of Christ; namely, if we respect the principal points of christian religion. Therefore in this behalf they also agree with the doctrine of the holy scripture, and with one accord affirm that Christ, as concerning his corporal presence, is in heaven only, and occupieth but one place at one time; so that he is not in many and divers places at once, as the adversaries teach. And that you may be well assured that this is their doctrine, I will here allege certain testimonies out of their own writings.

That ancient doctor and courageous bishop of Christ's church hath these words, I mean St Ambrose: "Christ is to be sought neither upon earth, nor in earth, but in heaven, where he sitteth at the right hand of his Father²." Again he saith: "Here the shadow, here the image; there the truth. Shadow in the law, image in the gospel; truth in heaven. Before the lamb was offered, the calf was offered: now is Christ offered; but he is offered as man, as receiving passion; but he offereth himself as a priest, that he may forgive our sins: here in image, there in truth, where as an advocate he maketh intercession for us unto the Father³."

Next in order followeth St Austin, that most worthy and faithful doctor, whose words are these: "Doubt not but that Jesus Christ, as concerning the nature of his manhood, is now there, from whence he shall come. And remember well, and believe the profession of a christian man, that he rose from death, ascended into heaven, sitteth at the right hand of his Father, and from that place, and from none other, shall he come to judge the quick and the dead. And he shall come (as the angels said), as he was seen go into heaven; that is to say, in the same form and substance, unto the which he gave immortality, but changed not nature. After this form (he speaketh of Christ's human nature) we may not think that he is every where. For we must beware that we do not so stablish his divinity, that we take away the verity of his body. For it followeth not that the thing, which is in God, should be in every place, as God is. For the scripture doth truly testify unto us, 'that we live, move, and be in him;' and yet are we not in every place, as he is. But man is otherwise in God, and God otherwise in man, by a certain proper and singular way. For God and man is one person, and both of them one Christ Jesus, which is in every place in that he is God, and in heaven in that he is man⁴." Again in the same place he saith:

[² See before, page 274, note 4.]

[³ Hic umbra, hic imago, illic veritas. Umbram in lege, imago in evangelio, veritas in cœlestibus. Ante agnus offerebatur, offerebatur et vitulus, nunc Christus offertur: sed offertur quasi homo, quasi recipiens passionem; et offert se ipse quasi sacerdos, ut peccata nostra dimittat: hic in imagine, ibi in veritate, ubi apud Patrem pro nobis quasi advocatus intervenit. —Ambros. Op. Par. 1686—90. De Offic. Minist. Lib. i. cap. xlvi. 248. Tom. II. col. 63.]

[⁴ Noli itaque dubitare ibi nunc esse hominem

Christum Jesum, unde venturus est, memoriterque recole, et fideliter tene Christianam confessionem, quoniam resurrexit a mortuis, ascendit in cœlum, sedet ad dexteram Patris, nec aliunde quam inde venturus est ad vivos mortuosque judicandos. Et sic venturus est illa angelica voce testante, quemadmodum ire visus est in cœlum, id est in eadem carnis forma atque substantia; cui profecto immortalitatem dedit, naturam non abstulit. Secundum hanc formam non est putandus ubique diffusus. Cavendum est enim, ne ita divinitatem adstruamus hominis, ut

Matt. xxiv.

In Lucam, Lib. x. cap. 24. De Off. Lib. iv. cap. 48.

Ad Dard. Epist. lvi.

Acts i.

Acts xvii.

“Doubt not but that our Lord Jesus Christ is every where as God, and that he is in a certain place of heaven, because of the measure of a true body¹.” Once again in the same place he saith: “Take away the spaces of places from the bodies, and so shall they nowhere be; and forasmuch as they shall be nowhere, neither shall they be. Take away the self bodies from the qualities of the bodies, and there shall be no place where they may be; and so it followeth of necessity that they are not².”

Tract. xxx.

And writing upon the gospel of St John, he saith thus: “The Lord is alone³, but yet his truth is here. For his body, wherein he rose, must be in one place; but his truth is dispersed in all places⁴.” Again: “As concerning the presence of his majesty, we have Christ ever with us; but as concerning the presence of his flesh, he said truly to his disciples: ‘Ye shall not ever have me with you.’ For as concerning the presence of his flesh, the church had Christ but a few days; yet now it holdeth him fast by faith, though it see him not with eyes⁵.” Also in another place he saith:

Tract. l.

“Where and how the body of the Lord is in heaven, it is a thing both curious and vain to demand. Notwithstanding, this must we believe, that the body of Christ is only in heaven⁶.”

De Fide et
Symb. c. vi.In Hom.
Pasch.

Saint Gregory also saith: “Christ is not here by the presence of his flesh; and yet is he absent nowhere by the presence of his majesty⁷.”

In Hom. in
Vigil. Pent.

The very same in effect writeth Beda on this manner: “Christ, after his resurrection ascending into heaven, left his disciples corporally; whom notwithstanding he never forsook concerning the presence of his divine majesty⁸.”

Ad Tract.
Lib. ii.

With these aforesaid ancient writers agreeth the noble clerk Fulgentius, whose words are these: “One and the self-same Christ of mankind was made a man, compassed in a place, who of his Father is God, without measure or place. One and the self-same person, as concerning his man’s substance, was not in heaven when he was in earth, and forsook the earth when he ascended into heaven; but, as concerning his godly substance (which is above all measure), he neither left heaven when he came from heaven, nor he left not the earth, when he ascended into heaven; which may be known by the most certain word of Christ himself, who, to shew the placing of his humanity, said to his disciples: ‘I ascend up to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God.’ Also, when he had said of Lazarus that he was dead, he added, saying: ‘I am glad for your sakes, that you may believe. For I was not there.’

John xx.

John xi.

Matt. xxviii.

But to shew the unmeasurable compass of his divinity, he said to his disciples: ‘Behold, I am with you always unto the world’s end.’ Now, how did he go up into heaven, but because he is a very man, contained within a place? Or how is he present with faithful people, but because he is very God, being without measure⁹?”

veritatem corporis auferamus. Non est autem consequens, ut quod in Deo est, ita sit ubique ut Deus. Nam et de nobis veracissima scriptura dicit, quod in illo vivimus, movemur et sumus, nec tamen sicut ille ubique sumus: sed aliter homo ille in Deo, quoniam aliter et Deus ille in homine, proprio quodam et singulari modo. Una enim persona Deus et homo est, et utrumque est unus Christus Jesus; ubique per id quod Deus est, in cœlo autem per id quod homo.—August. Op. Par. 1679—1700. Lib. ad Dard. seu Epist. clxxxvii. 10. Tom. II. col. 681.]

[¹ Christum autem Dominum nostrum unigenitum Dei filium æqualem Patri, eundemque hominis filium, quo major est Pater, et ubique totum præsentem esse non dubites tamquam Deum, et in eodem tempore Dei esse tamquam inhabitantem Deum, et in loco aliquo cœli propter veri corporis modum.—Id. ibid. 41. col. 682.]

[² Nam spatia locorum tolle corporibus, nusquam erunt; et quia nusquam erunt, nec erunt. Tolle ipsa corpora qualitatibus corporum, non erit ubi sint, et ideo necesse est ut non sint.—Id. ibid. 18. col. 683.]

[³ Perhaps the true reading here is *above*.]

[⁴ Sursum est Dominus: sed etiam hic est veri-

tas Dominus. Corpus enim Domini, in quo resurrexit, uno loco esse potest: veritas ejus ubique diffusa est.—Id. In Johan. Evang. cap. vii. Tractat. xxx. 1. Tom. III. Pars II. col. 517. This passage is cited by Lombard in somewhat different words: in uno loco esse oportet.—Lib. Sentent. Col. Agrip. 1576. Lib. IV. Dist. X. fol. 351.]

[⁵ See before, page 274, note 1.]

[⁶ Sed ubi et quomodo sit in cœlo corpus dominicum, curiosissimum et supervacaneum est quærere; tantummodo in cœlo esse credendum est.—Id. Lib. de Fid. et Symb. 13. Tom. VI. col. 157.]

[⁷ See before, page 274, note 5.]

[⁸ See before, page 275, note 8.]

[⁹ Unus idemque homo localis ex homine, qui est Deus immensus ex Patre: unus idemque, secundum humanam substantiam, absens cœlo, cum esset in terra, et derelinquens terram, cum ascendisset in cœlum: secundum divinam vero immensamque substantiam, nec cœlum dimittens, cum de cœlo descendit, nec terram deserens, cum ad cœlum ascendit. Quod ipsius Domini certissimo potest cognosci sermone; qui ut localem ostenderet humanitatem suam, dicit discipulis suis: Ascendo ad Patrem meum et ad

Vigilius also, a valiant defender of the christian verity, hath these words: "If <sup>Contra Euty-
tychen, Lib.
iv.</sup> the Word and the flesh were both of one nature, seeing the Word is every where, why is not then the flesh every where? For when it was in earth, then verily it was not in heaven; and now, when it is in heaven, it is not surely in earth. And it is so sure that it is not in earth, that as concerning it we look for him to come from heaven, whom as concerning his eternal Word we believe to be with us in earth. Therefore by your doctrine (the author speaketh unto the heretic Eutyches, who taught that the divinity and humanity in Christ was but one nature), either the Word is contained in a place with his flesh, or else the flesh is every where with the Word. For one nature cannot receive in itself two diverse and contrary things. But these two things be diverse and far unlike, that is to say, to be contained in a place and to be every where. Therefore, inasmuch as the Word is every where, and the flesh is not every where, it appeareth plainly that one Christ himself hath in him two natures; and that by his divine nature he is every where, and by his human nature he is contained in a place; that he is created, and hath no beginning; that he is subject to death, and cannot die. Whereof one he hath by the nature of his Word, whereby he is God; and the other he hath by the nature of his flesh, whereby the same God is man also. Therefore one Son of God, the self-same was made the Son of man, and he hath a beginning of the nature of his flesh, and no beginning by the nature of his godhead. He is comprehended in a place by the nature of his flesh, and not comprehended in a place by the nature of his godhead. He is inferior to angels in the nature of his flesh, and is equal to his Father in the nature of his godhead. He died by the nature of his flesh, and died not by the nature of his godhead. This is the faith and catholic confession, which the apostles taught, the martyrs did corroborate, and faithful people keep unto this day¹⁰."

I could rehearse divers other, both old and new writers, which with one consent teach, that as the godhead of Christ is every where, and cannot be shut up in one certain place, so likewise the manhood of Christ is only in heaven, and occupieth one certain place, and cannot be in more places than in one at once: but let these suffice for this present. For even of them learn we sufficiently, that the body of Christ is now only in heaven, and so in heaven that it is in none other place, neither shall be until the day of judgment; so far is it off from the truth that the papists teach, affirming that the natural body of Christ lurketh under the kinds of bread and wine, is upon every altar at every mass, is handled, touched, and broken with the priest's hands, is received with the bodily mouth of the priest and of the people, is crushed on pieces with the teeth of the communicants, is devoured of mice, rats, dogs, owls, flitter-mouses, &c.

Patrem vestrum, Deum meum et Deum vestrum : De Lazaro quoque cum dixisset, Lazarus mortuus est, adjunxit dicens : Et gaudeo propter vos, ut credatis, quoniam non eram ibi. Immensitatem vero suæ divinitatis ostendens discipulis dicit : Ecce ego vobiscum sum omnibus diebus, usque ad consummationem sæculi. Quomodo autem ascendit in cœlum, nisi quia localis et verus est homo ? Aut quomodo adest fidelibus suis, nisi quia idem immensus et verus est Deus ?—Fulgent. Op. Venet. 1742. Ad Trasimund. Lib. II. cap. xvii. p. 50.]

[¹⁰ Deinde si verbi et carnis una natura est, quomodo, cum verbum ubique sit, non ubique inveniatur et caro ? Namque quando in terra fuit, non erat utique in cœlo : et nunc quia in cœlo est, non est utique in terra ; et in tantum non est, ut secundum ipsam Christum spectemus venturum de cœlo, quem secundum verbum nobiscum esse credimus in terra. Igitur secundum vos, aut verbum cum carne sua loco continetur, aut caro cum verbo ubique est, quando una natura contrarium quid et diversum non recipit in seipsa. Diversum est autem et longe dissimile circumscribi loco, et ubique esse ; et quia verbum

ubique est, caro autem ejus ubique non est, apparet unum eundemque Christum utriusque esse naturæ, et esse quidem ubique secundum naturam divinitatis suæ, et loco contineri secundum naturam humanitatis suæ : creatum esse, et initium non habere : morti subjacere, et mori non posse : quod unum illi est ex natura verbi, quia Deus est, aliud ex natura carnis, quia idem Deus homo est. Igitur unus Dei Filius, idemque hominis factus Filius, habet initium ex natura carnis suæ, et non habet initium ex natura divinitatis suæ : creatus est per naturam carnis suæ, et non est creatus per naturam divinitatis suæ : circumscribitur loco per naturam carnis suæ, et loco non capitur per naturam divinitatis suæ : minor est etiam angelis per naturam carnis suæ, et æqualis est Patri secundum naturam divinitatis suæ : mortuus est natura carnis suæ, et non est mortuus natura divinitatis suæ. Hæc est fides et confessio catholica, quam apostoli tradiderunt, martyres corroboraverunt, et fideles nunc usque custodiunt.—Vigil. adv. Eutyche. in Cassandr. Op. Par. 1616. Lib. IV. pp. 543, 7.]

Of the omnipotency and almighty power of God.

Father. The opinion of the papists, I confess, is gross and too much unsavoury: notwithstanding, in my judgment, it greatly derogateth the omnipotency and almighty power of Christ, (which being God is able to do all things,) to affirm that Christ's body is so inclosed in heaven, that it can be in none other place, or to say, that the body of Christ can be but in one place at once. *Son.* First, as touching the omnipotency and almighty power of Christ, in that he is God, this thing derogateth nothing the glory, majesty, and virtue of the Lord Jesus, to teach, as we are taught of the holy scriptures, and have received from the most ancient fathers of Christ's church; namely, that Christ in his humanity hath forsaken the earth, and is gone up into the glorious kingdom of his Father, where he shall remain until he return unto the judgment. For Christ, being God, is not therefore called almighty because he is able to do all things without exception, but because he is of sufficient power to do whatsoever his good pleasure is to do; as the psalmograph saith: *Omnia quaecunque voluit fecit*; "He hath done whatsoever his good pleasure was to do." For there are many things which God cannot do. He cannot lie. He cannot deny himself. He cannot save the unfaithful. He cannot condemn the faithful. He cannot deny mercy to them that be merciful. He cannot make the damned inheritors of everlasting salvation. He cannot make one of like dignity with himself. He cannot love wickedness, nor abhor righteousness. He cannot delight in the death of sinners; and, as some write, he cannot restore virginity once violated; neither can he sin, nor do any thing against his word or determinate purpose, &c.

Why God is called almighty.

