

IV. The Promise of the Sacraments

measuring-rod of thought and reason, you will at last reach the point where you must also say that Christ does not dwell in the hearts of the faithful.

Now see, as I have said, how much the poor bodily voice is able to do. First of all it brings the whole Christ to the ears; then it brings him into the hearts of all who listen and believe. Should it then be so amazing that he enters into the bread and wine? Is not the heart much more tenuous and elusive than bread? You will probably not attempt to fathom how this comes about. Just as little as you are able to say how it comes about that Christ is in so many thousands of hearts and dwells in them—Christ as he died and rose again—and yet no man knows how he gets in, so also here in the sacrament, it is incomprehensible how this comes about. But this I do know, that the word is there: "Take, eat, this is my body, given for you, this do in remembrance of me." When we say these words over the bread, then he is truly present, and yet it is a mere word and voice that one hears. Just as he enters the heart without breaking a hole in it, but is comprehended only through the Word and hearing, so also he enters into the bread without needing to make any hole in it.

Take yet another example. How did his mother Mary become pregnant? Although it is a great miracle when a woman is made pregnant by a man, yet God reserved for him the privilege of being born of the Virgin. Now how does the Mother come to this? She has no husband [Luke 1:34] and her womb is entirely enclosed. Yet she conceives in her womb a real, natural child with flesh and blood. Is there not more of a miracle here than in the bread and wine? Where does it come from? The angel Gabriel brings the word: "Behold, you will conceive in your womb and bear a son, etc." [Luke 1:31]. With these words Christ comes not only into her heart, but also into her womb, as she hears, grasps, and believes it. No one can say otherwise, than that the power comes through the Word. As one cannot deny the fact that she thus becomes pregnant through the Word, and no one knows how it comes about, so it is in the sacrament also. For as soon as Christ says: "This is my body," his body is present through the Word and the power of the Holy Spirit. If the Word is not there, it is mere bread; but as soon as the words are added they bring with them that of which they speak.

LUTHER - "Against the Fanatics" - EXCERPT

The Sacrament of the Body and Blood—Against the Fanatics

Moreover, we believe that Christ, according to his human nature, is put over all creatures [Eph. 1:22] and fills all things, as Paul says in Eph. 4 [10]. Not only according to his divine nature, but also according to his human nature, he is a lord of all things, has all things in his hand, and is present everywhere. If I am to follow the fanatics who say that this is not fitting, then I must deny Christ. We read of Stephen in Acts 7 [56] that he said: "I see the heavens opened, and Jesus standing at the right hand of the Father." How does he see Christ? He need not raise his eyes on high. Christ is around us and in us in all places. Those people understand nothing of this. They also say that he sits at the right hand of God, but what it means that Christ ascends to heaven and sits there, they do not know. It is not the same as when you climb up a ladder into the house. It means rather that he is above all creatures and in all and beyond all creatures. That he was taken up bodily, however, occurred as a sign of this. Therefore he now has all things before his eyes, more than I have you before my eyes, and he is closer to us than any creature is to another. They speculate thus, that he must ascend and descend from the heavens through the air, and that he lets himself be drawn down into the bread when we eat his body. Such thoughts come from no other source than from foolish reason and the flesh. We must understand that it is not the words which we speak that draw him down. They have been given to us rather to assure us, that we may know we shall certainly find him.

Although he is present in all creatures, and I might find him in stone, in fire, in water, or even in a rope, for he certainly is there, yet he does not wish that I seek him there apart from the Word, and cast myself into the fire or the water, or hang myself on the rope. He is present everywhere, but he does not wish that you grope for him everywhere. Grope rather where the Word is, and there you will lay hold of him in the right way. Otherwise you are tempting God and committing idolatry. For this reason he has set down for us a definite way to show us how and where to find him, namely the Word. Those people, who say that it is unreasonable for Christ to be present in the bread and wine, do not know or see this at all, because they also do not understand what Christ's kingdom is, and the sitting at the right hand of God. If Christ were

not with me in dungeon, torture, and death, where would I be? He is present there through the Word, although not in the same way as here in the sacrament, where through the Word he binds his body and blood so that they are also received corporeally in the bread and wine. If we believe the one, it is easy also to grasp and believe the other. Heaven and earth are his sack; as wheat fills the sack, so he fills all things. And as a seed bears a stalk, an ear, and many kernels; or again, as a single cherrystone cast into the ground brings forth a tree which bears many blossoms, leaves, inner and outer bark, and cherries; or again, as my voice reaches so many ears; much more is Christ able to distribute himself whole and undivided into so many particles.

Now because the fanatics do not see this, they come up with their man-made opinion to the effect that God is thereby performing some kind of hocus-pocus. Well, let them just go on making fools of themselves; but you cling to the thought that Christ, as I have said, does all these things through the Word, just as the wonders which he daily thereby performs are countless. Should he not through the same power know how to do these things also here in the sacrament? He has put himself into the Word, and through the Word he puts himself into the bread also. If he can break into the heart and spirit and dwell in the soul, he must have much easier access to the material object because the heart is much more tenuous and elusive. But he retains the lesser miracles in order that through them he may remind us of the greater ones. For that he enters the heart through faith is a much greater miracle than that he is present in the bread. Indeed, it is for the sake of faith that he uses that very bread or sacrament. If we would bear this in mind, we would not talk so much of miracles in the sacrament. But if we wanted to follow after and think of God with our reason we should have to say of faith too that no man is able to believe. For God is too far beyond all reason. Hence, to sum it all up, what those people keep saying—that because it is not in accord with reason it is not true—we shall simply turn about and say the opposite: God's Word is true, therefore your notions must be false. Is it necessarily unreasonable, just because it seems unreasonable to you and you think that the Word must be wrong and your ideas valid?

The other argument which they bring up is that it is not

necessary. So Christ has to let himself be taken to school and taught by them. The Holy Spirit hasn't hit it right. For this is what they say: If I believe in Jesus Christ, who died for me, what need is there for me to believe in a baked God? Wait and see, he will bake them when the time comes, so that their hides will sizzle. Who says this? God or a human being? A man says it. Why? Because Satan has taken possession of them; they have learned no more than to speak and preach the words: "Christ died for us, etc.," but in their hearts they do not feel it in the least. Do you wish to instruct God as to what is necessary and unnecessary, and have him decide according to your notions? It is better for us to reverse this and say: God wishes it thus, therefore your notions are false. Who are you, that you dare to speak against that which God regards as necessary? You are a liar, and therefore God is true [Rom. 3:4].

You might as well tell me also that because faith alone justifies, Christ is not necessary. So let us say to God: You had sin, death, devil, and everything in your power; what need was there to send down your Son, and permit him to be treated so cruelly and to die? You could indeed have allowed him to remain on high; it would have cost you only a word, and sin and death would have been destroyed, along with the devil. For you are certainly almighty. Again, let us conclude that Christ was not born of the Virgin, and say: Of what use was it? Could not God have caused him to be born of a man just as well, and still be fashioned so that he would have been conceived without sin and have remained innocent? Indeed, let us even go further and say that it is not necessary that Christ be God. For through God's power he could just as well have risen from the dead and saved us, even if he had been purely human. Thus the devil blinds people, and the result is, first, that they are incapable of seeing any work of God in the right light, and second, that they also fail to regard the Word, and accordingly want to find out everything with their own minds. If you were to search out everything about a kernel of wheat in the field, you would be so amazed that you would die. God's works are not like our works.

Therefore you should reply to these opponents: What is it to me, whether it is necessary or not? God knows well how it shall be and why it must be thus. If he says that it is necessary, then all

creatures must be silent. But because in the sacrament Christ says in clear words: "Take, eat, this is my body, etc." it is my duty to believe these words, as firmly as I must believe all the words of Christ. If he handed me a mere straw and spoke these words, I should believe it. Therefore one must close mouth, eyes, and all the senses and say: "Lord, you know better than I." The same is true of baptism. The water is baptism, and in baptism is the Holy Spirit. So you might also say: "Why is it necessary to baptize with water?" But the Spirit says so, do you hear? Here is God's will and Word; adhere to it, and let your opinions go.

See, these are the two reasons they give for saying one should not believe that Christ's body and blood are in the sacrament. They are also the best reasons they can find, and the second one in particular they delineate at length. These are reasons, nevertheless, of the sort that sway devout hearts today, and have done so in the past. I myself have pondered much, what necessity there was in it, and how so great a body could be in so small a piece of bread, and how it could yet be undivided and whole in every particle. But if they examine a kernel of wheat or a cherrystone, it can well teach them manners. For why does God feed us through the bread, or under the bread, when he could do so just as well by the mere Word alone, without the bread? Why does he not create men as he created Adam and Eve, in a moment; he takes so long a time in doing it, in that man and woman must come together and the child must be trained so long with labor and effort. But he says: "What is that to you? [John 21:22]. I made Adam and Eve in this way at the beginning, but now I do not will to do it in this way any longer. I once caused a son to be born of the Virgin, and that also I do not will to do again." Thus those people would bind God by their laws, which is just as if I were to say: "Why have you given him a large body and me a small one? Why do you give this one black hair and that one blond, or this one brown eyes and that one gray?" Let this then be the sum of it: See only that you pay heed to God's Word and remain in it, like a child in the cradle. If you let go of it for a moment, then you fall out of it. This is the devil's sole aim, to tear people out of it and to cause them to measure God's will and work by human reason.

Those, I say, are still reasonable souls who concern themselves

with the two points which I have touched on above; they can still be helped. The rest, however, are vain fanatics who proceed to force the words of Christ open and shut like pincers. Indeed, they are arch-fanatics, and do not have a leg to stand on. Those two points at least have some standing in the eyes of reason. But from the way in which the latter tear and twist the words, reason can well see that they are fools. There are only three words: "This is my body." So the one [Karlstadt] turns up his nose at the word "this" and severs it from the bread, claiming that one should interpret it thus: "Take, eat,—this is my body"; as if I were to say: "Take and eat; here sits Hans with the red jacket."⁷ The second [Zwingli] seizes upon the little word "is"; to him it is the equivalent of "signifies." The third [Oecolampadius] says, "this is my body" means the same as, "this is a figure of my body." They set up these dreams of theirs without any scriptural basis. These fanatics do not disturb me, and are not worthy that one should fight with them. Some of them are crude, grammatical fanatics; the others are subtle, philosophical fanatics. Let them go, therefore, and let us adhere to the words as they read: that the body of Christ is present in the bread and that his blood is truly present in the wine. This does not mean that he is not present in other places also with his body and blood, for in believing hearts he is completely present with his body and blood. But it means that he wishes to make us certain as to where and how we are to lay hold of him. There is the Word, which says that when you eat the bread you eat his body, given for you. If the Word were not there, I would not pay any heed to the bread. Let this suffice for the first part.

PART II

Now that we have preserved the treasure, and not allowed the kernel to be taken out of the shell⁸ so that we have only chaff left instead of grain,⁹ we must now preach on the second part, namely, how one should make use of the sacrament and derive benefit from

⁷ The shorter sermon copy at this point adds in Latin: "and behold the bread, I have money in my purse." WA 19, 498.

⁸ Cf. *Sprichwörter-Lexikon*, *op. cit.*, IV, col. 78, *Schale*, No. 2.

⁹ Cf. *Ibid.*, II, col. 1542, *Korn*, No. 53.

JOHN CALVIN. "INSTITUTES"

CHAP. XVII.

CHRISTIAN RELIGION.

557

1. AFTER God has once received us into his family, it is not that he may regard us in the light of servants, but of sons, performing the part of a kind and anxious parent, and providing for our maintenance during the whole course of our lives. And, not contented with this, he has been pleased by a pledge to assure us of his continued liberality. To this end, he has given another sacrament to his Church by the hand of his only-begotten Son—viz. a spiritual feast, at which Christ testifies that he himself is living bread (John vi. 51), on which our souls feed, for a true and blessed immortality. Now, as the knowledge of this great mystery is most necessary, and, in proportion to its importance, demands an accurate exposition, and Satan, in order to deprive the Church of this inestimable treasure, long ago introduced, first, mists, and then darkness, to obscure its light, and stirred up strife and contention to alienate the minds of the simple from a relish for this sacred food, and in our age, also, has tried the same artifice, I will proceed, after giving a simple summary adapted to the capacity of the ignorant, to explain those difficulties by which Satan has tried to ensnare the world. First, then, the signs are bread and wine, which represent the invisible food which we receive from the body and blood of Christ. For as God, regenerating us in baptism, ingrafts us into the fellowship of his Church, and makes us his by adoption, so we have said that he performs the office of a provident parent, in continually supplying the food by which he may sustain and preserve us in the life to which he has begotten us by his word. Moreover, Christ is the only food of our soul, and, therefore, our heavenly Father invites us to him, that, refreshed by communion with him, we may ever and anon gather new vigour until we reach the heavenly immortality. But as this mystery of the secret union of Christ with believers is incomprehensible by nature, he exhibits its figure and image in visible signs adapted to our capacity, nay, by giving, as it were, earnest and badges, he makes it as certain to us as if it were seen by the eye; the familiarity of the similitude giving it access to minds however dull, and showing that souls are fed by Christ just as the corporeal life is sustained by bread and wine. We now, therefore, understand the end which this mystical benediction has in view—viz. to assure us that the body of Christ was once sacrificed for us, so that we may now eat it, and, eating, feel within ourselves the efficacy of that one sacrifice,—that his blood was once shed for us so as to be our perpetual drink. This is the force of the promise which is added, "Take, eat; this is my body, which is broken for you" (Matth. xxvi. 26, &c.). The body which was once offered for our salvation we are enjoined to take and eat, that, while we see ourselves made partakers of it, we may safely conclude that the virtue of that death will be efficacious in us. Hence he terms the cup the covenant in his blood. For the covenant which he once sanctioned by his blood he in a manner renews, or rather continues, in so far as

65
G. D. Pharis is like a
(curious) modern, hands-
on Parent in stead of a
Total families

He wants to
Speak of Union
But can't quite
Get to Incarnation
Efficacy

regards the confirmation of our faith, as often as he stretches forth his sacred blood as drink to us.

