

what their scandals and apostasy bereaved them of. But it is only Christ that hath deserved that our repentance through grace, and only grace, should reach these ends and benefits.

The sum of all is this: When we have abstracted the human satisfactions of the Papists from what God hath made our duty, and the condition of our salvation; or from what is due to the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost from us as creatures, subjects, and delivered sinners by price and power, to be trained-up according to the methods and assistances of gospel-laws and grace; and so from what I am bound to do to satisfy my injured and endamaged neighbour, offended Governor, and the church of Christ, according to the institutions, and for the necessary and, by God and Christ, enjoined ends and interest of the gospel; how narrow and useless will human satisfactions appear to be!

And thus I have gone through this task, as thoroughly as God's breaches on my family, my manifold diversions, great distractions, mean abilities, and slender furniture, and other hinderances, would admit of; and with my closing words, and to my last gasp, (if sensible so long,) must I bewail the miserable state of church and world, that must be scandalized, disturbed, and divided by wanton fancies, prurient wits, proud hearts, and sinister designs, in having doctrines clouded or sophisticated with dark and doubtful words and phrases imposed on them.

SERMON XXII. (XXI.)

BY THE REV. EDWARD LAWRENCE, A.M.

OF MAGDALEN COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

THERE IS NO SUCH THING AS TRANSUBSTANTIATION IN THE EUCHARIST; AND IT IS IDOLATRY IN THE PAPISTS TO WORSHIP THE CONSECRATED BREAD, THOUGH THEY THINK IT IS TURNED INTO THE BODY OF CHRIST.

THERE IS NO TRANSUBSTANTIATION IN THE LORD'S SUPPER.

For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, That the Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread: and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat: this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the new testament in my blood: this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.—1 Corinthians xi. 23—25.

GOD hath exalted man above all creatures of the visible world, in giving him a being capable of religion, and thereby of eternal life and happiness in the enjoyment of Himself. And to the end that God may make himself glorious in making lost man happy, he hath in infinite wisdom and grace given us his written word, to be a perfect rule of

that Christian religion by which we may obtain eternal life and happiness in God by Christ; in which word he hath not only revealed this glorious happiness to us, and "brought life and immortality to light through the gospel;" (2 Tim. i. 10;) but also told us what gives us a title unto, and fits us for, and the way that leads unto, the full possession of it.*

And therefore what tongue can express the desperate madness and folly of those men who forsake the good "word of the grace of God," (Acts xx. 32,) for a religion that hath no other foundation than the words of lying men? And such is the Popish religion, which, as it is Popish, is devised only by devils and men, to feed lusts, and to serve a carnal and worldly interest, and tends to the damnation of millions of souls.

Their doctrine of transubstantiation in the Lord's supper, which I am now called to bear witness against, is one of the chief articles of this religion; and if this falls, their idolatrous worshipping their host, their most abhorred propitiatory sacrificing Christ in their Mass, their sacrilegious robbing the people of the cup, and a great part of their religion, must fall with it: and yet, by the grace of God, I shall in this ensuing discourse make it appear, that transubstantiation is such a hideous error, that the very nature and clear consequences of it do cry of the true Christian religion, as they cried of Jerusalem, "Rase it, rase it, even to the foundation thereof!" (Psalm cxxxvii. 7.)

I shall therefore fall immediately to my work, which is to prove two things:—

1. *That there is no transubstantiation in the eucharist or Lord's supper.*

And take notice, that I do not question but the name "eucharist" hath been anciently, and may be still fitly, given to this sacrament; but I shall choose to call it, according to scripture, "the Lord's supper," it being better known among us by that name.

2. *That it is idolatry in the Papists to worship the consecrated bread, though they think it is turned into the body of Christ.*

Now because in these words (with those in the three evangelists, Matt. xxvi. 26—28; Mark xiv. 22—24; Luke xxii. 19, 20, which I would be understood to take into my text) the institution of the Lord's supper is fully and clearly delivered from Christ to his church; and because these words do carry us in a right line to the Author and nature and use and ends of this ordinance, and are the true standard by which we must try all doctrines and opinions and practices touching the Lord's supper; and also because our adversaries pretend to receive their doctrine of transubstantiation from Christ in these words; I have therefore chosen them for the most proper subject of this discourse.

And herein I shall proceed in this method:—

I. *I shall briefly acquaint you with the true doctrine of the Lord's supper, taught by Christ in these words.*

II. *Acquaint you with the doctrine of transubstantiation, which the Papists pretend to receive from Christ in these words.*

III. *Prove that there is no transubstantiation in the Lord's supper.*

* *In his quæ apertè posita sunt in scripturâ, inveniuntur illa omnia quæ continent fidem moresque vivendi.*—AUGUSTINUS *De Doctrinâ Christianâ*, lib. ii. cap. 9. "Amongst those things which are clearly revealed in the scripture, are found all those which relates to belief and the conduct of life."—EDIT.

IV. *I shall make application, and therein prove the second proposition, namely, "That it is idolatry in the Papists to worship the consecrated bread, though they think it be turned into the body of Christ."*

I. *I shall give you a brief and plain account of the doctrine of the Lord's supper, taught us in these words, in six particulars, which I shall further improve in the following discourse.*

1. *Jesus Christ hath in infinite wisdom and love appointed bread and wine for this sacrament.*—This is evident by those words, "Jesus took bread," and, "He took the cup," wherein was "the fruit of the vine:" (Luke xxii. 18 :) our dying Lord being about to institute and administer the Lord's supper, in order thereunto he solemnly took bread and wine.

2. *It is the will of Jesus Christ that bread and wine be blessed and consecrated by the ministers of the gospel.*—This bread and wine must be changed from that common use which they had before consecration, by being blessed to a holy and spiritual and sacramental use. This appears by our Saviour's practice, recorded in the text: "Jesus took bread and blessed it; and he took the cup, and gave thanks." The word *ευλογησας*, translated "blessed," and *ευχαριστησας*, translated "gave thanks," do here signify the same thing, and do assure us, that Christ blessed the bread and wine; which obligeth all ministers in this case to do the same; and therefore saith the apostle, "The cup of blessing which we bless," and, "The bread which we break;" (1 Cor. x. 16;) meaning "the bread of blessing, which we bless and break;" for both were blessed by our Saviour, and are to be blessed by his ministers, and are thereby made blessed bread and blessed wine.

3. *It is the will of Jesus Christ that this blessed bread be broken by his ministers.*—This was a holy rite or action of Christ, recorded by the three evangelists, and by St. Paul in the text, which tells us, "He blessed the bread, and brake it;" from which sacred rite expositors conceive that this sacrament is called "breaking of bread." (Acts xx. 7.) And it is clear, that our Saviour made this bread, as thus broken, to signify, "the body of Christ, which is broken for us:" and therefore saith the apostle, "It is broken bread," that is, "the communion of the body of Christ." (1 Cor. x. 16.) And though I cannot stay to quarrel with the Papists for lighter matters, yet take notice of their bold superstition in affronting Christ herein, by making their bread into little round wafers, and not breaking it, but putting it whole into the mouths of the communicants.

4. *Jesus Christ hath appointed that this blessed bread and blessed wine be administered to believers.*—This is clear by our Saviour's example mentioned in the text, which tells us, that "the bread which he took, and blessed, and brake, he gave to his disciples;" and, "The cup which he took and blessed, he gave to them." Jesus Christ administered the blessed bread and blessed wine in this sacrament.

5. *It is the command of Jesus Christ that believers do "take and eat and drink" this blessed bread and blessed wine.*—For Christ gave and administered them with a command to "take, and eat, and drink" them. The words are clear: "Take, eat;" "Drink ye all of it;" which command the disciples obeyed, and did take, and eat, and drink the blessed bread and wine which Christ gave them. And so we see this

blessed bread and wine passing from Christ to his disciples in the Lord's supper, and eaten and drunk by them. And therefore, Christians, be sure to hold fast these two things in the Lord's supper:—

(1.) *Never yield to part with the bread and wine out of the Lord's supper.*—For they are blessed: “Destroy them not; for a blessing is in them.” (Isai. lxx. 8.) All the blessings that come from the infinite love of God in Christ by the covenant of grace, for the salvation of believers, are in this blessed bread and blessed wine; and if ye lose the bread and wine, ye lose those blessings as conveyed by them.

(2.) *Take and eat and drink this bread and wine, as the bread of blessing and as the cup of blessing.*—Take the blessing that is offered with them; for it is the blessing that makes this glorious feast of the Lord's supper.

6. *Jesus Christ hath declared the use which this bread and wine are blessed and consecrated unto*; in these words: “This is my body,” or, “This is my body which is given,” or “broken, for you.” “This cup is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many,” &c.; or, “This cup is the new testament in my blood.”

