

Library of The Theological Seminary

PRINCETON · NEW JERSEY



PRESENTED BY

The John M. Krebs
Class of 1832

BR
350
.B92
A55

S E R M O N S

ON THE

S A C R A M E N T S,

BY

✓
HENRY BULLINGER,

MINISTER OF THE CHURCH OF ZURICH.

CAMBRIDGE:

PRINTED AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS,

FOR T. STEVENSON.

LONDON:

JOHN WILLIAM PARKER, WEST STRAND.

M.D.CCC.XL



PREFACE.

HENRY BULLINGER was regarded as one of the most learned men of his time ; and was distinguished, also, for his piety, christian wisdom, and moderation. All the Fathers of the English Reformation held him in great esteem ; and to many of them he afforded a hospitable refuge from the Marian persecution¹. He afterwards did good service to the Church of England by the letters which he addressed to different individuals in this country, during the disputes which grew up in Queen Elizabeth's reign, respecting Ecclesiastical affairs. For although BULLINGER himself, in common with many of the continental Protestants, preferred the disuse of the sacerdotal Habits², and had acquiesced in the presbyterian Discipline, yet he constantly exhorted those of the Puritan faction in England to abstain from dividing Christ's Church merely for the sake of their scruples respecting a particular kind of dress³: and he, moreover, counselled the English Bishops that "it ought especially to be provided that there should not be any high authority given" to those of the "Presbytery." By this decided expression of his

¹ Strype, *Mem.* II. 1., pp. 531, 532. Oxf. Edit.

² See p. 219 of these Sermons.

³ Collier, *Church Hist.* II. 501.

opinion, BULLINGER greatly served the cause of Order; insomuch that in a joint Letter written to him by Bishops GRINDAL and HORN, those eminent persons attribute chiefly to his instrumentality the favorable change which, they inform him, had taken place in the feelings of the people toward the Church¹. BULLINGER, in fact, was one of those who had offered to make EDWARD VI. the temporal Defender of the reformed continental Churches, and had expressed a willingness to have Bishops after the model of the Anglican Church². He, therefore, regarded those restless persons who were for abolishing Episcopacy in England, as no better than selfish innovators who, like the "seditious Tribunes of Rome," were, "by virtue of the Agrarian Law," for so bestowing "the public goods that they might enrich themselves³."

We need not, therefore, be surprised to find that among the writings of the continental Reformers, those of BULLINGER were held in marked estimation by the Anglican Divines. An example of this occurs in the circumstance, that the University of Oxford selected BULLINGER'S Catechism as one of those books which the Tutors there were required to use, for the purpose of imparting sound religious principles to their Pupils⁴. Several of BULLINGER'S works were, moreover, translated into our language; and among other productions of his pen, "Fiftie godly and learned Sermons, divided into

¹ Strype's *Grindal*, p. 156. Oxf. Edit.

² Strype, *Parker*, I. 139, 140. Oxf. Edit.

³ Strype, *Ann.* II. 1. 469. Oxf. Edit. Collier, II. 542.

⁴ "Ad informandum in verâ religione juventutem." Wood, *Hist. et Ant. Univ. Oxon. Lib.* 1. p. 296.

five Decades, containing the chief and principal points of Christian Religion," were rendered accessible to the English reader by a translation which appeared in 1577. From the title page of the Book we learn only that the Sermons were "translated out of Latin into English by H. I. Student in Divinitie," but Strype⁵ informs us that the translator was a "person of eminency in the Church." The object of the translation professedly was to furnish the younger and less learned portion of the Clergy with sound Divinity, "that the Ministerie which now is in place may be better able to do their dutie." The reason given in the Preface for selecting the Sermons of BULLINGER for translation, in preference to the "worthie works" of other "famous Divines" of that time, is, that some of the "sort" of Ministers for whom that labour was undertaken complained "that CALVIN'S manner of writing in his Institutions is over deep and profound for them. MUSCULUS, also," it is added, "in his Common Places is very scholastical; the Commentaries of MARLORAT upon John, of PETER MARTYR upon the Judges, of GUALTER upon the small Prophets, and other many are translated and extant, which altogether do handle most points of Christian doctrine excellently well: but this sort of Ministers for the most part are so bare bitten of their Patrons, that to buy them all would deeply charge them⁶. Therefore questionless no writer yet in the hands of men

⁵ Strype, *Ann.* II. II. 144.

⁶ Burton similarly complained, in his odd way, that "if our greedy Patrons hold us to such hard conditions as commonly they do, they will make most of us work at some trade, as Paul did—at last turn taskers, maltsters, costermongers, grasiers, sell ale, as some have done, or worse."—*Anatomy of Melancholy*. Preface.

can fit them better than Master BULLINGER in these his Decades, who in them amendeth much CALVIN'S obscurity with singular perspicuity; and MUSCULUS' scholastical subtilty with great plainness and even popular facilitie." The translator adds, that "the Decades of Master BULLINGER" possess this further recommendation to the Clergy that they are "Sermons in name and in nature:—fit to be read out of the pulpit unto the simplest and rudest people of this land:—the doctrine of them very plain, without ostentation, curiosity, perplexity, vanity, or superfluity; very sound also, without Popery, Anabaptism, Servetianism, or any other heresy."

That the translator had not too highly estimated this work of BULLINGER may be concluded from the important fact that, on the 2nd of December 1586, the Convocation, among other "Orders for the better increase of learning in the inferior Ministers, and for more diligent preaching and catechising," enjoined that

I. Every minister having cure, and being under the degrees of Master of Arts, and batchelors of law, and not licensed to be a public preacher, shall, before the second day of February next, provide a Bible, and Bullinger's Decads in Latin or English, and a paper-book: and shall every day read over one chapter of the holy Scriptures; and note the principal contentes thereof briefly in his paper-booke: and shall every weeke read over one Sermon in the said Decads, and note likewise the chief matters therein contained in the said paper [book]; and shall once in every quarter, (viz. within a fortnight before or after the end of the quarter) shewe his said note to some preacher nere adjoyninge to be assigned for that purpose.

II. Item, The bushop, archdeacons, or other ordinary, being a public preacher, shall appoint certaine grave and learned preachers, who shall privately examine the diligence, and view the notes of the said ministers, assigninge sixe or seaven ministers, as occasion shall require, to every such preacher, that shall be next adjoyninge to him,

so as the ministers be not driven to travall for the exhibitinge of their notes above sixe or seaven miles (if it may be) and the said preacher shall, by letters or otherwise, trulie certifie to the archdeacons or other ordinarye of the place, themselves being public preachers, and resiant within, or nere to their jurisdiction, and for want thereof to the bushop himself, who do performe the said exercises, and how they have profited therein, and who do refuse or neglecte to perform the same; the archdeacons, and others receiving the said certificates, shall signifye the same, once in the yere, to the busshope, and that about Michaelmas.

III. Item, Such as shall refuse to perform the exercises, or shall be negligent therein, and shall not after admonition by the bishop, archdeacon, or other ordinary aforesaid, reform himself, if he be beneficed, shall be compelled thereunto by ecclesiastical censures; if he be a Curate, shall be inhibited to serve within the jurisdiction¹.

One result of these "Orders" was that a new Edition of the Decades was put forth in 1587, "Cum gratiâ et privilegio Regiæ Majestatis."

Independently, therefore, of any value that may attach to these Sermons of "Master BULLINGER" considered as a work in which (as the translator affirms) "there will be found such light and instruction for the ignorant; such sweetness and spiritual comfort for consciences; such heavenly delights for souls" . . . that "the more diligently you peruse them the more delightfully they will please;" they come recommended to us as expressing the religious opinions of the Anglican Church. For since the Decades were selected by competent Ecclesiastical Authority as a Manual for preachers, they were invested by that act with the character of a Church-exposition of such points of Christian doctrine as are therein discussed. To reprint these Sermons, therefore, can never be regarded as

¹ Wilkins, *Concilia*, &c. Vol. iv. pp. 321, 322.

an unseasonable undertaking: for although by God's good Providence the Church of these Realms may be so abundantly supplied with fit and able Pastors, that there be no longer occasion to enjoin our Preachers to copy out weekly "an Homilie or Sermon of" BULLINGER, or of "some" other "excellent clerk;" yet the judgement pronounced upon the Decades by our Church remains in all its authority and importance.

It has now only to be stated that the following Sermons have been reprinted from the edition of 1587; the orthography having been modernised; corrections, when necessary, supplied; and the side Notes collected into a Table of Contents.

G. C.

CAMBRIDGE, *April*, 1840.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

SERMON I.

	PAGE		PAGE
SIGNS	1	Chrysostom, touching the cause of	
Division of Signs out of St Au-		Sacraments	18
gustine	—	The Lord is to be praised for in-	
Signs distinguished according to		stituting Sacraments.....	19
their times.....	2	The Wisdom of God shineth in	
Of Signs, some are given of Men,		the institution of Sacraments....	20
other some ordained of God...	3	The manner of making Leagues or	
Signs given of Men.....	—	Covenants.....	—
The diversity of Signs given of		The number of Sacraments.....	21
Man	4	Wholesome Rites of the Church	
Signs given of God.....	5	are not contemned	24
The diversity of Signs given by		In what things Sacraments con-	
God	—	sist	25
Signs and Wonders	—	Signs external and inward things.	27
Miraculous Signs.....	6	Signs earthly and visible: things	
Signs paradigmatical, or for ex-		heavenly and invisible.....	—
ample	7	The Word and Rite.....	28
Sacramental Signs are severed from		Promise and Ceremony	—
other Signs, with which they		What is understood by the Word	
have many things common	—	in Sacraments	31
Sacrament.....	8	In the Name of the Lord Jesus	
What a Sacrament is	9	Christ the feeble are healed.....	32
Sacrament taken for an Oath	—	The place of Paul in the 5th chap-	
Soldier's Oath	10	ter to the Ephesians is expound-	
What a Mystery is	11	ed.....	33
What a Symbol is	12	The words spoken do not form and	
Only God is the Author of Sacra-		make Sacraments effectual	37
ments	14	Whether by blessing the nature of	
Sacraments are to be received as it		things are changed	39
were at the hands of Christ.....	15	The Omnipotency of God	40
Why Sacraments were instituted		Of the word of blessing	41
unto us in visible things.....	17	Thanksgiving and blessing.....	42

PAGE	PAGE		
For what purpose Words are instituted, and of what force they are.....	43	the Signs and the things signified are joined together	59
How the power of Almighty God is attributed to the Word.....	44	Signs borrow the names of things signified	60
Of true Sanctification or Consecration.....	45	Circumcision	—
How our Sacraments are consecrated.....	48	The Paschal Lamb	61
The Signs and the thing signified do retain their several natures in the Sacraments.....	49	Sacrifices	62
The wicked are not partakers of the things signified in the Sacraments	50	Baptism	62
The affinity of the Word of God and Sacraments	51	The Supper of the Lord	63
The Scripture maketh difference between the ministry of Man and the operation of the Spirit	52	Sacramental and figurative Speeches	—
The opinion of the Papists touching Transubstantiation is confuted	53	The manner of Speech which we use	64
That Bread and Wine remain in their substances after Consecration	54	The ancient Fathers used no contention about the Sacraments... ..	—
Whether the Bread and Wine for their former substance are so called after Consecration	56	It is not said the Rock signified Christ: but the Rock is Christ. ..	66
The Council of Lateran was in the year of our Lord 1215.....	57	Their error which will not have sacramental speeches expounded sacramentally	—
Of the Sacramental union.....	58	Carnal bondage and servile weakness	67
It is declared how in Sacraments		How a figurative Speech is received and acknowledged	68
		The words of our Saviour in John vi, do make much for the interpretation in the words of the Supper	69
		Some argue from the Sacraments of the Old Testament to ours of the New	70
		We may use sacramental speeches	—
		Sacramental speeches are to be expounded	71

SERMON II.

We must use reverence in disputing of Sacraments	75	It is a great Sin not to attribute so much unto Sacraments as the Scripture doth attribute	76
The Ark of the Covenant	—	It is taught that Sacraments give grace.....	78
To attribute too much to Sacraments.....	—		

PAGE	PAGE		
Of the likeness and difference of the Sacraments of the Old and New Testament.....	79	The matter is made plain by a Parable.....	105
Augustine teacheth that the Sacra- ments of the Jews and ours are all one	81	Sacraments have a more effectual force than any sealed Charters	106
Grace, what it is	82	How Baptism sealeth	—
Sacraments do not confer or give Grace	83	Infants which believe not are Bap- tised.....	108
The error in the Apostolic Church	85	How the Lord's Supper is a Seal of the righteousness of Faith...	109
That Grace is given freely, and re- ceived by faith	86	Zuinglius of the Sacraments which certify and bear witness.....	110
Their fantasy which fain a general and special faith is here con- futed	87	The Holy Ghost doth properly seal	111
Whether the grace of God be con- tained in the Sacraments.....	88	The Sacraments seal nothing to the Unbelievers.....	112
What is sung in the Easter Holidays at their Consecration of Baptism	89	Sacraments represent things.....	113
Bonaventura saith that Grace is not contained in the Sacraments	—	Sacraments do stir up and help Faith.....	—
The seat of the grace of God.....	90	Of the analogy in Baptism.....	114
The Canon of the Nicene Council touching Baptism.....	92	To give and take Names in Bap- tism	115
The Apostles baptised in water not consecrated.....	—	Of the analogy in the Supper.....	116
To include grace in the Sacraments causeth idolatry	93	Synaxis-Communion	117
The godly are first justified and received into favour before they be made partakers of the Sacra- ments.....	—	How the Sacraments do stir up Faith	—
To evacuate the Sacraments and convince God of a lie.....	97	The efficacy or force in the preach- ing of God's word.....	118
Sacraments are holy and not pro- phane things.....	—	Zuinglius of the Sacraments up- holding faith	—
Sacraments are witnesses of the truth.....	100	A conjunction with Christ and with the Church.....	120
The Gospel is a witness	101	By Sacraments we are visibly ga- thered together into one religion and distinguished from others... —	—
Sacraments do visibly confirm the good-will of God to usward.....	—	The place of Paul, 1 Cor. x., “The Bread which we break,” &c., is expounded	121
Sacraments are Seals, and where- unto Seals do serve.....	102	They are members of the Devil that are partakers of unlawful Sacraments	125
The place of Paul, Rom. iv., is expounded, “And he received a Sign of the Circumcision,” &c.	103	Zuinglius of binding Sacraments, &c.	126
		Sacraments put the Faithful in mind of their duty.....	127
		That the Sacraments profit nothing without Faith	128

	PAGE		PAGE
Augustine doth teach that Sacraments received without faith are unprofitable to the Receivers....	130	fluous or void to them that have faith	133
Sacraments depend not on our worthiness or unworthiness	131	Sacraments are indifferent	135
Of Baptism of Infants	132	Many are sanctified without visible Sacraments	136
That Sacraments are not super-		Cyprian's error touching the Sacrament of Baptism	138

SERMON III.

Baptism	141	Soul of the uncircumcised shall be cut off"	168
What Baptism is	142	The exposition of the place "Except a man be born of Water," &c.	169
Who instituted Baptism	—	Who are to be baptised	173
When Baptism was instituted	143	Who be the people of God.....	—
Of what Baptism consisteth	—	Infants confessing or believing ...	177
One only Baptism.....	—	By what arguments the Anabaptists teach that Infants ought not to be baptised	—
The Baptism of John, of Christ, and of the Apostles is one and the self-same	144	Infants understand not the mystery of Baptism	181
Of the Baptism of Christ which is also the Baptism of fire.....	145	That the Baptism of Infants is of God, and that the Apostles baptised Infants	—
Of the Rite or Ceremony of Baptism	147	The Baptism of Infants hath lasted from the time of the Apostles... ..	185
What it is to Baptise in the Name of the Lord	148	The History of Anabaptism	186
Ceremonies added in times past to Baptism	150	Imperial Law against the Anabaptists	187
Whether we ought to baptise with Water not consecrated	153	The places alleged to prove Anabaptism are confuted	189
Why the Lord commanded to baptise with Water	154	The twelve men of Ephesus not re-baptised	—
Whether once or thrice the Infant ought to be dipped in the Water.	155	Of the force of Baptism.....	191
Of the place of Baptism.	156	We are baptised into the remission of Sins	192
The time of Baptism.	—	Baptism is effectual for Man's whole life.....	193
What the Baptism worketh	158	By Baptism we are gathered together to be the people of God.	—
Whether Midwives may baptise... ..	160	Baptism serveth for our Confession.	195
Zipporah circumciseth	161		
Of Salvation of Infants departing without Baptism.....	162		
The Pelagians deny the Baptism of Infants and why?	166		
The exposition of the place "The			

SERMON IV.

	PAGE		PAGE
Sundry names of the Lord's Supper	197	Of the place where the Supper is to be celebrated	216
The Lord's Table	—	Of the Lord's Altar or Table	217
Communion	198	Of vessels belonging to the Lord's Supper	218
Breaking of Bread	—	What Garment is to be worn at the Supper	219
A memorial of the Lord's Passion	—	What Tongue is to be used	220
A Thanksgiving	—	What Gestures	—
A Sacrament	—	Of taking it in the hands	—
Synaxis	—	The remnants of the Supper	221
An Assembly	—	Whether to be shut up and adored	—
A Testament	—	What time to be celebrated	222
What the Lord's Supper is	199	How often to be celebrated	223
The Supper of the Lord is an holy action	—	For whom the Supper is instituted	224
Who is the Author of the Supper	200	The Supper was not instituted for Infants	226
When the Supper was instituted	201	Whether it is to be celebrated against imminent dangers	227
Whereof it consisteth	—	The Supper not to be celebrated at home or privately for the sick nor the whole	228
The Words of the Supper	202	The Sacrament not to be offered for the dead	232
After what manner the Supper was celebrated and instituted	—	Sacrifices of two sorts of expiation and confession	233
Whether it be lawful to add anything to the Rite, &c.	204	Of the ends of the Lord's Supper	235
How in old time it hath been celebrated in the Church	205	The Lord witnesseth unto us his promise and communion	—
The performing of the Lord's Supper changed	207	Opinion of bodily presence confuted	237
Why it was instituted in the form of Bread and Wine	—	Of the true understanding of the Lord's words, "This is my Body"	238
Whether the Bread ought to be leavened or unleavened	—	When to depart from the letter	240
Whether Water is to be mingled with the Wine	208	The ancient exposition of the words of the Supper, "This is my Body"	—
In celebrating the Supper, nothing is to be followed but that which we have received of Christ	209	A demonstration of the figurative words of the Supper, "This is my Body"	243
Of both kinds to be given and received in the Supper	211		
Of the Consecration of the Bread and Wine	214		
Whether there must be one chief dealer in the action of the Supper	—		

	PAGE		PAGE
To ascend into Heaven	251	That Judas was present at the	
Miracles and the Omnipotency of		Lord's Supper.....	271
God	256	What Judas received of the Lord	
Of Christ's presence in the Supper	257	at the Supper	272
Christ is not divided	260	How the Unbelievers are made	
Of the true eating of Christ's		guilty of Christ's body and	
body	261	blood.....	273
How Christ hath given his flesh		Of the other ends of the Lord's	
unto us.....	262	Supper	275
How Christ's body is eaten and		Of worthily and unworthily eating	
his blood drunken.....	263	and drinking the Lord's Supper.	277
The Flesh profiteth nothing.....	268	To make difference of the Lord's	
The Lord's words in John vi. are		body	279
fitly to be applied to the matter		The punishment of those that eat	
of the Supper.....	269	unworthily	281
Of two kinds of eating the Lord's		How we should prepare ourselves	
Supper	270	for the Lord's Supper	283
The third kind of eating.....	271	A comfort for afflicted consciences	285

ADDENDA.

PAGE	LINE	
1	19	“ Fabius saith, &c.”, add, Lib. v. c. 19.
10	19	“ as Vegetius saith in his book <i>de Re Militare</i> ,” add, Lib. II. c. 24.
11	18	“ Cœlius (<i>in Lect. Antiq.</i>) &c.”, add, Lib. XVI. c. 9. Francof. 1666.
15	18	“ that saying of St Augustine which is in every man’s mouth, &c.”, add, <i>In Joan.</i> Tract. 82.
23	16	“ Augustine elsewhere maketh mention of the Sacrament of Orders,” add, <i>Contra Epist. Parmenian.</i> Lib. II. c. 12. <i>De Baptism. contra Donat.</i> Lib. I. c. 1.
92	16	“ The Canon of the Council of Nice,” add, <i>Concil. Sacr.</i> Labb. et Cossart. Tom. II. p. 234.

ERRATA.

20	9	“ In this ”	<i>read</i> In the.
68	12	“ that this meant ”	<i>read</i> that this is meant.
160	10	“ <i>liferis</i> ”	<i>read</i> <i>liferas</i> .
171	1	“ That ”	<i>read</i> that.
187	Note	“ i. e. ”	<i>read</i> Vide.—This Treatise is however falsely attributed to St Augustine, though sometimes printed with his works.
270	18	“ what was delivered ”	<i>read</i> that was delivered.

SERMON I¹.

Of Signs, and the manner of Signs. Of Sacramental Signs. What a Sacrament is. Of whom, for what Causes, and how many Sacraments were instituted of Christ for the Christian Church. Of what things they do consist. How these are consecrated. How the Sign, and the thing signified in the Sacraments, are either joined together, or distinguished: and of the kind of Speeches used in the Sacraments.

IN speaking of Sacraments delivered by Christ our King and High Priest, and received, and lawfully used, of His holy and catholic Church; I will, by God's grace and assistance, observe this order: first, to entreat of them generally, and then particularly or severally. And here beforehand, I will determine upon the certain signification of a Sign or Sacrament: wherein if I shall be somewhat long or tedious, I crave pardon (dearly beloved) therefore; for I hope it shall not be altogether fruitless. *Signum*, a Sign; the Latin writers call, a token, a representing, a mark and show of some thing that hath signification. So say Tully² and Fabius. Fabius saith, "Some call Signum σημειον, though some term it *Indicium*; other some *Vestigium*,—a mark or token whereby a thing is understood,—as slaughter by blood." S. Aurelius Augustine, the famous Ecclesiastical writer, (*De Magistro* c. 4,) saith, "We generally call all those things Signs which signify somewhat, where, also, we find words to be." Again (*De Doctrina Christiana*, lib. 11. c. 1) he saith, "A Sign is a thing besides the semblance which it layeth before our

¹ The sixth Sermon of the fifth Decade.

² De Invent. 1. 30.

senses, making of itself something to come into our mind or thought; as by seeing smoke we believe there is fire." The said Aurelius Augustine doth divide signs into Signs natural, and Signs given. Natural, he calleth those which, without any will or affection to signify besides themselves, make something else to be known; as is smoke signifying fire. For smoke hath not any will in itself to signify. Signs given, are those which all living creatures do give one to another, to declare, as well as they can, the affections of their mind, or any thing which they conceive, mean, or understand. And Signs given, he divideth, again, by the senses. "For some belong to the eyes, as the ensigns or banners of Captains; moving of the hands, and all the members. Some, again, belong to the ears, as the trumpet and other instruments of music; yea, and words themselves, which are chief and principal among men when they intend to make their meaning known." Unto smelling he referreth "that sweet savour of ointment mentioned in the gospel¹, whereby it pleaseth the Lord to signify somewhat." To the taste he referreth "the supper of the Lord;" For (saith he) "by the tasting of the Sacrament of His body and blood, He gave or made a Sign of His will²." He addeth, also, an example of touching,—“And when the woman by touching the hem of His garment is made whole³, that is not a Sign of nothing, but signifieth somewhat." In this manner had Augustine entreated of the kinds, and differences of Signs.

Other, also, whose opinion doth not much differ from his, distinguish Signs according to the order of times. For of Signs (say they) some are of things present, some of things past, and some of things to come. They think them

¹ John xii. 3.

² Mark xiv. 25.

³ Matth. ix. 20, 21.

Signs of things present, which signify those things to be present which are signified; as the Ivy garland hanging for a Sign, doth give us to understand that there is wine to be sold where it is hanged up. The Signs which our master Christ wrought, did signify that the Messias, and the kingdom of God promised by the prophets, was come⁴. Under Signs past they comprize all tombs, monuments of the dead, and those stones pitched of Joshua in the midst of Jordan⁵; signifying to them which came after what was done in times before. The fleece did give to Gideon a figure of things to come⁶: that is to say, a Sign of the victory which he should have over his enemies.

But these Signs being well considered and not neglected, may more amply and plainly be divided into other Signs; whereof some are given of men, and some ordained of God Himself. Signs or tokens are given of men, whereby they show and signify some thing; and by which, also, they keep some thing in memory among men; or do, as it were, seal up that which they would have certain and sure. After this manner is every description, or picture demonstrative, called a figure. For in Ezekiel (ch. iv.) Jerusalem, which was pourtrayed in a tile, is called a Sign. They, also, in ancient time termed the images of the dead Signs, because by those images they would renew afresh the memory of them whose Signs they were called; and keep them in remembrance as if they were alive. Yea, and the holy scripture calleth idols Signs, as it appeareth in Isaiah xlv. and 2 Chron. xxxiii. So stones being set or laid to mark out any thing, as land-marks, and all tombs, and monuments, are Signs. Rahab of Jericho said to the Israelites,—Give me a Sign by oath that you will shew mercy

⁴ Matth. xii. 6.⁵ Josh. iv. 5, 6.⁶ Judg. vi. 37—40.

to me¹: and they gave her a rope to hang out of her window. Behold, the rope was a Sign of their faith and truth, wherewith they did (as we should say) seal themselves surely and without all dissimulation, to take diligent heed that Rahab should not be destroyed. We Switzers term such Signs given or received in confirmation of faith and truth, *Wortzeichen*, because they are added to the words, and do, as it were, seal them: and *Wahrzeichen* also, because by them we do, as it were, give witness that in good faith, and without all fraud or guile, we will perform that in deed which we promised in word.

Now these kinds of Signs are of divers sorts. For some are mute or dumb, and pertain to the sense of the eyes; of which sort are standards used in war, crosses, banners, flaming fires, whereof mention is made Numb. ii. 2. Psal. lxxiv. 4. &c. Neither is a man able to reckon up all of this sort: for ever and anon new come in as pleaseth men. Judas gave a Sign unto his company, "Whomsoever" (saith he) "I shall kiss that same is he, take him." (Matth. xxvi. 48.) The joining of right hands, which pertaineth to the sense of feeling, is a Sign of faithfulness, help and fellowship; yea, it is the dumb Sign; which sign Paul calleth "the right hand of fellowship." (Gal. ii. 9.) Hitherto belong divers movings and gestures. Some of them are pertaining to the voices which are conceived by hearing, and are uttered by man's voice, or by the sound of things which have no life. By man's voice are uttered words, whistling, and whatsoever other things are of this kind: whereunto watch-words uttered by the voice, may be added, as Shibolet in Judges xii. 6. Moreover, voices without life are they which are made by trumpets, flutes, horns, guns, drums, ringing of bells, and

¹ Josh. ii. 12.

sounding instruments: which, also, extend very far and largely.

Now Signs are given of God to this end,—to teach and admonish us of things to come or of things past; either that they may, after a sort, lay before the eyes of the beholders and represent, in a certain likeness, the things themselves whereof they are Signs; or else, that they may, as it were, seal the promises and words of God with some visible ceremony celebrated of men by God's institution. To be short:—that they might exercise our faith, and gather together those which are scattered into one assembly and company. And these are not all of one sort, but do much differ between themselves. For some have their beginning of natural causes, and yet, nevertheless, are given as Signs of God to put us in mind of things, or to renew His promises, and to teach men things that have been done: of which kind is the rainbow mentioned by Moses, (Gen. ix. 16). For when the flood ceased, that God made a new league with Noah, and ordained the rainbow for a Sign of His covenant, He made it not anew, but being made long afore, and appearing by natural causes, by a new institution He consecrated it, to the intent it might cause us to call to our remembrance the flood; and, as it were, to renew the promise of God, that is to say, that it should never come to pass again that the earth should be drowned with water. Now this Sign hath not any ceremony ordained whereby it might be celebrated among men; neither doth it gather us together into the society of any body or fellowship. But this Sign is referred chiefly to God, saying, “I will set my rainbow in the clouds, that when I see it I may remember the everlasting covenant made between me and you.” (Gen. ix. 14, 15.) Not much unlike to this are signs and won-

ders:—Signs, I say, in the sun, the moon, and the stars¹; which do forewarn men of destruction and calamities to come, unless by repentance they amend. But neither have these any ceremony ordained to celebrate the remembrance of them, or to gather us together &c. Again, there be other signs altogether miraculous, not natural, though there be natural things in them; of which sort Gideon's fleece is; and the shadow of the sun going back in the Dial² of King Hezekiah. These Signs as we read them to have been once shown, so by no institution are they commanded to be followed or for some certain end to be celebrated. To Hezekiah they were given, at that time, to signify and witness the victory which he should have against his enemies, and the recovery of his health. Altogether and merely marvellous are those things which, in the last of Mark, by our Lord Jesus Christ, are called Signs, gifts, and means of healing, and speaking with tongues, given unto, and bestowed upon men; not by any power of man, or virtue of healing in him, but by the power and virtue of Christ only. These Signs declared unto men that that was the true and undoubted preaching of the Gospel, whereby Christ is declared to be Lord of all;— Lord of life and death, of Satan, and of hell also itself. For now when through the name of Christ the dead do rise, and diseases being driven out go their way, by these very Signs it is proved that that is true which is said, that Christ is Lord of all things. So the wonders which Moses and Aaron wrought in Egypt, (Exod. iv.) are called, in the scripture, Signs. For they were witnesses both of God's lawful sending, and tokens of His mighty power to be executed against Egypt; but neither had these any ceremony, neither gathered together into any society. Now, also, we read that some Signs

¹ Luke xxi. 25.

² Isai. xxxviii. 8.

are paradigmatical; that is, used indeed of men, but not without God's commandment; that these also may be said to be Signs from God. Those be altogether free from miracles, and indeed not only fetched from natural things, but also from things mere common and usual, as were the bands, pitcher, and chains, of the holy prophet Jeremy, whereby, being willed of God so to do, he laid before them those things in a certain evident form and figure³: I mean, in a visible Sign to be seen with men's eyes, which, by his preaching, he prophesied should fall upon them. The like we may see in Ezekiel, chap. xvii, xxiv. These Signs paradigmatical or for example, are in some things like to those exercises of Rhetoric, called *Chriæ Activæ*: yea rather they are certain mixed *Chriæ*, so termed; for that they consist partly in words, and partly in deeds. Aphthonius defineth an *Active Chria* to be "that which declareth and plainly sheweth a thing by action, deed, or gesture⁴." As when Pythagoras was demanded how long man's life lasted; he for a while stood still, that they might look upon him; but anon he shrunk away, and withdrew himself out of their sight: after that manner and action signifying, that man's life is but short, and momentary. But in the scripture for the most part are set down *Chriæ*, consisting of word and deed: as when Christ took a child and set him in the midst of His disciples, and spake these words: "Verily I say unto you, except ye shall turn and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven." (Matth. xviii. 3.) But these actions or Signs have not the institution, and commandment of God, charging us to renew this very action by solemn celebrating the same. Nevertheless sacramental Signs have some affinity with these, namely,

³ Jer. xix. 1: xxvii. 2.

⁴ Aphthon. *Progymnasmat.* a Joachim. Camerario Papce. p. 5.

Baptism and the Lord's Supper. For they are given to us from above, and are taken from natural things without any miracle: yea, they are instituted under the form of natural, and sensible things, and in such things as are very common—Water, Bread, and Wine. This they have common with other Signs given of God, in that they renew things past, and shadow out things to come; and, by a Sign, do represent things signified. They differ peculiarly from other Signs, in that they have ceremonies joined with the commandment of God; which ceremonies He hath commanded His church to solemnize. And this, also, is peculiar to them,—that being seals of God's promises, they couple us visibly to God, and to all the saints: and they are dedicated to the most holy mysteries of God in Christ. Of these I will intreat more largely and diligently hereafter.

The sacramental Signs of Christ and of Christ's church, namely, which Christ our Lord hath delivered to His church, and which His church hath received of Him, and doth lawfully use, the same are called of Latin writers by the name of *Sacraments*. But the word is not found in the whole scripture, saving that it is read to be used of interpreters. Howbeit the word *Sign* is oft in the scripture: and that which helpeth for our purpose is most significantly set down in Genesis xvii. and Romans iv. In the mean while we do not reject the Latin word *Sacramentum*, a Sacrament, as lightly regarding it; neither yet rejecting it, do we forge or devise a new. I like well enough of the word Sacrament so it be used lawfully. St Augustine, in his 5th *Epistle to Marcellinus* saith “It were too long to dispute of the diversity of Signs, which, when they pertain to holy things, are termed Sacraments.” From whence, doubtless, sprang that common definition, or description. “A Sacrament is a Sign of an

holy thing:" which as it cannot be rejected, so there is none but seeth that in it the nature of the thing is not fully comprehended, or expressed; neither is it separated from these things which also are holy Signs. There is another definition, therefore, brought forth and used, which indeed is more perfect than the other. "A Sacrament is a visible Sign of an invisible grace." But because this also, doth not in all points express the nature of the thing, this definition following seemeth unto many more allowable, which is after this manner: "Sacraments are Ceremonies wherewith God exerciseth His people, first to stir up, increase, and maintain their faith; then, to the end to testify before men His religion." This is a true and right definition. But what if you define a Sacrament somewhat more fully and largely in this manner? "Sacraments are holy actions consisting of words or promises of the Gospel, or of prescript rites or ceremonies, given for this end to the church of God from heaven, to be witnesses and seals of the preaching of the Gospel; to exercise and try faith; and, by earthly and visible things, to represent and set before our eyes the deep mysteries of God: to be short, to gather together a visible church or congregation; and to admonish them of their duty." This definition, truly, is far fet¹, large, and manifold; a definition, I say, gathered of many parts; but we mean to go to it simply, and plainly; and to lay forth the whole matter before your eyes to be seen. Then will we make manifest every part thereof, and confirm the same with testimonies of scripture.

Now, that I may fully intreat of the names that are given to this thing, I find that Latin writers call Sacrament, an oath, or a religious bond: because it was not done

¹ Extensive: so below, "Signum, the word Sign stretcheth very far."

(as I think) thoroughly and to the proof, without certain ceremonies. M. Varro, in his fourth book *de Lingua Latina*, declaring what it is to contend with an oath, saith, "The plaintiff and the defendant gaged down, at the place appointed for that purpose, five hundred pieces of silver, and also in other things a set number of ounces; so that he which recovered in judgment should have his gage again; but he which was cast should forfeit it to the treasury." Since, therefore, by intermeddling of holy things through partaking of the Sacraments, we are bound to God, and all the saints, as it were, by obligation; and that God himself, also, by the testimony of the Sacraments, hath, as it were, by an oath bound Himself to us; it appeareth that the name of Sacrament is very aptly, and properly applied to our Signs. We read, also, in Latin writers, of an oath that soldiers used to take. For it was not lawful for them to fight unless they were put to their oath, and sworn. They took a solemn oath, having one to recite the form of the oath to them word by word, (as Vegetius saith in his book *de Re Militari*) that they would stoutly and readily do whatsoever their Captain demanded them: and that they would never forsake the field in the defence of the common weal of Rome. They had a donation given unto each of them, as it were a pledge or earnest: they gave up their name to be enrolled; and were marked, that they might be known from other soldiers. Now because we by our Sacraments, specially by Baptism, are received and enrolled to be Christ's soldiers; and by receiving the Sacraments do profess and witness ourselves to be under Christ our Captain's banner, therefore not amiss, nor without reason, are the Signs of Christ and His church called Sacraments. In the mean while, I will not stoutly stand in contention that the word

Sacrament was for that cause chiefly attributed of them in ancient time to their own Signs. For Erasmus of Rotterdam, a man very well seen in the tongues, and thoroughly tried in old and ancient writers, none better, (*in Catech. sua Symb.* 5) saith;—"They which speak most exquisitely call *Sacramentum*, an oath or bond confirmed by the authority of God and reverence of religion. But our elders used this word to express that which the Greeks call a Mystery; which a man may call a religious Secret, because the common people were excluded from meddling with them¹." Thus far he. Therefore the old writers did call those signs Sacraments, instead of mysteries. For the self-same Signs are called of the Greeks *μυστήρια*, Mysteries, which the Latin writers, for the most part, interpret holy and religious Secrets: holy secrets, I say, from the celebration of which secrets the profane, common people were excluded, and debarred. For Coelius (*in Lect. Antiq.*) supposeth that they are called Mysteries, *ὅτι δεῖ μύσαντας τηρεῖν ἔνδον*, because it behoved them which hid them, or which ministered them, to keep them close, and to show them to no common person. Whereupon Mysteries may be called separated, and holy secrets, known to them only which were ordained for that purpose; and to be celebrated only of saints or holy men. Yet it may seem that *μυστήριον* is derived of *μύστης* and

¹ The following is the translation of this passage as given in "A playne and godly Expositon or Declaration of the Commune Crede, &c." by "Mayster Erasmus of Roterdame." Imprinted at London in Flete Strete by Robert Redman. "Those men who have spoken more exactly and perfytely doo call *Sacramentum* an othe, or an obligacion or bonde confirmed and strengthened by the comyng betwen of God or of religion. But our forefathers have applied and vsed the sayd word to signify that thyng which the Greeks doo call a mystery, and thou mayst call it a religiouse or holy *secrete* or priuyte.....Because the commune sorte of people was secluded and kept a part from the medlyng with those thynges." p. 117.

μύω; as ἀποδύτηριον is of ἀπὸ and ἔύω; that the etymon thereof with the Greeks, may be of no more force than *Testamentum* among the Latins, which is a witness bearing of the mind: although I am not ignorant what some also do reason in this case. Sacraments, therefore, are called Mysteries, because, in a dark speech, they hide other things which are more holy: and Paul willingly useth this word in his Epistles. And why this word was attributed to the holy Signs of the christian church, there is a plain reason: for these things are only known to the faithful, and are hid to those that are profane and unholy. And surely the preaching of the Gospel itself is called "the Mystery of the kingdom of God¹," to teach us that, the unclean being shut out, it is revealed only to the children of God². For our chief interpreter of mysteries, saith: "Cast not your pearls before swine, neither give that which is holy unto dogs." (Matthew vii. 6.) And Paul, "if our Gospel lie hid as yet (saith he) it is hid in them which are lost, in whom the God of this world hath blinded the minds of them that believe not." (2 Cor. iv. 3, 4.)

Furthermore, many of the Greek Doctors of the church have called our Sacraments *σύμβολα*, *Symbola*, which word is also received and used very often of the Latins. It is derived of *συμβάλλω*, that is to say, *Confero*, to confer, or compare together. For by comparing one thing with another symbols are made apparent, and rightly perceived. *Symbolum*, therefore, signifieth a Sign which hath relation to some other thing; as we said of the standard, &c. And, truly, among the Grecians in old time the use of Symbols or Signs, was diverse; for in their sacrifices they had their symbols: Signs, (I say) allegorically meaning some thing, as in the

¹ Matth. xiii. 11.

² Eph. iii.

sacrifices of Bacchus, a sieve was their Symbol or Sign; and the same they carried about when they were well tippled; thereby signifying that such as be drunken are blabs, and can keep nothing in secret. What if I can prove that opinions of men containing somewhat of deep understanding, by an allegory or dark speech, are called Symbols? For Pythagoras's symbols are well enough known. So mystical divinity began to be called symbolical, because it was inwrapped in more hid and secret mysteries. So that is mystical which is darkly uttered, and in manner of a riddle; having in it a far more contrary meaning than by words it seemeth to offer. Again, the gift and token of faith and truth, which, by mutual consent, passeth between the bride and the bridegroom, whereby it is not lawful for them to shrink or go back from their word, promise, or covenant, is called a Symbol. Furthermore, to soldiers also serving under one and the same banner Symbols or Badges were given. Unto certain confederate cities, in like manner, and joined together in league of friendship, to the end that they might go safely to the bordering cities; and to those which took parts with them, Symbols or mutual Signs were given: that is to say, Tokens which being showed and seen, they gave each other gentle and courteous entertainment, as to their league-fellows, companions, and singular friends. The ancient writers, therefore, hereupon have applied this word, Symbol, to our sacraments, because they represent and show unto us, the exceeding great, and deep mysteries of God. They are allegorical and enigmatical, hard and dark to understand, because the Lord himself, by the institution of His sacraments, hath bound Himself unto us; and we, again, by the partaking of them, do bind ourselves to Him, and to all

the saints: testifying and openly professing to fight stoutly and valiantly under the Lord's banner. Moreover, these holy Symbols and Signs do admonish and put us in mind of brotherly love, and concord: and that we remember to love them most entirely, and with all our heart, as God's children and our brethren, which are communicants or partakers with us of the same table, and are washed clean by the same Baptism. Thus much concerning Sacraments, what they are:—by what names they are called;—and why they are so called;—let it be sufficient that we have briefly noted.

Setting aside all other things it seemeth necessary, first of all, to declare and show who was the Author of the Sacraments; and for what causes they were instituted. All men, in a manner, confess that God alone is the author of Sacraments; and not men, nor yet the church itself. An odd man there is among the Schoolmen, which teacheth the church this lesson, to wit, that she should remember that she is no Lady, or Mistress over the Sacrament; but a Servant or Minister: and that she hath no more power or authority to institute any form of a Sacrament, than she hath to abrogate any law of God. Aquinas, also, (*Part. 3. Summ. Quæst. 64. Art. 2*) saith, "He instituteth or is the author of a thing, which giveth it force and virtue: but the virtue and power of the Sacraments cometh from God alone: therefore God alone is of power to institute and make Sacraments." And, indeed, God alone is of power to institute the true service and worship: but Sacraments belong to His service and worship, therefore God alone doth institute Sacraments. If any one in the Old Testament had offered sacrifice which God commanded not, or offered it not after that manner that God willed it to be offered, it was not only nothing available unto

him, but, also, his offence in so doing was rewarded with most terrible and fearful punishment¹. Who knoweth not that the sons of Aaron, for offering strange fire, were horribly burnt and scorched up with fire which fell down from heaven²? Such sacrifices, therefore, displease God as profane or unholy; neither deserve they to be called lawful Sacraments which have not God himself for their author. Hereunto is added that, Sacraments are testimonies, and, as it were, seals of God's good will and favour toward us. And who, I pray you, can better, more uprightly, or more assuredly bear witness of God's good will to usward than God himself? In no wise deserveth that to be called or counted the seal of God, whereto He neither set His hand, nor printed it with His own mark: yea, it is a counterfeit seal, because it cometh not from God, and yet, in the mean time, beareth a show outwardly of the name of God. In this behalf is read that saying of Saint Augustine, which is in every man's mouth "The word is added to the element, and there is made a Sacrament." Whereby we gather, that in the institution of Sacraments, the word of God obtaineth principal place, and hath most ado. The word, I say, of God, not the word of men, nor yet of the church. Whereupon it followeth, that the Sign ought to have its proceeding even from God himself, and not from any manner of men, be they never so many, be they never so clerklike or learned, be they never so harmless and holy of life: of that now there can be no other author of Sacraments than God himself alone.

As we do receive the word of salvation and grace, so it is needful, also, that we receive the signs of grace. Although the word of God be preached unto us by men, yet

¹ Isai. lxvi. 3, 4.

² Levit. x.

we receive it not as the word of man, but as the word of God; according to the saying of the Apostle:—"When ye had received the word of God which ye heard of us, ye received it not as the word of men (but as it is indeed) the word of God." (1 Thes. ii. 13.) It is behoveful for us to have respect to the first Author thereof; who, when He sent abroad His disciples, said "Go into the whole world, and preach the Gospel to all creatures; teaching them to observe whatsoever I have commanded you; and baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. He that heareth you, heareth me; and he which despiseth you, despiseth me." (Mark xvii. 15; Matth. xxviii. 19, 20; Luke x. 16.) And, therefore, albeit by the hands of men the Sacraments are ministered, yet are they not received, of the godly and religious, as proceeding from men, but, as it were, from the hands of God himself, the first and principal author of the same. To this belongeth the question which Christ our Lord asked in the Gospel, saying: "The baptism of John, was it from heaven or of men?" (Matth. xxi. 25.) Truly, John who did baptize was a man; but in that he baptized, he baptized according to God's institution and ordinance: and therefore the baptism of John was from heaven, though the water, wherewith he baptized, flowed out of the bottomless depth into the river Jordan, and John himself conversant on the earth. To this, also, notably agreeth that which Paul saith:—"that which I delivered unto you I received of the Lord." (1 Cor. xi. 23.) Therefore, although Saint Paul were a man, yea and a sinner too, yet that which he delivered to the church, he did not deliver it as from himself, or as any invention of man, but as Christ hath delivered the same; so that it is not his, or man's, but Christ's tradition.—a divine.

and heavenly tradition. Besides this, our High Priest and everlasting Bishop worketh, even at this day, in His church, whose ministry they execute; that is, at whose commandment they baptize; and according to whose institution they which are the stewards, or disposers of the mysteries of God, minister the holy Sacraments of the Lord's Supper. The institution, therefore, of the Sacraments must be acknowledged of us to be the very work of God. And thus far touching the Author of Sacraments.

Peter Lombard, in his Sentences¹, reckoneth up three causes why Sacraments were instituted, that is to say, why spiritual and heavenly things were delivered and committed unto us under visible signs, forms, and ceremonies: the first of which is so cold and weak, that I am loath to move it to memory. He placeth merit in that that by God's government and direction, (as he affirmeth) man seeketh salvation in things baser and inferior to himself. Unto the which he addeth this afterward:—"Although not in them, yet in God through them" he seeketh salvation:—which also, unadvisedly enough he hath uttered, and not sufficiently considered. The other two causes, to wit, that Sacraments were invented and ordained, under visible signs, for our instruction and exercise, seem not altogether absurd or disagreeing from reason. The truest and most proper cause why Sacraments be instituted under visible signs, seemeth partly to be God's goodness, and partly, also, man's weakness. For very hardly do we reach unto the knowledge of heavenly things, if without visible form, as they be in their own nature pure and excellent, they be laid before our eyes. But they are better and more easily understood, if they be represented unto us under the figure of earthly things; that is to say,

¹ Lib. IV. Dist. 1.

under signs familiarly known unto us. As, therefore, our bountiful and gracious Lord did covertly and darkly;—nay rather evidently and notably, set before us to view the kingdom of God in parables, or dark speeches; even so by signs it pleased Him to lay before our eyes, after a sort, the very same thing; and to point out the same unto us as it were painted in a table; to renew it afresh; and, by lively representation, to maintain the remembrance of the same among us. This cause doth John Chrysostom allow as a chief and proper cause; who, in his eighty and third Homily upon Matthew, saith; “The Lord hath delivered unto us nothing that is sensible. The things, indeed, are sensible, howbeit they have altogether a spiritual understanding or meaning. So Baptism is ministered under a sensible element, namely Water; but that which is wrought thereby, that is to say, regeneration and the new birth, doth spiritually enter into the mind¹. For if thou wert a bodyless creature, He would have delivered unto thee all these gifts, bare, naked, and bodyless, according to thy nature; but since thou hast a reasonable soul coupled and joined to thy body, therefore hath He delivered unto thee, in sensible signs and substances, those things which are perceived with a spiritual understanding.” Which I do not allege [to] this end as if I would take the testimony of man for my stay; but because I see Saint John Chrysostom’s Speech according to the manner observed and used in the scripture.

For who knoweth not that the scripture is full of parables, similitudes, allegories, and figurative speeches, which the Holy Ghost useth, not for His own, but for our sakes? The talk which Christ had in the Gospel with Nicodemus touching heavenly regeneration, is very well known; where He.

¹ John iii.

by hidden and covert kind of speeches of air, wind, water, &c., reasoneth saying:—"If I have told you of earthly things and ye believe not, how will ye believe if I shall tell you of heavenly things?" (John iii. 12.) He calleth "earthly things," that His doctrine of heavenly regeneration, or new birth, figured to us under earthly signs of water and the spirit, or of air and the wind. And by "heavenly things", He meaneth that self-same doctrine of heavenly regeneration, nakedly delivered to Nicodemus without any imagination, without similitude, or sensible signs. The Lord, therefore, signifieth hereby that men do more easily conceive and understand the doctrine of heavenly things, when it is shadowed out under some dark and covert sign of earthly things, than when it is nakedly, and spiritually indeed delivered: that by comparing together of things not much unlike, it may appear that the Sacraments were for none other cause found out or instituted, than for demonstration sake; to wit, that the heavenly things might become more familiar and plain unto us. In which thing we have to mark the analogy, which is a certain aptness, proportion, or (as Cicero² termeth it) a convenience, or fit agreement of things, I say, known by their signs; that if they be slightly passed over without this analogy, the reason of a Sacrament cannot be fully and perfectly understood: but this analogy being diligently discussed, and observed to the full, offereth to the beholder, without any labour at all, the very ἀναγωγή, that is to say, the hidden, and secret meaning of a Sacrament. We will, when we come to intreat of these things, do what we can to make them manifest by examples.

Whosoever, therefore, shall thoroughly weigh the institution of Sacraments, he cannot choose but extol with praises

² Timæus, iv.

the exceeding great goodness of the Lord, who doth not only open unto us miserable men the mysteries of His kingdom, but hath a singular care of man's infirmity; whereby He, framing Himself to our capacity, doth, after a sort, stut and stammer with us; whilst He, having respect to our dulness and the weakness of our wit, doth, as it were, clothe and cover heavenly mysteries with earthly symbols or signs: thereby most plainly and pithily opening them unto us, and laying them before our eyes evidently to be beheld. In this same institution of the Sacraments, we have cause to extol and praise the wisdom of God; if so be we take in hand to compare great and small things together. For this custom is received as a law throughout the world, that all the wisest men, when they had occasion to speak of high mysteries of wisdom, they did, not by words only, but by signs and words together, commend them to their hearers, to the end that the two most noble senses in man, to wit, hearing and seeing, might be both at once vehemently moved, and forcibly provoked to the consideration of the same. The volumes of heathenish philosophers are full of examples. What say you to the Jews, God's old and ancient people: did not God himself shew among them very many such kind of examples? Again, as in making leagues, or in confirming promises in earnest and weighty matters, men use signs or tokens of truth, to win credit to their words and promises: even so the Lord, doing after the manner of men, hath added signs of His faithfulness and truth in His everlasting covenant and promises of life, the Sacraments I mean, wherewith He sealeth His promises, and the very doctrine of His Gospel. Neither is this rare or strange unto Him. Men swear even by the Lord himself when they would make other believe certainly, and in no ease to mistrust the truth of their promises: yea, it is

read in the holy scriptures that the Lord himself took an oath, and swore by His own self, when He meant "most abundantly to shew to the heirs of the promises (as the Apostle saith) the stableness of His counsel." (Heb. vi. 17.)

Moreover, it was the accustomed manner among them of old, as they were making their league or covenant, to take a beast and to divide him in pieces, and each of them to pass through and between the pieces so divided; testifying by that ceremony, that they would yield themselves so to be divided and cut in pieces, if they did not stedfastly stand to that which they promised in their league or covenant. After the same manner the Lord making, or renewing a league with Abraham, (which Moses describeth at large in Gen. xv.) He commandeth him to take an heifer, a she goat, and a ram, each of them three years old, and to divide them in the midst, and to lay every piece one over against another: which when Abraham had done, the Lord himself in the likeness of a smoking furnace or firebrand, went between the said pieces; that thereby Abraham might know that the land of Canaan should of a certainty be given to him, and to his seed to possess; and that all things which He hath promised in that league should be brought to pass. Since, therefore, the good and true Lord is always like unto Himself, and frameth Himself after the same manner now to His church, as we said He did then; what wonder or strange thing is it (I pray you) that He hath left unto us also at this day, under visible things, signs and seals of His grace, and mysteries of the kingdom of God? And hitherto have we entreated of the chief causes of Sacraments for the which they were instituted.

Touching the kind, and number of Sacraments, which hath the next place to that which went before, there are divers opinions amongst the writers, specially of later time.

For, among the old and ancient, this question, as an undoubted and well known perfect principle, drew quickly to an end. But he which shall diligently search the scriptures shall find, that they of the Old Testament have Sacraments after one kind, and they of the New Testament Sacraments after another kind. The Sacraments of the people under the Old Testament, were Circumcision, and the Paschal Lamb; to which were added Sacrifices: whereof I have abundantly spoken in the third Decade, and the sixth Sermon. In like manner, the Sacraments of the people under the New Testament, that is to say, of christians, by the writings of the Apostles, are two in number, Baptism, and the Supper of the Lord. But Peter Lombard¹ reckoneth seven;—Baptism, Penance, the Supper of the Lord, Confirmation, Extreme Unction, Orders, and Matrimony. Him followeth the whole rabblement of interpreters, and rout of Schoolmen. But all the ancient Doctors of the church, for the most part, do reckon up two principal Sacraments: among whom Tertullian, in his first and fourth Book, *Contra Marcionem*; and in his book, *De Corona Militis*, very plainly maketh mention but of two only: that is to say, Baptism, and the Eucharist or Supper of the Lord. And Augustine, also, (*De Doctr. Christiana* lib. iii. c. 9.) saith, “The Lord hath not overburthened us with Signs, but the Lord himself and the doctrine of the Apostles have left unto us certain few things instead of many; and those most easy to be done, most reverend to be understood, most pure to be observed; as is Baptism, and the celebration of the Body and Blood of the Lord.” And, again, (*ad Januarium, Epistola* 118.) he saith;—“He hath knit and hid together the fellowship of a new people, with Sacraments in number very few, [in] observing very easy, in sig-

¹ Lib. iv. Dist. 2.

nification very excellent; as is Baptism consecrated in the name of the Trinity, and the partaking of Christ's Body and Blood; and whatsoever thing else is commended unto us in the canonical scriptures; except those things wherewith the servitude of the old people was burdened, according to the agreeableness of their hearts, and the time of the prophets." Which are read in the five books of Moses. Where, by the way, is to be marked, that he saith not "and whatsoever things else are commended unto us in the canonical scriptures:" but, "and whatsoever thing else &c.;" which plainly proveth that he speaketh not of Sacraments, but of certain observations both used and received of the church; as the words of Augustine which follow do declare. Howbeit, I confess, without dissimulation, that the same Augustine elsewhere maketh mention of the Sacrament of Orders: where, nevertheless, this seemeth unto me to be also considered,—that the self-same author giveth the name of Sacraments to anointing, and to prophecy, and to prayer, and to certain other of this sort, as well as he doeth to Orders. And, now and then, among them he reckoneth up the Sacraments of the scripture: so that we more easily see that in his works the word Sacrament, is now used one way, and sometimes another. For he calleth these Sacraments, because, being holy, they came from the Holy Ghost; and because they be holy institutions of God, observed of all that be holy; but yet so that these differ from those Sacraments which are holy actions, consisting of words and ceremonies, and which gather together, into one fellowship, the partakers thereof. But Rabanus Maurus also, Bishop of Mentz, a diligent reader of Augustine's works, (*de Institutione Clericorum*, lib. 1. c. 24,) saith "Baptism and Unction, and the Body and Blood, are Sacraments,—which for this reason are

called Sacraments,—because under a covert of corporal things, the power of God worketh more secretly our salvation signified by these Sacraments: whereupon, also, for their secret and holy virtue, they are called Sacraments.” This Rabanus Maurus was famous about the year of our Lord eight hundred, and thirty: so that even by this we may gather, that the ancient Apostolic Church had no more than two Sacraments. I make no mention here of Ambrose,—although he, in his books of Sacraments, numbereth not so many as the company of Schoolmen do,—because some of those works set forth in his name, are not received of all learned men, as of his own doing: so, I little force the authority of the works of Dionysius, which of what price and estimation they be among learned and good men, it is not needful to declare. But however the case standeth, the holy scripture, the only and infallible rule of life and of all things which are to be done in the church, commendeth Baptism and the Lord’s Supper unto us, as solemn institutions and Sacraments of Christ. These two are, therefore, sufficient for us; so that we need not be moved whatsoever, at any time, the subtle invention of man’s busy brain bring against, or beside these twain. For why? God never gave power to any to institute Sacraments. In the mean while we do not contemn the wholesome Rites, and healthful Institutions of God; nor yet the religious observations of the church of Christ.