2. Pious souls can derive great confidence and delight from this sacrament, as being a testimony that they form one body with Christ, so that everything which is his they may call their own. Hence it follows, that we can confidently assure ourselves, that eternal life, of which he himself is the heir, is ours, and that the kingdom of heaven, into which he has entered, can no more be taken from us than from him; on the other hand, that we cannot be condemned for our sins, from the guilt of which he absolves us, seeing he has been pleased that these should be imputed to himself as if they were his own. This is the wondrous exchange made by his boundless goodness. Having become with us the Son of Man, he has made us with himself sons of God. By his own descent to the earth he has prepared our ascent to heaven. Having received our mortality, he has bestowed on us his immortality. Having undertaken our weakness, he has made us strong in his strength. Having submitted to our poverty, he has transferred to us his riches. Having taken upon himself the burden of unrighteousness with which we were oppressed, he has clothed us with his righteousness.

3. To all these things we have a complete attestation in this sacrament, enabling us certainly to conclude that they are as truly exhibited to us as if Christ were placed in bodily presence before our view, or handled by our hands. For these are words which can never lie nor deceive—Take, eat, drink. This is my body, which is broken for you: this is my blood, which is shed for the remission of sins. In bidding us take, he intimates that it is ours: in bidding us eat, he intimates that it becomes one substance with us: in affirming of his body that it was broken, and of his blood that it was shed for us, he shows that both were not so much his own as ours, because he took and laid down both, not for his own advantage, but for our salvation. And we ought carefully to observe, that the chief, and almost the whole energy of the sacrament, consists in these words, It is broken for you: it is shed for you. It would not be of much importance to us that the body and blood of the Lord are now distributed, had they not once been set forth for our redemption and salvation. Wherefore they are represented under bread and wine, that we may learn that they are not only ours, but intended to nourish our spiritual life; that is, as we formerly observed, by the corporeal things which are produced in the sacrament, we are by a kind of analogy conducted to spiritual things. Thus when bread is given as a symbol of the body of Christ, we must immediately think of this similitude. As bread nourishes, sustains, and protects our bodily life, so the body of Christ is the only food to invigorate and keep alive the soul. When we behold wine set forth as a symbol of blood, we must think that such use as wine serves to the body, the same is spiritually bestowed by the blood of Christ: and the use is to foster, refresh, strengthen, and exhilarate. For if we duly consider

what profit we have gained by the breaking of his sacred body, and the shedding of his blood, we shall clearly perceive that these properties of bread and wine, agreeably to this analogy, most appropriately represent it when they are communicated to us.

4. Therefore, it is not the principal part of a sacrament simply to hold forth the body of Christ to us without any higher consideration, but rather to seal and confirm that promise by which he testifies that his flesh is meat indeed, and his blood drink indeed, nourishing us unto life eternal, and by which he affirms that he is the bread of life, of which, whosoever shall eat, shall live for ever—I say, to seal and confirm that promise, and in order to do so, it sends us to the cross of Christ, where that promise was performed and fulfilled in all its parts. For we do not eat Christ duly and savingly unless as crucified, while with lively apprehension we perceive the efficacy of his death. When he called himself the bread of life, he did not take that appellation from the sacrament, as some perversely interpret; but such as he was given to us by the Father, such he exhibited himself when becoming partaker of our human mortality, he made us partakers of his divine immortality; when offering himself in sacrifice, he took our curse upon himself, that he might cover us with his blessing, when by his death he devoured and swallowed up death, when in his resurrection he raised our corruptible flesh, which he had put on, to glory and incorruption.

5. It only remains that the whole become ours by application. This is done by means of the gospel, and more clearly by the sacred Supper, where Christ offers himself to us with all his blessings, and we receive him in faith. The sacrament, therefore, does not make Christ become for the first time the bread of life; but, while it calls to remembrance that Christ was made the bread of life that we may constantly eat him, it gives us a taste and relish for that bread, and makes us feel its efficacy. For it assures us, first, that whatever Christ did or suffered was done to give us life; and, secondly, that this quickening is eternal; by it we are ceaselessly nourished, sustained, and preserved in life. For as Christ would not have not been the bread of life to us if he had not been born, if he had not died and risen again; so he could not now be the bread of life, were not the efficacy and fruit of his nativity, death, and resurrection, eternal. All this Christ has elegantly expressed in these words, "The bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world" (John vi. 51); doubtless intimating, that his body will be as bread in regard to the spiritual life of the soul, because it was to be delivered to death for our salvation, and that he extends it to us for food when he makes us partakers of it by faith. Wherefore he once gave himself that he might become bread, when he gave himself to be crucified for the redemption of the world; and he gives himself daily, when in the word of the gospel he offers himself to be partaken by us, inasmuch as he was crucified, when he seals that offer by the sacred mystery of the Supper, and when he accomplishes inwardly

Exchange
Redeem
Exchange

Efficacy
Power
Witness
Vis, (as seen)
Vines = Spoken

2 "ERRORS"
69 am. 12 Aug.

what he externally designates. Moreover, two faults are here to be avoided. We must neither, by setting too little value on the signs, dis sever them from their meanings to which they are in some degree annexed, nor by immoderately extolling them, seem somewhat to obscure the mysteries themselves. That Christ is the bread of life by which believers are nourished unto eternal life, no man is so utterly devoid of religion as not to acknowledge. But all are not agreed as to the mode of partaking of him. For there are some who define the eating of the flesh of Christ, and the drinking of his blood, to be, in one word, nothing more than believing in Christ himself. But Christ seems to me to have intended to teach something more express and more sublime in that noble discourse, in which he recommends the eating of his flesh—viz. that we are quickened by the true partaking of him, which he designated by the terms eating and drinking, lest any one should suppose that the life which we obtain from him is obtained by simple knowledge. For as it is not the sight but the eating of bread that gives nourishment to the body, so the soul must partake of Christ truly and thoroughly, that by his energy it may grow up into spiritual life. Meanwhile, we admit that this is nothing else than the eating of faith, and that no other eating can be imagined. But there is this difference between their mode of speaking and mine. According to them, to eat is merely to believe; while I maintain that the flesh of Christ is eaten by believing, because it is made ours by faith, and that that eating is the effect and fruit of faith; or, if you will have it more clearly, according to them, eating is faith, whereas it rather seems to me to be a consequence of faith. The difference is little in words, but not little in reality. For, although the apostle teaches that Christ dwells in our hearts by faith (Eph. iii. 17), no one will interpret that dwelling to be faith. All see that it explains the admirable effect of faith, because to it it is owing that believers have Christ dwelling in them. In this way, the Lord was pleased, by calling himself the bread of life, not only to teach that our salvation is treasured up in the faith of his death and resurrection, but also, by virtue of true communication with him, his life passes into us and becomes ours, just as bread when taken for food gives vigour to the body.

6. When Augustine, whom they claim as their patron, wrote, that we eat by believing, all he meant was to indicate that that eating is of faith, and not of the mouth. This I deny not; but I at the same time add, that by faith we embrace Christ, not as appearing at a distance, but as uniting himself to us, he being our head, and we his members. I do not absolutely disapprove of that mode of speaking; I only deny that it is a full interpretation, if they mean to define what it is to eat the flesh of Christ. I see that Augustine repeatedly used this form of expression, as when he said (De Doct. Christ. lib. iii.), "Unless ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man" is a figurative expression enjoining us to have communion with our Lord's passion, and sweetly and usefully to treasure in our memory

67

that his flesh was crucified and wounded for us. Also when he says, "These three thousand men who were converted at the preaching of Peter (Acts ii. 41), by believing, drank the blood which they had cruelly shed."¹ But in very many other passages he admirably commends faith for this, that by means of it our souls are not less refreshed by the communion of the blood of Christ, than our bodies with the bread which they eat. The very same thing is said by Chrysostom, "Christ makes us his body, not by faith only, but in reality." He does not mean that we obtain this blessing from any other quarter than from faith: he only intends to prevent any one from thinking of mere imagination when he hears the name of faith. I say nothing of those who hold that the Supper is merely a mark of external profession, because I think I sufficiently refuted their error when I treated of the sacraments in general (Chap. xiv. sec. 13). Only let my readers observe, that when the cup is called the covenant in blood (Luke xxii. 20), the promise which tends to confirm faith is expressed. Hence it follows, that unless we have respect to God, and embrace what he offers, we do not make a right use of the sacred Supper.

7. I am not satisfied with the view of those who, while acknowledging that we have some kind of communion with Christ, only make us partakers of the Spirit, omitting all mention of flesh and blood. As if it were said to no purpose at all, that his flesh is meat indeed, and his blood is drink indeed; that we have no life unless we eat that flesh and drink that blood; and so forth. Therefore, if it is evident that full communion with Christ goes beyond their description, which is too confined, I will attempt briefly to show how far it extends, before proceeding to speak of the contrary vice of excess. For I shall have a longer discussion with these hyperbolic doctors, who, according to their gross ideas, fabricate an absurd mode of eating and drinking, and transfigure Christ, after divesting him of his flesh, into a phantom: if, indeed, it be lawful to put this great mystery into words, a mystery which I feel, and therefore freely confess that I am unable to comprehend with my mind, so far am I from wishing any one to measure its sublimity by my feeble capacity. Nay, I rather exhort my readers not to confine their apprehension within those too narrow limits, but to attempt to rise much higher than I can guide them. For whenever this subject is considered, after I have done my utmost, I feel that I have spoken far beneath its dignity. And though the mind is more powerful in thought than the tongue in expression, it too is overcome and overwhelmed by the magnitude of the subject. All then that remains is to break forth in admiration of the mystery, which it is plain that the mind is inadequate to comprehend, or the tongue to express. I will, however, give a summary of my view as I best can,

¹ See August. Hom. in Joann. 31 et 40, &c.; Chrysost. Hom. ad Popul. Antioch., 60, 61; et Hom. in Marc. 59.

2 am. 11
Bach

not doubting its truth, and therefore trusting that it will not be disapproved by pious breasts.

8. First of all, we are taught by the Scriptures that Christ was from the beginning the living Word of the Father, the fountain and origin of life, from which all things should always receive life. Hence John at one time calls him the Word of life, and at another says, that in him was life; intimating, that he, even then pervading all creatures, instilled into them the power of breathing and living. He afterwards adds, that the life was at length manifested, when the Son of God, assuming our nature, exhibited himself in bodily form to be seen and handled. For although he previously diffused his virtue into the creatures, yet as man, because alienated from God by sin, had lost the communication of life, and saw death on every side impending over him, he behaved, in order to regain the hope of immortality, to be restored to the communion of that Word. How little confidence can it give you, to know that the Word of God, from which you are at the greatest distance, contains within himself the fulness of life, whereas in yourself, in whatever direction you turn, you see nothing but death? But ever since that fountain of life began to dwell in our nature, he no longer lies hid at a distance from us, but exhibits himself openly for our participation. Nay, the very flesh in which he resides he makes vivifying to us, that by partaking of it we may feed for immortality. "I," says he, "am that bread of life;" "I am the living bread which came down from heaven;" "And the bread that I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world" (John vi. 48, 51). By these words he declares, not only that he is life, inasmuch as he is the eternal Word of God who came down to us from heaven, but, by coming down, gave vigour to the flesh which he assumed, that a communication of life to us might thence emanate. Hence, too, he adds, that his flesh is meat indeed, and that his blood is drink indeed: by this food believers are reared to eternal life. The pious, therefore, have admirable comfort in this, that they now find life in their own flesh. For they not only reach it by easy access, but have it spontaneously set forth before them. Let them only throw open the door of their hearts that they may take it into their embrace, and they will obtain it.