These words declare two main uses whereunto this bread and wine are blessed and consecrated:—

(1.) *To be sacramental signs, to signify and represent to us Jesus Christ crucified, and all the benefits of his death.*—For the words do clearly speak of Christ crucified, and that with respect to us: “This is my body, which is broken for you;” “This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you.” And by faith, whereby the heart doth assent to the truth of these words, we do in this ordinance discern the Lord's body broken for us, and his blood shed for us, and have our souls filled and suitably affected with the holy knowledge and remembrance and contemplation of Christ crucified for us.

(2.) *To be a seal to confirm the new testament or covenant of grace, whereby Christ and all the benefits of his death are conveyed to believers.*—This appears by these words, “This cup is the new testament,” &c.; and by the apostle's explication of the words, “This is my body,” “This cup is my blood:”—“The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?” And, “The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?” (1 Cor. x. 16 :) teaching us plainly, that by this blessed bread and wine there is a communication of the body and blood of Christ, and of all the benefits of his death, which believers are made partakers of in the Lord's supper. And therefore we are commanded to take and eat and drink this blessed bread and wine, for this use also; which we do, not only by seeing Christ crucified as here represented to us, but also by accepting and receiving and feeding upon him by faith as he is here offered to us, to be the most glorious feast of our souls. And although it is the great duty of believers to see and feed on Christ crucified, as revealed and offered to us in his word, and by other ordinances, yet this is proper and peculiar to this ordinance,—for believers to see and feed upon him, as he is represented and offered and given in the appointed use of bread and wine.

And thus I have given you a plain and brief account of the doctrine of the Lord's supper, taught us by Christ in these words; and for your

confirmation in the truth thereof, I shall commend three things to your serious consideration:—

1. *That for the matter of this feast, the Papists cannot with their transubstantiation declare it to be greater or more or better than we do without it.*—For we say, “Here is Christ and all that is purchased by his blood; here is all that is revealed and conveyed to us, from the infinite love of God, by the covenant of grace; here is God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost in covenant with us, to pardon our sins, and to bring us, through holiness, unto eternal life and happiness in heaven.”

2. *For the guests or communicants, we declare them to be the holy society of true believers, who are in union with Christ as his blessed bride and spouse and members.*

3. *We further declare, that all the glorious things of this feast are so far really present with these guests, that their souls do truly feed upon them, and are feasted with them.*—But there is no necessity of a local presence of the objects of the soul with the faculties, to make up this feast; but believers are here feasted by the remembrance of Christ's death, which is above one thousand six hundred years past, and by their hopes of glory in heaven, and at the day of judgment, which is to come; and in seeing by faith the crucified and glorified body of Christ in that place and order which the scriptures reveal it to them, though his blessed body be at a local distance from them. And so, according to this doctrine, you see sufficient reason in all thankfulness to acknowledge, that the Lord's supper is such a feast as is for the honour of the great Jehovah, to entertain his beloved children and friends withal on earth, till he call them to feast for ever with him in heaven, without the use of bread and wine.

II. *I proceed to acquaint you with the Popish doctrine of transubstantiation, which the Papists pretend to receive from Christ in these words.*—This transubstantiation is declared in the council of Trent thus: “That by the consecration of the bread and wine, there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ, and a conversion of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of his blood, which conversion the Catholic church doth fitly and properly call ‘transubstantiation.’ And if any shall say, that in the sacrament of the eucharist, the substance of the bread and wine do remain, and shall deny this wonderful and singular conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood, of Christ, the species of the bread and wine only remaining, which conversion the Catholic church doth very fitly call ‘transubstantiation;’ let him be accursed.”*

But, saith Solomon, “As the bird by wandering, as the swallow by flying, so the curse causeless shall not come:” (Prov. xxvi. 2:) and therefore “let them curse, but,” Lord, “bless thou.” (Psalm cix. 28.) For, in defiance of their brutish execrations, I do with detestation deny this monstrous and blasphemous doctrine; and do therefore proceed to the

III. *Third particular, to prove that there is no transubstantiation in the Lord's supper.*—Which I shall prove by these following arguments:—

* *Concil. Trident. sess. xiii. cap. iv. can. 2.*

ARGUMENT I. *The scripture is not for transubstantiation in the Lord's supper; but is fully against it, and condemns it.*—We have only the words of Papists for it; but there is not one tittle of the good word of God for it. But although there is no ordinance of worship more fully and plainly delivered from Christ in the scriptures than this of the Lord's supper, yet therein is not the least foundation for transubstantiation; but God saith in effect of it, as he did of that abomination of the Jews, "Which I commanded not, neither came it into my heart:" (Jer. vii. 31:) and if it came not into God's heart, God forbid that it should ever come into our hearts!

That the scripture is not for but against transubstantiation, will appear by examining those scriptures which our adversaries allege for it; and they are principally these two; namely, the words in the text, "This is my body," "This cup is my blood;" and John vi., where our Saviour hath a large discourse of eating his flesh, and drinking his blood. Now I shall vindicate both these scriptures from the sense of the Papists, and make it appear, that there is not in them the least warrant for transubstantiation.

(I.) I shall begin with the first, which they chiefly insist upon. And here take notice that their whole doctrine of transubstantiation is contained in these seven particulars, all which they pretend to prove from these words, "This is my body," "This cup is my blood."

1. They say that "consecration of the bread and wine is made by these words only."*

2. That "by virtue of these words, the substance of the bread and wine are turned into the body and blood of Christ:" and this is their transubstantiation.

3. That "after these words are pronounced by the priest, there is no substance of the bread and wine remaining in the Lord's supper."

4. That "the species or accidents only of the bread and wine do remain in the Lord's supper: and these do signify the spiritual feast, and are essential to this sacrament."†

5. That "by virtue of these words, the very material body and blood of Christ are locally and corporally present in the Lord's supper, and are contained under these species or accidents of bread and wine."‡

6. That "with these species or accidents of the bread and wine, the true, material body and blood of Christ are taken into the mouths and stomachs of the communicants, and corporally eaten and drunk by them."§

7. Lastly. That "the plain and necessary sense of these words, 'This is my body,' is this; namely, 'This substance contained under the accidents of bread and wine is my body.'"||

Now I shall make it appear, that all these are Popish inventions, contrary to the mind of Christ in the words; and for that end I shall speak briefly in confutation of each of them.

1. To the first I say, that consecration of the bread and wine is not

* *Sententia communis, non solum theologorum recentiorum, sed etiam veterum patrum, Christum consecrasse illis verbis: Hoc est corpus meum; hic est sanguis meus.*—BELLARMINUS *De Euchar.* lib. iv. cap. 13. † *Idem, ibid.* cap. 6. ‡ *Council. Trident. sess. xiii. cap. 1, can. 1.* § *BELLARMINUS De Euchar.* lib. i. cap. 11. || *Idem, ibid.*

made by these words, "This is my body," "This cup is my blood;" but it is made by the blessing of the bread and wine by Christ and his ministers.

(1.) That consecration is not made by these words, is evident; because these words do speak of bread and wine already consecrated, or else they cannot be true; for it cannot be said truly of any bread and wine in the world, "This *is* the body," and, "This *is* the blood, of Christ," but only of blessed and consecrated bread and wine.

(2.) That consecration is made by the blessing of the bread and wine, is also manifest; for it is by the blessing that they are made blessed bread and blessed wine; or else the blessing was in vain, and Christ and his ministers were not heard in the prayers and thanksgivings which they offered to God for a blessing on those elements. But if men would be concluded by scripture, the apostle doth fully decide this controversy: "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 the body of Christ?" (1 Cor. x. 16.) Where we see plainly that it is the blessing of the bread and wine which makes them the communion of the body and blood of Christ.

2. They say, that "by virtue of these words, 'This is my body,' 'This cup is my blood,' the substance of the bread and wine are turned into the body and blood of Christ;" which conversion they call "transubstantiation."

I refer you to all my arguments against transubstantiation, to convince you of the falsehood and odiousness of this sense; only here take notice, that this cannot be the meaning of the words; for the words declare what the bread and wine are, namely, what they signify, and not what they shall be when these words are pronounced. For it is not said, "Let this bread and wine be turned into the body and blood of Christ;" but, "This is my body," "This cup is my blood." Which words, being an affirmation of a truth, do affirm and report that which was a truth before the words are spoken; and not that which by the speaking of the words must be made true.

3. They say, that "after these words are pronounced by the priest, there remains no substance of the bread and wine in the Lord's supper."

This is such a prodigious error, that they may as well say that God would have all men turn infidels and madmen, and go out of their senses, to become Christians. But I shall here only give you three reasons against this opinion, whereunto I shall add more in the following discourse.