Neither doth this thing any whit at all hinder the omnipotency of God, or prove God to be the less omnipotent or almighty. For, as I said before, God is called almighty, because he is able to do whatsoever his godly pleasure is, and because there is no superior power above him, but that he may do all that he will; and all that his pleasure is to do, that may he bring to pass, and no power is able to resist him, as he saith by the prophet: "I will work, and who shall be able to turn it away?" Likewise saith the psalmograph: "The Lord breaketh the counsel of the heathen, and bringeth to nought the devices of the people. But the counsel of the Lord shall stand for ever, and the thoughts of his heart throughout all ages." For, as Salomon saith, "There is no wisdom, no forecast, no counsel, that can prevail against the Lord."

Isai. xliii.

Psal. xxxiii.

Prov. xxi.

Moreover, as concerning Christ's being in heaven only until the day of judgment, we are taught of the holy scriptures both so to believe and to teach. For in the word of God we find none other place appointed for the humanity of Christ than heaven, as we have tofore abundantly heard.

Note well.

And as touching the body of Christ, although immortal and glorified, to be but in one place only at one time, you have heard before both the determination of the Holy Ghost, and also the consent of the ancient godly fathers in this behalf; which all, with one perfect agreement, teach and affirm that the body of Christ is but in one place at one time, although his godhead be every where, and fulfilleth all things. For this is diligently to be noted, that to be in many or in all places at once is only appropriated to the nature of God. For no creature, although never so glorious, pure, immortal, and spiritual, can be in more places at once than in one only. Yea, the very angels and invisible spirits, forasmuch as they be creatures, are only in one place at once, as Basilius Magnus testifieth, saying: "The angel which stood by Cornelius was not at the same time also with Philip, nor the angel which spake to Zachary at the altar was not the same time in his proper place in heaven. But the Holy Ghost was at one time in Abacuck, and in Daniel at Babylon, and with Jeremy in prison, and with Ezechiel in Chobar¹." Of this sentence of Basil learn here two things: one is that all creatures, although never so pure and perfect, are only at one time in one place, and not in many and diverse places at once; again, that God alone, which is the Creator and Maker of all creatures, can be in many or in all places at once.

Lib. de Spiritu Sancto. cap. xxii.

[¹ Ὁ γὰρ τῷ Κορινθίῳ ἐπιστάς ἄγγελος οὐκ ἦν ἐν ταύτῳ καὶ παρὰ τῷ Φιλίππῳ, οὐδὲ ὁ ἀπὸ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου τῷ Ζαχαρίᾳ διαλεγόμενος κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρὸν καὶ ἐν οὐρανῷ τὴν οἰκίαν στάσιν ἐπλήρου. τὸ μὲν τοι πνεῦμα, ὁμοῦ τε ἐν Ἀββακοῦμ

ἐνεργεῖν, καὶ ἐν Δαυιδ ἐπὶ τῆς Βαβυλωνίας πεπίστευται καὶ ἐν τῷ καταβάκτῳ εἶναι μετὰ Ἰερემίου, καὶ μετὰ Ἰεζεκιὴλ ἐπὶ τοῦ Χοβάρ.—Basil. Op. Par. 1721—30. Lib. de Spir. Sancto. cap. xxiii. Tom. III. p. 46.]

And Didymus, in his book which he writeth of the Holy Ghost, proveth that the Holy Ghost is very God, because he is in many places at one time, which no creature can be. "For," saith he, "all creatures, visible and invisible, be circumscribed and environed either within one place (as corporal and visible things be), or within the property of their own substance (as angels and invisible creatures be); so that no angel," saith he, "can be at one time in two places. And forasmuch as the Holy Ghost is in many men at one time, therefore," saith he, "the Holy Ghost must needs be God²."

Cap. xxii.

Who seeth not now, except he be wilfully blind, that forasmuch as the body of Christ is a creature, although glorified and clad with immortality, it is and can be but in one place at once? To teach the contrary is none other thing than to evacuate and utterly to destroy the nature of Christ's humanity, and to affirm, with certain heretics, that the body of Christ is deified, and so swallowed up of the godhead, that it is now in all places with the godhead at all times; which is a most heinous and detestable heresy.

For St Austin affirmeth plainly, that a body must needs be in some certain place; and saith moreover, that if it be not within the compass of a place, it is nowhere: and if it be nowhere, then is it not³.

Ad Dardanum, Epist. lvii.

St Cyril likewise, considering the proper nature of a very body, said "that, if the nature of the godhead were a body, it must needs be in a place, and have quantity, greatness, and circumscription⁴."

De Trinit. Lib. ii.

We may therefore right well conclude, both with the authority of the holy scriptures and with the testimonies of the ancient writers, that the body of Christ, although utterly estranged from corruption and mortality, and now glorified and immortal, is and remain still a perfect and true body, circumscribed, compassed, and measured, and cannot be in divers places at one time.

²This doctrine is now so plain and evident, so open and manifest, that it cannot be denied; and I much marvel how the papists, specially the learned sort, durst ever maintain so damnable heresy, and teach that the body of Christ is in an infinite number of places at one time. For by this means they make his body to be God (whose property alone it is to be in many or in all places at once), and so confound the two natures of Christ, attributing to his human nature that thing which belongeth only to his divinity; which is a most heinous and abominable heresy.

Father. But what is then to be said concerning these words, which the papists continually object, and to the which they cleave with tooth and nail, and the which they defend with stocks and chains, with fire and fagot, with sword and halter, and with all other kind of tyranny?

Son. Of what words speak you? *Father.* Of these: *Hoc est enim corpus meum.* The words of consecration, as they call them, considered. For thus read we: "Christ took the bread, thanked, brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, Take, eat: this is my body, which is given for you," &c. Spake he these words, "This is my body," of the bread, or rather of his own natural body, which he received of Mary the virgin?

Son. I know what some hold and teach in this behalf. Some say that Christ, delivering the bread to his disciples for to eat, pointed to his own body and said: "This is my body, which is given for you;" and afterward said unto them: "Do that," that is to say, break the bread and eat it, "in the remembrance of me." But I rather approve and allow the judgment of them which teach that Christ spake these words, *Hoc est corpus meum*, "This is my body," of the bread, which he had now made and appointed the mystery of his body.

[² The following is probably the passage intended: Ipse vero Spiritus sanctus, si unus de creaturis esset, saltem circumscripam haberet substantiam; sicut universa quæ facta sunt. Nam etsi non circumscribantur loco et finibus invisibiles creaturæ, tamen proprietate substantiæ finiuntur. Spiritus autem sanctus, cum in pluribus sit, non habet substantiam circumscripam... Angelus quippe qui aderat, verbi gratia, apostolo in Asia oranti, non poterat simul eodem tempore adesse aliis in ceteris partibus mundi constitutis. Spiritus autem sanctus non solum se junctis a se hominibus præsto est, sed

et singulis quibusque angelis, principatibus, thronis, dominationibus inhabitator assistit.—Did. Alex. in Biblioth. Vet. Patr. Stud. Galland. Venet. 1765—81. De Spirit. Sanct. Lib. 6. Tom. VI. p. 265.]

[³ See before, page 278, note 2.]

[⁴ Εἰ γὰρ ὅλως τομῆς τε καὶ μερισμοῦ, καὶ ὧν ἐκεῖνοι φασίν, ἢ θεῖα φύσις ἀνέχεται, νοεῖσθω καὶ σῶμα· εἰ δὲ τοῦτο, καὶ ἐν τόπῳ πάντως πον, καὶ ἐν μεγέθει, καὶ ποσῶ. καὶ ἐπειδὴν πεπόσεται, μὴ φευγέτω περιγραφῆν.—Cyril. Alex. Op. Lut. 1638. De S. Trin. Dial. ii. Tom. V. Pars i. p. 447.]

[⁵ *Father*, prefixed in Folio.]

Father. If Christ spake these words of the bread, then is the bread his body. *Son.* His body, I grant, in mystery and figure, but not in nature and substance. For the body of Christ was made of the substance of Mary the virgin, and not of the substance of bread. Though Christ called the bread his body, yet doth it not therefore follow, that the bread is his natural body; but so termed for certain resemblances and likenesses between the body of Christ and the creature of bread, as we have tofore heard. Christ in divers places of the holy scripture diversly nameth himself. He calleth himself "a vine," "a door," "a stone," &c. and is called of St Paul "a rock;" not that he is a natural vine, door, stone, rock, &c. but for certain resemblances and properties which he hath with them. Christ calleth his Father a plowman, his disciples vine-branches; the good seed, the children of the kingdom; the tares, the sons of the wicked; the field, the world; the harvest, the end of the world; the reapers, the angels, &c.; not that they are so indeed, but for certain properties and resemblances which are between them. Even after the same manner Christ calleth the bread his body; not that it is his natural body indeed, but because it representeth, signifieth, declareth, preacheth, and setteth forth his body unto us; and hath also, as I may so speak, certain properties with the body of Christ. For as the bread is broken of the faithful in the action of the Lord's supper, so was Christ's body broken on the altar of the cross. And as the bread nourisheth, preserveth, and comforteth the body, when it is eaten, so likewise the body of Christ nourisheth, preserveth, and comforteth both the body and the soul of the faithful communicants; as Christ himself testifieth: "I am the bread of life: he that cometh unto me shall not hunger, and he that believeth in me shall never thirst." "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 which I shall give for the life of the world is my flesh." "He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life; and I shall raise him up in the last day. For my flesh is very meat, and my blood is very drink. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him," &c. For these and such like properties and resemblances did Christ call the bread his body.

Father. It is then no proper, but a figurative speech, when Christ calleth the bread his body. *Son.* You say truth. And that the breaking of Christ's body on the altar of the cross for our redemption might the more surely be fixed in our hearts, when we come together to eat the Lord's supper, Christ enabled¹ the sacramental bread with the name of his body, when notwithstanding it is the figure and sign of his body.

Neither is this a rare and seldom-found thing, but rather common and usual in the holy scriptures, to call the sign by the name of the thing that it signifieth, as St Austin saith: "The thing which signifieth is wont to be called by the name of that thing which it signifieth, as it is written, 'The seven ears are seven years.' It saith not, They signify seven years. And, 'Seven kine are seven years;' and many other like. And so said St Paul, that 'the stone was Christ,' and not, that it signified Christ, but even as it had been he indeed, which nevertheless was not Christ by substance, but by signification²," &c.

Again: "In such wise is blood the soul, as the stone was Christ; and yet the apostle saith not, that the stone signified Christ, but saith, 'it was Christ.' And this sentence, 'Blood is the soul,' may be understand to be spoken in a sign or figure. For Christ did not stick to say, 'This is my body,' when he gave the sign of his body³."

[¹ Folio, *ennobled*. Perhaps *ennobled*.]

[² Solet autem res quæ significat, ejus rei nomine quam significat nuncupari; sicut scriptum est, Septem spicæ septem anni sunt: non enim dixit, septem annos significant: et, Septem boves septem anni sunt: et multa hujusmodi. Hinc est quod dictum est, Petra erat Christus. Non enim dixit, Petra significat Christum, sed tamquam hoc esset, quod utique per substantiam non hoc erat, sed per significationem.—August. Op. Par. 1679—1700. Quæst. in Heptat. Lib. III. Quæst. lvii. 3. Tom. III. Pars II. col. 516.]

[³ Non enim Dominus dubitavit dicere, Hoc est corpus meum, cum signum daret corpus sui..... tamen illud quod lex dixit, fundendum esse sanguinem, nec in escam assumendum, quia sanguis est anima, esse positum dicimus, sicut alia multa; et pene omnia scripturarum illarum sacramenta signis et figuris plena sunt futuræ prædicationis, quæ jam per Dominum nostrum Jesum Christum declarata est. Sic est enim sanguis anima, quomodo petra erat Christus.....nec tamen ait, Petra significabat Christum: sed ait, Petra erat Christus.—Id. Cont. Adimant. cap. xii. 3, 5. Tom. VIII. cols. 124, 6.]

How the bread is Christ's body.

John xv.
John x.
Matt. xxi.
1 Cor. x.
John xv.
Matt. xiii.

Why Christ called the bread his body.

John vi.

In Lev. xvii. quest. 57.

Contra Adimant. cap. 12.

Lev. xvii.

Once again he saith: "We customably use to say, when Easter draweth nigh, To-morrow or the next day is the Lord's passion. And yet it is many years since he suffered, and that passion was never done but once. And upon the Sunday we say, This day the Lord did rise again; and yet it is many years since he rose from death. Why then do not men reprove us as liars when we speak in this sort, but because we call these days by a similitude of those days wherein these things were done indeed? And so it is called that day, which is not that day indeed, but by the course of the year it is a like day. And such things be said to be done that day, for the solemn celebration of the sacrament, which things indeed were not done that day, but long before. Was Christ offered any more but once? And he offered himself; and yet in a sacrament or representation, not only every solemn feast of Easter, but every day he is offered to the people, so that he doth not lie that saith he is every day offered. For if sacraments had not some similitude or likeness of those things whereof they be sacraments, they could in nowise be sacraments. And for their similitude and likeness, commonly they have the name of the things whereof they be sacraments. Therefore, as after a certain manner of speech the sacrament of Christ's body is Christ's body, the sacrament of Christ's blood is Christ's blood; so likewise the sacrament of faith is faith. And to believe is nothing else but to have faith. And therefore when we answer for young children in their baptism that they believe, which have not yet the mind to believe, we answer that they have faith, because they have the sacrament of faith. And we say also that they turn unto God, because of the sacrament of conversion unto God; for that answer pertaineth to the celebration of the sacrament. And likewise speaketh the apostle of baptism, saying that 'by baptism we be buried with him into death.' He saith not, that we signify burial, but he saith plainly that 'we be buried.' So that the sacrament of so great a thing is not called but by the name of the thing itself."

Ad Bonif. Epist. xxiii.
Rom. vi.

Of these words of St Austin it manifestly appeareth, that the sacraments are called by the names of those things whereof they be sacraments; as the sacrament of faith, which is baptism, is called faith. And the sacrament of Christ's body and blood is called the body and blood of Christ, not that they be the things themselves, but they be so called, because they be the figures, sacraments, and representations of the things which they signify, and whereof they bear the names.