9. The flesh of Christ, however, has not such power in itself as to make us live, seeing that by its own first condition it was subject to mortality, and even now, when endued with immortality, lives not by itself. Still it is properly said to be life-giving, as it is pervaded with the fulness of life for the purpose of transmitting it to us. In this sense I understand our Saviour's words as Cyril interprets them, "As the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself" (John v. 26). For there properly he is speaking not of the properties which he possessed with the Father from the beginning, but of those with which he was invested in the flesh in which he appeared. Accordingly, he shows that in his humanity also

fulness of life resides, so that every one who communicates in his flesh and blood, at the same time enjoys the participation of life. The nature of this may be explained by a familiar example. As water is at one time drunk out of the fountain, at another drawn, at another led away by conduits to irrigate the fields, and yet does not flow forth of itself for all these uses, but is taken from its source, which, with perennial flow, ever and anon sends forth a new and sufficient supply; so the flesh of Christ is like a rich and inexhaustible fountain, which transfuses into us the life flowing forth from the Godhead into itself. Now, who sees not that the communion of the flesh and blood of Christ is necessary to all who aspire to the heavenly life? Hence those passages of the apostle: The Church is the "body" of Christ; his "fulness." He is "the head," "from whence the whole body fitly joined together, and compacted by that which every joint supplieth," "maketh increase of the body" (Eph. i. 23; iv. 15, 16). Our bodies are the "members of Christ" (1 Cor. vi. 15). We perceive that all these things cannot possibly take place unless he adheres to us wholly in body and spirit. But the very close connection which unites us to his flesh, he illustrated with still more splendid epithets, when he said that we "are members of his body, of his flesh, and of his bones" (Eph. v. 30). At length, to testify that the matter is too high for utterance, he concludes with exclaiming, "This is a great mystery" (Eph. v. 32). It were, therefore, extreme infatuation not to acknowledge the communion of believers with the body and blood of the Lord, a communion which the apostle declares to be so great, that he chooses rather to marvel at it than to explain it.

10. The sum is, that the flesh and blood of Christ feed our souls just as bread and wine maintain and support our corporeal life. For there would be no aptitude in the sign, did not our souls find their nourishment in Christ. This could not be, did not Christ truly form one with us, and refresh us by the eating of his flesh, and the drinking of his blood. But though it seems an incredible thing that the flesh of Christ, while at such a distance from us in respect of place, should be food to us, let us remember how far the secret virtue of the Holy Spirit surpasses all our conceptions, and how foolish it is to wish to measure its immensity by our feeble capacity. Therefore, what our mind does not comprehend let faith conceive—viz. that the Spirit truly unites things separated by space. That sacred communion of flesh and blood by which Christ transfuses his life into us, just as if it penetrated our bones and marrow, he testifies and seals in the Supper, and that not by presenting a vain or empty sign, but by there exerting an efficacy of the Spirit by which he fulfils what he promises. And truly the thing there signified he exhibits and offers to all who sit down at that spiritual feast, although it is beneficially received by believers only who receive this great benefit with true faith and heartfelt gratitude. For this reason the apostle said, "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of

Explicate the
"Mystery of Mediation"
① "Distance" in history
② Self enclosed individuals =
Feelings

The "Spatial"
Separation of
the Person
Transcendence

Attempt to
address the
"Mystery" problem
The oneness
the Distance
sounds "high"

to gain a
relation practice?

Is the parallelism
overcome?

The Spirit overcomes
this spatial split.

via Trinitas/
Holy Spirit
(Deus ex Machina?)

the body of Christ"? (1 Cor. x. 16.) There is no ground to object that the expression is figurative, and gives the sign the name of the thing signified. I admit, indeed, that the breaking of bread is a symbol, not the reality. But this being admitted, we duly infer from the exhibition of the symbol that the thing itself is exhibited. For unless we would charge God with deceit, we will never presume to say that he holds forth an empty symbol. Therefore, if by the breaking of bread the Lord truly represents the partaking of his body, there ought to be no doubt whatever that he truly exhibits and performs it. The rule which the pious ought always to observe is, whenever they see the symbols instituted by the Lord, to think and feel surely persuaded that the truth of the thing signified is also present. For why does the Lord put the symbol of his body into your hands, but just to assure you that you truly partake of him? If this is true let us feel as much assured that the visible sign is given us instead of an invisible gift as that his body itself is given to us.

11. I hold then (as has always been received in the Church, and is still taught by those who feel aright), that the sacred mystery of the Supper consists of two things—the corporeal signs, which, presented to the eye, represent invisible things in a manner adapted to our weak capacity, and the spiritual truth, which is at once figured and exhibited by the signs. When attempting familiarly to explain its nature, I am accustomed to set down three things—the thing meant, the matter which depends on it, and the virtue or efficacy consequent upon both. The thing meant consists in the promises which are in a manner included in the sign. By the matter, or substance, I mean Christ, with his death and resurrection. By the effect, I understand redemption, justification, sanctification, eternal life, and all other benefits which Christ bestows upon us. Moreover, though all these things have respect to faith, I leave no room for the cavil, that when I say Christ is conceived by faith, I mean that he is only conceived by the intellect and imagination. He is offered by the promises, not that we may stop short at the sight or mere knowledge of him, but that we may enjoy true communion with him. And, indeed, I see not how any one can expect to have redemption and righteousness in the cross of Christ, and life in his death, without trusting first of all to true communion with Christ himself. Those blessings could not reach us, did not Christ previously make himself ours. I say then, that in the mystery of the Supper, by the symbols of bread and wine, Christ, his body and his blood, are truly exhibited to us, that in them he fulfilled all obedience, in order to procure righteousness for us—first that we might become one body with him; and, secondly, that being made partakers of his substance, we might feel the result of this fact in the participation of all his blessings.

12. I now come to the hyperbolical mixtures which superstition has introduced. Here Satan has employed all his wiles, withdrawing the minds of men from heaven, and imbuing them with the perverse error that Christ is annexed to the element of bread. And, first, we are not to

dream of such a presence of Christ in the sacrament as the artificers of the Romish court have imagined, as if the body of Christ, locally present, were to be taken into the hand, and chewed by the teeth, and swallowed by the throat. This was the form of Palinode, which Pope Nicholas dictated to Berengarius, in token of his repentance, a form expressed in terms so monstrous, that the author of the Gloss exclaims, that there is danger, if the reader is not particularly cautious, that he will be led by it into a worse heresy than was that of Berengarius (Distinct. ii. c. Ego Berengarius). Peter Lombard, though he labours much to excuse the absurdity, rather inclines to a different opinion. As we cannot at all doubt that it is bounded according to the invariable rule in the human body, and is contained in heaven, where it was once received, and will remain till it return to judgment, so we deem it altogether unlawful to bring it back under these corruptible elements, or to imagine it everywhere present. And, indeed, there is no need of this, in order to our partaking of it, since the Lord by his Spirit bestows upon us the blessing of being one with him in soul, body, and spirit. The bond of that connection, therefore, is the Spirit of Christ, who unites us to him, and is a kind of channel by which everything that Christ has and is, is derived to us. For if we see that the sun, in sending forth its rays upon the earth, to generate, cherish, and invigorate its offspring, in a manner transfuses its substance into it, why should the radiance of the Spirit be less in conveying to us the communion of his flesh and blood? Wherefore the Scripture, when it speaks of our participation with Christ, refers its whole efficacy to the Spirit. Instead of many, one passage will suffice. Paul, in the Epistle to the Romans (Rom. viii. 9-11), shows that the only way in which Christ dwells in us is by his Spirit. By this, however, he does not take away that communion of flesh and blood of which we now speak, but shows that it is owing to the Spirit alone that we possess Christ wholly, and have him abiding in us.

13. The Schoolmen, horrified at this barbarous impiety, speak more modestly, though they do nothing more than amuse themselves with more subtle delusions. They admit that Christ is not contained in the sacrament circumscriptively, or in a bodily manner, but they afterwards devise a method which they themselves do not understand, and cannot explain to others. It, however, comes to this, that Christ may be sought in what they call the species of bread. What? When they say that the substance of bread is converted into Christ, do they not attach him to the white colour, which is all they leave of it? But they say, that though contained in the sacrament, he still remains in heaven, and has no other presence there than that of abode. But, whatever be the terms in which they attempt to make a gloss, the sum of all is, that that which was formerly bread, by consecration becomes Christ: so that Christ thereafter lies hid under the colour of bread. This they are not ashamed distinctly to express. For Lombard's words are, "The body of Christ, which is visible in itself, lurks and lies covered after the

"Seal" will
become the
mark of "covenant"
theology

Stoicism
Revisited?
Berengarius?
Rationalism?

Virtualism
in Tainted

Calvin wants
Communion in Eucharist
Rationalism

Seems to
recognize
XP is present
Now against
Rationalism
But words of
"Results"

Retraction
Against
Transubstantiation
(as he said it)
"Aristotle"

Analogy of
Sunlight →
Sun
"Transubstantiation"
"Painted
Face"

Critical
"accidental"
"Theology"

act of consecration under the species of bread" (Lombard. Sent. Lib. iv. Dist. 12). Thus the figure of the bread is nothing but a mask which conceals the view of the flesh from our eye. But there is no need of many conjectures to detect the snare which they intended to lay by these words, since the thing itself speaks clearly. It is easy to see how great is the superstition under which not only the vulgar but the leaders also, have laboured for many ages, and still labour, in Popish Churches. Little solicitous as to true faith (by which alone we attain to the fellowship of Christ, and become one with him), provided they have his carnal presence, which they have fabricated without authority from the word, they think he is sufficiently present. Hence we see, that all which they have gained by their ingenious subtlety is to make bread to be regarded as God.

14. Hence proceeded that fictitious transubstantiation for which they fight more fiercely in the present day than for all the other articles of their faith. For the first architects of local presence could not explain, how the body of Christ could be mixed with the substance of bread, without forthwith meeting with many absurdities. Hence it was necessary to have recourse to the fiction, that there is a conversion of the bread into body, not that properly instead of bread it becomes body, but that Christ, in order to conceal himself under the figure, reduces the substance to nothing. It is strange that they have fallen into such a degree of ignorance, nay, of stupor, as to produce this monstrous fiction not only against Scripture, but also against the consent of the ancient Church. I admit, indeed, that some of the ancients occasionally used the term *conversion*, not that they meant to do away with the substance in the external signs, but to teach that the bread devoted to the sacrament was widely different from ordinary bread, and was now something else. All clearly and uniformly teach that the sacred Supper consists of two parts, an earthly and a heavenly. The earthly they without dispute interpret to be bread and wine. Certainly, whatever they may pretend, it is plain that antiquity, which they often dare to oppose to the clear word of God, gives no countenance to that dogma. It is not so long since it was devised; indeed, it was unknown not only to the better ages, in which a purer doctrine still flourished, but after that purity was considerably impaired. There is no early Christian writer who does not admit in distinct terms that the sacred symbols of the Supper are bread and wine, although, as has been said, they sometimes distinguish them by various epithets, in order to recommend the dignity of the mystery. For when they say that a secret conversion takes place at consecration, so that it is now something else than bread and wine, their meaning, as I already observed, is, not that these are annihilated, but that they are to be considered in a different light from common food, which is only intended to feed the body, whereas in the former the spiritual food and drink of the mind are exhibited. This we deny not. But, say our opponents, if there is conversion, one thing must become another. If

Aggravated
Theology
2. Dant

they mean that something becomes different from what it was before, I assent. If they will wrest it in support of their fiction, let them tell me of what kind of change they are sensible in baptism. For here, also, the Fathers make out a wonderful conversion, when they say that out of the corruptible element is made the spiritual laver of the soul, and yet no one denies that it still remains water. But say they, there is no such expression in Baptism as that in the Supper, *This is my body*; as if we were treating of these words, which have a meaning sufficiently clear, and not rather of that term *conversion*, which ought not to mean more in the Supper than in Baptism. Have done, then, with those quibbles upon words, which betray nothing but their silliness. The meaning would have no congruity, unless the truth which is there figured had a living image in the external sign. Christ wished to testify by an external symbol that his flesh was food. If he exhibited merely an empty show of bread, and not true bread, where is the analogy or similitude to conduct us from the visible thing to the invisible? For, in order to make all things consistent, the meaning cannot extend to more than this, that we are fed by the species of Christ's flesh; just as, in the case of baptism, if the figure of water deceived the eye, it would not be to us a sure pledge of our ablution; nay, the fallacious spectacle would rather throw us into doubt. The nature of the sacrament is therefore overthrown, if in the mode of signifying the earthly sign corresponds not to the heavenly reality; and, accordingly, the truth of the mystery is lost if true bread does not represent the true body of Christ. I again repeat, since the Supper is nothing but a conspicuous attestation to the promise which is contained in the sixth chapter of John—viz. that Christ is the bread of life, who came down from heaven, that visible bread must intervene, in order that that spiritual bread may be figured, unless we would destroy all the benefits with which God here favours us for the purpose of sustaining our infirmity. Then on what ground could Paul infer that we are all one bread, and one body in partaking together of that one bread, if only the semblance of bread, and not the natural reality, remained?