(1.) If these words destroy the substance of the bread and wine out of the Lord's supper, then Jesus Christ did by these words frustrate and make void his own blessing of the bread and wine; and so did cross his own will in praying for the blessing, and his Father's will in granting his prayer. For, according to this opinion, when Jesus Christ by prayer and thanksgiving had blessed the bread and wine, he presently utters words which make them neither bread and wine, nor blessed; and thus they make Christ curse his own blessing.

(2.) That bread and wine are in the Lord's supper, appears, because Jesus Christ himself did in this ordinance administer bread and wine

to his disciples, and that with a command to them to take and eat and drink bread and wine; which command the disciples obeyed, and did accordingly take and eat and drink them. For proof of this, weigh the words: "Jesus took bread, and blessed, and brake, and gave to his disciples, and said, Take, eat; this is my body. In like manner he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it; for this is my blood," &c. Now Bellarmine himself saith, that "it cannot be doubted but all these words, 'He took bread, he blessed and brake and gave to his disciples,' referred to the same matter of bread which was in his hands."* Seeing then that in our Saviour's administration of the Lord's supper to his disciples, which is the standing rule and pattern to all ministers and Christians to the end of the world, we find Christ himself administering bread and wine, and see bread and wine passing in this ordinance from Christ to his disciples, and Christ commanding them to eat and drink them; (for what he gave, he commanded them to take and eat and drink; and they did accordingly take and eat the bread, and take and drink the wine;) what prodigious folly and wickedness is this, to deny that bread and wine are in the Lord's supper!

(3.) The apostle Paul himself doth no less than three times call it "bread" after consecration; and likewise tells us, that the communicants do eat the bread and drink the cup. See verses 26—28: "For as oft as ye eat this bread and drink this cup." "Whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord." "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup." See, Christians, how the Papists do contradict and quarrel with the blessed apostle. Paul saith, that the communicants do oft eat this bread, and drink this wine, in the Lord's supper; the Papists say, that they never eat bread, nor drink wine. Paul saith, "Whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup;" the Papists say, "No man doth ever eat this bread, nor drink this cup." Paul saith, "Let him eat this bread, and drink this cup;" the Papists say, "Let him not eat this bread, nor drink this cup." See, I say, the difference betwixt God and the apostle on the one hand, and the pope and Papists on the other hand, and choose whether ye will believe; for if God be to be believed before the Papists, there is bread and wine in the Lord's supper.

There are several objections which the Papists make against this last reason: I shall only instance in two of the chief of them.

OBJECTION 1. "The scripture calls it 'bread,' because it was once bread: as, after Moses's rod was turned into a serpent, it is still called 'a rod;' (Exod. vii. 12;) and after the water was turned into wine, yet it is still called 'water:' (John ii. 9:) so," say they, "after this bread is turned into the body of Christ, it is still called 'bread,' because it was bread before this conversion was made."

ANSWER. The scripture calls the serpent "a rod," because that which was then a serpent was before a rod; and the wine is called "water," because that which was then wine was water a little before: but Christ's body never was bread, and therefore there is not the like reason to call it "bread."

* BELLARMINUS *De Euchar.* lib. i. cap. 11.

OBJECT. II. "The scripture often calls things, not from their nature, but from their outward appearance to us. So the angels that appeared to Abraham in the likeness of men are called 'men;' (Gen. xviii. 2;) and so, because this hath the outward appearance of bread, therefore the scripture calls it 'bread.'" This is Bellarmine's objection.*

ANSWER. As the scripture calls it "bread" before consecration, because it is so, and hath the true nature and properties of bread, so it calls it "bread" after consecration, not because it is like bread, but because it is bread; for consecration doth bless the thing consecrated, but never destroys it. And therefore this objection is vain, because these angels never were men, nor had the beings of men, but only appeared in the likeness of men; but this had the true substance of bread before consecration, as our adversaries grant, and hath the true substance of bread after consecration, as we have proved; and for that reason, both before and after, the scripture calls it "bread."

4. They say, that "the species or accidents only of the bread and wine remain in the Lord's supper, and these do signify the body and blood of Christ, and are essential to this sacrament." By "species or accidents" is meant the colour, smell, sweetness, length, breadth, moisture, &c., of the bread and wine: "And these," say they, "ye see, taste, feel, smell, eat, and drink; but ye do not see, nor taste, nor smell, nor touch, nor eat, nor drink bread and wine."

I shall only at present say two things against this opinion.

(1.) This, as our divines well argue, is a plain contradiction; for the essence and being of accidents is to be inherent in the subjects which they are accidents of; or else they subsist by themselves, and so are not accidents, but substances. To instance in the present case: if there be whiteness and redness and length and breadth and heaviness, there must be some substance that is white and red and long and broad and heavy; or else the communicants must, in the Lord's supper, solemnly eat and drink white and red and long and broad and heavy nothing.

(2.) There is the same reason to deny that the accidents of bread and wine do remain in the Lord's supper, as to deny that the substance of them do remain there; for if these words, "This is my body," "This cup is my blood," do destroy the substance, certainly they must destroy the accidents too; for they are pronounced over the whole blessed bread and wine, and make no distinction between the substance and accidents, but speak the same of both together. And therefore I shall here expostulate this case with our adversaries thus: When our Lord Jesus blessed the bread and wine, did he bless the substance with one kind of blessing and the accidents with another? did his blessing on the substance destroy it, and the same blessing on the accidents preserve them? Or when Christ said, "This is my body," "This cup is my blood," can they persuade themselves, that he therein said one thing of the substance, and another thing quite contrary of the accidents, so that by virtue of these words, the substance of bread and wine is turned into the body and blood of Christ, and the accidents of bread and wine are preserved without the substance, and appointed to signify his body and blood? Or if by virtue of these words the substance be destroyed, by virtue of what

* BELLARMINE'S *De Euchar.* lib. 1. cap. 14.

words are the accidents preserved, and consecrated to a use quite contrary to the use of the substance? If they say, their senses tell them [that] the accidents remain there; we say, and shall make it appear, that their senses and ours also tell us and them, that the substance with the accidents remains there also: and if faith must conclude against the senses in the case of the substance, why must it not also conclude against the senses in the case of the accidents? But if, against scripture and reason and sense, the Papists will usurp a power to keep and destroy what they please in this sacrament, let us keep our Lord's supper, and let them take their pope's supper.

5. They say, that "by virtue of these words, the very material body and blood of Christ are locally and corporally present in the Lord's supper, and are contained under the accidents of bread and wine."

I might plead many arguments against this, but I must remember that I am limited in my work, and shall therefore give you only one argument to convince you of the falseness and madness of this opinion; and that is this:—

ARGUMENT. If these words, "This is my body," "This cup is my blood," &c., do make the body and blood of Christ to be locally and corporally present in the Lord's supper, then his body crucified and dead upon the cross, and his blood there shed out of his veins, are locally and corporally present in the Lord's supper. Observe, Christians, where these men's principles lead them. I know, our adversaries do confess, that the body of Christ is no where found dead since his resurrection; and therefore, saith Bellarmine, "God doth not cause, nor ever will cause to all eternity, that the body of Christ be any where found dead;"* yet I say, it doth necessarily follow this doctrine, that his body is found dead upon the cross, and his blood there shed, in the Lord's supper. For if these words do make his body and blood locally and corporally present under the species of bread and wine, as they affirm, then it must be his body and blood as these words do expressly declare: "This is my body broken for you," "This cup is my blood shed for the remission of the sins of many;" which words do clearly speak of his body crucified and dead, and of his blood shed upon the cross. And therefore the apostle doth teach us, that in this ordinance we "do show forth the Lord's death;" so that nothing can be more clear, than that by this doctrine the bread and wine are turned into the dead body of Christ, and into his blood shed upon the cross; and that his body crucified and dead upon the cross, with his blood there shed, are locally and corporally present under the accidents of bread and wine. And so, by this doctrine, Christ's body was really and actually dead upon the cross, and so present under the accidents of bread and wine, when, at the first institution and administration of the Lord's supper, he said, "This is my body given or broken for you," and, "This is my blood shed," &c. And also, in despite of the apostle, that saith, "Christ being raised from the dead dieth no more," (Rom. vi. 9,) his body must be dead upon the cross, and as so dead must be locally and corporally present in the Lord's supper, under the accidents of bread and wine, whensoever or wheresoever

* *Deus non facit, nec est facturum in eternum, ut Christi corpus alicubi reperitur mortuum.*—BELLARMINUS *De Euchar.* lib. iv. cap. 21.

this sacrament hath been or shall be administered since his resurrection to his coming to judgment. And, moreover, it must also follow from this doctrine, that the very material cross on which Christ was crucified, and all the instruments of his death, must be locally and corporally present at the Lord's supper, and the very soldier that pierced him must be there present, piercing his side with a spear; yea, the very hour of his death, though so many years past, and the place of his death, so many miles distant, must be present in every time and place the Lord's supper is administered. Christians, these consequences are not forced; but these and a hundred more such wild contradictions do necessarily follow this doctrine, as appears to any who will but grant, that which cannot be denied, namely, that these words, "This is my body which is broken for you," "This cup is my blood shed for many," do directly point at the body of Christ crucified and dead upon the cross, with the manner, and all the instruments and circumstances, of his death, as recorded by the evangelists in the history of his passion.