Likewise in the old testament was it said of the paschal lamb, "This is the Lord's pass-by, or passover:" and yet that paschal lamb was not the Lord's very passover or passing-by, but it was a figure, which represented his passing by: even after the same manner in the new testament the sacramental bread is called the body of Christ, and the sacramental wine the blood of Christ; not that they be Christ's very body and blood indeed, but they be figures, which by Christ's institution be unto the godly receivers thereof sacraments, tokens, significations, and representations of his very flesh and blood; instructing their faith, that as the bread and wine feed

[⁴ Nempe sæpe ita loquimur, ut pascha propinquante dicamus, crastinam vel perendinam Domini passionem, cum ille ante tam multos annos passus sit, nec omnino nisi semel illa passio facta sit. Nempe ipso die dominico dicimus, Hodie Dominus resurrexit; cum ex quo resurrexit tot anni transierint. Cur nemo tam ineptus est, ut nos ita loquentes arguat esse mentitos, nisi quia istos dies secundum illorum, quibus hæc gesta sunt, similitudinem nuncupamus, ut dicatur ipse dies qui non est ipse, sed revolutione temporis similis ejus; et dicatur illo die fieri, propter sacramenti celebrationem, quod non illo die, sed jam olim factum est? Nonne semel immolatus est Christus in seipso? et tamen in sacramentum non solum per omnes paschæ solemnitates, sed omni die populis immolatur, nec utique mentitur, qui interrogatus eum responderit immolari. Si enim sacramenta quamdam similitudinem earum rerum, quarum sacramenta sunt, non haberent, omnino sa-

cramenta non essent. Ex hac autem similitudine plerumque etiam ipsarum rerum nomina accipiunt. Sicut ergo secundum quemdam modum sacramentum corporis Christi corpus Christi est, sacramentum sanguinis Christi sanguis Christi est, ita sacramentum fidei fides est. Nihil est autem aliud credere, quam fidem habere. Ac per hoc cum responderetur parvulus credere, qui fidei nondum habet affectum, responderetur fidem habere propter fidei sacramentum, et convertere se ad Deum propter conversionis sacramentum, quia et ipsa responsio ad celebrationem pertinet sacramenti. Sicut de ipso baptismo apostolus, Consepulti, inquit, sumus Christo per baptismum in mortem. Non ait, sepulturam significavimus: sed prorsus ait, Consepulti sumus. Sacramentum ergo tantæ rei non nisi ejusdem rei vocabulo nuncupavit.—Id. Epist. xcvi. 9. ad Bonifac. Tom. II. cols. 267, 8.]

them corporally, and continue this temporal life; so the very flesh and blood of Christ feedeth them spiritually, and giveth everlasting life.

Neither ought this phrase or manner of speaking seem strange to any man that hath but a spark of reason, seeing it is not only used in the scriptures of God, but also in our familiar and daily talk. When we behold the images of king Edward the sixth, or of queen Elizabeth, our most gracious queen and governess at this present, use we not to say, This is king Edward, and this is queen Elizabeth? Looking upon the pictures of Hercules, or Hector, our manner is also to say, This is Hercules, or this is Hector; whom notwithstanding they only represent those persons whom we name.

It is well and learnedly said of St Austin: "In sacraments we must not consider what they be, but what they signify. For they be signs of things, being one thing and signifying another¹." Which thing he doth shew specially of this sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, saying: "The heavenly bread, which is Christ's flesh, by some manner of speech is called Christ's body, when in very deed it is the sacrament of his body. And that offering of the flesh, which is done by the priest's hands, is called Christ's passion, death, and crucifying, not in very deed, but in a mystical signification²."

Again he saith, as it is recited in the pope's decrees: "As the heavenly bread, which is Christ's flesh, after a manner is called the body of Christ, when in very deed it is a sacrament of Christ's body, that is to say, of that body which, being visible, palpable, mortal, was put upon the cross; and as that offering of the flesh, which is done by the priest's hands, is called the passion, the death, the crucifying of Christ, not in truth of the thing, but in a signifying mystery; so is the sacrament of faith (which is baptism) faith³."

Upon these aforesaid words writeth the expositor on this manner: "The offering which the priest maketh is called improperly the passion, death, or crucifying of Christ, not that it is that, but that it signifieth it." "And the heavenly sacrament, which truly representeth Christ's flesh, is called Christ's body, but improperly. And therefore it is said 'after a manner, but not in the truth of the thing, but in the signifying mystery;' so that the sense is this: It is called the body of Christ, that is, signifieth⁴."

Father. These things, which thou hast alleged out of the ancient writers, are so evident and plain, that no man can with a good conscience (except he will wilfully resist the truth), deny that these words of Christ, "This is my body," "This is my blood," are figuratively to be understand, and not so grossly as the words sound; yea, and that so much the more, because, if they should literally be taken, they should utterly dissent from many other texts of the holy scriptures, which most evidently declare, that Christ as concerning his corporal presence is not in earth, but in heaven only, and there shall remain until the day of judgment.

Notwithstanding, I would be glad to hear how the ancient fathers of Christ's church have understand and taken these words of Christ, that by this means leaving error, and embracing truth, I might from henceforth walk with a quiet conscience in this behalf, and no more be carried about with every wind of doctrine. For it much grieveth me to see in these our days such and so great dissension to be raised up of Satan among men about this sacrament of the body and blood of Christ; which holy and heavenly sacrament the Lord Christ ordained to be not only a pledge of his

[¹ Hæc enim sacramenta sunt, in quibus non quid sint, sed quid ostendant semper adtenditur: quoniam signa sunt rerum, aliud existentia, et aliud significantia.—Id. Cont. Maxim. Arian. Lib. ii. cap. xxi. 3. Tom. VIII. col. 725.]

[² This appears to be the same passage with that cited immediately after.]

[³ See before, page 250, note 1.]

[⁴ Immolatio quæ fit a presbytero, improprie ap-

pellatur Christi passio, vel mors, vel crucifixio: non quod sit illa, sed quia illam significat.—Ibid. col. 2387. And again: Cœleste sacramentum, quod vere representat Christi carnem, dicitur corpus Christi, sed improprie. Unde dicitur suo modo, sed non rei veritate, sed significati mysterio, ut sit sensus, Vocatur Christi corpus, id est significat.—Decret. Gratiani, Par. 1583. Decr. Tert. Pars, De Consecr. Dist. ii. Gloss. in can. 48. col. 2388.]

Contra Max-
imin. Lib. iii.
cap. 22.

In Sent.
Prosp.

De Consec.
Dist. 2.
Hoc est.

De Consec.
Dist. 2. cap.
Cœlest.

Why Christ
instituted the
sacrament of
his body and
blood.

love toward us, but also a sure and an unloosable bond of hearty love and singular good will, which we that profess Christ, and are partakers of those holy mysteries, ought to have and continually to nourish among ourselves, all contention, strife, debate, envy, hatred, malice, and all uncharitableness utterly laid aside and cast away.

Son. How the ancient fathers took and understood these words of Christ, "This is my body," "This is my blood," it may easily be known by their own writings.

First, Tertullian, which lived in the year of our Lord one hundred and sixty, hath these words, writing against the heretic Marcion, which denied the verity of Christ's body, affirming it not to be a natural but a fantastical body: "Christ, taking bread and distributing it to his disciples, made it his body, saying, 'This is my body,' that is to say, a figure of my body. But this bread could not have been a figure of it, except Christ had had a true body. For a vain thing or a fantasy can take no figure⁵." Again he saith, writing against the aforesaid heretic: "Christ himself did not reprove or discommend bread, which doth represent his body⁶."

Adversus Marcionem, Lib. iv.

Contra Marcionem, Lib. ii.

St Ambrose, which lived in the year of our Lord three hundred and eighty, saith: "Before the consecration another kind is named, but after the consecration the body of Christ is signified, &c⁷." Again he saith: "Make unto us, O Lord, this oblation to be acceptable, which is the figure of the body and blood of our Lord Jesu Christ⁸."

De Mysteriis initiandis, cap. ult. De Sacram. Lib. iv. cap. 5.

St Jerome, which lived in the year of our Lord four hundred and twenty-two, writeth on this manner: "After the mystical Easter lamb fulfilled, and that Christ had eaten the lamb's flesh with the apostles, he took bread, which comforteth the heart of man, and passeth to the true sacrament of the Easter lamb; that as Melchisedech brought forth bread and wine prefiguring him, so might he likewise represent the truth of his body⁹."

In Matt. cap. xxvi. Psal. civ. Gen. xiv.

St Austin, which lived in the year of our Lord four hundred and thirty, writeth on this wise: "The Lord doubted not to say, 'This is my body,' when he gave the sign of his body¹⁰." Again he saith: "The Lord admitted Judas unto the maundy, wherein he did betake and deliver unto the disciples the figure of his body and blood¹¹."

Contra Adimant. cap. 12. In Psal. iiii.

St Cyprian, which lived in the year of our Lord two hundred and sixty, in a certain sermon writeth on this manner: "The Lord gave at the table, in the which he made his last banquet with the apostles, bread and wine with his own hands; but on the cross he gave his body to be wounded with the hands of the soldiers¹²," &c.

In Sermon. de Unctione Christi.

[⁵ Professus itaque se concupiscentia concupisse edere pascha ut suum (indignum enim ut quid alienum concupisceret Deus), acceptum panem, et distributum discipulis, corpus illum suum fecit. Hoc est corpus meum dicendo, id est, figura corporis mei. Figura autem non fuisset, nisi veritatis esset corpus. Ceterum vacua res, quod est phantasma, figuram capere non posset.—Tertull. Op. Lut. 1641. *Adversus Marcionem. Lib. iv. 40. p. 571.]*

[⁶ Sed ille quidem usque nunc nec aquam reprobovavit creatoris, qua suos abluit; nec oleum, quo suos ungit; nec mellis et lactis societatem, qua suos infantat; nec panem, quo ipsum corpus suum representat; etiam in sacramentis propriis egens mendicitatibus creatoris.—Id. *ibid. Lib. ii. 14. pp. 439, 40.]*

[⁷ Ante benedictionem verborum cœlestium alia species nominatur, post consecrationem corpus significatur.—Ambros. Op. Par. 1686—90. *De Myster. Lib. cap. ix. 54. Tom. II. col. 339.* There is much doubt of the genuineness of this work.]

[⁸ Dicit sacerdos: Fac nobis, inquit, hanc oblationem adscriptam, ratam, rationabilem, acceptabilem: quod figura est corporis et sanguinis Domini nostri Jesu Christi.—Id. *de Sacram. Lib. iv. cap. v. 21. col. 371.]*

[⁹ Postquam typicum pascha fuerat impletum, et agni carnes cum apostolis comederat, assumit panem,

qui confortat cor hominis, et ad verum paschæ transgreditur sacramentum; ut quomodo in præfiguratione ejus Melchisedec, summi Dei sacerdos, panem et vinum offerens fecerat, ipse quoque veritatem sui corporis et sanguinis repræsenteret.—Hieron. Op. Par. 1693—1706. *Comm. Lib. iv. in Matt. cap. xxvi. Tom. IV. Pars i. col. 128.]*

[¹⁰ See before, page 282, note 3.]

[¹¹eum tamdiu pertulit tamquam bonum, cum ejus cogitationes non ignoraret, cum adhibuit ad convivium, in quo corporis et sanguinis sui figuram discipulis commendavit et tradidit.—August. Op. Par. 1679—1700. *Enarr. in Psalm. iiii. 1. Tom. IV. col. 7.]*

[¹² Dedit itaque Dominus noster in mensa, in qua ultimum cum apostolis participavit convivium, propriis manibus panem et vinum: in cruce vero manibus militum corpus tradidit vulnerandum; ut in apostolis secretius impressa sincera veritas, et vera sinceritas, exponeret gentibus, quomodo vinum et panis caro esset et sanguis, et quibus rationibus causæ effectibus convenirent, et diversa nomina vel species ad unam reducerentur essentiam, et significantia et significata eisdem vocabulis censerentur, ut sacramentum et res sacramenti.—Cypri. Op. Oxon. 1682. *De Unct. Chrism. (Arnold.) Appendix, p. 48.]*

Ad Mag.
Lib. i. ep. 6.

Again: "The Lord called bread, made of many corns and joined together, his body; and the wine, pressed out of many grapes and made into wine, he named his blood¹."

Ad Cæcil.
Lib. ii. ep. 3.

Also in another place: "It was wine that the Lord called his blood²."

Dist. 2. cap.
Corpus.

Hilarius, which lived in the year of our Lord three hundred and fifty, saith: "There is a figure; for bread and wine be outwardly seen. And there is also a truth of that figure; for the body and blood of Christ be of a truth inwardly believed³."

In Catalo.
Sanctorum.

Petrus de Natalibus saith: "The body of Christ is corporally contained in heaven, but in the host it is contained sacramentally⁴."

In Serm. de
S. Mart.

St Bernard, which lived in the year of our Lord one thousand one hundred and forty, saith: "The flesh of Christ even at this present day is exhibited and given to us, notwithstanding spiritually, not carnally⁵."

Psal. cx.

Beda, which lived in the year of our Lord seven hundred and thirty-two, writing upon the gospel of Luke, hath these words: "After the solemnity of the old Easter lamb was finished, which was observed in the remembrance of the old deliverance out of Egypt, he goeth unto the new, which the church gladly observeth in the remembrance of his redemption; that he, in the stead of the flesh and blood of the lamb, might institute and ordain the sacrament of his flesh and blood in the figure of bread and wine, and so declare himself to be the same unto whom the Lord sware, 'Thou art an everlasting priest, after the order of Melchisedech.' And he himself brake the bread which he gave, to shew that the breaking of his body should not be done without his own will. And likewise he gave them the cup after he had supped. And because bread doth confirm or strength the flesh, and wine worketh blood in the flesh, therefore is the bread mystically referred unto the body of Christ, and the wine referred unto his blood⁶."

Psal. civ.

Christianus Druthmarus hath these words: "The Lord gave to his disciples the sacrament of his body unto the remission of sins, and unto the conservation of charity, that they, being mindful of that act, should always do that in a figure which he should do for them, and not forget this charity or love. 'This is my body,' that is to say, in a sacrament or holy sign⁷." Again he saith: "Wine maketh merry, and increaseth blood, and therefore not unaptly the blood of Christ is figured by it; for whatsoever cometh to us from him maketh us merry with a true mirth, and increaseth all our goodness⁸."

In Matt.

Psal. civ.

Rabanus Maurus saith: "Forasmuch as corporal bread confirmeth the heart, there-

Lib. Inst. i.
cap. 31.

[¹ See before, page 267, note 6.]

[² Qua in parte invenimus calicem mixtum fuisse quem Dominus obtulit, et vinum fuisse, quod sanguinem suum dixit.—Cypr. Op. Oxon. 1682. Epist. lxxiii. ad Cæcil. p. 152.]

[³ Corpus Christi, quod sumitur de altari, figura est, dum panis et vinum extra videtur; veritas autem, dum corpus et sanguis Christi in veritate interius creditur.—Hilar. in Decret. Gratiani, Par. 1583. Decr. Tert. Pars, De Consecr. Dist. ii. Can. 79. cols. 2411, 12.]

[⁴ nec tamen ex hostiarum multitudine corpus unicum plurificatur: quod etiam in cælo et in altare, tamen diversimode, continetur. In cælo enim corporaliter; in hostia sacramentaliter.—Petr. de Natal. Catalog. Sanct. Lugd. 1508. De Fest. Corp. J. Christ. Lib. v. cap. xlv. fol. 125.]

[⁵ Videtur tamen etiam in hoc manere de carnis agni nonnihil esse servatum: sed quod residuum est, utique jam datur igni: quod videlicet usque hodie eadem caro nobis, sed spiritualiter utique, non carnaliter exhibeatur.—Bernard. Op. Par. 1690. In Fest. S. Martin. Serm. Vol. I. Tom. iii. col. 1052.]