15. They could not have been so shamefully deluded by the impostures of Satan had they not been fascinated by the erroneous idea, that the body of Christ included under the bread is transmitted by the bodily mouth into the belly. The cause of this brutish imagination was, that consecration had the same effect with them as magical incantation. They overlooked the principle, that bread is a sacrament to none but those to whom the word is addressed, just as the water of baptism is not changed in itself, but begins to be to us what it formerly was not, as soon as the promise is annexed. This will better appear from the example of a similar sacrament. The water gushing from the rock in the desert was to the Israelites a badge and sign of the same thing that is figured to us in the Supper by wine. For Paul declares that they drank the same spiritual drink (1 Cor. x. 4.) But the water was common to the herds and

flocks of the people. Hence it is easy to infer, that in the earthly elements, when employed for a spiritual use, no other conversion takes place than in respect of men, inasmuch as they are to them seals of promises. Moreover, since it is the purpose of God, as I have repeatedly inculcated, to raise us up to himself by fit vehicles, those who indeed call us to Christ, but to Christ lurking invisibly under bread, impiously, by their perverseness, defeat this object. For it is impossible for the mind of man to disentangle itself from the immensity of space, and ascend to Christ even above the heavens. What nature denied them, they attempted to gain by a noxious remedy. Remaining on the earth, they felt no need of a celestial proximity to Christ. Such was the necessity which impelled them to transfigure the body of Christ. In the age of Bernard, though a harsher mode of speech had prevailed, transubstantiation was not yet recognised. And in all previous ages, the similitude in the mouths of all was, that a spiritual reality was conjoined with bread and wine in this sacrament. As to the terms, they think they answer acutely, though they adduce nothing relevant to the case in hand. The rod of Moses (they say), when turned into a serpent, though it acquires the name of a serpent, still retains its former name, and is called a rod; and thus, according to them, it is equally probable that though the bread passes into a new substance, it is still called by catachresis, and not inaptly, what it still appears to the eye to be. But what resemblance, real or apparent, do they find between an illustrious miracle and their fictitious illusion, of which no eye on the earth is witness? The magi by their impostures had persuaded the Egyptians, that they had a divine power above the ordinary course of nature to change created beings. Moses comes forth, and after exposing their fallacies, shows that the invincible power of God is on his side, since his rod swallows up all the other rods. But as that conversion was visible to the eye, we have already observed, that it has no reference to the case in hand. Shortly after the rod visibly resumed its form. It may be added, that we know not whether this was an extemporary conversion of substance.¹ For we must attend to the illusion to the rods of the magicians, which the prophet did not choose to term serpents, lest he might seem to insinuate a conversion which had no existence, because those impostors had done nothing more than blind the eyes of the spectators. But what resemblance is there between that expression and the following? "The bread which we break;"—"As often as ye eat this bread;"—"They communicated in the breaking of bread;" and so forth. It is certain that the eye only was deceived by the incantation of the magicians. The matter is more doubtful with regard to Moses, by whose hand it was not more difficult for God to make a serpent out of a rod, and again to make a rod out of a serpent, than to clothe angels with corporeal

¹ Compare together Ambrose on those who are initiated in the sacraments (cap. 9), and Augustine. De Trinitate, Lib. iii. cap. 10, and it will be seen that both are opposed to transubstantiation.

bodies, and a little after unclothe them. If the case of the sacrament were at all akin to this, there might be some colour for their explanation. Let it, therefore, remain fixed that there is no true and fit promise in the Supper, that the flesh of Christ is truly meat, unless there is a correspondence in the true substance of the external symbol. But as one error gives rise to another, a passage in Jeremiah has been so absurdly wrested, to prove transubstantiation, that it is painful to refer to it. The prophet complains that wood was placed in his bread, intimating that by the cruelty of his enemies his bread was infected with bitterness, as David by a similar figure complains, "They gave me also gall for my meat: and in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink" (Psaln lxix. 21). These men would allegorise the expression to mean, that the body of Christ was nailed to the wood of the cross. But some of the Fathers thought so! As if we ought not rather to pardon their ignorance and bury the disgrace, than to add impudence, and bring them into hostile conflict with the genuine meaning of the prophet.

16. Some, who see that the analogy between the sign and the thing signified cannot be destroyed without destroying the truth of the sacrament, admit that the bread of the Supper is truly the substance of an earthly and corruptible element, and cannot suffer any change in itself, but must have the body of Christ included under it. If they would explain this to mean, that when the bread is held forth in the sacrament, an exhibition of the body is annexed, because the truth is inseparable from its sign, I would not greatly object. But because fixing the body itself in the bread, they attach to it an ubiquity contrary to its nature, and by adding *under* the bread, will have it that it lies hid under it, I must employ a short time in exposing their craft, and dragging them forth from their concealments. Here, however, it is not my intention: professedly to discuss the whole case; I mean only to lay the foundations of a discussion which will afterwards follow in its own place. They insist, then, that the body of Christ is invisible and immense, so that it may be hid under bread, because they think that there is no other way by which they can communicate with him than by his descending into the bread, though they do not comprehend the mode of descent by which he raises us up to himself. They employ all the colours they possibly can, but after they have said all, it is sufficiently apparent that they insist on the local presence of Christ. How so? Because they cannot conceive any other participation of flesh and blood than that which consists either in local conjunction and contact, or in some gross method of enclosing.

17. Some, in order obstinately to maintain the error which they have once rashly adopted, hesitate not to assert that the dimensions of Christ's flesh are not more circumscribed than those of heaven and earth. His birth as an infant, his growth, his extension on the cross, his confinement in the sepulchre, were effected, they say, by a kind of dispensation, that he might perform the offices of being

against
Luther

born, of dying, and of other human acts: his being seen with his wonted bodily appearance after the resurrection, his ascension into heaven, his appearance, after his ascension, to Stephen and Paul, were the effect of the same dispensation, that it might be made apparent to the eye of man that he was constituted King in heaven. What is this but to call forth Marcion from his grave? For there cannot be a doubt that the body of Christ, if so constituted, was a phantasm, or was phantastical. Some employ a rather more subtle evasion, That the body which is given in the sacrament is glorious and immortal, and that, therefore, there is no absurdity in its being contained under the sacrament in various places, or in no place, and in no form. But, I ask, what did Christ give to his disciples the day before he suffered? Do not the words say that he gave the mortal body, which was to be delivered shortly after? But, say they, he had previously manifested his glory to the three disciples on the mount (Matth. xvii. 2). This is true; but his purpose was to give them for the time a taste of immortality. Still they cannot find there a twofold body, but only the one which he had assumed, arrayed in new glory. When he distributed his body in the first Supper, the hour was at hand in which he was "stricken, smitten of God, and afflicted" (Isa. liii. 4). So far was he from intending at that time to exhibit the glory of his resurrection. And here what a door is opened to Marcion, if the body of Christ was seen humble and mortal in one place, glorious and immortal in another! And yet, if their opinion is well-founded, the same thing happens every day, because they are forced to admit that the body of Christ, which is in itself visible, lurks invisibly under the symbol of bread. And yet those who send forth such monstrous dogmas, so far from being ashamed at the disgrace, assail us with virulent invectives for not subscribing to them.

18. But assuming that the body and blood of Christ are attached to the bread and wine, then the one must necessarily be dissevered from the other. For as the bread is given separately from the cup, so the body, united to the bread, must be separated from the blood, included in the cup. For since they affirm that the body is in the bread, and the blood is in the cup, while the bread and wine are, in regard to space, at some distance from each other, they cannot, by any quibble, evade the conclusion that the body must be separated from the blood. Their usual pretence—viz. that the blood is in the body, and the body again in the blood, by what they call concomitance, is more than frivolous, since the symbols in which they are included are thus distinguished. But if we are carried to heaven with our eyes and minds, that we may there behold Christ in the glory of his kingdom, as the symbols invite us to him in his integrity, so, under the symbol of bread, we must feed on his body, and, under the symbol of wine, drink separately of his blood, and thereby have the full enjoyment of him. For though he withdrew his flesh from us, and with his body ascended to heaven, he, however, sits at the right hand of the

Father; that is, he reigns in power and majesty, and the glory of the Father. This kingdom is not limited by any intervals of space, nor circumscribed by any dimensions. Christ can exert his energy wherever he pleases, in earth and heaven, can manifest his presence by the exercise of his power, can always be present with his people, breathing into them his own life, can live in them, sustain, confirm, and invigorate them, and preserve them safe, just as if he were with them in the body; in fine, can feed them with his own body, communion with which he transfuses into them. After this manner, the body and blood of Christ are exhibited to us in the sacrament.

19. The presence of Christ in the Supper we must hold to be such as neither affixes him to the element of bread, nor encloses him in bread, nor circumscribes him in any way (this would obviously detract from his celestial glory); and it must, moreover, be such as neither divests him of his just dimensions, nor dissevers him by differences of place, nor assigns to him a body of boundless dimensions, diffused through heaven and earth. All these things are clearly repugnant to his true human nature. Let us never allow ourselves to lose sight of the two restrictions. First, Let there be nothing derogatory to the heavenly glory of Christ. This happens whenever he is brought under the corruptible elements of this world, or is affixed to any earthly creatures. Secondly, Let no property be assigned to his body inconsistent with his human nature. This is done when it is either said to be infinite, or made to occupy a variety of places at the same time. But when these absurdities are discarded, I willingly admit anything which helps to express the true and substantial communication of the body and blood of the Lord, as exhibited to believers under the sacred symbols of the Supper, understanding that they are received not by the imagination or intellect merely, but are enjoyed in reality as the food of eternal life. For the odium with which this view is regarded by the world, and the unjust prejudice incurred by its defence, there is no cause, unless it be in the fearful fascinations of Satan. What we teach on the subject is in perfect accordance with Scripture, contains nothing absurd, obscure, or ambiguous, is not unfavourable to true piety and solid edification; in short, has nothing in it to offend, save that, for some ages, while the ignorance and barbarism of sophists reigned in the Church, the clear light and open truth were unbecomingly suppressed. And yet as Satan, by means of turbulent spirits, is still, in the present day, exerting himself to the utmost to bring dishonour on this doctrine by all kinds of calumny and reproach, it is right to assert and defend it with the greatest care.

20. Before we proceed farther, we must consider the ordinance itself, as instituted by Christ, because the most plausible objection of our opponents is, that we abandon his words. To free ourselves from the obloquy with which they thus load us, the fittest course will be to begin with an interpretation of the words. Three Evangelists and Paul relate that our Saviour took bread, and after giving

Calvin's
limits

ouged

thanks, brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, Take, eat: this is my body which is given or broken for you. Of the cup, Matthew and Mark say, "This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins" (Matth. xxvi. 26; Mark xiv. 22). Luke and Paul say, "This cup is the new testament in my blood" (Luke xxii. 20; 1 Cor. xi. 25). The advocates of transubstantiation insist, that by the pronoun, *this*, is denoted the appearance of bread, because the whole complexion of our Saviour's address is an act of consecration, and there is no substance which can be demonstrated. But if they adhere so religiously to the words, inasmuch as that which our Saviour gave to his disciples he declared to be his body, there is nothing more alien from the strict meaning of the words than the fiction, that what was bread is now body. What Christ takes into his hands, and gives to the apostles, he declares to be his body; but he had taken bread, and, therefore, who sees not that what is given is still bread? Hence, nothing can be more absurd than to transfer what is affirmed of bread to the species of bread. Others, in interpreting the particle *is*, as equivalent to being transubstantiated, have recourse to a gloss which is forced and violently wrested. They have no ground, therefore, for pretending that they are moved by a reverence for the words. The use of the term *is*, for being converted into something else, is unknown to every tongue and nation. With regard to those who leave the bread in the Supper, and affirm that it is the body of Christ, there is great diversity among them. Those who speak more modestly, though they insist upon the letter, This is my body, afterwards abandon this strictness, and observe that it is equivalent to saying that the body of Christ is with the bread, in the bread, and under the bread. To the reality which they affirm, we have already adverted, and will by-and-by, at greater length. I am not only considering the words by which they say they are prevented from admitting that the bread is called body, because it is a sign of the body. But if they shun everything like metaphor, why do they leap from the simple demonstration of Christ to modes of expression which are widely different? For there is a great difference between saying that the bread is the body, and that the body is with the bread. But seeing it impossible to maintain the simple proposition that the bread is the body, they endeavoured to evade the difficulty by concealing themselves under those forms of expression. Others, who are bolder, hesitate not to assert that, strictly speaking, the bread is body, and in this way prove that they are truly of the letter. If it is objected that the bread, therefore, is Christ, and, being Christ, is God,—they will deny it, because the words of Christ do not expressly say so. But they gain nothing by their denial, since all agree that the whole Christ is offered to us in the Supper. It is intolerable blasphemy to affirm, without figure, of a fading and corruptible element, that it is Christ. I now ask them, if they hold the two propositions to be identical, Christ is the Son of God, and Bread is the body of

Christ? If they concede that they are different (and this, whether they will or not, they will be forced to do), let them tell wherein is the difference. All which they can adduce is, I presume, that the bread is called body in a sacramental manner. Hence it follows, that the words of Christ are not subject to the common rule, and ought not to be tested grammatically. I ask all these rigid and obstinate exactors of the letter, whether, when Luke and Paul call the cup *the testament in blood*, they do not express the same thing as in the previous clause, when they call bread the body? There certainly was the same solemnity in the one part of the mystery as in the other, and, as brevity is obscure, the longer sentence better elucidates the meaning. As often, therefore, as they contend, from the one expression, that the bread is body, I will adduce an apt interpretation from the longer expression, That it is a testament in the body. What? Can we seek for surer or more faithful expounders than Luke and Paul? I have no intention, however, to detract, in any respect, from the communication of the body of Christ, which I have acknowledged. I only meant to expose the foolish perverseness with which they carry on a war of words. The bread I understand, on the authority of Luke and Paul, to be the body of Christ, because it is a covenant in the body. If they impugn this, their quarrel is not with me, but with the Spirit of God. However often they may repeat, that reverence for the words of Christ will not allow them to give a figurative interpretation to what is spoken plainly, the pretext cannot justify them in thus rejecting all the contrary arguments which we adduce. Meanwhile, as I have already observed, it is proper to attend to the force of what is meant by a testament in the body and blood of Christ. The covenant, ratified by the sacrifice of death, would not avail us without the addition of that secret communication, by which we are made one with Christ.