6. They say, that "with these species or accidents of bread and wine, the true material body and blood of Christ are taken into the mouths and stomachs of the communicants, and corporally eaten and drunk by them."

I have three things to say against this odious and barbarous doctrine.

FIRST. *It asserts that which is impossible.*

SECONDLY. *That which is unprofitable both to soul and body.*

THIRDLY. *That which is impious and flagitious.*

FIRST. *This opinion asserts a multitude of impossibilities and contradictions, and that in a very great and weighty point of religion.*—Now, that ye may understand the strength of these kinds of arguments, take notice, that when two things are affirmed that are altogether inconsistent, so that one of them fully destroys the truth of the other, and if one be true the other must necessarily be false, this is an impossibility or contradiction; as to affirm, that the same man is dead and alive at the same time, is a contradiction; because he cannot be dead of a natural death and live a natural life at the same time. Now I say, in this opinion of corporally eating the body and drinking the blood of Jesus Christ, is a multitude of most horrid contradictions, which are found in three cases:

(1.) *In the case of Jesus Christ, his eating and drinking the Lord's supper;* for our adversaries agree with us, that Jesus Christ did eat and drink the Lord's supper.

(2.) *In the case of the disciples, at the first administration of this ordinance.*

(3.) *In the case of all communicants ever after.*

(1.) *In the case of Jesus Christ, his eating and drinking the Lord's supper.*—I shall here only instance in three plain and gross contradictions.

(i.) That Jesus Christ did with his body eat his own whole body, and yet his body continue as it was before, whole and uneaten; and so the same body was eaten and not eaten at the same time; and the eater and that which is eaten is every way the same; and that which was eaten

did eat the body, which was the eater of it, in the same action, and at the same time.

(ii.) That the same sacred body of Jesus Christ was, in all its dimensions and proportions, sitting at the table in the view of his disciples; and yet was at the same time in his own mouth and stomach; and so either this one body of Christ was multiplied into two, namely, one within the other, or else the same whole body and flesh and bones was enclosed in a little part of his own body.

(iii.) That Jesus Christ did drink his own precious blood, and that the same material blood of Christ was shed, and was in the cup, and did pass out of the cup into the mouth and stomach of our Lord, and yet at the same time his blood [was] not shed, neither did move out of his veins. These are most filthy, odious, and hideous contradictions.

(2.) *There are many contradictions in the case of the disciples, who by this doctrine are said corporally to eat and drink the material body and blood of Christ, at the institution and first administration of the Lord's supper.*—For either they did eat and drink his body and blood as he was then alive before his death, or as dead and crucified with his blood shed on the cross, or as glorified in heaven, or as all these together. Now in every one of these there are many horrid contradictions.

(i.) *If they say, that they did eat and drink his body and blood as he was alive before his death, then there are these two contradictions therein:—*

First. That his whole body was sitting at the table with his disciples, and also in the mouths and stomachs of his disciples at the same time; and so every disciple had the same whole body in his stomach, which they all saw sitting before them at the table.

Secondly. That his blood was shed out of his body, and taken into the mouths and stomachs of his disciples; and yet not shed, but continued within his own body at the same time.

(ii.) *If they did eat his body dead and crucified upon the cross, and corporally drink his blood there shed, then his body was dead and crucified on the cross, and dead in their stomachs, and alive at the table, at the same time.*

(iii.) *If they did corporally eat his glorified body, and drink the blood of his glorified body, then his body was glorified in heaven after his death, and as such was in the disciples' stomachs, and yet at the same time was upon earth in the state of his humiliation before his death.*

(iv.) *If they did eat his body and drink his blood as alive and dead and glorified, and so considered altogether, then his body was really alive before his death, and dead upon the cross, and glorified in heaven, and, in all these cases, in the mouths and stomachs of his disciples, at the same time. These and many such blasphemous contradictions are in the disciples' corporally eating the body and drinking the blood of Jesus Christ.*

(3.) *There are also many plain and horrid contradictions in the case of all communicants eating and drinking the body and blood of Christ, under the species of bread and wine, since the institution and first administration of this ordinance. I shall only instance in this one:—*

That one and the same body of Christ which is a finite being, should

be wholly in heaven, and at the same time wholly under the accidents of bread and wine in the Lord's supper, wheresoever it is administered, and nowhere else in the world; and that this one body in heaven should be wholly present with these accidents, in all the mouths of the many thousand communicants in Rome, Spain, France, England, and in all other parts of the world where this sacrament is administered; doth speak as many contradictions as there are communicants in the world, and all as impossible as it is for the same particular man to be preaching in a pulpit at Rome, and at the same time to be preaching the same sermon in all the pulpits of the world. And thus I have showed you, that this corporal eating the body and drinking the blood of Jesus Christ with the species or accidents of bread and wine, is impossible.

SECONDLY. *It is unprofitable, and doth neither good to soul nor body.*—This appears by our Saviour's words: "The flesh profiteth nothing;" (John vi. 63;) that is, the corporal eating the flesh of Christ profiteth nothing. And that this is our Saviour's meaning is evident; because it is the design of our Saviour, in the foregoing words, to show *the necessity and the great profit and advantage* of eating and drinking the body and blood of Christ spiritually by faith: *the necessity* hereof is expressed in verse 53: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you." And this, saith Christ, *is profitable*, as the means of our union with him: "He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him;" (verse 56;) and is also profitable to eternal life and happiness: "Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life; and I will raise him up at the last day." (Verse 54.) Now the Jews were startled at his words, understanding that he meant a corporal eating of his flesh; and therefore say they, "How can this man give us his flesh to eat?" (Verse 52.) This was such a mistake as that of Nicodemus, who when our Saviour spake of the necessity of being born again,—he wondered, and said, "How can a man be born when he is old? can he enter the second time into his mother's womb, and be born?" (John iii. 3, 4.) And the disciples themselves, understanding our Saviour in that gross and carnal sense of corporal eating his flesh, were offended, and said, "This is a hard saying; who can hear it?" (John vi. 60.) And therefore Christ explains his words: "It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, are spirit, and are life:" (verse 63:) that is, "My words, as you mistake them for a corporal eating my flesh and drinking my blood, are not true; for the eating my flesh so profiteth nothing: but that eating my flesh and drinking my blood by faith, in a spiritual manner, will make you blessed for ever; and so my words which I speak of this matter 'are spirit, and they are life.'" And hereby it is manifest to all but such who study to corrupt and pervert the scriptures, that our Saviour himself tells us, that corporal eating his flesh and drinking his blood is altogether unprofitable. And I say, it neither doeth good to *body* nor *soul*.

(1.) *It doeth no good to the body.*—For it doth neither gratify the palate, nor allay or satisfy hunger or thirst, nor turns into any bodily nourishment; and so hath no use or property of bodily food.

(2.) *It doeth no good to the souls, either of the wicked or of the godly.*

(i.) *It doeth no good to the souls of the wicked, as our adversaries themselves confess; and yet they will have this glorious body and precious blood of Christ to be taken corporally into the blasphemous mouths, and into the open sepulchres, of the throats of swearers, and into the beastly maws or stomachs of drunkards and gluttons, and within the rotten bodies of whoremongers and harlots; and there to lodge till the accidents of bread and wine be digested, and then to remove nobody knows whither, leaving the cursed inhabitants no better than he found them.*

(ii.) *Neither doth this corporal eating the flesh or drinking the blood of Christ do any good to the souls of the godly.*—It kills no sin, begets or quickens no grace, yields no comfort, and indeed is not desirable to any wise and holy Christian, who never hungers and thirsts to have the body and blood of Christ in his mouth and stomach. Neither is it Christ's way, by entering into the mouths and going down into the stomachs of his people, to feed and feast their souls; but Christ is spiritually formed in their hearts, (Gal. iv. 19,) and the Spirit doth glorify Christ in them, (John xvi. 14,) and by the word and sacraments their souls are feasted with the remembrance of his death, and with seeing him by faith "crowned with honour and glory" in heaven, (Heb. ii. 9,) and in their joyful expectation of all the benefits of his death and resurrection and intercession in the holy and blessed world; but the bodies of believers shall never meet the body of Christ till they "meet the Lord in the air, and so be for ever with the Lord." (1 Thess. iv. 17.) But, for this doctrine of the corporal presence of Christ in the mouths and stomachs of men, which the frantic Papists would make us believe, it is a doctrine fitter to make our hairs stand an end, than to feed our souls; and is good for nothing but to make the Popish religion odious to all wise and sober Christians.