We have declared elsewhere touching Penance and Ecclesiastical Order: of the residue, which later writers do authorize for Sacraments, we will speak in their convenient place. So have we, also, elsewhere, so far forth as we thought requisite, entreated of the likeness, and difference of Sacraments of the people of Old, and New Testament.

Now let us see in what things Sacraments consist. By the testimony of the scripture, and of all the godly men, they consist in two things, to wit, in the sign, and the thing signified;—in the word, and the rite; in the promise of the Gospel, and in the ceremony;—in the outward thing, and the inward; in the earthly thing, (I say) and the heavenly: and (as Irenæus¹, the Martyr of Christ, witnesseth) in the visible thing, and the invisible;—in the sensible thing, and the intelligible. For hereunto belongeth that which Saint John Chrysostom, upon Matthew, saith οὐδεν γὰρ αἰσθητὸν παράδωκεν ἡμῖν ὁ χριστος, ἀλλ' αἰσθητὰ μὲν τὰ πράγματα² πάντα δὲ νοητά. “Christ delivereth nothing unto us that is sensible, but under visible things, the outward things are sensible, but yet all spiritual.” But he calleth those things αἰσθητά “sensible,” which are perceived by the outward senses, as by seeing, hearing, tasting, and touching: but those things he calleth νοητά, intelligible, or mental, which are perceived by the mind, the understanding, consideration, discourse, or reasoning of the mind, not of flesh but of faith.

By the testimony of the scriptures, this thing shall be made manifest. The Lord saith to His disciples in the Gospel, “Go into the whole world, and preach the Gospel to all creatures; and he which shall believe and be baptized, shall be saved. Ye shall baptize in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.” (Mark xvi. 15, 16. Matth. xxviii. 19.) The same saith of John Baptist, “John baptized in the wilderness, preaching the baptism of repentance, for the remission of sins.” (Mark i. 4.) So, also, Saint Luke witnesseth that St Peter said

¹ Lib. iv. 25.

² The Benedictines read αἰσθητοῖς μὲν τοῖς πράγμασι. Hom. in Matth. 33.

to the Israelites: "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ for the remission of sins; and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost." (Acts ii. 38.) Therefore in Baptism, water or sprinkling of water, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of Holy Ghost, and all that which is done of the church, is a sign, rite, ceremony, and outward thing, earthly and sensible; lying open and made plain to the senses: but remission of sins, partaking of everlasting life, fellowship with Christ and His members, and gifts of the Holy Ghost which are given unto us by the grace of God through faith in Christ Jesus; is the thing signified, the inward and heavenly thing, and that intelligible thing which is not perceived but by a faithful mind.

After the same manner the scripture bearing witness also of the Supper of the Lord, which is the other Sacrament of the church, saith; "The Lord Jesus when He had taken bread, He gave thanks, and brake it, and gave it to His disciples and said,—Take ye, eat ye: this is my body which is given for you. Likewise He took the cup, and gave it to them, saying,—Drink ye all of this; for this is my blood of the New Testament which is shed for many for the remission of sins: do this in remembrance of me." (Matth. xxvi. 26, et seq.: Luke xxii. 17. et seq.) Now, therefore, all that action which is done of the church after the example of Christ our High Priest, I mean breaking of bread, the distribution thereof, yea and the banquet or receiving of bread and wine; is the sign, rite, ceremony, and the outwardly or earthly thing, and also that self-same sensible thing which lieth open before the senses. But the intelligible thing, and thing signified,—the inward and heavenly thing, is the very body of Christ given for

us, and His blood shed for the remission of sins ; and our redemption, and fellowship which we have with Christ and all His Saints, yea, which He chiefly hath with us.

By these things, it shall be easy to determine certainly of the names or terms now given to the Sacraments. For they are called external or outward signs, because they are corporal or bodily ; entering outwardly into those senses whereby they be perceived. Contrariwise, we call the things signified, inward things : not that the things lie hid, included in the signs ; but because they are perceived by the inward faculties or motions of the mind, wrought in men by the Spirit of God. So, also, these signs are termed both earthly and visible, because they consist of things taken from the earth, that is to wit, of Water, Bread, and Wine ; and because they are manifestly seen in these likenesses. To be short, the things signified are called heavenly and invisible, because the fruit of them is heavenly ; and because they are discerned with the eyes of the mind or of faith, not of the body : for otherwise, the same body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ which, in the Supper, are represented to the faithful, by the form of bread and wine, are not of their own proper nature heavenly or invisible. For the body of our Lord, touching His substance and nature, is consubstantial, or of the same substance that our bodies are of. Now the same is called heavenly for His deliverance from corruption and infirmity ; or else because it is clarified ; not by reason of the bringing to naught, or laying aside of His own nature. The same body of His own nature is visible, not invisible, resident in heaven : howbeit, it is seen of the godly celebrating the Supper, not with the eyes of the body, but with the eyes of the mind or soul ;

therefore in respect of us it is called invisible, which of itself is not invisible.

Now the word in the Sacraments is called, and is indeed, a witnessing of God's will, and a remembrance and renewing of the benefits and promises of God; yea, and it is the institution and commandment of God which showeth the author of the Sacrament, with the manner and end of the same. For the word in Baptism is the very same that even now we have received,—“Go ye into all the world &c.” In the Supper of the Lord, this is the word of God,—“Jesus took bread &c.”—And the rite, custom, and manner how to celebrate the Supper, is to be sought out of the example of the Lord going before in the holy action; wherein we comprehend both prayers and those things which are recited out of the word of Christ. For as He brake bread and divided it, and in like manner, the cup, so likewise with holy imitation and sacramental rite, we follow the same in this holy action. As He gave thanks, so also we do give thanks; we, by certain prayers in Baptism, do request the assistance and grace of the Lord; we recite certain places out of the Gospel, which we know to be requisite in the administration of Baptism; and we are wont to do the same, also, in the celebration of the Lord's Supper. . . . But it is not my intent, at this present, to speak largely, and exactly of the rites of the Sacraments; which, notwithstanding, we hold to be best that are taken out of the holy scripture, and do not exceed: of which it shall be spoken in their place.

Some instead of the word, do put promise; and instead of rite, ceremony. And, truly in the word ceremony, I see no danger at all, if by ceremony be understood the outward comeliness, and rite which the Lord himself hath commended to us by His example, and left to be used in

the celebration. And in very deed sacramental signs, are not simple or bare signs; but ceremonies, or religious actions: so, also, there seemeth to be no danger in the word promise, so that by promise we understand the preaching of the Gospel, and the commemoration or remembrance of God's promises which we often use in the preaching of the Gospel, and celebration of the Sacraments: that is to say, that God doth receive us into His fellowship, for Christ's sake, through faith; doth wash away our sins; endueth us with divers graces; that Christ was given for our sins; shed His blood to take away the sins of all faithful. For in celebrating of Baptism we use these words of the Lord,—“Suffer little children to come unto me, for unto such belongeth the kingdom of heaven,” &c. (Matth. xix. 14.) In the celebration of the Banquet of God's holy children, we use these holy words of our Lord—“And after supper Jesus took bread; and after He had given thanks He brake it, and gave it to them saying, Take ye; eat ye: this is my body which is given for you. This is my blood which is shed for you, for the remission of sins; this do in remembrance of me, &c.¹” For these remembrances and rehearsals, are p̄mises of the Gospel; promising forgiveness of sins to the believers; showing that the Lord's body is given for them, and His blood shed for them; which faith verily is the only, and undoubted means to obtain life and salvation: Christ is the strength and substance of the Sacraments, by whom only they are effectual, and without whom they are of no power, virtue, or effect. But if any man by promise, do understand covenant, whereby the Lord doth singularly bind, or, as you would say, tie Himself to the signs; in which, or with which, He would be present

¹ 1 Cor. xi. 23—25: Matth. xxvi. 26—28.

bodily, essentially, and really; therein he saith more than he can show or prove by the scriptures. For in no place hath Christ promised to be present corporally, that is with His true body, in the signs or with the signs: otherwise I am not ignorant how God appeared sometimes to our fathers under a bodily figure, that is, in some visible form, or shape; as when He showed Himself to Jacob, which was named Israel, leaning on a ladder; and to Moses in the hole of a rock, as it were in a glass¹. But these do not properly pertain to this purpose where we intreat of the corporal presence of Christ, and of the sacramental signs. But because many wrest these words of the Lord, "This is my body; this is my blood"; to prove a corporal presence of the Lord's body in the supper; I answer that those words of the Lord are not roughly to be expounded according to the letter, as though bread and wine were the body and blood of Christ, substantially, and corporally; but mystically, and sacramentally: so that the body and blood of Christ do abide in their substance and nature, and in their place: I mean in some certain place of heaven: but the bread and wine are a sign or Sacrament: a witness, or sealing; and a lively memory of His body given, and His blood shed for us But of this thing, in place convenient, we will intreat more at large. By these things which we have spoken of, it appeareth sufficiently how Sacraments, consist of two things, the sign, and the thing signified; of the word of God, and the rite or holy ceremony.

There are some, notwithstanding, which think there is such force grafted of God into the words, that if they be pronounced over the signs, they sanctify, change, and, in a manner, bring with them, or make present the things signified; and plant,

¹ Gen. xxviii. 13. Exod. xxxiii. 22. 23.

or include them within the signs; or at the least join them with the signs. For hereupon are these kind of speeches heard; that the water of Baptism by the virtue of the words doth regenerate; and that by the efficacy of the words, the bread itself and the wine, in the Supper, are made the natural flesh and blood of the Lord. But the Sacraments of Christ and His church do consist of the word, and the sign. But it seemeth that we must diligently search out what must be understood by "The word." I said even now that "The word" in the Sacraments, was a witness-bearing of God's will, and the commandment of God itself, or institution of God, which declareth unto us, the author, manner, and end of a Sacrament. By this word, I say, and commandment of God,—by this will and institution of God,—the Sacraments are sanctified; not that the words are so pronounced of the ministers as they are read afore to be recited of the Lord himself, or delivered by His Apostles: but because God so would, so did, and commanded His Apostles to do. For whatsoever God doth, or commandeth to do, is sanctified by the very commandment or deed of God. For all things which He hath done are exceeding good; therefore those things which He commandeth to do cannot choose but be holy, because He is holy, and the only Sanctifier. Wherefore by the nature, will, deed, and commandment of God, and not by the pronounciation of any words, are the Sacraments sanctified. To which will of God, that it may be applied unto man and do him good, the faithful obedience of men is necessarily required; which altogether should make us put our trust and confidence in the mercy and power of God, who in no wise should despise or cast behind us the institution of God; although it seem, in outward appearance, base and contemptible. This will appear more plainly in the example of

Naaman¹, the captain of the king of Syria's band. He heard of the prophet, undoubtedly at the Lord's commandment, that he should wash himself seven times in Jordan; for so it should come to pass that he should be cleansed from his leprosy. Here thou dost hear the word, the will, I say, and commandment of God; but thou dost not hear that any words were rehearsed either over Jordan, or over Naaman; or that any words were prescribed of the prophet to Naaman, that he should rehearse, whereby (forsooth) there might be any force of purifying, or cleansing given to the water. Naaman by faith obeyeth the commandment of God, and is cleansed from his leprosy: not by his own merit, or by the benefit of the water of Jordan, but by the power of God and faithful obedience. Lepers also in the Gospel², and that not a few, are cleansed by the power and will of Christ, and through faith, and not by pronouncing or speaking of words. The Lord indeed said, "I will, be thou clean:" but if any man at this day should have recited the same words a hundred times over any leper, he should have prevailed nothing. Whereby it is manifest, that to words there is no force given of working health if they be pronounced. The Apostles, indeed, said to the sick, feeble, and lame, "In the name of the Lord Jesus, arise and walk:" (Acts iii. 6, 7.) And they rose up and were healed; but they were not healed by the benefit of the words, but by the name, by the power, I mean, and the virtue of Christ. For Peter which said unto the lame man in Jerusalem, "In the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, arise and walk"—said in the midst of the council of Jerusalem—"If we this day be examined of the deed done to the sick man, by what means he is made whole; be it known unto you all, in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth this man standeth here

¹ 2 Kings v.

² Matth. viii. 2, 3.

whole." (Acts iv. 9, 10.) And to the same people he saith, "and His name, through faith in His name, hath made this man sound whom ye see and know; and the faith which is by Him hath given this man health³." Besides these, we read in the Acts of the Apostles⁴ that the sons of one Scæva a priest, being exorcists or conjurors, did call on the name of the Lord Jesus over them that had evil spirits; but these were so far off from giving place to their exorcisms and conjurings, that they ran on them, and overcame them, so that they had much ado to escape alive. Where it is most apparent that those exorcists used the same form almost in their enchantments, which the Apostle used; (for in the name of the Lord Jesus they proved to cast out the foul Spirit); but since they were not able so to do, who cannot see and perceive that the words pronounced do prevail nothing at all? Neither is that any let or hindrance at all, that those Exorcists were without faith. For this is a thing very well known and received of all men, that Sacraments are no less effectual when they were ministered by wicked ministers, than when they are ministered by the best ministers.

But here is objected against us this saying of the Apostle, "Christ gave Himself for the church to sanctify it; cleansing it in the fountain of water by the word, or in the word⁵." Behold, (say they) men are cleansed by the water of baptism, which by the word hath the force of sanctifying put into it: therefore it must needs be that words have force to sanctify. But I will confute them by an evident demonstration that the Apostle did not so mean as they suppose. The Apostle prescribeth unto married Christians their duty; to the more plain, and pithier setting forth thereof, he useth the example of Christ and His

³ Acts iii. 16.⁴ Acts xix. 13, et seq.⁵ Ephes. v. 25, 26.

church; commending that exceeding love which Christ beareth toward His church, wherewith being inflamed, He gave Himself for it to this end, to make it to Himself a pure, and glorious Spouse: where, by the way, He setteth down the manner of purging. For the Lord Jesus himself saith—He hath cleansed it: for it is only Christ's office to purge, and to cleanse. Now the manner of purging followeth: "In the fountain of water by the word;" which, because it is briefly spoken, hath in it some obscurity. He maketh mention of two things which the Lord useth to cleanse those that be His:—"the fountain of water", and "the word." "The fountain of water", is Baptism, which is the outward action and witness-bearing, of the inward purifying or cleansing wrought by the grace and Spirit of God; as the Apostle saith—"According to His mercy He saved us, by the fountain of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost which He shed upon us richly through Jesus Christ our Saviour." (Titus iii. 5, 6.) For he addeth in way of interpretation, "And renewing of the Holy Ghost", whereof the "fountain of water" is a sign. Moreover, the "word" is the very preaching of the Gospel, testifying that, by the grace and mercy of God the Father, His only Son was given unto us; who being given for our sins, maketh them that believe in Him heirs of eternal life, so that now these words of Paul to the Ephesians, the fifth chapter, do very well agree with this commandment of the Lord mentioned in St Mark: "Go into all the whole world and preach the Gospel to all creatures: he which shall believe, and be baptized shall be saved." For by these words, also, the Lord shadoweth out unto us the manner, and means of our salvation; that it is He only which purgeth us by faith: yet, in the mean while, He willeth the believers to be signed

with Baptism; and that it should be preached openly in the world that it is He which pardoneth sinners; yea, and which freely giveth everlasting life. But what do all these things, (I pray you) make for their purpose who will prove, by those words of Paul, that there is force and virtue in the words to sanctify Baptism? These words of the Lord, spoken to His Apostles, do yet make our matter more manifest:—"Now are ye clean," saith He, "through the word which I have spoken unto you." (John xv. 3.) Shall we say here that through the words which Christ rehearsed, the disciples of Christ were made clean? What then needeth He the next day to be crucified, and to have died? What, to the end that He might purchase power unto the words? Wherefore, all boasting in the force of words shall be clean taken away. Doth not faith and godliness tell us, by "the word" of the Lord, we should rather understand this which is declared by the preaching of the Lord; that is, the death and redemption of Christ whereby, because they believed it, "they are cleansed"? For in another place he saith, "purifying their hearts by faith." Wherefore they err in that, because they do not rightly judge of the word or speech. For the Lord speaketh of the word preached and believed; and they understand Him of the word pronounced, as though being pronounced it had force from the Lord to sanctify. Saint Augustine, also, maketh for us who, in his eightieth Treatise upon John, saith, "From whence cometh so great virtue and power unto the water that it should touch the body, and wash the heart, but through the working of the word? Not because it is spoken or pronounced, but because it is believed. For, in the word itself, the sound passing away is one thing, and the virtue which remaineth is another thing. 'This is the word of

faith which we preach,' saith the Apostle, 'because if thou shall confess with thy mouth that Jesus is the Lord, and believe with thy heart that God hath raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.' Rom. x. 10. Whereupon we read in the Acts of the Apostles, 'purifying (or cleansing) their hearts by faith'.¹ And St Peter in his epistle saith: 'So also baptism saveth us; not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but in that a good conscience maketh request to God'.² This is the word of faith which we preach, wherewith undoubtedly Baptism is also consecrated that it may have power to cleanse. For Christ, which is the Vine, with His Father the husbandman, hath loved the church, and gave Himself for it. Read the Apostle, and mark what he addeth, saying: 'That He might sanctify it, cleansing it by the fountain of water in the word.' In vain, therefore, should cleansing be attributed to a frail and vading element, unless this were added. 'In the word.'³ And so forth: For thus far I have recited St Augustine's words; not that I stay myself upon man's testimony, or, that I would have any man to urge the same; or, that I am content to be ruled by the witness of man; but because in these words he hath gathered together some testimonies out of the scripture, bearing witness of the word. Whereby we may understand that the word of faith preached, and not the word spoken or pronounced, ought to be received. This word, I say, doth truly cleanse; that is to say, the grace of Christ only doth purify, to the which both the word and faith are directed: and for that cause he said expressly, "Not because it is spoken, but because

¹ Acts xv. 9.² 1 Pet. iii. 21.

it is believed." Anon after he saith, "The word of faith which we preach." Furthermore he saith, "by the word of faith baptism is consecrated that it might have power to cleanse." Which what is it else than if he had said, the very substance of faith maketh Baptism effectual. For it followeth, "For cleansing, in vain should be attributed to the vading and corruptible element, unless were added, 'In the word'."

Now if a man do consider the mysteries of the Saints or holy men in old time, he shall not find in the celebration of circumcision, the feast of the passover, and sacrifices, any words to have been spoken or pronounced, whereby they were formed, and, as it were, created Sacraments, and were made effectual. To which belongeth this, that John Baptist did not only baptize the common people without respect of person, but the Lord Jesus himself also in the water of Jordan: no words, in the mean while, being pronounced, whereby he called, and drew down the heavenly grace over, or upon the waters of Baptism. Again, whilst Christ our high Bishop did institute His Supper in the Gospel, He commanded nothing to be spoken or pronounced, by the virtue of which speech or pronounciation, the elements might either be changed, or the things signified, being drawn down from heaven, should be present with, or joined to the signs: but what the Lord hath simply done, and what His will was, we should do; after what manner, and to what end, He instituted His Supper, the Evangelists have declared. We read in no place that the Lord said, "As often as ye speak; or pronounce these my words, 'This is my body; this is my blood'; it shall come to pass by the virtue of my words, that the substance of the sign shall be made void; and that in the same prick of time wherein the words are spoken, it shall begin to be

the true body, and the true blood of the Lord, under the forms or likenesses of bread and wine; or that the forms and likenesses and the truth of the signs remaining, it shall begin at once with the bread and wine to be the very body and blood of Christ." Wherefore in the pronouncing, or speaking of the words of the Lord in the Supper, there is no power or virtue, either to call down the things signified, or to change the things present. These imaginations do rather seem more to maintain superstition than religion. As though the word pronounced according to the form conceived, had power to call down out of heaven; to bring from one place to another; to restore health; to draw to, to put from, or to transform, or change. S. Augustine reckoneth up among superstitious vanities, those things which, for remedies of diseases, are tied or fastened about the body; which also physic maketh no account of, whether it be in charming, or in certain signs called characters, or in hanging certain things about some part of the body. The place is to be seen *De Doct. Christ.* Lib. ii. c. 20. And Chrysostom being very angry with them that hang the written gospel about their neck hath these words upon Matth. xxiii. "Wherein consisteth the force, or power of the Gospel? In the form and figure of the letters; or in the understanding of the meaning, and sense of the same? If in the form of letters, thou doest well to hang it about thy neck: but if in the understanding of the meaning, it is better they were laid up in thy heart." Thus saith he. But there is the same reason of the figures, and of the pronounciation of the letters, or words of the Gospel: for as the figure of the letters is of power to do nothing, even so is there no force or virtue, either in the pronounciation, or sound of words. Pliny, an heathenish writer, allegeth many heathenish examples wherein he declareth that words

are effectual: but yet among other things which he bringeth, he hath this: "It is a question" (saith he) "whether words, or enchanting speeches, are of any force: but every one that is wise is so far from believing it, that even man by man they utterly deny it;" The place is to be seen *Lib. xxviii. c. 2.* But most worthily is the true word of God itself preferred before all these; the which by Moses, Deut. xviii, with great severity, forbiddeth and condemneth all kind of superstitions and enchantments.

I know what the adversaries will here object unto me, namely, that it is a blessing or consecration, and not a superstition which they use. Beside this, they bring many examples out of the scripture, set down in their canonical Decrees, whereby very foolishly and most unaptly, doubtless, they go about to prove that by blessing, or consecration, (as they say) the nature of the things are changed: whereupon they, also, gather that the bread, by the words of blessing or consecrating, is turned into flesh. Their examples are these, and of this sort. The water flowing out of the rock, after it was smitten with Aaron's rod¹; the river Nilus turned into blood²; the water at the marriage of Cana of Galilee turned into wine³; the bitter waters of Marah changed into sweet water⁴; and Moses's rod turned into a serpent⁵. But (I beseech you) what make these to the Lord's Supper, wherewith they have no manner of similitude or likeness? So that this must needs be an unapt comparison and a doltish, which they make. The river Nilus was turned into blood; therefore the bread is turned into flesh: the water at the marriage of Cana was changed into wine; therefore the wine in the Lord's Supper is changed into the blood of Christ. For while that the water

¹ Numb. xx. 8.

² Exod. vii. 19.

³ John ii. 9.

⁴ Exod. xv. 25.

⁵ Exod. vii. 10.

gushed out of the rock when it was smitten; while the river Nilus was turned into blood; while the water of the marriage was changed into wine; while the bitter waters of Marah became sweet; while Moses's rod was turned into a serpent;—the water truly, the blood, the wine, the sweet water, and the serpent, so turned and changed, were not under the form or likeness of those things which they were before, neither were they at once that which they were before, and that which they were then made: but the water of Nilus was very blood, not water and blood together; neither was there invisible blood under the visible form of water. And so stands the case also in the other examples. Therefore they do nothing agree with the Sacramental signs, but are so far from being like them that they are altogether unlike them. Moreover, who can well tell by what pronounciation of words Moses made water burst out of the hard rock: turned the river Nilus into blood: changed the bitter waters into sweet? Who knoweth what form, also, of words the Lord used when He changed water into wine? Therefore very unfitly do they apply these examples to their blessing or consecration changing the nature of things, since it cannot be showed what manner of blessings the saints or holy men used. Likewise, we read not that Moses and Joshua¹ pronounced any words of blessing, whereby they divided the channel of the Erythrean Sea and the river Jordan. Eliseus is read to have uttered no words of blessing when he made the axe to swim, and reached it out of the water by the helve². In all these things the power of God did work: but we must not imagine what we list to proceed from it. For it is weakness and not power, which is repugnant to justice, and taketh things in hand which are contrary to God's truth. But the mighty works of God are of such sort, that any man may

¹ Exod. xiv. 27: Josh. iii. 16.

² 2 Kings vi. 6.

understand, and manifestly see that they are such as they are said to be. The Lord said "Let there be light, and there was light³." Such a kind of light, I mean, which was both called light, and, according to the nature of light, gave light. It was not called, or made light, which was light indeed and yet gave not light; as the bread is called the body of Christ, which yet hath not so much as one jot of the body of Christ.

Furthermore, this word blessing, in no place in the scripture, is so used as they would make us believe. To bless, in the scripture, is to thank, to praise, to salute, to bid farewell, to speak well of any, to wish well, to rejoice, highly to extol, to give thanks for a good turn, to increase, to enrich, to multiply, or to make fruitful. I could, if need were, bring examples to prove each of them. But a man shall no where read that to bless, is as much as, to turn the nature of things by the words of God, or otherwise by good words, and prayers after a set manner pronounced. We read, (say they) in the Gospel, that the "Lord took bread and blessed." Yea, and Paul, also, calleth the bread and cup by that name, to wit, "The bread and cup of blessing⁴:" the bread and cup undoubtedly of consecration, by which consecration the substance of the sign is miraculously changed. I answer, that the words both of the Gospel, and of the Apostle, are wrongfully wrested to that sense which never came into the mind of the Lord or His Apostles. For, to declare the meaning of that place in the Gospel, to bless, is not with the gesture of the hand to make the sign of the cross, or to lay one's mouth to the bread and cup, and, in a low voice, to whisper out the set syllables of the words of consecration: but to sing praises to God, or to give thanks for His benefits bestowed on us.

³ Gen. i. 3.

⁴ 1 Cor. x. 16.

That which I have said I will confirm by the authority of the Evangelists and Apostles. For the Apostles and Evangelists use the word of blessing or thanksgiving indifferently: for where Mark hath *εὐλόγησας*¹, that is to say, "blessing," Matthew, Luke, and Paul² have *εὐχαρίστησας*, that is to say, "giving thanks"; which word Mark, also, using a little after writeth, "and when He had took the cup *εὐχαρίστησας*," that is, "When He had given thanks He gave to them." "To bless," therefore, is, as the Apostles themselves do interpret it, to give thanks, since that they put the one for the other. The diligent reader may see them, also, in that place of Paul which is 1 Cor. x.; which place we will fully and wholly intreat of in that which followeth. Our adversaries, therefore, have not as yet proved out of the scriptures, that "to bless" is as much as to change the things; or that by words, pronounciation, or reciting of words, the things themselves signified are brought to, or made present. The ancient writers, truly, made mention of a mystical blessing, but in a far other sense than these consecrators. Of true consecration we will speak anon, and will confute, also, in another place, whatsoever things they have brought concerning blessing, or consecrating of Baptism: now we will make an end of that which we began.

Words of themselves were instituted of God to this end, to signify, and by signifying, to bear witness, and to admonish; neither have they beside any hidden force to change the natures of things, or to cause the things themselves to be corporally present; neither do we read that holy men ever used them after this manner: therefore they sin, and deceive

¹ Mark xiv. 22.

² Luke xxii. 19; 1 Cor. xi. 24. St Matthew also has *εὐλόγησας*, xxvi. 26.

men, which otherwise use them than they were instituted. Aurelius Augustine acknowledgeth the very same thing, who, in his *Enchiridion ad Laurent.* cap. 22, saith, “And verily words to this purpose are instituted, not that men should deceive one another by them, but by the which one might make another to know his meaning; therefore, to use words unto deceit and not to that end whereunto they were ordained, is sin.” The same Aurelius Augustine, gathering a sum of his whole book intituled, *De Magistro*, asketh this question:—“but now I would have thee tell me what thy opinion is of all this that I have spoken unto thee?” Which, by and by, he answereth: “I have learned, being admonished by thy words, that a man is taught no other thing by words than to learn; and that it is a very small matter that, by speech or talk, we know partly what he thinketh that speaketh: but whether the words which he spake were true, that teacheth he only who admonished that he dwelt in the heart, when the other spake with the tongue.” Thus much he, in the last chapter of his book *De Magistro*. To this purpose pertain the words of Solomon the wise, in the book of the Preacher, saying: “The words of the wise are like pricks and nails that go through of the authors of gatherings, which are given of one shepherd³.” Where we willingly acknowledge that there is a great force in eloquence, and prayers of the just; as the Grecians signified by that Hercules of Gallia: also, Cicero very plentifully hath declared the same, Lib. 1. *De Oratore*. But that which they do forge, and imagine of *Pytho*, or *Suada* or *Suadela*, the Lady and Mistress of Eloquence, that, verily, do we attribute to the Holy Ghost; which doth both give grace to the speaker, and prepareth and stirreth up the minds of

³ Eccles. xii. 11.

the hearers. By these things it is manifest unto all men, I think, that it is a new forgery of man, and not a doctrine of Oracle, to say that in the celebration of the Sacraments there is such force grafted in the words recited, that they turn and change the things, or make the things signified to be present; and either put on, or join them with the signs. But we will show hereafter that the signs are not changed, or mingled with the things signified; but that both of them do remain still in their own nature and property. It shall be sufficient if we attribute that to the words which the scripture doth attribute; to wit, the office of signifying and admonishing; of moving and stirring up, which they have from God. For they do defile and blemish the words of God, which deck them with strange and falsified titles.

We acknowledge, indeed, that all the power of Almighty God is attributed to the word of God; but who seeth not that that is spoken and meant of the everlasting Son of God, who in the scripture is called the Word of God? Who is such a dotard that cannot rightly distinguish between the everlasting Word of God, which is the Son of God, the second person in the reverend Trinity, and the word rehearsed spoken, or pronounced by man? The everlasting Word of God remaineth in His own substance and nature a Creator, and not a creature: it is not mingled; it is not grafted or incorporated into man's voice. The word which proceedeth from man is a creature, not a Creator; and remaineth still a creature: for it is a sound which passeth away. Nevertheless it is a virtue which still remaineth if it be sincere and not adulterated, and received by faith. For so it preserveth; yet not of his own proper virtue or power, or because it is pronounced by man.

but through His power or virtue which revealed the word; who is true, and therefore preserveth those things which by His word He promiseth to preserve: so that now indeed God himself doth preserve, who said that by His word He would preserve those that believe. The word, therefore, which God hath revealed unto us by His servants the prophets, and by His chosen Apostles, is not, neither is called the word of God as if the sound of syllables, words, and voices, are of their own nature the word of God; that very same, I mean, which, of His own substance, is the Son of God; but because the revelation of the word was made from God in the Holy Ghost, through the word, or wisdom of God. Wherefore, although the original be of God, and not of man; yet the words which the prophets and Apostles uttered are man's words; neither can they do anything else but give signification: with the which, notwithstanding, I would not have the due force of the external word of God, to be lifted up above that which is meet and comely; and those things imputed to the literal word which is proper to God. I acknowledge all those things which, with a sound understanding or judgment, are attributed to the word of God. But of this thing I have elsewhere discoursed more at large.

But now some will say;—if by reciting the word of God, Sacraments are not sanctified or consecrated, from whence then have they this that they be, and are, called Sacraments or holy Signs? Is the consecration vain, and of no force? Surely vain and of no force is that consecration which the Papists have feigned. But of consecration, or true sanctification, I have spoken in the beginning of this chapter, which now I will set forth a little plainer and more abundantly. The holy scriptures when they make mention of holy things,

they use very often this Hebrew word, שָׁדַף , which the Greek interpreters commonly have translated by $\alpha\gamma\iota\alpha\zeta\omega$; the Latins by *sanctifico*, *consecro*, and *initio*. The use of this word reacheth very far: for it signifieth to sanctify, to offer unto God, to purify or cleanse, and to justify; also, to sever, or put apart, and to separate; to separate, (I mean), from profane use, and to dedicate them to holy things; to call a thing by some name; to apply; and to appoint. Therefore we say that to consecrate, in this place, is no other thing but to sanctify, to dedicate to God, and, after a fashion, to separate, or of a thing profane to make an holy thing. But who doeth this? Or he which doeth it, by what means or instrument (I pray you) doeth he it? Who, I beseech you, consecrateth or holieth? Is it God, or is it man? Verily God, and not man. For God instituting any thing, and testifying and declaring, by His word, what He hath instituted and to what end; of His own holy, just, and good will; by His own only institution, (I say) without any other mean, He consecrateth the thing which He himself hath already instituted. For as He is holy, just, and good, so whatsoever He commandeth is holy just and good. And man understanding by the word of God, that God hath instituted any thing to a holy just and good use, accepteth, receiveth, and useth that institution for holy good and just. Therefore man doth not, by uttering certain words, consecrate and make holy the institution. And because he believeth that all the institutions of God are holy and good; therefore he also celebrateth this institution of God even as God hath ordained; and giveth God thanks, depending altogether upon God, and the rule of the word. Of this manner of sanctification the Apostle, speaking in another certain place, saith, "Now the Spirit speaketh evidently, that in the latter times there

shall arise deceivers, forbidding to marry; and commanding to abstain from meats which God hath created to be received with thanksgiving of them which believe, and know the truth. For every creature of God is good, and nothing to be refused, if it be received with thanksgiving. For it is sanctified by the word of God and prayer." (1 Tim. iv. 1—5.) Lo! he saith, "Meat is sanctified by the word of God and prayer." But the word of God is, in this place, (as Paul the Apostle expoundeth it), a testimony of the scripture, and will of God; whereby we are taught that all things which God hath made are exceeding good; and that they are clean and not unclean which God hath created for to be eaten, and for our use. In the Acts, S. Peter heareth, "Arise, Peter, slay and eat": (for he saw in a vision before him all living creatures of the earth, and the air,) "Peter answered, Not so Lord; for I have never eaten any thing that is common or unclean."—Therefore he heard again, "What God hath cleansed that call thou not common." (Acts x. 13—15.) But where, I pray you, did He make them clean? When He made, and gave them for the use of man. To the word is annexed prayer, not a charming or an enchantment, but a faithful thanksgiving. For the Apostle more than once or twice maketh mention of thanksgiving, that by the general word, that is to say, prayer, no other thing might be understood than the special word, I mean thanksgiving. For prayer is, as man would say, to invocation, and giving of thanks, as the root to the branches. Therefore saith he, the meat is holy, because God, who is good, hath made and appointed the same for the use of man; and, also, because it is received of man with faith and thanksgiving. For meat is not holy and good to many men: not through any fault in the meat, which is always the good creature of God, but in them is the fault

which acknowledge not by faith the benefits of God, or which abuse them, and glut themselves contrary to the word of the Lord. Even so standeth the case with the matter of sanctification, which we must also apply to the Sacraments: God, of His own good will, and for the commodity of men, ordained Sacraments. He chose unto Himself out of His good creatures, water, bread, and wine; and appointing them to some certain end, He laid a platform, and commanded us to use and celebrate them. Now, therefore, by the commandment and choice of God, the water, bread, and wine, are consecrated; and He signeth them with His word, and declareth that He will have them counted for Sacraments; and sheweth the manner how He will have them celebrated. So that the consecration of Sacraments is made through the will, institution, choice, or commandment of God, and seal of his word. Wherefore water, bread, and wine, used after a common manner, or not so as they are chosen and instituted of God, the word of God is, as it were, slandered; and they are altogether common and profane: but being only used, according to the choice, or commandment of God, holily; and the word or sign being added, they begin to be Sacraments, which they were not before. The same substance remaineth in them still which they had before: but they are instituted to another end and use; for they are sealed with the word and commandment of God; and, therefore, are hallowed: whereunto may, also, be added their holy use, by a true faith setting forth the benefit of our redemption, and giving of thanks, by faithful prayers, to our bountiful Redeemer. To this purpose we may fetch examples of civil government, wherein some things, for certain new causes adjoined, having their substance remaining still, are now made that which before they were not. For silver and

gold being not yet coined with the magistrate's mark, is nothing else but silver and gold. But if by the commandment of the magistrate a new form be added by a print, it is made money, which it was not before, although it be the very same substance which it was before. Wax before it be sealed, is common and usual wax; but when, by the King's will and commandment, that which is engraven in the King's seal is printed in the wax, and is set to Evidences and Letters Patents, by and by it is so esteemed that whoso shall deface the sealed Evidence is attached as guilty of treason. Whereby I trust you see plainly that the true sanctification or consecration of Sacraments, doth consist in the will, and institution of God; in a certain end, and holy use of the same, which are declared unto us in the word. Of the which, peradventure, I have spoken more at large than some may think needful: but the godly reader will pardon me this my tediousness, since my desire is to open all things faithfully, diligently, and at large.

Now that I have defended the lawful use of the word, and declared the virtue of it; and opened unto you, as occasion served, the true sanctification or consecration of Sacraments, I will return to that where I left. And because I taught that Sacraments consist in two parts,—the sign, and the thing signified; it remaineth to show that those two parts retain their natures distinguished, not communicating properties; by declaration whereof, both to those things which go before, and to those which follow, yea, and to the whole substance of the Sacrament, a wonderful light, without doubt, shall appear. But of communicating of the names and terms, I will speak in their convenient place.

That each part retaineth their natures distinguished, without communicating or mingling of properties, it is to be

seen hereby, that many be partakers of the sign, and yet are barred from the thing signified. But if the natures of the parts were united or naturally knit together, it must needs be then that those which be partakers of the signs, must be partakers also of the thing signified. Examples of scripture as they are ready, so are they evident. For Simon Magus, in the Acts of the Apostles, received the sign, and was baptized; but of the thing signified he had not, neither received so much as one jot. And Judas Iscariot, a cruel and faithless traitor of His master, did likewise eat the bread of the Lord, but he did not eat bread the Lord, otherwise he had lived happy, just, and blessed for ever: for, "he which eateth me" (saith the Lord himself) "shall never die." But Judas died everlastingly; therefore he did not eat that food of life.

To these evident testimonies of scripture, I will now add, also, certain of Saint Augustine's pertaining to that purpose; who, in his 26th Treatise upon John, saith, "We receive this day visible meat; but the Sacrament is one thing, and the virtue of the Sacrament is another. How many do receive of the things of the altar, and when they have received it do die! Whereupon the Apostle saith, 'he eateth and drinketh his own damnation.' Was not the morsel poison, which the Lord gave unto Judas? And yet he received it, and after he had received it the enemy entered into him; not because that was evil which he received, but because he being evil, did receive that good thing unworthily." And immediately after he saith, "The Sacrament of the thing, that is, of the knitting together of the body and blood of Christ, is received at the Lord's table, of some unto life, of other some to destruction: but the thing itself whereof it is a Sacrament, is received of all men unto life, of none

to destruction, whosoever shall be partakers thereof." And again he saith, "He which dwelleth not in Christ, nor Christ in him, without doubt he neither eateth His flesh, nor drinketh His blood spiritually; although carnally, and visibly he chew with his teeth the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ; but he doth rather eat and drink the Sacrament of so great a thing to his own damnation." And so forth. He has the like words in his book *De Civit. Dei*, Lib. XXI. c. 25. And in his book *De Doctr. Christ. Lib.* III. c. 9, he showeth that "in the conjunction of natures there had need to be a distinction, lest we should stick too much upon the outward sign."

Now we come to the proofs of the scripture. The Apostle witnesseth in 1 Cor. x. "that all our fathers were baptized; and did all eat of one spiritual meat; and did all drink of one manner of spiritual drink; but the Lord in many of them had no delight." Whereas if they had eaten that spiritual meat, and drunk that spiritual drink spiritually by faith, undoubtedly the Lord had delighted in them. "For without faith," as he himself saith, "it is impossible to please God:" (Heb. xi. 6.) therefore, with them that have faith, God is well pleased. Wherefore, our fathers truly were partakers of visible Sacraments, but they were destitute of invisible grace: whereby it followeth, that the sign and the thing signified, do retain their natures, not confounded or mingled, but distinguished and separated. Besides this, the words of the Gospel have some affinity, or, at the least, some likeness, with sacramental signs. Otherwise the words are preferred far before the signs, the Apostle saying, "That he was sent to preach, and not to baptize." But many hear, with their outward ears, the words of the Lord, who for all that, because

they are void of faith, are also without the inward fruit of the word; Paul saying yet again, "For to us was the Gospel preached as well as unto them, but the word which they heard did not profit them, because it was not coupled with faith." (Heb. iv. 2.) For so it cometh to pass that many receive the visible Sacraments, and yet are not partakers of the invisible grace which by faith only is received. Whereupon, yet again, it followeth that the sign is not confounded with the thing signified, but both of them do retain the substance and nature distinguished. What, and doth not the scripture expressly and pithily make a difference between the outward ministry of man, and God the inward Worker, and Giver of spiritual gifts? For John Baptist saith "I baptize you with water, but He (Christ) shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost." (Matth. iii. 11.) Wherewith agreeth that saying of Peter, "Baptism saveth us; not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but in that a good conscience maketh request to God." (1 Pet. iii. 21.) To this, now, pertaineth that evident testimony of Saint Augustine, which is read *Quæst. in Levit. lib. 10. quæst. 83.* in these words: "We must diligently consider as often as He saith 'I the Lord which sanctify him,' that He speaketh of the priest: when He, also, spake this to Moses, 'and thou shalt sanctify him.' How, therefore, doth both Moses and God also sanctify? For Moses doth not sanctify for the Lord; but Moses doth sanctify in the visible Sacraments by his ministry: and the Lord by invisible grace, by His Holy Spirit: where the whole fruit of visible Sacraments also is. For without this sanctification of invisible grace, what profit have we by visible Sacraments?" Thus far Augustine. As John Baptist made distinction between his own ministry in baptism, and the power of Christ; even

so maketh he distinction between the ministry of preaching, and the drawing of the spiritual teacher. "I am" (saith he) "the voice of a crier in the wilderness: make straight the way of the Lord." (John i. 23.) And again "He that cometh from on high, is above all: he that is of the earth is earthly, and speaketh of the earth; He that cometh from heaven is above all; and what He hath seen and heard, that He testifieth, &c." (John iii. 31, 32.) Saint Paul, also, agreeing thereunto saith "Who is Paul; what is Apollos; but ministers by whom ye believed even as the Lord gave to every man? I have planted, Apollos watered, but God gave the increase. So that neither is he that planteth anything, nor he that watereth, but God that giveth the increase." (1 Cor. iii. 5—7.) Albeit the comparison of ministers with the signs agree not altogether, and in every part, (which I told you before) because ministers are fellow-labourers with Christ according to their office; but the signs which are without life are not so, unless *κατ' ἐξόχην* we translate unto them that which is the ministers: yet, by other proofs, I suppose it to be made plain that the sign, and thing signified, do retain their natures distinguished in the Sacraments.

These things do specially disprove, and convince those who are persuaded of that papistical transubstantiation of bread and wine into the substance of the body and blood of Christ. For these men utterly deny that the bread and wine being consecrated in the mysteries, do remain in their own substances. For they contend, that the substances of bread and wine are annihilated, and turned into the very body and blood of the Lord; so that, after the consecration, the accidents of bread and wine do remain, and no part of the substance thereof at all. For they say, that the Lord in express

words pronounced over the bread and wine, "This is my body; This is my blood;" and that the Lord can easily bring to pass, by His own omnipotency, that that which He said, may be as He said. For proof whereof, they allege these, and such like places: that the Lord, forsooth, fashioned man out of the clay of the earth; and by and by of the rib of man, made woman; and, also, turned Lot's wife into a pillar of salt: and therefore, that He, by the self-same His power, can make of bread His body, and of wine His blood. And these, truly, are their bulwarks. But we, in another place, have plentifully disputed of the meaning of the Lord's words "This is my body:" so that it is superfluous to make long repetition of them. I have, also, told you that of the omnipotency of God, we must not gather and determine whatsoever cometh into our brain: and, also, that God's power doeth nothing against truth, neither against itself; and that no godly man ought to take that in hand, under pretence of the power of God, which is repugnant to the plain scriptures, and the articles of the Catholic faith.

Now it is evident and plain, that after consecration there remaineth in the Sacraments, the substance of bread and wine. And herein we need no other witness than our very senses, which perceive, see, taste and feel, no other thing than bread and wine. But while clay was turned into a man's body; the rib into a woman; and Lot's wife into a pillar of salt; they were not, as the Sacrament of the Supper, that which they were before; neither did there appear unto the senses any jot of the clay, of the rib, of Lot's wife. Very foolishly, therefore, and unaptly are these examples applied to the mystery of the Lord's Supper, where-with they nothing agree; which thing, also, we touched before.

The Gospel very diligently describing the most holy institution of the Lord's Supper, and the manner thereof, maketh no mention of miraculous transubstantiation; but calleth the bread and wine, which the Lord took and distributed to His disciples, and which they also received, by the names of bread and wine, as well after the words of consecration, (as they term it,) were spoken, as, also, before consecration. Doth not the Lord, in the twenty and sixth chapter of Matthew, call the wine, being consecrated, not wine only, but the fruit of the vine, after a more vehement and significative kind of speech; lest any should be ignorant that the wine was wine indeed, and so remaineth? In Mark we read this of the cup, "And He took the cup; and when He had given thanks, He gave to them, and they drank of it; and He said unto them, 'This is my blood of the New Testament,' &c." Lo they drank all (saith he) of the cup, before the words of consecration, (as they term it,) were spoken; therefore they drank wine. Now, if so be they answer, that this place of the Evangelist, is to be expounded by the figure *Hysteronproteron*, that is, when any thing is declared out of order preposterously, then admit they tropes and figures in the celebration of the supper; which, notwithstanding, they have contended ought simply to be understood without the help of tropes or figures. But Paul, also, the Apostle, in 1 Cor. x. calleth the bread of the Lord, being now in the very holy use, and, (that I may so say,) consecrated, by the name of bread; and in 1 Cor. xi. the third time he calleth it "bread." To this appertaineth, that the Acts of the Apostles do testify, how that the churches of the Apostles do call the whole mystical action, "The breaking of bread," not "The breaking of His body, or distribution of His blood." It is manifest, therefore, that

the substance of bread and wine in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, do remain in their own nature; and that transubstantiation is a sophistical imagination.

This, also, is a sophistical and a notable papistical forgery, in that they say, that the bread and wine consecrated in the Supper, is therefore called of the Apostles, "bread and wine," because they were bread and wine before. For that is now done which is read in Exodus vii. 12, to have been done in times past, where Aaron's rod is said to devour the enchanters' rods; which, nevertheless, these were not rods, but serpents: but now they are named rods, because they were rods before they were so changed which now are serpents and not rods. But, again, who doth not see this example hath no similitude, or likeness with the bread and wine of the Lord? For the rod truly was called a rod: but, in the mean while, it was, and seemed plainly to be, not now a rod but a serpent. But the bread, is called bread; neither doth it appear to be any thing else but bread: here is no form of flesh seen, as was seen there the form of a serpent. Beside this, the rod is said to be turned into a serpent; and is showed for a wonder or miracle: but ye shall read in no place that the bread was turned into flesh, by any miracle: but a Sacrament is instituted which, indeed, loseth the name and nature of a Sacrament when the substance of the sign being annihilated and made void, nothing remaineth there but the thing signified. For that which they trilling say of accidents miraculously subsisting without their subject, and remaining instead of a sign, is to no purpose. If we should go about to boast of our dreams for miracles, there will be nothing so absurd and foolish which we shall not colour with our fancies and lies. What if this word "transubstantiation," doth ma-

nifestly prove, that this whole trifling toy is not fetched from the simple and plain doctrine of the Apostles, but from the subtle school of quarrelling sophisters? But the Apostle Paul¹ giveth us in charge to beware both of philosophy, and strangeness of words; though, at this present, we do not only entreat of new words, but, also, of new matter, and new doctrine, contrary, in all points, to the Apostles. For this doctrine of transubstantiation, is clean contrary both to the doctrine of the Apostles and Evangelists touching the true incarnation of our Lord, and the true nature and property of his human body; and, also, the true raising up again of our bodies. For they are constrained to forge many things altogether miraculous; as of the invisible body of Christ, and of the subtle body of Christ piercing, by His subtilty, through the gate, and the stone,—I mean that which covered His sepulchre: or the Lord's very body being altogether, and at one time, in many places; and filling all things: and other innumerable which are of this stamp absurd and wicked. Now also John Scotus, a subtle Doctor, in his work *Sentent. lib. IV, distinct. 11. quæst. 3*, saith;—That the article of transubstantiation is neither expressed in the Creed of the Apostles, neither in those Creeds of the ancient fathers; but that it was brought in and invented of the church; (so saith he, meaning the Romish church) under Innocentius the Third, in the Council of Lateran. Whereby we gather, that the doctrine of transubstantiation is of late time, and newly start up; the history whereof we have elsewhere more largely compiled. But by this that I have said, I think it plainly and effectually enough declared, that the signs are not mingled with the things signified, or changed into them, but that each of them

¹ Col. ii. 18: 1 Tim. vi. 3—5.

remain in their several natures. But, albeit either of the parts without mixture do retain their own nature, yet those two agree in one Sacrament; and being joined together and not divided, do make one perfect, and lawful Sacrament. For water alone both privately and ordinarily sprinkled, is no Sacrament, unless it be applied and used according to the institution of Christ. Purifying, also, or washing away of sins, and the engrafting or receiving into the league and fellowship of God and all saints, of itself is no Sacrament, unless there be also a sprinkling of water in the name of the blessed Trinity. In like manner, it is no Sacrament if we eat bread in a common assembly, and drink wine of the self-same cup after the common manner: neither is it a Sacrament if through a faithful remembrance thou consider that the Lord's body was betrayed for thee, and His blood shed for thee, for the which, also, thou givest thanks: but so far forth as they are all mysteries of God and our salvation, they are generally termed Sacraments; that is, secret and spiritual mysteries of God and our salvation. For, in a perfect and lawful Sacrament, there must needs go together both the holy action corporal or sensible, and the spiritual celebration thereof; for the which this sacramental action was invented and put in practice.

But here, some move many and divers questions touching the sacramental union; whether it be personal, real, or rational. I, because I see nothing of this matter doubtfully delivered of the Apostles, and, that the thing, being plain of itself, by such manner of sophistications is made dark, doubtful, difficult, and obscure; simply, and plainly say, that the sign and the thing signified are joined together in the Sacraments by God's institution: by faithful contemplation and use: to be short, in signification and likeness of the things.

But I utterly deny that those two are naturally united together, so that the sign in the Sacrament beginneth to be that which the thing signified in his own substance and nature: I deny that the thing signified is joined corporally with the sign, so that the sign remaineth still in his own substance and nature, and yet, nevertheless, in the mean time hath the thing signified corporally joined unto it; that thereby whosoever is partaker of the sign, should be also by the sign, or with the sign, partaker of the thing itself. The reason why I do so constantly deny that, appeareth, I think, sufficiently by those examples which I have hitherto declared, and which hereafter shall be declared. Furthermore, I say that the sign and the thing signified, are coupled together by God's institution; because He which instituted the Sacrament of Baptism and the Supper, instituted it not to this end, that with water we might wash away the filth of the body as the custom is to do by daily use of baths; neither that we should take our fill of the bread and wine; but that, under invisible signs, He might commend unto us the mysteries of our redemption and His grace: and, to be short, of our salvation, by representing them to renew them, and by sealing them to confirm them. My saying is, that they are coupled together in a faithful contemplation, because they which partake the Sacraments religiously, do not fasten their eyes on sensible things only, but rather on things insensible, signified, and heavenly: so that the faithful have in themselves both twain coupled together, which otherwise in the sign, or with the sign, are knitted together with no bond. For corporally, and sensibly, they receive the signs; but spiritually, they possess, comprehend, renew, and exercise the things signified. In signification and likeness of the things, I say, they are coupled together, because the sign is a token

of the thing signified: and unless signs have likenesses with those things whereof they are signs, then could they be no signs. They have, therefore, most apt and very near affinity between themselves. For, as water washeth away the filth of the body; as bread and wine satisfieth and maketh merry the heart of man; even so by the grace of God the people of God are purified: even so the body and blood of the Lord which was given for us, being apprehended by faith, doth both satisfy, and make merry the whole man; that he may yield himself wholly unto thanksgiving, and obedient to God-ward.