21. It remains, therefore, to hold, that on account of the affinity which the things signified have with their signs, the name of the thing itself is given to the sign figuratively, indeed, but very appropriately. I say nothing of allegories and parables, lest it should be alleged that I am seeking subterfuges, and slipping out of the present question. I say that the expression which is uniformly used in Scripture, when the sacred mysteries are treated of, is metonymical. For you cannot otherwise understand the expressions, that circumcision is a "covenant"—that the lamb is the Lord's "passover"—that the sacrifices of the law are expiations—that the rock from which the water flowed in the desert was Christ,—unless you interpret them metonymically.¹ Nor is the name merely transferred from the superior to the inferior, but, on the contrary, the name of the visible sign is given to the thing signified, as when God is said to have appeared to Moses in the bush; the ark of the covenant is called God, and the face of God, and the dove is called the Holy Spirit.²

¹ Gen. xvii. 10; Exod. xii. 11; xvii. 6; 1 Cor. x. 4.

² Exod. iii. 2; Psalm lxxxiv. 8; xlii. 3; Matth. iii. 16.

For although the sign differs essentially from the thing signified, the latter being spiritual and heavenly, the former corporeal and visible,—yet, as it not only figures the thing which it is employed to represent as a naked and empty badge, but also truly exhibits it, why should not its name be justly applied to the thing? But if symbols humanly devised, which are rather the images of absent than the marks of present things, and of which they are very often most fallacious types, are sometimes honoured with their names,—with much greater reason do the institutions of God borrow the names of things, of which they always bear a sure, and by no means fallacious signification, and have the reality annexed to them. So great, then, is the similarity, and so close the connection between the two, that it is easy to pass from the one to the other. Let our opponents, therefore, cease to indulge their mirth in calling us Tropists, when we explain the sacramental mode of expression according to the common use of Scripture. For, while the sacraments agree in many things, there is also, in this metonymy, a certain community in all respects between them. As, therefore, the apostle says that the rock from which spiritual water flowed forth to the Israelites was Christ (1 Cor. x. 4), and was thus a visible symbol under which, that spiritual drink was truly perceived, though not by the eye, so the body of Christ is now called bread, inasmuch as it is a symbol under which our Lord offers us the true eating of his body. Lest any one should despise this as a novel invention, the view which Augustine took and expressed was the same: “Had not the sacraments a certain resemblance to the things of which they are sacraments, they would not be sacraments at all. And from this resemblance, they generally have the names of the things themselves. This, as the sacrament of the body of Christ, is, after a certain manner, the body of Christ, and the sacrament of Christ is the blood of Christ; so the sacrament of faith is faith” (August. Ep. 23, ad Bonifac.). He has many similar passages, which it would be superfluous to collect, as that one may suffice. I need only remind my readers, that the same doctrine is taught by that holy man in his Epistle to Evodius. Where Augustine teaches that nothing is more common than metonymy in mysteries, it is a frivolous quibble to object that there is no mention of the Supper. Were this objection sustained, it would follow, that we are not entitled to argue from the genus to the species; *e. g.*, Every animal is endued with motion; and, therefore, the horse and the ox are endued with motion.¹ Indeed, longer discussion is rendered unnecessary by the words of the Saint himself, where he says, that when Christ gave the symbol of his body, he did not hesitate to call it his body (August. Cont. Adimantum, cap. 12). He elsewhere says, “Wonderful was the patience of Christ in admitting Judas to the

¹ French, “Certes si on ne veut abolir toute raison, on ne peut dire que ce qui est commun à tous sacrements n'appartienne aussi à la Cène.”—Certainly if we would not abolish reason altogether, we cannot say that that which is common to all the sacraments belongs not also to the Supper.

feast, in which he committed and delivered to the disciples the symbol of his body and blood” (August. in. Ps. iii).

22. Should any morose person, shutting his eyes to everything else, insist upon the expression, *This is*, as distinguishing this mystery from all others, the answer is easy. They say that the substantive verb is so emphatic, as to leave no room for interpretation. Though I should admit this, I answer, that the substantive verb occurs in the words of Paul (1 Cor. x. 16), where he calls the bread the communion of the body of Christ. But communion is something different from the body itself. Nay, when the sacraments are treated of, the same word occurs: “My covenant shall be in your flesh for an everlasting covenant” (Gen. xvii. 13). “This is the ordinance of the passover” (Exod. xii. 43). To say no more, when Paul declares that the rock was Christ (1 Cor. x. 4), why should the substantive verb, in that passage, be deemed less emphatic than in the discourse of Christ? When John says, “The Holy Ghost was not yet given, because that Jesus was not yet glorified” (John vii. 39), I should like to know what is the force of the substantive verb? If the rule of our opponents is rigidly observed, the eternal essence of the Spirit will be destroyed, as if he had only begun to be after the ascension of Christ. Let them tell me, in fine, what is meant by the declaration of Paul, that baptism is “the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost” (Tit. iii. 5); though it is certain that to many it was of no use. But they cannot be more effectually refuted than by the expression of Paul, that the Church is Christ. For, after introducing the similitude of the human body, he adds, “So also is Christ” (1 Cor. xii. 12), when he means not the only-begotten Son of God in himself, but in his members. I think I have now gained this much, that all men of sense and integrity will be disgusted with the calumnies of our enemies, when they give out that we discredit the words of Christ; though we embrace them not less obediently than they do, and ponder them with greater reverence. Nay, their supine security proves that they do not greatly care what Christ meant, provided it furnishes them with a shield to defend their obstinacy, while our careful investigation should be an evidence of the authority which we yield to Christ. They invidiously pretend that human reason will not allow us to believe what Christ uttered with his sacred mouth; but how naughtily they endeavour to fix this odium upon us, I have already, in a great measure, shown, and will still show more clearly. Nothing, therefore, prevents us from believing Christ speaking, and from acquiescing in everything to which he intimates his assent. The only question here is, whether it be unlawful to inquire into the genuine meaning?

23. Those worthy masters, to show that they are of the letter, forbid us to deviate, in the least, from the letter. On the contrary, when Scripture calls God a man of war, as I see that the expression would be too harsh if not interpreted, I have no doubt that the similitude is taken from man. And, indeed, the only pretext which enabled

Council of Trent - 1545-63

The Thirteenth Session

Being the third under the Sovereign Pontiff, Julius III., celebrated on the eleventh day of October, MDLI.

DECREE CONCERNING THE MOST HOLY SACRAMENT OF THE EUCHARIST

The sacred and holy, oecumenical and general Synod of Trent, -lawfully assembled in the Holy Ghost, the same Legate, and nuncios of the Apostolic See presiding therein, although the end for which It assembled, not without the special guidance and governance of the Holy Ghost, was, that It might set forth the true and ancient doctrine touching faith and the sacraments, and might apply a remedy to all the heresies, and the other most grievous troubles with which the Church of God is now miserably agitated, and rent into many and various parts; yet, even from the outset, this especially has been the object of Its desires, that It might pluck up by the roots those tares of execrable errors and schisms, with which the enemy hath, in these our calamitous times, oversown the doctrine of the faith, in the use and worship of the sacred and holy Eucharist, which our Saviour, notwithstanding, left in His Church as a symbol of that unity and charity, with which He would fain have all Christians be mentally joined and united together. Wherefore, this sacred and holy Synod delivering here, on this venerable and divine sacrament of the Eucharist, that sound and genuine doctrine, which the Catholic Church, -instructed by our Lord Jesus Christ Himself, and by His apostles, and taught by the Holy Ghost, who day by day brings to her mind all truth, has always retained, and will preserve even to the end of the world, forbids all the faithful of Christ, to presume to believe, teach, or preach henceforth concerning the holy Eucharist, otherwise than as is explained and defined in this present decree.

*mentis
(gen. mens)
mind, understood
i.e. agreed*

CHAPTER I.

On the real presence of our Lord Jesus Christ in the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist.

In the first place, the holy Synod teaches, and openly and simply professes, that, in the august sacrament of the holy Eucharist, after the consecration of the bread and wine, our Lord Jesus Christ, true God and man, is truly, really, and substantially contained under the species of those sensible things. For neither are these things mutually repugnant, -that our Saviour Himself always sitteth at the right hand of the Father in heaven, according to the natural mode of existing, and that, nevertheless, He be, in many other places, sacramentally present to us in his own substance, by a manner of existing, which, though we can scarcely express it in words, yet can we, by the understanding illuminated by faith, conceive, and we ought most firmly to believe, to be possible unto God: for thus all our forefathers, as many as were in the true Church of Christ, who have treated of this most holy Sacrament, have most openly professed, that our Redeemer instituted this so admirable a sacrament at the last supper, when, after the blessing of the bread and wine, He testified, in express and clear words, that He gave them His own very Body, and His own Blood; words which, -recorded by the holy Evangelists, and afterwards repeated by Saint Paul, whereas they carry with them that proper and most manifest meaning in which they were understood by the Fathers, -it is indeed a crime the most unworthy that they should be wrested, by certain contentions and wicked men, to fictitious and imaginary tropes, whereby the verity of the flesh and blood of Christ is denied, contrary to the universal sense of the Church, which, as the pillar and ground of truth, has detested, as satanical, these inventions devised by impious men; she recognising, with a mind ever grateful and unforgetting, this most excellent benefit of Christ.

CHAPTER II.

On the reason of the Institution of this most holy Sacrament.

Wherefore, our Saviour, when about to depart out of this world to the Father, instituted this Sacrament, in which He poured forth as it were the riches of His divine love towards man, making a remembrance of his wonderful works; and He commanded us, in the participation thereof, to venerate His memory, and to show forth his death until He come to judge the world. And He would also that this sacrament should be received as the spiritual food of souls, whereby may be fed and strengthened those who live with His life who said, He that eateth me, the same also shall live by me; and as an antidote, whereby we may be freed from daily faults, and be preserved from mortal sins. He would, furthermore, have it be a pledge of our glory to come, and everlasting happiness, and thus be a symbol of that one body whereof He is the head, and to which He would fain have us as members be united by the closest bond of faith, hope, and charity, that we might all speak the same things, and there might be no schisms amongst us.

CHAPTER III.

On the excellency of the most holy Eucharist over the rest of the Sacraments.

The most holy Eucharist has indeed this in common with the rest of the sacraments, that it is a symbol of a sacred thing, and is a visible form of an invisible grace; but there is found in the Eucharist this excellent and peculiar thing, that the other sacraments have then first the power of sanctifying when one uses them, whereas in the Eucharist, before being used, there is the Author Himself of sanctity. For the apostles had not as yet received the Eucharist from the hand of the Lord, when nevertheless Himself affirmed with truth that to be His own body which He presented (to them). And this faith has ever been in the Church of God, that, immediately after the consecration, the veritable Body of our Lord, and His veritable Blood, together with His soul and divinity, are under the species of bread and wine; but the Body indeed under the species of bread, and the Blood under the species of wine, by the force of the words; but the body itself under the species of wine, and the blood under the species of *concomitance* bread, and the soul under both, by the force of that natural connexion and concomitancy whereby the parts of Christ our Lord, who hath now risen from the dead, to die no more, are united together; and the divinity, furthermore, on account of the admirable hypostatical union thereof with His body and soul. Wherefore it is most true, that as much is contained under either species as under both; for Christ whole and entire is under the species of bread, and under any part whatsoever of that species; likewise the whole (Christ) is under the species of wine, and under the parts thereof.