[⁶ Finitis paschæ veteris solenniis, quæ in commemorationem antiquæ de Ægypto liberationis agebantur, transit ad novum, quod in suæ redemptionis memoriam ecclesia frequentare desiderat. Ut vide-

licet pro carne agni vel sanguine suæ carnis sanguinisque sacramentum in panis ac vini figura substituens, ipsum se esse monstraret, cui juravit Dominus et non poenitebit eum, Tu es sacerdos in æternum, secundum ordinem Melchisedech. Frangit autem ipse panem quem porrigit, ut ostendat corporis sui fractionem non sine sua sponte futuram, sed sicut alibi dicit, potestatem se habere ponendi animam suam, et iterum sumendi eam. Similiter et calicem, postquam cœnavit, dedit eis. Quia ergo panis carnem confirmat, vinum vero sanguinem operatur in carne; hic ad corpus Christi mystice, illud refertur ad sanguinem.—Ven. Bed. Op. Col. Agrip. 1612. In Luc. Evang. cap. xxii. Lib. vi. Tom. V. col. 424.]

[⁷ Dedit discipulis suis sacramentum corporis sui in remissionem peccatorum, et in conservationem caritatis; ut memores illius facti, semper hoc in figura facerent; quod pro eis acturus erat, non obliviscerentur. Hoc est corpus meum: id est in sacramento.—Christ. Druthmar. Expos. in Math. Evang. Argent. 1514. fol. 84.]

[⁸ Vinum namque et lætificat et sanguinem auget. Et idcirco non inconvenienter sanguis Christi per hoc figuratur; quoniam quicquid nobis ab ipso veniat lætificat lætitia vera, et auget omne bonum nostrum.—Id. ibid.]

fore it is aptly called the body of Christ; and because wine worketh blood in the flesh, therefore is it referred unto the blood of Christ⁹."

Isidorus writeth on this manner: "The bread and wine through mystical prayer ^{Etym. Lib. vi.} and pronouncing of Christ's words are consecrate unto the remembrance of the Lord's passion, which he suffered for us¹⁰."

Father. These words of the ancient fathers are so open, plain, and evident, that no man can with a good conscience deny, but that these words, "This is my body," "This is my blood," are not carnally but spiritually, not properly but figuratively, not naturally but significatively to be understand.

But forasmuch as all these testimonies which thou hast hitherto alleged are borrowed out of the Latin writers, I desire also to know and understand the minds of some Greek authors, and by this means learn the truth of God's word not only of the Latin, but also of the Greek fathers; that I, being confirmed through their authority in the true understanding of Christ's words concerning his holy supper, may from henceforth eschew falsehood and lies, and embrace the truth of God's most holy word, and continue in the same unto the end.

Son. God give us all grace so to do!

First, Origen, which lived in the year of our Lord two hundred and thirty, offereth himself unto us, and saith: "Consider that these things written in God's books (he speaketh of the eating of Christ's body, and of the drinking of Christ's blood) are figures; and therefore examine and understand them as spiritual, and not as carnal men. For if you understand them as carnal men, they hurt you and feed you not. For even in the gospel is there found a letter that killeth. And not only in the old testament, but also in the new, is there found letter that slayeth him that doth not spiritually understand that which is spoken. For if thou follow the letter or words of this that Christ said, 'Except ye eat my flesh and drink my blood,' this letter killeth¹¹."

John vi.

Like unto this writeth Chrysostom: "If any man understand the words of Christ carnally, he shall surely profit nothing thereby. For what mean these words, 'The flesh profiteth nothing?' He meant not of his flesh (God forbid!), but he meant of them that fleshly and carnally understood those things that Christ spake. But what is carnal understanding? To understand the words simply as they be spoken, and nothing else. For we ought not so to understand the things which we see; but all mysteries must be considered with inward eyes, and that is spiritually to understand them¹²." For, as he saith in another place: "If thou were spiritual or without a body, Christ would have given unto thee nakedly those gifts (which are signified by baptism, and the sacrament of thanksgiving) even spiritual and without a body. But forasmuch thy soul is joined to the body, things worthy of understanding are delivered unto thee in sensible things¹³." Again: "What do I call the communion? Even the

In Joan. Hom. 46.

In Matt. cap. xxvi. Hom. 83.

In 1 Cor. cap. x.

[⁹ Ergo quia panis corporis cor firmat, ideo ille corpus Christi congruenter nuncupatur. Vinum autem quia sanguinem operatur in carne, ideo ad sanguinem Christi refertur.—Raban. Maur. Op. Col. Agrip. 1626—7. De Inst. Cler. Lib. i. cap. xxxi. Tom. VI. p. 12.]

[¹⁰ Sacrificium dictum, quasi sacrum factum; quia prece mystica consecratur in memoriam pro nobis Dominicæ passionis: unde hoc eo jubente corpus Christi et sanguinem dicimus, quod dum sit ex fructibus terræ, sanctificatur, et fit sacramentum, operante invisibiliter Spiritu Dei, cujus panis et calicis sacramentum Græci eucharistiam dicunt.—Isidor. Hispal. Op. Col. Agrip. 1617. Orig. sive Etymol. Lib. vi. cap. xix. p. 52.]

[¹¹ Agnoscite quia figuræ sunt, quæ in divinis voluminibus scripta sunt; et ideo tanquam spiritalis et non tanquam carnales examine, et intelligite quæ dicuntur. Si enim quasi carnales ista suscipitis, lædunt vos, et non alunt. Est enim et in evangelii litera quæ occidit; non solum in veteri testamento occidens litera reprehenditur. Est et in novo testamento litera, quæ occidat eum, qui non spiritaliter

quæ dicuntur adverterit. Si enim secundum literam sequaris hoc ipsum quod dictum est, Nisi manducaveritis carnem meam, et biberitis sanguinem meum, occidit hæc litera.—Orig. Op. Par. 1733—59. In Levit. Hom. vii. 5. Tom. II. p. 225.]

[¹² Ἐὰν γὰρ αὐτὸ σαρκικῶς τις ἐκλάβοι, οὐδὲν ἀπώνατο. τί οὖν, οὐκ ἔστι ἡ σὰρξ αὐτοῦ σὰρξ; καὶ σφόδρα μὲν οὖν. καὶ πᾶς εἶπεν, ἡ σὰρξ οὐκ ὠφελεῖ οὐδέν; οὐ περὶ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ σαρκὸς λέγαν μὴ γένοιτο· ἀλλὰ περὶ τῶν σαρκικῶς ἐκλαμβάνοντων τὰ λεγόμενα. τί δὲ ἐστὶ τὸ σαρκικῶς νοῆσαι; τὸ ἀπλῶς εἰς τὰ προκείμενα ὁρᾶν, καὶ μὴ πλέον τι φαντάζεσθαι. τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστὶ σαρκικῶς. χρεὶ δὲ μὴ οὕτω κρίνειν τοῖς ὁρῶμένοις, ἀλλὰ πάντα τὰ μυστήρια τοῖς ἔνδοις ὀφθαλμοῖς κατοπτεῖν· τοῦτο γὰρ ἐστὶ πνευματικῶς.—Chrysost. Op. Par. 1718—38. In Joan. Hom. xlvii. Tom. VIII. p. 278.]

[¹³ Εἰ μὲν γὰρ ἀσώματος εἶ, γυμνὰ ἂν αὐτὰ σοι τὰ ἀσώματα παρέδωκε δῶρα· ἐπεὶ δὲ σώματι συμπλέκται ἡ ψυχὴ, ἐν αἰσθητοῖς τὰ νοητὰ σοι παραδίδωσι.—Id. In Matt. Hom. lxxii. Tom. VII. p. 787.]

very same body are we. What signifieth the bread? The body of Christ. What are they made which receive it? The body of Christ¹." Once again: "If Christ died not, whose symbol and sign is this sacrifice? So [see] what an earnest study he had, that we should alway remember that he died for us²." Also in another place: "If it be perilous to put these hallowed vessels unto private uses, in the which the true body of Christ is not, but a mystery of his body is contained; how much more the vessels of our body, which God hath prepared a dwelling-place for himself, ought we not to give over to the devil for to do in them what he will³?" Item: "When ye come to these mysteries, think not that ye receive the divine body (he meaneth the body of Christ) at the hand of man⁴." Once again he saith: "He prepared this table, that daily, for a similitude or likeness of the body and blood of Christ, he should shew unto us in a sacrament bread and wine, after the order of Melchisedech⁵."

In Matt. Hom. 83. cap. xxvi.

In Opere im-
perfecto in
Matt. Hom.
11.

In Sermo de
Euch. in En-
cænii.

In Psal. xxii.

In Dio. i.

Theodoretus also saith: "Our Saviour Christ without doubt changed the names, and gave to the body the name of the sign or token, and to the token he gave the name of the body. And so when he called himself a vine, he called that blood which was the token of blood." And a little after he saith: "The cause is manifest to them that be expert in true religion. For he would that they which be partakers of the godly sacraments should not set their minds upon the nature of things which they see; but by the changing of the names should believe the things which be wrought in them by grace. For he that called that which is his natural body corn and bread, and also called himself a vine; even he also did honour the visible tokens and signs with the names of his body and blood; not changing the nature, but adding grace to nature⁶."

In Ancor.

Epiphanius saith: "Christ speaking of a loaf, which is round in fashion, and cannot see, hear, nor feel, said of it: 'This is my body'⁷."

In Joan. Lib.
iv. cap. 14.

Cyril saith: "Christ gave to his disciples pieces of bread, saying: 'Take and eat: this is my body.'⁸"

Lib. i. de
Pasch.

Theophilus Alexandrinus saith: "The mystical waters in baptism are consecrate through the coming of the Holy Ghost; and the Lord's bread, wherein the body of our Saviour is shewed and represented, and the which we break for our sanctifying, and the holy cup, which is set on the table of the church, being things without

[¹ Τί γὰρ λέγω κοινωνίαν, φησίν; αὐτό ἐσμεν ἐκεῖνο τὸ σῶμα. τί γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ ἄρτος; σῶμα Χριστοῦ, τί δὲ γίνονται οἱ μεταλαμβάνοντες; σῶμα Χριστοῦ· οὐχὶ σῶματα πολλά, ἀλλὰ σῶμα ἓν.—Id. in Epist. i. ad Cor. Hom. xxiv. Tom. X. p. 213.]

[² Εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἀπέθανεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, τίνας σύμβολα τὰ πελούμενα; ὅρας ὅση γέγορε σπουδὴ, ὥστε αἰεὶ ἀναμνησθεσθαι ὅτι ἀπέθανεν ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν;—Id. in Matt. Hom. lxxxii. Tom. VII. p. 783.]

[³ Si enim vasa sanctificata ad privatos usus transferre peccatum est et periculum, sicut docet nos Balthasar, qui bibens in calicibus sacratis de regno depositus est et de vita: si ergo hæc vasa sanctificata ad privatos usus transferre sic periculosum est, in quibus non est verum corpus Christi, sed mysterium corporis ejus continetur: quanto magis vasa corporis nostri, que sibi Deus ad habitaculum præparavit, non debemus locum dare diabolo agendi in eis quod vult?—Id. Op. Imperf. in Matt. Hom. xi. Tom. VI. p. 63.]

[⁴ Διὸ καὶ προσερχόμενοι, μὴ ὡς ἐξ ἀνθρώπου νομίσητε μεταλαμβάνειν τοῦ θείου σώματος, ἀλλ' ὡς ἐξ αὐτῶν τῶν σεραφίμ τῇ λαβίδι τοῦ πυρός, ἡμπερ Ἡσαΐας εἶδε, τοῦ θείου σώματος μεταλαμβάνειν νομίζετε. Id. De Pœnit. Hom. ix. Tom. II. p. 350. See also Op. Lat. Basil. 1547. De Euch. in Encæn. Admon. Sum. Tom. III. col. 919.]

[⁵ Et quia istam mensam præparavit servis et ancillis in conspectu eorum, et quotidie in similitudinem corporis et sanguinis Christi panem et vinum secundum ordinem Melchisedec nobis ostenderet in

sacramento, ideo dicit: Parasti in conspectu meo mensam adversus eos qui tribulant me.—Id. Op. Basil. Expos. Psal. xxii. Tom. I. col. 712.]

[⁶ Ὁ δὲ γε σωτὴρ ὁ ἡμέτερος ἐνίλλαξε τὰ ὀνόματα· καὶ τῷ μὲν σώματι τὸ τοῦ συμβόλου τέθεικεν ὄνομα, τῷ δὲ συμβόλῳ τὸ τοῦ σώματος. οὕτως ἄμπελον ἐαυτὸν ὀνομάσας, αἶμα τὸ σύμβολον προσηγόρευσεν..... διήλος ὁ σκοπὸς τοῖς τὰ θεῖα μεμνημένοις. ἡβουλήθη γὰρ τοῖς τῶν θείων μυστηρίων μεταλαγχάνοντας, μὴ τῇ φύσει τῶν βλεπομένων προσέχειν, ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς τῶν ὀνομάτων ἐναλλαγῆς πιστεύειν τῇ ἐκ τῆς χάριτος γεγεννημένῃ μεταβολῇ. ὁ γὰρ δὴ τὸ φύσει σῶμα σίτου καὶ ἄρτου προσαγορεύσας, καὶ αὐτὸ πάλιν ἐαυτὸν ἄμπελον ὀνομάσας, οὕτως τὰ ὀράμενα σύμβολα τῇ τοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος προσηγορία πετιμῆκεν, οὐ τὴν φύσιν μεταβαλὼν, ἀλλὰ τὴν χάριν τῇ φύσει προσθετικῶς.—Theod. Op. Lut. Par. 1642—84. Immut. Dial. i. Tom. IV. pp. 17, 18.]

[⁷ Τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἐστὶ στρογγυλοειδὲς καὶ ἀνάσθητον, ὡς πρὸς τὴν δύναμιν. καὶ ἠθέλησεν χάριτι εἰπεῖν, τοῦτό μόνον ἐστὶ τὸδε, καὶ οὐδεὶς ἀπιστεῖ τῷ λόγῳ.—Eriphan. Op. Par. 1622. Ancorat. 57. Tom. II. p. 60.]

[⁸ Τοῖς γὰρ ἡδὴ πεπιστευκόσι διακλάσας τὸν ἄρτον ἐδίδον, λέγων· λάβετε, φάγετε· τοῦτό ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμά μου.—Cyril. Alex. Op. Lut. 1638. In Joan. Evang. Lib. iv. cap. ii. p. 360. It may be observed that in the old Latin version of George Trapezont. from which most likely Becon quoted, the expression is rendered: fragmenta panis dedit.]

sense or understanding, are sanctified through the invocation and coming of the Holy Ghost⁹.”

Gregorius Nazianzenus saith: “Let us be partakers of the passover, and notwithstanding as yet in a figure, although this passover be more plain and evident than the old passover. For the passover of the law, I speak boldly, was a more obscure figure of the figure; but not long hence we shall enjoy it more perfectly and more manifestly, when the Son of God shall drink with us that new (wine) in the kingdom of his Father, revealing and teaching us those things which he hath now but little declared unto us¹⁰.”

In Oratone
de Pasch.