I would speak here more largely of the analogy, or of the sign and thing signified, but that I see I may do the same hereafter in place more convenient. But I think I shall not need any more places out of the scripture to open these things more evidently; since they follow, of their own accord, upon that which we have hitherto, by testimonies of scripture, confirmed, and will hereafter more at large confirm. Moreover, in respect of the likeness of the sign and the thing signified, the name of the one is given to the other; as I will prove by most evident testimonies of scripture. In Genesis xvii, the Lord saith thus to Abraham, "Thou shalt keep my covenant, therefore, both thou, and thy seed after thee in their generations. This is my covenant which ye shall keep between me and you: Every man-child among you shall be circumcised. Ye shall circumcise the flesh of your foreskin; and it shall be a token of the covenant between me and you." The mouth of the Lord hath spoken this. Who will gainsay the word of God? The word of God calleth circumcision a covenant, therefore the name of the thing signified, is given to the sign. For in very deed circumcision is not the covenant itself: for the covenant is the bargain, and agreement between God and

men, which hath certain conditions and articles. Wherefore, afterwards, by interpretation, the same circumcision is called “A token of the covenant.” And who will find fault with this interpretation of God? The signs, therefore, yea God being the interpreter, take the names of the things signified. So you may read in the twelfth chapter of Exodus. “Ye shall eat the lamb in haste, for it is the Lord’s Passover.” Again, “And the blood shall be unto you a sign in the houses where you are, &c.” and again, “This day shall be unto you a remembrance, &c.” What can be spoken more plainly than that the lamb is called the Passover? But what is the proper meaning of the Passover? Let us give ear to the Lord, here again expounding Himself and saying,—“I will pass through the land of Egypt this same night, and will smite all the first-born of Egypt, from man to beast; and when I shall see the blood (of the lamb) I will pass over you, and the plague shall not be upon you to destroy you.” Behold, the Passover, God himself so interpreting it, is that passing over whereby the angel of God, passing over the house of the Israelites which were marked with the blood of the lamb, spared their first-born, and slew the first-born of the Egyptians. If thou art ignorant what, and what manner of lamb it was, listen again to the Lord instructing thee, and saying,—“In the tenth day of this month, every man take unto him a lamb according to the household, and let your lamb be without blemish, a male of a year old, which ye shall take out from among the sheep and from among the goats.” And here the lamb is plainly called the Passover. And who doth not see that the lamb is not the Passover? Yet because it is a sign, or remembrance of the Passover, as the mouth of the Lord saith, surely it taketh the name of the Passover, or passing-by. Again, you read in the nineteenth of Numbers, “Thus spake the Lord unto Moses: Speak unto the children of Israel, that

they bring thee a red cow without blemish. And ye shall give her unto Eleazar, the priest, that he may bring her without the host, and cause her to be slain before his face, and to be burnt whole. And a man that is clean, shall gather up the ashes of the cow, and lay them without the host in a clean place. And it shall be kept for the multitude of the children of Israel, for a water of separation (or sprinkling): for it is sin." Mark, again, the manner of the speaking of the scriptures. A heifer or cow is sin: that is, a sacrifice for sin: as "Christ is said to be made sin for us," that for (or by) sin, He might condemn sin; which is, that by the one oblation of His body, He [might] cleanse and purge us from sin¹. Hitherto, also, belongeth that which the Apostle, speaking of sacrifices unto the Hebrews, saith,— "But in these sacrifices there is mention made of sins every year; for it is not possible that the blood of bulls and goats should take away sins." (Heb. x. 3, 4.) As often, therefore, as sacrifices, as heifers, goats, bulls, and lambs, are called sanctifications, cleansings, or sins, the signs take the names of the things signified. For these were certain types and figures of the priest which was to come, and of Christ upon whom all our sins are laid: for He truly is "the Lamb of God which taketh away the sins of the world." (Zech. iii: Isai. liii: John i. 29.)

Now we are come, also, to the Sacraments of the New Testament, whose signs also bear the names of the things signified. For Peter saith, in the second of the Acts, "Let every one of you be baptised in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins." And Paul, also, in the Acts of the Apostles², heareth "Arise and be baptised, and wash away thy sins by calling on the name of the Lord." Therefore, truly Baptism is called a cleansing, or washing away of sins. And Peter, also, elsewhere saith,

¹ 2 Cor. v. 21: Rom. viii. 3.

² Acts xxii. 16.

“Baptism saveth you; not that thereby the filth of the flesh is put away, but in that a good conscience maketh request unto God.” (1 Pet. iii. 21.) And Paul, also, saith;—“Ye are washed, ye are sanctified, ye are justified, in the name of the Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God.” (1 Cor. vi. 11.) Therefore, in due and right comparing of the places between themselves doth manifestly prove, that to the sign of baptism, which is water, is given the name of the thing signified. After the same manner is it to be seen in the institution of the Lord’s Supper, or Eucharist. The bread is called the body of Christ, and the wine the blood of Christ. But since the right faith believeth that the true body of Christ, ascended out of this world, liveth, and is now in heaven; and that the Lord returneth no more into this world until He come in the clouds of heaven to judge the quick, and the dead;—every man understandeth that to the sign, to wit, bread and wine, the names of the things themselves, to wit, the body and blood of Christ, are given through the communicating of names.

Many other speeches used in the scripture, and in our daily talk, are not much unlike to the speeches used in the Sacrament. We read that Christ is, and is called, a Lion; a Lamb; a Shepherd; a Vine; a Door; a Way; a Ladder; the Day; the Light; the Sun; the Water; the Bread; a Spring; and a Rock¹: which if, at this day, any should roughly urge, contending that Christ is a Lamb indeed, a door in substance, a natural vine, or such like; who, I pray you, could abide him so reasoning? We should hiss and drive out from among us such a one, as a madman and a perverter of God’s oracles. We read, indeed, “And

¹ Rev. v. 5: John i. 29: x. 11: xv. 1: x. 7: xiv. 6: Luke i. 78: John viii. 12: Mal. iv. 2: John vii. 37: Rev. xxii. 17: John vi. 35: 1 Cor. x. 4.

that rock was Christ ;” in the mean time it is to be considered what should follow : for if that rock really, and in very deed, had been Christ, none of them that drank of that rock had been reprobates. For they are acceptable unto God which are partakers of Christ. “ But in many of them that drank of the rock, the Lord had no delight :” for they were slain in the wilderness. Therefore they which drank of the rock which was Christ, were not made partakers of Christ. Therefore, the rock was not Christ really, and in very deed. We, also, seeing the standards of Kings, Princes, and Cities, we call the signs by the names of the Kings, Princes, and Cities, for we say, ‘ This is the king of France ’ : ‘ This is the prince of Germany ’ : ‘ This is Tigre ’ : ‘ This is Berne.’ So, if we see the marriage ring, or the image of any prince, we call it the faith and troth of wedlock, or man and wife ; yea, and we say by the image, ‘ This is the Prince.’ For matrons, showing their wedding ring say, ‘ This is my husband ’ : when we show to any man the picture, or image of the Duke of Saxony, we say, ‘ This is the Duke of Saxony.’ If any should go obstinately to affirm, that the sign in very deed is the thing signified, because it beareth the name thereof, would not all men cry out that such a one were without wit or reason ; and that he were to be abhorred by all means as an obstinate brawler ? Those, therefore, that are skilful in the things, understand that that is and hath been Catholic, received of all men, and, also, sound, which we showed even now at large ; to wit, that the signs do borrow the names of the things, and not turn into the things which they signify.

And, therefore, the ancient fathers moved no strife nor contentions about the Sacraments, as are at this day among us. For, as they did beautify the signs with the names of

the things signified, so did they acknowledge the kind of speech: neither did they roughly urge the words, as though the very signs were really and corporally that selfsame thing which they signified. Therefore, this canon or rule, is so often repeated, and beaten upon by Aurelius Augustinus: “that the signs do take, or borrow the names of things signified.” By the same canon or rule, he worketh plain certain dark places; of which thing we will now set down some testimonies. In his *Epist. 23, ad Bonifacium de parvulorum baptisate*, he saith; — “If Sacraments had not some likeness with those things whereof they are Sacraments, no doubt they were no Sacraments: for of this likeness, for the most part, they take the names of the things themselves. As, also, the Apostle speaking of baptism saith, ‘We are buried with Christ by baptism into His death.’ He doth not say we signify the burial; but he doth flatly say, ‘We are buried.’ Therefore he called the Sacrament of so great a thing, no otherwise than by the name of the self-same thing.” And in *Tract. super Johan. 63*: “When the unclean person is gone, all which remain are clean. Such a like thing shall there be when the world, being overcome of Christ, shall pass away, and there shall no unclean person remain among the people of God: when the tares being separated from the wheat, the just shall shine like the Sun in the kingdom of their Father. The Lord foreseeing this would come to pass, and now witnessing that it was signified when Judas fell away as tares separated, the holy Apostles remaining as wheat, He saith, ‘Now is the Son of man glorified:’ (John xiii. 31.), as if He had said, ‘Behold what shall be when I am glorified, where there shall be no wicked person, and where no good man shall perish.’ For He saith not thus, ‘Now is the

glorifying of the Son of man signified ;' but He saith, ' Now is the Son of man glorified.' As it is not said, ' The rock signified Christ ;' but ' The rock was Christ.' Neither is it said, ' The good seed signifieth the children of the kingdom ;' but He saith, ' The good seed these are the children of the kingdom ; and the tares the children of the wicked.' (Matth. xiii. 38.) As the scripture is, therefore, wont to speak, calling the things which signify as the things that are signified, even so spake the Lord, saying, ' Now is the Son of man glorified.' After that wicked (Judas) was separated, and His holy Apostles remaining with him, His glorification was signified ; when, the wicked being divided, He shall remain eternally with the saints." The same Aurelius Augustinus, in his Epistle to Euodius, 102, saith, " The sound of a voice, and the bodily shape of a dove, and cloven tongues like unto fire, which came upon every one of them, as those things in Mount Sinai which were done in a most fearful manner : and as that pillar of the cloud by day, and that pillar of fire by night, were ordained and set for some operation which they signified. Herein we must specially take heed of this, that none be persuaded or believe that the nature and substance of the Father, or of the Son, or of the Holy Ghost is changeable, or may be turned. Neither let any man be moved, for that sometime the thing which signifieth, taketh the name of that thing which it signifieth. The Holy Ghost is said to descend, and remain upon Him in the bodily shape of a dove ; for so, also, is the rock of Christ, because it signifieth Christ."

By these examples alleged out of the scripture it is plain, that the signs do borrow the names of the things, and not their natures and substances. Whereupon it is undoubtedly

true that they err, as far as heaven is wide, which are persuaded that the sacramental speeches are not to be expounded as figurative, and borrowed, but most properly and literally; so that by that means the water, bread, and wine, are not now signs, and tokens of regeneration, and of the body of Christ given, and of His blood shed for us; but regeneration itself, and the very substantial body and blood of our Lord Jesus. For, being of this opinion, they are offensive unto the common manner both of speaking, and interpreting, used in all ages: they are also repugnant to true faith; yea, and to common sense. Whereby it cometh to pass that by their confounding of the sign with the thing signified, they bring in a servile weakness, and, that I may use S. Augustine's words, "A carnal bondage." For he, (*De Doct. Chr.* Lib. III. c. 9.) entreating of the Sacraments of christians, saith;—"The Lord himself and the Apostles in their doctrine, have left us few things instead of many, and those most easy to be done, most reverend in understanding, and most pure in observing: as is baptism, and the celebration of the body and blood of the Lord. Which Sacraments every man when he receiveth, being instructed, acknowledgeth whereunto they are referred; that we should not worship them with carnal servitude or bondage, but rather with spiritual freedom or liberty. And as to follow the letter, and to take the signs instead of the things which are signified by them, is a point of servile weakness: so to expound the signs unprofitably, is a point of evil wandering error." And yet he speaketh more plainly (c. 5). "First of all, you must beware lest you take a figurative speech according to the letter. For to this agreeth that which the Apostle saith;—'The letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life'. For when that which is figuratively spoken, is taken as though it were spoken properly, it is carnally

understanded. Neither is there any thing that may more agreeably be termed the death of the soul, than when that wherein we excel beasts, which is understanding or knowledge, is made subject to the flesh by following the letter. For he that followeth the letter understandeth words translated or borrowed, as proper or natural; neither doth he refer that which is signified by a proper word to another signification: but if, (for an example,) he shall hear mention of the Sabbath, he understandeth it no otherwise than as one day of the seven which, by continual course, come and go. And when he heareth mention made of sacrifice, it will not out of his head, but that this meant of that which is wont to be done about offering of beasts, and fruits of the earth. To be short: this is the miserable bondage of the soul, to take the signs for the things themselves, and not to be able to lift up the eyes of the mind above the bodily creature, for the obtaining of everlasting life." Thus far Augustine. By these words of Augustine we do gather that they reverence the Sacraments by spiritual liberty, which neither stick to the letter; neither worship and reverence the visible things and elements, as water, bread, and wine,—instead of the things signified; but being rather admonished and stirred up by the signs, they are lifted up in their minds to behold the things signified. This same Augustine, in the same book (c. 15.) teaching when, and after what manner, a trope or figure is to be received, or acknowledged, saith, "In figurative speeches this manner of rule shall be kept, that so long you view with diligent consideration what is read, until the interpretation come unto the rule of charity. For if it be not repugnant to charity think not that it is a figurative speech." And yet more plainly he addeth in the 16th Chapter following:—"If it be an

imperative speech, either forbidding any heinous offence, or wicked deed; or commanding any profitable, or good deed; it is no figurative speech. But if it command any wicked deed, or forbid any deed of charity, then it is figurative. ‘Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you’. He seemeth to command some horrible offence, or wicked deed; therefore it is a figurative speech, commanding us to communicate with the passion of Christ; and comfortably, and profitably to lay up in our remembrance that His flesh was crucified and wounded for us. The scripture saith, ‘If thine enemy hunger, feed him:’ here no man doubteth but he commandeth well doing; but that which followeth;—‘for in so doing thou shalt heap coals of fire upon his head’,—a man would think that a wicked and evil deed were commanded: therefore doubt not but that is figuratively spoken.” And so forth. All these things do convince their error which interpret sacramental speeches as proper, and reject all figures and tropes; especially in the institution of the Supper. Nevertheless, I am not ignorant what they set against this last testimony of Saint Augustine;—that the words of our Saviour, in John vi, do make nothing to the interpretation of the ministration of the Sacrament; and, therefore, that the place of Saint Augustine doth nothing agree to our purpose. But it is manifest that, in the same book, Saint Augustine disputeth of signs, and of the sacramental speeches. And that is manifest, also, by many other places out of Saint Augustine that he often allegeth these words of our Saviour out of John vi, to expound the celebration of the Supper. But why do they nothing pertain to the celebration of the Supper? Doth He speak of one body in the Supper, and of another in the sixth chapter of John? Shall we believe that

the Lord had, and hath, two bodies? Our Lord Jesus hath but one body, the which as it profiteth nothing being eaten corporally, according to John vi, even so that body being corporally eaten, doth nothing avail, according to St Matth. xxvi. But this matter we have elsewhere handled. And of as little force is this unsavory objection of theirs, which is, that the consequence is false when we argue thus;—circumcision is the covenant; the lamb is the Passover; sacrifices are sins; and sanctifications or cleansings are sacramental speeches mystical and figurative; therefore, this also, “This is my body,” is a mystical and figurative speech. For since in Sacraments there is the like reason, why may we not frame arguments from the one to the other? And that Sacraments have the like reason, it is received of all them which acknowledge the truth aright, and it shall be proved hereafter to the full. But if it be not lawful to reason from the Sacraments of the Old Testament, and by them, after a certain comparison, to interpret ours; and by ours to make them plain; truly then the Apostle did not well, who, by a false consequent by comparison, we read to have argued from their Sacraments into ours in 1 Cor. x. and to the Coloss. ii.

But now we return to our purpose. That we may yet at length make an end of this place,—they are sacramental and figurative speeches, when we read and hear that the bread is the body of Christ, and the wine the blood of Christ; and, that they do eat and drink the body and blood of Christ, which eat and drink the Sacrament of the body and blood of the Lord: also, that they are purged from their sins, and regenerated into a new life, which are baptized in the name of Christ; and that baptism is the washing away of our sins. And after this manner speaketh the scripture; and this form of speech kept the old doctors of the church;

whom, for so doing, none that is wise doth dispraise, neither can one discommend any man which speaketh after this manner; so that he, also, abide in the same sincerity wherein it is manifest that those holy men of God did walk. For as they did willingly, and simply use those speeches; so did they not roughly, and rigourously strain the letter and speeches. They did interpret them in such sort, that none was so unskilful but what he might understand that the signs were not the thing itself which they signified; but that the signs do take the names of the things: therefore, they used words significatively, sacramentally, mystically, and figuratively.

Now whereas some will not have the sacramental speeches to be expounded, as though, being not expounded, they were of more authority, majesty and worthiness; this draweth after it a sore danger, and giveth a most grievous offence; and is repugnant to the rule of the Apostles, to sound reason, and to the custom of them of old. For when these kind of speeches are set forth and uttered to the simple sort being not expounded, to wit, "That bread is the body of Christ. When thou drinkest the wine of the Lord, thou drinkest the very blood of the Lord. Baptism saveth us, &c.," what other thing, I pray you, is set forth than a snare of carnal bondage, and a most dangerous offence of idolatry? Many words need not in this matter, since experience doth abundantly enough set forth in this place what hath been done, and what at this day is done.

The rule of the Apostles commandeth the divine Oracles to be expounded in the church; and to lay forth all the mysteries of the scripture, that they may be soundly understood as we may see in 1 Cor. xiv. And reason itself teacheth us that the mind of man is little or nothing

moved, if the things themselves be not understood. What fruit, therefore, shall the simple sort receive by the Sacraments unto whom the meaning of the Sacraments hath not been opened? Better, therefore, did the ancient Fathers, not only in expounding all the mysteries of the kingdom of God,—and especially the Sacraments,—but, in teaching also that they ought to be expounded. Which, although it be made plain enough by those things which go before, yet will I add two examples out of Saint Augustine touching this matter. He (*De catechisandis rudibus*, c. 6.) saith, “ Let the new christian man be taught concerning the Sacraments, that they be visible signs of heavenly things; and that invisible things are to be honoured in them; neither that the sign, after it is blessed and sanctified, is so to be taken as it is daily used. It must, also, be told him what that speech signifies which he heareth; and what thing is given in the sign whereof it is a representation. Moreover, upon this occasion, he must be taught that if he hear anything, even in the scriptures, that sounded carnally, although he understood it not, yet to believe that some spiritual thing is signified thereby, which belongeth to holy manners, and to the life to come.” And it followeth. The same Augustine, (*De Doctr. Chr.* Lib. iv. c. 8.), doth utterly forbid the doctors and teachers of the church to think that they ought therefore to speak obscurely of the mysteries of the scripture, because they see that these things are delivered somewhat intricately and darkly in the scripture; but he rather required light and plainness in them. If any man desire to hear his words they are these: “ If we fetch examples of the manner of speaking out of the writings of our canonical authors and Doctors, which are easily understood: yet we ought not to think that we should follow

them also in those speeches wherein they have used a profitable and wholesome obscurity to exercise, and as it were, to quicken the readers' minds; and to take away loathsomeness; and to stir up the studies of the willing learners; and, also, to make the minds of the wicked zealous, that they may either be turned to godliness, or else excluded from the mysteries. For so they spake that those which came after them and could understand, and rightly expound them, might reveal a second grace unlike to the former, but yet ensuing in the church of God. Therefore they which expound them, ought not so to speak as if they, by the like authority, would offer themselves to be expounded; but in all their kind of speeches, first let them labour chiefly and first of all, to be understood, with as plain kind of speaking as they can, that he be very dull and slow witted which doth not understand; or, at the least, let not the fault of the hardness and subtilty of the things which we go about to open and declare, be in our own speech, whereby that which we speak should be somewhat longer in understanding." Thus far Augustine. And let this that I have hitherto said of sacramental speeches, be sufficient. The Lord be praised. Amen.

SERMON II¹.

That we must reason reverently of the Sacraments: That they do not give grace, neither have grace included in them. Again, What the virtue, and lawful end, and use of Sacraments is. That they profit not without faith. That they are not superfluous to the faithful: and that they do not depend upon the worthiness or unworthiness of the Minister.

YESTERDAY (dearly beloved) I told you what a Sacrament was; who was the Author of them; and for what cause Sacraments were instituted; of what things they consist; that is to say, of the sign and the thing signified. I told you, also, what a sign is, and what the thing signified; and by what names they are termed; how they are consecrated; that the sign is not mingled with the thing signified; but that both of them remain in their own nature and property of nature:—that the sign is not taken away or miraculously turned; neither that the thing signified is so joined with the same, that whosoever is partaker of the one, is partaker also of the other. To be short;—I declared how, and after what manner, the signs and the thing signified are coupled together to make a full, perfect, and lawful Sacrament; where, also, I intreated of sacramental speeches. Now, therefore, it remaineth that I, also, consequently speak of the nature, virtue, and efficacy of Sacraments; and of those things which are joined, and of affinity with them: for so the order which I used in my division requireth.

¹ The seventh Sermon of the fifth Decade.

Touching the virtue and nature of Sacraments, that is to say, what they work in man, writers have disputed diversely, and plentifully. It seemeth unto me that reverence must be used in this disputation; and that heed must be taken, that I do not incline either to the right hand or to the left: that is, that I do not attribute too much unto them to the derogating of the doctrine of the Evangelists and Apostles; neither that I should diminish, or take from them, to my own damnation, that which the scripture, the word of God, doth attribute unto them. But we shall plentifully give great praise and glory to the Ordinances of God, if we shall say that of them which the Spirit of God hath set down in the holy scriptures: to be willing to attribute more unto them, is not only an error in man, but a great fault, which bringeth death and a horrible destruction. This is declared unto us in the holy scripture by examples most worthy of remembrance. The Ark of the Covenant given by Moses to the people of Israel, was a witness of God's presence among the people, and of the league and friendship between God and man; for in these words God made a league with the people "I will make my dwelling-place among them, and walk among them, and I will be their God, and they shall be my people²." Of the ordinance and agreement, the Ark itself was called "The Lord of Hosts sitting between the Cherubims," as we may see 2 Sam. vi. and in the Book of the Chronicles³. It was also called "The Ark of the Covenant of the Lord⁴." For when the Prophets of God did attribute these things to the Sacrament of God, they both thought and spake plentifully and reverently enough of the Sacrament of God; but when the ig-

² Levit. xxvi. 11, 12.

³ 2 Sam. vi. 2; 1 Chron. xiii. 6.

⁴ Numb. x. 33.

norant and malicious Priests, and the people corrupted by them, did attribute far greater things to the Ark or Sacrament of God, what (I pray you) came to pass? Give ear, first, what they attributed to the Ark;—“The elders of Israel said, wherefore hath the Lord cast us down this day before the Philistines? Let us fetch the Ark of the Covenant of the Lord out of Shiloh unto us, that when it cometh among us, it may save us out of the hands of our enemies.” You have heard what they attributed to the Ark: Now give ear what they did. “So the people sent into Shiloh, and brought from thence the Ark of the Covenant of the Lord of Hosts which sitteth between the Cherubims. And it came to pass that when the Ark of the Covenant of the Lord came into the Host, all Israel shouted out a mighty shout, so that the earth rang again. And when the Philistines heard the noise of the shout, they said, ‘what meaneth the noise of this mighty shout?’ And they understood that the Ark of the Lord was come into the host. And the Philistines cried, ‘Woe be unto us, God is come into the host. Who shall deliver us out of the hands of those mighty Gods that smote the Egyptians?’” But hearken now what happened, and how God did declare that the Ark was not God, as it was called and counted of the unskilful in holy things; and how he punished the sins of the people, because they attributed too much to the Sacrament. It followeth therefore: “And the Philistines fought, and Israel was smitten down, and fled every man into his tent; and there was an exceeding great slaughter, for there were overthrown of Israel thirty thousand foot-men, besides that also, the Ark of God was taken, and the two sons of Eli were slain.” All these things are read in the first Book of Samuel, the fourth chapter. Again, when the Sacrament of God was unrever-

ently handled of the swinish Philistines, they were smitten with a loathsome and deadly plague. They did boast that their gods and the religion of the Philistines, had overcome the God and the religion of the Israelites; but the gods of the Philistines fell down and are broken in pieces, and their heathenish religion is confounded¹. What and did not the Israelites perish with a more grievous plague than before, when they lightly handled and contrary to the law of God, (Numb. iv. 15.) looked into the Sacrament brought back by the Philistines into Bethshemesh? “For the Lord smote fifty thousand and three score and ten men.” (1 Sam. vi. 19.) When Moses did negligently defer the circumcising of his children, he fell into great danger². The Sichemites for receiving circumcision rashly were destroyed³. And Simeon and Levi, “for prophaning the Sacrament are cursed of their Father.” (Gen. xlix.) To this that agreeth which the Apostle saith of them which celebrateth the Supper unworthily. “For this cause many are weak and sick among you and many sleep.” (1 Cor. xi. 30.) Hitherto, also, belongeth the example of Uzzah, a man not altogether evil, which touched this same Sacrament that was not lawful for him to do. Wherefore the Lord struck him with a sudden death, and that not privately in the tabernacle, but in the sight of all the people⁴. Of the which deed of God, David also speaking in the congregation and church of the Israelites saith to the Levites: “The Lord hath chosen the Levites to bear the Ark of the Lord” (and not that kine shall draw it in a new cart) “therefore see that ye be holy, that ye may bring in the Ark of the Lord God of Israel unto the place which I have prepared for it. For because ye did not this at the

¹ 1 Sam. v.² Exod. iv. 24.³ Gen. xxxiv. 24, 25.⁴ 2 Sam. vi. 6, 7.

first, our Lord God hath made a rent among us, for that we sought him not as the fashion ought to be."...And it followeth immediately, "The Priests and Levites sanctified themselves to fetch the Ark of the Lord God of Israel. And the children and Levites bare the Ark of God upon their shoulders with staves as Moses commanded according to the word of the Lord." All these things are to be seen in the first of the Chronicles, chap. xv. Whereby we gather that the Lord will none of our good meanings or intents, and pompous celebrations in celebrating the Sacraments: but that He only requireth that we should so judge and speak of the Sacraments, as He judgeth and speaketh by His word; and that we should so use and celebrate them, as He himself hath instituted and celebrated them. Therefore he sufficiently setteth forth the dignity of Sacraments, who attributeth that unto them, which God himself, in the holy scriptures, vouchsafeth to give them.

Let us therefore, first of all, search out of what dignity Sacraments have been, for the most part, in our time; that thereby we may the better understand what is to be attributed, and what is not to be attributed unto them. The common sort of Priests and Monks have taught, that the Sacraments of the new Law are not only signs of grace, but together, also, causes of grace; that is, which have power to give grace. For they say, that they are as instruments, pipes, and certain conduits of Christ's passion, by which the grace of Christ is conveyed and poured into us: but that the signs of the Old Testament, given to the Fathers, were signs only, and not causes of grace also; which have force to signify, but not to give grace. They seem truly to have sucked that error out of St Augustine's words wrongfully understood: for he writeth upon the 73rd

Psalm thus: "The Sacraments of the new Law are more wholesome and happy than they of the old Law, because they promise, these give." But Saint Augustine meant to say no other thing than that which, in another place, he speaketh after this manner. "The Sacrament of the old Law did foreshow that Christ should come, but ours do show that He is come," For also against Faustus (Lib. XIX. c. 14.) he calleth the Sacraments of the old Law "Promises of things to be performed; but our Sacraments tokens of things that are already performed." Wherefore, upon the 73rd Psalm he saith: "The Sacraments of the old Law are given to signify the very thing; but ours do witness that it is given, and signifieth that it is present." I confess that he saith more than once, that our Sacraments are more comfortable and effectual: but he said that by no other reason than for that the Messias being already revealed, and given unto us in the New Testament, our Sacraments are more perfect, more lightsome, and more beautiful: for Christ hath brought all signs to an end; wherefore ours have a more full signification, and, after a sort, are the more lively. But if Augustine had been altogether of that opinion which these men do favour and follow, would not godliness itself persuade us to forsake the authority of men, and cleave to the word of truth?

Let us see, therefore, what may be gathered out of the word of truth, that is, out of the canonical scriptures, touching the likeness and difference of the Sacraments of the Old and New Testament. This we hold for a certainty out of the scriptures that there is but one everlasting and unchangeable God and Lord of either church; that there is but one way laid down in either church to attain to the promises of salvation: to be short,—that there is but one

church of the only living God, gathered together out of either people, both of the Jews and Gentiles. I think there needeth no large confirmation of these things out of the scripture; because, in the eighth Decade and third Sermon, I have handled them at the full.

Now that I have fortified and confirmed these things before by the writings of the Apostles, thus I conclude, not of mine own brain, but by the authority of God: They which always have one everlasting, and unchangeable God; one way of salvation set forth for all in Christ from the beginning; one faith; one church; one baptism; the same spiritual meat and drink;—they cannot choose but have the self-same Sacraments as touching their substance. But the Jews and Christians have one God, one faith, one way of salvation (which is) by Christ; to be short, one church;—therefore have they also, the self-same Sacraments, saving that ours are given under other signs; and for that through the revelation of the Sun of righteousness (I mean) Christ, are made more lightsome and manifest. I say, further, that the scripture witnesseth that the Sacraments of the Old Testament and ours, are of the same force; insomuch that Paul calleth them circumcised which are baptized, and them baptized which are circumcised. And he, also, teacheth, “That our Fathers did eat that spiritual meat which we eat, and drank of that spiritual drink,” that is, “the Rock.” But anon he addeth, “and that Rock was Christ.” The words of the Apostle are well known and are read in 1 Cor. x. The same Apostle in the second chapter to the Colossians saith “In Christ ye are complete,” (or made perfect) “in whom also ye are circumcised with circumcision made without hands, by putting off the body of the flesh, subject to sin by the circumcision of Christ; buried with

Him in Baptism, &c.” What, I pray you, can be spoken more plainly? “Circumcision made without hands” is the circumcision of christians, which is Baptism. But in the former place of Paul to the Corinthians, we must mark (as elsewhere I put you in mind) that to be “baptized into Moses,” is not the same that it is to be baptized into Christ. For to be baptized into Moses, is all one as if he had said, to be “baptized by Moses,” or “through the ministry of Moses”: for it is manifest that Moses brought the people to God which were only committed to his charge.

In many places in Augustine ye shall read the like, howsoever our adversaries do father upon Augustine this difference between the Sacraments of the old law and ours, of their own bringing in: for he (*Cont. literas Petil.* Lib. II. c. 27.) saith, “The Sacraments of the Jews were in outward tokens diverse from ours; but in the things signified they were equal and all one.” Also (*Tract. in Joan.* 26.) upon this place, “He is the Bread which came down from heaven.” he saith, “Manna did signify this Bread: the Altar of God signified this Bread. Those were Sacraments. In signs they are diverse, but in the thing signified equal.” The like words thou mayest read *Contra Faustum Manichæum*, Lib. XIX. c. 13, 16, 17. And again (*Tract. in Joan.* 45.) “Before the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, when He came basely in the flesh there were just and righteous men, who did so believe in Him then that was to come, as we do believe in Him now that is come. The times were changed, but so was not faith.” And so forth. And anon, “In diverse signs is all one faith, so in diverse signs as in diverse words; because words change their sounds by times, and truly words are nothing but signs. For in that they signify, they are words; take away the signification from the word, and it is

a vain noise. Therefore all words are significations. Did not these that ministered those signs in the old Law, believe those things which we now believe were prophesied before, and by them? No doubt they did believe them: but they believed they should come; and we, that they are come." Also upon the 77th Psalm, "The same meat and drink (saith he) had they in the Sacraments which we have in ours; but in signification the same, not in likeness. For the self-same Christ was figured to them in the rock, but manifested to us in the flesh. But with them all, God was not well pleased. All verily did eat one spiritual meat, and drank one spiritual drink; that is, which signified some spiritual thing: but in all of them God had no delight. And whereas the Sacraments were common to all, yet grace was not common to all which is the pith of the Sacraments. As even now at this day faith is revealed, which then was hid; the fountain of regeneration is common to all which are baptized in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; but the inward grace whereof they are Sacraments, whereby the members of Christ with their Head are born anew, is not common to all." Thus far Augustine: who teacheth that their Signs, or Sacraments are not unequal or unlike, which have the same faith and religion; but that all the difference that is, resteth in the diversity of the time: otherwise they differ not.

Now that I have made an end of the similitude and difference of the Sacraments of the Old and New Testament, and that by occasion of a received opinion that the Sacraments of the new Law do confer, or give grace of themselves; let us, also, consider what manner of thing the same is. And, first, touching the word "Grace," I will give you these few things to note. Grace is the favour and good-

will of God, wherewith God the Father embraceth us for Christ's sake; purifieth, justifieth, and endueth us with His good gifts, and saveth us. For the writings of the Apostles do plainly call that "Grace" whereby we are saved, and justified, or made righteous by faith in Jesus Christ. Of this grace it is written, "I make not the grace of God of no effect: for if righteousness come by the Law, then Christ died in vain." (Gal. ii. 21.) Of this grace it is written, "Christ unto us is become unprofitable, as many as are justified by the Law are fallen from grace." (Gal. v. 4.) Of this grace it is written, "If it come of grace, then is it not of works, for else grace now is no more grace." (Rom. xi. 6.) What, is not the Son of God himself called "The Grace and Gift of God?" (John iv. 10: Titus ii. 11.) Now to confer grace, what is it else than to give, or frankly, and freely to bestow something on a man which he had not before? Therefore, if the Sacraments do give grace to the receivers of them, then truly they give those things which they signify, to them which had them not; I mean Christ with all His gifts: that is to say, they make them pleasant, and acceptable unto God; they justify and save; yea, and that of themselves, insomuch as they are said to have received virtue to sanctify from the passion of Christ; and not to signify only, or to help, to commend, or to further. Yea, and they, also, attribute the receiving of grace to our work whereby we receive the Sacrament. But how contrary this doctrine is to the truth of holy Prophets and Apostles, I will now declare.

It was an old error among the Jews, that Sacraments did justify. Hereof cometh it, that the holy Prophets of God reasoning, and rebuking the people of God committed to their charge, yet savouring of false opinions, cried, that

their labour which they bestowed upon their ceremonies and sacrifices was in vain: and that God is delighted with faithful obedience¹: with faith, I say, charity, innocency, and also with true godliness. Among whom Jeremiah saith, "Thus sayeth the Lord of Hosts, the God of Israel, heap up your burnt offerings with your sacrifices, and eat the flesh: for when I brought you out of Egypt, I spake no word unto them of burnt offerings and sacrifices: but this I commanded them, saying: Hearken and obey my voice, and I will be your God, so that ye walk in all the ways which I have commanded you, that ye may prosper." (Jer. vii. 21—25.) The like place is in Isaiah the first Chapter. The Lord hath not despised neither have His holy Prophets contemned all sacrifices in general, since He himself instituted them by Moses; but they sought to suppress, and beat down that false opinion, and vain confidence which they had in sacrifices. It is a vain confidence, and a false opinion (to believe and think) that sacrifices of themselves, and for our works' sake, do make us acceptable unto God; for faith maketh us acceptable unto God by the Messias. And, therefore, the Lord did not institute Sacraments or Sacrifices, that, being offered, they might give grace, or justify us; but to be witnesses of the grace of God: and that by them His people might be kept, and drawn in due order from idols, and heathenish worshippings, and led to Christ the High Priest and only Sacrifice (or Oblation) for the whole world. For they were certain schoolings or exercises, as Paul proveth, saying: "The Law was our schoolmaster unto Christ, that we should be justified through faith: but after that faith is come, we are no longer

¹ Isai. i. 11—14: Jer. vi. 20: Amos v. 21, 22: Psalm l. 23: Li. 16, 17: Mic. vi. 8.

under a schoolmaster." (Gal. iii. 24, 25.) Therefore the sacrifices of the old Law did not give grace to them that sacrificed; neither wrought they their justification; but were tokens and testimonies that God doth sanctify and justify by, and through, the Sacrifice appointed before all worlds, the Messiah, I mean: to faith in whom they did, as it were a certain schoolmaster, by guiding us, bring us.

And truly, when the Apostles preached the pure and sound doctrine of the Gospel,—that by the only grace of God in Christ the faithful are saved,—this ancient error of their elders had taken such deep root in the minds of the Jews, that even they which had received Christ, stood, nevertheless, in contention, that Christ was not able fully to sanctify and justify, without the help of the Jewish sacrifices. Against whom the Apostles, disputing with great gravity and invincible power of the Spirit, did plainly prove, that a christian without any observations of the ceremonial law, or help of any works, even by the only mere and free grace and mercy of God in Christ, is sanctified, purified, justified, and saved. Which undoubtedly is the helm, (as commonly is said) and stern of the Evangelists' and Apostles' doctrine; which whoso denieth he hath no part, doubtless, in the inheritance of Christ and his Gospel. Neither is it obscure or doubtful which, even now, I have set forth in these few words. For who is ignorant of that memorable dissension between the chief Apostles of Christ, Paul and Barnabas, kindled against those which taught, "Except the christians were circumcised after the manner of Moses they could in no-wise be saved?" Against whom Peter maketh this conclusion, "That our hearts are purified by faith, and that we which believe shall be saved by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ." (Acts xv. 1, 9, 11.)

True it is that the adversaries would bring back again that which the Apostles abrogated, and took away: but in the mean while, this is also undoubtedly true,—that the Apostles with no other forcible engine more strongly battered, (as it were) and beat down more flat to the ground, their adversaries' bulwark, in defence of Sacraments that purify than with this, "That we which believe shall be saved by the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ." And whereas in every place almost they add, "Not by the Law, not by ceremonies, or other ritual observances," do we think that they will admit Sacraments to the partaking of such power and virtue, seeing they be comprehended under rites and ceremonies, and so accounted? Christian faith doth attribute the grace of God, remission of sins, sanctification, and justification, fully and wholly to the free mercy of God, and to the merit of Christ's passion; yea, in such sort doth christian faith attribute these special benefits unto it, that beside it nothing at all is admitted to take part with it. Therefore whereas Lombard (*Sent. iv. dist. 2.*) saith, "that Sacraments have received power to confer or give grace by the merit of the passion of Christ" it is of his own forging. For as Christ giveth not His glory to any, either saint or mortal man, much less to a creature without life: even so he that believeth to be fully justified by the death and resurrection of the Lord, seeketh no further grace and righteousness in any other thing, than in Christ only; upon whom he stayeth; whom, also, by faith, he feelth in his heart or mind already to exercise His force, by the Holy Ghost. For hereunto pertain those things in the Gospel "Go in peace, thy faith hath saved thee." (Luke vii. 50.) And also "He which drinketh of this water shall thirst again, but whosoever shall drink of that water which I shall give him shall never thirst, &c." (John

iv. 13, 14.) To this pertaineth the saying of Paul also, "Therefore being justified by faith, we are at peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ. By whom also we had an entrance by faith unto this grace wherein we stand and rejoice in hope of the glory of God." (Rom. v. 1, 2.)

I am not ignorant of the crafty sleights of some, who imagine there is a certain general, and also a special faith. The general faith, they call that whereby we believe that we are truly justified by the death and resurrection of Christ: but that they call a special faith, whereby we believe that by the Sacraments, and by our own works, the gifts of God are applied particularly to every one of us one by one. But to what purpose was it, being in a land where they might be fed with manna, to look back to the pottage pots, and unsavoury leeks of Egypt? What, (I pray you) have christians to do with the distinctions of subtile sophisters? Or how will they prove this distinction of theirs unto us? Verily there is but one faith; and the same is no other in the use of the Sacraments than it is without the use of them. Without the use of them we believe that we are sanctified by the death and resurrection of Christ. In Baptism and the Lord's Supper, we practice no other faith than [that] whereby we believe, that we are purged from our sins by the grace and mercy of Christ; and that by His body given for us, and His blood shed for us, we are redeemed from death, and become heirs of eternal life. Not the Sacraments, but faith through the Holy Ghost, applieth these things unto us: which thing all the writings of the Apostles do witness, but such feigned glosses do obscure and darken. To be short: there is one God and Saviour of all; one salvation; one redemption and purging; one faith whereby we receive salvation offered unto us of God, in Christ, through the Holy

Ghost. The same is declared, or preached unto us in the word, by the minister; and is represented, and sealed by the Sacraments.

And now, who knoweth not what Paul the Apostle in all his writings only laboureth to prove, that those that believe are justified by faith, in the Lord Jesus, and not by any works? Again, who is ignorant that the receiving and celebration of Sacraments, are also counted among our works? Whereunto I will add this,—that Sacraments give not that which they have not themselves: but they have not grace, and righteousness, and heavenly gifts;—therefore they do not give them.

But hence springeth up another disputation for us to handle;—whether the grace of God, and a certain heavenly power, be put in, or included in the Sacraments; and, as it were, contained in them; so that from them it might be conveyed into the receivers? The whole rabble of Priests and Monks, as well in word as in deed, have bewrayed themselves that they think,—that in the bare signs there is heavenly grace included; yea, and that God himself is comprehended in them. For from no other fountain sprang their careful disputations concerning “What the mouse eateth, when it eateth the Sacrament of the body of Christ.” Pope Innocent, (*Myster. Evangel. Legis*, &c., Lib. iv. c. 11.), saith “Miraculously doth the substance of bread return again: not that bread which was turned into flesh; but it cometh to pass, that instead of it other bread is miraculously created, which bread is eaten, &c.” Behold here is certain witty and miraculous kind of divinity. I pass over, of purpose, many other which are of this kind. Add hereunto, that by crossings, and certain secret words, gestures, and breathings, they consecrate the water of Baptism; all which things they

beautify with the name of blessing. And (*Ad Benedic. Fontis*) among other things they sing thus: "God by the secret mixture of his light make fruitful this water prepared to regenerate men withal; that being sanctified, and born again of the immaculate womb of the heavenly fountain, it may come forth a new creature. Let this holy, and innocent creature be free from all the assaults of the adversary. Let him not entrap it in his snare. Let it become a living fountain, a regenerating water, a purifying river; that all that are dipped in this wholesome laver, the Holy Ghost working in them, they may attain to the excellency of perfect purification. Wherefore, O thou creature of water, I bless (or conjure) thee, by the living God; by the true God; by the holy God; by the God which in the beginning separated thee by His word from the dry land, &c." Again, breathing thrice on the water he forthwith uttereth these words, "Thou, O Lord, bless with thy word these waters which make request unto Thee; that beside their natural cleanness, which in washing they may give to our bodies, they may also be effectual to purify our souls." Then the Priest taketh a burning wax candle, and putteth it thrice in the water consecrated to Baptism, saying: "Let the power of The Holy Ghost come down into this plentiful fountain." He addeth, "And let it make the whole substance of this water fruitful with the fruit of regeneration." And so forth. All these things they understand and expound to be spoken simply, and without tropes or figures; which evidently enough declareth what these men attribute to holy or consecrated water; and how they think that in the signs the holy things themselves are contained. About this matter Bonaventura hath wonderfully busied himself, who in his writing (*In lib. iv. Magistri, distinct. 1, quest. 3.*) among other things at the length saith, "We

must not say, by any means, that grace is contained substantially in the Sacraments, as water in a vessel, or as a medicine in a box; yea, to understand it so it is erroneous. But they are said to contain grace in that they signify grace; and because, unless there be a want on the part of the receiver, grace is always given in them; so that ye must understand that grace is in the soul, and not in the visible signs. For this cause they are called also Vessels of Grace. They may be also called vessels after another manner; because as that which is in a vessel is no part of it, neither cometh of it, and yet, nevertheless, is drawn out of it: so grace cometh neither of, nor by, the Sacraments, but springeth from the eternal Fountain; and is drawn out from thence by the soul in the Sacraments. And as a man when he would have liquor, goeth straight to the vessel, so he that seeketh after the liquor of grace, and hath it not, must have recourse to the Sacraments." Thus far Bonaventura, who rightly referred grace unto God, the fountain of all good things. I would he had also more purely and simply set down the rest. He also said truly, that the soul of man was the seat and receptacle of grace, and of the gifts of God; and not things without sense. For the holy scripture teacheth every where, that the mind of man, not any element, or whatsoever is forged by man's desire, is a mansion place of the grace of God; and that it is not to be sought for, or worshipped, as included in any insensible thing." "If the heaven of heavens (saith Solomon) be not able to contain Thee, how should then this house do it that I have builded?" (1 Kings viii. 27.) Whereunto the most constant martyr of Christ Stephen alluding, saith "He that is highest of all dwelleth not in the temples made with hands, as saith the prophet: Hea-

ven is my seat, and the earth is my foot-stool, what house will ye build for Me saith the Lord, or which is the place of my rest? Hath not my hand made all these things?" (Acts vii. 48—50.) Which that great Apostle of Christ, Paul following, saith, "God that made the world, and all that are in it, seeing that He is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands, neither is worshipped with men's hands, as though He needed of anything, seeing He himself giveth to all life and breath and all things, &c." (Acts xvii. 24, 25.) Whereupon Christ himself, in the Gospel, speaketh more expressly, "The hour cometh, when ye shall neither in this mountain, neither at Jerusalem worship the Father; but the hour cometh and now is, when the true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and truth." (John iv. 23, 24.) The faithful, therefore, do lift up the eyes of their mind from earthly and visible things unto heavenly; whereupon our godly forefathers, when they celebrated the Lord's Supper, heard that saying repeated or sung unto them most agreeable to such holy mysteries: "Lift up your hearts;" all the people answered together—"We lift them up unto the Lord." Doth not the very gross absurdity of the thing plainly prove that grace is not contained in the signs? For if by grace you understand the favour and goodwill of God; if pardon and forgiveness of sin; cleansing, I say, and justifying of the believers: if, finally, the gifts and graces of the Spirit,—what, I pray you, can be imagined more absurd, and senseless, than that such excellent things should be kept inclosed in water, bread, and wine? The signs, truly, have no need of grace, nor any pardon and forgiveness of sins. To what purpose, then, should grace be contained within Sacraments? What profit, I pray you, will redound unto men? Or, who knoweth not that all the in-

stitutions of God were ordained for the commodity of man? Or, shall we say that grace is therefore kept included within the Sacraments, that from thence it might be conveyed unto us by channels? But the scripture speaketh not after that manner. For grace, as hath been often now repeated, is the favour and good will of God; whereby He himself, not by sensible matters, but of His own accord, and through His power and might, is brought unto us. These things are spiritual, and, therefore, are brought to pass by the gift and mediation of the Holy Ghost. God is joined unto us by His Spirit, and we are coupled to Him by faith, through the gift of the Holy Ghost; which thing, in the writings of the Evangelists and Apostles, is every where to be seen.

Moreover, the words of the Canon of the Council of Nice, are not to be understood after such a gross and vile manner:—"Our baptism is not to be considered with the bodily eyes, but with the eyes of the mind. Thou seest water, weigh the heavenly force which lieth hid in the water, &c." For it is a sacramental speech which truly every body at that time understood: as, also, at this day it is no new, nor hard kind of speaking to say, that in the seal, there is faith and truth; in a marriage ring, the faith and love of wedlock; in a sceptre and crown, the King's authority. For no man is so foolish that, by reason of the kind of speeches, he will affirm that the things themselves are contained, and inclosed in the signs: every man knoweth this kind and manner of speech.

To this matter, also, appertaineth that John the Baptist baptized in the river Jordan; and, that the Apostles also themselves baptized with water neither consecrated, nor prepared with any enchantments, breathings, or crossings that it

might receive the grace of God unto it, and make them that are baptized partakers thereof. The Ethiopian, in the Acts of the Apostles, saw a fountain not mingled with oil; neither consecrated with any holy charms; neither, moreover, prepared with any breathings, nor putting in of wax candles, nor pictures of crosses; yet, nevertheless, he said to Philip the Apostle — “See here is water: what doth let me to be baptized?” (Acts viii. 36.) But Philip required faith of him in the Lord Jesus; and upon his confession, he forthwith baptized him; no consecration of the fountain first provided for, by the which, forsooth, he might call down the grace of the Holy Ghost, and the power of regeneration into the water; and forthwith might apply it to the purifying of the Ethiopian.

And if so be we proceed to include the grace of God within the elements, and the things themselves within the signs by the which they are represented, who seeth not with how great danger we shall do the same, especially among the simple sort? For unto those we shall give occasion of idolatry, and to cleave unto the visible signs: of whom, also, they will require and ask that which ought to be asked of God, the Author of all goodness, with minds lifted up into heaven. For whereas it is objected, that by a certain, heavenly covenant, it is so appointed by God, that Sacraments should have grace in themselves; and should from themselves, as by pipes, convey abroad the water of grace unto those that are thirsty;—that is alleged without warrant of the scripture, and is repugnant unto true religion; as by those things which have hitherto been handled and disputed of, doth, as we think, sufficiently appear: whereunto, also, we add this.

The holy and elect people of God are not then first of all partakers of the first grace of God, and heavenly gifts,

when they receive the Sacraments: for they enjoy the things before they be partakers of the signs. For it is plainly declared unto us, that Abraham, our father, was justified before he was circumcised. And who gathereth not thereby, that justification was not exhibited, and given unto him by the Sacrament of circumcision; but rather that that righteousness which he, by faith, before possessed, was, by the Sacrament, sealed and confirmed unto him? And, moreover, who will not thereof gather that we, which are the sons of Abraham, are after no other manner justified, than it appeareth that our father was justified; and that our Sacraments work no further in us, than they did in him: especially since the nature of the Sacraments of the people of the Old Testament, and ours is all one? Whereof I will speak a little afterward more at large, when I expound the place of the Apostle in the fourth to the Romans.

The Eunuch, of whom I spake even now out of the Acts, as he journeyed and saw water, he said to Philip, "See, here is water: what letteth me to be baptized? Philip said unto him: If thou believest with all thine heart thou mayest. And he answered and said, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God." Afterward immediately it followeth, "And they went down both into the water; and he baptized him." (Acts viii. 36—38.) The Eunuch (saith the Evangelist) believed with all his heart, that is to say, truly, and without dissimulation. Now let us see what the scripture saith concerning such a faith. St John, the Apostle and Evangelist, saith, "Whosoever believeth that Jesus is Christ, is born of God." (1 John v. 1.) He again saith, "Whosoever confesseth that Jesus is the Son of God, in him dwelleth God, and he in God." (1 John iv. 15.) Also, Paul, that elect vessel and doctor of the Gentiles,

saith, "If thou shalt acknowledge with thy mouth, the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God raised Him from the dead, thou shalt be saved." (Rom. x. 9.) And again, Saint John saith, in his Epistle, "He that believeth on the Son of God, hath the witness in himself. And this is the record, how that God hath given unto us eternal life, and this life is in His Son. He that hath the Son hath life, and he that hath not the Son, hath not life." (1 Joh. v. 10—12.) Briefly, of these things this we gather:—the Eunuch believed before he received Baptism; therefore, before he received Baptism he was born of God, in whom he dwelled and God in him; he was just, and acceptable in the sight of God; and moreover, had life in himself; and therefore, the Baptism which followed did not give that to the Eunuch which he had before, but it became unto him a testimony of the truth, and a seal of the righteousness which came by faith; and therewithal to assure unto him the continuance, and increase of God's gifts. After the same manner we read of Cornelius, the Centurion, in the same Acts of the Apostles, that he, believing the preaching of the Apostle Peter, received the Holy Ghost also in a visible shape, as the Apostle did at Jerusalem in the day of Pentecost. And that Peter, when he knew that thing, said, "Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptized, which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we." (Acts x. 47.) Forasmuch, therefore, as Cornelius, with his household, received the Holy Ghost before they were baptized; it is manifest that he did not obtain the Holy Ghost as given first by Baptism, or with Baptism. Again, we read in the Acts of the Apostles, "They that gladly received the words of Peter were baptized." (Acts ii. 41.) "Therefore, before they were baptized of Peter, they had

obtained the grace of God through faith. For why, I pray you, do we baptize our infants? Is it because they believe with their heart, and confess with their mouth? I think not. Do we not therefore baptize them, because God hath commanded them to be brought unto Him? Because He hath promised that He will be our God, and the God of our seed after us? To be short:—because we believe that God of His mere grace and mercy, in the blood of Jesus Christ, hath cleansed and adopted them, and appointed them to be heirs of eternal life? We, therefore, baptizing infants for these causes, do abundantly testify that there is not first given unto them in Baptism, but that there is sealed and confirmed which they had before.

Let us, also, join unto these things, a testimony of the Supper of the Lord. The Apostle teaching how the godly should prepare themselves to come to the Lord's table, saith, "Let a man prove himself, and so let him eat of this bread and drink of this cup." (1 Cor. xi. 28.) But to examine or prove, signifieth to search, as much as lieth in man, the heart or mind; and through diligent inquisition to sift one's conscience. And God is said "To prove our hearts," (Psal. vii. 9.): and the same Apostle willeth us, "To prove what is the good and acceptable will of God." (Rom. xii. 2.) But this proof cannot be without knowledge and judgment; and the knowledge and judgment of christians is faith: therefore, whosoever proveth himself before he come to the Supper, hath faith. If he have faith, then he wanteth not those things that are coupled with faith; and, therefore, in the Supper, those heavenly benefits are not first received; but thanks are given for those that are received. I have hereby showed and proved, I suppose, that Sacraments do not confer grace.

They object, I know well enough, against these things, (who are persuaded that Sacraments give grace, and contain included within them the things signified,) that we do evacuate, and make of none effect the Sacraments: and, that we teach that the faithful receive in them, or by them, nothing but bare water, and bare bread and wine: and that, by that means, God by us is accused of falsehood and lying. We briefly answer: if they set void, or empty things, (as I may so say,) against full things, so as they be void or empty which have not the things themselves included in them; truly I had rather confess them to be void than full. But if they call them void or empty, and mean profane or unholy things; that is to say, which differ nothing from profane signs: if by bare, they understand things of no force; we openly profess that we have Sacraments which are holy, and not profane; effectual, and not without force; garnished from above, not naked; and therefore full, not void or empty. For they are holy things, and not profane, because they are instituted of God, and for godly men, not for profane persons. They are effectual, and not without, force; for in the church, with the godly and faithful, they work the same effect and end whereunto they are ordained of God. Whereof more hereafter. They are, also, worthily said to be beautified, and adorned by God, and not bare things, which have the word of God itself, wherewith they are most beautifully adorned. And therefore, also, they are full, and not empty Sacraments, because they have those things which make a perfect Sacrament.

We will repeat here the parables, or similitudes which above also, intreating of consecration, for the most part we did allege; to the intent to give things more clear light unto this treatise All the while that wax for confirma-

tion and witness sake, is not hanged on Letters Patents or other public Instruments, it is common, void, and bare wax: that is to say, nothing else but wax: but when it is sealed, and fastened to those public Instruments, it is now neither void nor bare wax; for it is called the testimony of the truth. The arms of a Prince or of any Commonwealth, if it be painted in a window, or on a wall, it is a bare sign; if but the same be fastened to Writings, or set to Letters, there is great difference between this and the other. For now it declareth, and witnesseth the will of the Prince, or Commonwealth; therefore it hath the estimation among all men that whoso defaceth it, or, contrary to the will of the Prince and Commonwealth, doth set it to any other Charter, is reputed guilty of counterfeiting, and of high treason. A stone as when it is not yet set for a mark, or bound of fields, it is a bare and void; that is to say, a common stone, which to tread under foot, or to remove out of his place, is no offence: but being set to part the bounds of fields, it is no more a bare, and void stone, but a Witness of lawful division, and just possession; which to move out of his place is accounted an heinous offence. And therefore water, bread, and wine, without the institution and use of the Sacrament, are nothing else but water, bread, and wine; but being used in the celebration of the Sacrament, they differ very far from that they were before, and are Sacraments signed of Christ by his word; ordained for the salvation of the faithful. Therefore, they that are partakers of the Sacrament do not receive nothing, as these say, unless the institution of God be to be esteemed as nothing. He instituted Sacraments to be testimonies of His grace, and seals of the truth of His promises; (which thing I will anon declare more at large). ¶Therefore as God is true,

and cannot lie, so the seals of His promises are most true. He hath promised that He will be ours; and that, in Christ, He will communicate Himself unto us, with all His gifts. He, therefore, of a certainty showeth Himself such an one, and doth communicate Himself unto us: although He do it not now first of all when we receive the Sacraments, as if He should pour out of Himself into us by them as it were by conduit pipes; and were included in them as in vessels. For immediately upon the beginning of the world He promised His grace unto us; as soon as we first believed He began to show Himself such an one unto us; and doth show Himself more and more through the whole course of life: we receive Him, and comprehend Him spiritually, and by faith. Therefore, when we are partakers of the Sacraments, He proceedeth to communicate Himself unto us after a special manner; that is to say, proper unto Sacraments: and so we, which before were made partakers of Christ, do continue, and strengthen that communion or fellowship spiritually and by faith, in the celebration of the Sacraments; outwardly sealing the same unto ourselves by the signs. Now, who will hereafter say that they which think thus of the Sacraments, and are by this faith partakers of them, have nothing but empty shows; and receive nothing in them: albeit we neither include grace in the signs, neither derive it from them? But if any man have any other opinion of God and His ordinances, that shall no more be falsehood in God, or accuse Him of untruth, than if any one should charge a just man with a lie, because he performeth not that which he looked for: when, in the mean time, this man promised not the thing which he looked for; but he, through his corrupt and false opinion, hath dreamed it was promised unto him.