CHAPTER IV.

On Transubstantiation.

And because that Christ, our Redeemer, declared that which He offered under the species of bread to be truly His own body, therefore has it ever been a firm belief in the Church of God, and this holy Synod doth now declare it anew, that, by the consecration of the bread and of the wine, a conversion is made of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of His blood; which conversion is, by the holy Catholic Church, suitably and properly called Transubstantiation.

JOHN WESLEY

OF THE EUCHARIST.

Q. 62. WHAT is the eucharist?

A. It is a sacrament wherein is truly, really, and substantially contained whole Christ, God-Man, body and blood, bones and nerves, (*Catech. Rom.*, par. 2, c. 4, n. 33,) soul and divinity, under the species or appearance of bread and wine. (*Concil. Trid.*, Sess. 13, de *Real. Præs.*, c. 1; *A Sum of Christian Doctrine*, printed 1686.)

Q. How do they attempt to prove this?

A. From the words of our Saviour,—“This is my body;” which, say they, clearly demonstrate that the same body which was born of the Virgin, and is now in heaven, is in the sacrament. (*Catech.*, par. 2, c. 4, n. 26.)

Q. 63. What becomes of the bread and wine after consecration?

A. Upon consecration there is a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of Christ's body; and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of Christ's blood; which conversion is usually called transubstantiation. (*Concil. Trid. ibid.*, c. 4; *Concil. Later.*, 4, can. 1.)

REPLY. (1.) “No such change of the substance of the bread into the substance of Christ's body, can be inferred from our Saviour's words, ‘This is my body;’” (*Matt. xxvi. 26.*) for it is not said, “This is *turned* into my body,” but, “This is my body;” which, if it be taken literally, would rather prove the substance of the bread to be his body. Therefore Cardinal Cajetan acknowledges, it is nowhere said in the Gospel that the bread is changed into the body of Christ; but they have it from the authority of the Church. (*Cajet. in Aquin.*, par. 3, q. 75, art. 1.)

(2.) It is farther evident that the words are not to be taken in their proper sense; for it is called bread as well after consecration as before it. (*1 Cor. x. 17; xi. 26—28.*) So that what was called his body was also bread at the same time.

(3.) The mystical relation which the bread by consecration has to Christ's body is sufficient to give it the name of his body. “For it is the usual way of Scripture, to call things of a sacramental nature, by the names of those things they are the figure of.” (*Aug. Epist. 23.*) So, circumcision is called the covenant. (*Gen. xvii. 13.*) And the killing, dressing, and eating the lamb, is called the passover. (*Exodus xii. 11.*) And after the same manner is the bread in the sacrament Christ's body; that is, as circumcision was the covenant, and the lamb the passover, by signification and representation, by type and figure. And so the elements are called by the Fathers, “the images,” (*Orig. Dial. 3, Contr. Marcion.*), “the

ROMAN CATECHISM, AND REPLY.

symbols,” (*Euseb. Dem. Evang. l. 1, c. 1, et ult.*), “the figure,” (*Aug. contr. Adimant.*, c. 12,) of Christ's body and blood.)

Q. 64. What is then that which is seen and tasted in the eucharist?

A. The things seen and tasted are the accidents only of bread and wine; there is the savour, colour, and quantity of bread and wine, without any of their substance; but under those accidents there is only the body and blood of Christ. (*Catech. Rom.*, n. 37, 44.)

REPLY. Our Saviour appealed to the senses of his disciples: “Handle me, and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have.” (*Luke xxiv. 39.*) Take away the certainty of sense, and there is no discerning a body from a spirit; and grant transubstantiation, and we take away the certainty of sense.

Q. 65. Is the body and blood of Christ broken when the host is broken and divided?

A. No, because Christ is impassible; (*Abridgment of Christ. Doctrine*, c. 11, sec. *Euchar.*;) and, besides, there is whole and entire Christ under either species or element, under the species of bread, and under every particle of it; under the species of wine, and under every drop of it. (*Conc. Trid., ibid.*, c. 3.)

REPLY. If every particle of the host is as much the whole body of Christ, as the whole host is before it be divided, then a whole may be divided into wholes; for, divide it and subdivide it, it is still whole. Whole it is before the division, whole it is in the division, and whole it is after it. Thus unreasonable, as well as false, is the doctrine of transubstantiation.

18th C. Empiricism

? Rationalism

Q. 68. What is the mass?

A. In the sacrifice of the mass, the same Christ is contained, and unbloody offered, who bloodily offered himself upon the altar of the cross. (*Conc. Trid., Sess. 22, can. 1.*)

Q. 69. Of what virtue is the sacrifice in the mass?

A. It is truly a propitiatory sacrifice, and is available, not only for the sins, punishments, and satisfactions of the living, but also for those of the souls in purgatory. (*Ibid.*)

Q. 70. Is this necessary to be believed?

A. Yes; and whosoever denies any of this, is accursed, (*Conc. Trid., Sess. 22, can. 1.*) and incapable of salvation. (*Bulla Pii IV.*)

REPLY. The Scripture when it extols the perfection and infinite value of Christ's sacrifice, doth infer from it, that there needed not therefore any repetition of it: "He needeth not daily, as those High Priests, to offer up sacrifice, &c.; for this he did once, when he offered up himself." (Hebrews vii. 27.) But if the same Christ is offered in the mass as was on the

cross, and that unbloody sacrifice is alike propitiatory as the bloody, there is then a repetition of the same sacrifice, and he is daily offered.) And what is it to say, the one was bloody and the other is unbloody, when the unbloody is of the same virtue, and is applied to the same end, as the bloody? So that, as, if Christ had again been bloodily offered up, there had been a repetition of that sacrifice; so there is a repetition of it when he is offered up unbloody. (To have then a perfect sacrifice daily repeated, and a sacrifice without suffering, and a propitiation and remission without blood, are alike irreconcilable to the Apostle.) (Hebrews ix. 22, 25, &c.)

CHARLES WESLEY

HYMNS

83 (57) [—]

1 Oh the depth of love Divine,
Th' unfathomable grace!
Who shall say how bread and wine
God into man conveys!
How the bread his flesh imparts,
How the wine transmits his blood,
Fills his faithful people's hearts
With all the life of God!

2 Let the wisest mortal show
How we the grace receive,
Feeble elements bestow
A power not theirs to give.
Who explains the wondrous way,
How through these the virtue came?
These the virtue did convey,
Yet still remain the same.

3 How can heavenly spirits rise,
By earthly matter fed,
Drink herewith Divine supplies,
And eat immortal bread?
Ask the Father's Wisdom *how*;
Him that did the means ordain!
Angels round our altars bow
To search it out in vain.

4 Sure and real is the grace
The manner be unknown;
Only meet us in thy ways,
And perfect us in one.
Let us taste the heavenly powers;
Lord, we ask for nothing more:
Thine to bless, 'tis only ours
To wonder and adore.

IV. THE HOLY EUCHARIST AS IT IMPLIES A SACRIFICE

92 (116) [771]

1 Victim Divine, thy grace we claim
While thus thy precious death we show;
Once offer'd up, a spotless Lamb,
In thy great temple here below,
Thou didst for all mankind atone,
And standest now before the throne.

2 Thou standest in the holiest place,
As now for guilty sinners slain;
Thy blood of sprinkling speaks, and prays,
All-prevalent for helpless man;
Thy blood is still our ransom found,
And spreads salvation all around.

3† The smoke of thy atonement here
Darken'd the sun and rent the veil.
Made the new way to heaven appear,
And show'd the great Invisible;
Well pleased in thee our God look'd down,
And call'd his rebels to a crown.

4† He still respects thy sacrifice,
Its savor sweet doth always please;
The offering smokes through earth and skies,
Diffusing life, and joy, and peace;
To these thy lower courts it comes,
And fills them with divine perfumes.

5 We need not now go up to heaven,
To bring the long-sought Savior down;
Thou art to all already given,
Thou dost even now thy banquet crown:
To every faithful soul appear,
And show thy real presence here!

William Ames
(1576-1633)
The Marrow of Theology

The Sacraments

So much for the ministry, or the first means of the Spirit in applying Christ and his benefits.

1. The second means is found in the signs, or symbols.
2. A sign is something perceptible to the senses which, beyond the appearance of the thing it brings directly to the senses, at the same time makes something else come into the mind. In this regard the role of a sign is as far-reaching as that of a logical argument.
3. Some signs are natural and others have been instituted.
4. There is such a difference between these two that only an ugly error can confuse them.
5. There is also an ordinary and perpetual sign and another that is extraordinary and temporary.
6. In reference to the thing signified, a sign relates either to things past and is called *ἀναμνηστικός*, commemorative, or to things present and is called *διαγνωστικός*, demonstrative, or future and is called *προγνωστικός*, annunciative. It may consist of all these, setting forth things present, past, and future.
7. In reference to end and use, it either serves the understanding and is called an informing [*notificans*] sign; or it serves the memory

and is called a reminding [*commonefaciens*] sign; or it serves faith and is called a sealing [*obsignans*] sign; or lastly it may serve all of these together.

8. Hence a holy sign is either a bare sign, or a seal as well.
9. A bare sign only represents something. A seal not only represents but presents something by sealing.
10. A sign sealing the covenant of God is called a sacrament, Rom. 4:11.
11. It is a sign commemorating, demonstrating, announcing, informing, reminding, and sealing.
12. A sacrament of the new covenant, therefore, is a divine institution in which the blessings of the new covenant are represented, presented, and applied through signs perceptible to the senses.
13. Such a sacrament has the meaning of a secondary divine testimony in which the primary testimony of the covenant itself is specially confirmed for us.
14. Therefore, the special application of God's favor and grace which arises from true faith is very much confirmed and furthered by the sacraments.
15. In a sacrament there is something perceptible to the senses and something spiritual.
16. The former is a sign which represents or applies and the latter is what is represented and applied.
17. Yet the word *sacrament* usually and most properly signifies the outward or perceptible thing itself.
18. The sacramental signs do not include the spiritual thing to which they refer in any physically inherent or adherent sense for then the signs and things signified would be the same.
19. Neither are they bare signs which merely indicate and represent. They communicate and testify to the thing itself; indeed, they present the thing to be communicated.
20. None can institute such a holy sign but God alone. No creature can communicate the thing signified, or make its communication certain to us, or finally add such force to signs that they can confirm faith and confidence, or stir up spiritual grace in us, more than anything else can.
21. The thing itself which is set apart and separated for such holy use is properly called a representing sign, illustrated in the bread and wine in the Supper. But the use of these things is called an applying sign, illustrated in the distributing, receiving, eating, and drinking.
22. Therefore, the sacraments do not properly exist apart from their being used, i.e., they are not revered sacraments either before or after their use.

23. The spiritual thing which is signified by the sacraments of the new covenant is the new covenant itself, or Christ himself with all the blessings which are prepared in him for the faithful.

24. Yet some sacraments more expressly represent some dimension or aspect of this covenant than others, which set forth some other dimension.

25. But all have this in common, namely, that they seal the whole covenant of grace to believers. And they have this use not only at the time they are administered but to the end of life.

26. The form of a sacrament is the union between the sign and the things signified.

27. This union is neither physical nor yet imaginary; it is rather a spiritual relation by which the things signified are really communicated to those who rightly use the signs.

28. Those who partake of the signs do not necessarily partake of the spiritual thing itself, and the same manner and means of partaking do not apply to both.

29. From this union follows a communication of predicates. First, the sign is predicated of the thing signified, as when sanctification of the heart is called circumcision; second, the thing signified is predicated of the sign, as when circumcision is called the covenant and bread the body; third, the effect of the thing signified is predicated of the sign, as when baptism is said to regenerate; fourth, a property of the sign is predicated of the thing signified, as when breaking, which is applicable to bread, is attributed to Christ; fifth, a property of the thing signified is attributed to the sign, as when sacramental eating and drinking is called spiritual.

30. The basis of these relations is found, first, in the likeness or analogy of the sign to the thing signified. Indeed, such a likeness, although not constituting the sacrament itself, is prerequisite for the constituents of a sacrament and becomes as foundation for them. Second, the basis is in the word of institution, consisting of a command and a promise. The command imposes on us the duty of using the creatures of bread and wine to this holy end. The promise leads us to believe that we shall not use them in vain. This word of institution distinctly applied with appropriate prayer is called the word of consecration, blessing, sanctification, and separation. Third, the basis is completely laid in the prescribed observance and use itself, which have such great force that if this or that person pays no heed to them, though he be present in body and receiving, there is no sacrament for him, though for others it is most effectual.

31. The primary end of a sacrament is to seal the covenant. And this occurs not on God's part only but secondarily on ours, for not

only are the grace and promises of God sealed to us but also our thankfulness and obedience towards him.