THIRDLY. I have this further to charge on this doctrine, that *it teacheth a practice most horribly impious and flagitious.*—For to feed on man's flesh and to drink man's blood was ever accounted a most barbarous transgression of all the rules of piety and humanity; and therefore this must be the height of that kind of impiety, to eat the sacred flesh and to drink the precious blood of Christ in a corporal manner; which the Popish cannibals teach men to practise, and which they pretend to prove, both from the text, and from John vi. Against which odious sense, holy Austin pleads the same argument which I now use, saying, "If there be a precept forbidding sin, and commanding good, it is not then a figurative speech; but if it seem to command a horrible wickedness, or forbid that which is profitable, then it is a figurative speech." And he gives this example in John vi. 53: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man." "This," saith he, "seems to command a most heinous wickedness; and therefore it is a figurative speech, commanding us to communicate with the sufferings of our Lord, and sweetly and profitably to lay up this in our memories, that his flesh was crucified and wounded for us."*

But the Papists proceed in their blasphemy, and are not ashamed to tell us, that if dogs, or mice, or rats, or worms, do eat the consecrated

* AUGUSTINUS *De Doctrina Christiana*, lib. iii. cap. 15, 16.

host, they do therewith eat the body of Christ; and therefore, according to their wisdom, they have provided in their Missal, that "if rats or worms do eat the body of Christ, they must be burned."* What, for heretics? because their senses took it only for bread? But if their host be not God, why do they worship him with divine worship? And if he be God, why will they cast their God into the fire?

And Thomas Aquinas, their Angelical Doctor, as they call him, (and of whom they tell us this tale,—that his doctrine of the sacrament was confirmed by this miracle: A wooden crucifix miraculously saluted him with these words: *Bene scripsisti de me, Thoma*: "Thou hast written well of me, Thomas,") doth assert and plead for this dirty ribaldry, saying, that "it doth no more detract from the dignity of Christ to be eaten by dogs and mice, than his being willing to be crucified for our sins."† A goodly argument for such an acute Schoolman; as if, because Jesus Christ in the state of his humiliation was willing to be crucified for our sins, therefore in the state of his exaltation he is willing that his glorified body in heaven should be eaten by dogs and mice! But thus they talk, as if their doctors had sat in the council with devils in the gates of hell, to debauch the faith of Christians, and to disgrace the body of Christ.

7. Lastly. They say; that "the plain and necessary sense of these words, 'This is my body,' is this: 'This substance contained under the accidents of bread is my body.'"

What I have already spoken to the former particulars doth fully conclude against this sense; and yet I shall here add two things against it.

(1.) *That this sense is inconsistent with their own doctrine.*

(2.) *That it is repugnant to the true and plain and necessary sense of Christ in the words.*

(1.) *That this sense is inconsistent with their own doctrine appears in two particulars.*

(i.) *In their forcing two different, and both false, senses on these words, "This is my body."*—Namely, "This substance contained under the accidents of bread is my body," and, "These accidents of bread do signify my body." And so the word "this" must both mean "this substance," namely, Christ's body, and also "these accidents of bread;" and the word "is" must both be "is properly and essentially my body," and "is figuratively and significantly the sign of my body."

I know, Bellarmine sometimes grants, that it is truly most absurd, to say that by the word "this," is meant "these accidents;"‡ yet the same Bellarmine tells, that "the accidents of bread and wine do signify the spiritual feast," meaning, as he explains himself, "the body and blood of Christ," and that "the accidents of bread and wine, as well as the body and blood of Christ, do pertain to the essence of this sacrament."§ Now, that they force this sense on these words is clear, because all their pretended miracles in the Lord's supper, whereof the preserving the accidents without the substance is one, are with them effected by virtue of these words, and also because consecration, one effect whereof must be to consecrate the accidents of bread to signify the body of

* Can. 39; *Glossa* in can. 2, *de Consecratione*.
quæst. lxxx. art. 3.

† BELLARMINUS *De Euchar.* lib. 1. cap. 11.

‡ AQUINATIS *Summa* pars tertia,
§ *Idem*,

lib. iv. cap. 6.

Christ, is in their sense made by these words. So that it is evident, that they distort these words, "This is my body," to both these senses: "This substance contained under the accidents of bread is my body;" and, "These accidents of bread do signify my body:" which are so inconsistent, that all the rope of popes can never be able to tie them together.

(ii.) *This sense is inconsistent with their doctrine, which teacheth, that the substance of the bread is turned into the body of Christ by virtue of these words.*—"And," saith Bellarmine,* "in the last moment when all these words are spoken, then this conversion is made." Now, to say that the conversion of the bread into the body of Christ is not made till all these words are spoken, and yet to say that the first word "this" doth demonstrate Christ's body, are plainly inconsistent.

(2.) I proceed to prove, that *this sense is repugnant to the true and plain and necessary sense of Christ in the words.*—For which purpose observe that excellent rule of holy Augustine: "It is as manifest an error in the explication of scripture to take figurative words properly, as to wrest those words which are properly spoken, into a tropical or figurative sense:" † by both which ways of perverting the holy scriptures, multitudes of heresies have troubled the church of God. And this doctrine of transubstantiation, with all the mischiefs in doctrine, worship, and practice which attend it, proceeds from the Papists' interpreting these words, "This is my body," in a literal and proper sense, which must be understood in a figurative sense. The hinge of the present controversy is turned upon these two words, "This is." Now I shall make it appear, that by the word "this" is meant "this bread," and that by the word "is" must be meant, "is a sign," or "doth signify;" and so that the true sense of our Saviour in the words is this; namely, "This bread is a sign of my body;" or, "This bread doth signify or represent my body."

First. That by the word "this" is meant "this bread," appears by three reasons.

(i.) By the order and course of the words; by which it is plain, that of that bread which Jesus took, and blessed, and brake, and commanded his disciples to eat, he said, "This is my body."

(ii.) Because Jesus Christ saith expressly of the cup which he took, and blessed, and gave, and commanded them to drink, "This cup is the new testament." So say Luke and Paul in the text; therefore we must conclude, that of the bread, which he took, and blessed, and brake, and gave, &c., he saith, in effect, "This bread is my body."

(iii.) St. Paul's interpretation of the words may fully convince all, that the word "this" doth demonstrate "the bread:" "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 the body of Christ?" (1 Cor. x. 16.) Which speak the same thing,—though in other words,—as, "This bread is the body of Christ;" "This cup is the blood of Christ." So that it is clear, that by the word "this," is meant "this bread."

Secondly. Hence it follows, that the word "is" cannot be taken pro-

* *De Euchar.* lib. ii. cap. 11.

† AUGUSTINUS *De Doctrina Christiana*, lib. iii.

perly; but must mean "is a sign," or "doth signify or represent." It cannot be taken properly; for bread and the body of Christ are two substances essentially different; and therefore it cannot be properly said, that bread is essentially Christ's body.* But this is a sure rule,—that when the word "is" stands between the sign and the thing signified, then it must mean "is a sign," or "signifieth," or "representeth." And this is the present case: the blessed bread is a sign of Christ's body, and therefore the meaning of Christ must be, "This bread signifieth or representeth my body;" according to that known saying of Augustine: "Christ doubted not to say, 'This is my body,' when he gave the sign of his body." †

Observe yet further, that whereas there is no example in all the scripture of a sign being turned into the thing signified, yet it is very ordinary in scripture-similitudes to give a thing the name of that whereunto it is likened: "I am the rose of Sharon, and the lily of the valleys." (Canticles ii. 1.) "I am the living bread." (John vi. 51.) "I am the door." (John x. 7.) "I am the true vine." (John xv. 1.) All these saith Christ of himself; but is he therefore turned into a rose, or lily, or bread, or door, or vine? No: the words taken literally and properly are blasphemy; but the meaning is, He is like these, as to the particular cases whereof he speaks.

So the scripture ordinarily gives to signs the names of the things signified: "The three branches are three days." (Gen. xl. 12.) "The three baskets are three days." (Verse 18.) And of such things we have a multitude of examples. And thus the Holy Ghost gives to sacramental signs the names of the things signified by them. Circumcision is called the "covenant," whereof it was a sign and seal. (Gen. xvii. 13.) The lamb is called "the passover." (Exod. xii. 11.) And so in the text the bread is called Christ's "body," and the wine his "blood," because they are signs and a seal to signify and convey Christ, with the benefits of his body broken and of his blood shed for us.