And thus far, by occasion, I have showed what agreement and difference there is between the Sacraments of the Old and New Testament; and that our Sacraments do neither confer, nor contain grace.

Now we return to that which we began: I mean to the principal ground of this disputation; that forasmuch as we have taught what they do not work, so now, at length, we may set down what they work in very deed; that is to say, expounding what is the power, end, and lawful use of the Sacraments, whereunto they are ordained of God. We handled, indeed, the place of the causes why they were instituted, in the beginning almost of the sixth Sermon; but now I will add other things which pertain to this purpose, and intreat of each thing by itself, more fully and at large.

The chief end of Sacraments is this,—that they are testimonies to confirm the truth, by which the Lord in His church, even visibly, doth testify that the things now uttered by preaching the gospel, and by the promises assured to the faithful from the beginning of the world, are in every point so brought to pass; and are so certainly true as they are declared and promised in the word of truth. Even so Baptism is the heavenly, and public witness in the church of Christ, whereby the Lord testifieth that it is He which receiveth men freely into favour; and which cleanseth from all blemishes; and, to be short, maketh us partakers, and heirs of all His goodness. For after the same manner circumcision, in times past, was a public, and heavenly testimony, that it is God that purgeth, and adopteth us: for therefore Moses saith (Deut. xxx. 6.) “The Lord thy God will circumcise thine heart, and the heart of thy seed, that thou mayest love the Lord thy God with all thine heart, &c.” After the self-same manner the Lord himself, instituting the

holy Supper in His church, by the present signs doth openly be our witness that His body was certainly given for us, and His blood truly shed for the remission of our sins: that He, also, is that living food that feedeth us to eternal life. Wherefore, we read in Chrysostom, his 83rd Homily upon Matthew, in these words, “As in the old law, so in the same manner hath He here left with us a memory of the mysteries; stopping, and bridling, hereby the mouths of hereticks. For when they say, ‘Whereby appeareth it that Christ was offered, and many other mysteries?’ Then we, alleging these things, do hereby stop their mouths. For if Jesus be not dead, whose representation, or sign is the sacrifice?” Thus far he. You perceive, I suppose, how this writer doth bring against hereticks the Sacraments of the Supper, for the testimony of the truth; that is to say, of the Lord’s true death. Wherefore, as the Gospel is called a witness, and the preachers of the gospel witnesses, even so we call Sacraments witnesses of the same truth; which, though they be dumb, yet, nevertheless, are visible: after which name, S. Augustine (*Contr. Faust.* lib. XIX. c. 16.) calleth them “visible words”. For the preaching of the gospel, consisting in words heard with the ears, is a speaking witness: but Sacraments, which consist of signs, and are seen with the eyes, are speechless witnesses; and, as it were, remnants, and remembrances of the preaching of the Gospel. Yea, Sacraments were instituted by God to that end, that they might visibly confirm unto us the ready good will of God unto us, and, also, the preaching of the gospel, and all the promises of life and salvation; and, that they should be, as it were, seals set and fixed to the gospel and promises made by God; which might testify and confirm, that faith in Christ is true righteousness.

That which I have said, I will confirm by the writings of the Apostles. But I taught a little before, that there is all one ground of the Sacraments of the Old Testament and of the New, a few things only excepted: so that now, by very good right, by the comparing of both together, we may estimate and utter what the force, and use of our Sacraments is. Paul, therefore, to the Romans (iv. 9—12.) saith:—“We say that faith was imputed to Abraham for righteousness: how was it then imputed, when he was circumcised, or when he was uncircumcised? Not when he was circumcised, but when he was uncircumcised. After he received the sign of circumcision, as the seal of the righteousness of the faith which he had when he was uncircumcised; that he should be the father of all them which believe, not being circumcised, that righteousness might be imputed unto them also: and the father of circumcision, not unto them only which are of the circumcised; but unto them, also, that walk in the steps of the faith of our father Abraham which he had when he was uncircumcised.” All these are Paul’s words. Among which, first of all, some words are meet to be expounded: then, we must seek after the sense, and meaning of the Apostle’s words: and, last of all, we must apply them to our purpose touching the Sacraments.

The Apostle here useth two words; that is to say, “The sign”, and “The seal”. *Signum*, the word “sign”, is more general, and stretcheth very far: but a “seal”, is a word that properly belongeth unto Sacraments, which are seals and confirmations. For all signs seal not: for some by signification only do accomplish their duty. But *σφραγίζειν*, properly is, to seal for assurance, and confirmation sake of faith, or credit: wherefore *σφραγίς*, is a seal which is set to keep, and confirm our faith and promise; and to be with-

out all danger of deceit. And here, as elsewhere very often, the Lord doth imitate the manner of men; for we men are wont, by setting to our seals, to confirm our writings, covenants, and faithful promises, which we before had made by word. And, that this hath always been the cause of the instituting, and use of seals, appeareth plainly by these testimonies of the scripture.... When the children of Israel, under Ezra, made a covenant with the Lord. by and by they set down their covenant in writing; and sealed the writing to be a testimony of the truth; as in Nehemiah (ix. 38.) and Haggai (ii. 23.) thou mayest read: "I will take thee my servant Zerubbabel thou son of Salathiel, (saith the Lord,) and will make thee as a sign, or sealing ring; for I have chosen thee." As if He had said, 'All men shall certainly learn, that in the son of Salathiel the continuance of the posterity of the Messias doth consist, and remain.' Thus writeth Jeremiah (xxii. 24.) "As sure as I live, saith the Lord if Coniah, the son of Jehoiakin, king of Judah, were the signet, or seal on my right hand, yet will I pluck thee thence." Which is as much as if He had said, 'Though thou wert he in whom I will keep my promises, yet shalt thou be led captive into Babylon.' To this agreeth that of Matthew (xxvii. 66.) written of the Jews: "So they went and made the sepulchre sure, and sealed the stone:" without doubt, against deceitful practices they appointed a watch. It appeareth, therefore, by these testimonies, whereto the use of seals serveth.

These things being thus declared, let us now diligently search out the counsel, and meaning of the Apostle's words. Paul showeth, that justification happeneth unto men by the power and virtue of the works of no ceremonies or sacraments; but by the only merit of Christ, through faith. To

prove this, he bringeth the example of Abraham, of whom the scripture hath pronounced, "Abraham believed God and it was imputed unto him for righteousness." Thence he gathereth, that Abraham was justified by faith; yea, that that was imputed unto him for righteousness. Where, both by the word, or force of imputation, and by the whole sentence of Moses, he doth most strongly reason, showing that, through grace, righteousness is imputed by faith. Whereunto he joineth, also, a testimony out of David touching righteousness by imputation. I handled that place in the first sermon of the fourth Decade. Then he returneth again to the example of Abraham; and applieth to his purpose that place alleged out of Genesis, weighing the circumstances of the manner, and time of his justification, and saith "How was it, then, imputed? When he was circumcised, or when he was uncircumcised? Not when he was circumcised, but when he was uncircumcised." Which things, verily, are plainer than that they require any exposition. But because the Jew might object,—“Why, then, the institution and use of circumcision was of no force; but void, unprofitable, and vain. For, if Abraham were justified before he was circumcised, what could circumcision profit him further? And if it brought nothing, surely it was superfluous, and unprofitable.” Paul, preventing that objection, maketh answer, “And he received (saith he) the sign of circumcision, as the seal of the righteousness of faith, &c.” Circumcision (saith he) was neither void, nor unprofitable. For albeit it justify not, neither cleanse nor apply the gifts of God; yet it followeth not, therefore, that there is no further use of it: for it hath another end. For he receiveth the sign of circumcision for a certain seal of the righteousness of faith; that is to say, God instituted circum-

cision, that it should be a seal to ratify, and confirm,—yea, and also visibly to testify, that faith is righteousness; and, that men are justified through faith; I say in such sort as faith is, also, imputed unto them for righteousness, as it was imputed unto Abraham. For it followeth:—“That he might be the father of all that believe, though they be not circumcised; that righteousness might be imputed unto them also.” And so forth. And although these things be more clear than the day light, yet I will endeavour, further, to open the same by a parable. For suppose that a king, of his favour and mere liberality, would entertain some servant into his court; yea, and make him partaker of all his goods: and, moreover, would extend this benefit unto the children, and posterity also of him whom he had adopted; and would immediately command that that covenant, privilege, and favour granted by lively words, should, also, be put in writing, which he might confirm by setting to his seal: to the end that might be to his posterity a sure testimony against all gainsayers, that the same favour and adoption, doth pertain to them also; and that the prince would continue his good and favourable kindness unto the posterity of him whom he had adopted, if they also continue faithful unto their prince. For even after the same manner Almighty God, the king of kings, and most bountiful of all princes, freely, and not by any merit of ours going before, chooseth Abraham upon whom He bestoweth innumerable benefits, and unto whom He offereth a covenant, and participation of all goodness: and not unto him only, but to all his posterity also, saying: “I the Almighty God, will be thy God, and the God of thy seed after thee: I will bless thee and thy seed; and in thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed.” (Gen. xvii. 7: xxii. 18.) He sanctified, also, this privilege, confirming it with an oath; and

by and by, commandeth to deliver the same unto their children, as it were from hand to hand instead of writing; and last of all, He himself (by instituting circumcision) now, as it were, setting to His seal to the Letters Patents, or Charter, would have it confirmed and ratified to them that should come after, to the end they might certainly know that that also pertained unto them. Where, notwithstanding, it seemeth this must not be dissembled of us, that Sacraments have a greater, and more effectual force than any sealed charters can have. For privileges which princes give, are written in parchment, and their seals are set to parchment written; but God imprinteth His seal into the very bodies of those that are His. For He causeth circumcision to be on that member whereby issue is raised, increased, and continued; that as a mark, printed in the very bodies, it might more than seal and witness that the blessing, and partaking of all good things, pertaineth to the circumcised, if they abide faithfully to the Lord God entered into league with men. And, therefore, very significantly, is circumcision called of Paul, not, "The seal of righteousness;"—but, "The seal of righteousness of faith;" that is, a ratifying, and assurance that faith is righteousness; that it is faith whereby we are justified; that righteousness is due to them that believe; that God assuredly will bless the faithful; and impute faith unto them for righteousness, as he, also, imputed unto Abraham.

Now since Sacraments have the like reason, we may apply these things to our Sacraments. Christ, therefore, the anointed of the Lord, after He had, by guiltless and undeserved death, redeemed the world from the power of Satan; and being now ready to ascend into heaven to the Father, He called His disciples about Him, and said, "Go into the

whole world, and preach the Gospel to all creatures: he that shall believe and be baptized, &c." (Mark xvii. 15, 16.) The preaching of the gospel doth lay open and abroad the great, the precious, the healthful, the lively, the bountiful, the royal, and divine privilege, that of the children of the devil, we are made the children of God; the heirs (I say) of God, and joint heirs with Christ; who, by the shedding of His blood, hath purchased for us this inestimable salvation. From this grace of God none is excluded, but he which, through disobedience, by his own corruption and fault, doth exclude himself. For, touching the children and infants of the believers, the Lord in the gospel pronounceth saying, "Suffer the young children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of God." (Mark x. 14.) And again, "Verily, I say unto you, except ye turn and become as little children, ye shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven. Who shall receive such a little child in my name, receiveth me. Take heed that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you that in heaven, their angels do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven, &c." (Matt. xviii. 3, 5, 10.) Neither is it likely now Christ is come, that God is more unmerciful than He was before He came into the world. But then He said, "I will be thy God and the God of thy seed after thee." That, therefore, is now of more force, since the Lord is come to seek and to save that which was lost: and, to be short, to pour forth most liberally His grace, and good gifts upon all flesh. Wherefore that royal, ample, and divine privilege, is, first, by the very preaching of our Lord Christ; and then, by the doctrine of His Apostles, revealed unto the world; and afterward, the Lord so commanding, the same privilege was set down of the Apostles

and Evangelists in writing. Now, the Lord himself added this Sacrament as a sign and seal unto His preaching, and to the scriptures; ordaining baptism in the place of circumcision; the which, because it was a bloody thing, and, to conclude, a sign of the blessed seed which was to come, which then was revealed, ought to be abrogated. And baptism itself, also, succeeding circumcision, is also a seal of the righteousness of faith; an evidence and sealed charter, that God doth assuredly cleanse us and make us heirs of eternal life; and that the whole grace of baptism pertaineth to them that are baptized, if they stand stedfast in true faith.

But (thou wilt say) the infants, of christians which are to be baptized believe not. I grant. No more did the infants of the Jews believe; which nevertheless were circumcised, and were in league with God, and made partakers of all good gifts: so that true godliness biddeth us attribute the same to our infants. When the offspring of the Jews, waxed in age, and did wickedly transgress, they fell from the covenant of God. So, likewise, the infants of the christians, when they come to age and commit wickedness, do fall from the grace of the gospel: yet are they received again by faithful repentance into the same grace from whence they fell.

But to our purpose. Baptism, the seal of the righteousness of faith, is not set to parchment, or to the writing of the gospel; but it is applied to the very bodies of the children of God; and is, as it were, marked and imprinted in them. For we are wholly dipped with our bodies, or wholly sprinkled with the water of baptism; which truly is a visible sealing, confirming that the true God is our God, which sanctifieth and purifieth; and that purification and every good gift of God, is due unto us as the heirs

of God. And to the setting forth of this matter pertaineth that evident place of Paul, which, in the epistle to the Galatians is thus read, "For ye are all the children of God by faith in Christ Jesus. For all ye that are baptised have put on Christ." (Gal. iii. 26, 27.) And so forth. The Supper of the Lord hath the like reason, which, also, is a seal of the righteousness of faith. For the Son of God died; He by His death redeemed the believers; also His body and blood is our meat and drink unto eternal life. And truly this singular and excellent privilege, given unto the faithful, is declared, and set down in writing by the Apostles: but it is consecrated and sealed of the Lord himself by the Sacrament of His body and blood, whereby He sealeth us an assurance that we are justified by faith in the death of Christ; and that all the good gifts of Christ are communicated unto us; and that we are fed, and strengthened by Christ. Moreover, that the sealing might be the more lively, He setteth not the seal to written parchment, but it is brought, and also given to be eaten of our bodies; that we might have a witness within ourselves that Christ with all His gifts is wholly ours, if we persevere in faith. For the Lord himself, in the gospel, saith:—"He that eateth me shall live, by the means of me." But he eateth which believeth: for in the same place the Lord saith,— "I am the bread of life: he that cometh to me shall not hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst." (John vi. 57, 35.)

Hereby we gather the sum of the whole matter: that the Sacraments do seal up the promises of God and the gospel; and that, therefore, so often mention is made in the church of evidences, or letters patent, or charters, and seals of the preaching of the gospel, and the promises of God;

and that the whole mystery of our salvation is renewed, and continued, as oft as those actions instituted of God (I mean Sacraments) are celebrated in the church.

Hitherto, I think, doth that belong, which the faithful minister of Christ Zuinglius, upon the Sacraments, hath delivered in these words;—" Sacraments bear witness of a thing that hath been done; for all laws, customs, and ordinances, do show their authors, and beginners. Therefore Baptism since it setteth forth in signification the death and resurrection of Christ, it must needs be that those things were done indeed." These words are to be found *In expositione fidei ad regem Christianum*. The same Zuinglius (*Ad principes Germaniæ contra Eccium*) saith, " When that noble man, taking his journey into a far country, distributing bread and wine, did far more lively and peculiarly give Himself unto us, when He said, " This is my body ;" than if He had said, " This is a token or sign, of my body ;" although He took away His natural body and carried it into heaven; yet, nevertheless, by these words, in that appertaineth to faith and grace, He giveth Himself wholly, as if He had said: Now I go to die for you, and, after a while, will wholly depart from hence. But I will not have you doubt of my love and care to you ward. How much soever I am, I am altogether yours: In witness whereof, I commend unto you a sign of this my betraying and testament; to the intent you might maintain the memory of me, and of my benefits: that when ye see this bread, and this cup ministered unto you, in the supper of my remembrance, ye may be no otherwise mindful of me (that is, that I delivered up myself for you) than if you should see me with your eyes face to face, as ye now see me both to eat with you, and by and by shall see me to be led from you

to die for you." Hitherto I have recited Zuinglius' words; and anon I will rehearse other words of his again; not that I stay myself upon them, or upon any testimony of man; but that it may be made manifest that this man did not (as some have falsely thought) contemn the Sacraments.

In the mean while, we acknowledge these testimonies of the holy scriptures: "And God it is which stablisheth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us: which hath, also, sealed us, and hath given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts." (2 Cor. i. 21, 22.) And also: "After ye believed ye were sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance, unto the redemption of the purchased possession unto the praise of His glory." (Eph. i. 13.) And again: "Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God by whom ye are sealed unto the day of redemption." (Eph. iv. 30.) We acknowledge the truth of God to be sufficiently sound, true, and certain of itself; neither can we from elsewhere have a better confirmation than out of it. For if our mind be not confirmed, on every side it wavereth. God, therefore, framed Himself according to our weakness; and by His Sacraments, as much as may be, doth as it were uphold us; yet so that we refer all the benefits of our confirmation to the Spirit itself, and to His operation, rather than to the element. Wherefore, as we attribute confirmation to doctrine, and to teachers, even so do we sealing to the Sacraments. We read in the Acts of the Apostles, (xiv. 22.) "The Apostles returned and strengthened the disciples' souls again and exhorted them to continue in the faith." Again, in the First to the Thessalonians, (iii. 9.) "We have sent," (saith Paul) "Timotheus our brother and minister of God, to confirm or stablish you; and to comfort you concerning your faith." Nevertheless, unless the inward

force of the Spirit do draw and quicken the hearts of the hearers, the outward persuasion of the teacher, though it be never so forcible and vehement, shall nothing avail. But if the Holy Spirit do show forth His might, and work with the word of the preacher, the souls of the hearers are most mightily strengthened. And so it standeth with the mystery of the Sacraments. For if the inward anointing and sealing of the Holy Ghost be wanting, the outward action will be counted but a toy to the unbelievers; neither worketh the sealing of the Sacraments any thing at all: but when faith, the gift of the Holy Ghost, goeth before, the sealing of the Sacraments is very strong and sure. Some, also, have said very well, "If our minds be destitute of the Holy Ghost, the Sacraments do no more profit us than it doth a blind man to look upon the bright beams of the sun. But if our eyes be opened through the illumination of the Spirit, they are wonderfully delighted with the heavenly sight of the Sacraments." And Zuinglius (*in Libello ad principes Germaniæ*) saith, "It doth not offend us though all those things which the Holy Ghost worketh be referred to the external Sacrament, as long as we understand them to be spoken figuratively, as the Fathers spake." Thus saith he. And although Sacraments seal not the promises to the unbelievers, because they mistrust them; yet, nevertheless, the Sacraments were instituted of God that they might seal. The wicked and ungodly person receiveth not the doctrine of the gospel, yet no man therefore doth gather that this doctrine was not instituted of God to teach. Some one there is that will not give credit to a sealed charter; yet doth it not therefore follow that the sealed charter served not to assume or confirm one's faith. Therefore, since the doctrine of the gospel worketh nothing in him that

is obstinate and rebellious; since the Sacraments do nothing move him that is profane and unholy; neither profit the wicked by any manner [of] means; that cometh not to pass through Him that did institute them, or through the word and Sacraments, but through the default of the unbeliever. In the mean time, of themselves they are instituted to profit, and to seal; and to have their holy use and end in the holy. And thus much have I said of the principal virtue of Sacraments: that they be testimonies of God's truth, and of His good will toward us; and are seals of all the promises of the gospel; sealing and assuring us that faith is righteousness, and that all the good gifts of Christ pertain to them that believe.

There is, also, another end and use of sacramental signs, that is to say, that they signify, and in signifying do represent: which were superfluous to prove by many testimonies, since it is most manifest to all men; at least by that which we spake before. Now to signify, is to show, and by signs and tokens, to declare and point out any thing. But to represent, doth not signify (as some dream) to bring; to give, or make that now again corporally present, which sometime was taken away: but to resemble it in likeness, and by a certain imitation; and to call it back again to mind, and to set it, as it were, before our eyes. For we say that a son doth represent or resemble his father, when, after a sort, he expresseth his father in favour, and likeness of manners; so that he which seeth him may verily think that he seeth his father as it were present. And after this manner do Sacraments stir up and help our faith, while we see outwardly before our eyes that which stirreth up the mind; worketh in us, and warneth us of our duty: yea, that every thing which we a while before comprehended in our mind,

is now, after a sort, visibly offered to our senses, in a similitude, parable, type or figure; to be viewed and weighed in our minds, that mutually they might help one another. The similitude, therefore, or analogy of the sign to the thing signified, is here, by the way, to be considered.

I told you before that analogy is an aptness, proportion, and a certain conveyance of the sign to the thing signified; so that this may be seen in that, as in a looking-glass. The matter shall be made manifest by examples. . . . The bountiful and gracious Lord of His mere mercy receiveth mankind into the partaking of all His good gifts and graces; and adopteth the faithful that now they be not only joined in league with God, but, also, the children of God; which thing by the holy action of Baptism, being instead of the sign or the very sign itself, is most evidently by representation laid before the eyes of all men. For the minister of God standeth at the holy font, to whom the infant is offered to be baptised; whom he receiveth and baptiseth into the name, or in the name, of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. For we may find both, "Into the name," and, "In the name:" so that to be baptised "Into the name of the Lord," is to be sealed into His virtue and power; (for the name of the Lord signifieth power) into the favour, mercy, and protection of God; yea, to be grafted, and, as it were, to be fastened, to be dedicated, and to be incorporated into God. To be baptised "In the name of the Lord," is by the commandment or authority of God to be baptised: I mean, by the commission or appointment of God, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, to be received into the company of the children of God; and to be counted of God's household; that they which are baptised, are, and be, called christians; and be named with the name of God; being

called the children of God the Father, &c. This speech, therefore, doth somewhat resemble that which we read elsewhere: "That the name of God was called upon, over some one;" which is, in a manner, as if we should say, that one is called by the name of God; that is, to be called, "The servant and son of God¹." They, therefore, which before by grace invisibly are received of God, into the society of God; those self-same are visibly now by Baptism admitted into the self-same household of God, by the minister of God; and, therefore, at that time also receive their name, that they may always remember that in Baptism they gave up their names to Christ, and, in like manner, also received a name. After this manner, by a most apt analogy, the very sign resembleth the thing signified. To be short: Baptism is done by water; and water, in men's matters, hath a double use: for it cleanseth filth, and, as it were, reneweth man; also, it quenbeth thirst, and cooleth him that is in a heat: so, also, it representeth the grace of God, when it cleanseth His faithful ones from their sins; regenerateth, and refresheth us with His Spirit. Beside this, the minister of Christ sprinkleth, or rather poureth in, water; or, being dipped, taketh them out of the water: whereby it is signified that God very bountifully bestoweth His gifts upon His faithful ones. It signifieth, also, that we are buried with Christ into His death, and are raised again with Him into newness of life. Pharaoh was drowned in the gulph of the Red sea, but the people of God passed through it safe. For our old Adam must be drowned and extinguished; but our new Adam, day by day, must be quickened and rise up again (out of the water). Therefore is the mortification, and vivification of christians, very excellently represented by Baptism.

¹ Isai. xliii. 1: lxiii. 19: Jer. xiv. 9: Dan. ix. 19.

Now in the Lord's Supper, bread and wine, represent the very body and blood of Christ. The reason hereof is this:— as bread nourisheth and strengtheneth man, and giveth him ability to labour; so the body of Christ eaten by faith, feedeth and satisfieth the soul of man; and furnisheth the whole man to all duties of godliness. As wine is drink to the thirsty, and maketh merry the hearts of men, so the blood of our Lord Jesus drunken by faith, doth quench the thirst of the burning conscience; and filleth the hearts of the faithful with unspeakable joy. But in the action of the Supper, the bread of the Lord is broken, the wine is poured out; for the body of our Saviour was broken, that is, by all means afflicted; and His blood gushed and flowed plentifully out of His gaping wounds: and we ourselves are in fault that He was torn and tormented. Our sins wounded Him; and we ourselves crucified Him: that is to say, He was crucified for us, that by His death He might deliver us from death. Furthermore, we take the bread into our hands, we, likewise, take the cup into our hands, because He said: 'Take ye, eat ye, take ye, and divide it among you.' Neither do we lay them aside, or hide them; neither do we give them forthwith to others: but when we have received them, we eat and drink them, swallowing them down into our bodies: then afterward we do communicate and offer them to other. For they which lawfully celebrate the Lord's Supper, do not only believe that Christ suffered; or that He suffered for other, and not for them: but they believe that Christ suffered for themselves: they believe that Christ doth [communicate] and as it were, hath already communicated all His gifts most liberally unto them. Therefore, as the substance of bread and wine, passing into the bowels, is changed into the sub-

stance of man's body; even so Christ being eaten of the godly by faith, is united unto them by His Spirit: so that they are one with Christ, and He one with them. And as meat plentifully prepared, daintily dressed, and only seen upon the table, doth not assuage hunger; so if thou hear Christ reverently preached unto thee, and dost not believe that Christ, with all His good gifts, is thine,—neither the word though reverently preached, nor yet the board though abundantly stored, do profit thee any thing. And it maketh much to the reconciling, renewing, and maintaining of friendship, that we are all partakers of one bread; that we offer bread to our brethren; and that we drink of the cup which we receive at our brethren's hand. For upon no other cause the ancient fathers seem to call the supper, *Synaxis*, a communion. But of that we will speak somewhat elsewhere.... And this much have I brought for example sake, touching the analogy of the sign and thing signified; and would say more but that I trust, to them that be diligent, this is sufficient. For I have ministered occasion to think upon, and to find out more and greater things.

By this short treatise touching the analogy, I think it is plain that Sacraments stir up and help the faith of the godly. For whilst our mind comprehendeth and considereth the benefits of God, Christ's blessing, our redemption, and other good gifts; while it enjoyeth them with great pleasure of the spirit; whilst in them it is glad and rejoiceth;—Sacraments are now, also, outwardly given which do visibly represent those things to our eyes, and, as it were, make them to enter into all our senses; which the mind inwardly comprehendeth, considereth, and meditateth upon. For because the whole action, which consisteth of the words and the rite or ceremony, is counted with the sign, our eyes

see the signs and all things which are done in the whole action of the signs, all which do, as it were, speak. Our ears hear the words and institutions of Christ: yea, our very touching and tasting, they, also, do feel and perceive how sweet and good the Lord is: so that now the whole man, as it were, both body and soul caught up into heaven, doth feel and perceive that his faith is stirred up and holpen: and, to be short, that the fruit of faith in Christ is passing sweet and comfortable. All these things have place in them that believe: in them that believe not, the signs remain, as they are, without life. Therefore, these things are brought to pass by the virtue or power of faith, and of the Spirit working in the lawful use of the Sacraments: without faith and the Holy Ghost they are not felt or perceived. There is not unlike efficacy or force, also, in the preaching of the word of God. For where this word by parables, by examples, and by description, is set forth to the hearers; if the Spirit and faith shine in their mind, by these they seem, not only to hear things expounded, but to see them with their eyes. In consideration whereof, I think, Paul said:—"O foolish Galatians, who hath bewitched you that ye should not believe the truth, to whom Jesus Christ was described before your eyes, and among you crucified?" (Gal. iii. 1.) For it is certain that Christ was no where either described or crucified among the Galatians: he speaketh, therefore, of his plainness of preaching the word, whereby things indeed are showed, but yet with such force and efficacy as if they were, in a manner, laid before their eyes. There is the same reason, also, in Sacraments, which, for that cause, were called of them of old, "visible words." Of these things, in this manner, intreateth Zuinglius, in his book, *Ad principes Germaniæ contra Eccium*, saying: "Doth

not a faithful man desire when he feeleth his faith to fall, to be upholden and restored to his place? And where, in the whole world, shall he hope to find that more conveniently than in the very actions of the Sacraments, so much as belongeth to all sensible things? For, let it be that all creatures allure and provoke us to the contemplation or beholding of God's majesty, yet all that their allurement or provoking is dumb: but in the Sacraments there is a lively, provoking, and speaking allurement. For the Lord speaketh, and the elements also speak: and they speak and persuade that to our senses which the word and Spirit speaketh to our mind. Howbeit, hitherto all these visible things are nothing, unless the sanctification of the Spirit go before." These things he handleth more at large; first, in his Annotations upon the 27th chapter of Jeremy, and afterward *In expositione fidei ad regem Christianum*.

Furthermore, we read that S. Augustine, disputing against the Manichees, (*Contra Faustum* lib. XIX. c. 11.) said: "Men cannot be gathered together into any name of religion, either true or false, unless they be knit together in some fellowship, or visible signs or Sacraments, &c." We acknowledge this opinion of S. Augustine, fetched from the scriptures, doth teach touching the Sacraments that we by them are gathered and knit together into the unity of the body of Christ; and are separated from all other religions, fellowships, and assemblies: and more too, we are bound by them, as by an oath, to the true worship of one God, and into one sincere religion, to the which we openly profess that we agree and give our consent, with all them that are partakers of the Sacraments. Where this is chiefly to be marked, that the gathering or knitting together into the unity of the body of Christ, hath a double respect: for, either we are joined with

Christ that He is in us, and we live in Him; or, else we are coupled with all the members of Christ,—to wit, with Christ's faithful servants; I mean, with the catholic church itself. Furthermore, we are knit together with Christ in spirit and faith: but we are joined to the church or to the members of Christ, by the unity of faith and of the Spirit, and by the bond of charity: all which, verily, are the inward gifts of the Spirit which freely are bestowed on us by the Lord only, not by any creatures, not by any elements. Sacraments, therefore, do visibly graft us into the fellowship of Christ, and His saints who were invisibly grafted by His grace before we were partakers of the Sacraments; but by receiving of the Sacraments, we do now open and make manifest of whose body we should be, and are, members; the Lord with His signs or marks, by His ministers, also visibly marking us for His own household, and for His own people. Which things, by the scriptures, we will more fully open and make manifest.

They who, in time past, by the force of the covenant, by the grace, mercy, and promise of God, were the people of God; were, by circumcision, visibly gathered together into one church, and knit together into one body: for the Apostle Saint Paul saith unto the Ephesians: "Wherefore, remember that ye, being in time passed Gentiles in the flesh, called uncircumcision of them which are called circumcision in the flesh made with hands,—that at that time (I say) ye were without Christ, and were aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenant of promise, &c." (Eph. ii. 11, 12.) Whereby it is, also, easily understood how the Jews, by circumcision, were distinguished from other religions and fellowships: and that circumcision in another place, for this cause, is put for them that are circum-

cised; and why the name of uncircumcised was reproachful. For those that were uncircumcised were counted for ungodly and unclean persons; that had no fellowship nor part or inheritance with God and His saints. Of Baptism, which was ordained in the stead of circumcision, (Phil. iii.: Rom. xv.) something is spoken in my former sermons. And, also, the Apostle setteth out most plainly,—“As the body” (saith he) “is one and hath many members, and all the members of the body, which is one, though they be many, yet are but one body; even so is Christ: for, by one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free; and have been all made to drink into one Spirit.” (1 Cor. xii. 12, 13.) We are, therefore, knit together by the Sacrament of Baptism into the unity of the body of Christ, so that to have broken this bond, and to yield ourselves into another fellowship of religion and brotherhood, may worthily be called sacrilege and treason.

Hereunto the Apostle seemed to have respect when he asked the Corinthians: Are ye not baptised into the name of Christ¹? Declaring thereby that they which are baptised into the name of Christ, have openly sworn and bound their faith before the church of Christ; so that now they neither can, nor ought to rejoice in any other name than in the name of Christ, into whose household they are received by Baptism; so, I say, we are separated by Baptism from all other religions, and are only consecrated to christian religion. He hath the like place, in all points, touching the Supper of the Lord. (1 Cor. x. 14 et seq.) For when the Apostle would declare to the Corinthians, that it is a thing far from all godliness, unseemly, yea, and sacrilegious, that christians

¹ Reference seems to be had to 1 Cor. i. 13.

should eat, in the idols' temples, things offered to idols; and be partakers of the Gentiles' sacrifices;—reasoning from the manner and nature of the Sacraments of the Lord's Supper, he saith: “Fly from idolatry. I speak as unto them that have understanding, judge ye what I say: The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? For we that are many are one bread, and one body, because we are all partakers of one bread. Behold Israel which is after the flesh: are not they which eat of the sacrifices partakers of the altar? What say I then, that the idol is any thing, or that which is sacrificed unto idols, is any thing? Nay but rather this I say, that those things which the Gentiles sacrifice, they sacrifice to devils, and not to God. And I would not that ye should have fellowship with the devils. Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils. Ye cannot be partakers of the Lord's table, and of the table of devils, &c.” For all this is Paul's saying: which, since it serveth notably to our purpose and is very plain, I will but briefly run over it. First, he layeth down the state and scope of the matter, wherunto he immediately directeth his whole discourse:—“Fly” (saith he) “idolatry:” and he meaneth by the word “idolatry” whatsoever pertaineth to idolatry; especially the eating of meat offered to idols. But if you know not what *Idolothytum* is, (which word he there useth) understand that it is a Greek word which Paul useth in this case; and it signifieth, a thing sacrificed to an idol, or a thing publicly in sacrifice consecrated to an idol. And it was the manner of the Corinthians to sacrifice at the altar of their Gods in idol-houses;—that is to say, in their idol-temples,—and to call christians unto those their sacrifices: and they, when they came, sat and ate of that which was offered unto idols; eating, with-

out difference, with the idolaters, thinking they might have done that without any fault at all: because, by the bright shining of the gospel, it appeareth that neither the idol, neither that god whom the idol represented, and therefore, also, the things themselves that were offered to idols were nothing else but vain names, and things of no price or estimation. But Paul, disputing against these from the eighth chapter unto the eleventh, teacheth, that it is far wide from christianity to be partakers of the Gentiles' sacrifice; and saith, I will speak unto you as unto them that have discretion, that after I have shadowed out unto you which way to walk, you, by the sharpness of your wit, may understand what is true, and what is false: and, to be short, which way you must incline. And then he scattereth certain grounds of arguments, which they, afterward discussing, might by their diligence polish and make perfect. They, (saith he) that are partakers of the Supper of the Lord (in which the bread of the Lord is broken, and the cup of the Lord is drunken) are of the same communion, fellowship or body with the Lord. For *κοινωνία*, which word Paul useth here, and which interpreters have translated "communion or partaking," (though "fellowship" is better than "partaking": as, in the German translation, *Gemeinde* is better than *Gemeinschaft*¹) is not taken actively, (as I may so say) for the distributing, giving or reaching out Christ's body by the minister: but passively, for the fellowship and society, for the body, I say, of the church: as when the church is called a communion, that is, an assembly, a gathering together and society of saints or godly christians. Furthermore, the church is called *κοινωνία*, or a communion of the body and blood of Christ, because it is redeemed by the body and blood of Christ;

¹ Luther in his translation of the verse under discussion uses *Gemeinschaft*.

and being partaker of Christ, liveth by Him: for He liveth in the godly christians, communicating unto them all His good gifts of life. And that the partakers of the Supper of the Lord, are the body or communion of Christ, he declareth by a reason which followeth saying, "Because we that are many, are one bread and one body." Whereunto, by and by, he addeth another more evident reason, for interpretation's sake, saying, "For we are all partakers of one bread." In that we are partakers of one bread, saith he, we do openly testify that we are partakers of the same body with Christ and all His saints. In which words he hath a notable respect to the analogy. "For as by uniting together of many grains, (as Cyprian saith) is made one bread or one loaf; as of many clusters of grapes one wine is pressed out; so out of many members groweth up and is made the body of the church, which is the body of Christ." (*Epist. ad Magnum.*)

Now, in the words of Paul, these things offer themselves unto us to be marked;—first, for that now he calleth that a multitude or many, by a word expressing his mind better, which before he named a communion. A communion, therefore, is nothing else but a multitude or congregation. For he said, "The bread is the partaking of the body of Christ: but now he saith, "We being many are one bread, one body." "We being many," saith he: that is, all we which are a multitude, and a congregation or church, redeemed by the body of Christ which was given, and by his blood which was shed for us. Afterwards he saith, "We being many are one body:" he doth not say, 'are made one body'. For we are not first grafted into the body of Christ, (as we have often repeated already,) by partaking of the Sacraments: but we, which were before ingrafted by grace invisible, are now also visibly consecrated. Again: by the like reason of

Sacraments, or by an example of the scripture taken from the Sacraments of the people of the Old Testament, he showeth that the partakers of the Sacraments are one body, both with Him to whom they offer, and with them with whom they offer, or with whom they eat of things offered to idols. Behold (saith he) the Israelites which offer sacrifices after the flesh: are not they that eat the sacrifices, *κοινωνοί*, that is to say, communicants, fellows or partakers of the things of the temple or of the altar? For under the word of the things of the temple or of the altar, (*θυσιαστήριον* is his word,) he comprehendeth whatsoever doth belong to the worship and religion of the God of the Jews: so that the sense or meaning may be this,—Are not all they one body, one communion, one people, both with the God of Israel and with His people, which eat of the sacrifices offered to the God of Israel, by the Israelitish people? As if he had said,—There is none that is ignorant of it, or that can deny it, since it is confessed and manifest among all men. By these things he leaveth to the Corinthians, of their own accord, thus much to be gathered:—Therefore they that are partakers of the Sacraments of the Gentiles are one body and one fellowship with the gods of the Gentiles, and the Gentiles which do sacrifice. Now by the figure, *Occupatio*, (which is when in answering we prevent an objection that may be made) he placeth these words between:—“What say I then? That the idol is any thing? Or, that that which is offered in sacrifice to idols is any thing?” Whereunto, by and by, he addeth, “But this I say, that the things which the Gentiles offer in sacrifice, they offer to devils and not to God.” Hereupon he might lawfully have inferred,—Therefore if you continue to be partakers of things offered to idols, ye shall verily be one body and one fellow-

ship, both with the devil himself and all his members. But because this might have been taken of many to have been bitterly spoken, he addeth another saying somewhat more mild and gentle, and saith,—“And I would not that ye should be *κοινωνοί*,” that is, communicants, or “partakers, and have fellowship with devils.” After which words, by comparing the contrary parts, he bringeth in the sum of the whole matter, to which he directed all his reasons and saith,—“Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord, and the cup of devils: ye cannot be partakers of the Lord’s table, and of the table of devils.” And so forth.

The Sacraments, therefore, do separate us from all other worshippings and religions; and do bind and consecrate, yea, and also, as it were, make us of the same body with one true God, and sincere, christian religion; because we, being partakers of them, do openly profess that we be the members of Jesus Christ, which no man, that is well in his wits, will take and make them the members of fornication, and of idols.

That which Zuinglius, that learned man, hath, (*In expositione fidei Christiana ad regem Christianum*) is not impertinent to this purpose. “Sacraments” (saith he) “are instead of an oath. For *Sacramentum* with the Latins is used, also, for an oath. For, they that use one and the self-same Sacraments, are one peculiar nation, and an holy sworn congregation: they are knit together into one body, and into one people, whom whosoever betrayeth shall perish’. Therefore the people of Christ, since by eating His body sacramentally they are knit into one body: now he that is faithless, and yet dare be so bold as to make himself one of this society or fellowship, betrayeth the body of

¹ “Perjurus est.” Latin Edit. and in Zuinglius.

Christ, as well in the Head as in the members, &c." Thus far he.

By this it is easy to understand, that Sacraments put us in mind of our duty: especially if we mark in the writings of the Apostle, how, considering the manner of Sacraments, the Apostles frame their exhortations. Where, again, the analogy being considered it hath very much light and force in it. Trees are pruned, and all that which is dry, barren, and superfluous in them is cut away. And so, by circumcision, they that were circumcised were put in mind to cut away, with the knife of the Spirit, whatsoever grew up in the flesh against the law of God. Hereunto had Moses respect when he said in Deuteronomy,—“Circumcise, therefore, the foreskin of your heart: and be no more stiff-necked.” (Deut. x. 16.) Whom Jeremiah following, in the fourth chapter, saith, “Be ye circumcised in the Lord, and cut away the foreskins of your hearts, &c.”.... Those things which the Apostle hath taught touching the celebration of the Passover, are more plain than that they need here to be rehearsed: and I have already intreated of them at large in the sixth Sermon of my third Decade. The very same Apostle, in his epistle to the Romans, saith,—“Know ye not, that all we which have been baptised into Jesus Christ, have been baptised into His death. We are buried, then, with Him by Baptism into His death, that likewise as Christ was raised up from the dead, by the glory of the Father: even so we should walk in newness of life, &c.” (Rom. vi. 3, 4.) So we are put in mind, by the mystery of Baptism, to renounce and forsake Satan and the world; to mortify and subdue the flesh; and to bury the old Adam, that the new man may rise up again in us through Christ. Furthermore, the Supper

of the Lord doth admonish us of brotherly love and charity, and of the unity that we have with all the members of Christ: it warneth us, also, of purity and sincerity in faith: that because we have openly professed that we are united to Christ and to all His members, we should have a special care and regard, that we be not found faithless and untrue to our Lord Christ and His church: that we should not defile ourselves with foreign and strange sacrifices. We are, also, admonished of thankfulness, to magnify the grace of God, who hath redeemed us; according to that saying, —“As often as ye shall eat of this bread, and drink of this cup, ye shall shew forth the Lord's death until he come.” (1 Cor. xi. 26.)

Thus far have I intreated of the force, the end, and the effect of Sacraments: unto the which I have, (as I think,) attributed no more, nor no less than I ought; that is, as much as may be proved out of the scripture to be due unto them. They are the institutions of Christ: therefore they care not for counterfeit and strange praises. They have praise sufficient, if they have those praises, which He that instituted them,—namely, God and Christ Jesus, the High Priest of the catholick church,—vouchsafed to attribute unto them. Now, because there is mention made very often of faith, in this whole book, I will, further, show also that without faith Sacraments profit nothing: and, again, that to those which receive them by faith, they are not superfluous or vain. For this seemeth, as yet, to belong to the full exposition and consideration of Sacraments.

That Sacraments without faith profit not, it is easily proved. For it is said that Sacraments are seals of the preaching of the Gospel, and things appertaining to the same. For if the preaching of the Gospel be heard without

faith, it doth not only profit nothing unto life, but it turneth rather unto judgment (to him that heareth); the Lord himself bearing witness, and saying,—“If any man hear my words and believe not, I judge him not, for I came not to judge the world but to save the world: the word that I have spoken the same shall judge him in the last day.” (John xii. 47, 48.) To that saying of the Lord agreeth this of the Apostle,—“For unto us was the Gospel preached as well as unto the fathers: but the word which they heard did not profit them, because it was not coupled with faith to them that heard.” (Heb. iv. 2.) Who is now such a dotard which cannot gather, that Sacraments without faith are unprofitable, especially since the same Apostle saith,—“Whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord?” (1 Cor. xi. 27.) But all our worthiness before God doth consist in faith; the same Apostle, yet again, witnessing out of the prophet,—“The just shall live by faith.” (Rom. i. 17.) And,—“By faith the elders (or fathers) obtained a good report.” (Heb. xi. 2.) Whereunto also belongeth that which is read in the Gospel,—“They which were bidden were not worthy;” (Matt. xxii. 8.) Whereupon it followeth, that worthiness consisteth in faithful obedience. Hereunto also may be referred, (I think) those examples whereof mention hath been made more than once already before:—“All our fathers were baptised, and did all eat of one spiritual meat: but in many of them God had no delight.” (1 Cor. x. 2.) And Paul again saith,—“Without faith it is impossible to please God:” (Heb. xi. 6.) Therefore without faith Sacraments profit nothing. The example of Simon Magus and Judas the traitor are very well known, of which one was baptised, the other admitted to the Sup-

per; and yet had no fruit of the Sacraments, because they wanted true faith. To these pithy and divine testimonies of God, we will now add some places of St Augustine out of his nineteenth book against Faustus, and twelfth chapter. "Peter saith, 'Baptism saveth us:' and lest they should think the visible Sacrament were sufficient, by which they had the form of godliness, and through their evil manners, by living lewdly and desperately, should deny the power thereof, by and by he addeth, 'Not the putting away of the filth of the flesh, but in that a good conscience maketh request to God'."

Again, (*Contra literas Petilianæ*, lib. 11. c. 7.) he saith,— "They are not, therefore, to be thought to be in the body of Christ which is the church or congregation, because they are corporally partakers of His Sacraments. For they in such are also holy; but to them that use and receive them unworthily, they shall be forcible to their greater judgment. For they are not in that society of Christ's church, which, in the members of Christ by being knit together, and touching one another, do grow into the fulness of God. For that church is built on a rock, as saith the Lord, 'Upon this rock will I build my church': but they build on the sand,—as the Lord also saith, 'He that heareth my words and doeth them not, I will liken him to a foolish man'". And, again, in his treatise upon John xiii.²—"The syllables of Christ's name and His Sacraments profit nothing, where the faith of Christ is resisted. For faith in Christ and His Sacraments is to believe in Him which justifieth the ungodly; to believe in the Mediator without whose intercession we are not reconciled unto God." Thus far Augustine.

¹ Matt. xvi. 18.² Matt. vii. 26.³ In Joan. Tract. 53.

An objection is made,—If Sacraments do nothing profit without our faith, then they depend on our worthiness or unworthiness; so that they are not perfect. I answer, That among the wicked and unbelievers, Sacraments verily of themselves are sufficiently ratified and confirmed by the institution of God; neither dependeth their perfectness upon the condition and state of the partakers, that they are either better among the good, or worse among the bad. For that remaineth perfect and sound, which the Lord hath instituted, and retaineth His institution always good; however men vary and are faithless. For the Apostle saith,—“Shall their unbelief make the faith of God without effect? God forbid. Yea, let God be true and every man a liar.” (Rom. iii. 3, 4.) But I have touched this matter also somewhat before. Yet, because it is one thing to offer, and another thing to receive, God verily offereth of His goodness His bountiful gifts unto men to this end to profit and to save them; and to make them whole, as the physician doth by ministering physic to his patient. But because that foolish and mad man doth not acknowledge the benefit, as the sick patient which refuseth physic being ministered; the benefit which is offered doth no more profit the one, than physic not received doth good to the other: not through the default of Him that offereth the benefit, or of him which ministereth physic, but through the folly of him which refuseth and will none of it. After this manner disputeth St Augustine, also, of this matter: for (*De Baptismo contra Donat.* lib. III. c. 14.) he saith,—“It skilleth not, when the perfectness and holiness of the Sacrament is in handling, what he believeth, and what manner of faith he hath that receiveth the Sacrament. Verily it availeth very much to the way of salvation; but for the question of the

Sacrament it maketh no matter." Also, (*Contra literas Petilianæ*, lib. ii. c. 47.) he saith,—“Remember that the lewd life and corrupt manners of evil men do nothing hinder the Sacraments of God, to make them not holy at all, or less holy: but that to the ungodly they are a testimony of their damnation, and not a furtherance of their salvation.” He also, (*Tract. in Joan.* 26.) saith, “If thou receive the Sacrament carnally, it ceaseth not to be spiritual, but to thee it is not so.”

As easily is that objection confuted,—that Baptism profiteth not infants, if we still say that Sacraments without faith profit not; for infants have no faith: thus they babble. We answer, first, that the baptism of infants is grounded upon the free mercy and grace of God, who saith, “I will be thy God, and the God of thy seed.” (*Gen.* xvii. 7.) And again, “Suffer children to come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of God, &c.” (*Mark* x. 14.) Infants, therefore, are numbered and counted of the Lord himself among the faithful; so that Baptism is due unto them as far forth as it is due unto the faithful. For, by the imputation of God, infants are faithful: whereunto pertaineth this saying of our Saviour, “He that shall offend one of these little ones that believe in me, &c.” (*Matt.* xviii. 6.) For He manifestly calleth “little ones,” believing: for imputation’s sake, doubtless, not for confession, which by no means, as yet, is in little ones. To this also may be added, that the father of the infant doth therefore desire to have his child signed with the mark of the people of God, to wit, Baptism, because he believeth the promises of God; that is, that his infant is of the household of God: therefore there is faith in the baptism of infants. But the father doth not believe. Be it so: yet that is no hinderance to the infant. For in the

faith of the church he is brought to be baptised. The church verily believeth that infants ought to be brought to the Lord: the church believeth that they are of the household and people of God: therefore she commandeth them to be partakers of the mysteries. So that, again, in the baptism of infants a man may find faith. Hereunto doth St Augustine add this saying,—(*De peccatorum meritis et remissione*, lib. 1. c. 19.) “Wherefore infants are rightly called faithful, because they, after a sort, do confess their faith by the words of them that bear them.” He reasoneth more touching this matter in his Epistle to Boniface, which is in order the three and twentieth, where, he that desireth may find more.

But all these things (say they) prove not that infants have faith of their own. For the faith of their parents, of their bearers, or the faith of the church is another's faith and not theirs. Be it so. Yet most certain is that saying, that the Lord counteth infants among His, that is, among the faithful: so that now they are not only baptised in another's faith, but in their own; that is to say, which it pleaseth the Lord to impute unto them. Furthermore, that is not another's, which is common to the self-same body: but infants are in the very same body of the church, whereby that which is the church's, is their own and not another's. Neither can any man easily tell, what motions of the Holy Spirit infants have beside, &c.: for insomuch as they are of God, they have the Spirit of God, “And whoso have not, they are not of God. (Rom. viiii. 9.)

As they decline too much to the left hand, which are persuaded that Sacraments, yea, without faith, do profit the receivers; so they go too far wide on the right hand, who think that the Sacraments are superfluous to them that have faith. Faith (say they) doth fully acquit us, so that after

we have faith, Sacraments can increase nothing in us; therefore it must needs be that they are unprofitable. Such in times past are the hereticks *Messaliani* read to have been; who were both called *Euchitæ* and *ἰθουσιασται*, that is, Divine men, forsooth, and inspired of God. For they did contend that the faithful, after they had received the Holy Ghost, had need of no Sacraments. But these men are very injurious even to God himself, who instituted not His Sacraments for the faithful without great cause; neither unprofitably. And, "Verily Abraham believed God and it was reckoned unto him for righteousness, (Rom. iv. 3.) and he was counted the friend of God, just and holy, not being void, doubtless, of the Holy Ghost: but he, also, "Received circumcision the seal of the righteousness of faith which was before he was circumcised." (Rom. iv. 11.) It is said to the same Abraham, "Every man-child whose foreskin shall not be circumcised, shall be cut off from my people, because he hath broken my covenant." (Gen. xvii. 14.) Truly the angel of the Lord is ready to kill Moses, because he delayed circumcision in his children longer than was lawful, either by his own negligence, or through the fault of his Midianitish wife¹. What, shall there be found any more righteous and holy than the Son of God; as He which having received the fulness of the Spirit, poureth plentifully of the same into His members? He himself being the Head, yet He came to John Baptist and requireth to be baptised of him in Jordan: and when he refused and said, "I have need to be baptised of thee, and comest thou to me?" He heareth, "Suffer it to be so now: For thus it cometh us to fulfil all righteousness." (Matt. iii. 14, 15.) Certainly righteousness giveth to every man that which is his

¹ Exod. iv. 24.

own. Faith, therefore, which is the righteousness of christians, giveth glory to God, and believeth that He, being wonderful wise, doth will well unto men; and, therefore, that He hath instituted nothing unprofitably, but all things, for the salvation of His faithful ones: a faithful man, therefore, useth all the institutions of God without any reasoning or gainsaying.

Neither is there any here, I think, that will say, that this deed of Christ pertaineth nothing to him; whereby undoubtedly He laid before us an example to follow. Yea that which He himself did, He willed other also to do when He sent His disciples forth and said,—“Go into the whole world and preach the Gospel to all creatures, baptising them in the name of the Father, &c. He which shall believe and be baptised shall be saved.” (Matt. xxviii. 19: Mark xvi. 16.) Where truly He joineth together both faith and Baptism; which to abide upon He would not have done, if Sacraments were superfluous there where faith is. Whereby it manifestly appeareth, that they are wrong as far as heaven is wide, which think that Sacraments are indifferent; that is to say, a thing put to our own will and choice, either to use or not to use. For as we have heard already a flat commandment concerning Baptism, so the Lord instituting and celebrating the Supper saith: “Do this in the remembrance of me.” (Luke xxii. 19.) He, therefore, that despiseth these commandments of God, I see not how he can have faith, whereby he should be invisibly sanctified. Hitherto belongeth now, that which the faithful prince of Ethiopia confesseth, that he believeth with all his heart in the Lord Jesus, yet nevertheless as soon as he saw water, he said, “Behold, here is water, what letteth me to be baptised?” (Acts viii. 36.) He doth

not say, 'I believe with all my heart, and I feel that I am justified and cleansed, why then should I be washed with water, having no faith remaining?' Therefore, where-soever true faith is, there Sacraments are not contemned or refused, but more desired. For Cornelius, the Centurion also, after he had received the Holy Ghost, doth not gainsay Peter, who said,—“ Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptised which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?” (Acts x. 47.) Peter was a faithful preacher of the Gospel, a skilful teacher of the truth, therefore he deceiveth no man; and he teacheth us by his own deed, that faith doth then specially provoke us to be partakers of the Sacraments, when it is true in the faithful. To whom Paul, his fellow minister, agreeth saying,—“ Let every one prove himself, and then let him eat of this bread, and drink of this cup.” (1 Cor. xi. 28.) But that proving is made by faith: therefore not faith, but unthankfulness doth contemptuously reject the Sacraments.