Athanasius, entreating of the eating of Christ's flesh and drinking of his blood, saith that “for this cause he made mention of his ascension into heaven, to pluck them from corporal phantasy, that they might learn hereafter, that his flesh was called the celestial meat that came from above, and a spiritual food, which he would give. ‘For those things which I speak to you,’ saith he, ‘be spirit and life.’ Which is as much to say as, that thing which you see shall be slain and given for the nourishment of the world, that it may be distributed to every body spiritually, and be to all men a conservation unto the resurrection of eternal life¹¹.”

De Peccato
in Spiritum
Sanctum.

Theophylact saith: “Behold the foolishness of these people (he speaketh of the Capernaïtes). For it had been their duty to ask and to learn those things which they knew not. But they ran back, and expounded nothing spiritually, but all things as they appeared. For when they heard of flesh, they imagined that he would compel them to become devourers of flesh and blood. But forasmuch as we understand of it spiritually, we are no devourers of flesh, and moreover we are sanctified by such meat.” Again he saith: “Forasmuch as we have oftentimes said, they expounding carnally those things which Christ spake were offended, he saith: ‘When the things which I speak are spiritually understood, then do they profit.’ For the flesh, that is to say, carnally and fleshly to expound those things, profit nothing, but is made an occasion of offence, &c. The words therefore that I speak are spirit; that is to say, they are spiritual, and life, having in them no carnal and fleshly thing, and bringing everlasting life¹².”

In Joan. vi.

These aforesaid authorities alleged out of the books of the ancient learned fathers, both of the Latin and Greek church, do evidently declare, that these words of Christ, “This is my body,” “This is my blood,” are spiritually and figuratively to be understood, and that they themselves did alway so take and expound them; and in that

[⁹ Dicit enim Spiritum sanctum non operari ea quæ in anima sunt, nec ad irrationabilia pervenire. Quod asserens non recogitat aquas in baptisate mysticas adventu sancti Spiritus consecrari, panemque dominicum, quo Salvatoris corpus ostenditur, et quem frangimus in sanctificationem nostri; et sacrum calicem; quæ in mensa ecclesie collocantur, et utique inanima sunt; per invocationem et adventum sancti Spiritus sanctificari.—Theophyl. Alex. in Mag. Biblioth. Vet. Patr. Col. Agrip. 1618—22. Epist. Pasch. i. Tom. IV. p. 712.]

[¹⁰ Μεταληψόμεθα δὲ τοῦ πάσχα, ὡς μὲν τυπικῶς ἔστι, καὶ εἰ τοῦ παλαιοῦ γυμνότερον· τὸ γὰρ νομικὸν πάσχα, τολμῶ καὶ λέγω, τύπου τύπος ἦν ἀμυρότερος· μικρὸν δὲ ἕστερον, τελεώτερον καὶ καθαρώτερον, ἡνίκα ἂν αὐτὸ πίνῃ καινὸν μεθ' ἡμῶν ὁ Λόγος ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ Πατρὸς, ἀποκαλύπτων καὶ διδάσκων, ἃ ὡς μετρίως παρέδειξεν.—Gregor. Nazianz. Op. Par. 1778—1840. In Sanct. Pasch. Orat. iv. 23. Tom. I. p. 863.]

[¹¹ Ἄλλα διὰ τοῦτο τῆς εἰς οὐρανὸν ἀναβάσεως ἐμνημόνευσε τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου, ἵνα τῆς σωματικῆς ἐννοίας αὐτοῦ ἀφελκῶς, καὶ λοιπὸν τὴν εἰρημνὴν σάρκα βρῶσιν ἄνωθεν οὐράνιον, καὶ πνευματικὴν τροφήν παρ' αὐτοῦ διδομένην μάθωσιν· ἃ γὰρ λελάληκα, φησὶν, ὑμῖν, πνεῦμά ἐστι καὶ ζωὴ ἴσον τῷ εἰπεῖν, τὸ μὲν δεικνύμενον καὶ διδόμενον

ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου σωτηρίας, ἐστὶν ἡ σὰρξ ἣν ἐγὼ φορῶ· ἀλλ' αὐτὴ ὑμῖν καὶ τὸ ταύτης αἷμα παρ' ἐμοῦ πνευματικῶς δοθήσεται τροφή· ὥστε πνευματικῶς ἐν ἐκάστῳ ταύτην ἀναδίδωσθαι, καὶ γίνεσθαι πᾶσι φυλακτήριον εἰς ἀνάστασιν ζωῆς αἰωνίου.—Athanas. Op. Par. 1698. Epist. iv. ad Serapion. 19. Tom. I. Pars II. p. 710.]

[¹² Ὅρα δὲ ἀνοησίαν· δεῖν γὰρ ἐρωτῆσαι, καὶ μαθεῖν τὰ ἀγνοούμενα, οἱ δὲ ἀποπηδῶσι, καὶ οὐδὲν πνευματικῶς ἐκλαμβάνονται, ἀλλὰ πάντα κατὰ τὸ φανόμενον. ἐπεὶ γὰρ σάρκα ἤκουον, ἐνόμιζον, ὅτι σαρκοφάγους αὐτοὺς ἀναγκάζει γενέσθαι καὶ αἰμοβόρους. οἱ δὲ πνευματικῶς νοούντες ἡμεῖς οὔτε σαρκοφάγοι ἐσμέν, καὶ μᾶλλον ἀγιαζόμεθα διὰ τῆς τοιαύτης τροφῆς..... ἐπειδὴ, ὡς πολλάκις εἶπομεν, σαρκικῶς ἐκλαμβάνοντες τὰ λεγόμενα παρὰ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐσκανδαλίζοντο, φησὶν, ὅτι τὸ πνευματικῶς νοεῖν τὰ λεγόμενα παρ' ἐμοῦ, τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ ὠφελεῖν. ἡ δὲ σὰρξ, τουτέστι, τὸ σαρκικῶς αὐτὰ ἐκδέχασθαι, οὐδὲν ὠφελεῖ, ἀλλὰ σκανδάλου ἀφορμὴ γίνεται, οὕτω δὴ αὐτοὶ σαρκικῶς ἀκούοντες τῶν παρὰ Χριστοῦ λεγομένων, ἐσκανδαλίζοντο. ἐπιφέρει οὖν, ὅτι τὰ ῥήματα ἃ ἐγὼ λαλῶ, πνεῦμά ἐστι, τουτέστι, πνευματικὰ ἔστι, καὶ ζωὴ ἐστίν, οὐδὲν ἔχοντα σαρκικόν, καὶ ζωὴν προσενοῦντα αἰώνιον.—Theophyl. Op. Venet. 1754—63. In Joan. Comm. cap. vi. Tom. I. p. 597.]

sense their words remained in the church of Christ a long time after, even unto the time of pope Nicholas the second, which lived in the year of our Lord one thousand¹ and fifty-eight, which first of all taught the gross and corporal presence of Christ in the sacrament, affirming that after the words of consecration the body of Christ was so present, that it was handled and broken with the hands of the priest, and crushed and torn on pieces with teeth of the faithful communicants. Afterward, about the year of our Lord one thousand two hundred and fifteen, pope Innocentius the third did not only affirm that the body of Christ lurked under the kinds of bread and wine, and was handled and broken with the hands of the priest, yea, and crushed and torn on pieces with the teeth of the communicants, according to the doctrine of pope Nicholas the second; but also he decreed by general council, that the sacramental bread was turned into the natural substance of Christ's body, and the sacramental wine into the natural substance of the blood of Christ; so that from that time unto this present age this wicked doctrine of Christ's bodily presence in the sacrament hath so prevailed, that few have espied the truth of God's holy word in this behalf: which thing is the alone occasion that many even at this present day remain and abide still in their old error and blindness.

Father. God have mercy on us and bless us, and lighten his countenance upon us, that we here on earth may know his ways and his saving health among all nations!

Son. Amen.

Father. Methink that this one rule, which the learned inculck and beat in all their preachings and writings, might seem to appease the contention of all men in this behalf.

Son. What is that?

Father. When one sentence of the holy scripture seem to repugn a multitude of sentences, the one sentence ought to give place to the multitude, and not to destroy the verity of the other. As for an example, this one sentence, "This is my body," grossly taken and fleshly understand, yea, and received after the literal sense, seemeth to teach that the natural, corporal, real, substantial, and essential body of Christ is in the sacrament: but if we consider the other places of the holy scripture, which are many in number, affirming plainly that Christ as concerning his corporal presence is not on earth, but in heaven, and so in heaven that he neither is or yet shall be in any other place until the day of judgment; we shall easily grant that it is but a sacramental and figurative speech, and confess that this one sentence ought to give place to a multitude; so that the sacrament is called Christ's body, because it signifieth and representeth to us the body of Christ, and not that it is so in deed and in truth.

Son. It is truly said. For sacraments and signs in the holy scripture, yea, and in our daily speech also, are called by the names of the things which they signify, as we have tofore heard. But as we may draw to an end in this matter, would God all men would at all times remember this good lesson of St Augustine!

"Seldom," saith he, "is any difficulty in proper words, but either the circumstance of the place, or the conferring of divers translations, or else the original tongue wherein it was written, will make the sense plain; but in words that be altered from their proper² signification, there is great diligence and heed to be taken. And specially we must beware that we take not literally any thing that is spoken figuratively." "Nor contrariwise we must not take for a figure any thing that is spoken properly. Therefore must be declared," saith St Austin, "the manner how to discern a proper speech from a figurative. Wherein," saith he, "must be observed this rule, that if the thing which is spoken be to the furtherance of charity, then is it a proper speech, and no figure." "So that if it be a commandment that forbiddeth any evil or wicked act, or commandeth any good or beneficial thing, then it is no figure. But if it command any evil or wicked thing, or forbid any thing that is good and beneficial, then is it a figurative speech. Now this saying of Christ, 'Except ye eat the flesh of the

[¹ The folio has 158.—For popes Nicholas and Innocentius, see before, p. 260, note 2, and 264, n. 3.]

[² Folio, *prayer.*]

Son of man, and drink his blood, ye shall have no life in you,' seemeth to command an heinous and a wicked thing; therefore it is a figure, commanding us to be partakers of Christ's passion, keeping in our minds to our great comfort and profit, that his flesh was crucified and wounded for us³." Again he saith: "The Lord and the teaching of his apostles hath given to us a few signs for many, and those most easy to be done, most excellent in understanding, and in performing most pure; as the sacrament of baptism, and the celebration of the body and blood of the Lord; which every man, when he receiveth, knoweth whereunto they be referred, being taught that he worship not them with a carnal bondage, but rather with a spiritual freedom. And as it is a vile bondage to follow the letter, and to take the signs for the things signified by them; so to interpret the signs to no profit is an error that shrewdly spreadeth abroad⁴."

De Doctrina
Christ. Lib.
ix. cap. 9.

Father. These sentences of St Augustine, if they were diligently noted, weighed, pondered, and considered, might soon put away the too much uncharitable contention, strife, and debate, which (alas for sorrow!) reigneth now-a-days among men concerning the corporal presence of Christ in the sacrament; while every one with tooth and nail goeth about to defend his own assertion, little regarding what the apostles of Christ and the ancient fathers of Christ's church have taught in this behalf. But come off, my son, seeing we have sufficiently talked for this present of this matter, let us fall in hand with the third error, which thou notedst in the doctrine of the papists concerning the Lord's supper.

Son. The papists teach, that not only the faithful and godly, but also the unfaithful and wicked, eat and drink in the sacrament the body and blood of Christ.

The third
error of the
papists in the
doctrine of the sacra-
ment.

Father. And what sayest thou, my son, to this their doctrine? Is it to be allowed?

Son. Nothing less; forasmuch as it is contrary both to the doctrine of Christ and to the teaching of the ancient fathers. And, notwithstanding, the papists are fallen to such impudency and unshamefacedness, while they affirm the corporal presence of Christ in the sacrament, that they shame not to say, that not only the wicked and ungodly, but also the brute beasts, as the mouse, the cat, the rat, the weasel, &c. eating the sacrament, eat also the very true and natural body of Christ, as he was born of Mary the virgin, and hanged on the cross; which is so monstrous doctrine, that nothing can be invented more prodigious or monster-like.

Father. Let me hear it proved by the word of God, that the wicked and ungodly eat not the flesh of Christ, nor drink his blood. *Son.* Christ himself, which is not only true, but also the self truth, saith thus: "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 which I shall give is my flesh, which I shall give for the life of the world." "Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye shall not have life in you. But whosoever eateth my flesh, and drinketh

John vi.

[³ Rarissime igitur et difficillime inveniri potest ambiguitas in propriis verbis, quantum ad libros divinarum scripturarum spectat, quam non ad circumstantia ipsa sermonis qua cognoscitur scriptorum intentio, aut interpretum collatio, aut præcedentis linguæ solvat inspectio. Sed verborum translatorum ambiguitates, de quibus deinceps loquendum est, non mediocrem curam industriamque desiderant. Nam in principio cavendum est, ne figuratam locutionem ad literam accipias..... Hujc autem observationi, qua cavemus figuratam locutionem, id est translata, quasi propriam sequi, adjungenda etiam illa est, ne propriam quasi figuratam velimus accipere. Demonstrandum est igitur prius modus inveniendæ locutionis, propriæ an figuratæ sit. Et iste omnino modus est, ut quidquid in sermone divino neque ad morum honestatem neque ad fidei veritatem proprie referri potest, figuratum esse cognoscas..... Si præceptiva locutio est aut flagitium aut facinus vetans, aut utilitatem aut beneficentiam jubens, non est figurata. Si autem flagitium aut facinus videtur jubere, aut utili-

tatem aut beneficentiam vetare, figurata est. Nisi manducaveritis, inquit, carnem Filii hominis et sanguinem biberitis, non habebitis vitam in vobis. Facinus vel flagitium videtur jubere: figura est ergo, præcipiens passioni dominicæ communicandum, et suaviter atque utiliter recommendandum in memoria, quod pro nobis caro ejus crucifixa et vulnerata sit.—August. Op. Par. 1679—1700. De Doctr. Christ. Lib. iii. 8, 9, 14, 24. Tom. III. Pars i. cols. 47, 9, 52.]

[⁴ quædam pauca pro multis, eademque factu facillima, et intellectu augustissima, et observatione castissima ipse Dominus et apostolica tradidit disciplina: sicuti est baptismi sacramentum, et celebratio corporis et sanguinis Domini. Quæ unusquisque cum percipit, quo referantur imbutus agnoscit, ut ea non carnali servitute, sed spiritali potius libertate veneretur. Ut autem literam sequi, et signa pro rebus quæ iis significantur accipere, servilis infirmitatis est; ita inutiliter signa interpretari, male vagantis erroris est.—Id. Ibid. 13. col. 49.]

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, even so live I by my Father; and he that eateth me shall live by me. This is the bread which came down from heaven; not as your fathers have eaten manna, and are dead: he that eateth of this bread shall live for ever." Again he saith: "I am that bread of life. He that cometh to me shall not hunger, and he that believeth on me shall never thirst," &c.

The wicked and unfaithful neither eat nor drink the body and blood of Christ.

Of these words of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ it is manifest, plain, and evident, that the virtue and power of his flesh and blood is so great and mighty, that whosoever eateth and drinketh thereof shall live for ever, and have everlasting life. But the wicked and unfaithful, although they eat the sacramental bread and drink the sacramental wine, have not everlasting life, as we have Judas for an example: therefore it followeth, that the wicked and unfaithful do not eat nor drink the body and blood of Christ.