And thus I have proved, that this scripture is not for, but against, transubstantiation, in all the branches of it.

(II.) The other scripture which they allege for transubstantiation, is our Saviour's discourse of eating his flesh, and drinking his blood, in John vi. And Bellarmine pretends to prove that doctrine from verse 51 of that chapter, almost to the end of the chapter. ‡

To this I say, that I do readily grant, that the flesh and blood of Christ here spoken of, which include the benefits of his death, is the spiritual matter of the feast of the Lord's supper; and that believers are here required to feast their souls by faith on the body and blood of Christ, and on all the benefits of his death, in all those ways which God is pleased to offer it to them. And therefore, though the Lord's supper be since instituted, yet they are bound by this scripture to feed on the body and blood of Christ in that ordinance, in the appointed use of bread and wine. But yet this scripture also is fully against transubstantiation

* *Disparatum de disparato non propriè predicatur.* "That which is negatively opposed cannot with propriety be predicated of that to which it is opposed."—EDIT. † *Non dubitavit dicere, Hoc est corpus meum, cum signum daret corporis sui.*—AUGUSTINUS *Contra Adamantum Manichæum*, lib. xii. ‡ BELLARMINUS *De Euchar.* lib. i. cap. 5, 6.

and the corporal presence of the body and blood of Christ under the accidents of bread and wine, and the communicants eating and drinking the same ; and this appears by these three reasons :—

1. Because, as I have proved, our Saviour tells us, that his flesh, namely, the corporal eating his flesh, “profiteth nothing.” (Verse 63.)

2. Because the eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ here spoken of is of absolute necessity to salvation : “Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.” (Verse 53.) But though none can be happy who do not eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ in the sense of this scripture ; yet our adversaries do not deny but many have eternal life who never ate and drank the Lord’s supper.

3. Because eternal life is certainly settled and entailed on all those who do eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ in the sense of this scripture : “Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day.” (Verse 54.) And yet the Papists tell us that wicked men may corporally eat the flesh and drink the blood of Christ : so that the Popish eating the flesh and drinking the blood of Christ, and that eating his flesh and drinking his blood which our Saviour here speaks of, are as far different as heaven and hell.

ARGUMENT II. *It is impossible that this transubstantiation should be in the Lord’s supper.*—This is evident by the nature of the thing ; for whoso understands the nature of this act of transubstantiation, and the terms thereof, (namely, the bread and wine, which are the things that are turned, and the body and blood of Christ, into which this bread and wine are turned,) must clearly see, that as hereby the bread and wine must be taken away, so the body and blood of Christ must be hereby made and produced. And therefore in their Litany of the sacrament they do invoke it thus : *Panis, omnipotentia Dei caro factus, miserere nobis* : “O bread, which by the almighty power of God art made flesh, have mercy upon us ;” implying that the flesh and body of Christ is made by this transubstantiation : and thus by this blasphemous contradiction they make the substance of the glorious body of Christ, so long since born of the Virgin, to be the birth of this prodigious monster of transubstantiation. Now I say, it is impossible to make that which was made before, to do that by an act which was done before the act ; it is impossible for the effect to be before the cause ; and it is impossible for bread of a few hours old to be turned into the substance of the body of Christ, which was continually of the same substance for above a thousand years before.

And therefore, though these blasphemers seem devoutly to adore the almighty power of God, which by this conversion hath wrought *stupendum supra omnia miraculum*, “the most stupendous of all miracles,” as they invoke it in the same Litany of the Sacrament ; yet all in effect that they can say is this,—that the great God, out of his infinite love to his church, hath, in this blessed ordinance of the Lord’s supper, by many astonishing miracles, done just nothing. And thus they most profanely abuse the fearful name of God, in ascribing a work to his dreadful omnipotency which is beneath the power of his meanest creature ; namely, to

make that which was made before ; which indeed cannot be a work of any power at all. I know, some learned men of the church of Rome do undertake to decline this impossibility and contradiction, and yet to defend this doctrine of transubstantiation as defined in the council of Trent ; and therefore Bellarmine, with many of his brethren, the Jesuits, to avoid the foresaid impossibility, explains this action of transubstantiation thus :—that the conversion of the bread into the body of Christ *non esse productivam, sed adductivam* ; that “it is not such a conversion that produceth the body of Christ ; for that was extant before ; but it is such a conversion whereby the body of Christ, which was before in heaven, is now (yet without any local motion from heaven) made present under the accidents of bread in the Lord's supper.” * But whilst their champion by another contradiction (in making the same body of Christ, which is in heaven, to be under the accidents of bread on earth, and yet without receiving any new being or moving from heaven to earth) pleads for transubstantiation, he destroys both *the name and nature* of it.

He destroys the name of it.—For that conversion which he speaks of may be called “a desubstantiation” or “destruction” of the bread, and “a translocation” or “transposition” of the body of Christ, whereby it is placed where it was not before ; but can by no means bear the name of “transubstantiation,” which, saith the council of Trent, the catholic church doth very fitly and properly give it.

Again: He destroys the nature of transubstantiation.—For in every substantial conversion, whereby one substance is turned into another, the latter is always produced, and receives being, upon the destruction of the former. As when Moses's rod was turned into a serpent, (Exod. iv.,) had God only destroyed the substance of the rod, and set a serpent, that was extant before, in the place of it, this had not been a turning the rod into a serpent. So when, at the marriage-feast, (John ii.,) Christ turned water into wine, had God only destroyed the substance of the water, and set wine that was extant before in some wine-cellar, and placed it in the water-pots, this had not been a turning water into wine. But the true substance of the serpent and the true substance of the wine were by those miraculous conversions made and produced ; and so if the true substance of the bread and wine be miraculously turned into the substance of the body and blood of Christ, as the council of Trent will have it, upon the destruction of the substance of the bread and wine, there must necessarily be produced the substance of the body and blood of Christ, as the effect and product of that conversion : and, notwithstanding all the noise which our adversaries make in the Christian world about this matter, they must either assert this monstrous impossibility and contradiction, or disclaim their own doctrine of transubstantiation.

ARGUMENT III. *This doctrine of transubstantiation destroys the Lord's supper.*—My reason is, because this doctrine takes away those sacred signs of bread and wine which God hath appointed to be of absolute necessity to the being of this sacrament ; and if these be taken away, there is no such thing as the Lord's supper in the world.

Our adversaries grant, that it is necessary to the being of a sacrament that there be a sensible and sacred sign, and that must signify a sacred

* BELLARMINUS *De Euchar.* lib. iii. cap. 18.

and holy thing ; and this sign must be of God's institution.* Now the sign or signs in this sacrament of the Lord's supper, must be one of these three things :—

1. It must be either the body and blood of Christ.
2. Or it must be the accidents of bread and wine.
3. Or it must be true bread and wine.

1. It cannot be the body and blood of Christ ; for these are not sensible : and they are the things signified ; and therefore they cannot be the signs.

2. It cannot be the accidents of bread and wine, though Bellarmine, as I have showed, makes these to signify the body and blood of Christ, and so to be essential to this sacrament ; but this cannot be, for two reasons :—

(1.) Because, as I have proved, the accidents without the substance are nothing, and so can signify nothing ; and therefore can be no signs.

(2.) Every sacramental sign must be, as our adversaries confess, of God's institution. Now God never ordained the accidents of bread and wine without the substance to signify the body and blood of Christ. If he did, either they must be consecrated to this use by virtue of these words, "This is my body," "This cup is my blood," &c. ; or these words must declare them to be of this use. But our adversaries dare not stand to either of these ; for then they must yield, that the meaning of these words is, "These accidents of bread and wine are signs of," or "do signify," "the body and blood of Christ." But that by the word "this" is meant "these accidents," Bellarmine, as I have showed, denies ; and that the word "is" doth denote "is a sign," or "doth signify," they will by no means admit, because it doth justify our sense of that word, as speaking of the bread and wine, and overthrows all their disputations to prove that the word "is" must not be taken in a figurative but proper sense, and indeed overthrows their whole doctrine of transubstantiation. So that it is manifest, that neither Christ's body and blood, nor the accidents of bread and wine, can be the signs in this sacrament.

3. It remains therefore, that the true bread and wine must be the only sacred and appointed signs of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's supper ; and that therefore the Papists, in destroying the bread and wine, do utterly destroy this blessed sacrament, and tear off this sacred seal from the covenant of grace, and rob the church of God of the body and blood of Christ, and of all the benefits of his death, as signified and conveyed to them by this ordinance.