Truly I am not ignorant that very many without the use of visible Sacraments have been sanctified, and, at this day also, are sanctified: but none of those despised or contemned them. They were not partakers of the Sacraments, being thereunto driven by necessity; as there be at this day some that are held captives under the tyranny of Antichrist and the Turk, and, for the time, believe with their whole heart in the Lord Jesus. Therefore, the examples of these or such like, are no defence for them which may receive the Sacraments; if they regarded the ordinances of God, and set so much by them as of duty they should do. I will note here for the singular benefit of the readers, St Augustine's disputation, because it maketh notably for our purpose. He, (*Quæst. in Levit. lib. III.*

c. 84.) saith, "It is demanded, not without cause, whether invisible sanctification do profit nothing without visible Sacraments, wherewith a man is visibly sanctified? Which without doubt is absurd. For more tolerably it may be said, that this sanctification is not without them, than that it doth not profit if it be without them; since in sanctification all their profit consisteth. But we must also weigh this how it is rightly said, that without the Sacraments sanctification cannot be. For visible Baptism did nothing profit Simon Magus, to whom invisible sanctification was wanting: but because this invisible sanctification profited them that had it, in like manner they which were baptised received also the visible Sacraments. And yet neither is it showed where Moses himself was sanctified with visible sacrifices or oil, who, notwithstanding, did visibly sanctify the priests: but who dare deny that he was invisibly sanctified, whose grace was so great, surpassing, and excellent? This, also, may be said of John Baptist. For he was first a baptiser, before he was seen to be baptised; whereupon we can deny by no means that he was sanctified, yet we do not find that that was visibly wrought in him before he came to the ministry of baptising. This, also, may be verified of the thief crucified with Christ, to whom the Lord said, as he hung with Him on the cross,—'To day shalt thou be with me in paradise¹.' For he could not have been partaker of so great felicity, unless he had been invisibly sanctified. Whereby we gather, that invisible sanctification hath been present with some, and profited them, without the visible Sacraments: and that visible sanctification which is wrought by visible Sacraments, may be present without this invisible sanctification, but yet may not

¹ Luke xxiii. 43.

profit us. Yet, nevertheless, the visible Sacrament is not therefore to be contemned. For the contemner thereof can by no means be invisibly sanctified. Hereof it is, that Cornelius and they that were with him, when they did now appear to be invisibly sanctified by the Holy Ghost poured into them, yet notwithstanding they are baptised: neither is visible sanctification which had invisible sanctification going before it, counted superfluous." Thus far he.

With this disputation another question, also, hath some affinity or likeness, which is,—Whether Sacraments depend upon the worthiness of the ministers, and whether they be hindered in their force by the unworthiness of the ministers? Cyprian, more than in one place doth contend, "That they can not baptise which want the Holy Ghost¹:" which error springeth hereupon, for that he attributeth too much to the ministry of Baptism. He doth think that men are purified or cleansed by Baptism: so that thereby he doth gather, that an unclean person cannot purify or cleanse; and, therefore, not baptise; and, that the baptism of an unclean person is not Baptism: from whence he deriveth anabaptism, or rebaptising. But if that holy man had rightly and religiously distinguished between power and ministry; between the sign and the thing signified; between the outward and inward sanctification; he had, undoubtedly, understood that we are invisibly sanctified by the mere grace of God, and that this inward sanctification is outwardly by the ministry represented and sealed: there he might have understood that sealed evidences may be published as well by an evil minister as by a good. God's Sacraments are to be referred to God the author of them; who is faithful and true in all his ordinances, how false and faithless soever men

¹ Ad Januar. et cæter. Episc. : Ad Jubaïan. : Ad Pompei. : et alibi.

be. Although Judas were a thief, yet he preached and baptised, whose doctrine and Baptism, was as well the doctrine and Baptism of Christ, as was Peter's and Andrew's, James' and John's. And touching the perfectness and pureness both of the doctrine and Baptism done by the ministry of Judas, no man ever doubted, as though they were never taught or baptised whom he taught and baptised; who in the mean while is called of the Lord himself, not a devilish man, but a very devil. For he baptised, not in his own name, but, in the name of Christ: he preached not his own, but the doctrine of Christ. To conclude: the Lord of His goodness for His truth's sake, and not for Judas' sake, wrought in the faithful: which working of His another's ungraciousness and maliciousness could not hinder; as at this day verily it hindereth not a whit. Truly we must do what we can to have holy and unblameable ministers, so far forth as by our care and diligence we are able to procure and bring to pass: yea, let us deprive and degrade them whom we shall find to behave themselves unworthy of their function: but, in the mean time, let us not doubt at all of the pureness of the Sacraments, which they, while they were in their office, ministered unto us; that is to say, after the same manner and form as the Lord instituted. And verily as the faithful do not fasten their minds on the elements; so neither do they on the ministers. They, in all things, look only up to God, the author of all goodness, and to the end of those things which the Lord ordained.

Saint Augustine hath handled this matter very diligently, excellently well applying to these things very effectual arguments; whose words I will set down, (*Contra Donatist. de Baptismo*, lib. III. c. 10.) "The water is not unholy"

(saith he) “or defiled, over which the name of the Lord is called on, though it be called on of unholy and unclean persons: because neither the creature itself, nor yet the name is unclean. And the Baptism of Christ, consecrated with the words of the Gospel, is holy both by them that are unclean, and in them that are unclean, though they be defiled and unclean: because His holiness cannot be polluted, and in His Sacraments a divine power is present, either to the salvation of them that use them well, or to the condemnation of them that use them ill. Doth the light of the sun or of a candle, when it shineth through a filthy sink, gather no uncleanness from thence: and can the Baptism of Christ be polluted with any man’s wickedness? For if we apply our minds unto the very visible things under which Sacraments are delivered, who knoweth not that they are corruptible? But if we ascend unto that which is figured by them, who seeth not that they be incorruptible? Though men by whom it is ministered, according to their deservings, are either rewarded or punished.” And so forth.

I could allege many examples of this kind, if I thought them necessary: for, I think that by them it is largely and plainly enough declared, that the perfectness and pureness of the Sacraments are not to be esteemed by the worthiness or unworthiness of the ministers, but by the truth of God who did institute them. To him be glory, power, and dominion, for ever and ever. Amen.

SERMON III¹.

Of holy Baptism; what it is; by whom, and when it was instituted: and that there is but one Baptism of water. Of the Baptism of fire. Of the rite or ceremony of Baptism; how, of whom, and to whom it must be ministered. Of Baptism by midwives; and of infants dying without Baptism. Of the Baptism of infants, against Anabaptism or Rebaptising: and of the power or efficacy of Baptism.

Now I have to intreat particularly of holy Baptism, and of the holy Supper of the Lord; which may be done so much the more briefly, as we have largely spoken already of Sacraments in general. Christ our Lord open your minds, and guide my tongue, unto the glory and praise of His blessed name for ever.

Baptism, is a word fetched from the Greeks, who use both these words *Baptismus* and *Baptisma*, (both which signify baptism) as the Latins also do. And Baptism is a dipping; which word Tertullian willingly useth. For, βάπτω, signifieth to dip, or dip in; and, βαπτίζω, to plunge or put far in: whereupon, also, to baptise is used for to plunge in, to wash away, or to cleanse: and baptisings in the scriptures are put for washings and purifyings; as it appeareth in St Mark the seventh chapter, and in Paul to the Hebrews the ninth chapter. To be baptised with the same baptism, is proverbially spoken of him that is partaker of the selfsame danger or misfortune. And to be baptised with blood, is to be imbrued with blood.

¹ The eighth Sermon of the fifth Decade.

They define Baptism, for the most part, to be a token or recognizance of our cleansing; yea, of our enrolling, whereby we are received into the Church to be of the number of God's children. But we, describing the nature of Baptism more at large, do say, That it is an holy action instituted of God; and consisting of the word of God and the holy rite or ceremony, whereby the people of God are dipped in the water in the name of the Lord: to be short, whereby the Lord himself doth represent and seal unto us our purifying or cleansing; gathereth us into one body; and putteth the baptised in mind of their duty.

In this description of Baptism, these things seem chiefly to be considered: Who did institute Baptism? Of what things it consisteth? Whether it be simple, but one, and the self-same; or drawn into many parts. What rite or ceremony of baptising is delivered (to the Church)? What the end, and force of Baptism is?

It was no man that did institute the Sacrament of Baptism, but God himself; though by man it took the name, that is to say, by John (it was ministered), who of it was called the Baptist. That we might understand this, the Evangelists, in many places, have confirmed that the calling of John was from heaven. For thereby we may gather that his ministry was from heaven. Doth not he say himself in express words, "He which sent me to baptise with water, the same said unto me, upon whomsoever thou shalt see the Holy Ghost, &c.?" (John i. 33.) Also, our Lord in the Gospel arguing that the baptism of John was, not from men, but from God, He demandeth of the Pharisees, "The baptism of John, whence was it; from heaven or of men?" (Matt. xxi. 25.) Wherefore the godly, yea even at this day, do receive Baptism, as it were, at

the hands of God himself, though they be baptised through the ministry of men. For the Lord, establishing His institutions by His Spirit, worketh salvation in the elect. So that it must needs follow, that the virtue or efficacy of Baptism is not hindered by an evil minister: whereof hath been already elsewhere, and hereafter shall be, spoken. At that time, truly, Baptism was instituted and began at St John the Baptist, when he began to preach openly that the time was fulfilled; and that Christ was exhibited and given to the world. But the signs of things to come or of things which should be revealed, the thing itself being present, do no more remain, but ought to be changed into other signs. And circumcision was a sign of the blessed seed which was to come; I mean, of the Messiah himself, which, by the shedding of His blood, should bestow His blessing upon the whole world. Therefore when He was come, and should forthwith shed forth His blood, it was needful that circumcision should be changed into Baptism. Whereof shall be spoken hereafter.

Now, Baptism consisteth of the sign, and of the thing signified; of the word or promise of God, and of the holy rite or ceremony. The sign is the outward action; that is, the sprinkling of water, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; with the calling upon of the name of God. The promise or word of God is "Baptising them. He that shall believe and be baptised, shall be saved." And so forth. Whereof we have spoken abundantly enough in the sixth Sermon.

Many in the old time have distinguished between the Baptism of John, and the Baptism of Christ and His Apostles. For some of them deny that forgiveness of sins was comprehended in the baptism of John: but if we dili-

gently view and weigh the doctrine of the holy scripture, we shall find that the baptism of John, and Christ, and His Apostles, is one and the self-same. Certainly the doctrine of John, of Christ, and His Apostles, is one and the self-same every where. For they all, with one mouth, do preach the Gospel; and by it repentance and remission of sins, in the name of Christ. Let him that will confer those things which John the Evangelist writeth of the doctrine of John Baptist, in the first and third chapter: and that which Luke writes, in the four and twentieth chapter of his gospel, and in the Acts of the Apostles, of the doctrine of Christ and His Apostles; and he will say that all their doctrine is one and the self-same. But to their doctrine is Baptism set to, as a seal to an evidence. Who, therefore, believeth that there are divers seals of their doctrine, or divers baptisms? St John baptised with water; the Lord commended no other element to His disciples than water; neither baptised they any otherwise than with water. They themselves baptised into Christ, into repentance and remission of sins. But St Mark writeth of John Baptist, "John baptised in the wilderness, preaching the baptism of repentance for the remission of sins." (Mark i. 4.) And St Paul speaking of the doctrine and baptism of John, saith: "Johu baptised with the baptism of repentance, saying unto the people that they should believe on Him which should come after him, that is, on Jesus Christ." (Acts xix. 4.) By these testimonies, who cannot gather that the baptism of John and of Christ is altogether the very same? Unless this, peradventure, seem to any man to bring some difference, that John baptised in Him that was to come and should be revealed; but the Apostles into Him that was already revealed. But I see not how so little space of time can bring any differ-

ence; especially, since John spake so much from the beginning of his preaching of Him which should be revealed. For, immediately he did both point Him out present with his finger; and he bare witness that He was present and revealed; and that He should come no more or be revealed. Hereunto is added, that Christ was baptised with no other than with the baptism of John. For if John's baptism were another baptism beside the Baptism of the church of Christ, it would follow, that neither Christ was baptised with our Baptism, neither we in the Baptism of Christ. But Christ did sanctify with His body the baptism of John, and did vouchsafe to be baptised with us into the same fellowship; so that we at this day are also baptised, not with the baptism of John, but of Christ; who by John instituted Baptism, and He himself consecrated the same. Wherefore, Christ in Matthew xxviii. and in Mark xvi. doth not abrogate the Baptism which John began; He doth not institute anew, but commandeth to continue, and to minister the same to them that believe, "In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

Now, whereas John saith himself, "I baptise with water, but He shall baptise you with the Holy Ghost:" (Mark i. 8.) he maketh not difference between his own baptism of water, and Christ's Baptism; but he attributeth somewhat more unto Christ; wherein no man or minister (for they did err which, in time past, baptised with fire) had part with Him, but He alone giveth the baptism of fire; that is, the singular gifts of the Holy Ghost; but first of all the use of tongues under the form of fire. For so this matter is expounded in the Acts; first, by the Lord Christ himself, then, by experience in the church. For the Lord saith, "Depart not from Jerusalem, but wait for the promise of

the Father; whereof, saith He, ye have heard of me: for John truly baptised with water, but ye shall be baptised with the Holy Ghost after these few days." (Acts i. 4, 5.) And, consequently, upon the day of Pentecost they were baptised with the Baptism of Christ, not with water again; but were all filled with the Holy Ghost; cloven tongues, as it were fiery, sitting upon each one of their heads; and they began to speak with other tongues.

In the Acts, the citizens of Samaria are baptised of Philip, with the Baptism of Christ in water, lawfully and fully: but the very same afterward are baptised with the peculiar Baptism of Christ, while by the laying on of hands by Peter and John, they receive the Holy Ghost'. Not that hitherto they were altogether void of the gift of the Holy Ghost: (for how could they believe without the Holy Ghost!) but, for that they were baptised with the visible Baptism of fire beside, and received the gift of tongues, and other excellent graces. As it is, also, read of Cornelius, who verily being first baptised with fire, I mean with the peculiar Baptism of Christ, spake with tongues; and afterward was baptised with water¹. Contrariwise, those twelve disciples at Ephesus were first fully baptised with the baptism of John, and with the Baptism of the water of the christian church or congregation; and afterward, Paul the Apostle laying his hands on them, they are baptised, not with water again, but with fire; Luke bearing witness and saying, "The Holy Ghost came upon them, and they spake with tongues and prophesied²."

But this Baptism of fire, and the visible ministration of the gifts, ceased together with miracles; neither at this day is it usual or common in the church: but the Baptism of

¹ Acts viii. 12—17.

² Acts x. 44—48.

³ Acts xix. 1—6.

water remaineth, which is one and the self-same, whether it be ministered by the hands of John, or of the Apostles, or by divers hands of the ministers of the church. For divers hands make not divers baptisms. Therefore, we rightly believe that there is but one only and simple Baptism of the faithful in all ages. For Paul in express words saith, "There is one Lord, one faith, one baptism, and one God and Father of all." (Ephes. iv. 5, 6.) Whereunto, also, tendeth this saying of the same Apostle, "I thank God that I baptised none of you, but Crispus and Gaius, lest any should say that I had baptised in mine own name." (1 Cor. i. 14, 15.) Upon this apostolic truth, the reverend Fathers of the Council of Constantinople are read to have made this confession in their creed, "I believe one Baptism for the remission of sins." For there is but one church only, one body, one head, and one King, Prince, and High Priest of the catholick church.

Now I am come to expound the rite or ceremony of Baptism. It was simple and but one, from the beginning; and not chargeable or burdenous to the church, through immoderate ceremonies. John baptised in Enon beside Salim, because much water was there⁴; and he baptised in the name of Christ. So did the Apostles likewise. Whereby it remaineth for an undoubted truth, that the very best form of baptising is that which is done by water, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. For so the Lord commandeth in the xxviiith of Matthew. Do you ask how it cometh to pass, that Luke in the Acts maketh mention that Peter and Paul baptised in the name of the Lord⁵; and expresseth not that they baptised in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost? I answer,

⁴ John iii. 23.

⁵ Acts ii. 38 : xix. 5.

that under the name of the Lord, the mystery of the Trinity is comprehended. For when the Lord said, "I and the Father are one";¹ he which is baptised into the Lord, is also baptised into the Father, and so in like manner into the Holy Ghost, which is not divided from them. For verily they have one and the self-same Spirit. For truly Luke saith, that they were baptised of the Apostles in the name of the Lord, whom the Apostles baptised according to the Lord's institution. Some say, Christ is the accomplishment or fulfilling, and the proper object of Baptism: wherefore, it is no marvel that the Apostles baptised into the name of the Lord, who, nevertheless, were commanded to baptise in the name of the Father and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. For all the mysteries of Baptism are laid forth unto us in the only Son of God. Truly we say both, "To baptise into the name of the Lord," and "To baptise in the name of the Lord." The use of speaking after the first manner, is read in the xxviiith of Matthew, and in Luke, Acts xix. For both have *εἰς τὸ ὄνομα*, *In nomen*, "into the name". And so, also, Tertullian interpreteth it, (*Contra Praxeam*, c. 26.) saying, "He commanded that we should be baptised into the Father, and the Son, &c." The latter manner doth the same Luke use in the Acts (x. 48.) saying, *ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι*, and (ii. 38.) *ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι*, that is, "In the name." Moreover, what it is to baptise "into the name," or "in the name" of the Lord, I told you in the last Sermon next before this, that it is to be enrolled into God's household, that he which is baptised may now receive the name of God; and be called the Son of God; yea, and be, as it were, registered into the roll of the children of God; citizens of the kingdom of Heaven. Whereupon, we have

¹ John x. 30.

also names given us in Baptism, that as often as we hear ourselves named, we may remember our Baptism and the mysteries thereof. Neither is it a new thing or strange from the scriptures, that names are given us in baptism: for so it was used also in circumcision, which is to be seen in Luke ii.

Furthermore, the question is asked, whether we ought to baptise with these bare words, "I baptise thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost"? Or whether it be lawful to add or join something else? I think we ought to answer, That it is the servant's duty to add nothing to his Lord's institution; but diligently to keep that which He hath delivered; yea, and advisedly to mark what in baptism the Lord himself and His Apostles did; and holily to imitate the same: that in the church of God, (as Paul hath commanded) "all things may be done decently and in good order." (1 Cor. xiv. 40.) But after that most holy form of baptising set down and delivered, we see two things in holy Baptism and in the use thereof to be observed. For, first, the Apostles, and they that were with the Apostles, did teach very significantly of the promises of God and faith in Christ; which is apparent in the Acts of the Apostles. It is lawful, therefore, in the action or ministration of Baptism, to recite the promises of God; to rehearse the belief; and require faith, either of them that are to be baptised, being of perfect age; or else of them which bring the infants to be baptised. Moreover, when the Lord was baptised of John Baptist in Jordan, He prayed: which thing Luke reporteth of Him in the history of the Gospel². It is lawful, therefore, in the use of Baptism to pray, and solemnly to call upon the name of

² Luke iii. 21.

the Lord. At the first, these prayers were moderate and short, not of a great length and tedious: in process of time there was no measure kept, not only in tedious blessings, but also in divers ceremonies, which they that came after added thereunto. Of the which it shall not seem altogether unprofitable to rehearse somewhat out of the old Doctors.

Tertullian, in his book *De Corona militis*, (c. 3,) saith, “When we go to the font, there, and also a little before in the church, the bishop laying his hand on us, we do confess that we forsake the devil, his pomps, and all his angels. Then are we thrice dipped in the water, not (some leave out not :) answering any thing more than the Lord hath set down in the Gospel. When we be taken out of the font, we taste of milk and honey mingled together; and from that time we abstain from daily washing, by the space of a whole week.” We hear in this an utter denying or renouncing; a third dipping; a tasting of milk and honey; and, after baptism, an abstinence from bathing by a week’s space. In his first book against Marcion, (c. 14,) he maketh mention also of oil. Truly milk is meet for children, unto whom, also, they that be of perfect age, being baptised, are likened. Beside this, in the Old Testament there is often mention made of the land of promise flowing with milk and honey. Those things were first offered to be tasted of them that are baptised, to give them to understand that Christ Jesus being their captain, and having passed over Jordan, they might, by an infallible hope, have an inheritance in the land of promise. St Jerome witnesseth that wine was mingled with milk, and saith (*Comment. ad Isaiam*, lib. xv.) “The Lord provoketh us not only to buy wine, but milk also; which signifieth the innocency of infants; which type and custom is, even unto this day. kept in the

West churches, to give them that are born anew in Christ, wine and milk." At this day neither of them both is given to infants, no not of them which will seem to be zealous maintainers of the old ceremonies. They believe, in the mean while, that their omitting of these ceremonies is without sin, and needeth no satisfaction. Now, also, we may gather out of the sixth book of Augustine *de Bapt. contra Donat.* c. 25, that they used divers, and what prayers they thought good about Baptism. The same Augustine (*Contra Pelag. et Celest.* lib. 11. c. 40.) saith: "In baptising, of children they first conjure and blow away all contrary power." Which, also, the infants, by the words of them that bear them, do answer that they renounce. This ceremony he mentioneth, also, *Libro primo de Nupt. et Concup. ad Valer.* c. 20: et *libro 11. cap. 18*: "It is said in the ecclesiastical Decrees, that the holy church throughout the whole world used that ceremony." Again, Augustine, (*in Epistola ad Bonifac.* 23,) saith that the godfathers do answer for the faith of the children; and confess their faith. "We ask them," (saith he), "which offer the infants and say, 'Believeth he in God?' (who being of that age, knoweth not whether there be a God or no:) They answer, 'He believeth:' and so they answer unto every question which is asked." The same Augustine, in his book *De Trinitate*, lib. xv. c. 26, maketh mention also of oil, wherewith they that were baptised were anointed. Rabanus Maurus, Bishop of Mentz, a long time following after Augustine, reckoneth up many more ceremonies of Baptism. For he, (*De Institutione Cleric.* lib. 1. c. 27.) saith, "They are marked in the forehead and heart with the cross in Baptism, that the devil seeing that mark, may know that that sheep is not of his fold. Also, consecrated salt is put into the child's mouth, that being seasoned

with the salt of wisdom, he may be free from the stench of wickedness; and rot no more with the worms of sin. His ears and nostrils are touched with spittle, the word ‘Ephphatha,’ used of our Saviour, being thereunto added; that by the virtue of Christ, the high Priest, his ears may be opened to receive the knowledge of God, and to hear the will and commandments of God. Then the child is blessed, and his breast anointed with holy oil; that no relicks of the enemy may lurk and remain in him. After this, in the name of the holy Trinity, he is baptised, being dipped thrice in the water.” And, in his 28th chapter: “And being baptised, he immediately is signed in the forehead with the Chrism; with a prayer together following, that he may be made an inheritor of the kingdom of Christ, and of Christ may be called a Christian. And in the 29th chapter: “After Baptism, there is delivered to the Christian a white garment, signifying pureness and innocency.” Also, for this cause were the baptised clothed with white garments, that they might now remember that they were set free; and of servants and bond slaves of the Devil, made the free men of Christ Jesus. Moreover, white colour in times past was consecrated to victories and triumphs: whereby it may seem that the white garment was therefore given to them that were baptised, that they might be mindful that whilst they live here on earth, they must continually fight and overcome in Christ. For the life of man is a warfare upon earth. And certainly whereas offerings, also, began to be given to the baptised by the god-fathers, that seemeth to have been borrowed from warfare. For by the offering or earnest (which we Switzers call, *Die Eingebinde*) he that is baptised is warned of his faith given in Baptism; always to be mindful what a captain he forsook, and into what

garrison he was entertained; wherein he must keep his faith given to the new captain, Christ. Many other things of this kind, which I find among writers of this latter age, I willingly pass over; lest I should seem to abuse your patience and gentleness. And who perceiveth not, yea, that at this day, other of this kind innumerable new devices are added to Baptism. Therefore, the safest and surest way is to build upon the first foundations of the blessed Apostles. For if antiquity seem to bolster up these last invented ceremonies, who dare deny that the authority of the Apostles doth excel it many ways? For the Apostles were before them all which have lastly invented, and delivered those manifold ceremonies to be used in Baptism.

This, also, cometh in question, Whether we ought to baptise with bare fair water, or with consecrated water; and why the Lord commanded to baptise with water? St Cyprian (*Epist. ad Januar. et cœt. de heret. baptiz.*) saith, "The water ought to be cleansed and sanctified before of the priest, to wash away the sins of the man that is baptised." But the examples and testimonies of the holy scripture do more prevail with me, than the authority of Cyprian or any other man, whatsoever it be. This good man of God was, also, deceived in another place about the mystery of Baptism; so that we must read his writings with judgment. The scripture telleth us that John Baptist, and the Apostles and faithful disciples of Christ, baptised with water not consecrated. For what can be spoken or read more plain, than that John baptised in Jordan? Yea, that Christ himself and His Apostles, also, baptised in the river Jordan? Where, or how, did the Apostles consecrate the water of baptism in the Acts of the Apostles? Philip when the Eunuch showed him the water, as they journeyed, he baptised him out of that

pure and clear fountain. Beside this, I have declared, in the Sermon next going before, how little pureness is in common form of Baptism, whereby the font is consecrated. But if any man think that we ought to baptise with consecrated or holy water, and by consecrated, do neither understand anointed, or prepared with crosses, or sanctified with charms, but chosen to holy uses; I would stand in contention with him never a whit. For the water of baptism, in very deed, is holy; not in respect of the words rehearsed, or by crosses and other signs made: but because God hath instituted it; and in respect of the holy use and prayers of the godly. Of which matter I spake not long ago, when I intreated of the sanctification or consecration of the Sacraments.

And Christ commanded His disciples to baptise with water, for divers causes. For types or figures went before Baptism in water; as the flood; as the Red sea, through which the people of Israel passed; as divers cleansings and set washings mentioned in the law. Neither do the Apostles of Christ dissemble those things. For Peter saith that Noah was saved in the water of the flood, but the wicked drowned in the water¹. Paul affirmeth that all our fathers were baptised by Moses in the cloud and in the sea². Therefore mortification and vivification is prefigured. And, truly, the principal badge of the New Testament is Baptism; witnessing that full remission of sins is brought unto us by Christ. And the holy Prophets of God, by the mouth of the Lord foreshewing and promising this, have willingly shadowed out this inestimable benefit by water: therefore Baptism must be ministered in water. This, also, served notably to represent the mystery. Of which matter I have

¹ 1 Pet. iii. 20.

² 1 Cor. x. 2.

spoken in my last Sermon, when I intreated of the analogy or likeness of signs. And for these causes chiefly, Baptism ought to be ministered in this, and not in any other element.

There is contention also about this, Whether once or thrice he that is baptised ought to be dipped or sprinkled with water? Truly the Apostles have not curiously commanded any thing in this behalf. So that it is free either to sprinkle or to dip. Sprinkling seemeth to have been used of the old Fathers: for honesty and shamefacedness forbiddeth to uncover the body. And also the (weak) state of infants for the most part cannot away with dipping; since sprinkling also doeth as much as dipping. And it standeth in the choice of him that ministereth baptism, to sprinkle him either once or thrice, after the custom of the church whereof he is minister. Tertullian, (*contra Praxeam*,) saith: "The Lord commanded to baptise into the Father, and into the Son, and into the Holy Ghost. Not into one: for we are baptised not once, but thrice; at each name into each person." And Gregory, answering Leonard the bishop, (*Epist.* lib. 1. indic. ix. c. 41.) saith: "A diverse custom hindereth nothing the holy church, so that it be done in one faith. We by thrice dipping do signify the mystery of Christ's lying in the grave three days." Again, the reverend Fathers in the fourth Council held at Toledo, do allow but one dipping in baptism; and then add immediately this reason, "And lest any should doubt of the mystery of this Sacrament, why we allow but one dipping, he may see therein our death, and resurrection. For the dipping into the water, is, as it were, the going down into the grave: and the coming up again out of the water, is the rising again out of the grave. Also he may perceive that therein is showed the Unity of the Godhead, and the Trinity of the Persons. The

Unity is figured, when we dip once; the Trinity, when we baptise in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." This I do not allege to stay myself upon man's testimonies, but by man's testimony to show that it is free to follow that which serveth most the edifying of the church.

Also, there is a question moved touching the place of Baptism: Whether it be not lawful to baptise in any other place than in the church? I say that the church is consecrated to ministries, and to the worship of God, and, therefore, that comeliness itself requireth to baptise openly in the church. But if necessity will not permit this, the baptism of Christ is tied to no place. For we hear that Philip baptised out of the fountain in the broad field. Yet let us take heed that we make not necessity a pretence for our lewd affections: but let all things in the church be clean, which pertain unto Baptism: let all superfluity be laid aside: let all filth and uncleanness be banished: let all things (as saith the Apostle) be done honestly and in order.

Touching the time, there is no law prescribed of the Lord: that is left free to the judgment of the godly. They that believed the preaching of St Peter at Jerusalem in the day of Pentecost; the Eunuch, also, whom Philip baptised; and Cornelius the Centurion likewise: finally, Paul the Apostle at Damascus; yea, and Lydia, the purple seller, a religious or devout woman; and the keeper of the prison; they of Philippi, also, and other faithful men and women,—as soon as they had tasted of the gifts and graces of Christ, and believed His word, forthwith they desired to be baptised: they did not foade it off till another next time. Wherefore they do very well, which neither in themselves, nor in their families do linger in receiving baptism. The delaying of circumcision in his children, fell not out well

unto Moses. As, therefore, we grant that the time of baptism is free, so it ought to be our duty, to take heed that we abuse not our liberty: being always mindful of these words spoken by God, “The uncircumcised man-child, in whose flesh the foreskin is not circumcised, that soul shall be cut off from his people, because he hath broken my covenant.” (Gen. xvii. 14.) But we are not ignorant that Baptism came into the place of circumcision: therefore, the omitting of Baptism is not free. There were some in the time of Cyprian which held opinion, that baptism ought to be received on the eighth day, after the manner of circumcision. But Cyprian, and the sixty-six Bishops and Elders that were with him in the Council, ordained the contrary: to wit, that every one without any delay, should receive baptism, and procure the same speedily in their family. That place is extant, *Epist. ad Fidum de infant. baptiz.* Furthermore, Socrates the historiographer (lib. v. c. 21.) saith, “I know, also, another custom in Thessaly, according to the which they baptise only on the days of Easter. Whereby it cometh to pass, that saving a very small number, they die unbaptised.” But after a certain time, there was a law made that the infants of the faithful should not be baptised but at the feasts of Easter and Whitsuntide: they excepted the time of necessity. We may read this in *Decret. Syrici Pont.* in Isidore: and in the Epistles of Pope Leo unto the Bishops of Campania, and Sicily¹. But the things that moved them hereunto, are such as may be easily disproved and overthrown. Truly, from the beginning, the time of Baptism was not so limited. Nevertheless, that Law of baptising the faithful at the feast of Easter and Pentecost, was revived by Pepin, Charles, Lodovick, and Lothar, French kings, and

¹ *Concil. Labb. et Coss. Tom. II. p. 1017: Tom. III. p. 1297.*

was spread far, as their dominions reached far. Many things are sung in the service of the Papists, at the time of Easter and Whitsuntide, which are not understood but by this law and custom. At the length it grew out of use, and the faithful were baptised as occasion and opportunity first served.

This is also in controversy, Who ought to baptise, and what the baptiser worketh? Of the last I will speak first. The baptiser giveth visibly the Sacrament of regeneration, and a testimony of the remission of sins: but the Lord, by His Spirit, doth invisibly regenerate, and forgiveth sins, and sealeth the regeneration. John and the Apostles baptise with water: Christ baptiseth with the Holy Ghost: not only with the visible sign of fire, and the gift of tongues, but even He only giveth all spiritual gifts. Which thing the ancient Fathers that they might expressly declare, did diligently distinguish between power and ministry. For Augustine (*Tract. in Joh. v.*) saith, "It is one thing to baptise in way of ministry: another thing to baptise by power. Our Lord Jesus Christ could, if He had would, have given power to any one servant to give His baptism, as in His stead; and could translate or remove from Himself power to baptise, and place it in one of His servants; and give as great force to baptism being translated or removed into His servant, as it should have been given by the Lord. He would not do so for this purpose,¹ that the hope of them which were baptised should hang on him of whom they acknowledge themselves to be baptised. He would not, therefore, that a servant should settle his hope in a servant. And therefore, cried the Apostle, when he saw men willing to put their hope and trust in him, 'Was Paul crucified for you? Or were ye baptised in the name of Paul?' Paul

¹ 1 Cor. i. 13.

therefore baptised as a minister, not as the power itself; but the Lord baptised as the power." And, again, "John Baptist, learned by the dove, 'Upon whomsoever thou shalt see the Spirit descending like unto a dove, and tarry still upon him, the same is He which baptiseth with the Holy Ghost².' Therefore, O dove, let not deceivers seduce thee, which say, 'We baptise:' O dove, acknowledge what the Dove taught; 'The same is He which baptiseth with the Holy Ghost.' By the Dove it is known that it is He; and dost thou think that thou art baptised by his power, by whose ministry thou art baptised? If thou be of that mind, thou art not yet in the body of the Dove: and if thou be not in the body of the Dove, it is no marvel, because thou hast not simplicity. For simplicity especially is figured by the dove. John learned by the simplicity of the dove, that 'this is He which baptiseth with the Holy Ghost'." Thus far he. Furthermore, the minister of the church, being lawfully ordained, ought to baptise. The Donatists contend, that none can baptise but he which is pure and holy. They boldly avouched that the baptism was fruitless and void of effect, which a lewd living minister or defiled with wicked vices did administer. Against these Augustine gravely disputed, and convinced them by the truth of the scripture. He, in his 166th Epistle, saith: "See how perversely and wickedly that is spoken, which ye are wont to say, 'Because, if he be a good man, he sanctifieth him whom he baptiseth; but if he be an evil man and he not know so much which is baptised, then God sanctifieth him.' If this be true, then men ought rather to wish to be baptised of ministers unknown to be evil, than of them which are known to be good, that they

² John i. 33.

may rather be sanctified of God than of man. But far from us be this madness. Why then do we not speak truth, and are rightly wise? Because that grace belongeth alway to God, and the Sacrament is His, and the ministry only committed unto man; who if he be good, he cleaveth to God, and worketh with God: but if he be evil, God worketh by him the visible form of the Sacrament, but He himself giveth the invisible grace. Herein let us all be wise, and let there be no schisms or division among us." The same Augustine, in his third book *Contra Iulianum Pelagianum*, cap. 49, doth plentifully set forth the same matter. And because we have, also, handled the same thing in the end of our former sermon next before this, it is needless to speak one thing twice.

Here is a question objected unto us touching the baptism of Midwives: Whether women Midwives upon the point of necessity, that is, when the infant is in jeopardy to die, before he comes to be baptised at the hands of the Ecclesiastical minister, ought [to] and may baptise? We answer, that Baptism is a Sacrament of the church, and that women are forbidden to minister in the church: therefore, that they neither can nor ought to baptise; as they are by no means permitted to teach. The laws of the Apostle are well known: "But I suffer not a woman," saith Paul, "to teach; neither to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence." (1 Tim. ii. 12.) The same law is repeated of the same Apostle, (1 Cor. xiv. 34), and is confirmed by God's law. Man's testimonies agree with God's: for Tertullian, in his book *De Velandis Virginibus*, (cap. 9.) saith,—“It is not permitted unto a woman to speak in the church, much less to teach, or to baptise, nor to offer; neither to take to herself the execution of any man's office; much less the priest's.” This

also is read repeatedly in the fourth Council of Carthage¹; where, also, Aurelius Augustine is said to have been present. Epiphanius, Bishop of Salome in Cyprus, disputing against divers heresies, and confuting Marcion, (*Hær.* XXII. vel XLII. §. 4.) saith,—“He also giveth women leave and licence to baptise.” He saith as much of the Quintilian and Peputian hereticks. (*Hær.* XXIX. vel XLIX.) He, also, reasoning against the hereticks Collyridiani, (*Hær.* LIX. vel LXXIX. §. 3.) saith,—“If women were commanded to sacrifice unto God, or to execute any regular thing in the church, then Mary ought rather to do sacrifice in the New Testament, which was made worthy to carry in her own arms the King of all kings, the heavenly God, the Son of God; whose womb was made a temple and dwelling for the dispensation of the Lord in the flesh, being prepared for that purpose through the bountifulness and marvellous mystery of God. But it did not so please God. But neither was it committed or granted unto her to baptise: otherwise her Son might have been rather baptised of her than of John.” The same author addeth,—“And truly there is in the church an order of women-ministers, called women-deacons, but not permitted to sacrifice; neither to attempt any thing, but for reverence sake of women-kind; or for the hour of bathing; or visiting; or for affection and travail.” Whereas they object the example of Zipporah the Midianite, wife of Moses, which circumcised her son in the time of necessity², that doth establish no common law; as the particular example of Deborah, maketh not all women Judges³. For there are many peculiar things done in the scripture, out of which, if any man shall go about to draw general things and common laws, he shall bring in absurdities innumerable. What if Moses in the same place doth

¹ Can. 100.² Exod. iv. 25.³ Judg. iv. 4.

only describe the deed of his wife moved thereunto by anger and displeasure, and not for religion's sake, to perform the ministry unto God? For she, grudging against her husband, yea, and against God, took the foreskin of her son which was cut away, and cast it at his father's, her husband's, feet, not without reproach saying,—“A bloody husband art thou unto me.” As if you should say, *Ich habe wol ein blütig mann an dir.* And though the Angel was appeased with Moses, because he seemed to allow the deed of the woman as well pleasing to God; yet that is more to be imputed to the mercy of God, rather than to the righteousness of the woman's deed. It did grievously displease God that David had slain Urias, and moreover had taken Beersheba to himself to wife; yet, of His goodness and singular mercy, He vouchsafed to call Solomon who was born of Beersheba, by this name Jedidiah, because the Lord loved him¹: so the gracious Lord is, also, reconciled with Moses, who either by his own negligence or through the fault of his Midianitish wife, lingered circumcision in the body of their son, against the law, longer than was meet; and is content, too, and taketh in good part the circumcision which the woman performed rather of indignation than for religion; yet he will not that after her, as a perfect example, other women should circumsise.

But, (you say) by Baptism ministered by a woman, the peril of death or eternal damnation was to be prevented, into which the infant falleth if he depart this world without Baptism. My answer is, When the infant being newly delivered out of his mother's womb, departeth with too too speedy death, so that the parents cannot, though they would never so fain, bring him to be baptised of the minister of

¹ 2 Sam. xii.

the church: this pinch of necessity, truly, is not to the damnation or death of the infant; because he, being received into the covenant by the grace of God, is delivered from death through the blood of the Son of God. We are not destitute of testimonies of scripture duly serving in this behalf. In the law it was not lawful to circumcise an infant before the eighth day; but it is certain that very many departed out of this world before the eighth day: yet in the mean while, if any man child had departed the third or fourth day after his birth, no condemnation was imputed unto him. For otherwise David, a very sound man in religion, and one that loved his children dearly, and one very desirous of the salvation of his household, when his child was dead, which was begotten and born unto him of Beer-sheba, could not have showed himself so cheerful to his courtiers; to whom, among other things, he said that he should go unto the dead child; to wit, into the land of the living². If it were no danger unto women children to die uncircumcised, (for they without circumcision were saved) neither, verily, shall it be damnable for men children, being not baptised, to die at the point of necessity. For we oftentimes said, that holy Baptism entered and took the place of circumcision. Hitherto pertain the testimonies out of the law and the prophets. In the law the Lord protesteth more than once, that He hath a most certain care and regard of infants. In Jonas He expressly professeth that He hath a consideration and a respect of those that are not yet come to the years of discretion. For the Lord spared the most famous city of Nineveh, partly for their sakes³.

Thou sayest,—“These testimonies of the Old Testament pertain nothing to us, which live under the New Testa-

² 2 Sam. xii. 23.

³ Jonah iv. 11.

ment." I answer,—That God after the coming of Christ in the flesh, is not more rigorous unto us than He was before Christ's coming. For if it were so, what should we say else, but that Christ came not to fulfil, but to weaken and abolish the promises of God: since that in times past among them of old, the grace and the promise were effectual in necessity without the sign; but now among us, being without the sign, they begin to be void and of no force. Wherefore I, trusting to God's mercy and His true and undoubted promise, believe that infants departing out of this world by too too timely death, before they can be baptised, are saved by the mere mercy of God, in the power of His truth and promise through Christ, who saith in the Gospel, "Suffer little ones to come unto me, for of such is the kingdom of God." (Mark x. 14.) Again, "It is not the will of my Father which is in heaven, that one of these little ones should perish." (Matt. xviii. 14.) For verily God, who cannot lie, hath said, "I am thy God, and the God of thy seed after thee." (Gen. xvii. 7.) Whereupon Saint Paul, also, affirmeth, that they are born holy which are begotten of holy parents¹. Not that of flesh and blood any holy thing is born; "For that which is born of the flesh, is flesh²:" but because that holiness and separation from the common seed of men is of promise, and by the right of the covenant. For we are all by nature and natural birth, born the sons of wrath, death, and damnation. But Paul attributeth a special privilege to the children of the faithful, wherewith, by the grace of God, they which by nature were unclean are purified. So the same Apostle in another place doth gather holy branches of an holy root³. And, again, elsewhere saith,—"If by the sin of one many be

¹ 1 Cor. vii. 14.

² John iii. 6.

³ Rom. xi. 16.

dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift of grace which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many." (Rom. v. 15.) And therefore Augustine doubted not to say,—“As all which die, die no otherwise but in Adam, even so all that are made alive, are not made alive but in Christ. And upon this, whosoever shall say unto us, that any, in the resurrection of the dead, can be made alive otherwise than in Christ, he is to be abhorred and detested as a common plague of christian faith.” (*Ad Hierony. Epist.* 28.)

They object, ‘By this means the use of Baptism is made void and quite taken away. Yea, Pelagianism is sprung up again, which with so great travail, St Augustine, with many other learned and holy men, beat down and kept under. He falsely spake that said, “The soul whose foreskin is not circumcised, shall be cut off from his people, because he hath broken my covenant.” (Gen. xviii. 14.) He falsely spake that said, “Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a man be born of water, and of the spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.” (John iii. 5.) For if these sayings be true, and children not baptised; truly the sequel is, that they, dying without baptism, are not saved.’ I answer, That I weaken holy Baptism by no means; much less take it quite away, when I defend that infants, upon the pinch of necessity, not being guilty of the contempt of God, or wicked negligence, are not damned though they die unbaptised. For so salvation should be tied to the sign, and the promise of God should be made void; as though that alone without the sign, upon the point of necessity, were vain, and could work nothing: and as if the hand of God were shortened, and bound, as it were, to the sign. For otherwise, I teach, by all means, that infants are to be

baptised; and that baptism is not to be delayed negligently, or to be put off maliciously: but, in the mean time, if by too too speedy death they depart unbaptised, I exhort and charge that a good hope and confidence be had in the truth and mercy of the Lord, who promiseth in the law and the Gospel, that He is the God of young infants; and that His will is, that not so much as one of His little ones should perish. With Pelagius and Pelagians we have nothing to do: neither are we ignorant what St Augustine hath written unto Jerome, (*Epist.* 28.) in this behalf: "Who-soever shall say" (saith he) "that infants which leave this life, not having been partakers of Christ's Sacrament of Baptism, are quickened and made alive in Him, this man doubtless doth set himself both against the preaching of the Apostles, and condemneth the whole church: where for this cause they make haste, and run with their children to have them baptised; for that without doubt they believe, that by no means otherwise they could be made alive in Christ." And against the Pelagians, (*Epist.* 106.) "The Apostolical seat, dealing against Pelagius, accurseth them which said, that infants unbaptised have life everlasting." The same Augustine (*De Anima et ejus Origine*, lib. 1. c. 9.) to Rhenatus, disputeth against Vincentius Victor, who granted that infants are intralled to original sin, and yet nevertheless are saved though they be not baptised: against whom he bringeth forth this saying of our Saviour, "Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." But we which condemn both Pelagius and Pelagians, do affirm both those things which they deny; to wit, that infants are born in original sin, and, therefore, that the sanctification of Christ is necessary unto them, without which they are not saved. Again, we defend

and maintain, that the same infants ought to be baptised if it be possible; though, by the right of the covenant, they belong to the body of Christ, and are sanctified by the blood of Christ. Pelagius taught, that infants ought not to be baptised, for that he held opinion they are without all fault; or any sin, blame, and offence. That wicked and ungodly man, therefore, did not acknowledge, either our own corruption, or the benefit which God hath performed by, in, and through Christ. Yet canst thou find neither of these in our assertion and doctrine: wherefore we take no part with the Pelagians. St Augustine, in that self-same epistle unto St Jerome, expressly saith, “Thou art none of them which say there is no guilt drawn from Adam, from which the infant should be washed by baptism.” And against Julian, also (Lib. 1. c. 2.) he proveth by the sentences of the holy fathers, that infants have original sin; and thereupon gathereth that, therefore, infants ought to be baptised, because they have sin. For the Pelagians gathered clean contrary. They have no sin, therefore they are not to be baptised. For the council of Carthage writeth thus to Innocent¹:—“The Pelagians deny that infants are to be baptised: ‘for these,’ say they, ‘perished not, neither is there any thing to be saved; because there is nothing in them that is corrupt or wicked, &c’.” But we, insomuch as we believe that infants are born in sin; yea, and that they are both born the children of wrath, and are corrupt and wicked: moreover, because we believe that the Son of God was born without sin of a pure virgin, to fulfil, and confirm God’s promises, which do not shut out infants from salvation, but let them in as joint partners in the league: therefore, we hold and defend that they are to be baptised.

¹ *Concil. Labb. et Cossart. Tom. II. p. 1535.*

And, therefore, this reason gathered of Augustine (*De peccat. merit. et remiss.* lib. 111. c. 4.) we cannot simply allow:—out of the fellowship of Christ, no man cometh unto life; but by Baptism we are joined as members into the body of Christ, and have fellowship with Him: therefore, infants which are not to be baptised, are without the fellowship of Christ, and therefore are condemned. For as we deny not that we are grafted into the body of Christ by partaking of the Sacraments, (as we declared in our last sermon of Sacraments, next and immediately going before this) so we have elsewhere shewed, and that too oftentimes already very largely, that the first beginning of our uniting or fellowship with Christ, is not wrought by the Sacraments: but that the same uniting of fellowship which was founded and grounded upon the promise, and, by the grace of God through the Holy Ghost, was communicated unto us and ours, yea, before the use of the Sacraments; is continued and sealed unto us by the participation, or receiving of the Sacraments. Although, therefore, an infant die without Baptism, and being shut out by necessity from having fellowship with Christ, so that he be neither partaker, nor yet sealed by the visible sign of the covenant; yet he is not altogether an alien or stranger from Christ, to whom he is fastened with the spiritual knot of the covenant, by the virtue whereof he is saved.

The place of Gen. xvii. alleged of cutting off the uncircumcised from the people of God, in consideration of the time, it fitly agreeth to those that are of perfect age and well grown in years, and not to babes or infants: which thing is seen in Moses, whom the angel of the Lord, for neglecting circumcision, or for delaying it longer than was lawful, would have slain, as he testifieth of himself. Neither

am I ignorant that certain old interpreters refer that not to Moses, but to Eleazar the son of Moses. But the very course of the history and the circumstances of the same, do sufficiently prove, that the danger lay on the father's, and not on the son's neck. What if a reason be added in the words of the law, which by no means agreeth to infants, "Therefore shall the uncircumcised perish (saith he) because he hath broken my covenant¹?" So that if we consider that circumcision, in the very same place, was commanded not only to infants, but to such as were of perfect age; as to Abraham, Ishmael, and others desiring visibly to be joined into the fellowship of God, we are not to marvel that destruction is threatened to the disobedient. For if any man at this day understand and know the Lord's ordinance, comprehended in these His words, "He which shall believe and be baptised shall be saved," will yet nevertheless not be baptised, but boasteth that faith is sufficient for him unto salvation; that baptism is 'superfluous; he hath despised the ordinance of God, and is condemned for a rebel and an enemy to God. Furthermore, that place of John iii. is not to be understood of the outward sign of holy Baptism, but simply of the inward and most spiritual regeneration of the Holy Spirit, which, when Nicodemus understood not perfectly, the Lord figured and made the same manifest unto him, by parables of water and of the Spirit; that is to say, of the wind or the air; by elements very base and familiar. For, by and by, he addeth, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh, &c." Again, "The wind bloweth where it listeth," &c. which must needs be meant of the air. For the other part of the comparison followeth, "So is every one that is born of the Spirit." Furthermore, he

¹ Gen. xvii. 14.

addeth, "If I tell you of earthly things and ye believe not, how will you believe if I tell you of heavenly things?" But the argument which He put forth was not altogether earthly. For this is the argument of His whole dispensation: "Except a man be born from above, he cannot see the kingdom of God:" that is to say, unless a man be renewed, and, as it were, born again by the Spirit of God which is given from above, that is to say, poured into him from heaven, he cannot be saved. The doctrine is altogether heavenly: but the means whereby He delivered, declared, and set forth this heavenly doctrine, is earthly. For, by things taken from the earth, He shadowed out to man, being gross of understanding and earthly, a spiritual and heavenly thing, and laid it open, as it were, even to the view of his eyes. As by water and air oftentimes the qualities of bodies are changed, and as the effect and working of water and the air in bodies is marvellous; in like manner is the working of the Holy Ghost in the soul of man, which it changeth, purifieth, and quickeneth, &c. For so the Lord himself afterward (which I told you even now) expoundeth another parable of the Spirit. And because all old writers, for the most part, by water have understood sacramental water, that is to say, holy Baptism, we also receive this interpretation. For we willingly grant that baptism is necessary to salvation, as well in such as are of perfect age as also in babes or infants; so that necessity constrain not the contrary. For otherwise, if we go forward stubbornly, with St Augustine, to condemn infants by this place, truly we shall be compelled also to condemn even those that are baptised, if they depart this life without partaking of the body and blood of Christ. For St Augustine being infected with the like error, defendeth

(*De peccat. merit. et remiss.* lib. 1. c. 20.) That the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper ought to be put into the infant's mouth, or else they are in danger of death and damnation, because it is written: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you." Therefore after this same order he placeth these two sentences: "Except a man be born of water and of the spirit, he cannot see the kingdom of God." And, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, &c." So that if thou persist obstinately in St Augustine's sentence, verily thou wilt condemn the whole church at this day, which denieth the partaking of the Lord's Supper unto infants. But if in this thing there be admitted a convenient interpretation, why are ye so rigorous and obstinate in another, and the like place and cause not disagreeable? What will you say if in this opinion, Augustine doth not satisfy, no not himself, in all and every point? To a layman he thinketh it venial sin, if he baptise in time of necessity. He cannot tell whether it be godlily spoken, that Baptism ministered by a layman ought to be iterated, or done again. But how much better and safer had it been, letting the necessity of baptism pass which had no lawful causes, to hold opinion that infants, if they be not prevented by death, ought to be baptised of the minister of the church, in the church; their parents procuring it as opportunity first serveth: and that, too too speedy and sudden death, (which we call the pinch of necessity,) is no let or hindrance to salvation to them which are not yet brought to be baptised. The same Augustine trembleth, and is afraid to determine of the punishment of damned infants for not being baptised: neither knoweth truly what he might certainly say. In his first book, *De anima et ejus orig.* c. 9, he saith, "Let no

man promise to infants unbaptised, as it were, a middle place of rest or felicity, whatsoever it be or wheresoever it be, between hell and the kingdom of heaven." But that sentence is for the most part received of all men: whereupon, also, the infants are buried in the churchyard in a certain middle place, between the profane and holy ground. And, again, the same Augustine, (*Contra Julianum Pelagianum*, lib. v. c. 8.) writeth, "That those infants of all other shall come in the easiest damnation." And immediately he addeth: "Which, of what manner, and how great it shall be, although I cannot describe, yet I dare not say that it were better for them to be as no body, than to be there." And again, in his Epistle to St Jerome¹, he saith: "When I come to determine of the punishments of little infants, believe me, I am driven into narrow straits; neither find I any thing at all to answer." Here, also, may that be added which he disputeth upon. (*Contra Donatist*. lib. xv. c. 22, 23.) Touching the thief which was crucified with Christ; among other things saying, "That then Baptism is fulfilled invisibly, when, not the contempt of religion but, the point of necessity excludeth and shutteth out from visible baptism." Why then should we not believe, also, that in infants departing by too too timely death, baptism is invisibly performed; since that, not contempt of religion but, the extremity of necessity, which cannot be avoided, excludeth and debarreth them from visible baptism. And since very many at this day do grant, that any man of perfect age without baptism, in the point of necessity, may be saved, so that he have a desire of baptism; why then may not the godly desires of the parents acquit the infants, now newly born, from guiltiness. But thus much hitherto.

¹ Epist. 28.

Touching this, also, who are to be baptised, both in time past and our age there hath been bitter jarring. Pelagius, in time past, denied that infants ought to be baptised, which we heard even now. Before Pelagius' time, Auxentius Arianus, with his sectaries, denied that they are to be baptised. Some in the time of St Bernard denied the same; as we may gather out of his writings. The Anabaptists at this day, a kind of men raised up of Satan to destroy the Gospel, deny it likewise. But the Catholick truth, which is delivered unto us in the holy scriptures, doth simply pronounce, that all they are to be baptised, whom God acknowledgeth for His people, and giveth sentence that they are partakers of purification or sanctification or remission of sins. For in all this treatise concerning the Sacraments I have already, and do now show, that Baptism is a badge or cognisance of the people of God, and an assured token of our purification by Christ. Therefore, since the young babes and infants of the faithful are in the number or reckoning of God's people, and partakers of the promise touching the purification through Christ; it followeth of necessity, that they are as well to be baptised, as they that be of perfect age which profess the Christian faith.