32. Therefore, mystical signs of holy things cannot be instituted by man without prejudice to and violation of the sacraments, even though they do set forth the duty only of man.

33. Such signs are not properly sacraments; they are rather sacramental signs, that is, they partake of the nature of sacraments. Even as such they cannot be instituted by man.

34. A secondary end is the profession of faith and love. Taking the sacraments symbolizes the union we have with God in Christ and the communion we hold with all those who are partakers of the same union, especially with those who are members of the same church.

XXXVII

Ecclesiastical Discipline

Discipline is associated with the word and sacraments. In summary it has always been considered with them and, therefore, can be fitly treated in this place.

1. Holy discipline is an application of the will of God to persons through censure to guard against offenses or remove them from the church of God.

2. In the preaching of the word, the will of God is set forth and really applied to beget and increase faith and obedience. In the administration of the sacraments the will of God is applied to persons through the seals to confirm faith and obedience. In the exercise of discipline the will of God is also applied to persons in censure to remove the vices contrary to true faith and obedience.

3. Therefore, discipline is usually associated by the best theologians with the word and sacraments in the marks of the church. Although the relationship is not essential and reciprocal (nor is it in the case of the other two), yet it ought to appear in a full consideration of the church.

4. This discipline is ordained and prescribed by Christ himself, Matt. 16:19, 18:15-17. It is, therefore, plainly of divine right and may not be taken away, diminished, or changed by men at their pleasure.

5. Indeed, he sins against Christ, the author and ordainer, who does not do all he can to establish and promote this discipline in the churches of God.

6. It applies, without exception, to members of visible, instituted

(2) THE EUCHARISTIC PRESENCE

No. 199. RICHARD HOOKER

[From *The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, Book V, Chapter lxvii, § 12. *Works*, ed. J. Keble, Vol. II, pp. 359 f. Cp. note on No. 148.]

VARIETY of judgements and opinions argueth obscurity in those things whereabout they differ. But that which all parts receive for truth, that which every one having sifted is by no one denied or doubted of, must needs be matter of infallible certainty. Whereas therefore there are but three expositions made of *This is My Body*: the first, 'this is in itself before participation really and truly the natural substance of My Body by reason of the coexistence which My omnipotent Body hath with the sanctified element of bread,' which is the Lutherans' interpretation; the second, 'this is itself and before participation the very true and natural substance of My Body, by force of that Deity which with the Words of Consecration abolisheth the substance of bread and substituteth in the place thereof My Body,' which is the Popish construction; the last, 'this hallowed food, through concurrence of divine power, is in verity and truth unto faithful receivers instrumentally a cause of that mystical participation, whereby, as I make Myself wholly theirs, so I give them in hand an actual possession of all such saving grace as My sacrificed Body can yield, and as their souls do presently need, this is to them and in them My Body.' Of these three rehearsed interpretations the last hath in it nothing but what the rest do all approve and acknowledge to be most true, nothing but that which the Words of Christ are on all sides confessed to enforce, nothing but that which the Church of God hath always thought necessary, nothing but that which alone is sufficient for every Christian man to believe concerning the use and force of this Sacrament, finally nothing but that wherewith the writings of all antiquity are consonant and all Christian confessions agreeable. And as truth in what kind soever is by no kind of truth gainsayed, so the mind which resteth itself on this is never troubled with those perplexities which the other do both find, by means of so great contradiction between their opinions and true principles of reason grounded upon experience, nature and sense.

Deand Westmasta 1603-James I
No. 200. LANCELOT ANDREWES

1600 - [From *Responsio ad Apologiam Cardinalis Bellarmini*. Ed. L. A. C. T., pp. 13, 262, 265, 266 f., 250 f.; the first passage is from the reply to Chapter I of the *Apologia*, the remainder from that to Chapter VIII. The new Oath of Allegiance, occasioned

by the Gunpowder Plot of 1605, led James I to become engaged in controversy with Cardinal Bellarmine. Andrewes was drawn into the fray, and wrote two important books against the Cardinal. The first, entitled *Tortura Torti*, was an answer to a work which Bellarmine had written under the pseudonym *Matthaeus Tortus*; the other was the *Responsio*, from which the extract is taken. For the translation of these passages we are indebted to D. Stone, *A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, ii, 264-266.]

1554-1600
"The Temple"
vs. Latin Transl.
Doesn't
do enough!
Christ said, "This is My Body." He did not say, "This is My Body in this way." We are in agreement with you as to the end; the whole controversy is as to the method. As to the "This is," we hold with firm faith that it is. As to the "This is in this way" (namely, by the Transubstantiation of the bread into the Body), as to the method whereby it happens that it is, by means of In or With or Under or By transition, there is no word expressed. And because there is no word, we rightly make it not of faith; we place it perhaps among the theories of the school, but not among the articles of the faith. . . . We believe no less than you that the presence is real. Concerning the method of the presence, we define nothing rashly, and, I add, we do not anxiously inquire, any more than how the Blood of Christ washes us in our Baptism, any more than how the Human and Divine Natures are united in one Person in the Incarnation of Christ. . . .

Becomes
Classic
Anglican
position

It is perfectly clear that Transubstantiation, which has lately been born in the last four hundred years, never existed in the first four hundred. . . . In opposition to the Jesuit, our men deny that the Fathers had anything to do with the fact of Transubstantiation, any more than with the name. He regards the fact of Transubstantiation as a change in substance (*substantialis transmutatio*). And he calls certain witnesses to prove this. And yet on this point, whether there is there a conversion in substance, not long before the Lateran Council the Master of the Sentences himself says "I am not able to define." But all his witnesses speak of some kind of change (*pro mutatione, immutatione, transmutatione*). But there is no mention there of a change in substance, or of the substance. But neither do we deny in this matter the preposition *trans*; and we allow that the elements are changed (*transmutari*). But a change in substance we look for, and we find it nowhere. . . .

At the coming of the almighty power of the Word, the nature is changed so that what before was the mere element now becomes a Divine Sacrament, the substance nevertheless remaining what it was before. . . . There is that kind of union between the visible Sacrament and the invisible reality (*rem*) of the Sacrament which there is between the manhood and the Godhead of Christ, where unless you want to smack of Eutyches, the Manhood is not transubstantiated into the Godhead. . . .

About the adoration of the Sacrament he stumbles badly at the very threshold. He says "of the Sacrament, that is, of Christ the

6th which
1607-1608
1609

Robert Bellarmine

LANCELOT ANDREWES

Lord present by a wonderful but real way in the Sacrament." Away with this. Who will allow him this? "Of the Sacrament, that is, of Christ in the Sacrament." Surely, Christ Himself, the reality (*res*) of the Sacrament, in and with the Sacrament, outside and without the Sacrament, wherever He is, is to be adored. Now the King [*i.e.* James I] laid down that Christ is really present in the Eucharist, and is really to be adored, that is, the reality (*rem*) of the Sacrament; but not the Sacrament, that is, the "earthly part," as Irenæus says, the "visible," as Augustine says. We also, like Ambrose, "adore the flesh of Christ in the mysteries," and yet not it but Him Who is worshipped on the altar. For the Cardinal puts his question badly, "What is there worshipped?" since he ought to ask, "Who?" as Nazianzen says, "Him," not "it." And, like Augustine, we "do not eat the flesh without first adoring." And yet we none of us adore the Sacrament. . . .

Our men believe that the Eucharist was instituted by the Lord for a memorial of Himself, even of His Sacrifice, and, if it be lawful so to speak, to be a commemorative sacrifice, not only to be a Sacrament and for spiritual nourishment. Though they allow this, yet they deny that either of these uses (thus instituted by the Lord together) can be divided from the other by man, either because of the negligence of the people or because of the avarice of the priests. The Sacrifice which is there is Eucharistic, of which Sacrifice the law is that he who offers it is to partake of it, and that he partake by receiving and eating, as the Saviour ordered. For to "partake by sharing in the prayer," that indeed is a fresh and novel way of partaking, much more even than the private Mass itself. . . . Do you take away from the Mass your Transubstantiation; and there will not long be any strife with us about the Sacrifice. Willingly we allow that a memory of the Sacrifice is made there. That your Christ made of bread is sacrificed there we will never allow.

No. 204. WILLIAM NICHOLSON

[From *A Plain but Full Exposition of the Catechism of the Church of England*, "Of the Lord's Supper." Ed. L. A. C. T., p. 179. This treatise was first published in 1655, and was dedicated to his parishioners of Llandilo-Vawr. A new edition appeared in 1663 after the author's consecration to the see of Gloucester in 1661; this edition contained a dedication to Gilbert Sheldon, then Bishop of London.]

Christ is said to be present four manner of ways:—

1. Divinely, as God, and so He is present in all places. *Whither shall I fly from Thy presence? I, the Lord, fill heaven and earth.*
2. Spiritually, and so He is present in the hearts of true believers. *Christ dwells in our hearts by faith.*
3. Sacramentally, and so is He present in the Sacrament, because He hath ordained the Sacrament to represent and communicate Christ's death unto us. *The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion*

Realitas

②

4. Corporally; so present in Judæa in the days of His flesh.

And as the word 'presence,' so the word 'really,' is diversely taken: for sometimes,

1. It is opposed to that which is feigned, and is but imaginary, and imports as much as 'truly.'

2. It is opposed to that which is merely figurative, and barely representative, and imports as much as 'effectually.'

3. It is opposed to that which is spiritual, and imports as much as 'corporally' or 'bodily.'

We then believe Christ to be present in the Eucharist Divinely after a special manner, Spiritually in the hearts of the communicants, Sacramentally or relatively in the elements. And this presence of His is real, in the two former acceptions of 'real'; but not in the last, for He is truly and effectually there present, though not corporally, bodily, carnally, locally. *Thomas*

15th Edinb. No. 205. WILLIAM FORBES 1585-1634

[From *Considerationes Modestae et Pacificae Controversiarum de Justificatione, Purgatorio, Invocatione Sanctorum, Christo Mediatore, et Eucharistia, De Eucharistia*, Book I, ch. i, 2 (*bis*); I, i, 7; I, i, 27; I, ii, 1; I, iii (chapter-heading); I, iv, 12; II, ii, 8; II, ii, 9; III, i, 10, 12; III, ii, 2; III, ii, 17. This collection of passages has been borrowed from Darwell Stone, *A History of the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist*, Vol. II, pp. 305-308, of whose translation we have availed ourselves. The *Considerationes Modestae* were first edited by Bishop Sydeserf and published in London in 1658, over 20 years after the author's death. On the title page, it was described as an *Opus Posthumum Dni Desideratum*. A very careful edition, with an English translation, was prepared for the L. A. C. T. by George Hay Forbes (two vols. 1850 and 1856 respectively).]

The opinion of Zwingli which the Divines of Zurich tenaciously maintained and defended, namely that 'Christ is present in the Eucharist only by the contemplation of faith; that there is no place to be given here to a miracle, since we know in what way Christ is present to His Supper, namely, by the quickening Spirit, spiritually and efficaciously; that Sacramental union consists wholly in signification,' etc., is by no means to be approved, since it is most clearly contrary to Scripture and the common opinion of all the Fathers. . . .

The holy Fathers . . . most firmly believed that he who worthily receives these mysteries of the Body and Blood of Christ really and actually receives into himself the Body and Blood of Christ, but in a certain spiritual, miraculous, and imperceptible way. . . .

The opinion of those Protestants and others seems to be most safe and most right who think, nay, who most firmly believe, that the Body and Blood of Christ are really and actually and substantially present and taken in the Eucharist, but in a way which the human mind cannot understand and much more beyond the power of man to express, which is known to God alone and is not revealed to us in the Scriptures,—a way indeed not by bodily or oral reception, but not only by the understanding and merely by faith, but in another way known, as has been said, to God alone, and to be left to His omnipotence. . . .

In the Supper by the wonderful power of the Holy Ghost we invisibly partake of the substance of the Body and Blood of Christ, of which we

Res/Veritas
vs
figura again

The Reformation
power of Tradition

Wm. Forbes

(3)

are made recipients no otherwise than if we visibly ate and drank His Flesh and Blood. . . .

As regards Transubstantiation, many Protestants very perilously and too rashly deny that God is able to convert the bread substantially into the Body of the Lord. For Almighty God can do many things above the understanding of all men, nay, even of the angels. All indeed allow that what implies contradiction cannot be done. But inasmuch as in the particular case it is not clear to any one what the essence of each thing is and therefore what implies or does not imply a contradiction, it is certainly a mark of great rashness, on account of the weakness of our blind understanding, to prescribe limits to God, and stubbornly to deny that He can do this or that by His Omnipotence. . . .

Transubstantiation is not of faith, nay, is contrary to the Scriptures and the more ancient Fathers, yet is by no means to be condemned as heretical. . . .