ARGUMENT IV. *Those miracles which the Papists affirm to be wrought by transubstantiation in the Lord's supper, are all false and feigned.*—In pursuance of this argument, I shall,

First. *Repeat some of those miracles which are said to be wrought by this act of transubstantiation.*

Secondly. *Prove them to be false and feigned.*

First. *I shall only repeat four of their pretended miracles.*

1. That the substance of the bread and wine is turned into the body and blood of Christ ; and yet his body and blood were extant above a thousand years before the bread and wine were in being.

* THOMÆ *Paræ Tertia*, quest. lx. art. 1, 2, 5.

2. That the substance of the bread and wine is destroyed, and the accidents made to remain without the substance; and yet no sensible difference made between the natural properties of this blessed bread and wine, and all other bread and wine in the world, wherein the substance continues with the accidents.

3. That at the first administration of this sacrament, the body of Christ should be in all its complete parts, head, arms, limbs, and all his flesh and bones, at the table, and there seen and to be felt; and yet the same body at the same time in the mouths and stomachs of his disciples, and they not have the least sense of it.

4. That the same body of Christ should be glorified in heaven, and at the same time be in the mouths and stomachs of all the communicants in the world, and be with those accidents of bread, wheresoever they are, and nowhere else; and yet not move from heaven to earth, nor from one place of the earth to another, and still be one and the same body.

Secondly. I say, *These and all such are feigned and false miracles*; as appears by these six reasons:—

1. Because, though they are pretended to be the stupendous and miraculous works of the almighty power of God, yet are they no miracles at all, but impossibilities and contradictions, as I have proved; and so are nothing, and are not works of so much power as for a worm to creep, and a grass-hopper to leap.

2. Because no miracles were ever wrought upon sensible creatures but the change made by them was discerned, or at least discernible, by the senses of men, for whose sake they were wrought. The serpent which Moses's rod was turned into, the wine which the water was turned into, and all the miracles wrought by Moses in Egypt, with all other such miracles recorded in scripture, not one excepted, were perceived by the senses. And so if one sensible creature be turned into another sensible creature, that which the former is turned into must be made sensible; or if a sensible creature be turned into an insensible, that which is so turned must pass out of the reach of the senses, and become insensible. And therefore there is no such miracle wrought as is here pretended, because here is sensible bread and wine, and the senses of men do see and handle and taste as plain bread and wine, as there is any in the world.

3. Because God never settled such a power on any order of men, for every one in that order to have in all ages a constant power to work miracles; and yet by this doctrine of transubstantiation, every priest doth carry about him a power to work more and greater miracles than ever were wrought by Christ and his apostles.

4. Because God never set up any stated ordinance in the church for the working of miracles, nor bound himself, upon any men's using any scripture-words, always to work miracles; and yet the Papists will have God always bound to work miracles, upon every priest's rightly pronouncing in the Lord's supper these words, "This is my body."

5. God never gave men a power to work miracles on the glorified body of Christ. Moses had power to divide the waters of the Red Sea; (Exod. xiv. 21;) and Joshua had once power to say to the sun and

moon, "Sun, stand thou still upon mount Gibeon; and thou, Moon, in the valley of Ajalon;" (Joshua x. 12;) and the disciples had power to "cast out devils;" (Matt. x. 8;) and Christ tells his disciples, "If ye have faith as a grain of mustard-seed, ye shall say unto this mountain, Remove hence to yonder place; and it shall remove." (Matt. xvii. 20.) But for every dirty priest to practise such a miraculous power upon the glorified body of Christ, as, upon the using of these words, "This is my body," to call it to be locally and corporally present in all the mouths and stomachs of all the communicants at the Lord's supper, is such a Popish dream, as exceeds all the fanatic enthusiasms in the world; but can never be reckoned in the number of any true divine miracles.

6. All these pretended miracles are of no use and to no purpose, as to the ends of this ordinance; but without them we have the body and blood of Christ, with all the benefits of his death, represented and communicated to us, and so do attain all the ends of this sacrament in the appointed use of this blessed bread and wine.

ARGUMENT V. *The doctrine of transubstantiation is false, because all the senses of all men in the world do testify, that bread and wine remain in the Lord's supper after consecration, and this testimony is true.*—That all the senses of all men in the world, who are in their senses, and know what bread and wine are, and have them so placed that the senses may perceive them, do testify that this is bread and wine, is not denied; but that which is denied, and I am to prove, is, that this testimony of the senses is true; and that I prove by these four reasons:—

1. Because by this testimony a man hath the same evidence that bread and wine remain in the Lord's supper after consecration, as he hath that there are any visible or sensible creatures in the world. For if when a man sees and toucheth and tastes and smells bread and wine, and hears the wine poured out, he cannot truly know, and upon his knowledge by his senses truly say, that what he so sees and tastes and toucheth and smells and hears is bread and wine; he cannot upon his knowledge by his senses truly say, that there is a sun, or moon, or stars, or men, or birds, or beasts, or trees, or stones, or earth, or water, or any bread and wine in the world; for the senses cannot give him a more full and sure evidence of the being of any of these creatures, than they do of the being of bread and wine in the Lord's supper.

2. Because, if the testimony of the senses be not true, then all that religion which is founded on God's manifesting himself by the creatures to the understandings of men in the use of their senses, is not a true religion, but is quite extinguished out of the world; and so there is no law of nature binding men truly to know and love and praise God, as he is manifested in the creatures; and then it is no sin at all for men to take no notice of the glory of God, which the heavens and earth, and day and night, declare to them. (Psalm xix.) And then the apostle's words are not true, in telling us, that "the eternal power and Godhead are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made." (Rom. i. 20.) For if by the use of our senses we cannot know that these things are true, then we neither can nor are bound to know and honour and love the wisdom and power and goodness of God in them.

3. If the testimony of the senses be not true, we have no certainty of

the Christian religion ; for we cannot know there is a Bible, or letters or words in it ; or that there is a church, or any such society of believers, or that there are ministers, or sermons, or sacraments in the world ; for all these are perceived by our senses.

4. If our Saviour's argument was good, to prove that by his flesh and bones perceived by the senses, he was no spirit : " Behold my hands and my feet, handle me and see ;" (Luke xxiv. 39 ;) then this argument is also good : " Behold, handle, taste, and smell, and thereby judge if there be not a sensible substance, and this particular substance of bread and wine, in the Lord's supper."

There are two main objections which the Papists make against this argument, which I shall answer, and so proceed.

OBJECTION I. " Senses do not indeed err in their testimony of their own objects : but accidents only, and not substances, are the objects of the senses ; and therefore the testimony of the senses concerning substances is not to be trusted."

ANSWER. If so, then we can judge of no substance in the world by our senses, and we cannot know but we are only in a world of accidents ; namely, of colours and smells and sounds, &c. ; and our understandings cannot perceive by them that there are any substances in the world, much less discern betwixt one substance and another. But every man by the use of his senses perceives sensible substances by means of the accidents inherent in them ; or else no man can swear in judgment any thing concerning any man, or beast, or house, or lands, or goods, neither can there be any civil converse among men in the world.

OBJECT. II. " Sense must yield to be corrected and over-ruled by faith ; and God's word must be believed before our senses."

ANSWER 1. This is but a Popish trick, to hide the truth of God. For it is not our present question, whether we must believe God or our senses ; but whether we must believe the words of a company of cheating Papists, or believe God speaking to our understandings by scripture, by reason, by the creatures, and by our senses, and by all those things which are witnesses of his truth to our souls.

2. We do in this matter give faith its due place in our hearts. For our understandings do here perceive, by that use of our senses which God hath made them for, that here is bread and wine ; but that this bread and wine are blessed to signify and convey to us the body and blood of Christ, this we assent unto by faith ; and by faith we do " discern the Lord's body " and blood, in the use of that bread and wine which we discern by our senses. And thus we own both the truths of God ; namely, that there is bread and wine in the Lord's supper, and that Christ crucified is therein presented to our souls in the use of them : and so we give both faith and sense their due place and use in us.

3. We believe, that the truths revealed to our understandings by the visible creatures, in the use of our senses, are, as the apostle speaks, " the truths of God ;" (Rom. i. 25 ;) and that it is a truth of God, that the creatures we speak of are bread and wine, because we understand by our senses that they have the nature and all the properties of bread and wine ; and we know that the God that cannot lie, cannot speak a truth to

our understandings by the creatures and by our senses, and then deny and contradict it by his word to our faith.

It may now be expected that I should here give you an account of the doctrine of the ancients in this matter ; but to this I shall only say these three things :—

1. That this is undertaken, and I doubt not is effectually performed, by a reverend brother, whose work assigned him is to prove the novelty of Popery both in this their great article of transubstantiation, and also in other Popish doctrines, to whose discourse I refer you for satisfaction herein.