Again Christ saith: "He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him." But the wicked and unfaithful dwell not in Christ, nor Christ in them; therefore the wicked and unfaithful neither eat nor drink the body and blood of Christ, although they daily receive the sacraments and signs of them, as St Augustine saith: "He receiveth the meat of life, and drinketh the everlasting cup, that dwelleth in Christ, and in whom Christ dwelleth. For he that agreeth not with Christ doth neither eat the flesh of Christ, nor drink his blood, although to the condemnation of his presumption he receive every day the sacrament of so high a matter.

In Sententiis Prosp.

For this is to eat that bread of life, even to believe in Christ, that is to say, by love to be incorporate in him. Therefore, forasmuch as the reprobate hath not believed in him, he hath not eaten him; and so he had not the faith of the Christians, whereby alone sins are released¹."

Father. These words are very plain, and cannot justly be denied; of the which we learn truly, that not the unfaithful, but the faithful, not the wicked, but the godly-disposed only, eat and drink the body and blood of Christ. Notwithstanding, I would also in this behalf gladly hear the judgment of the ancient fathers and old writers, that we may be well assured, even by their testimonies also, that this is no new doctrine, to teach that the godly only eat Christ, and not the wicked; the faithful, and not the unfaithful; the members of Christ, and not the members of Satan.

Son. The ancient writer Origen hath these words: "The Word was made flesh and very meat, which whoso eateth shall surely live for ever, which no evil man can eat. For if it could be that he that continueth evil might eat the Word made flesh, seeing that he is the Word and bread of life, it should not have been written, 'Whosoever eateth this bread shall live for ever².'" Again he saith: "The one and perfect sacrifice is Christ offered. If any man touch the flesh of this sacrifice, he is made holy straightways³."

St Cyprian saith: "None do eat of this Lamb, but such as be true Israelites⁴," that is to say, pure christian men, without colour or dissimulation.

St Hierome saith: "All that be lovers more of pleasure than of God eat not the

[¹ Escam vitæ accipit, et æternitatis poculum bibit, qui in Christo manet, et cujus Christus habitator est. Nam qui discordat a Christo, nec carnem ejus manducat, nec sanguinem bibit: etiam si tantæ reisacramentum ad judicium suæ præsumptionis quotidie indifferenter accipiat.—Id. Prosp. Lib. Sentent. ex August. cccxli. Tom. X. Appendix, col. 247. See also In Johan. Evang. cap. vi. Tractat. xxvi. 18: below, page 293, note 11.]

[² Πολλά δ' ἀνακαί περι αὐτοῦ λέγοιτο τοῦ Λόγου, ὡς γέγονε σὰρξ, καὶ ἀληθινὴ βρωσίς, ἢν τίνα ὁ φαγῶν πάντως ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, οὐδενὸς δυναμένου φαῦλου ἐσθίειν αὐτήν· εἰ γὰρ οἶόν τε ἢν ἐτι φαῦλου μένοντα ἐσθίειν τὸν γεόμενον σάρκα, Λόγου ὄντα

καὶ ἄρτου ζῶντα, οὐκ ἂν ἐγέγραπτο, ὅτι πᾶς ὁ φαγῶν τὸν ἄρτου τούτου ζήσεται εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.—Orig. Op. Par. 1733—59. Comm. in Matt. Tom. xi. Tom. III. p. 500.]

[³ Igitur sacrificium, pro quo hæc omnia sacrificia in typo et figura præcesserant, unum, et perfectum, immolatus est Christus. Hujus sacrificii carnem si quis tetigerit, continuo sanctificatur.—Id. In Levit. Hom. iv. 8. Tom. II. p. 203.]

[⁴ Una est domus ecclesiæ, in qua agnus editur; nullus ei communicat, quem Israelitici nominis generositas non commendat.—Cypri. Op. Oxon. 1682. De Cæn. Dom. (Arnold.) Appendix, p. 42.]

In Matt. cap. xv.

John vi. In Levit. cap. vi. Hom. 4.

In Serm. de Cœna Dom.

In Esai. cap. lxvi.

flesh of Jesu, nor drink his blood, of the which himself saith: 'He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life⁵.'" Again he saith: "Heretics eat not the flesh of Jesu, whose flesh is the meat of faithful men⁶." Also in another place he saith: "They eat this bread which are strong in Christ, &c. And they drink this wine which are virgins, holy both in body and in spirit⁷." John vi.
In Hiero.
cap. xxii.
In Zach.
cap. ix.

St Ambrose saith: "Jesus is the bread, which is the meat of saints, and he that taketh this bread dieth not the death of a sinner. For this bread is the remission of sins⁸." And in another place he saith: "He that did eat manna died; but he that eateth this body shall have remission of his sins, and shall not die for ever⁹." De Bened.
Patriarch.
cap. ix.
De Sac. Lib.
iv. cap. 5.

St Augustine saith: "They cannot be both the members of Christ and the members of an harlot. For he saith: 'He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.' Here doth he shew what it is, not sacramentally, but truly and effectually, to eat the body of Christ, even to dwell in him. He that dwelleth not in Christ, let him not say or think that he eateth the body of Christ, forasmuch as he is not of his body. He is not a member of Christ, which maketh himself a member of an harlot¹⁰." Also in another place he saith: "This is to eat that meat, and to drink that drink, even for a man to dwell in Christ, and to have Christ dwelling in him. And therefore he that dwelleth not in Christ, and in whom Christ dwelleth not, without doubt he neither eateth spiritually his flesh, nor drinketh his blood, although carnally and visibly¹¹ he bite the sacrament of Christ's body and blood; but he rather eateth and drinketh the sacrament of so worthy a thing unto his own damnation." Item: "They judge truly that say, that he eateth not the body of Christ, which is not in the body of Christ. Neither are they counted to eat the body of Christ, forasmuch as they are not reckoned among the members of Christ¹²." Once again he saith: "The heretics that are without the church may have the sacrament; but the matter of the sacrament they cannot have¹³." De Civ. Dei,
Lib. xxi.
c. 25.
John vi.
In Joan.
Tract. 26.
De Civit. Dei,
Lib. xxi.
c. 25.
Ad Bonifacium.

Hilarius saith: "These things taken and received (he speaketh of the body and blood of Christ) make that both we are in Christ, and Christ in us¹⁴." De Trinit.
Lib. viii.

[⁵ Omnes voluptatis magis amatores, quam amatores Dei.....nec comedunt carnem Jesu, neque bibunt sanguinem ejus. De quo ipse loquitur: Qui comedit carnem meam, et bibit sanguinem meum, habet vitam æternam.—Hieron. Op. Par. 1693-1706. Comm. Lib. XVIII. in Isai. cap. lxvi. Tom. III. col. 506.]

[⁶ Possumus autem hunc locum juxta anagogen contra hæreticos accipere...Quodque infert, Non comedent et non bibent, subauditur corpus et sanguinem Salvatoris.—Id. Comm. Lib. iv. in Jerem. Proph. cap. xxii. cols. 630, 1.]

[⁷ Hunc panem comedunt, qui in Christo robusti sunt...Qui frumentum est electorum, sive juvenum, ipse est et vinum quod lætificat cor hominis; et bibitur ab his virginibus, quæ sunt sanctæ et corpore et spiritu.—Id. Comm. Lib. II. in Zach. Proph. cap. ix. col. 1763.]

[⁸ Hic ergo panis factus est esca sanctorum.....qui autem accipit, non morietur peccatoris morte, quia panis hic remissio peccatorum est.—Ambros. Op. Par. 1686-90. De Bened. Patriarch. Lib. cap. ix. 38, 9. Tom. I. cols. 524, 5.]

[⁹ Deinde manna qui manducavit, mortuus est: qui manducaverit hoc corpus, fiet ei remissio peccatorum, et non morietur in æternum.—Id. De Sacram. Lib. iv. cap. v. 24. Tom. II. col. 372.]

[¹⁰ Ut enim alia taceam, non possunt simul esse et membra Christi et membra meretricis. Denique ipse dicens, Qui manducat carnem meam, et bibit sanguinem meum, in me manet, et ego in eo; ostendit quid sit non sacramento tenus, sed re vera corpus Christi manducare, et ejus sanguinem bibere: hoc est enim in Christo manere, ut in illo maneat et Christus. Sic enim hoc dixit, tamquam diceret, Qui

non in me manet, et in quo ego non maneo, non se dicat aut existimet manducare corpus meum, aut bibere sanguinem meum. Non itaque manent in Christo, qui non sunt membra ejus. Non sunt autem membra Christi, qui se faciunt membra meretricis.—August. Op. Par. 1679-1700. De Civ. Dei, Lib. xxi. cap. xxv. 4. Tom. VII. cols. 646, 7.]

[¹¹ Folio, invisibly.—Hoc est ergo manducare illam escam, et illum bibere potum, in Christo manere, et illum manentem in se habere. Ac per hoc qui non manet in Christo, et in quo non manet Christus, procul dubio nec manducat spiritaliter carnem ejus, nec bibit ejus sanguinem, licet carnaliter et visibiliter premat dentibus sacramentum corporis et sanguinis Christi; sed magis tantæ rei sacramentum ad judicium sibi manducat et bibit.—Id. In Johan. Evang. cap. vi. Tractat. xxvi. 18. Tom. III. Pars II. col. 501. See the 29th Article of our Church.]

[¹² recte intelligunt, non dicendum esse eum manducare corpus Christi, qui in corpore non est Christi.....Nec isti ergo dicendi sunt manducare corpus Christi; quoniam nec in membris computandi sunt Christi.—Id. De Civ. Dei, Lib. xxi. cap. xxv. 3, 4. Tom. VII. col. 646.]

[¹³ Isti autem cum quibus agimus, vel de quibus agimus, non sunt desperandi: adhuc enim sunt in corpore: sed non quærant Spiritum sanctum, nisi in Christi corpore, cujus habent foris sacramentum, sed rem ipsam non tenent intus cujus est illud sacramentum; et ideo sibi judicium manducant et bibunt.—Id. Lib. de Corr. Donatist. seu Epist. ad Bonifac. clxxxv. 50. Tom. II. col. 663.]

[¹⁴ De veritate carnis et sanguinis non relictus est ambigendi locus. Nunc enim et ipsius Domini pro-

In Joan.
cap. x.

Cyril saith: "The fathers which did eat manna died, because they received thereby no strength to live ever (for it gave no life, but only put away bodily hunger); but they that receive the bread of life shall obtain immortality, and shall eschew all evils of destruction, and for ever live with Christ¹." Again: "He that eateth the flesh of Christ hath everlasting life²." Once again: "When we eat the flesh of Christ, then have we life in us. For if through the touching of Christ's body alone things corrupt were made whole, how then shall we not live, which both taste and eat his flesh³?"

In Joan.
cap. xv.
In Joan.
cap. xiv.

And in a certain gloss recited in the pope's law, we read thus: "As in baptism Christ is put on sometime sacramentally, and sometime unto the sanctification of life (the first is common both to good and bad, but the second is proper only to the good); so likewise Christ is eaten of evil persons sacramentally only: but of the good he is received both sacramentally and spiritually, and of all the faithful spiritually⁴."

All these testimonies of the ancient writers, diligently considered, declare manifestly that not the wicked and unfaithful, but the godly and faithful persons only eat the body and drink the blood of Christ. The ungodly eat the sacrament; but they eat not Christ, which is signified by the sacrament, as St Augustine writeth of Judas: "The apostles," saith he, "did eat bread, that was the Lord; but Judas did eat but the bread of the Lord, and not the bread that was the Lord⁵." For whosoever eateth Christ liveth for ever, dwelleth in Christ and Christ in him, is incorporated and made all one with Christ, is made a member of Christ's body, is sanctified and made holy, is made clean both in body and soul, dieth not the death of a sinner, hath remission of his sins, obtaineth immortality, escheweth all evils of death, and for ever liveth with Christ. But none of all these things chance to the unfaithful and wicked persons; therefore eat they not the body of Christ, nor yet drink his blood.

In Joan.
Tract. 59.

Father. I would gladly hear what it is to eat Christ. *Son.* Christ is eaten or received two manner of ways; that is to say, sacramentally and spiritually. He is received or eaten sacramentally, when we eat and drink the sacramental bread and wine, according to the institution of Christ; which thing is done not only of the faithful, but also of the unfaithful. He is also eaten or received spiritually, when we believe in Christ, embrace him as our alone Saviour, put our whole hope, trust, and confidence of our redemption and salvation in that one and alone sacrifice, which Christ offered upon the altar of the cross, having his body there broken, and his blood there shed, for the remission of our sin: again, when we earnestly consider in our minds the passion and death of Christ, with all the benefits thereof, chewing and digesting them with the stomach of our heart, be thankful for them to God the Father, and labour to the uttermost of our power to live worthy his kindness, daily increasing more and more in all godliness and honesty. And after this manner

What it is
to eat Christ.

fessione et fide nostra vere caro est, et vere sanguis est. Et hæc æcclæ atque hausta id efficiunt, ut et nos in Christo, et Christus in nobis sit.—Hilar. Op. Par. 1693. De Trin. Lib. viii. 14. col. 956.]

[¹ Οὐκοῦν οἱ μὲν φαγόντες τὸ μάννα, φησί, τετέλευτήκασι, ὡς οὐδεμίᾳς δηλονότι ζωῆς μετουσίᾳ παρ' αὐτοῦ δεξάμενοι· οὐ γὰρ ἦν ὄντως ζωοποιόν, λιμοῦ δὲ μᾶλλον ἐπίκουρον σαρκικοῦ, καὶ ὡς ἐν τύπῳ τοῦ ἀληθεστέρου παραληφθέν. οἱ δὲ τὸν ἄρτον ἐν ἑαυτοῖς εἰσκομίζοντες τῆς ζωῆς, γέρας ἔξουσι τῆν ἀθανασίαν, φθορᾶς τε καὶ τῶν ἐκ ταύτης κακῶν παντελῶς ἀλογήσαντες, πρὸς ἀμήρυστόν τε καὶ ἀτελεύτητον βίου τοῦ κατὰ Χριστόν ἀναβήσονται μῆκος.—Cyril. Alex. Op. Lut. 1638. In Joan. Evang. Lib. iv. cap. ii. Tom. IV. p. 351.]

[² Οὐκοῦν ὁ τρώγων τὴν ἁγίαν σάρκα Χριστοῦ ζωὴν αἰώνιον ἔχει.—Id. ibid. p. 363.]

[³ Καὶ ἐπεὶ ζωοποιὸς γέγονε τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡ σὰρξ, ἄτε δὴ τῇ κατὰ φύσιν ἠνωμένῃ ζωῇ, τῷ ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀκλονότι λόγῳ, ὅταν αὐτῆς ἀπογεσώμεθα,

τότε τὴν ζωὴν ἔχομεν ἐν ἑαυτοῖς συννεοῦμενοι καὶ ἡμεῖς αὐτῇ, καθάπερ οὖν αὐτῇ τῷ ἐνοικήσαντι λόγῳκαὶ εἰ διὰ μόνης ἀφῆς τῆς ἁγίας σαρκὸς ζωοποιεῖται τὸ ἐφθαρμένον, πῶς οὐχὶ πλουσιωτέρην ἀποκερδανούμεν τὴν ζωοποιὴν εὐλογία, ὅταν αὐτῆς καὶ ἀπογεσώμεθα.—Id. ibid. p. 361.]