The reasons by which the more-rigid Protestants seem to themselves to have proved most clearly that each doctrine, both that of the Romanists and that of the Lutherans, is contrary to the Articles of the Faith and therefore heretical, impious, and blasphemous, have been abundantly refuted both by the maintainers of these opinions and by others who are anxious for the unity of the Church. . . .

Gigantic is the error of the more rigid Protestants who deny that Christ is to be adored in the Eucharist with any but inward and mental adoration, and contend that He is not to be adored with any outward rite of worship, as by kneeling or some other like position of the body. Almost all these hold wrong views about the presence of Christ the Lord in the Sacrament, Who is present in a wonderful but real manner. . . .

As regards the first assertion of Bellarmine about venerating the symbols with a kind of lesser worship, we admit it. But as regards his saying that the adoration of supreme worship, though in itself and properly it is due and given to Christ, yet belongs also to the symbols insofar as they are apprehended as one with Christ Himself, Whom they contain and Whom they cover and conceal like garments, it is false and is contrary to the opinion of many others. . . .

The holy Fathers say very often that the Body of Christ itself is offered and sacrificed in the Eucharist, as is clear from almost numberless places; but not in such a way that all the properties of a sacrifice are properly and actually preserved, but by way of commemoration and representation of that which was performed once for all in that One Only Sacrifice of the Cross whereby Christ our High Priest consummated all other sacrifices, and by way of pious prayer whereby the Ministers of the Church most humbly beseech God the Father on account of the abiding Victim of that One Sacrifice, Who is seated in Heaven on the right hand of the Father and is present on the Holy

Table in an ineffable manner, to grant that the virtue and grace of this perpetual Victim may be efficacious and healthful to His Church for all the necessities of body and soul. . . . Assuredly, in every real Sacrifice that is properly so called, it is necessary that the victim should be consumed by a certain destructive change, as Romanists themselves universally admit. But in the Mass the Body of Christ is neither destroyed nor changed, as is clear. . . .

The more moderate Romanists rightly affirm that the Mass is not only a sacrifice of thanksgiving and service or honour, but that it can also be called hilastic or propitiatory in a sound sense; not indeed as if it effected the propitiation and forgiveness of sins, for that pertains to the Sacrifice of the Cross, but as impetrating the propitiation which has already been made, as prayer, of which this Sacrifice is a kind, can be called propitiatory. . . .

The Sacrifice which is offered in the Supper is not merely of thanksgiving, but is also propitiatory in a sound sense, and is profitable to very many not only of the living but also of the departed.

Note Early modern view of Euchar

Expiation
Propitiation

Sacra
הַסֵּדֶה דַּבָּר
הַסֵּדֶה דַּבָּר

הַסֵּדֶה דַּבָּר - מִשְׁחָה - פָּסוּק 4
הַסֵּדֶה דַּבָּר תַּחֲנוּן
הַסֵּדֶה דַּבָּר תַּחֲנוּן
הַסֵּדֶה דַּבָּר תַּחֲנוּן
הַסֵּדֶה דַּבָּר תַּחֲנוּן

viaticum
Eucharist
Sacrament

Impetate -
L. - in (in tons)
Petition - request
Old English custom - Benefices of Roman Church
Requested by a priest - Eucharist not for
To request as assumption of grant - 9
SO = 1111

Jeremy Taylor + 1667 - Charles I, Cromwell, Charles II

HEAVENLY SACRIFICE AND EARTHLY SACRAMENTS.

h. - "Potence" - accomplishment
To gain by Rights
Sacrificed by Reformation
Total Reformation
Beneficial of the Roman Church in England granted to the country
on some grounds -

4. It is the greatest solemnity of prayer, the most powerful liturgy and means of impetration in this world. For when Christ was consecrated on the cross and became our high-priest, having reconciled us to God by the death of the cross, He became infinitely gracious in the eyes of God, and was admitted to the celestial and eternal priesthood in heaven; where in the virtue of the cross He intercedes for us, and represents an eternal sacrifice in the heavens on our behalf. That He is a priest in heaven, appears in the large discourses and direct affirmatives of S. Paul;⁷ that there is no other sacrifice to be offered but that on the cross, it is evident, because "He hath but once appeared in the end of the world to put away sin by the sacrifice of Himself"; and therefore since it is necessary that He hath something to offer so long as He is a priest⁸ and there is no other sacrifice but that of Himself offered upon the cross; it follows that Christ in heaven perpetually offers and represents that sacrifice to His heavenly Father, and in virtue of that obtains all good things for His church.

Now what Christ does in heaven, He hath commanded us to do on

earth, that is, to represent His death, to commemorate this sacrifice, by humble prayer and thankful record; and by faithful manifestation and joyful eucharist to lay it before the eyes of our heavenly Father, so ministering in His priesthood, and doing according to His commandment and His example; the church being the image of heaven, the priest the minister of Christ; the holy table being a copy of the celestial altar, and the eternal sacrifice of the lamb slain from the beginning of the world being always the same; it bleeds no more after the finishing of it on the cross; but it is wonderfully represented in heaven, and graciously represented here; by Christ's action there, by His commandment here. And the event of it is plainly this; that as Christ in virtue of His sacrifice on the cross intercedes for us with His Father, so does the minister of Christ's priesthood here, that the virtue of the eternal sacrifice may be salutary and effectual to all the needs of the church both for things temporal and eternal. And therefore it was not without great mystery and clear signification that our blessed Lord was pleased to command the representation of His death and sacrifice on the cross should be made by breaking bread and effusion of wine; to signify to us the nature and sacredness of the liturgy we are about; and that we minister in the priesthood of Christ, who is "a priest for ever after the order of Melchisedec"; that is, we are ministers in that unchangeable priesthood, imitating in the external ministry the prototype Melchisedec, of whom it was said, "he brought forth bread and wine, and was the priest of the most high God"; and in the internal, imitating the antitype or the substance, Christ himself; who offered up His body and blood for atonement for us, and by the sacraments of bread and wine, and the prayers of oblation and intercession commands us to officiate in His priesthood, in the external ministering like Melchisedec; in the internal

JOHN KEBLE

John KEBLE - Quoting Archdeacon George Anthony Denison
of Taunton - who was embroiled in controversy with the
Bishop of Bath & Wells - in his *On Eucharistical Adoration; 1853*

That the Body and Blood of Christ being really present after an immaterial and spiritual manner in the consecrated bread and wine, are therein and thereby given to all, and are received by all who come to the Lord's Table—that to all who come to the Lord's Table, to those who eat and drink worthily, and to those who eat and drink unworthily, the Body and Blood of Christ are given, and that by all who come to the Lord's Table, by those who eat and drink worthily, and by those who eat and drink unworthily, the

Body and Blood of Christ are received—that the universal reception of the inward part or thing signified of the Sacrament in and by the outward sign, is a part of the doctrine of the Real Presence itself—that worship is due to the real, though invisible and supernatural, presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Holy Eucharist under the form of bread and wine—that the act of Consecration makes the Bread and Wine, through the operation of the Holy Ghost, to be Christ's Body and Blood—that in the Lord's Supper the outward parts or signs and the inward parts or things signified are so joined together by the act of Consecration, that to receive the one is to receive the other—that all who receive the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper receive the Body and Blood of Christ.³

JOHN KEBLE

On Eucharistical Adoration
(SELECTION)

Editor's introduction.

O God of Mercy, God of Might,
How should pale sinners bear the sight,
If, as Thy power is surely here,
Thine open glory should appear?

For now Thy people are allow'd
To scale the mount and pierce the cloud,
And Faith may feed her eager view
With wonders Sinai never knew.

Fresh from th' atoning sacrifice
The world's Creator bleeding lies,
That man, His foe, by whom He bled,
May take Him for his daily bread.

O agony of wavering thought
When sinners first so near are brought!
"It is my Maker—dare I stay?
My Saviour—dare I turn away?"

* * *

Thomas?
The presence of which our Lord speaks has been termed sacramental, supernatural, mystical, ineffable, as opposed *not* to what is real, but to what is natural. The word has been chosen to express, not our knowledge, but our ignorance; or that unknowing knowledge of faith, which we have of things divine, surpassing knowledge. We know not the manner of his presence, save that it is not according to the natural presence of our Lord's human flesh, which is at the right hand of God; and therefore it is called sacramental. But it is a presence without us, not within us only; a presence by virtue of our Lord's words, although to us it becomes a saving presence, received to our salvation, through our faith. *Human Reception*
It is not a presence simply in the soul of the receiver, as "Christ dwells in our hearts by faith" [Eph. 3:17]; or as, in acts of spiritual, apart from sacramental, communion, we, by our longings, invite him into our souls. But while the consecrated elements, as we believe (because our Lord and God the Holy Ghost in Holy Scripture call them still after consecration by the names of their natural substances, and do not say that they cease to be such) — while the consecrated elements remain in their natural substances, still, since our Lord says, "This is my body," "This is my blood," the Church of England believes that "under the form of bread and wine," so consecrated, we "receive the body and blood of our Saviour Christ."⁸ And since we receive them, they must be there, in order that we may receive them. We need not then (as the school of

Calvin bids men) "ascend into heaven, to bring down Christ from above" [Rom. 10:6]. For he is truly present, for us truly to receive him to the salvation of our souls, if they be prepared by repentance, faith, love, through the cleansing of his Spirit, for his coming.

[Pusey compares the Eucharist with other unfathomable mysteries — the Virgin Birth and Resurrection of Christ.]

This acknowledgment of our ignorance is a refuge from our perplexity about the things of God. We acknowledge, since Scripture saith it, that the natural substance remains. "What was bread remains bread; and what was wine remains wine."⁹ But faith regards not things visible, only or chiefly; as it regarded not the outward dress of our Lord, save when it touched the hem of his garment, and virtue went out of him, and healed those who touched in faith (Mt. 9:20-22; 14:36). Yea rather, faith forgets things outward in his unseen presence. What is precious to the soul is its Redeemer's presence, and its union with him. It acknowledges, yet is not anxious about, the presence of the visible symbols. It pierces beyond the veil. It sees him who is invisible, and receives him in the ruined mansion of the soul; and by him is strengthened; in him has peace; in his presence has the pledge of forgiveness and of everlasting union with its Lord and its God. It owns as a truth of fact, and as taught in God's word, the presence of the outward symbols. Its joy, the contentment of its longings, its hope, its strength, its stay, its peace, its life, is the presence of its Lord.

The mystery of worship

The Greek word "liturgy" originally meant the act of an individual in the service of the city; for example, fitting up a ship for war or sponsoring a choir for the tragedies in honor of Dionysius; service generally, and in particular the service of God in public worship. In this sense it is used by Old and New Testament.

When we place the words "mystery" and "liturgy" side by side, and take mystery as mystery of worship, they will mean the same thing considered from two different points of view. Mystery means the heart of the action, that is to say, the redeeming work of the risen Lord, through the sacred actions he has appointed; liturgy, corresponding to its original sense of "people's work," "service," means rather the action of the church in conjunction with this saving action of Christ's.

■ THE CHRISTIAN MYSTERY, 1930

Liturgy and symbol

In the Greco-Roman world, clothing was not a casual or indifferent matter; with a new garment went a new identity. In the mysteries a garment or a sign of the god was put on, and the initiate became that god. In connection with these customs, Paul cries out, "All of you who have been baptized in Christ, have put on Christ." In Easter week the church sings this of the baptized who stand about the altar in their white clothing. This example shows us once more that some customs which signify a mystical uniting with the godhead were particularly well appointed to serve the Christ mysticism of the liturgy. Thus the age-old idea of representing the embodiment of divine strength with food and

drink is brought up to its highest pitch of reality by the eucharist: a real meal with God, representing our deepest union with the God-man and rendering it fact, as the Lord himself says of it in John 6.

■ THE CHRISTIAN MYSTERY, 1930

The church year

When the church year celebrates historical occurrences and developments, it does not do so for its own sake but for that of eternity hid within it. The great deed of God upon us, the redeeming work of Christ which wills to lead us out of the narrow bounds of time into the broad spaces of eternity, is its content.

Yet this content is not a gradual unfolding in the sense that the year of nature naturally develops; rather, there is a single divine act which demands and finds gradual accustoming on our part, though in itself complete. When the church year fashions and forms a kind of unfolding of the mystery of Christ, that does not mean it seeks to provide historical drama but that it will aid us in our step-by-step approach to God, an approach first made in God's own revelation. It is the entire saving mystery that is before the eyes of the church and the Christian, more concretely on each occasion. We celebrate Advent, not by putting ourselves back into the state of unredeemed humankind, but in the certainty of the Lord who has already appeared to us, for whom we must prepare our souls; the longing of ancient piety is our model and teacher. We do not celebrate Lent as if we had never been redeemed, but as having the stamp of the cross upon us, and now only seeking to be better conformed to the death of Christ, so that the resurrection may be always more clearly shown upon us.

■ THE CHURCH'S SACRED YEAR, 1931