But there is a busy disputation begun,—Who be the people of God, and partakers of remission of sins by Christ? So that the disputation is touching the secret election of God, and other hard questions depending on this thing. But briefly and simply we can rid our hands of this. We say that the people of God are acknowledged, either by men's confession of the Christian faith, or else by the bountiful promise of God. By men's confession; for we acknowledge them to be the children of God, who being now grown to perfect age, do openly confess the true God; that God

is their God; and that Jesus Christ is their Saviour. But that confession is either unfeignedly, or hypocritically made. Unfeignedly, as when St Peter saith, "Thou art Christ the son of the living God¹." When the Eunuch saith, "I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God²:" but hypocritically, as when Simon Magus in the Acts of the Apostles saith, 'That he believeth in Jesus Christ³.' But whether a man believe unfeignedly, or hypocritically, when he maketh open confession of his faith in Christ, (the secrets of the heart God only seeth: for He only is rightly believed to be the searcher of men's hearts) it belongeth not to us, if he make a right confession, to separate or cast him away from the people of God. For Philip did not cast off or put back Simon Magus; but, upon his confession, received him for a faithful man; and baptised him as a faithful man; though he in very deed, and before God, were an hypocrite. In the first sermon of this Decade we declared that hypocrites also are reckoned in the church, till time they be revealed: but concerning remission of sins, those only among them that be of perfect age do obtain it, which unfeignedly believe: which, in another place, is often showed. St Peter said to Simon Magus, though he were baptised, "Thou hast neither part nor fellowship in this business, because thy heart is not right in the sight of God." (Acts viii. 21.) Furthermore, by the free and bountiful promise of God, not only by the confession of men, we esteem and acknowledge the people of God. For to whomsoever the Lord promiseth that He will be their God; and whomsoever He receiveth, and acknowledgeth for His, those no man, without an horrible offence, may exclude from the number of the faithful. And God promiseth that He will not only

¹ Matt. xvi. 16.

² Acts viii. 37.

³ Acts viii. 13.

be the God of them that confess Him, but of infants also: He promiseth to them His grace and remission of sins. Who, therefore, gainsaying the Lord of all things, will yet deny that infants belong to God; are His; and that they are made partakers of purification through Christ? And that God acknowledgeth infants for His, and sanctifieth them, by the very sum of the covenant it is manifest⁴: “I will make my covenant between me and thee,” saith the Lord unto Abraham, “and thy seed after thee in their generations, by an everlasting covenant, that I may be God unto thee and to thy seed after thee.” (Gen. xvii. 7.) There is added circumcision, a sign of sanctification, whereof I spake abundantly, when, according to order, I intreated of circumcision. Neither is there any cause why any man should fear, that with circumcision and the ceremonies of the law, the promise is abrogated; and that by the coming of Christ the covenant is broken and annihilated. For we said even now, that Christ came to fulfil the promises of God and not to break them. And, therefore, the Lord in the gospel speaketh of infants, that is to say, which have not as yet confessed the faith, and saith, “Suffer little children to come unto me, and forbid them not, for of such is the kingdom of God.” (Mark x. 14.) And though it be said “of such,” and not, “of those,” yet no man is so ignorant but understandeth there is a likeness between those things which are compared between themselves. Therefore, if the kingdom of God belongeth unto them that are of perfect age, because they are become like little children; surely it followeth of necessity, that the inheritance of the kingdom of heaven belongeth also to infants or little children. For it followeth in the gospel, “Whosoever shall not re-

⁴ Gen. xvii. 2—10.

ceive the kingdom of God, as a little child, he shall in no wise enter therein." (Mark x. 15.) Therefore it behoveth the heirs of the kingdom of God to be first infants or little children. And who knoweth not, that no man, unless he be sanctified and purified, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven? Children enter into the kingdom of God; therefore, they are purified, to wit, by the grace of God. For by their nature and birth they are unclean, and sinners; but for Christ's sake they are purified: who said, that "He came to seek and to save, that which was lost." (Luke xix. 10.) Paul, also, expressly testifieth, that "by the sin of one—Adam, sin came on all men unto condemnation: and, that by the righteousness of one—Christ, good came upon all men to the righteousness of life." (Rom. v. 18.) Therefore it is certain that infants are partakers of purification and remission of sins, through Christ, albeit they do not confess remission of sins. What, doth not the Lord say in the Gospel, "It is not the will of your Father which is in heaven that one of those little ones should perish?" Again, "He that shall receive such a young child, in my name, receiveth me: but he that shall offend one of these little ones, that believe in me, it were better that a millstone were hanged about his neck, &c." "See, therefore, and take heed, that ye despise not one of these little ones; for I say unto you, that their angels in heaven do always behold the face of my Father which is in heaven." (Matt. xviii. 5, 6, 10, 14.) Behold, what could be more manifestly spoken? It is not the will of my heavenly Father that infants should perish: therefore, He receiveth them freely into grace and favour, though they have not yet confessed. Moreover, he that receiveth such a little one, to wit, as He himself set in the midst of them, for Christ's

sake ; he is said to receive Christ himself. Lo, He attributeth to the receivers of infants that which He promised to the receivers of the prophets. He addeth, “But he which shall offend one of these little ones that believe in me:” He manifestly calleth the little ones, not yet able to confess, believers ; because He reputeth them, of His grace, for believers. Neither is this any wonder or strange thing : since God, yea to them that are of perfect age, imputeth faith for righteousness. For, in all things, righteousness, acceptance, or sanctification is free, and imputative, that the glory of His grace might be praised. Furthermore, His will is that little ones should not be despised, much less to be cast out among the number of the saints. Yea, He doth affirm that Angels are given unto them to be their keepers ; who, though they be ministers of God’s majesty, yet, the self-same are given and granted to little children to be their guard : so that hereby we may judge what great store the Lord setteth by infants ; and learn not to wipe them out of the score of God’s people to whom the inheritance of life is due. We attribute nothing here to the birth, which is after the flesh ; but all things to the grace and promise of God. Now it is evident by all the testimonies, that as well the infants of the faithful are to be baptised, as also those that are of perfect age, confessing the faith.

Now, on the contrary part, the Anabaptists do contend, that none is to be baptised but he alone which both is able to be taught, and to believe ; yea, and to make confession of his faith also. And for confirmation of this thing, they bring these sayings of our Saviour, out of St Matthew “Go ye therefore and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, &c.” (xxviii. 19.) Out of Mark “Go

ye into the whole world, and preach the Gospel to all creatures, he which shall believe and be baptised shall be saved &c." (xvi. 15, 16.) Behold, say they, teaching goeth before Baptism: therefore, they that are not able to be taught, ought not to be baptised. Furthermore, to believe goeth before, and to baptise followeth after: infants do not believe, therefore they are not to be baptised. Upon all these, they heap up, out of the Acts of the Apostles, examples which prove that the faithful, that is to say, they that confess the faith, were baptised of the Apostles. They reckon up, also, the newly instructed christians of the old time, to whom, say they, there had been no place given, if they had baptised infants. I answer, If the order of the words make anything in this matter, we also have in a readiness to serve our turn: for, in Mark, thus we read, "John baptised in the desert, preaching the baptism of repentance:" (i. 4.) in which place we see, that to baptise goeth before, to preach followeth after. Yea, I will shew, also, that that place which they allege out of Matthew for themselves, maketh also for us: for Matthew's words be these, "All power is given unto me both in heaven and in earth," saith the Lord, "Go, therefore, and *μαθητευσατε*, that is to say, disciple (that I may so speak) that is, make ye me disciples, or gather together all nations. Yea, He teacheth them, also, the way and means how to gather disciples unto Him out of all nations, or all nations: by baptising and teaching them. By baptising and preaching ye shall gather Me together a church. And He fetcht out both of them separately one after another, sweetly and shortly saying "Baptising them in the name of the Father and of the Son and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things which I have commanded you." Now, therefore, Baptism goeth before teaching. But we do

not thereby gather, that those nations which never heard anything before of God, and the Son of God, and the Holy Ghost, are to be baptised, neither would the Apostles have borne that: but we allege these things to declare upon how fickle a foundation the Anabaptists do build: and we simply say, that it is not true which these men imagine, that the Lord commanded His Apostles to baptise them only whom they taught. Neither doth He here point out who are to be baptised in the whole world, but He speaketh of them that are of perfect age; and of laying the first foundations of faith and of the church among the Gentiles, being rude as yet and ignorant altogether in religion. They that are of perfect age are able to hear preaching or teaching; infants are not so: therefore, He speaketh nothing here of infants. Yet, therefore, they are not debarred from Baptism. It is a general law "He which doth not labour let him not eat." (2 Thes. iii. 10.) but who is so cruel and unnatural, to think that, therefore, infants are to be famished to death? The Lord, when true religion became to be spread abroad, sent His Apostles into all nations; unto them which both were ignorant of God, and strangers from the Testaments of God: truly it behoved them not first to baptise, and afterward to teach; but first to teach, and then to baptise. If at this day we should go to convert or turn the Turks to the faith of Christ, first, truly, we should teach them; afterward baptise the servants of Christ, and those that would yield themselves into His subjection. So the Lord himself in times past also, first renews His covenant with Abraham himself, and instituted circumcision for a seal of the covenant; and after that Abraham was circumcised. But he himself, when he understood that infants also were partakers of the covenant, and that circumcision was the

seal of the covenant; he, afterwards, did not only circumcise Ishmael, being thirteen years of age, and all that were born in his own house, but infants also, among whom we reckon Isaac also. Even so the faithful, which were turned by the preaching of the Gospel from Gentilism and confessing were baptised, when they understood that their infants were counted among the people of God, and that Baptism was the badge of God's people, they caused, also, their infants to be baptised. As, therefore, it is written of Abraham, he circumcised all the men-children in his house; so we oftentimes read in the Acts and writings of the Apostles, that after the master of the house is turned, the whole family is baptised. But as concerning the newly instructed christians, they came, in the old time, from the Gentiles daily unto the church; whom these did instruct in the principles of faith, being ignorant therein, and afterwards baptised them: but the ancient Fathers themselves, nevertheless baptised, also, the infants of the faithful which anon we will declare.

Neither do they lawfully gather, when they conclude in this sort, "He which shall believe and be baptised shall be saved:" infants do not believe: therefore, they are not to be baptised. For again, it is certain that it is spoken of them that be of perfect age, as in Matthew. And because He requireth faith and confession of faith of those that are of perfect age, it doth not follow thereupon, that He requireth the same of infants. For He accounteth these as His own, of His mere grace and free promise, without their confession. So that of the contrary part we do thus reason: They that believe are to be baptised; (which the very adversaries, also, do confess) infants do believe, for God reckoneth them in the number of the faithful;—which

I have afore manifestly proved,—therefore infants are to be baptised.

They object that infants understand not the mystery of Baptism: and, therefore, that it is not only repugnant to religion, but to common sense and reason to baptise infants: for to baptise an infant, is to baptise a log, since neither of them hath the use of reason. But these filthy knaves let their tongues run at random, against the very majesty of God. God commanded to circumcise the infants; and circumcision containeth high mysteries, which infants understand not. But hath God ordained any thing against reason and common sense? Go ye false knaves, go, with your blasphemies, to the place which you deserve. It is a most filthy deed, yea, and more than barbarous, in that ye compare infants to logs: for what great store God setteth by infants, we taught you already before out of the Gospel. But men, which now begin to have the use of sounder reason, are diligently and earnestly to be taught, and admonished to remember they are baptised; and to endeavour, by calling on the name of the Lord, in all points to be answerable in life and conversation to their promise and profession. For Abraham instructed his son Isaac, and all the holy Fathers their children.

But letting pass these brain-sick, frantic, and foul-mouthed railers, who, (as we have heard) never want words to wrangle, though we have had never so much, never so often, and never so earnest conference with them: let us proceed to declare in a few, but yet manifest, arguments, that infants are to be baptised; and that the Apostles of Christ our Lord have baptised infants. The Lord commanded to baptise all nations, and, therefore, infants; for they are comprehended under the word of “all nations.”

Again, whomsoever God reckoneth among the faithful, are faithful; for Peter, in a vision, heareth, "that which God hath cleansed call not thou common or unclean." (Acts x. 15.) God reckoneth infants among the faithful, therefore, they are faithful, except we had rather resist God, and seem to be stronger than He. And now we count it out of all controversy, that the Apostles of Christ baptised them whom Christ commanded to baptise; but He commanded to baptise the faithful; therefore the Apostles baptised infants. The Gospel is greater than Baptism; for Paul saith, "The Lord sent me to preach the Gospel, and not to baptise." (1 Cor. i. 17.) Not that he did absolutely deny that he was not sent to baptise; but because he preferred doctrines: for the Lord commended them both to His Apostles. Furthermore, in the Gospel, children are received of God, and not refused; who then, unless he be willingly obstinate, can debar them from the less? In Sacraments the thing signified and the signs are considered. The thing signified is the excellenter: from that infants are not debarred. Who then will deny them the sign? Truly, the holy Sacraments of God are more esteemed by the word, than the sign. By the word we gather that women are not excluded from the Supper of the Lord. Although, therefore, we read not that they were in the first institution, and sat at the first table of the Lord; neither that there is any express law which commandeth us to admit them to the Supper, yet, nevertheless, without fear or doubt by a perfect argument we admit them. St Peter could not deny them the baptism of water, to whom he saw the Holy Ghost to be given, which is an assured token of God's people; for he saith in the Acts of the Apostles: "Can any man forbid water that these should not be baptised,

which have received the Holy Ghost as well as we?" (x. 47.) Wherefore, the holy Apostle Peter denied not baptism to infants; for he knew assuredly, even by the doctrine of his Lord and Master, (that I may speak nothing now of the everlasting covenant of God) that the kingdom of heaven is of infants. No man is received into the kingdom of heaven unless he be the friend of God: and these are not destitute of the Spirit of God, "for he which hath not the Spirit of Christ, the same is none of His." (Rom. viii. 9.) Children are God's; therefore, they have the Spirit of God. Therefore, if they have received the Holy Ghost as well as we; if they be accounted among the people of God, as well as we, that be grown in age; who (I pray you) can forbid these to be baptised with water in the name of the Lord? At first the Apostles murmured, being then not sufficiently instructed, against them that brought infants unto the Lord; but the Lord rebuked them and said, "Suffer little children to come unto me," why then do not the rebellious Anabaptists obey the commandment of the Lord? For what other thing do they, at this day, which bring children unto Baptism, than that which they in times past did which brought infants unto the Lord? And the Lord received them, laid His hands on them and blessed them: and, to be short, by words and gestures He notably signified, that children are the people of God, and most acceptable to God. But why, then, by the same means, say they, did not He baptise them? Because it is written that "Jesus himself did not baptise but His disciples." (John iv. 2.) Now since, of the thing itself, it is so plainly determined, why, as yet, do we contend about the sign? Hitherto good men are satisfied; but contentious persons go on to busy themselves with questions. Besides

this, circumcision amongst the old people of God was given to infants; therefore, Baptism ought to be given to infants among the new people; for Baptism succeeded in the place of circumcision, for, St Paul saith, "by Christ ye are circumcised, with circumcision made without hands, by putting off the body of the flesh subject to sin, by the circumcision of Christ, buried with Him in Baptism." (Col. ii. 11, 12.) Lo, Paul calleth Baptism the circumcision of christians, made without hands; not that water is not ministered by hands, but in that no man henceforth is circumcised with hands: the mystery of circumcision remaining, nevertheless, in the faithful. Neither shalt thou read any of the old interpreters of the church, which have not confessed that Baptism came instead of circumcision; yea, the likeness and similitude of both of them do shew a manifest succession.

To that which I have said, I join this: the servants of God have always been careful to give the signs to them for whom they were ordained. For, that I may pass over all other, did not Joshua diligently provide that the people should be circumcised afore they entered into the land of promise¹. And since the Apostles, the preachers to the whole world, have been the faithful servants of Jesus Christ; who hereafter may doubt that they baptised infants, since Baptism came into the place of circumcision? Undoubtedly, the Apostles of Christ framed all their doings unto the types and figures of the Old Testament; therefore, it is certain that they framed Baptism also; and therefore, that they baptised infants, because they were in the figure of Baptism. For the people of Israel went through both the Red Sea and the River Jordan, with their children. And although they be not always expressed, as neither women

¹ Josh. v.

are, in the holy scriptures; yet, they are comprehended and understood by them.

To this appertaineth that which is clearly set down in the scriptures, that the Apostles baptised whole houses or families: in houses, first of all children are comprehended, as the greatest and most beautiful part of the house. So then the Apostles baptised children or little ones, and not only them that are of perfect age. And that a house especially comprehendeth infants or little ones, it may be declared very easily. And first, out of the place of Gen. xvii. which even very now I alleged. Next, in that Joseph sent for Jacob his father with his whole house out of the land of Canaan into the land of Egypt, lest his house should have perished with hunger. There are many places of this kind in the Law, and the Prophets, and in the whole scripture. But be it that there were no infants in those houses (which thing these janglers object) which the Apostles baptised, yet, nevertheless, they do pertain unto the house, and are counted of it; so that if they had been in the house without doubt they had baptised them. Whereas, therefore, they contend, that they were not baptised in those families or houses, truly I say that the fault was neither in the children, as though they had been unworthy of Baptism; neither in the Apostles, as though they were not wont to baptise infants; but in that because they were not present: for if they had been present, they had been baptised. For why? The Apostles baptised whole houses, unto which children belong.

Now I can shew by the writings of the old Doctors, that Baptism of infants hath continued from the Apostles' time even unto us: neither was it ordained by any councils, or by the decrees of any Pope, or other men; but insti-

tuted and delivered of the Apostles out of the scriptures, Origen, (*Enarrat. in epist. Pauli ad Rom.* lib. v. expounding the sixth chapter) saith, "That the church of Christ received of the Apostles themselves, baptising of infants." St Jerome maketh mention of the baptising of infants, (*Contra Pelagianos*, lib. III.) and in his Epistle to *Læta*. St Augustine citeth the place of Chrysostom, nay being cited of Julian, (*Contr. Julian*, lib. 1. c. 2.) He, also, unto St Jerome, (*Epist.* 28.) saith "St Cyprian maketh no new decree, but most stedfastly keeping the faith of the church, was of this opinion with certain of his fellow Bishops, that the new born child might rightly be baptised." The place of Cyprian is to be seen in *Epist. ad Fidum*; as, also, I declared before when I spake of the time of Baptism. The same Augustine against the Donatists (lib. iv. c. 23, 24.) boldly affirmeth, that baptising of children was not fetcht from the authority of men or of Councils, but from the tradition or doctrine of the Apostles. Cyril. (*Lib. in Lectit.*) both approveth the baptising of children; and condemneth the iterating of Baptism*. Which thing I do not allege to this end, to build the baptising of children upon man's witness; but to teach that man's testimonies agree with the testimonies of God; and that the truth of antiquities is on our part, lies and new forgeries on the shameless Anabaptists' side, who feign that the baptising of children was commanded by the Pope.

Now, I think it not labour lost to speak somewhat of anabaptism. In the time that Decius and Gallus Cæsar were Emperors, there arose a question, in the parts of Africa, of rebaptising hereticks; and St Cyprian, and the rest of the Bishops, being assembled together in the council of Carthage, liked well of anabaptism: but Cornelius, Bishop

* De adorand. in spirit. lib. vi.

of Rome, in very deed a holy and learned man, and a martyr also, together with the other Bishops of Italy, misliked the same: for they would that hereticks, after they had renounced their wicked opinions, and made their confession touching the right opinion, should be cleansed by the only laying on of hands. Ye may read this in Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History, (lib. VII. cap. 2, 3.) There is also extant a treatise of that matter in the Ecclesiastical Decrees, cap. 52¹. But we must understand, that St Cyprian affirmed nothing obstinately in this cause: for in the end of his Epistle to Jubaianus he writeth "These things have I briefly sent unto you in writing, after our mean capacity (most dear brother) commanding no man to follow them; neither preventing any man's opinion; but that every Bishop, having liberty of his own judgement, may do what he thinketh best." After that time, both the Arians and Donatists did rebaptise.—Touching the Arians, historiographers write, and especially Sozomenus, (lib. VI. cap. 4 et seq.) Ecclesiastical writers do touch the same thing elsewhere in their works. Against the Donatists St Augustine, with other learned men, disputed. There is also an Imperial Law made by Honorius and Theodosius, that holy Baptism should not be iterated. Justinian Cæsar hath published the same, in Cod. lib. I. Tit. 6, in these words. "If any Minister of the Catholic Church be detected to have rebaptised any, let both him which committed the unappeasable offence, (if at least by age he be punishable) and he, also, that is won and persuaded thereunto, suffer punishment of death." Moreover, Valentinianus, Valens, and Gratianus, give in charge to Florianus, superintendant of Asia, in these words "The same minister which, by unlaw-

¹ i. e. Augustine *de Ecclesiast. Dogmat.*

ful usage, shall iterate holy Baptism, we account him unworthy of an ecclesiastical function: for we condemn their error which tread under foot the precepts of the Apostles; and, having obtained the Sacraments in Christ's name, they purify not again by a second Baptism, but defile and deflower them under the name of cleansing." Thus far they. And verily they which rebaptise, and are rebaptised, they both defile the name of God, which was called on over the baptised in the former Baptism, and cast from them the institution of God as vain and vicious. Christ is read to be baptised but once: the Apostles were not baptised twice: all the saints of God are baptised only but once. Yea, those which Judas baptised once, are not read to be baptised again of a worthier minister. For, in my last sermon, I showed, that the pureness of the Sacraments dependeth not upon the worthiness or unworthiness of the minister. Neither can you read, that any in the old time were twice circumcised; no, not they which were manifestly known to be circumcised of idolatrous priests before the reign of Hezekiah and Josiah; but they were not baptised into idolatry, but into the covenant of the Lord God: whereof I have admonished you elsewhere. Therefore, it is a horrible offence to iterate the ceremony of Baptism, and it is without example. Neither in this matter is there any necessity: for to what end is it to baptise again, when as Baptism once given is sufficient for the whole course of a man's life? Beside this, since anabaptism is nothing else but a confederacy, conspiracy, and a certain linking together by one mark into a new and seditious, or at the least superstitious, company; into a new and schismatical church; and into a new and strange kind of doctrine; and as con-

¹ Cod. Justin. ubi supr.

trary as can be to the doctrine of Christ and His Apostles : truly it is no marvel that the obstinate Anabaptists are kept under and punished by common laws. For otherwise these things are damnable, and not to be dissembled or suffered of a christian magistrate.

But the Anabaptists presently object unto us these two places : the first out of the fifth chapter of Joshua, where we read in these words,—“ Make thee sharp knives (of stone), and go to again, and circumcise the children of Israel the second time.” (ver. 2.) Behold, the second time they could not be circumcised, say they, unless they had been also circumcised before. I answer, to circumcise the second time, or to do a thing once again, doth not signify to do that which was done before : for when the foreskin was once cut off, how could it be cut off again ? Therefore, that which was left undone for a certain space, is now again renewed ; and is said to be done the second time. So that the second time is not applied to them that would be circumcised, but unto the very time wherein they that were uncircumcised should be circumcised. For they were first solemnly circumcised in Egypt, before they did eat the passover : now entering into the land of Canaan, they are the second time solemnly circumcised, which hitherto, by reason of the wilderness and -journeying, were not circumcised. And so it followeth immediately in the same chapter, that all the males that came out of Egypt died in the wilderness ; and that their sons were uncircumcised : so that now it was expedient that they should be circumcised, as their fathers were before them. Therefore the Anabaptists, in this testimony of the Law, have no defence at all.

The latter testimony to maintain anabaptism or rebaptising, they bring out of the nineteenth chapter of the Acts ;

where, they say that, those twelve men of Ephesus were once baptised by Apollos, with the Baptism of water, and with that of John's likewise: but the very same afterward are rebaptised of Paul in the name of Christ. I answer, that those twelve men were not baptised again of Paul with water. They were once baptised with water, which was sufficient for them; but neither could Paul administer another Baptism of water than that of John's: for I taught, and evidently proved anon after the beginning of this sermon, that the Baptism of water ministered by John, Christ, and His Apostles, is one and the self-same. There I declared that the Baptism of fire, or of the Spirit, is peculiar and proper to Christ. Those men, therefore, of Ephesus were baptised with the Baptism of water as the Samaritans were by Philip¹: but they were not, as yet, fully instructed of the Baptism of fire; neither were they baptised with fire; yea, they confess they know not whether there be any such Baptism: that is, whether there be a Holy Ghost which, in the visible form of fire, should come down upon men. For they could not be altogether ignorant that there was a Holy Ghost, without whom undoubtedly they had not believed; yea, in whom they had believed, if they had rightly believed: therefore, they were only ignorant of that Baptism of fire. As, therefore, Peter and John laid their hands on the Samaritans, and they forthwith received the Holy Ghost; so Paul layeth his hands on the men of Ephesus, and they receive the Holy Ghost. For Luke saith, "when they heard these things, they were baptised in the name of the Lord Jesus." And lest any man should understand this of the Baptism of water, by and by he addeth the manner thereof; and a plain exposition saying,—“and

¹ Acts viii.

when Paul had laid his hands on them, the Holy Ghost came upon them." This, I say, he called baptising "in the name of the Lord Jesus;" for it followeth, "and they spake with tongues and prophesied." And this always hath been the fruit and effect of the Baptism of fire, in the primitive church; as I declared anon after the beginning of this Sermon. Wherefore, the Anabaptists have no testimony out of the scriptures, for their anabaptism or rebaptising: that all that will gather their wits about them do plainly see, that they are to be forsaken and shunned of all good men. But we have sufficiently disputed against them, as it seemeth: now we go forward to expound those things that remain to be opened touching Baptism, which are not the last and of the least account.

Now we are come to intreat of the virtue and efficacy of Baptism, we will follow that order, which we shadowed out in the description of Baptism; knitting up, at least, the particulars, because, in the general consideration of Sacraments, we have spoken largely of them. Yet, nevertheless, it is good, first of all, to know what the adversaries of the church have sometimes thought touching the force of Baptism.

The Manichees baptised none of their sect; for they taught that Baptism did avail the receivers nothing to salvation. The Seleucians, who are also called Hermiani, did likewise set Baptism at naught. The Messalians which be also called Euchetæ or prayer-makers, (as I have shewed in the end of my former Sermon) and the Enthusiastæ, inspired (I say) by some heavenly power, nay, rather by some hellish fury, are persuaded that Baptism neither profiteth nor hindereth any man: for so they did attribute all means of salvation, to the inward working of the Spirit; yea, to man's prayers; insomuch that they loathed and abhorred

all outward helps, yea, and doctrine also, as unprofitable and without force. Which Theodoret, in his Ecclesiastical History, (lib. iv. cap. 11.) rehearseth of them. But the holy scripture teacheth, that we are washed clean from our sins by Baptism: for Baptism is a sign, a testimony, and sealing of our cleansing. For God, verily, hath promised sanctification to His church; and He, for His truth's sake, purifieth His church from all sins by His grace, through the blood of His Son; and regenerateth, and cleanseth it by His Spirit: which cleansing is sealed to us by Baptism which we receive; and thereof is it called in the scriptures, cleansing, and remission of sins; purifying; new birth; regeneration, and the laver or fountain of regeneration; as circumcision is called the covenant; and sacrifices, sins and sanctifications. For we read in the Gospel according to St Mark, "John baptised in the desert, preaching the Baptism of repentance, for the remission of sins¹." The same also is mentioned in Luke². In the Gospel of John, the third chapter, Baptism is called purifying. In the Acts of the Apostles, Peter saith to the people which demanded what they should do: "Repent ye, and let every one of you be baptised in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins³." Ananias, also, saith to Paul, "Arise and be baptised and wash away thy sins, in calling on the name of the Lord⁴." And now Paul himself saith, "Christ loved the church, and gave Himself for it, to sanctify it, when He had cleansed it, in the fountain of water in the word⁵." Wherefore the promise, yea, the truth of sanctification, and free remission of sins, is written and engraven in our bodies, when we are baptised; for God by His

¹ Mark i. 3.² Luke iii. 3.³ Acts ii. 38.⁴ Acts xxii. 16.⁵ Eph. vi. 25, 26.

Spirit, through the blood of His Son, hath newly regenerated, and purged again our Souls; and even now doth regenerate and purge them. And Baptism is sufficient and effectual for the whole life of man; yea, and reacheth and is referred to all the sins of all them that are baptised: for the promise of God is true. The seal of the promise is true, not deceivable. The power of Christ is ever effectual thoroughly to cleanse, and wash away all the sins of them that be His. How often, therefore, soever we have sinned in our life time, let us call into our remembrance the mystery of holy Baptism, wherewith for the whole course of our life we are washed; that we might know and not doubt that our sins are forgiven us of the same God and our Lord; yea, and by the blood of Christ, into whom by Baptism once we are grafted, that He might always work salvation in us, even till we be received out of misery into glory. Neither is there any doubt that Abraham, in his whole life, had continually in his mind the mystery of circumcision, and rested in God and the seed promised unto him: yet I think that that ought diligently to be marked which St Augustine pithily and plainly hath often cited:—“That our sins are forgiven, or purged in Baptism: not that they are no more in us, (for as long as we live concupiscence beareth sway and always breedeth and bringeth forth in us somewhat like itself,) but that they should not be imputed unto us: neither that we may not sin, but that it should not be hurtful for us to have or [that we] had sinned; that our sins may be remitted when they are committed, and not suffered to be continued.” (*De fide et oper.* c. 20.) And, also, many more of this kind Gratian reciteth (*Distinct. 4 de consecrat.*)

Beside that, by Baptism we are gathered together into the fellowship of the people of God. Whereupon, of some

it is called the first sign or entry into christianity; by the which an entrance into the church lieth open unto us. Not that before we did not belong to the church: for whosoever is of Christ, partaker of the promises of God and of His eternal covenant, belongeth unto the church. Baptism, therefore, is a visible sign and testimony of our ingrafting into the body of Christ. And it is rightly called, a planting, incorporating or ingrafting into the body of Christ: for I said in the general discourse of Sacraments, that we first by Baptism were joined with Christ; and afterward with all the members of Christ, our brethren: for Paul saith: "all ye that are baptised, have put on Christ." (Gal. iii. 27.) But to put on Christ, is to be made one with Him, and, as it were, to be joined and incorporated in Him; that He may live in us and we in Him. For He only, by the Spirit, regenerateth and reneweth us, and most liberally enricheth us with all manner of good gifts: which the same Apostle, in another place, expresseth in these words "God saved us by the fountain of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost, which He shed on us richly through Jesus Christ our Saviour." (Tit. iii. 5, 6.) Yea, and therefore Christ our Lord is baptised in our Baptism¹; to declare that He is our Brother and we joint heirs with Him. Very well, therefore, said St Augustine² "that Baptism is thus far forcible, that we being baptised are incorporated into Christ and counted His members." The same Augustine³ calleth Baptism "the Sacrament of christian fellowship; for we are gathered again visibly by Baptism, to the unity of one body with all the faithful, as many as have been, are, and shall be." For Paul, also, saith, "by one Spirit we are

¹ Luke iii.

² De peccat. merit. et remiss. lib. i. c. 26.

³ De nat. et orig. anim. Ep. 28.

all baptised into one body." (1 Cor. xii. 13.) And it followeth hereby, that Baptism serveth for our confession, and is rightly called the Token of christian religion: for it is a badge or cognizance, whereby we witness and profess that we consent and are linked into christian religion. We confess that we by nature are sinners and unclean, but sanctified by the grace of God through Christ. For if we were clean by nature, what need we then any cleansing? But now since we are cleansed, who doubteth of the truth of God? Therefore, when we receive Baptism, we truly and freely confess, both our sin wherein we were born; and, also, free forgiveness of sins.

Lastly, the remembrance and consideration of the mystery of Baptism, putteth us in mind of the duties of christianity and godliness; that is to say, all our life long to weigh diligently with ourselves, of whose body we be made members; to deny ourselves and this world; to mortify our flesh with the concupiscences of the same; and to be buried with Christ into His death, that we may rise again in newness of life, and live innocently; to love our brethren as our members, with whom, by Baptism, we are knit together into one body; to remain in the bond of concord, and in the unity of the church; not to follow strange religions; being mindful that we are baptised into Christ, to whom alone we are consecrated, and far separated and divided from all other gods, worships, or religions; and, to be short,—from all heresies. Let us think, also, that we must constantly and valiantly fight against Satan. As often, therefore, as we remember we are baptised with Christ's Baptism, so often are these things put into our minds, and we admonished of our duty. But the Apostle handleth this matter more at large in the sixth chapter of his Epistle to the Romans; where he expressly

maketh mention, that we by Baptism are made the grafts of Christ; that is to say, that we might grow out of Him, as branches out of the vine; and feel in our minds and bodies both the death and resurrection of Christ. For, since we are endued with the Spirit of Christ, which worketh in us, our body, verily, dieth daily, but our spirit liveth and rejoiceth in Christ. To whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen.

SERMON IV¹.

Of the Lord's holy Supper; what it is; by whom, when, and for whom it was instituted; after what sort, when, and how oft it is to be celebrated; and of the ends thereof. Of the true meaning of the words of the Supper, "This is my body." Of the presence of Christ in the Supper. Of the true eating of Christ's body. Of the worthy and unworthy eaters thereof; and how every man ought to prepare himself unto the Lord's Supper.

UNTO the holy Baptism of our Lord Christ, is coupled the Sacrament of the body and blood of our Lord which we call the Lord's Supper. For, those whom the Lord hath regenerated with the laver of regeneration, those doth He also feed with His spiritual food; and nourisheth them unto eternal life: wherefore it followeth necessarily, that we entreat next of the holy Supper of the Lord.

This hath many names, even as hath the feast of the passover; and is instituted in the place thereof: in old time it was called, the passing-over, or the Lord's passover, which was indeed a memorial of the passover: also a Remembrance; Sign; Solemnity; a Festival or Holy-day; a Meeting together or an holy Assembly; an Observation or Worshipping; a Ceremony and Sacrifice of Passover; a Sacrifice or Offering; of which we have spoken in place convenient. This is called by St Paul the Apostle, the Lord's Supper; because this ceremony was instituted by the Lord in His last Supper, and because therein is offered unto us the spiritual banquet. The same Paul termeth it, The Lord's table, and that,

¹ The ninth Sermon of the fifth Decade.

doubtless, for none other causes. By the same Paul it is also called the Communion; not so much for that we have communion or fellowship with Christ, and He with us, as that we, being many, are one bread and one body, which do partake of the same bread. Luke calleth it Breaking of bread, naming the whole by a part. And it is evident that our forefathers of old gave not unto the receivers of the Lord's Supper a morsel, but that they brake the bread among themselves. In time past firm leagues were performed by breaking of bread. It is called, also, a Memorial and remembrance of the Lord's passion. For the Lord said, "Do this in remembrance of me." It is named a Thanksgiving, because when we celebrate the Lord's Supper, we thank Him for all His benefits; and especially for His death, by the which we are redeemed. It is called, also, a Token, and a Mystery; and a Sacrament of the body and blood of the Lord. Our forefathers did term it by this word, *Synaxis*. Synaxis, is a joining together, a knitting, a closing, or an agreement. For the church is joined and united unto Christ in the holy Supper, by a most straight league: and, to conclude, the members themselves are therewith joined very fast together. Furthermore, it is called an Assembly of saints, an holy company, and a gathering together. For in the old time it was never customably celebrated, but in the common assembly of the church: which is plainly to be proved by the words of the Apostle 1 Cor. ii. To conclude, we shall offend nothing at all, if we call the Supper of our Lord, the Testament and will of God and of our Lord: for herein shalt thou find all things belonging to a full and perfect testament. For Christ is the testator; all faithful christians are appointed heirs; the legacy is the forgiveness of sins, and life everlasting, obtained by the body of Christ

(which was) given, and His blood (which was) shed. The letters or table of this testament or will, be the words of the Lord's Supper; witnessing, as it were, by a public writing, that Christ is the food and life of the faithful: the order and doing thereof, is as it were, the seal. Wherefore, even as we do call that a testament which hath letters sealed, containing a testament both by writing and sealing; so the Lord himself did call His Supper a Testament. For, "this cup," said He, "is the New Testament in my blood." (1 Cor. xi. 25.) For otherwise the New Testament is not the remission of sins. Which thing Jeremiah, the prophet, doth plainly testify in the thirty-first chapter; and Paul to the Hebrews in the eighth chapter. This holy mystery hath divers other names; but these, for the most part, are chiefest and most commonly used. Of the other names we will speak elsewhere.

They do define (for the most part) the Lord's Supper to be a spiritual banquet, wherewith the Lord doth both keep His death in remembrance, and, also, feedeth His people unto life (everlasting.) But let me set down a more large description thereof unto you. The Supper of the Lord is an holy action instituted unto the church from God; wherein the Lord, by the setting of bread and wine before us at the banquet, doth certify unto us His promise, and communion; and sheweth unto us His gifts, and layeth them before our senses; gathereth them together unto one body visibly; and, to be short, will have His death kept of the faithful in remembrance; and admonisheth us of our duty, and especially of praise and thanksgiving.

First we say, that the Supper of the Lord is an action or deed: for the Lord when He made His Supper did give thanks unto God; He brake bread and gave the cup, and

said, "Do this in remembrance of me." Again, it cannot be every action: for at the table where we eat meat, we, also, give thanks unto God; we break bread, and give the cup: but it is an holy action, because it is from God, and instituted unto the church, therefore, it far differeth from our ordinary meat suppers, as well for that it is specially instituted by the Son of God unto the church: as, also, because it hath the word of God, and the peculiar example of Christ. Therefore, St Paul, making a difference between this and common eating, saith, "If any man hunger, let him eat at home, lest that ye come together to your condemnation." And again, "Have ye not houses to eat and drink in." (1 Cor. xi. 22. 34.) As though he might say, this supper is mystical. Again, what manner of action it is, it doth forthwith appear by that which followeth; where the Lord, by the setting of bread and wine before us at the banquet, doth assure us of His promise and communion, &c. This Supper, therefore, hath its peculiar limits; of the which, although I spake when I entreated generally of the virtue of the Sacraments, yet, will I repeat certain of them that make most for this purpose, when I shall draw towards an end of this Sermon.

But concerning the description of this Supper, these things are chiefly to be considered and declared: first, who did institute it, and who is the true author and maker of the Lord's Supper: not any man, but the very Son of God himself; the Wisdom of the Father; very God and man. So that we come not to the table of men, although a man being the minister be the chiefest there; neither do we receive holy signs at the hands of the minister only, but, also, at the hands of the Lord himself; whose guests we are if we be faithful. He hath consecrated the Supper for us;

and doth yet consecrate it by His holy word, His will and His power : of which matter we spake before. And because the faithful understand and know these things, they sit down to the holy and heavenly banquet with Christ ; being wholly occupied in heavenly things both in mind and soul.

He instituted the Supper the same night, when He was betrayed ; and the next night, by His death and bloodshedding, He confirmed the New Testament. For so soon as He had eaten the figurative lamb with His disciples, and had plainly told them, that from that time forward that ceremony should not be used ; the Supper was established in the place of that which was abolished. That like as the bloody lamb did signify that Christ should suffer ; even so the bread, which is without blood, witnesseth that Christ, who is the bread of life, is, also, baked upon the cross ; and hath suffered, and [been] made the food of all believers. Wherefore, that night was worthy to be observed and celebrated ; and that last Supper is full of mysteries. For we commonly most of all account of the words and deeds of our dearest friends which they use a little before their death. Wherefore, as all Christ's doings are beloved and precious unto us, so ought this His last Supper to be most dearly beloved and precious in our sight.

The Supper consisteth of the word and manner ; promise and ceremony. The word is this, that Christ is preached to have been given up to death for our sins ; and that He shed His blood for the remission of our sins. Promise is made unto all that believe, that their offences shall be forgiven. The same thing is, also, expressed by the manner. The manner is diligently set down in writing by Saint Matthew, Mark and Luke ; whom St Paul following, hath nothing at all varied from them. The words, therefore,

(dearly beloved) as they be gathered out of these four into one text, I will recite unto you. "The same night in the evening wherein He was betrayed, the Lord came with the twelve, and when it was time He sat down and the twelve with Him. And while they were eating, Jesus took bread; and when He had given thanks, He brake it and gave it unto His disciples, saying: "Take and eat, this is my body which is given for you (or broken). Do this in remembrance of me. Likewise taking the cup (after He had supped) He gave thanks and delivered it unto them, saying Take ye this, and divide it among you; drink ye all thereof. And they drank all thereof. And He said unto them, This is my blood which is of the New Testament; which is shed for many for the remission of their sins. This cup is the New Testament in my blood (which is shed for you). This do as oft as you shall drink it, in the remembrance of me. Verily I say unto you, that I will not drink henceforth of the fruit of the vine, until that day come that I drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom'." These are, word for word, the solemn and most holy words of the Lord spoken at His last Supper.

The high Bishop of the catholic church, Christ our Lord, celebrated His Supper with His disciples in like sort as we have now seen and heard; without all pomp; simply, plainly, and sparingly. He took away the over-busy ceremony of the Law; appointing another very easy to be gotten, and nothing sumptuous. Most things appertaining to the Law were troublesome; and all belonging to the Gospel easy and nothing sumptuous. The Lord sitteth down with His twelve disciples: whereby we learn, that,

¹ Matth. xxvi. 26, et seq. : Mark xiv. 22, et seq. : Luke xxii. 24, et seq.

first of all, there must a company be gathered together, which must celebrate the Supper. In His assembly these things doth the Lord: first of all, He preacheth most diligently unto His disciples of those things especially which concerned the mystery of His passion, and of our redemption. But wheresoever is the preaching and hearing of the word of God, or of the gospel of Christ, there are, also, groanings and vows or prayers of the faithful: wherefore, they that intend to celebrate the Supper of the Lord, before all things, according to the example and institution of the high Bishop Christ our Lord, they do most diligently hear the preaching of the Gospel, and, also, pray most earnestly. Afterward, He took bread; and the Lord blessed it and brake it; moreover, He gave unto His disciples and bade them to eat. Anon He parted the cup among them; commanding them all to drink thereof. And, thereupon, He plainly and expressly commandeth saying, "Do this;" to wit, as you have seen me do. Wherefore, the disciples did eat the bread, and drank all of the cup. Therefore, they that celebrate the Lord's Supper lawfully, do one unto another break, distribute, and eat the Lord's bread, which they receive at the hands of Christ's ministers: and, likewise, distribute and drink all of the Lord's cup, which they receive at the hands of Christ's ministers. And like as the high Bishop, Christ, bade them do it in remembrance of Him; so they that celebrate the Lord's Supper, remember the death of Christ and all His benefits. Moreover, as the Lord hath gone before us in His example in giving thanks to God the Father; so, likewise, do the faithful make an end with this holy mystery with giving of thanks; praising His goodness and mercy, because He is good and His mercy endureth for ever. This is the most simple and

best manner of the Lord's Supper; which the Apostles, receiving of Christ, delivered to be observed of all nations. Wherefore, when this question is asked, Whether it be lawful to sup after another rite or manner; whether it be lawful to add or diminish any thing from the manner left and delivered, or to change any thing therein; whether the Supper of the Lord ought only to be celebrated after the manner already delivered, and not after any other;—there is no small folly and rashness, yea, rather great ungodliness therein betrayed. For to what end serveth the most simple, most plain, best, and perfectest form of the Supper delivered of the Lord himself, and received of His Apostles, if we devise another? Who, I pray you, shall deliver a better than the Son of God himself, the high priest of the catholic church hath already delivered? Or who (I beseech you), that is well in his wits, shall either add [to] or diminish any thing from the ordinance of God? Who dare be so bold as to change any thing delivered by the everlasting Wisdom of God? All the sayings and doings of Christ are most perfect: therefore, the form, also, of the Lord's Supper is a most perfect form of a right singular and excellent ordinance or institution. The rites or ceremonies of celebrating the Sacraments of the Old Testament were most perfect; so delivered from the first institution of them, that nothing was added to them nor taken from them, by such as were religious; no not many years after. For Hezekiah, the king, celebrated the passover; so, likewise, did Josiah celebrate the same; but not after any other rite or manner than was delivered from Moses¹. The fathers circumcised their infants, but not after any other manner, nor any other rite than was first instituted. In times past,

¹ 2 Chron. xxx. xxxv.

whoso had not sacrificed in the same place, and according to the same manner which God commanded by Moses, was by the law accused of murder. (Levit. xvii. 3, 4.) Nadab and Abihu are smitten with lightning from heaven, for bringing strange fire into the tabernacle. (Levit. x. 1, 2.) Uzzah is smitten with sudden death, for that the ark of the Lord of hosts was not handled in such sort as was by the Law commanded. (2 Sam. vi. 6, 7.) And, therefore, that manner of celebrating the Lord's Supper, as it was by the Lord instituted, and delivered to the church by the apostles, is to be observed with great religion: unless we will believe that the institutions and manners of celebrating our Sacraments are more perfect than theirs of old time; and that God the Father doth, now a days, less regard the profanation, or the religious observation of His Son's institution, than those of Moses and the Fathers in old time. But Paul, the vessel of election, knowing Christ's institution to be most perfect; and that the same ought to be kept still in the church, simply and without any addition, saith to the Corinthians "I received that of the Lord which I have also delivered unto you." (1 Cor. xi. 23.) For he thought it an heinous offence to deliver any other thing to the church than that which he had received of the Lord. Let us, therefore, with great religion, hold that fast which is delivered unto us by the Lord and the Apostles. But the Apostle delivered none other thing to the Corinthians, yea, many years after the Lord's ascension into heaven, than that which was faithfully set down unto us in writing by the holy Apostles and Evangelists, St Matthew, Mark, and Luke.

Certainly it is well known, how that certain hundred years after the death of the Apostles, this simple manner

of celebrating the Lord's Supper was held in the church. For the pastor or minister of the church, after that he had preached the gospel, and given public thanks unto God in open prayer; then came he forth into the midst of the holy assembly. Before the face of the people stood a table furnished with bread and wine; behind the which the minister standing blessed the people, saying, "The Lord be with you." The people answered, "And with thy spirit." Then replied the minister, "Lift up your hearts," admonishing the congregation, that the holy mysteries shall be celebrated; and, therefore, that they must lift up their minds from visible things unto invisible. The people answered, "We lift them up unto the Lord." Afterwards, exhorting the whole company to give thanks, he cried aloud, "Let us give thanks unto the Lord our God:" the congregation answered; "It is meet and right so to do." Then proceeded the minister saying "It is very meet and right, our bounden duty and behoveful for us" (turning himself then to the Lord) "that we give thanks always, and in all places unto thee, Lord, Holy Father, Almighty and Everlasting God, through Christ our Lord; who the day before that He suffered His passion, took bread, gave thanks, brake it, and gave it to His disciples:" with the residue as it followeth in the gospel. These things being repeated out of the gospel, the minister proceedeth further, saying; "Let us pray, being admonished by wholesome precepts and instructed by divine institutions, we are emboldened to say; Our Father, which art in heaven, &c." After the rehearsal of the Lord's prayer, the people received the holy mysteries, and did communicate together; and after they had given thanks and praised God they were dismissed. And of this form there remain certain footsteps in the writings of the ancient

Fathers; to be seen, to wit, in St Cyprian, St Augustine and others. But consequently, in latter times the prayers, blessings, and the ceremonies grew to be very great. Moreover, Christ's institution was changed, and turned into a strange use; and, in fine, the Mass was patched together, in which appeareth but small antiquity. But touching these matters I have entreated very largely in another place; and you yourselves are very well seen in this point: we which defend and hold that the institution of our Lord Christ, which is delivered unto us by the Apostles, is most pure and perfect, do nothing regard neither what any man nor at what time any bishop hath added this or that to the holy rite; or else hath taken away or changed: but rather what He, who is before and above all, did first Himself, and commanded to be done. If the authority of Him that did institute; if learning and holiness; if antiquity may be of force; then the victory is ours, who have Christ on our side with the best chosen company of the Apostles: for from these we have what we celebrate; and that which we hold, that all godly men ought to celebrate.

But why the Lord instituted this mystery under the form of bread and wine, it is evident. For bread comforteth, and wine maketh glad the heart of man; which I, also, touched where I entreated of the proportion and agreement of the Sacraments. Moreover, our fathers, in the figure of manna, did eat bread which rained down from heaven. Also, in their sacrifices gratulatory and of thanksgiving, and in their drink offerings, they used bread and wine. But there hath sprung a great contention concerning the substance of the Lord's Supper; some holding opinion that it ought to be celebrated with unleavened bread, and others with such as is leavened. But among our forefathers of old

there was about these no such contention; for the church used both indifferently as them pleased. It may seem that at the first Supper the Lord used unleavened bread at the table, according to the ancient manner of celebrating the passover. Whereupon many churches used unleavened bread, who notwithstanding condemned not them of heresy which used leavened bread. The Pope and his adherents, conceiving no small displeasure thereat, hath deeply accursed the Greek church for so trifling a matter. But the Artolyrites were, upon some just cause, condemned by the ancient fathers, of whom Epiphanius¹ maketh mention between the Pepuzianes and the Priscillianes, setting bread and cheese upon the table in their celebrating, contrary to Christ's institution.

It is, furthermore, disputed upon, Whether unmingled wine or delayed with water, is by the faithful, to be used at the Supper. Cyprian, the Martyr, holdeth opinion, that in this mystery the wine ought not to be unmingled, but delayed with water, and so to be offered; that is to say, to be drunk by the faithful. For thus he hath written; "Because Christ hath borne us all, who also bare our sins, we may perceive that in the water the people is to be understood; in the wine the blood of Christ is to be understood. For, when water is mingled with the wine in the cup, the people is united unto Christ; and the multitude of the believers is coupled and joined unto Him in whom they believed. And thus in blessing the Lord's cup, only water may not be offered; neither in like sort may wine only. For if any man offer only wine, the blood of Christ beginneth to be without us; but if it be water only, then doth the multitude begin to be without Christ. But when they are both mingled together, and are joined with a confused

¹ HER. XXIX. vel XLIX.

mixture betwixt them, then is there a heavenly and spiritual Sacrament wrought²." By these words truly doth S. Cyprian shew unto us a good mystery: but why do we seek to be wiser than Christ, and to mingle together more mysteries than we have received of Him? The holy scripture maketh mention of no water, but rather reporteth that the Lord used naught else but mere wine. For the Lord saith, "Verily I say unto you that henceforth I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine." For he plainly said, not the wine, but the fruit of the vine; that herein we should make no manner of mingling. But what if that holy martyr of God himself Saint Cyprian, hath laboured by all the means he might, to shew that that only is to be followed of the faithful in celebrating of the Lord's Supper, which they have received of our Lord Christ himself? And forasmuch as that testimony doth make much to all this our treatise concerning Christ's supper to be celebrated according to the words of the Gospel, I will recite it word for word out of the second epistle of the third book of his Epistles³. "We must not," saith he, "depart in any respect from the doctrine of the gospel; and those things that our Master taught and did Himself, the scholars, also, ought to observe and do." The blessed Apostle in another place speaketh more constantly and stoutly, saying, 'I marvel that you are so soon changed from Him that called you to grace, unto another gospel: which is nothing else, but there be some that trouble you and go about to overthrow the gospel of Christ. Howbeit if we ourselves or an angel from heaven, do preach unto you any other thing than that we have taught, let him be accursed. As I have said before, so say I now again, if any man preach any other thing unto you

² Epist. ad Cæcilium.

³ Epist. 63, in the edition of Bp. Fell.

than that which you have received, let him be accursed.' Since, therefore, neither the Apostle himself, neither an angel from heaven can preach or teach otherwise than Christ himself once hath taught, and His Apostles have preached; I much marvel from whence this custom hath grown that, contrary to the doctrine of the gospel and the Apostles, in some places water is offered in the Lord's cup, which being taken alone cannot express the Lord's blood." And again, "There is no cause, dearly beloved brother, that any man should think that the custom of certain men is to be followed, if there be any that heretofore have supposed that water alone is to be offered in the Lord's cup. For it must be demanded of them, whom they have followed herein? For if in the sacrifice, which is Christ, none is to be followed but Christ, doubtless then ought we to hearken unto, and to do after that which Christ hath done, and commanded to be done; since He himself saith in His gospel, 'If you do that which I command you to do, I will call you no longer servants but friends¹.' And that Christ alone should be heard, the Father himself also witnesseth from heaven, saying; 'This is my well-beloved Son in whom I have delight; hear him.' Wherefore, if only Christ is to be heard, we ought not to regard what any other before us hath thought meet for us to do; but what Christ did first who is before all other. Neither ought we, in any case, to follow the custom of men, but the truth of God; considering what the Lord speaketh by the prophet Isaiah, saying, 'They worship me in vain, teaching the commandments and doctrine of men².' And again, the Lord repeating the self-same words in the gospel, saith, 'Ye set God's commandments aside to establish your own traditions³.' And in another

¹ John xv. 15.² Isai. xxix. 13.³ Mark vii. 9.

place He saith, 'He that shall break any one of the least of these commandments, and shall on this sort teach men, shall be accounted least in the kingdom of heaven⁴.' But if it be not lawful to break the least of the commandments of God, how much more heinous is it to break things so great, so weighty, and so much belonging to the Lord's passion, and the Sacrament of our redemption; or else to change it to any other order, by man's traditions, than is instituted by God?" And so forth, as followeth. There is no man can deny, but that these things are of authority even against the author himself. For neither by the scriptures, nor by the example of Christ can it be proved, that water was mingled with the wine at the supper. As for the authorities and testimonies which the author allegeth, every man may perceive how little they make to the purpose; yea, that they be wrested from their natural meaning. The gospel plainly pronounceth that the Lord drank of the fruit of the vine with His disciples. And as often as Paul maketh mention of the cup, yet teacheth he in no place that water was mingled with the wine; or that it ought to be mingled with it. Wherefore, these water-men, that is to say, they that use water only, in celebrating the Lord's Supper, are justly condemned; such as the Marcionites and Tatians were. Howbeit, it is an indifferent matter, whether you use red wine or white in the Supper.

Again, why did not the Lord deliver the Sacrament of the Supper unto us under one form of bread or wine only, but rather under both kinds? The Doctors of the church, by one consent, suppose this to be the cause: for that He would signify, or rather testify, unto us, that He took both soul and flesh upon Him, and gave the same for us; and,

⁴ Matt. v. 19.

also, hath delivered our souls and flesh from everlasting destruction. For although there be two kinds, yet do they make but one Sacrament; and they may not be separated. Neither is their opinion of judgement to be allowed of who, of their own private or rather sacrilegious authority, do corrupt the institution of Christ; offering to the lay people, which do communicate, the one kind only of bread; and granting to priests both kinds; and so challenging both kinds to themselves only. But Paul, the Apostle, received the authority from the Lord himself to admit all the faithful people of Christ unto the Lord's cup: and, therefore, let these bold fellows consider from whom they have received commandment to put back the laity; and to forbid them the cup which, by the Lord our God, is granted unto them. For Christ in plain words, and, as it were, by the spirit of prophecy, foreseeing what should come to pass in the church; said not of the bread "Eat ye all of this:" but when He took the cup, He added, "Drink ye all of this¹." St Mark also adjoineth hereunto, not without deep judgement, "and they drank all thereof²." Hereunto, also, appertaineth that which the Lord speaketh in St Luke: "Take this, and divide it among you³." St Paul the Apostle, having a special regard unto this excellent and plain institution of Christ, three or four times joineth the cup to the bread; saying, "As often as you shall eat of this bread, and drink of this cup you shall express the Lord's death⁴." Again, "Whosoever eateth of this bread, or drinketh of the Lord's cup unworthily, he shall be guilty of the body and the blood of the Lord." And again he saith⁵; "Let a man examine himself, and then let him eat of the bread and drink of

¹ Matt. xxvi. 27.