[⁴ Nam sicut in baptismo induitur Christus interterdum sacramento tenus, interdum quoad vitæ sanctificationem (primum bonorum et malorum est commune, secundum bonorum et piorum: sed secundum est proprium bonorum); sic a malis manducatur Christus sacramentaliter tantum, a bonis vero sacramentaliter et spiritualiter, et ab omnibus credentibus spiritualiter.—Decret. Gratiani, Par. 1583. Decr. Tert. Pars, De Consecr. Dist. ii. Glossa in can. 59. col. 2396.]

[⁵ Illi manducabant panem Dominum, ille panem Domini contra Dominum: illi vitam, ille pœnam.—August. Op. Par. 1679–1700. In Johan. Evang. cap. xiii. Tractat. lxx. 1. Tom. III. Pars II. col. 663.]

the godly and faithful only eat and receive Christ. Other eating or receiving of Christ there is none.

Father. Why, is not the very natural body of Christ eaten of the communicants both faithful and unfaithful at the Lord's supper? *Son.* Christ is only received and eaten of the faithful communicants: the unfaithful receive not the body and blood of Christ, but the sacraments of the same only, yea, and that unto their damnation. 1 Cor. xi.

Father. And is Christ received corporally with the corporal mouth of the faithful communicants? *Son.* The natural body of Christ is only in heaven; and, notwithstanding, the soul of the faithful communicant with her mouth, that is to say, with faith, doth truly and unfeignedly feed upon it unto her great joy and comfort, and feelth no less true refection than the body doth by receiving corporal food; yea, the faithful communicant, thus eating and receiving Christ, receiveth both in body and soul an heavenly nourishment, a singular comfort, and an unoutspeakable joy.

Father. Faith then is the mouth of the soul, wherewith Christ is received and eaten. *Son.* Yea, verily, as Christ saith: "I am that bread of life. He that cometh unto me shall not hunger, and he that believeth in me shall never thirst." John vi.

Hereto pertaineth the saying of St Augustine: "Why dost thou prepare thy teeth and thy belly? Believe, and thou hast eaten⁶." "For to believe in him is to eat the bread of life. He that believeth in him eateth him⁷." In Joan. Tract. 25.

Likewise saith St Cyprian: "So oft as we do these things (he speaketh of receiving the mysteries of the body and blood of Christ), we whet not our teeth to bite, but with pure faith we break the holy bread⁸." In Serm. de Cena Dom.

Hereto agreeth the saying of Eusebius Emisenus, which lived about three hundred years after Christ's ascension: "When thou dost go up to the reverend altar to feed upon spiritual meat, look upon the holy body and blood of thy God with thy faith, honour him, touch him with thy mind, take him with the hand of thy heart, and chiefly drink him with the draught of thy inward man⁹." In Serm. de Euchar. De Consec. dist. 2.

Chrysostom also saith: "'Where the dead corpse is', saith Christ, 'thither will the eagles resort'. The dead corpse is the body of the Lord, because he died. For except he had fallen, we had never risen again. He nameth eagles, to declare that he that cometh to this body, must climb up on high, and have nothing to do with the earth, nor to be drawn unto the things beneath and to creep; but always to fly up unto the things that are above, and to look upon the Sun of righteousness, and to have a most quick and sharp eye of the mind. For this is a table of eagles, and not of jays¹⁰." In 1 Cor. cap. x. Rom. 24.

And in the Nicene council we are admonished "not to look down unto the bread and the cup that are set on the Lord's table; but to lift up our minds, and with our faith to consider the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world¹¹." Concil. Nicen.

Bertrammus saith, speaking of the body and blood of Christ: "It is a spiritual meat, and a spiritual drink, spiritually feeding the soul, and giving the life of ever-
In Lib. de Corp. et Sang. Dom.

[⁶ Ut quid paras dentes et ventrem? Crede, et manducasti.—Id. In Johan. Evang. cap. vi. Tractat. xxv. 12. Tom. III. Pars II. col. 489.]

[⁷ Credere enim in eum, hoc est manducare panem vivum. Qui credit, manducat: invisibiliter saginatur, quia invisibiliter renascitur.—Id. Tractat. xxvi. l. col. 494.]

[⁸ Hæc quotiens agimus, non dentes ad mordendum acuminis, sed fide sincera panem sanctum frangimus et partimur.—Cypr. Op. Oxon. 1682. De Cœn. Dom. (Arnold.) p. 44.]

[⁹ ita cum reverendum altare cœlestibus cibis satiandus ascendis, sacrum Dei tui corpus et sanguinem fide respice, honora, mirare, mente continge, cordis manu suscipe, et maxime haustu interiore assume.—Euseb. Emiss. in Decret. Gratiani, Decr. Tert. Pars, De Consecr. Dist. II. can. 35. cols. 2377, 8.]

[¹⁰ Οπου γάρ τὸ πτώμα, φησιν, ἐκεῖ καὶ οἱ

ἀετοί, πτώμα καλῶν τὸ σῶμα διὰ τὸν θάνατον. εἰ μὴ γὰρ ἐκεῖνος ἔπασεν, ἡμεῖς οὐκ ἀνέστημεν. ἀετοὺς δὲ καλεῖ, δεικνύς ὅτι καὶ ὑψηλὸν εἶναι δεῖ τὸν προσιόντα τῷ σώματι τούτῳ, καὶ μηδὲν πρὸς τὴν γῆν κοινὸν ἔχειν, μηδὲ κάτω σπύρσθαι καὶ ἔρπειν, ἀλλ' ἄνω πέτεσθαι διηλεκτῶς, καὶ πρὸς τὸν ἥλιον τῆς δικαιοσύνης ἐνορᾶν, καὶ ὀξυδερκέες τὸ ὄμμα τῆς διανοίας ἔχειν. ἀετῶν γὰρ, οὐ κολοῖων, αὕτη ἡ τράπεζα. Chrysost. Op. Par. 1718—38. In Epist. I. ad Cor. Hom. xxiv. Tom. X. p. 216.]

[¹¹ Ἐπὶ τῆς θείας τραπέζης πάλιν κἀνταῦθα μὴ τῷ προκειμένῳ ἄρτῳ καὶ τῷ ποτηρίῳ ταπεινῶς προσέχωμεν' ἀλλ' ὑψώσαντες ἡμῶν τὴν διάνοιαν, πίστει νοήσωμεν κείσθαι ἐπὶ τῆς ἱερᾶς ἐκείνης τραπέζης τὸν ἀμῶν τοῦ Θεοῦ, τὸν αἴροντα τὴν ἀμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου, ἀθῶτως ὑπὸ τῶν ἱερῶν θυόμενον.—Gelas. Hist. Concil. Nic. in Concil. Stud. Labbei. Lut. Par. 1671-2. cap. xxx. Tom. II. col. 233.]

John vi. lasting satiety, as our Saviour himself, commending this mystery, saith: 'It is the Spirit that quickeneth; for the flesh profiteth nothing¹.'

In the pope's own law we read thus: "Christ is eaten two manner of ways: one way sacramentally, which chanceth both to the good and to the bad: another way, when he is received by faith and love working together; and this belongeth only to the good²."

Father. I perceive now right well, that Christ's natural body is not eaten, as the papists teach, with the mouth of the body, but with the mouth of the soul, which is faith. *Son.* It is truth. For thus read we in the book of the pope's canons: *Christum fas vorari dentibus non est*; that is to say, "Christ cannot be devoured with teeth³."

As St Austin likewise saith, as we tofore heard: "Why dost thou prepare the teeth and the belly? Believe, and thou hast eaten." "For to believe in him is to eat the bread of life. He that believeth in him eateth him⁴." Again he saith: "When the Lord spake of his flesh, and said, 'Except a man eat my flesh, he hath not everlasting life in him,' his disciples were offended (peradventure they were seventy), and said, 'This is an hard saying: who can away with this? And they went away from him, and walked no more with him.' This seemed hard unto them, that he saith: 'Except a man eat my flesh, he shall not have everlasting life.' They took it foolishly: they understood it carnally: they thought that the Lord would have cut off certain pieces from his body and given them; and therefore they said, 'This is an hard saying.' Notwithstanding they were hard, and not the saying. Yet he instructed them, and said unto them: 'It is the Spirit that quickeneth: the flesh profiteth nothing. The words which I have spoken to you are spirit and life.' Understand you spiritually the thing that I have spoken unto you. This body that ye see shall ye not eat, neither shall ye drink that blood which they shall shed that shall crucify me. I have set forth unto you a certain sacrament, which, being spiritually understood, shall quicken you, or make you alive⁵."

Father. If Christ be not otherwise truly eaten than with the mouth of the soul, which is faith, and if the faithful alone eat the body of Christ, and drink his blood, how cometh it to pass that we sometime read in ancient fathers, that the wicked also eat the body of Christ? St Austin saith on this wise: "Judas received the body and blood of the Lord⁶," &c. *Son.* You heard before, that sacraments in the holy scripture have the names of the things that are signified by them. After the same

[¹quoniam spiritualis est esca, et spiritualis potus, carnaliter animam pascens, et æternæ satietatis vitam tribuens; sicut ipse Salvator mysterium hoc commendans, loquitur: Spiritus est, qui vivificat, nam caro nihil prodest.—Ratram. Lib. de Corp. et Sang. Dom. Oxon. 1838. cap. ci. pp. 51, 2.]

[² Duobus modis manducatur Christus: uno modo sacramentaliter, quod competit bonis et malis: alio modo spiritualiter, cum per fidem et dilectionem cooperantem accipitur. hoc est tantum bonorum.—Decret. Gratiani, Decr. Tert. Pars, De Consecr. Dist. ii. Glossa in can. 46. col. 2386.]

[³ Sed quia Christum vorari dentibus fas non est, voluit Dominus hunc panem et vinum in mysterio vere carnem suam et sanguinem suum consecratione Spiritus sancti potentialiter creari, et quotidie pro mundi vita mystice immolari.—Id. Dist. ii. can. 72. cols. 2405, 6.]

[⁴ See the preceding page, notes 6, 7.]

[⁵ Tunc autem, quando hoc Dominus commendavit, de carne sua locutus erat, et dixerat, Nisi quis manducaverit carnem meam, non habebit in se vitam æternam. Scandalizati sunt discipuli ejus quidam, septuaginta ferme, et dixerunt, Durus est hic sermo, quis potest eum intelligere? Et recesserunt ab eo, et amplius cum eo non ambulaverunt. Durum illis visum est quod ait, Nisi quis manducaverit carnem

meam, non habebit vitam æternam: acceperunt illud stulte, carnaliter illud cogitaverunt, et putaverunt quod præcisurus esset Dominus particulas quasdam de corpore suo, et daturus illis, et dixerunt, Durus est hic sermo. Ipsi erant duri, non sermo. Ille autem instruxit eos, et ait illis, Spiritus est qui vivificat, caro autem nihil prodest: verba quæ locutus sum vobis, spiritus est et vita. Spiritualiter intelligite quod locutus sum: non hoc corpus quod videtis, manducaturi estis; et bibituri illum sanguinem, quem fusuri sunt qui me crucifigent. Sacramentum aliquid vobis commendavi; spiritaliter intellectum vivificabit vos. Etsi necesse est illud visibiliter celebrari, oportet tamen invisibiliter intelligi.—August. Op. Par. 1679—1700. Enarr. in Psalm. xcvi. 9. Tom. IV. cols. 1065, 6.]

[⁶ The following, though not couched in precisely the language above given, is probably the passage intended: Sicut enim Judas, cui buccellam tradidit Dominus, non malum accipiendo, sed male accipiendo locum in se diabolo præbuit: sic indigne quisque sumens dominicum sacramentum non efficit, ut quia ipse malus est, malum sit, aut quia non ad salutem accipit, nihil acceperit.—Id. De Bapt. cont. Donatist. Lib. v. 9. Tom. IX. col. 146. But see In Johan. Evang. cap. xiii. Tractat LXII. 3. Tom. III. Pars II. col. 669.]

John vi.

De Consec.
Dist. 2. Glossa
in cap.
Quid est.De Consec.
Dist. 2. cap.
Ururum.In Joan.
Tract. 25.

In Ps. xcvi.

John vi.

De Bapt. con-
tra Donat.
cap. 8.

manner speaketh St Austin in this place. He saith, that Judas received the body and blood of the Lord, when he meaneth the sacrament of the body and blood of the Lord. For that Judas received not the body and blood of Christ, it appeareth manifestly by these words of St Austin: "The apostles," saith he, "did eat bread that was the Lord; but Judas did eat but the bread of the Lord, and not that bread that was the Lord." Here St Austin affirmeth plainly that the apostles, receiving the sacramental bread, received also Christ himself; but Judas, which was wicked and unfaithful, received only the sacramental bread, and not Christ; so far is it off that he received the very body and blood of Christ, which cannot be eaten nor drunken, but only of the faithful, yea, and that none otherwise than with the mouth of the soul, which is faith, which faith the believing alone have; and therefore they alone eat and drink the body and blood of Christ. For this cause, when we read in the old fathers that the wicked receive the body and blood of Christ, it is to be understand of the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ; remembering always that figures, signs, or sacraments bear the names of the things which they signify and represent. "All mysteries," saith St John Chrysostom, "are to be considered with inward eyes, that is to say, spiritually."

In Joan.
Tract. 59.

A good
lesson.


In Joan.
Hom. 46.

Father. Hitherto thou hast declared, my son, what the Lord's supper is, who did institute the Lord's supper, why the Lord's supper was instituted, how we ought to prepare ourselves unto the Lord's supper, and what abuses and errors have crept into the church of Christ through the wicked doctrine of the papists about the Lord's supper; so that nothing almost concerning the supper of the Lord hath escaped thee, whereof thou hast not sufficiently spoken, yea, and confirmed the same both by the authority of the holy scriptures, and by the testimonies of the ancient fathers. Notwithstanding, let me ask thee one or two questions, although not of so great and weighty importance. What thinkest thou, is it more meet to receive the supper of the Lord at a table, or rather at an altar? *Son.* At a table.

Father. Why so? *Son.* For our Saviour Christ did both institute this holy supper at a table, and the apostles of Christ also did receive it at a table. And what can be more perfect than that which Christ and his apostles have done? All the primitive church also received the supper of the Lord at a table. And St Paul, speaking of the Lord's supper, maketh mention not of an altar, but of a table. "Ye cannot be partakers," saith he, "of the Lord's table, and of the devils' table also." Tables for the ministration of the Lord's supper continued in the church of Christ almost three hundred years after Christ universally, and in some places longer, as histories make mention⁹; so that the use of altars is but a new invention, and brought in, as some write, by pope Sixtus, the second of that name¹⁰.