² Mark xiv. 23.

³ Luke xxii. 17.

⁴ 1 Cor. xi. 26.

⁵ Ibid. ver. 29.

the cup⁶." Again, "Whoso eateth and drinketh unworthily, &c.⁷." These testimonies are manifold, and worthy absolutely to be believed; and unto which all traditions, of all men whatsoever, should give place. The Lord hath instituted the cup of the Supper unto all the faithful: wherefore the Apostles exhibited the same unto all the faithful. For if the Sacrament of the blood of Christ were given to the Apostles only, surely then the thing itself,—to wit, the remission of sins which is obtained through Christ's blood,—belongeth only to the Apostles. Howbeit the Lord saith plainly, "This is the blood of the New Testament which is shed for many for the remission of sins⁸." It is, also, in other places of scripture manifestly set down, that Christ's blood was shed for the remission of the sins of all the faithful. Wherefore, if the laity be capable of the thing, how much more of the sign? Now, if our adversaries proceed further and say, that the Apostles only sat at the supper, (who represented the figure of the priests) and that the use of the cup was granted unto them only, and not to be granted unto other, but to such only as were present at the first supper; then do we demand of them, by what authority they give the Lord's bread to the laity; or by what right they do admit simple women unto the Lord's Supper: since it is manifest that neither the one nor the other (according unto their speaking in this matter) sat at the Lord's Table? And, in this point, they being taken tardy can go no further. But they object the danger of the cup; which, if it be given unto all without exception, it would come to pass through the folly and negligence of men, there might some great offence be committed in letting it fall or pouring it upon the floor. As who should say, the eternal

⁶ 1 Cor. xi. 28.

⁷ Ibid. ver. 27.

⁸ Matt. xxvi. 28.

Providence hath not forseen so great an offence, which these wise men do well perceive now at length in the end of the world; and do amend that wherein the Son of God did amiss. For they cry out, that one kind is enough for the lay people, forasmuch as, by a necessary coherence, it followeth that where the body of Christ is, there is His blood also: and thus must it follow that the one kind is instituted in vain. But the Lord distinctly first offered the bread, and afterward the cup: and the Lord instituted nothing in vain. Therefore, both kinds, since the Lord hath so commanded, ought to be parted among all the faithful: which as many as have read the writings of the ancient Fathers, well report was observed ever before, even almost unto, the time of the Council of Constance. Of whom many have not been afraid to say, that the dividing of this Sacrament after this manner, could not be done without sacrilege.

The matter, and substance of the supper being declared, there is lightly some question moved concerning the form, or of the consecration of the bread and wine. But forasmuch as I have entreated thereof in the general consideration of the Sacraments, there is no cause why I should, with loathsomeness to the hearers, repeat the self-same thing again. We do not acknowledge any transubstantiation to be made by force of words or characters; but we affirm, that the bread and wine remain as they are in their own substances; but that there is added unto them the institution, will, and word of Christ; and so [they] become a Sacrament; and so differ much from common bread and wine, as we have said in place convenient.

Consequently ensueth the question as toucheth this point: Who should administer the Supper: that is to say, whether any of the congregation ought to be chief in the celebrating

of the Supper? Then, Who the same should be? Surely the thing itself requireth, and nature also commandeth, that every thing be done decently and in good order: and religion requireth that all things appertaining to the Supper be done according to Christ's example. But He was the chief dealer in the Supper; and He, likewise, hath appointed ministers of the church, by whom He will have the Sacraments to be administered. Wherefore, like as every man doth not baptise, but the lawful minister of the church; so appertaineth it not unto every man to prepare and minister the holy Supper, but to the minister which is ordained by God. Herein now we disprove the papistical doctrine which alloweth of private Masses; and teacheth that the priest offereth up the body and blood of our Lord for the standers by; and that by the Mass he applieth the merit of redemption unto them that with devotion come to that sacrifice. For as there is no one word of the Lord extant that commandeth the priests to sacrifice, or privately to apply the supper for others; or that promiseth any thing unto them that stand by and look on it; for He saith, "Do this; eat ye, and drink ye all in the remembrance of me;" He saith not, 'look upon the priests only while they be eating and drinking for you':—so Christ is not bodily present in the bread and wine: He is joined unto our hearts and minds by His Spirit; for it were of none effect that He remained in the bread. And if He were present there indeed, yet could He not be sacrificed; both for that He hath offered up Himself once upon the cross,—neither can the most worthy and only begotten Son of God be offered up again to God the Father by sinful man,—as, also, for that there is no need for Him to offer again. For Saint Paul saith, "Christ being one only sacrifice offered up for sin, sitteth for ever at the right hand

of God; looking for that which is yet to come, until His enemies be made His footstool. For by one oblation He hath made them for ever perfect, that are sanctified¹." And, again, he saith, "Where is full remission of sins, there is no more oblation for sin²." But we have full remission of sins by the death which Christ once suffered: therefore, there is no sacrifice in the church for sin. Indeed, the church doth celebrate the memorial of the sacrifice which was once perfectly finished upon the cross; but the church doth not offer up sacrifice any more, either with blood or without blood. Praise and thanksgiving are a most acceptable sacrifice unto the Lord: the same the minister offereth not for others, but with others. Here now, therefore, we ascribe none other thing to the minister but the ministry, that he be the president or chief dealer to recite the prayers in the celebration of the supper; and after the holy prelection and the pronouncing of the solemn words, let him, after the example of Christ, begin to break the Lord's bread, and distribute His cup: and let him receive, also, the Sacrament for himself, as the other faithful people do, as companion of the faith; and when the communion is done, let him end the holy action with thanksgiving, and some holy exhortation.

Concerning the place where the Supper is to be celebrated, I find no contention hath been among the most ancient ministers of the church. It is read how that our Lord Jesus used the hall of a certain private man's house: and, also, the Apostle Paul both preached and brake bread at Troas in a certain dining place. The ancient church which ensued immediately after the death of the Apostles, almost unto the time of Constantine the Great, had none, or very few, large and public churches. For it was scarce

¹ Heb. x. 10—14.

² Ibid. ver. 26.

lawful or safe, in so troublesome a time, for the Christians to creep abroad. In the mean time they used very honest places, in the which they met together in holy assemblies; having places of prayer. At this present there seemeth to be no place more worthy or more commodious to celebrate the holy Supper in, than that which is appointed for doctrine and prayer. For so have we learned of St Paul. (1 Cor. xi. 22.) Howbeit, if tyrannical power will not suffer us to have a church, what shall let us but that we may reverently celebrate the Supper in honest private houses?

Touching the holy instruments belonging to the Supper, the matter, also, requireth to speak something in this place. In the time that the Apostles lived they supped at tables, set forth and furnished for the purpose: they knew no fixed altars builded of stone, which are more fit to make fire upon, and to burn beasts for a sacrifice. A removing-table agreeth better with the example of Christ. Notwithstanding, we condemn not standing altars; so that they serve only to the lawful use of the Supper. St Paul, in the first Epistle to the Corinthians, called the altars of the Ethnicks, 'tables'; so that one need not to marvel the ancient Fathers termed our tables, 'altars.' For it is an easy matter to fall from one to the other; and it should seem that they alluded unto the only altar of the tabernacle of God. In old times the tables were covered with some fair cloth; with some linen table-cloth or towel. From whence, perhaps, were borrowed those things which are called 'corporals.' As for that outward bravery and worldly trimming, it was not then used on the altars of christians. We read how it was forbidden by the law that there must no altar be builded of hewn stone: by which proviso all cost and bravery in religion is forbidden.

Thus it is manifest that, in the ancient times, there were no precious nor costly vessels used at the Supper. For like as Christ and the Apostles taught that frugality should be used in all places; condemning superfluity, and beating into us the contempt of gold and silver; so in those holy mysteries they have not overthrown that doctrine of theirs, or given occasion of excess. After long persecution, when peace was restored to the church, then began the custom to celebrate in the church with vessels of gold and silver. But then, also, there were some that brought the same again to his old frugality and simplicity. Chrysostom cried out (as I have also declared in another place) that in receiving the Lord's Supper, we ought to have golden minds, not golden vessels¹. And Saint Ambrose saith, "The sacraments require not gold, neither are those things pleasant in gold, which are not bought with gold. The ornaments of the sacraments is the redemption of captives²." St Jerome commends Saint Exuperius bishop of Toledo, who carried the Lord's body in a basket of wicker, and the blood in a glass; and had expelled covetousness out of the church³. And truly that Canon of the Triburean Council⁴, which is yet extant in the Pope's decrees, forbidding that no priest should minister his holy mystery in wooden vessels; doth prove sufficiently that certain churches more than eight hundred years since Christ's passion, used to drink the blood of Christ in wooden vessels: wherefore wooden cups in the supper be of all most ancient. Boniface the Archbishop (which example though I have alleged elsewhere, yet am I enforced to repeat it here again, for that it agreeth so fitly with this present matter) being asked long since, whether it

¹ In Matth. Hom. 50.

² De Officiis, Lib. 11. c. 28.

³ Ad Rustic. Monach. Ep. 95.

⁴ Can. 18.

were lawful to minister the sacraments in vessels of wood? answered; "In old times (saith he) golden priests used wooden cups; but now, contrariwise, wooden priests use golden cups⁵." But if any man bring vessels made of any other stuff without excess and superstition, I would not greatly strive with him, so that he will, also, acknowledge that they do not offend who use the wooden. For as touching the form and matter of the cups, all are free and lawful for the church to use.

Moreover, it is evident that the Lord in the first Supper, yea, and the Apostles, also, in celebrating the same Supper, used their own usual and decent apparel⁶. And, therefore, it is not disagreeable from the first institution of the minister to come unto the Lord's table covered with his own garment; so that it be comely and honest. Surely the communicants do wear on them their own usual apparel. He must take heed that there creep in no superstition. Our forefathers, as it seemed, did wear a cloak cast over their common garment: which they did not after the example of Christ or the Apostles, but according to man's tradition. At the length that stuff which is used at this day was taken up, according to the imitation of the priest's garment of the old law; and appointed to be worn by ministers that would celebrate the supper. Neither doth Innocentius, the Third of that name, dissemble this matter in the fourth Chapter and fourth Book of his work, *De Myster. Evangel. Leg. et Sacr. &c.* As for us, we have learned of late, that all

⁵ *Concil. Labb. et Coss. Tom. ix. p. 451.*

⁶ Look more of this matter in Epist. added at the end of this book. [The Epistle here referred to is that which was written by Bullinger and Gualter to certain ministers in England, to convince them of the lawfulness of wearing the ecclesiastical habits. This Epistle was added to the translation of the Decades in the edition which was printed by authority in 1587.]

heretical matters are not only put away, but not to be brought again into the church by any. Forasmuch, therefore, as we remain in the light of the gospel, and not in the shadow of the law, we do upon good cause reject that Levitical massing-apparel.

I have, also, declared in another place, that it hath been the manner in old time, that every nation hath used their own native and vulgar tongue in ministering the Sacraments. Of the gestures which the ministers do use in celebrating the Lord's Supper, we can say none other thing out of the gospel than what we have learned, "The Lord took the bread, blessed it, brake it, distributed it, &c." If the minister do follow these things he needs not to be careful of other gestures. Those which at this day are, by the invention of men, received into the celebration of the Mass, are so far off from giving any majesty to the mysteries, that they bring them rather the more into contempt. I will say nothing else that may seem more grievous.

The matter is indifferent whether the church take the Supper sitting down or going to the table: whether a man take the holy mysteries in his own hand, or receive it into his mouth at the hands of him that ministereth. It is most agreeable with the first simplicity and institution of the Supper to sit, and to receive the Sacrament in a man's own hands of him that ministereth; and afterwards to break it, eat it, and to divide it unto others. For as the Lord sat at table with his disciples, so he reached forth the mysteries, saying: "Take and divide it among you." (Luke xxii. 17.) Moreover, as there is more quietness and less stir in sitting at the supper, while the ministers carry the holy mysteries about the congregation; so it is well known by histories of antiquity, that the Sacrament hath

been delivered into the hands of the communicants. It is mere superstition, and repugnant to the doctrine of the Apostles, to scrape the hands of the lay people that have touched the holy Sacrament of the Supper. Why do they not also, by the same law, scrape the lips, tongue, and jaws of the communicants?

Of these things before handled springeth another question, What is to be thought of the remnants and leavings of the Lord's Supper: and whether there ought any part of it to be reserved; and whether that which is reserved or shut up ought to be adored? This question seemeth to have no godliness in it, but to be altogether superstitious and very hurtful. For who knoweth not that bread and wine out of the holy and lawful use appointed are not a Sacrament? Shall we proceed to demand, with these Sophisters, what that is which the mouse gnaweth when he gnaweth the Lord's bread? These questions are most unworthy to be demanded, and [ought] to be raked up in holy oblivion.

Touching the shutting up of the Sacrament, the Lord teacheth us not one word in the gospel; much less of worshipping it. "Take," saith He, "eat, and divide it among you." He saith not, "Lay it up and worship it:" for the true worshippers "worship the Father in Spirit and in truth." Moreover, we read how the Lord hath plainly said in the gospel, "If they say unto you behold where He is in the desert, go not forth; behold where He is in the innermost parts of the house, do not believe. (Matt. xxiv. 26.) He setteth down the cause of this His commandment, "For like as the lightning goeth forth of the east, and appeareth in the west, so shall the coming of the Son of Man be." The coming again of the Son of Man, saith He, shall be glorious and not obscure; neither shall He

come again but to judge both the quick and the dead. And, therefore, St Paul the Apostle, teaching us true religion, willeth us to worship Christ, not upon the earth, but with our minds lifted unto heaven, where He sitteth at the right hand of His Father. And who will be so frantic, I beseech you, to worship the holy sign for the holy thing itself? It appeareth by the decrees made of late, that these things were invented by man's device: for it is certain that the Feast of Christ's body, commonly called *Corpus Christi*, was instituted but of late years under Pope Urban, in the year of our Lord 1264: as it may appear in Clement¹, the third book, title 16; the chapter beginning "*Si Dominum.*"

It remaineth that we discuss the question concerning the time of celebrating the Lord's Supper; and what season is meetest for the same, the morning or evening? Whether we ought to sup together? Whether we must receive it fasting or when we have dined? Also, how often we must celebrate the Supper—once, or often, or seldom? It is evidently enough known that Christ sat down at the table with His disciples in the evening; but it followeth not hereof that the Supper cannot be rightly celebrated at any other time but at evening. The Lord upon occasion of the feast of the passover, and because He should be betrayed at night, did both eat the Supper that evening with His disciples; and instituted, also, the Supper for us. Notwithstanding, He left the liberty to remove this mystery unto the morning; for that when we be sober, then are we most meet to deal in all matters, specially in religion; for which we be then fitter than when our bellies shall be full of good cheer. Wherefore, this banquet requireth fasting and empty guests: but yet not so fasting

¹ Constitut. Clement. Pap. v.

that a man may not taste of somewhat afore-hand for his health's sake. For Saint Paul saith "If any man be hungry let him eat at home." (1 Cor. xi. 34.) The same Apostle will not have any other feast to be celebrated with the Lord's mystical Supper. And, therefore, we say that we ought not to receive that with other meat. Tertullian² writeth, that christians have used oftentimes to eat other meat with it: which kind of supper, as he writeth, was called ἀγάπη, that is to say, mutual love or charity; borrowing the name from love, for that the poor were refreshed with the feasting of the richer sort. Howbeit, provision of meat, drink and other necessaries, might well enough be moved for them without the church. Paul will not permit that in one place both public feasts should be made, and also the mystical Supper of the Lord celebrated.

Furthermore, how many times in the year the faithful ought to receive this Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the Apostles have given forth no commandment; but have left it indifferent unto every church's discretion. For what is more plain than that which St Paul hath said. "As often as you shall eat of this bread, and drink of this cup, you shall declare the Lord's death until he come." (1 Cor. xi. 26.) For the Lord (as the same Apostle setteth it down) first commanding, said, "Do this as oft as you shall drink it in remembrance of me." Howbeit let no man think that the celebration of the Lord's Supper is left so freely to him, that he need never to receive it. For that were no lawful liberty, but most unlawful licentiousness. They that celebrate the Supper of the Lord upon certain and ordinary times of the year, would not have it brought into contempt, or loathed by reason of the daily frequenting.

² Apologet. c. 39.

For they have some consideration of their own people; and they would have the Supper to be celebrated worthily; and that the people may have a desire unto it. But they that celebrate it very oft, they suppose it an unmeet thing that good things, by often frequenting them, should be despised: for the better the thing is, the oftener, they say, it is to be used. Both these sorts desire to serve the Lord; and would have that to be done to great and good effect, which the Lord hath left free. Between these if St Augustine be made umpire and judge, doubtless he would pronounce none other judgement than that which he hath already pronounced of the same cause, writing unto Januarius' and saying, "He shall best decide this strife between them, who so advised them especially to abide in the peace of Christ; and that every man do that which, according to his faith, he is persuaded to be good and godly. For neither of them dishonoureth the body and blood of our Lord: only that meat must not be contemned."

Now for whom this holy Supper is instituted, and to whom it is to be ministered we have, also, to consider. It seemeth that it is instituted and to be given unto all faithful christian people, of what sex soever,—men and women, high and low. Wherefore so great a mystery is not cast unto swine and dogs, to be contemned and trodden under foot. Before it be ministered, all men are earnestly and effectually to be admonished unto whom the meat appertaineth; namely to them that acknowledge their sins; that are sorry for their faults; and believe in Christ: all are to be admonished, that every man, descending into himself, do prove himself, and afterward so eat of this holy bread, and drink of this holy drink; that he eat not and drink not

¹ Epist. III.

thereof unworthily, unto his condemnation. But after this severe admonition, if any approach unto the table and sit down, and by their sitting down do, as it were, openly profess both that they are, and, also, do desire to remain true worshippers of Christ, by whom they trust to have remission of their sins; surely such are not to be put back by the ministers, neither are the holy mysteries to be denied them. For the Lord himself, who is the searcher of hearts, severely, diligently, plainly, and in many words, in His last Supper before He distributed the mysteries, admonished Judas, being a hypocrite, a thief, a traitor, a murderer, yea a parricide, a blasphemer, and a forsaker of His master; but being admonished, when, notwithstanding, he departed not from the table but tarried among the saints, the Lord did not violently put him away, nor bade him openly to depart; neither withheld He the Lord's bread from him, but gave it unto him as He did unto others, although He knew assuredly what he was: which thing the ministers of the church do not always so certainly know of them that sit down at the table. Neither did the Lord offend any whit at all in so doing; neither did He cast that which was holy unto the dogs. For the Lord warned him diligently of all matters, whereof he was to be warned; and he hearing and understanding them all remaineth, notwithstanding, among the saints, vaunteth himself for one of the faithful, not for an hog; and, as one of the faithful, taketh part of the bread and of the cup. By which hypocrisy, notwithstanding, he provoked the heavy judgement of God against him, even as also at this day this holy meat and this holy drink turneth to the destruction both of the body and soul of all hypocrites. Neither did the presence of the hypocrite at the Lord's

table defile the other faithful disciples of Christ which sat at the table: like as neither at this day are the faithful polluted, although they see many hypocrites sit down at the table with them. For they sup not with them as with hypocrites, but, as it were, with the faithful. In the mean while the hypocrite hurteth himself and not others: he falleth and perisheth to his own destruction: he eateth and drinketh his own damnation: but the faithful liveth by his own faith:—of which thing we have entreated in other Sermons.

And although that infants are reputed to be of the church, and in the number of the faithful, yet are they not capable of the Supper. In this point the ancient fathers shamefully erred; which I have, also, noted in the Sermon on Baptism. Infants are not deprived of everlasting life, although they depart out of this world without receiving this mystical meat. This was instituted for them that are of lawful years, and not for infants. Let a man examine himself (saith the Apostle) and let him so eat of the bread, and drink of the cup. And the Lord saith, "Do this in remembrance of me." And again "Shew forth the Lord's death until He come." All which sayings take place in people of lawful years, not in infants. Our children must be diligently instructed from their infancy, that they may rightly understand those mysteries, and frequent them; which things the Lord commanded the children of Israel, saying: "If your children shall say unto you, What manner of worshipping is this? you shall answer: It is the sacrifice of the Lord's passover, who passed over the houses of the children of Israel, when He struck the Egyptians, and delivered our houses." (Exod. xii. 26, 27.) Surely we must not shew ourselves to be more slack in informing our

children than they were, since we have received a more noble benefit than they have.

Of like nature unto this question are these other: Whether the Supper be to be celebrated privately for every cause or necessity? Whether it be to be carried unto the sick, and those that keep their beds? Whether it be to be applied to the dead; that is to say, to be offered for the dead, to obtain rest for them? Touching these matters I know what is commonly said and done. There happeneth some pestilence, famine, war, or tempest, and by and by the Supper is commanded to be celebrated; that, as it were, by this sacrifice, the present calamity may be taken away. Again, there is one sick, another perisheth with hunger, and afflicted for want of all manner of necessaries; the same requireth of the priest to have the Lord's Supper ministered unto him; that thereby the disease may be cured, as by a most present and approved remedy, and his hunger and poverty released. But this is not the due celebration of the Supper, but a filthy profanation thereof. For the Lord hath not instituted it to be a cleansing sacrifice against all calamities, whereby He would be pleased; but to be a memorial of His death, and a dutiful thanksgiving. For when we be at the Supper, we offer nothing unto Him for which He should be favourable unto us; and turn away such an evil from us; and give us such a good thing as we desire of Him; but we give thanks for the benefits which we have received. It is lawful, otherwise, for them that are oppressed with troubles, to offer up their vows, (that is to say) their prayers to the Lord: but it is not lawful to convert His holy mysteries to any other purpose than He hath appointed. Neither have we any examples to prove, that any holy man did ever use the Lord's Sup-

per to any such end as these men do. The children of Israel received the feast of the Paschal Lamb in remembrance of their deliverance out of Egypt; and that they should continue thankful unto so beneficial a Lord: how great an offence had they committed, if they had so oftentimes eaten their banquet as, being oppressed with calamities, they desired to be delivered, and desired it by doing that deed. They received the Ark of the covenant from the Lord, in token of His divine presence and assured help; but when, contrary unto the end whereunto it was appointed, they bare it into the camp, to the intent they might obtain the victory thereby, they themselves were put to flight and slain, and the Ark carried away by the Philistines into captivity.

Again, if the Lord's Supper be a public holy feast of the whole church gathered together in one, in the which there ought to be breaking, distributing, eating, and drinking, and thereby the communion of the body and blood of Christ be declared and sealed; it followeth that the Lord's Supper ought not to be ordained either for any in health or sickness, either for any lying sick on his bed, or at the point of death; be it either privately at home or openly at church: neither can the godly require the Lord's Supper unto any such private uses. For the institution of Christ our Lord must not be altered by any human authority or custom. Verily St Paul requireth a public assembly of the church, and a general meeting for the due celebration of the Supper. "When you meet together, therefore, in one place, this is not to take the Supper of the Lord," that is to say, "Ye do not eat the Lord's Supper." The reason is, "for every one when they should eat, taketh his own supper, &c." (1 Cor. xi. 20, 21.) Wherefore he will not

that any thing be done therein privately. Likewise in the same place, he saith, that they meet together and eat the Lord's Supper unto their own damnation, which make haste to the Supper, not tarrying for the congregation until they do all meet, and they eat and drink together. For, he saith "Wherefore, my brethren, when you meet to eat and drink, tarry one for another" (if any man be hungry, let him eat at home, to wit, that he be not constrained to eat before the residue) "that ye meet not together to your condemnation." Wherefore the Lord's Supper is not a private but a public supper, to be given to no man privately. And, forasmuch, as that assembly is not public or general when four or five do communicate with the sick, their saying is nothing which say, that Supper may be ordained for the sick, if so be that others do sup with them. Moreover, who will deny that the example of Christ and the Apostles is perpetually to be followed? But it is evident enough that Christ celebrated His Supper in a common dining place, having gathered the church unto Him as well as it might at that time be gathered. Saint Paul saith, that in that point he followed the example of the Lord; and that he hath delivered no other thing to the church than that which he received of the Lord. Neither read we in any place of the scriptures, that the other Apostles of Christ carried the Sacrament to the sick; and that they ordained the holy Supper privately for every one to appease his temptation. But all the Apostles command us, in every place, to confirm and strengthen the sick and afflicted conscience with the Lord's word: they teach us, also, to succour the distressed with diligent prayer. Saint James hath diligently set down in writing how the faithful shall behave themselves towards the sick and them that

are departing out of this world (James v. 14): but as touching the celebrating or carrying the Sacrament unto them, he speaketh not one word. Neither is it likely that the Apostles, the most faithful Doctors of the church, would dissemble the matter, if so be they had thought that it appertained chiefly to our salvation. They have warned us often of things of far less importance: and certain it is that they have taught the church all things that belong to true godliness and salvation: but as for this matter they have not mentioned one word of it.

They object, out of the Acts of the Apostles, this authority, "And breaking bread from house to house; they ate meat together with gladness and singleness of heart, praising God." (Acts ii. 46, 47.) But that place is to be understood of the bodily and nourishing meat, not of the mystical food. For it followeth, "They received meat"¹ or sustenance together: and, therefore, as it is read in the fifty-eighth chapter of Isaiah, "to break bread," is as much as to say, "to feed;" and so it signifieth here also. For the richer sort gave food to the poorer, which they did with a cheerful, not a slothful heart: and they that received the benefit praised God. But if any man do stubbornly contend, that the Apostles did sup in private houses, we answer, that it maketh nothing to the present matter of the sick, and of private communion. For, as I have said before, at that time they used private houses instead of churches: and, therefore, they supped in private houses, not to feed the sick with the bread of the Sacrament, but because the universal church of that place was gathered together in them; as it appeareth in the twentieth chapter of the Acts; as the manner is in persecutions. They object,

¹ μεταλαμβάνειν τροφῆς

moreover, that the ancient Fathers sent the Sacrament unto them that were bound in prison; to them that were departing, to feed upon on the way. But I have declared, in place elsewhere, wherefore the ancient Fathers did so. Hereunto, also, we add, that man's custom cannot prejudice the word of God. The blessed martyr Irenæus² writeth, that the bishops of Rome were wont to send the Sacrament to other bishops which came to Rome from other places, in token of concord and agreement: but that custom was not used by all bishops, neither is it used in the church at this present. Hereof it followeth, that many things were used by the ancient Fathers, (as that whereof we spoke before, which was in giving the Sacrament to infants :) which, notwithstanding, are no law unto us. Good men, also, at this day may suffer a private supper, for a time, for them that do not yet understand the full use of the Supper. But who will gather hereof, that every man ought of duty to do that, which is permitted unto some upon sufferance? But if we continue contentiously to affirm it to be a relief for us in travel, it will grow to this, (which we have seen received already certain hundred years ago) that there shall be hope and confidence put in the receiving of the Sacrament as though that in respect thereof we were acceptable unto God; and when we depart out of this life we should fly straightways up into heaven, but without receiving the Sacrament be thrown directly down to hell. There must also needs arise sundry other errors.

Neither is there any necessity to constrain us to minister the Sacrament to the sick: for as prisoners are absent from receiving the Lord's Supper without danger of sal-

² Edit. Grabe, p. 466.: *Euscb. Hist. Eccl.* v. 24.

vation, so likewise are the sick, and those that are ready to die. For being, nevertheless, by perfect faith gathered to the body of Christ, and although they be absent in body, yet being in mind present with the congregation, they be, also, made partakers of all spiritual good things. And it is sufficient for them that as long as they have been in health, they have been always present at the holy mysteries. The feast of passover was not celebrated everywhere, but at Jerusalem only, in one place: but how many were there, think we, that by reason of their bodily health impaired with sickness, and for old age, could not travel to Jerusalem from so large and wide a kingdom? And although no man brought them home a piece of the paschal Lamb in their pockets, notwithstanding they did communicate with the whole church of Israel. And who doubteth that, by the coming of Christ, the condition of the christians is not impaired?

Our Lord Christ did not institute his mystical Supper for the dead, but for the living only: wherefore it is not to be celebrated for the dead, and to be applied to their redemption. They that be without faith, immediately fall under the judgement of damnation: but they that are dead in Christ are already joined unto the company of the elders, and stand before the Lamb, singing "Alleluiah" for evermore. For I have declared in my sermon, *Of the Soul*, that the salvation of the faithful souls which are departed by corporeal death, is most undoubted. And where some object, that the ancient Fathers have made mention of offering for the dead, we suppose that it appertaineth not unto us. For we believe the canonical scriptures, without contradiction: we believe not the Fathers further than they can prove their own sayings by the canonical scriptures.

Neither would they have themselves otherwise believed. And, therefore, if the Fathers think that the Supper is a sacrifice; and that is to be offered to procure rest to the souls departed; we do not receive that opinion, as not agreeing with the canonical scriptures, which teach, that the Lord instituted not His Supper for that purpose: and, therefore, by such abuse of the Supper, God is rather displeased than pleased. Yea, that there is no work of man, be it never so good, much less it be against God's word, that can sanctify; since that prerogative belongeth only to the merit of the Son of God: and, moreover, that the souls departed are not in any such state in that other world, that they can, or ought to be holpen by any works in this world. But if the ancient Fathers by oblation or offering, do understand the sacrifice of praise or thanksgiving, we will not strive against them, but that there may be made oblations for the dead; that is to say, that thanks be given to God, and His goodness praised, who hath called out of this miserable world such as were endued with true faith; and hath joined them unto the companies of angels and all the blessed saints in that everlasting kingdom of all joy and felicity. But surely there is no truth nor godliness that willeth us to celebrate the Supper for the dead.

And we make a distinction in sacrifice or oblation. For there is a sacrifice of expiation; and there is a sacrifice of confession or praise. The sacrifice of expiation is offered to cleanse or purge sins, and also for satisfaction for sins. This cannot be accomplished without death and blood: as St Paul the Apostle sheweth plainly in the ninth chapter to the Hebrews. The sacrifice of Christ was such an one; (the figures of which were all the sacrifices of all the holy Fathers of the Old Testament) who, being both Priest and

sacrifice offered by Himself once to God the Father while He suffered upon the cross; and shedding His most innocent blood, there gave up the ghost. The Supper at this day is no such sacrifice, but a commemoration of the death, or of the sacrifice once offered upon the cross. For neither ought, nor can Christ be sacrificed again, who, being once offered, is sufficient to cleanse all the sins of all ages. Why then should He be sacrificed again? Neither can the Son of God be sacrificed by any man, since that, for the same cause, He offered up Himself once to God, as being a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec. Therefore, the minister of the church doth not, in the church, sacrifice the body and blood of Christ in the Supper, for the living: but, together with the whole church, doth celebrate the remembrance of the sacrifice which was once offered upon the cross. Of which, as I have said elsewhere, the Supper may, also, be called a sacrifice, because it is a Sacrament or sign of the sacrifice which was once offered by Christ, as Augustine also hath left written. The sacrifice of confession, is of praise and thanksgiving, which we offer to God for the redemption and benefits of God freely bestowed upon His church. And since we offer the same always unto God in prayer, but chiefly when we are joined in the Sacrament of the Eucharist, or celebrating the Supper: therefore, the ancient Fathers called it a sacrifice, because in the same we give thanks unto God for our deliverance from death, and for the inheritance of everlasting life which is given unto us. And that this sacrifice is generally offered by the universal church in celebrating the Supper, and not by the minister of the church alone, for those that live in the church; we told you before.

Now forasmuch as we have hitherto discussed certain circumstances or questions which are wont to be moved about the Lord's Supper, so far forth as the necessity of the matter seemed to require; and as much as our small ability was able to perform; it remaineth that we descend, further, to declare, for what cause the Lord's Supper was, by the Lord, instituted: which place truly is not rashly reckoned among the chiefest; for we made mention of the same immediately upon the beginning of this Sermon. For the Lord by setting bread and wine before us in the holy Banquet, would have His promise and communion testified unto us, and His gifts represented unto us, and made manifest unto our senses; and would, also, gather us visibly into one body; and retain the memory of His death in the hearts of the faithful; and, finally, put us in mind of our duty, chiefly of praise and thanksgiving. All these things have we severally expounded, having discoursed upon them at large in the general consideration and treatise of the Sacraments: and, therefore, at this present, we will do no more but touch them briefly for memory's sake; meaning to handle those things somewhat largely which shall by occasion arise as they are intreated upon. But [by] this word, 'Communion', I mean the society, conjunction or partaking of the Lord Christ; by the which, through His Spirit, He doth wholly knit and join Himself to us, and we are made partakers of Him by faith, and are coupled unto Him: so that being by Him delivered from sin and death, we may live in Him, being made heirs of everlasting life; and that He may live in us, and be wholly ours as we be wholly His. Neither do we say, that the communion of the Lord's body and blood is any thing else. For by His body which was delivered over to death for us, and by

His blood which was shed for the remission of sins, it is come to pass, that we, being purged from our sins, are made His members and He now quickeneth us, and sustaineth us as food which giveth life: whereupon we are, also, said to eat and drink Him as the meat and drink of life. The promise, therefore, whereof we made mention even now, is none other than the word of God, which declareth unto us that life is in Christ only: for Christ delivered His body to the death, and shed His blood for the remission of sins, that we, believing in Him, may have life everlasting. But this promise and communion of Christ is not now first of all given in the Supper or by the Supper. For the Lord our God, immediately after the creation of the world, promised life and remission of sins unto Adam and his seed through Christ: and afterwards renewed the same promise with Noah, Abraham, Moses, and David, and the other Fathers. And that the Fathers did communicate with Christ, and were partakers of His goodness, Paul the Apostle with the whole scripture is a witness. But this so great goodness happened not to the Fathers only. For the promise was made unto us also; and the communion of Christ was conveyed unto us; and is conveyed particularly unto every one of us in holy Baptism; and also in the manifest preaching of the gospel. Moreover, we receive the same by faith, by which we are joined to Christ and are made His members. Therefore, as we are not void and without Christ before the Supper, but are quickened by Him, and made His members or partners; so, in the very action or celebration of [the] Supper, the promise is renewed unto us; and we renew and continue that fellowship which we have in Christ, by the body and blood of Christ spiritually; truly participating His life and all

His good gifts through faith. And by this means we eat the Lord's body, and drink His blood. Moreover, the Lord doth visibly declare and seal unto us that spiritual communion and promise of life made through Christ by visible signs; to wit, the banquet of bread and wine, joined to this word or promise,—namely, that it is a quickening bread and drink; and that we, (having received the signs by faith and obedience,) being thereto sealed, do take upon us the promise and communion of Christ, by imprinting or transferring into our bodies the seal or sacrament of the body and blood of Christ. Of which thing the Apostle hath, also, intreated in the first Corinthians, chap. x.; and also to the Romans, chap. iv.: and we, also, have said more thereof in the general treatise of the Sacraments.

But before I intreat further of the other ends of the Supper consisting in the description thereof, I will recite what other some allege of the promise and communion of Christ. They condemn our doctrine as heretical: for they contend, that the Lord promised that He would give unto the faithful His very body and blood, to be eaten and drunken under the form of bread and wine: therefore, it must, by all means and without all contradiction, be believed, that the bread is the Lord's natural body, and the wine His blood; and that these ought to be eaten and drunken not only spiritually, but also corporeally, unto life everlasting. And, that Christ is bodily present in the Supper, and that bread is His body, and the wine His blood, thus they prove: that which the Lord speaketh cannot be false, for He is the truth itself. But He saith that the bread is His body, and the wine His blood: therefore the bread and wine of the Sacrament, are verily, really, and essentially the body and blood of Christ. Which truth,

they say, must simply be believed, although reason itself, the whole world, all senses, and nature itself be against it. We answer, that indeed all things are true which the Lord hath spoken, who is truth itself; but in that sense which He himself said and understood, not in that meaning which we will enforce upon His words. Wherefore, before all things we must search out the true sense of the Lord's words in the Supper, "This is my body:" "This is my blood," &c.

These men cry out saying, that the Lord's words ought to be expounded simply, and according to the letter: for they are the words of a Testament; and that permitteth not His words to be expounded by a trope or figure. But we say, all the evangelical and apostolical books are numbered under the title of the Testament; and therefore, throughout all and every place of the scripture, nothing must be corrupted, nothing added, nothing diminished; unless we will be subject to the curse of God. And yet we are, also, constrained to confess, that there be infinite sentences in the holy scriptures, which if we will proceed to expound simply according to the letter, we shall overthrow the whole scripture and the true faith; or we shall seem to charge the scriptures with lies and contradiction. I will bring forth one or two examples of this sort. The Evangelist St John writeth "The Word became flesh¹." Now if we will cleave to the very words, then must we say that God was changed into man. But forasmuch as this sense is contrary to the faith and the scriptures,—for God is immutable, and Christ is true God and man; and, therefore, without all mixture and connection of natures, but remaining still in their own properties,—we do admit that exposi-

¹ John i. 14.

tion, which declareth that the Word took flesh, and that God was made man. And this sense is not against scripture: for Paul saith, that the Son of God in no sort took upon him the nature of Angels, but the seed of Abraham². Moreover the catholic Fathers, together with that Apostle, do expound this word, *est*, by this word, *assumpsit*, 'took upon him.' Whereof, Theodoret, hath intreated at large in his *Polymorphus, Dialog.* 1. Again, the Lord saith in the same John, "The Father is greater than I³:" We should enforce an equality in the holy Trinity, if we should contend that the Lord's words are simply to be understood without interpretation. But by conference of other places, and taking advice of faith, we say, that the Son is equal with the Father touching His divinity, but inferior unto Him in respect of His humanity: according to that saying of the Prophet, which is alleged by the Apostle to the purpose, "Thou hast made Him little inferior to the Angels⁴." We read in the Gospel, that Christ our Lord had brethren; and that St John, the Apostle, was called the son of Mary; and Mary called the mother of John. But who, unless he were infected with the heresy of Helvidius, will stand herein, that these places are to be expounded according to the letter, specially since other places of scripture do manifestly prove that they were called brethren, which indeed were brothers' and sisters' children, cousins german, kinsmen, or near of blood: also, the circumstances of place in the nineteenth chapter of St John, prove that Mary was committed to John as a mother to her son. Wherefore, if they have a desire still to wrangle, as hitherto at their own pleasures they have by proof found them to do, crying out and reiterating in their cries, "This is my body:" "This is my

² Heb. ii. 16.³ John xiv. 28.⁴ Heb. ii. 9.

blood:" "This is," "This is," "This is," "This is," "Is," "Is," "Is:"—we will also repeat, "The word was made," "was made," "was made flesh:" "The Father is," "Is," "is greater than I:" "Christ has brethren;" I say, "He hath brethren;" "He hath brethren:" "The scripture hath so:" "The truth saith so." But, tell me now, what commodity shall there redound to the church by these troublesome and odious outeries, and most froward contentions? How shall the hearers be edified? How shall the glory of God be enlarged? How shall the truth be set forth? Necessity, therefore, constraineth us to confess, that in some places we must forsake the letter, but not the sense; and that sense is to be allowed which faith itself, with other places of scripture conferred with it; and finally, the circumstances of the place, the first being compared with the last; do yield as it were of their own accord. Howbeit we also cry out, and repeat again and again, that we ought not without great cause to go from the simplicity of the word. But when as the absurdity, not of reason but of piety, and the repugnancy of the scriptures, and contrariety to the articles of our faith, do enforce us; then we say, affirm, and contend, that it is godly, yea, necessary to depart from the letter, and from the simplicity of the words. And that these places which we alleged even now, do constrain us to depart from the letter in these words of the Lord, "This is my body;" "This is my blood," we will prove by most sound arguments taken out of the scriptures, when I have first briefly declared the true and ancient sense and meaning of those usual and solemn words.

The Lord, sitting at the self-same table with His disciples, reached the bread unto them with His own hand: and He, having only one true, human, and natural body,

with the very same body delivered bread unto His disciples; and not a body either any other man's, or that of His own. Neither doth that trouble us which St Augustine reciteth of David, in expounding the 33d Psalm¹:—"And he was borne in his own hands:"—whereunto he addeth immediately: "Who is borne in his own hands? A man may be borne in the hands of other men, but none can be borne in his own. This is, therefore, meant of David, not of Christ. For Christ was borne in His own hands, when as commending His very body unto them He said; 'This is my body.' For that body was borne in His own hands." For by these words St Augustine doth not feign that Christ hath two human bodies; but he meaneth, that the human body bare in His hands the sacramental body; that is to say; the bread which is the Sacrament of the true body. For he speaketh plainly, saying, "He, commending his body, bare that body in his hands." For in the second sermon, almost in the same words being but a little changed, he saith: "How was He borne in His own hands? For when He had commended His body and blood, He took that in His hands which the faithful know: and after a sort He bare Himself when He said, 'This is my body'." By which words he manifestly declared, that he meant not that Christ, in His natural body, delivered His natural body to His disciples; but that which the faithful do know; to wit, the Sacrament or mystery. For it followeth, "And He bare Himself after a sort." (I pray you mark this saying, "After a sort") "when He said, 'This is my body'." Wherefore, those solemn words, "This is my body which is broken for you:" And likewise, "This is my blood which is shed for you;"—can have none other sense

¹ Concio. 1.

than this, 'this is a commemoration, memorial or remembrance, sign or sacrament of my body which is given for you. This cup, or rather the wine in the cup, signifieth or representeth unto you my blood, which was once shed for you.' For there followeth, in the Lord's solemn words, that which notably confirmeth this meaning;—"Do this in remembrance of me." As if he should say, 'Now am I present with you, before your eyes: I shall die and ascend up into heaven, and then shall this holy bread and wine be a memorial or token of my body and blood given and shed for you. Then break the bread and eat it; distribute the cup and drink it; and do this in remembrance of me; praising my benefits bestowed on you in redeeming you, and giving you life.' Although this interpretation be most slanderously reviled and become abominable in the sight of many, yet it is manifest to be the true, proper, and most ancient interpretation of all other. Tertullian, (*Contra Marc.* lib. iv. c. 40.) saith, "Christ taking the bread and distributing it to His disciples, made it His body in saying, 'This is my body:' that is to say, the figure of my body." Jerome upon St Matthew's¹ Gospel saith, "That like as, in the prefiguring of Christ, Melchisedec the priest of Almighty God had done in bringing forth bread and wine; so He might represent the truth of His body." Chrysostom, also, in his 83d Homily upon St Matthew; "If Jesus be not dead," saith he, "whose token and sign is this sacrifice." Ambrose² upon the first of Corinthians, chap. xi., "Because we be delivered by the Lord's death," saith he, "being mindful therefore in eating and drinking, we do signify the

¹ Cap. xxvi.

² The commentary here quoted, though formerly ascribed to St Ambrose, is now generally admitted not to have been written by him.

flesh and the blood which were offered for us." Aurelius Augustine, also, in many places, heapeth up many speeches like to this same kind of speech: "The blood is the soul:" "The rock was Christ:" and "This is my body." Let us hear, then, what he saith of these speeches, that we may understand what he thinketh of the true interpretation of this text, "This is my body." In the 3d Book of Questions, in the 57th Question upon Leviticus, he saith, "It remaineth that that be called the soul, which signifieth the soul. For the thing that signifieth, is wont to be called by the name of that thing which it signifieth: as it is written, 'The seven ears of wheat are seven years.' He said not 'Do signify seven years.' And, 'seven oxen are seven years;' and many such like. In like sort it is said, 'The rock was Christ.' He said not, 'The rock signifieth Christ;' but as though it were so indeed, which is not the same in substance, but by signification. So, likewise, the blood, because, through a certain vital substance in it, signifieth the soul, in the Sacraments is called soul." Thus far he. The same Augustine, also against Adimantus, cap. 12, saith, "So is blood the soul, like as the rock was Christ." And again, in the same place, he saith, "I may also expound that that precept of the blood and soul of the beast, &c. consisteth in the sign. For the Lord doubted not to say, 'This is my body,' when He gave the sign of His body." Thus much Augustine. There is no fool so doltish that will say, that these words of Augustine are dark or doubtful. Who so list may add hereunto that which the same author hath plainly written concerning figurative speech. *Contra Advers. Legis* lib. II. cap. 2.

But let us leave off to cite men's testimonies concerning the proper and most ancient exposition of Christ's words,

“This is my body:” let us rather proceed to allege sound arguments out of the scriptures, as we promised to do, thereby to prove that we must sometime of necessity depart from the letter; and that Christ's words are accordingly, as I have said, to be expounded by a figure.

First it is evident, that the Lord at this present instituted a Sacrament: whereby it is manifest, that the Lord spake after the same manner as He is wont to speak in other places of the scripture concerning Sacraments; as when He saith, that circumcision is the Lord's covenant; the lamb, the Lord's passover; that sacrifices are sins and sanctifications; baptism, the water of regeneration¹. But we declared in the sixth Sermon of the Decade, that all these kinds of speeches remain to be expounded. This saying or speech, therefore, is to be expounded, “This is my body;” “This is my blood;”—because it is sacramental. For it received the common interpretation, which most truly and for certainty was used and received by the catholic church, even since the time of the Apostles: yea and ever since the time of the Patriarchs, until this day; to wit, that signs do receive the terms and names of those things that are signified: so that thereby they receive no part of their substance, but do still continue and remain in their own proper nature. For this cause it cometh to pass, that our Lord Christ, in the Gospel written by St Luke, did join the banquet of the passover with this our Lord's Supper, in such sort, that He substituted this in the place of the other; that it should not seem strange if He had said in this our Supper, “This is my body:” for in the solemnizing of the feast of passover, it is thus said, “The lamb is the

¹ Gen. xvii. 13: Exod. xii. 27: Levit. iv. 3, 25, 29: Heb. ix. 13: Tit. iii. 5.

Lord's passover." Which kind of speech was not dark to be understood by the Apostles, who understood that this lamb was a remembrance of the passage once passed. By that means, also, they understood that the Lord's bread, given unto them by the Lord, is a remembrance of His body. For in other matters of much less weight they diligently questioned and enquired of the Lord, touching the proper sense and signification of the words. But of these words they never doubted or asked any question: for all sacramental speeches were to the holy Fathers very well known. Moreover, if we continue to understand the words of the Supper simply according to the letter, it followeth that the Lord hath delivered unto us His body and blood corporally to be received. And, I pray you, to what end should He deliver them, but that we receiving them corporally, might live? But the universal, canonical scripture teacheth, that our life or salvation, and our justification consisteth in faith only; which we repose in the body which was given and the blood shed for us, (which is the spiritual eating) not in any work of ours; much less in the bodily eating of Christ's body, which He sheweth in another place, to be nothing available. Then, since there is but one means, and that most simply whereby to attain life and justification, to wit, by faith only, not by the work of our eating, neither is the scripture repugnant to itself; surely the Lord hath not instituted any such work of eating; and, therefore, the solemn words of the Supper do admit some other exposition. If the bread were the Lord's true and natural body, it must needs follow, that even the wicked, being partakers of this bread, should eat Christ's body; and that verily His flesh should be meat to feed the belly: since they that eat it, lack both minds and faith.

But all holy men abhor that thought as absurd and most unworthy: of which matter I will entreat more hereafter. Therefore, the saying of Christ, "This is my body," admitteth an exposition. The whole, universal, canonical scripture witnesseth that our Lord Jesus Christ took a body of the undefiled Virgin, consubstantial in all points unto our bodies; that is to say, a human body; yea, that He was made like unto us in all respects except sin. Now it is manifest that He spake of His true, sensible body, when He saith, "This is my body:" for He addeth, "Which is broken or given for you." But the true, natural, sensible, or human body was delivered and died for us. But this appeareth not in the bread, or under the bread: wherefore the Lord's words must be expounded. Surely if it had been the Lord's will to make His body bread, and His blood of wine, according to the power whereof He made all things with His word; as soon as ever he said, "This is my body," the bread had been the body of Christ; and that very body whereof He spake, mortal, passible, to be felt and seen. For "He spake the word and they were made, He commanded and they were created¹." He said "Let there be light, and light was made²:" and such kind of light as might be perceived and did shine. But in the Supper we see nothing in Christ's hands but bread: no body. And, therefore, it was not our Saviour's meaning by these words, "This is my body," to create or make His body of the bread. For, if He had meant so to do, surely it had been done. Neither is there any cause why they should here, as it were, casting their mists before our eyes, [produce an obscurity] and apply their coloured interpretation unto a rotten construction; using words, 'unspeakably,' 'super-

¹ Psalm cxlviii. 5.

² Gen. i. 3.

naturally,' 'invisibly,' 'not qualitatively,' 'not quantitatively,' 'not as in a place.' For by these terms, they, intending in the mean while to bring some other thing to pass, do by the wonderful judgement of God, quite subvert and overthrow all that is their own. For if this their mystery be unspeakable, why then do they use these terms, essentially, substantially, really, corporally? For they that speak so, do utter, truly, and set down the manner of His presence. If the bread be supernaturally the body of Christ, why then do they add naturally? And if the bread be Christ's body invisibly, then can it not be corporally; neither can it be a true body, whose property is to be visible. Who would not laugh if he should hear that fire burnt and gave no heat; and that light did shine and gave no light? If He be not present in quality, quantity, and as in a place; then is He not corporally present. For, I pray you, are not qualities, quantities, and place belonging to the body? Hearken what Augustine saith unto Dardanus touching the presence of God, "Take," saith he, "space of place from bodies, and they shall be no where; and because they shall be no where, they shall not be at all. Take the bodies themselves from the qualities of bodies, and they shall be no where; and therefore, it must needs be they cannot be at all." Let not us, therefore, rob or spoil the Lord's body of the properties thereof, and so deny the truth of His body. Again, that we bring not so contrarities and absurd things into one and the same opinion, we interpret the words of the Lord, "This is my body;" this is a memorial or remembrance of my body: or else, this signifieth my body. Moreover if this word, *est*, is, be to be understood substantively in the Lord's words, "This is my body;" it followeth then, that the bread is changed into Christ's

body. But that this is not so, all our senses do witness; the very substance remaining, not only the accidents of the bread. It is necessary, therefore, that our adversaries do understand, that in this, with this, or under this, is Christ's body. But so are they gone from the simplicity of the Lord's words, who said, "This is my body:" and not, "under this is my body."

Again, if we be so tied to the words above recited, that, upon pain of sacrilege, we may not start from them an hair's breadth; I beseech you then, how durst Luke and Paul recite the words which belong to the cup, far otherwise than Matthew and Mark? "This is my blood which is of the New Testament, which is shed for many for the remission of their sins." But they two recite them thus: "This cup being the New Testament through my blood, which is shed for you:" and "This cup is the New Testament in my blood." But shall we think that there is no difference between the blood of Christ and the New Testament? St Paul defineth the New Testament, after Jeremiah, to be a full remission of sins. And the self-same saith, that this remission of sins is obtained through the blood of Christ. But who will so imprudently contend, as will dare to affirm that the very cup is really and substantially the remission of sins? What cause is there if we hold on and stick precisely to the letter, why we should be forced to confess that the cup, not the wine, nor the drink, is either the blood of Christ; either the New Testament; or the remission of sins? For the Lord saith not, "This wine:" but "This cup." Howbeit in this place, to avoid absurdity, we willingly admit a trope; wherefore then are we not indifferent in a matter of equal importance? Therefore, like as the cup or the wine is the Testament or remission

of sins; so, likewise, the cup or the wine is Christ's blood, and in like manner also the bread, is Christ's body. But the cup is not substantially the remission of sins obtained for us: therefore, the bread is the body of Christ, because it is the Sacrament of the body of Christ.

Surely it is a strong and firm argument that we have brought forth: and of no less force and strength, we hope, is that behind which we will now bring forth . . . The Lord at the celebrating of the holy Supper, saith: "Do ye this in remembrance of me." These words do not import, that we would determine them to be really present, whom we ought to remember. For who shall be said to remember those things which he beholdeth before him in presence? But we must [not] go from the simple signification of remembrance or memory; specially since Paul saith, "Declare the Lord's death until he come." For thus we gather thereby,—he whose remembrance is repeated until he come or return, he surely is not counted to be present, but is looked for to come: therefore the Lord's body which was given for us, the remembrance whereof is celebrated in the mystical Supper, is not present, but is looked for to come.

Now those places, touching Christ's leaving the world and departing hence do not simply admit the interpretation of the words of the Supper. "It is expedient for you," saith He, "that I depart. For if I go not away the Comforter shall not come unto you. But if I depart from you, then will I send him unto you." Also, "I went from the Father, and came into the world: Again, I leave the world, and go to the Father." (John xvi. 7, 28.) And again, "And henceforth I am not in the world, but these are in the world, and I come unto Thee." (John xvii. 11.) These sayings, truly, are repugnant; That He went hence: That

He is no longer in the world: That He left the world: and that His natural body is in the world, and that verily it is given and received really and substantially in the Supper. Neither is it lawful figuratively to interpret the testimonies which are brought forth of St John's Gospel, concerning Christ's departure. For the Apostles do confess, that the Lord spake plainly, or simply without any parable. Insomuch, therefore, as the Apostles do testify that this speech of the Lord was simple, and simply pronounced; it is needful that those other words which are contrary unto these,—“This is my body.”—be expounded by a figure, that the scripture be not repugnant to itself. Moreover, these places which bare record that Christ's body, after the resurrection was circumscribed by place, seen and felt; which, also, do make a difference between Christ's body clarified and the angelical spirits, (where, by the way, we may see, that there is no place left for the device of the definitive mean) do not admit the bare interpretation of the solemn words of the Lord. The angels say, “He is risen; He is not here. Behold the place where they laid Him.” Also, “He shall go before you into Galilee, there shall you see Him.” (Mark xvi. 6, 7.) And again He himself saith to His disciples, “Feel me, and see: a spirit hath not flesh and bones as you see me have.” (Luke xxiv. 39.) These sayings of the clarified body (which is that which ascended, and sitteth at the right of the Father) repugn wholly with ubiquity, or being in every place, and the insensibility of Christ's body: which notwithstanding must needs be granted, if we proceed to enforce the real presence of Christ's body out of the words of the Supper simply understood. Whereto belongeth that which the Apostle, disputing of the resurrection of the dead, saith. “If the dead do not rise, neither

is Christ risen." But, "Christ is risen, being the first fruits of them that sleep:" (1 Cor. xv. 16, 20.) and therefore shall we rise also. Wherefore, by our own bodies being raised again it appeareth, what manner of body Christ's glorious body was, or is, whereunto our bodies are made like. But our bodies shall be true bodies, consisting of sinews, veins, flesh, skin, and bones; visible not invisible; and remaining in some certain place in heaven, not everywhere: whereupon it followeth, that the Lord's body is not invisible and everywhere. But if any man think that to be no good argument which is set from our raised bodies to the Lord's raised body, or contrariwise; let him accuse St Paul who hath taught us this by his example. Therefore, the catholic, and right ancient faith constraineth to expound the words of the Supper by a trope or figure.