A table is
more meet
for the minis-
tration of the
Lord's supper,
than an
altar.

1 Cor. x.

Moreover, an altar hath relation to a sacrifice. And altars in the old law were built and set up at the commandment of God, to offer sacrifice upon them. But all those sacrifices do now cease (for they were but "shadows of good things to come"); therefore the altars ought to cease with them. Christ alone is our altar, our sacrifice, and our priest. Our altar is in heaven. Our altar is not made of stone, but of flesh and blood; of whom the apostle writeth thus: "We have an altar, whereof it is not lawful for them to eat which serve in the tabernacle."

Heb. x.

Heb. xiii.

Furthermore, the papists have greatly abused their altars, while they had such confidence in them, that without an altar, or in the stead thereof a *superaltare*, they were persuaded that they could not duly and truly, and in right form, minister the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ. And this their altar and *superaltare* likewise must be consecrate, have prints and characters made therein, washed with oil, wine, and water, be covered with a cloth of hair, and be garnished with fine white linen cloths, and other costly apparel; or else whatsoever was done thereon was counted vain and unprofitable. The use also of altars hath greatly confirmed and maintained

[⁷ See before, page 294, note 5.]

[⁸ See before, page 287, note 12.]

[⁹ For a full account of the custom of the primitive church, and the use of the terms *altar*, and *table*,

see Bingham, Orig. Eccles. Book viii. chap. vi. 11—14.]

[¹⁰ See Stella, Vit. Pontif. Basil. 1507. Sixtus II. fol. B.]

the most wicked error and damnable heresy, which the papists hold, concerning the sacrifice of the mass; while they teach that they offer Christ in their mass to God the Father, an oblation and sacrifice for the sins of the people, both of the living and of the dead, and by this means they greatly obscure and deface that most sweet-smelling and alone true, perfect, and sufficient sacrifice of Christ's death. And therefore all the altars of the papists ought now no less to be thrown down and cast out of the temples of the Christians, than in times past the altars of the priests of Baal; so far is it off that they be meet to be used at the celebration of the Lord's supper.

Finally, who knoweth not that we come unto the Lord's table, not to offer bloody sacrifices, to the performance whereof we had need of altars, but to eat and drink and spiritually to feed upon him that was once crucified and offered up for us on the altar of the cross, a sweet-smelling sacrifice to God the Father, yea, and that once for all? Now if we come together to eat and drink these holy mysteries, and so spiritually to eat Christ's body, and to drink his blood, unto salvation both of our bodies and souls, who seeth not that a table is more meet for the celebration of the Lord's supper than an altar?

Father. Thy reasons are good, and not to be discommended. But what sayest thou concerning the gestures to be used at the Lord's table? Shall we receive those holy mysteries kneeling, standing, or sitting? *Son.* Albeit I know and confess that gestures of themselves be indifferent; yet I would wish all such gestures to be avoided as have outwardly any appearance of evil, according to this saying of St Paul: "Abstain from all evil appearance." And first of all, forasmuch as kneeling hath been long used in the church of Christ at the receiving of the sacrament, through the doctrine of the papists, although of itself it be indifferent to be or not to be used, yet would I wish that it were taken away by the authority of the higher powers.

Father. Why so? *Son.* For it hath an outward appearance of evil. When the papists, through their pestilent persuasions, had made of the sacramental bread and wine a god, and had taught and commanded the people to take and worship it as God, then gave they in commandment straightways that all people should with all reverence kneel unto it, worship, and honour it. And by this means this gesture of kneeling crept in, and is yet used in the church of the papists, to declare that they worship the sacrament as their Lord God and Saviour. But I would wish with all my heart, that either this kneeling at the receiving of the sacrament were taken away, or else that the people were taught that that outward reverence was not given to the sacrament and outward sign, but to Christ, which is represented by that sacrament or sign¹. But the most certain and sure way is utterly to cease from kneeling, that there may outwardly appear no kind of evil, according to this commandment of St Paul, "Abstain from all evil appearance:" lest the enemies, by the continuance of kneeling, should be confirmed in their error, and the weaklings offended and plucked back from the truth of the gospel. Kneeling with the knowledge of godly honour is due to none but to God alone. Therefore, when Satan commanded our Saviour Christ to kneel down before him and worship him, he answered, "It is written, Thou shalt worship the Lord"²...

Standing, which is used in the most part of the reformed churches in these our days, I can right well allow it, if it be appointed by common order to be used at the receiving of the holy communion. And this gesture of standing was also used at the commandment of God of the old Jews, when they did eat the paschal lamb, which was also a sacrament and figure of Christ to come, as our sacrament is a sign and figure of Christ come and gone. Neither did that gesture want his mystery. For the standing of the Jews at the eating of the Lord's passover signified, that they had a further journey to go in matters of religion, and that there was a more clear light of the gospel to shine than had hitherto appeared unto them, which

[¹ A notice to the effect here mentioned had appeared in the second book of king Edward VI. It was laid aside under queen Elizabeth, but restored with some slight alterations at the last review of the

Liturgy, in 1662.]

[² It seems probable that there is some omission here; as the sense is confused.]

Of gestures to be used at the Lord's table.

1 Thess. v.
Of kneeling.

1 Thess. v.

Matt. iv.

Of standing.

Exod. xii.



were wrapped round about with the dark shadows of ceremonies: again, that other, yea, and those more perfect, sacraments were to be given to God's people; which all things were fulfilled and came to pass under Christ, the author of the heavenly doctrine of the gospel, and the institutor of the holy sacraments, baptism and the Lord's supper.

Now, as concerning sitting at the Lord's table, which is also used at this day Of sitting. in certain reformed churches, if it were received by public authority and common consent, and might conveniently be used in our churches, I could allow that gesture best. For as it is not to be doubted but that Christ and his disciples sat at the table, when Christ delivered unto them the sacrament of his body and blood, which use was also observed in the primitive church, and long time after³; so likewise it is most comely that we Christians follow the example of our Master Christ and of his disciples. Nothing can be unreverently done, that is done after the example of Christ and of his apostles. We come together to eat and drink the holy mysteries of the body and blood of Christ: we have a table set before us: is it not meet and convenient that we sit at our table? The table being prepared, who standeth at his meat? Yea rather, who sitteth not down?

When Christ fed the people, he bade them not kneel down, nor stand upon their John vi. feet, but he commanded them to sit down; which kind of gesture is most meet when we assemble to eat and drink, which thing we do at the Lord's table. Neither doth ☞ the sitting of the communicants at the Lord's table want her mystery. For as the standing of the Jews at the eating of the Lord's passover signified that there was yet to come another doctrine than the law of Moses, even the preaching of the glorious gospel of our Lord and Saviour Christ Jesu, and other sacraments than circumcision and the passover, even the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's supper; so in like manner the sitting of the christian communicants at the Lord's table doth signify, preach, and declare unto us, that we are come to our journey's end concerning religion, and that there is none other doctrine nor none other sacraments to be looked for than those only which we have already received of Christ the Lord. And therefore we, sitting down at the Lord's table, shew by that our gesture that we are come to the perfection of our religion, and look for none other doctrine to be given unto us. Notwithstanding, as I said before, gestures are free, so that none occasion of evil be either done or offered. In all things which we call indifferent, this rule of St Paul is diligently to be obeyed: "Abstain from all evil appearance."

Father. I do not disallow thy judgment in this behalf. But come off, tell me, what sayest thou concerning the vestures which the ministers use at the ministration of the Lord's supper? 1 Thess. v. Of vestures at the ministration of the Lord's supper.

Son. In some reformed churches the ministers use both a surplice and a cope; in some only a surplice; in some neither cope nor surplice, but their own decent apparel.

Father. And what thinkest thou in this behalf? *Son.* When our Lord and Saviour Christ Jesus did minister the sacrament of his body and blood to his disciples, he used none other but his own common and daily apparel, and so likewise did the apostles after him, and the primitive church likewise used that order; and so was it continued many years after, till superstition began to creep into the church. After that time, fond foolish fancy of man's idle brain devised, without the authority of God's word, that the minister in the divine service and in the ministration of the holy sacraments should use a white linen vesture, which we now commonly call a surplice. Surplice. Until this time, the church of God continued in the simplicity of Christ and of his apostles, requiring no painted visors to set forth the glory and beauty of our religion; which is then most glorious and most beautiful when it is most simple, and none otherwise set forth than⁴ it was used and left unto us of Christ and of his apostles. And contrari-

[³ On the posture observed in receiving the sacrament of the Lord's supper in church, see Bingham, Orig. Eccles. Book xv. chap. v. 3., who gives numerous quotations from the fathers to shew "that the

ancients received sometimes standing, sometimes kneeling, but never sitting."]

[⁴ Folio, *whan.*]

wise, it is then most obscured and defaced when it is daubed over with the vile and vain colours of man's wisdom, although outwardly never so gorgeous and glorious.

Afterward, as superstition grew and increased, so likewise the people began more and more to be liberal in giving to the church, and in adorning, decking, and trimming the temples of the Christians; yea, and that so much the more, because they were now persuaded that such temple and will-works pleased God, deserved remission of sins and everlasting life. By this means came it to pass that the simple and plain tables, which were used in the apostolic and primitive church, were taken away, and standing altars set up and gorgeously decked with sumptuous apparel, and garnished with gold, pearl, and precious stone. And because that he which should minister at that gorgeous and sumptuous altar should answer in some point to the glory thereof, therefore it was devised that the minister also should have on his back gallant and gorgeous apparel, as an amice, an alb, a tunicle, a girdle, a fannel¹, a stole, a vestment, &c., whereof some were made of silk, some of velvet, some of cloth of gold; yea, and those garnished with angels, with images, with birds, with beasts, with fishes, with flowers, with herbs, with trees, and with all things that might satisfy and please the vain eye of the carnal man. And all these things, being before but voluntary, grew afterward unto matters of so great weight and importance, yea, unto such necessity, that it was made a matter of conscience, yea, it was become deadly sin to minister the holy communion without these scenical, histrionical, and hickscorner-like garments; so that now to sing mass or to consecrate, as they use to say, without these popish robes, is counted in the church of the papists more than twice deadly sin; so far is it off that these missal vestures are now things of indifferency.

Vestments.

Note.

2 Cor. vi.

Whether it be lawful to wear a surplice.

Rom. xiii.

Acts v.

Of receiving the sacrament with the hands.

Wherefore, in my judgment, it were meet and convenient that all such disguised apparel were utterly taken away; forasmuch as it is but the vain invention of man, and hath been greatly abused of the massing papists. For "what hath the temple of God to do with idols?" "What concord is there between Christ and Belial?" What have the vestments of a popish altar to do with the table of the Lord Christ?

Father. But what thinkest thou of the surplice, which is now commonly used in the most part of the reformed churches? is it lawful to wear a surplice, or not? *Son.* In things indifferent we may use our liberty, which we have gotten by Christ. Therefore if a magistrate, being godly, command that the minister in the time of his administration wear a surplice, not for the maintenance of superstition, but for a seemly and decent order, his commandment in this behalf is to be obeyed, and no godly minister ought to resist it. For in all matters that are not contrary to God's word the magistrate is to be obeyed, "not only for fear of punishment, but also for conscience sake." But if the magistrate command any thing directly against God's word, in this behalf he is not to be obeyed, nor his commandment to be accomplished; but we must answer with the apostles: "We must obey God more than men." "Whether it be righteous in the sight of God to hear you rather than God, judge ye." But in things that be indifferent, we must take heed that we clog no man's conscience, nor make that a thing of necessity which is mere voluntary.

Father. It is well said. But what thinkest thou of the receiving of the mysteries of Christ's passion and death? In the church of the papists the lay people can by no means be suffered with their hands to touch either the Lord's bread or the cup; but the sacrificing priest put the bread into the people's mouth and give them the wine, as though the people were unworthy either to touch the bread or the cup. In the reformed churches they take both the sacramental bread and cup in their own hands, delivered unto them by the minister.

Son. When the popish priests had exalted themselves too far above the laity, and counted the common people, in comparison of themselves, profane and unclean persons; again, when they had made of the sacrament a god, and had taught the people to worship it, and to kneel unto it; then, that the sacrament might be had in the greater estimation, they decreed among themselves that the laity should by no means touch with their unclean hands the body of their Lord God, as they call it;

[¹ Fannel, or fanon: a sort of small scarf worn by a priest on his arm while saying mass.]

again, that they with their profane hands should not touch the sacred and hallowed chalice, wherein notwithstanding not the mystery of Christ's blood, but mere wine is contained. For as the papists, like thieves, have stolen away from the common people the Lord's cup, contrary to Christ's institution. And although I know, that it is a matter neither of salvation or damnation, as they use to say, the laity either to take the sacrament into their own hands, or else to receive it at the hand of the minister into their mouths; yet is it more agreeable to the institution of Christ, and to the order of the primitive church, to take the sacraments into their own hands, both the bread and the cup. For what hath the hand more offended than the lips, the tongue, the mouth, the teeth, &c.? Hath not he sanctified the hand which hallowed the mouth? Be not both of like holiness before God? A layman to touch the sacramental bread or cup with his bare hand is counted in the parish church a grievous sin; but if the layman have a glove on his hand, made of a sheep's skin, then he may be bold to touch it: as though there were more holiness or worthiness in a sheep's skin than in a christian man's hands. O hypocrites, swallowing in a camel and straining out a gnat!

When Christ delivered the signs of his body and blood to his disciples sitting at the table, he said not unto them, Gape, hold, eat, &c. and so thrust the bread into their mouths; but he delivered the bread into their hands, and said: "Take ye, and eat." Neither said he, Hold, open your mouths, I will pour wine into them; but he delivered the cup into their hands, saying: "Take, and divide this among you." And this order continued many years after Christ's time, as we may find both in histories, and also in the monuments of the ancient writers.² This popish custom therefore, of thrusting the sacramental bread into the mouths of the communicants, ought utterly to be abolished, lest that by the maintenance thereof the popish and wicked error of Christ's corporal presence be established and confirmed.

Father. Is the sacramental bread to be worshipped, as the papists have heretofore taught? *Son.* Nothing less. For it is written: "Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God, and him alone shalt thou serve." To worship any creature as God is plain idolatry. Christ said: "Take, eat," "divide among you." He said not, Behold, fall down and worship. The worshipping therefore of the sacrament ought utterly to be forbidden and to be abolished, as mere idolatry and most execrable abomination before the Lord our God, to whom alone all worship, honour, and glory is due.

Father. Well, my dear son, thou hast not only satisfied, but also overcome mine expectation in all things wherein I have hitherto talked with thee. Five parts of the Catechism have we passed over: one part now remaineth behind to be entreated of, which is concerning the offices of all degrees. *Son.* You say truth, most loving father.

[² See Cypr. Op. Oxon. 1682. De Lapsis, p. 132; De Bon. Patient. p. 216; August. Op. Par. 1679—1700. Cont. Lit. Petil. Lib. ii. 53. Tom. IX. col.

233. An abundance of other authorities may be seen in Bingham, Orig. Eccles. Book xv. chap. v. 6.]

Whether the sacrament ought to be worshipped.