Finally, when the Capernaïtes had heard the Lord dispute touching the eating of His body and drinking of His blood; and did think and imagine of a carnal eating and drinking; He said, that He would ascend into heaven: to wit, that they should not think on the eating of His natural body; since in the self-same body He would ascend into heaven. Neither is there left here any place for the new and frivolous device of certain men, which feign, that to ascend into heaven, is nothing else than to lay down the weak state and condition thereof, and to receive a supernatural. For St Luke, whom altogether we must rather believe than such subtle devices or rather follies, saith, that the Lord was lifted up on high, and carried up into heaven from the sight of His disciples: Moreover, that His body was received by a cloud: and that His disciples looked up into heaven after Him, until they heard the angels say unto them, that He would return again in the very same

manner altogether as they saw Him depart away¹. But who knoweth not that He shall come again in the clouds of heaven? Therefore, heaven, into which the Lord ascended, is the name of a place, not of a state or condition. Also, in the Gospel He promiseth us a place with Himself, saying, "If I go to prepare you a place I will come again, and take you unto me; that where I am, there you may be also." (John xiv. 3.) Yea, He laid down all the conditions and infirmities of a mortal body in His resurrection, so that He had no need to lay them down at His ascension.

I suppose that there is none of the faithful that will deny, that the Lord instituted nothing to us in vain, or without some singular and special commodity to us. But when the Lord said in the gospel, that His flesh being corporally eaten availed nothing: where He speaketh of none other body than of that very same whereof he spake in the words of the Supper; to wit, which He gave for us: it followeth, without all contradiction, that the Lord delivered nothing unto us in the Supper, but that would profit us. But He should have delivered that which would not have profited us, if He had given us His body to be eaten corporally. It is evident therefore that it is very necessary the words of the Supper should be expounded.

Hereunto belongeth the notable prophecy, and manifest commandment of our Lord Jesus Christ, saying in the gospel: "Then if they shall say unto you, 'Lo, here is Christ, or there is Christ;' do not believe. For there shall arise false Christs and false prophets; and they shall work great signs and wonders; so that, if it were possible, the very elect shall be brought into error. Behold I have told you be-

¹ Acts i. 9—11.

fore. If therefore they shall say unto you; ‘Behold where he is in the wilderness; go not forth: Behold where he is in the innermost parts of the house,’ (in the closets or coffers, I say: for this word, ἐν ταμείοις signifieth the most secret and innermost parts of all the house, wherein we use to lay up those things which we would have safest kept, which in German we call, *Schrein, Schloss und Gehalt*,) do not believe. For like as the lightning goeth out of the east and appeareth even unto the west, so shall the coming of the Son of man be.” (Matt. xxiv. 23—26.) But although this place is used to be expounded by many of the calamities of the Jews, yet that cannot be denied, which St Jerome also, himself confesseth¹, that in the same likewise the destiny of all the world is prophesied of, even unto the end thereof. Wherefore this place which we have alleged, is concluded with the saying concerning Christ’s last coming into the world at the day of judgement. And, moreover, it cannot be denied that the Lord doth absolutely condemn that doctrine that defendeth that Christ remaineth, or is present, in diverse places in the world in boxes or close places: which not only the books of the teachers of transubstantiation are seen to do; but, also, tabernacles which are erected unto Christ’s body; (which they call “Meat-tents”) also, chapels, with famous temples, and monasteries. In all, and every one of these places, I say, they shew us Christ, saying, “Lo here is Christ; and there is Christ;” “Behold the bread of Angels.” “Christ is wholly in all these sacrifices; and He is fully and wholly in every part of them; even in such sort as He was when He was born of the Virgin Mary, and hung upon the cross.” Which thing they, by and by, confirm by miracles and wonders:

¹ Comment. in Matt. xxiv. 27.

they, also, set it forth with circumstance of words, saying, 'that so great Mysteries are not to be inquired of, but simply to be believed: and, that these things were wrought unspeakably and invisibly by the Omnipotence of God.' Neither did the Lord dissemble how much this error should increase. There shall be such plenty, such great numbers of people, that receive this error, and running after Christ into the deserts and innermost places of the houses, that the very elect shall be in danger. But, in the mean while, in so great peril and danger of things, what doth Christ teach His elect to do? Immediately he addeth, "Do not believe." What, do not believe? That Christ is here or there upon earth; in the wilderness, or in the innermost parts of the house; or even in the midst of the cities; or in the fields. He addeth, moreover, "Go not forth." Follow not the multitude which, by distance of place, seeketh for Christ; as if He were yet conversant upon the earth. Therefore now, if so be the whole world, and all the Councils in the world; all the kings and princes; yea, if all the Angels and Saints should command as to believe that Christ is here or there corporally; yet the commandment of our only Redeemer, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the Father of Wisdom, by whom all things were made, who forbiddeth us to believe the same; ought to be of that authority among all the godly, that they may know that they must not believe as creatures command them, but as the Creator hath commanded them. Yea, moreover, the Lord vouchsafeth, in this very same place of the Gospel, to give us a reason of His doctrine. For why must we not believe that Christ is conversant or bodily present upon the earth, but invisibly? Because, "like as the lightning goeth forth of the east, and appeareth in the west, so shall the coming of the Son of

Man be." Which is as much as if He had said: 'The Son of God came once humbly into the earth, to redeem us through His humility and death on the cross: which thing being finished, He forsook the earth and ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of the Father: from thence He shall not return into these our regions, but to judgement. But then shall He appear glorious, noble, to be seen of all men, as it were the most clear Sun; yea, rather like a lightning right terrible to all the wicked. And, therefore, there is no cause, why, from the time of His ascension until His coming to judgement, we should look for Him to come invisibly, and to remain with us corporally present. St Jerome¹ expounding the same place, saith: "This also must be said, that the second coming of our Saviour shall not be shewed in humility as before, but in glory. It were a foolish part, therefore, to seek Him in a little corner, or in some secret place, who is the light of the world." Thus far he. But lest I may seem to stay myself upon some human authority, I will rehearse that which St Paul teacheth us in his Epistle to the Hebrews, saying: "Christ appeared once before the end of the world, to put away sin by offering up of Himself. And forasmuch as it is appointed to men once to die, and after this cometh the judgement; even so Christ being once offered up to take away the sins of many, shall the second time be seen of them without sin, who look for Him to their salvation." (Heb. xix. 26—28.) Because, therefore, our Lord came once into the world, He was once offered up; but He shall come again, or the second time, at the end of the world; truly He cometh not again, every day into the world. And because He hath forbidden us to believe, if any man should

¹ Ubi supr.

shew Him present here or there unto us in this world: it must needs follow that He may be shewed present here or there; yea, in all places where the Sacrament of thanksgiving is celebrated; if we will understand the words of the Supper according to the letter: therefore it followeth, without all contradiction, by conference of places, that the words of the Lord's Supper ought not to be expounded according to the letter.

I think herewith I have satisfied such as be not of a contentious disposition: for undoubtedly their meaning is, that we should speak of the Sacraments sacramentally; and that sacramental speeches ought to be expounded sacramentally. Besides that we ought to believe nothing that is repugnant to the rule of belief. But by the miracles and omnipotency of God, brought forth and alleged in this place for the setting out and persuading of an evil matter, they do no good at all, after so many and manifest arguments of truth. Miracles are joined unto the word, as it were seals: which things the Lord God himself testifieth in St Mark¹. If, then, they be repugnant to the word, and affirm that which the word altogether denieth; who will not perceive them to be of that kind of miracles whereof the Apostle speaketh in the second chapter of the second Epistle to the Thessalonians; and whereof we have heard now that the Lord gave us warning in the gospel, that we should in no case believe them? The Lord can do all things; but, therefore, He doth not all things: the prophet saith, "Whatsoever the Lord would do, that He did, both in heaven and in earth." (Psalm cxxxv. 6.) Moreover, He will not do such things as are contrary to His word and His faith; therefore, He cannot do that He will not do.

¹ Mark xvi. 17, 18.

Theodoret, in this third Dialogue entitled *Polymorphus*, saith : “The Lord God will do nothing that is not in Him of His own nature : but He can do whatever He will : but He will do such things as are fit and agreeing to His nature.” Therefore God of His own nature is true ; He cannot do that which is contrary to His word. Other sound writers do add : Not that He can do all things ; but that He will not do that which is contrary to His nature ; and because it doth not become Him to do against Himself.

In the mean season, I do expressly profess that I condemn not, or flatly am against all manner of Christ's presence in the church ; and in the action, also, of the Supper. For I am flat against that bodily presence of Christ in the bread, which the Papists defend and enforce upon the churches of God. But I confess, and acknowledge with open mouth and sincere heart, that spiritual, divine, and quickening presence of our Lord Christ, both in the Supper, and also out of the Supper, whereby He continueth to pour Himself into us, not by signs lacking life, but by His Holy Spirit ; to make us partakers of all His good graces ; to justify, quicken, nourish, sustain, and satisfy us : which presence we do, also, feel in ourselves through faith ; by the which we are both sustained, nourished, and satisfied. For Christ is the Head of His church ; and we have fellowship with Him. But how should a living body be without his head ? How should we be partakers of Christ, if we should not feel Him present ; yea, living and working in us ? But of these matters we have also entreated more at large in place convenient.

Some there are, I know well enough, who otherwise are not injurious to the truth, which gainsay these things ; crying out, that by this reason the manner of Christ's pre-

sence in the Supper is not fully enough expressed; especially since He himself, also, hath said elsewhere, "Behold I am with you continually unto the world's end." (Matt. xxviii. 20.) I, saith He, wholly: not my power or divinity; not my Spirit, nor my strength. Moreover, it is a hazard lest we should seem to tear Christ in pieces; seeing that He cannot be wholly with us, unless He be present with us as well in body as in divinity. But we wonder what is in their heads. Do they not understand that the Lord, in that divine talk spoken both in the very Supper, and also immediately after the Supper, did beat upon nothing so much as that very same thing against which they set shoulder; to wit, that Christ would be absent in body, but present in spirit: and that this presence would be more profitable to the church than His bodily presence? Do they not, also, understand wherefore He took flesh and was nailed on the cross: that is to say, what the effect and use is of Christ's body; to wit, that the sacrifice of His body being once offered for us upon earth, He might carry the same up into heaven; in token that both our bodies and souls after our death shall, through His merit, be also carried thither? Therefore, after that the Lord's body had fulfilled on earth that which it came to fulfil, there is no cause why it should do any thing else on earth. He now sitteth, and ought to sit, at the right hand of the Father; that He may draw all us thither unto Him. If there be any that doth not yet fully believe that which we say, let him read the doctrine of St Paul, the Apostle, in the ninth and tenth chapters of his epistle to the Hebrews. Let him, also, read the fourteenth and sixteenth chapters of St John's Gospel. But if it be a pleasure to them to hale at the cable of contention; and to stick precisely as well to these words of the Lord, "I am

with you unto the world's end;" as to these, "This is my body;" "This is my blood;" let them then expound to me these holy testimonies of the holy scripture. Paul saith that Christ dwelleth in our hearts; and that Christ liveth in him; and he in Christ¹. The Lord saith to the thief, "This day shalt thou be with me in paradise." (Luke xxiii. 43.) And the Evangelist saith of the Lord being dead, "They laid Him into the sepulchre." (Luke xxiii. 53.) The scripture saith not, they laid flesh and bones into the sepulchre: but, "They laid Him into the sepulchre." The Lord said not to the thief, Thy soul shall be with my spirit or soul in paradise: but, "Verily I say unto thee, this day shalt thou be with me in paradise." Neither doth St Paul say, that Christ's spirit and life doth live in him, or dwell in our hearts: but he saith simply, "That Christ doth dwell in our hearts." But who is so foolish and given to contention, that for these words and places of the scripture, will contend that Christ's divinity was buried with His body; that Christ's body was with His soul that same day in paradise, in which either of them departed this life; that Christ's body together with His Spirit dwelleth in the hearts of the faithful and liveth in Paul; and that Paul liveth in Christ's flesh? All men do willingly admit the catholic sense of the catholic church, gathered out of the word of God; namely that Christ, in His spirit, is present in His church even to the world's end; but absent in body: and that the thief's was that day present in paradise with Christ's soul, not with His body. So judgeth it, also, of the residue. But if any man mistrust mine interpretation, let him hear St Augustine, in his 50th Treatise upon St John, saying thus, "He speaketh of the presence of His

¹ Eph. iii. 17: Gal. ii. 20.

body, when He saith, 'the poor you shall always have with you, but Me shall you not have always.' For in respect of His majesty, of His providence, and of His unspeakable grace, is that fulfilled which He spake, 'Behold I am with you always, even to the world's end;' but in respect of the flesh which the word took upon it; in respect that He was born of the Virgin; that He was taken by the Jews; that He was nailed to the cross; that He was taken down from the cross; that He was wound in a sheet; that He was laid into the sepulchre; that He was manifested in the resurrection;—'you shall not have Me with you always.' And why so? Because He was conversant, as touching His bodily presence, forty days with His disciples; and they accompanying Him, but not following Him, He ascended into heaven; 'And is not here.' For there He sitteth at the right hand of the Father. And 'He is here.' For He is not gone hence in respect of the presence of His Majesty." Thus far St Augustine. But if they yet proceed, not regarding all this that we have said, to urge that saying of the Lord out of Matthew, "Behold I, even I; I say, am μετ' ὑμῶν with you;" we will, also, object against them this saying of the Lord, and the same out of the Gospel, "It is expedient for you, that I (lo here they have also this word 'I') do depart."—We object also, against them this testimony of the Angels out of Luke: "This Jesus which is taken up, ἀφ' ὑμῶν, from you, into heaven, &c." They shall be at length constrained, whether they will or no, to reconcile such places as seem to be repugnant; and to admit the general understanding which we have alleged and defended hitherto.

Neither is there any danger of dividing Christ: neither divide we Christ's person with Nestorius, since we defend

the property of both natures in Christ against the Eutychians. While Christ our Lord in body was yet conversant upon the earth, He himself witnesseth in the gospel, that nevertheless He was also in the heavens¹. And indeed Christ who was both God and man at the same time, was then in heaven when He was crucified and conversant upon earth; although His body was not crucified in the heavens. But as Christ divided not Himself; although being in heaven, He was notwithstanding conversant and crucified in body upon earth, not in heaven; so neither do we divide Christ, who is both God and man, although we say He is present with us when we celebrate the Supper, and that we communicate with Him: yet, nevertheless, we affirm that in His body He remaineth in heaven, where He sitteth at the right hand of the Father: and so let us keep ourselves within the compass of the scripture. Of this matter I have reasoned at large, when I have entreated of one person and of both natures in Christ unpermixed.

Hitherto have I spoken of the natural meaning of the words of the Lord's Supper as briefly and plainly as possibly as I could. Touching the place of Paul in the first to the Corinthians, chapter x. 16. "The cup of blessing which we bless, &c." with such other texts which are alleged to prove bodily presence, I shall not need to use many words; for we have handled that place already once or twice.

It remaineth, therefore, that we examine and weigh what they deliver unto us touching the eating of Christ's body; and, also, what the canonical scriptures do teach to be thought of that eating. What, say they, the Lord hath promised, the same most surely and fully He performeth. They add, But He promised that He would give us His

¹ John iii. 13.

true body and very blood to be eaten and drunk, in the form of bread and wine, unto everlasting life. They gather, therefore, He hath given His very body and blood to the faithful, under the form of bread and wine, for meat and drink to everlasting life. Whereupon it must be eaten corporally, as it is corporal. To the confirmation whereof they allege the Lord's words, as they are written in the 6th chapter of John's gospel. (ver. 51.) We answer, God most perfectly and fully performeth that which He hath promised; but we add, that He performeth not according to that meaning which we devise, but as His word truly importeth. We must therefore see, first of all, in what sense the Lord promised to give His flesh for bread, and His blood for drink to the faithful: and, next, how we ought to eat His flesh and drink His blood. These things truly which the Lord promiseth here, are well nigh allegories and parables. The Lord promiseth that He will give us His flesh for bread or meat, and His blood for drink. But because meat and drink are ordained and given unto men to preserve their bodily life, and the Lord in the 6th chapter of John speaketh not of the life of the body but of the soul; then is a passage made from bodily things to spiritual things. When, therefore, the Lord promised that He would give us His flesh for bread or meat, and His blood for drink: what other thing did He promise us than that He would give His body to the death, and shed His blood for the remission of sins? For by the death of Christ, we are, as it were, by meat preserved and delivered from death. By Christ's blood we are washed from sin, and our souls are, as it were, with drink spiritually drunken. Therefore, the Lord speaketh nothing here of the bread of the Lord's Supper; neither doth He promise that at the Supper He will make of bread His

flesh, or that He would give His body in form of bread. Then let this mine exposition of Christ's words concerning the giving of Christ's body or flesh in the form of bread, &c. be false and feigned, unless I confirm the same by the words of Christ.

The Lord said in the gospel, "Seek for the meat that perisheth not, but remaineth to life everlasting, which the Son of man shall give unto you." (John vi. 27.) A little after, by interpretation, He addeth, "and the bread which I will give unto you is my flesh which I will give for the life of the world." (ver. 51.) I said, that I would give you bread or meat (for this word bread, is, after the Hebrew manner, used by the Lord for meat and all manner of sustenance) but, saith He, the bread or this meat is my flesh; and, therefore, I promise to give you my flesh, when I promise to give you the bread of life. Here hast thou expressly to understand, that the Lord by "bread", did not mean bodily bread, or the bread of the Supper. But how doth He promise to give His flesh for bread, that is to say, to be meat for us, to quicken us? The Lord repeateth this word, "I will give;" and saith, "which I will give for the life of the world:" I will give it, that is to say, even to the death, that through my death I may quicken you. By dying, therefore, my flesh shall feed; that is, shall quicken. Thus much concerning the promise of His flesh for bread: hereafter followeth of the eating thereof.

Like as the holy scripture setteth down in every place without trope or allegory, that we are made partakers of Christ's death, or of His body which was given for the world unto life, through faith; so, also, in this present place, by a trope or allegory, He biddeth us to eat and drink the flesh and blood of Christ unto everlasting life.

Therefore, to eat Christ's flesh and to drink His blood, is nothing else than to believe that Christ's body was given for us, and His blood shed for us to the remission of sins; and consequently, that we remain in Christ and have Christ remaining in us. For the faith whereof we spake is not only an imagination or thought concerning things past, and exceeding our capacity; but a most certain assurance, and a feeling of heavenly things received within us to our great commodity. For therefore not only faith, but, also, the virtue and force of faith, is by the Lord signified, in John, by the allegory both of eating and drinking. Meat passeth not unto the substance of our body without delight; so, also, by faith, through a great desire of the spirit we are joined with Christ, that He may live in us, and we may live in Christ, and be partakers of all His good gifts. This is the spiritual eating of Christ, who never thought, no not so much as once dreamed, in this place of the gross and bodily eating; which is indeed unprofitable. But forasmuch as the whole point of the controversy consisteth in these words, of eating and drinking the flesh and blood of the Lord, they interpreting the same words bodily and we spiritually, it seemeth good to be showed, that by the words of eating and drinking, the Lord meant no other thing than to believe; and consequently to abide in Christ, and to have Christ abiding in us: we will, therefore, by conference of places of the scripture, bring forth six evident testimonies in confirmation of our assertion.

1. "I am" (saith the Lord) "that bread of life; whoso cometh to me shall not hunger, and whoso believeth in me shall not thirst for ever." (John vi. 35.) But who will deny that there is relation between to eat and not to hunger; to drink and not to thirst? Because, therefore,

the Lord said "He shall not hunger," He should first have said, "Whoso eateth me:" but He rather used the word of coming, and said, "whoso cometh to me shall not hunger." To eat, therefore, is to come; and to come is to eat. And what it is to come to Him, He expoundeth immediately, saying; "Whosoever hath heard from the Father, and hath learned, he it is that cometh to me." (ver. 45.) That is to say, receiveth me, and believeth in me. For Paul also saith, "Whosoever will come to God, must believe." (Heb. xi. 6.) These testimonies without contradiction do prove, that to eat is nothing else but to believe. Yet that followeth which is more manifest: "and whoso believeth in me shall never thirst;" and, "whoso drinketh shall not thirst:" therefore "to drink" He hath put for "to believe." Therefore to drink is to believe. For faith satisfieth and purifieth our minds. Here they have an answer that make this objection: Whether the Lord himself had not words whereby He might declare His mind, if so be by eating and drinking He had meant believing? They have, I say, an open testimony whereby He useth the one for the other.

2. Again, in the same treatise the Lord saith, "Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life, and I will raise him at the latter day." (John vi. 54.) And, again, in the same treatise He saith "This is the will of Him that sent me, that whosoever shall see the Son and believe in Him, may have everlasting life; and I will raise him at the latter day." (ver. 40.) Lo, here thou hast again these words, to eat Christ's flesh, to drink His blood, and to believe in Christ all in one sense.

3. Again, the Lord saith, "I am the lively bread which came down from heaven." And again, He saith,

“ Verily I say unto you, he that believeth in me hath life everlasting. Whosoever shall eat of this bread shall live for ever.” (vv. 47, 51, 58.) Then to eat Christ and to believe in Christ are all one.

4. And, again, He saith, “ Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, abideth in me and I in him.” (v. 56.) Moreover John, in his canonical epistle, saith; “ whosoever shall confess” that is to say, shall believe, “ that Jesus is the Son of God, God abideth in him and he in God.” (1 John iv. 15.)

5. Again, “ Verily, verily, I say unto you, unless you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink His blood you can have no life in you.” (John vi. 53.) And the same Lord saith in the eighth chapter of John, (v. 24.) “ If you do not believe that I am He, ye shall die in your sins.” And again, “ Verily, verily, I say unto you, whoso keepeth my sayings shall never see death.” (John vi. 52.)

6. Again, the Lord saith, “ Like as the living Father hath sent me, and I live by means of the Father: so likewise whoso eateth me shall also live by means of me.” (ver. 57.) And John in the fifth chapter, (v. 26.) saith “ Like as the Father hath life in Himself, so hath He given to the Son to have life in Himself.” And likewise in his canonical epistle, he saith, “ Whoso believeth in the Son of God hath a testimony in himself.” (1 John v. 10.) And, “ whoso hath the Son, hath life.” (ver. 12.)

Unto these most evident testimonies of God, we will now join the testimonies of men; which do say the very same, that to eat Christ is nothing else but to believe in Christ and to abide in Christ. S. Augustine in his 25th Treatise upon John, expounding these words of the Lord,

saith; "This is the work of God, that you should believe in Him whom He sent, as He left written: This is, therefore, to eat the meat that perisheth not, but which remaineth unto everlasting life. Why then dost thou prepare thy teeth and thy belly? Believe and thou hast eaten." The same, again, in his twenty-sixth Treatise, saith, "To believe in Him, this is to eat the bread of life. Whoso believeth in Him, eateth invisibly; and is filled because he is born [again] invisibly." And, again, in the same Treatise, he saith, "This is to eat that meat and drink that drink; to abide in Christ and to have Christ abiding in him; and by this means, whoso abideth not in Christ, and in whom Christ doth not abide, doubtless he neither spiritually eateth His flesh, &c." The same Augustine *De doctrina Christiana* (lib. III. cap. 16.) shewing when a figurative speech is to be admitted, and when not, saith, "If it be an enjoining speech, or forbidding some heinous offence or trespass, or commanding some profit or good deed to be done, it is not figurative. But if it seem to command some heinous offence or trespass, or to forbid some profit or good deed, then it is figurative. Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood, you can have no life in you; this seemeth to command an heinous offence and trespass; therefore, it is figurative: willing us to be partakers of the Lord's passion, and sweetly and profitably to keep in memory, that His flesh was crucified and wounded for us." Thus said Augustine; who doubtless set down not only his own meaning herein, but, also, the meaning of the whole catholic church which was at that time. Let our adversaries, therefore, take heed what they do, who shall drive all the faithful to this wickedness and offence; to wit, that we should corporally eat Christ's body.

Furthermore, hereunto is to be added that which, by reason of the perspicuity and plainness thereof, doth almost surpass all that we have alleged before; which the Lord himself answered to those that wondered, or rather murmured, saying, "How can He give us that His flesh to eat?" (John vi. 52.) after that He had declared the sum of the true faith. "Doth this offend you," saith He, "that I said I would give you bread which came from heaven, even my flesh to be meat to all believers? I suppose that offence shall take no just place, when you shall see me ascend into heaven, from whence I came down unto you; and where I was with my Father before all beginning: then shall ye perceive by my divine ascension, that I am the heavenly bread, the natural Son of God, and the life of the world: ye shall perceive, moreover, that my flesh is not to be eaten bodily, and to be consumed and torn in morsels, but is carried up into heaven for a pledge of the salvation of mankind." And shortly after this He saith, further, "It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the flesh availeth nothing;" and yet more manifestly He speaketh, "The words which I speak unto you are spirit and life." (John vi. 63.) Certain it is that Christ's flesh availeth very much, and is more profitable to the world than any tongue, yea the most eloquent, can express. Yea, the Lord hath warned us beforehand, that we shall have no life unless we eat His flesh. Then doth the Lord deny that His flesh availeth us any thing at all, if so be it be eaten as the Capernaïtes understood, that is to say, bodily. For being bodily eaten it availeth nothing, but being spiritually eaten it quickeneth; and the Lord hath plainly professed, that He spake of the spiritual eating in which consisteth life.

These things being declared and confirmed after the manner, we gather such things into a short summary, wherein we think sufficient answer is made to our adversaries' objection. The proposition is true which holdeth that the Lord doth certainly perform that which He hath promised. But the second proposition is false, which saith, that the Lord by His words in the sixth chapter of John, by bread meant the material bread of the Sacrament; and that He promised that He would convert the same into His flesh. For by bread He meant, not the material bread of the sacrament, but meat to live withal, according to the propriety of the Hebrew tongue; yea, His very flesh which was delivered to the death: to be meat, I say, that we might live through Christ's death. Thus, therefore, should the argument have been framed: That what God promiseth He performeth: but He promiseth that He will give us His flesh for bread; that is to say, to be meat and life for us: Therefore, hath He given His flesh to be meat; that is to say, He hath given over Himself to the death, that by His death we might live. Which being so, surely the meat whereof the Lord speaketh is no bodily meat, although the Lord himself have a true human and natural body of like substance to ours,—but spiritual: not that the flesh is converted into the Spirit, but for that it ought to be received spiritually, not bodily. But it is eaten spiritually, by faith, not with the bodily mouth. For as chewing or eating maketh us partakers of the meat: so are we made partakers of the body and the blood of Christ through faith.

But thou wilt say, How cometh it to pass that seeing bread, whereof mention is made in the 6th chapter of John, doth not signify the bread of the Supper, that almost all the doctors, interpreters, and ministers of the churches do

apply these words to the Lord's Supper? I answer, that these words of the Lord may be applied to the matter of the Lord's Supper for other causes; although the bread signify not the bread of the Sacrament. Yea, I confess, that these words of the Lord, of the eating His flesh and drinking His blood, do bring great light to the matter of the Lord's Supper. St Augustine *De consensu Evangelistarum* (lib. III. c. 1.): saith, "John said nothing in this place (John xiii.) of the body and blood of the Lord; but plainly witnesseth that the Lord hath spoken more at large hereof in another place." Thus much saith he speaking undoubtedly of the sixth of John. Since, therefore, it is one and the self-same body of our Lord whereof he speaketh in both places, in the 1st of Saint John and the 26th of Matthew; and the self-same is said in both places to have been delivered to the death for us, or for our life: and likewise, because there is but one means to be partaker of Christ, which is, by faith in His body what was delivered, and His blood shed: and finally, because it is the catholic or universal and undoubted doctrine, that Christ's flesh being bodily eaten availeth nothing:—surely the things before written in the sixth chapter of John, are agreeable [with] and do fully open the matter of the Lord's Supper.

And to the intent that this yet may be the better understood, I will recite what testimonies have been always alleged in the church, out of the holy scriptures, concerning the two kinds of eating of Christ. Christ's body is eaten, and His blood drunken spiritually; it is also eaten and drunken sacramentally. The spiritual manner [is] accomplished by faith; whereby, being united to Christ, we be made partakers of all His goodness. The sacramental manner is only performed in celebrating the Lord's Supper. The

spiritual eating is perpetual unto the godly, because faith is to them perpetual. They communicate with Christ both without the Supper and in the Supper; and by it they do more increase and continue their new beginnings, as we have also shewed before: and now, by adjoining of the holy action, all things are done more manifestly and plainly. As for the unbelievers and hypocrites, with their captain Judas, they never communicate with Christ; neither before the Supper, nor in the Supper, nor after the Supper, inasmuch as they continue in their unbelief, but they [partake] of the Lord's Sacraments to their own judgement and condemnation.

I know here what some do teach, and how they devise a certain third kind of eating Christ, which is neither spiritual nor yet sacramental, but altogether compounded of sacramental and corporal: for they hold opinion, also, that the true and natural body of Christ is received bodily by the unbelievers in the forms of the Sacrament. Howbeit, it shall easily appear, by certain sound arguments of the scripture, that this is but a device of man: which arguments we will apply to the traitor Judas; that, by this one example, all the godly may learn what they eat and drink at the Lord's Supper. For that the judgement which is made of the head being revealed unto us, it shall be easier for us to pronounce of the members.

Some, truly, do make a doubt whether Judas were present at the Supper when the Lord distributed the holy mysteries; among whom is St Hilary¹. Howbeit the evangelical history saith plainly, that the Lord sat down to meat with the twelve: yea, Luke so handleth his narration, that we cannot doubt but that Judas did communicate of the mysteries with the rest of the Apostles: which St Augustine,

¹ Comment. in Matth. Can. xxx.

also, avoucheth, *Libro de Consensu Ecangelistarum tertio, capite primo*. And, likewise, in the 62nd Treatise upon John; and upon the 10th Psalm; and in his 163rd Epistle. Yea, moreover, Aquinas also answering in this point to St Hilary, approveth of the same with us. (Sum. Theol. Part III. Quæst. 81. art. 2.) Now, therefore, being manifest that Judas was at the Supper with the rest of the Apostles, it seemeth needful that it were known, what he received of the Lord. He received the Sacrament of Christ's body as the other disciples did; but, because he had not faith as the others had, he partaked not of Christ; neither did he eat and drink the Lord's body and blood. For as many as eat the Lord's body and drink His blood do not hunger nor thirst: for they dwell in Christ, and Christ in them; they are Christ's members; they never die. The contrary altogether appeareth in Judas and all his followers: wherefore the unbelievers do neither eat the Lord's body, nor drink His blood. Moreover, it is out of all doubt that there is no agreement between Christ and Belial: for this hath the Apostle pronounced out of the general consent of the scriptures. But Judas is, by Christ himself, called Satan: therefore Judas did not communicate with Christ. Now, if we will contend absolutely that Judas did eat the Lord's body; truly we shall be constrained wickedly to affirm that it is not only an unprofitable, but, also, an hurtful meat: howbeit, godliness teacheth us that Christ is a wholesome meat always to all them that eat Him truly. St Augustine, also, denieth that Judas did eat the Lord's body, or drink His blood. In the 59th Treatise upon St John "The Apostles," (saith he) "did eat the bread which was the Lord, but Judas did eat the Lord's bread against the Lord. They did eat life, but he punishment." Again, in the 26th

Treatise, "Whoso dwelleth not in Christ, nor Christ in him, doubtless, he neither eateth His flesh spiritually, nor drinketh His blood; although, carnally and visibly, he break in his teeth the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ; but he rather eateth and drinketh the Sacrament of so great a matter to his condemnation, &c." The like, also and almost plainer, doth he write in the 21st book and 25th chapter *de Civitate Dei*.

Against these they object the authority of Paul, saying that they which eat unworthily are not guilty of the bread and cup which they have eaten and drunken of, but of the Lord's body and blood: and, also, that they do eat and drink their own damnation, for that they make no difference of the Lord's body. Whereby it followeth necessarily, that they have eaten and drunken the Lord's body unworthily, and not only the Sacraments of the body and blood of Christ. We answer, that Paul saith thus in plain words, "Whosoever eateth of this bread and drinketh of the Lord's cup." (1 Cor. xi. 27.) Mark this, he saith: "Whoso eateth this bread and drinketh of this cup unworthily:" he saith not, 'whoso eateth the flesh, and drinketh the blood unworthily.' For they which eat the Lord are not without faith; and Christ dwelleth in them, and they in Him. If thou yet marvel, how the unbelievers can be guilty of the Lord's body and blood being eaten but sacramentally, learn this out of other places in scripture. The Lord saith in John, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that receiveth whomsoever I shall send, receiveth me; and whoso receiveth me, receiveth Him that sent me." (xiii. 20.): wherefore, whoso receiveth not an Apostle trespasseth not against the Apostle, but against God himself; although in the mean while he hath not seen God, nor will not seem to have repelled

Him. We read how the Judge will say to them that are on His left hand, "Depart from me ye wicked into everlasting fire; for I was hungry and ye gave me no meat; I was thirsty and ye gave me no drink; &c." (Matt. xxv. 41, &c.) But hearken now how the reprobate will make exceptions against this sentence of the Judge, "Lord, when did we see thee hungry or thirsty, and ministered not unto thee?" Then hear, again, what the Judge will answer, "Verily I say unto you, in that ye did it not unto one of the least of these, ye did it not to me." Wherefore, like as he that sinneth against a minister or a beggar, sinneth against Christ himself, although, in the mean while, he hath not Christ's person in any point; so is he, also, guilty of the body and blood of Christ whosoever receiveth the Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ unworthily; although, in the mean season, he have not received the very body and blood of the Lord. Paul saith in another place, that revolvers do crucify again unto themselves the Son of God¹. He, also, denieth in another place, by all manner of means, that it is not possible for Christ to be crucified, or to die any more². Therefore, Christ cannot be crucified again by the apostates, or revolvers; howbeit their shameful falling away from Him is so esteemed of as if they had crucified the Son of God. Although, therefore, the wicked do not eat the Lord's very body, nor drink His blood; nevertheless, they are guilty of betraying the Lord's body and blood, as far as in them lieth. If a rebel tread under his foot the seal or letters of the prince or magistrate, although he touch not the magistrate himself, nor tread him under his foot, yet is he said to have trodden the magistrate under his foot; and is accused, not for hurting the seal or defiling

¹ Heb. vi. 6.

² Rom. vi. 9: Heb. ix. 25, 26.

the letters, but he is charged of treason, and accused for treading the prince under his feet. What marvel, then, if we hear it said, that they which do eat the Lord's bread unworthily, are guilty of the body and blood of Christ? For the bread and the mystical cup are a sacrament and seal of it.

Hitherto have we disputed of the eating of the body of Christ, and of drinking of His blood; handling every one point thereof with as much brevity as we could. Now we go to knit up the other ends of the Lord's Supper, being placed in the description of the Supper We said that the Supper was instituted by the Lord, that it might represent visibly the gifts of God unto the Church, and lay them forth before the eyes of all men. But we have learned by the whole discourse of this matter, that Christ himself is a most full and rich treasure of all the gifts of God; as, namely, from whom, being delivered for us unto death, we have all things belonging to life, remission of sins, and life everlasting. Since these things be invisible, and gotten by faith; they be, also, visibly, that is to say, by Sacraments represented almost unto all the senses;—to the sight; to hearing; to tasting; and to feeling;—to the intent that man, being wholly therewith moved both in body and soul, may celebrate this most comfortable mystery with great rejoicing in heart. Hereunto, now, appertaineth that analogy whereof I have spoken before in the seventh Sermon of this Decade; whereby I would have these things to be better learned.

Furthermore, we have said, that the Supper was instituted of the Lord, that He might visibly gather together into one body all His members, which were in a manner dispersed throughout all parts of the world. Whereupon we have

said somewhere else, that the holy men did call the Supper a League or Confederacy. We are knit invisibly with Christ, and all His members, by unity of faith and participation of one spirit; but in the Supper we are joined together, even by a visible conjunction. For now, not by words, but by deeds, also; but by mystery; but by Sacrament,—we are very nearly knit and joined together; opening and declaring to all men by celebrating the Supper, that we are, also, of the number of them that believe that they are redeemed by Christ; and that they are Christ's members and people. But we bind ourselves together unto Christ and the church, both that we will keep the sincere faith, and promising that we will use good deeds and charity towards all men. Look for more touching this matter in the seventh Sermon of this Decade. Hereupon, truly, did Saint Paul prove that it was not lawful for them which receive together at the Lord's table, to eat of meat offered to idols, and to take part of profane sacrifices; which thing, if at this day many would rightly weigh and consider, they would not seem to be seen so busy in strange and foreign sacrifices.

We said, also, that the Lord instituted the Supper, that thereby He might keep His death in memory; so that it should never be blotted out with oblivion. For Christ's death is the summary of all God's benefits. He will have us, therefore, to keep in memory the benefit of His incarnation, passion, redemption, and of His love. And although the remembrance of a thing that is passed be celebrated, to wit, of His death, yet the same belongeth greatly unto us and quickeneth us. Neither must we think that this is the least end. For there is none so diligently expressed as this is: for the Lord repeateth this saying,

“Do this in remembrance of me¹.” But that holy rite or holy action, being joined with the word, or with the preaching of Christ's death and the redemption of mankind, how marvellously doth it renew from time to time that benefit, and suffereth it not to be forgotten!

Last of all we said, that the Supper was ordained of the Lord that thereby we might be admonished of our duty, praise and thanksgiving. It is our duty to be sincere in the faith of Christ, and to embrace all our brethren with christian charity for the Lord's sake; and to beware that we defile not our bodies with the filth of the world, since we be cleansed with the blood of Christ. Paul, the Apostle, saith: “So often as ye shall eat of this bread and drink of the Lord's cup [ye] declare the Lord's death until he come. (1 Cor. xi. 26.) But to declare the Lord's death, is to praise the goodness of God; and to give thanks for our redemption obtained through His death. For the Apostle Peter saith, “Ye are a chosen generation, a royal priesthood, an holy nation, a people set at liberty, that ye should shew forth the virtues of Him that hath called you out of darkness into His marvellous light.” (1 Pet. ii. 9.) But hereof we have spoken also in another place.

Thus much I thought good in few words to repeat touching the ends of the Supper, which every godly man, being instructed by the Holy Ghost, doth diligently consider. I would now let you go, dearly beloved brethren, but that I see it will be a common commodity to teach, in few words, how every one should prepare himself to the Lord's Supper, that he come not to it unworthily. But it were not lost labour, first of all, to search out, who do worthily or unworthily eat and drink of the Lord's bread and cup. There

¹ Luke xxii. 19.

is no man that can deny that there are degrees in our worthiness and unworthiness, if he rightly examine the judgements of God; and, looking narrowly into the nature of our religion, is able to give judgement thereon. The chiefest degree of unworthiness is, to come to the holy mysteries of faith without faith. He cometh worthily that cometh with faith: unworthily, he that cometh without faith. Such are said to be works worthy of repentance in the gospel as are penitent works, or seemly for such as profess repentance. But what is more beseeching, more meet, and just, than that he who is to celebrate the Lord's Supper do believe that he is redeemed by Christ's death, who was offered up as a price for the whole world; and that, for that cause, is desirous to give thanks to Christ his Redeemer? Contrariwise, what is more unseemly and unjust, than to receive that pledge of Christ's body, and in the meanwhile to have no communion or fellowship with Christ? To come to thanksgiving, and yet not to give thanks from the bottom of his heart? For what uniteth us to Christ; or what maketh us partakers of all His benefits, and therewith, also, to be thankful, but faith? What doth separate us from Christ, and spoileth us of all His gifts; and maketh us most loathsome, but unbelief? Therefore, faith or unbelief maketh us partakers of the Lord's table worthily or unworthily. Paul, the Apostle, in the Acts, saith to the Jews, who, through unbelief did reject or set at nought the preaching of the gospel, "The word of God ought first to be preached unto you: but because you reject it, and judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life, behold, we turn unto the Gentiles." (Acts xiii. 46.) How did the Jews pronounce against themselves that they were unworthy of everlasting life; and like judges give sentence against themselves? In setting

themselves against God's word through unbelief; neither apprehending Christ by faith, who is the life and righteousness of the world. Wherefore, the chief and greatest portion of our worthiness and unworthiness is, and consisteth in faith or unbelief. St Peter witnesseth that our hearts are purified by faith¹: true faith, therefore, is the cleanness of christians. Whereupon, St Augustine saith², "The unbeliever eateth not the flesh of Christ spiritually, but rather eateth and drinketh the sacrament of so great a thing to his own condemnation; because, being unclean, he hath presumed to come to Christ's sacraments; which no man receiveth worthily, but he that is clean: of whom it is said 'blessed are the clean in heart for they shall see God,' &c."

Moreover, they eat and drink of the Lord's Supper unworthily, who, although they be not destitute of faith, yet by their abusing of it, do pervert the right institution of the Lord. Such seemeth to have been the error of the Church of Corinth, which mingled the private and profane with the ecclesiastical and mystical banquet; and did put no difference between the Lord's bread, which is called Christ's body, and common meat. For Paul saith; "Whoso eateth and drinketh unworthily, he eateth and drinketh his own damnation, making no difference of the Lord's body³." Therefore, to make no difference of the Lord's body is unworthily to eat the Lord's bread and to drink of His cup. For this word (*διακρίνειν*) 'to judge' or 'to make a difference,' is, to weigh and consider of a matter exactly with judgement to the uttermost of a man's power; to judge of it, and make a difference between that and all other things. Furthermore, the Lord's body is not only that spiritual

¹ Acts xv. 9.

² In *Evangl. Joan.* Tract. 26.

³ 1 Cor. xi. 29.

body of the Lord, to wit, the church of the faithful, but that very body which the Lord took of the Virgin, and offered up for our redemption; and that now sitteth at the right hand of the Father. To be short: the bread of the Sacrament in the Supper is the Lord's body; it is, I say, the Sacrament of the true body which was given for us. Whosoever, therefore, putteth no difference between this the Lord's mystical bread and profane meat, but cometh to Christ's table as he would to a table of common and gross meat, and acknowledgeth not that this heavenly meat differeth far from other human meat; neither cometh after that sort as the Lord hath instituted; but followeth his own reason, surely he maketh no difference of the Lord's body, but eateth and drinketh his own damnation. Paul, again, expoundeth himself, saying: "Therefore my brethren when ye come together to eat, tarry one for another that ye meet not to condemnation:" (1 Cor. xi. 33.) Whoso therefore, perverteth the public supper by eating his own private supper,—that is to say,—whoso suppeth not as the Lord hath appointed; the same eateth and drinketh unworthily. For before, unworthy eaters and drinkers are said to eat and drink their own damnation; and here they are said to meet together to their condemnation that make haste to the supper, not tarrying for their brethren: and they make no difference of the Lord's body. St Augustine, in his twenty-sixth Treatise upon John, saith: "The apostle speaketh of those which receive the Lord's body without difference and carelessly, as if it had been any other kind of meat whatever. Here therefore, if he be reprov'd which maketh no difference of the Lord's body,—that is to say,—doth not discern the Lord's body from other meats, how then should not Judas be damned who came to the Lord's table feign-

ing that he was a friend, but was an enemy, &c.” How much more grievously do they seem to sin at this day, who, perverting the lawful and first use that was instituted by the Lord, do stablish their own abuse with great contention; yea, and grievously persecute them that cry out against it, and will not receive it?

Furthermore, since by experience we find every day that there are many things wanting unto our faith, by means whereof divers vices spring up among us, whereof our unworthiness is the lightest or least of all; which the Lord of His grace may easily wash away, and almost wipe away by seeing His cross upon us, not imputing such infirmities to us to our condemnation¹. For the apostle, in another place, saith, “that there is no condemnation for them which are grafted into Christ Jesus, and walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit.” (Rom. viii. 1.)

Neither with equal punishment doth our most just Lord punish those sundry sorts of unworthiness. Let us, therefore, see, what the blessed Apostle teacheth us concerning the punishment of those that eat unworthily: therefore, he saith, “whoso eateth this bread, or drinketh of the Lord's cup unworthily, the same shall be guilty of the Lord's body and blood.” (1 Cor. xi. 27.) By which words verily he meaneth that chief and most foul unworthiness of all other, to wit, unbelief. For he is guilty of the Lord's body and blood to whom the fault of the Lord's death is imputed; that is to say, to whom Christ's death becometh death, and

¹ The obscurity of this sentence will be best removed by the Latin from which it is translated: “Præterea cum reipsa experiamur in diem, fidei nostræ multa deesse, unde varia inter nos exoriuntur vitia, ex quibus deinde et indignitas nostra levissima quidem omnium existit; utpote quam Dominus gratia sua facile diluit, ac ferè cruce immissa extergit, infirmitates hujusmodi non imputans ad condemnationem.”

not life: as it also happened unto them who, through unbelief and wickedness, did crucify Christ. For unto them Christ's blood seemed profane, as it had been the blood of some beast, murderer, or wicked person; as being worthily shed for His offences. And, I pray you, what else doth he think than that Christ's blood is profane, who believeth not that the same was shed for the sins of the world? And yet he dareth take part of the Lord's Supper, that he may worthily be said to be guilty of the Lord's body and blood. It is a very great offence to eat the Lord's bread, and to drink of His cup unworthily through unbelief; which thing by the example of Judas is laid before our eyes. He believed not in the Lord Jesus; yea he invented how to deliver Him into the hands of thieves and murderers; yet, nevertheless, he sat down to meat, and took part of the Lord's Supper; therefore, in the end the Devil worthily challenged him wholly unto him. For St John witnesseth that, about the end of the Supper, the Devil entered into Judas: not that he was not in him before that he came to the Supper; for he had begun before to dwell in him, and to stir him forward: but for that after so many admonitions of our Lord Christ, and after that he had profaned the mysteries of Christ, and, as it were, trodden them under foot, he wholly entered into him, and fully possessed him.

The same Apostle Paul threateneth damnation to them that make no difference of the Lord's body, who are placed, as it were, in another degree of unworthiness, saying: "For whoso eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh his own damnation." (1 Cor. xi. 29.) The reason hereof he setteth down in the sentence; to wit, why we ought not rashly and carelessly to come to the Lord's table; for that

we approach then to our condemnation. But condemnation or judgement is the pain or punishment which the Lord layeth on His faithful people when they sin; not in another world, truly, as He doeth upon the unbelievers, but in this world. For it followeth in the words of the Apostle, which ministereth unto us the same sense. "For this cause many are weak and feeble among you, and many sleep. For if we had judged ourselves, we should not have been judged. But when we are judged, we are corrected by the Lord, that we should not be condemned with the world." (1 Cor. xi. 30—32.) The Apostle plainly distinguisheth between the unworthy eaters that are subject to God's correction, and worldly men; that is to say, unbelievers; whose punishment the Lord deferreth to that other world: but upon His faithful people, who yet offend through negligence, and come to the Supper not sufficiently instructed, He layeth divers and sundry afflictions—as pestilence, famine, sickness, and such like—to shake off their drowsiness. For it followeth, 'if we had judged ourselves,' that is, 'if we ourselves had restrained our vices, and separated ourselves from evil, we had not been judged,' that is to say, 'punished and corrected.' For immediately he addeth, "But when we are judged we are chastened of the Lord." To be judged, therefore, is to be chastised. But hereby we learn, from whence there do flow so many mischiefs unto the church, to wit, by the unworthy use of the Lord's Supper.

But some men will answer here, If the matter be so, it were better wholly to abstain from the Lord's Supper. But if any abstain wholly he, also, thereby sinneth against the Lord; and that grievously. For he setteth at nought the Lord's commandment, who saith, "Do this": yea he setteth at nought both the Lord's death, and all the gifts of God.

Wherefore, he hath not escaped danger who hath omitted to celebrate the Supper: [which thing, also, we have said before. Thou must go another way to work, if thou desire to avoid both danger and sin. Hear the counsel of Paul very compendiously saying, "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup." (1 Cor. xi. 28.) And we must mark, that in this examination he sendeth no man to another, but every man to himself. The Papists bid thee go to an auricular Confessor, there to confess thyself; to receive absolution; and to make satisfaction for thy sins, according to the form that is commanded thee. And so they bid thee, as sufficiently cleansed, to go to the Lord's table. But Paul, the Doctor of the Gentiles and the vessel of election, speaketh not a word of those things, but saith simply, "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup." For like as God is the searcher of the hearts, and requireth the affection of the mind, and hateth hypocrisy; so none knoweth what is in the heart of man, or what affections we have to Godward: but we ourselves do; therefore, he willeth us ourselves to examine every thing in ourselves: that is to say, he willeth every man to descend into himself, and to examine himself. This examination cannot be made without faith, and the light of God's word. But the faithful man having the light of God's word shining before him, and faith extending her force and power, enquireth of himself whether he both acknowledge all his sins which he hath manifestly committed against God; and whether he be sorry for them being committed; and whether with sincere faith of heart he believe that Christ hath washed away and forgiven all his sins; and whether he confess freely with his mouth, as he believeth in his heart, that life and salva-

tion consisteth in Jesus Christ only, and in none other; and whether he have determined with himself to die in this confession; and whether he mean diligently and earnestly to apply himself to innocency and holiness of life; and whether he be ready to love, and help all the members of Christ's body, of whom he is also a member; and be ready to spend his life for them, according to the example of Christ; and whether he have remitted or pardoned all anger and enmity; and whether he be desirous to call to mind Christ's passion, and the whole mystery of our redemption; and to give thanks to God for our redemption, and for all other gifts of God already received, and to be received? This is the right examining which agreeth with the receiving of the mystical Supper: and when we have done so we may in humbleness and fear of the Lord, and with gladness, approach to the Supper of our Lord Christ.

But here the faithful do tremble, who are, as it were, privy to their own imperfection and infirmity. For they do not find these things to be so perfect in their minds as otherwise they know just perfection requireth. Satan cometh, and he casteth in many and great stays to the intent he may draw us back from the celebration of the Supper. Therefore we say, if any man suppose that none is to be admitted to the Supper but he that is purged from all sin and infirmity, surely he shall drive away and exclude all men, how many soever live in this world; nay he shall altogether deprive them of the Lord's Supper, as not to be any longer for sinful men but for angels. We must remember that this examination resteth within his own bounds; and that God here, also, as everywhere else, doth use this clemency and mercy towards us. He knoweth our weakness and corruption; and with us can bear our infirmities. The

Israelites under king Hezekiah, being not fully cleansed, took part of the Paschal lamb; but the king prayed and said, "The Lord who is good will have mercy upon all men, that with all their heart seek after the God of their Fathers, and will not impute it unto them that they are not sanctified." And hereunto is added, in the holy history, "And the Lord heard Hezekiah and He was pleased with the people." (2 Chron. xxx. 18—20.) The worthiness which is enquired for by exact examination, is not absolute perfection; but a will and mind instructed by God, which humbly acknowledgeth its own unworthiness, and, therefore, humbly prayeth for increase of faith and charity, and all perfection in Christ only. At that first Supper the Apostles were Christ's guests, and among these was Judas: but because he lacked faith and was a traitor, yea, a murderer, he was made guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. The other Apostles were, also, sinners themselves, but not wicked; they believed in Christ; they loved Christ; and one of them loved another like brethren: and, therefore, they did not eat of the Lord's Supper unworthily, as Judas did. Although, in the mean time, at the same table they shewed tokens of great imperfection. For Peter, not without great contempt and reproach of his brethren, preferreth himself before them all. Moreover they contend among themselves for honour, which of them should seem to be greater than another. I will not now recite that straightway after they arose from the table, they shamefully forsook their Master and ran away; and many ways behaved themselves unworthily: but all these things were easily washed away, for that faith had taken very deep root within them.

Neither will I here stick to recite word for word, the comfort of Master John Calvin, a godly and learned man,

who with great commendation teacheth in the church at this day, my fellow minister, and most well-beloved and dear brother, which he hath set down for the afflicted in this case; "Let us call to remembrance" saith he "that this holy banquet is a medicine for the sick; a comfort for the sinful; a largess to the poor; which to the whole, righteous and rich, if there could any such be found, would bring small advantage. For seeing that in this banquet Christ is given unto us to be eaten, we understand that without Him we faint, fail and are forsaken. Moreover, seeing He is given unto us to be our life, we understand that without Him we are but dead. Wherefore, this is the greatest and only worthiness which we can give unto God, if we lay before Him our own vileness and unworthiness; that, through His mercy, He may make us worthy of Himself: if we despair in ourselves, that we may be comforted in Him: if we humble ourselves, that we may be lifted up by Him. Moreover, if we attain unto that unity which He commendeth unto us in the Supper: and like as He maketh us all to dwell in Him, so that we may wish likewise, that there were one soul, one heart, and one tongue in us all. If we well weigh and meditate these things, then shall these thoughts never trouble us: we that are naked and destitute of all goodness; we that are stained with spots of sin; we that are half dead, how should we worthily eat the Lord's body? Let us rather think, that we being poor do come to a plentiful giver; we that are sick come to a physician; we that are sinful come to a Saviour: that the worthiness which is commanded by God, consisteth in faith chiefly, which repositeth all in God, and nothing in ourselves: secondly in charity, and such charity, as it is sufficient if we offer it unto God unperfect, that He may increase it to the

better, seeing we cannot perform it absolute as it ought to be." Thus far he.

Thus much have I said hereto of the most holy Supper of our Lord Jesus Christ, the most excellent and wholesome Sacrament of christians; for which, even from the very beginning and while the Apostles were yet living, Satan the most deadly enemy to our salvation, lying in wait, hath gone about to overthrow by many corruptions and defilings: from which being now for a time faithfully cleansed, yet doth he not so leave it, but intermingles and throws an heap of contentions into it, being made unto the church the token of a covenant never to be broken. Whereupon, the thing itself and our salvation requireth that we be circumspect, and give no place to the tempter; but agreeing altogether in Christ and being joined into one body (by faithful celebrating of the Supper) we may love one another, and give everlasting thanks to our Redeemer and Lord Christ; to whom be praise and glory now and for ever. Amen, Amen.

THE END.