2. That I do profess to honour the ancient fathers in the church of God, who have in their several ages been faithful witnesses to this and other truths of God revealed in the scriptures ; and I do rejoice in my hopes of being in the same blessed body of Christ with them. But I have chosen to insist on these arguments, which I hope to defend, knowing that all that the scripture, reason, and senses do speak, God speaketh by them ; but I cannot say of all that Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Cyprian, Ambrose, Austin, Jerome, &c., do speak, that God speaketh by them. And if it had happened, that any of these men had contradicted scripture, reason, and sense, could their opinions have been as old as the devil in hell, I would say with the apostle, “Whatsoever they were, it maketh no matter to me : God accepteth no man’s person ;” (Gal. ii. 6;) for God and his truth must not be tried by the judgments of fallible men.

3. That the same doctrine which I have delivered had its beginning from Christ, and hath passed from him by the scriptures through all true antiquity, is fully proved by bishop Jewel, bishop Morton, Crakanthorpe, Moulin, and Albertinus, and many others, who have said more in this case than I have either time or ability to speak, or than would be fit for this discourse. And it is as manifest that the judgment of the ancient fathers is against transubstantiation, as it is that there were such persons, and that their writings are extant in the world ; insomuch that had they lived under Popish persecutions, they would have burnt those very men on earth, and cursed them to hell, whom they canonize for saints, and vainly and impiously crave their intercession in heaven.

I shall yet answer two objections, and then conclude with a brief application.

OBJECTION I. “The pope and his council have determined that transubstantiation is in the Lord’s supper, and we must believe them.”

ANSWER. Chemnitius hath told them that it is the confession of Scotus, Cameracensis, and others, that neither scripture, nor the opinion of the ancients, compels us to believe the doctrine of transubstantiation.* And Bellarmine confesseth, that what Scotus saith, is not improbable ; namely, that “there is no express place of scripture [which] compels us to admit transubstantiation without the declaration of the church.” † And so, after all their disputations and curses and bloodshed, and deluding so many souls, we must believe this doctrine of transubstantiation, because the pope and his council have said it. But how shall we be infallibly

* CHEMNITII *Examen Concilii Tridentini*.
cap. 23.

† BELLARMINUS *De Euchar.* lib. iii.

assured that God doth transmit his mind and will to us by the pope and his council? Or where doth God command us to go to this infallible oracle, the bishop of Rome, either singly, or conjunctly with his council, to be concluded by him or them, in matters of faith? But, alas! what a dreadful case is this,—that a whole world of precious souls must have no better a foundation for their religion and salvation than this; namely, that we must all believe the Papists, and that we must believe them for this reason, because they tell us we must believe them! But if they will damn their souls in believing one another, let us labour to save ours by believing the God of truth, speaking to us by his word.

OBJECT. 11. "These words, 'This is my body,' &c., are the words of our dying Lord, and to his disciples, to whom he would not speak darkly in figures: and they are the words of a testament, and of a law, and expressed in entire propositions, all which require plainness, and to be spoken properly, and not in dark figures." Do not these seem plausible objections, and cunningly devised to trepan poor souls into error? Why, these are Bellarmine's objections.*

ANSWER 1. They themselves are forced to confess, that the words, "This cup is my blood," &c., which are "the words of our dying Lord, and to his disciples, and words of a testament, and of a law, and an entire proposition," are yet spoken in a figurative sense, which overthrows all their pretended reasons for a proper or literal sense of the words.

2. Words are not therefore dark because they are figurative; for figures often do explain, and not darken, the sense of words. I confess, a trope, a figure, a metonymy, a synecdoche, &c., are hard words to vulgar ears; but you must know that these are words of art, which learned men have wisely invented, but they are grounded on the natural way of men's expressing themselves, in their ordinary and familiar language: and therefore even children, and unlearned men that cannot read, do ordinarily speak and understand the language that is spoken in tropes and figures, though they know not what trope or figure to reduce such expressions unto. For example: if a man say, "Drink off this cup or glass;" or, as he looks on the signs in the streets, saith, "This is a swan," and, "This is a lion;" or saith of pictures in a chamber, "This is Alexander," or "Cæsar;" or saith of a written parchment wherein he hath signified his will, in bequeathing his estate, "This is my will;" all this is plain and easy, and familiar language; and yet few understand the tropes in these expressions. And so the words, "This is my body," "This cup is my blood," are plain and intelligible words, though few understand the names of those tropes or figures which they are spoken in.

3. Whereas the Papists pretend to give a proper or literal sense of these words, yet their sense to justify their transubstantiation is so full of monstrous and blasphemous contradictions, and so dark, that neither they themselves nor others understand them. Sometimes the word "this" must signify "these accidents;" sometimes, "this substance contained under these accidents:" but this substance must neither be the bread nor Christ's body, but an *individuum vagum* [a "vague individuality"]. And though the word "this" applied to a substance doth always determine

* BELLARMINUS *De Euchar.* lib. i. cap. 9.

and demonstrate the said substance, yet here they make it to signify such a vagrant, that all the world knows not where to find it. And in like manner they rack the word "is," which must sometimes mean "is properly and essentially," when it speaks of the accidents; sometimes, "is made;" sometimes, "is transubstantiated;" and one* will have it to denote all these. And thus they torture this plain scripture, to serve their odious doctrine of transubstantiation; and when they have done all, they have nothing but the word of a blasphemous pope and factious council for it.

IV. Application.

USES. SIX INFERENCES.

INFERENCE I. *That it is idolatry in the Papists to worship the consecrated bread, though they think it is turned into the body of Christ.*

I should here speak to two things:—

1. *That their worshipping the consecrated bread is idolatry.*
 2. *That their thinking it to be the body of Christ, doth not excuse them from idolatry.*

1. For the first, I shall briefly speak to three things:—

(1.) *Acquaint you with their doctrine herein.*

(2.) *Acquaint you with their practice.*

(3.) *Prove that their practising this doctrine is idolatry.*

(1.) *Their doctrine is declared in the council of Trent thus:—*that "it is an undoubted truth, that all Christians ought to give the same worship to the sacrament of the eucharist which they give to God himself;" and that "if any deny this, let him be accursed." †

(2.) *They practise this doctrine.*—For in their Roman Missal, the priests are taught to lift up the host, and to worship it themselves, thrice striking their breasts, and saying, "O Lamb of God, that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us." And among many instances that may be given of their idolatrous practice herein, I shall only give you this: "In the year 1666, at Lyons, in France, it was instituted, that a company of devout persons, taking their turns, should perpetually day and night adore the holy sacrament, some of them always kneeling before it in a certain church chosen by them. And in a large place more spacious than Lincoln's-Inn Fields, London, called Belle Cour, the sacrament was exposed on a rich and magnificent altar, set on a high scaffold, to be adored by all the town together; and there were about threescore thousand people on their knees together, worshipping it; the most glorious triumph that ever was seen," saith a Jesuit in his late description of this city. And thus do these poor deluded wretches solemnly give that worship to wafers which is only due to God himself.

(3.) *That this practice is idolatry, appears,*

First. *By all that I have said against transubstantiation.*—For, seeing the substance of the bread remains, as I have proved, the Papists' wor-

* CORNELIUS A LAPIDE in 1 Cor. xi. † Nullus itaque dubitandi locus relinquitur, cum omnes Christi fideles, pro more in Catholicâ ecclesiâ semper recepto, latræ cultum, qui vero Deo debetur, huic sanctissimo sacramento in veneratione adhibeant.—Concil. Trident. sess. xiii. cap. 5. Si quis dixerit in sancto eucharistiæ sacramento Christum, unigenitum Dei Filium, non esse cultu latræ etiam æterno adorandum, venerandum; neque in processionibus, secundum laudabilem et universalem ecclesiæ sanctæ ritum et consuetudinem, et solemniter circumgestandum, vel non publicè, ut adoretur populo, proponendum; et ejus adoratores esse idololâtras; anathema sibi.—Can. 6.

shipping this bread must needs be gross idolatry : for the council of Trent makes transubstantiation to be the ground and reason of this solemn adoration.* And it is a known saying of their own Costerus to this purpose, that "if by transubstantiation the bread be not turned into the body of Christ, their worshipping the host is the greatest idolatry in the world."

Secondly. *It is gross idolatry to give that worship to a creature which is only due to God.*—And yet these men fall down unto and worship and call upon this bread, as all believers fall down unto and worship and call upon God. Their practice herein is much like their idolatry in worshipping their graven images, mentioned in Isai. xlv. 16, 17: "He burneth part thereof in the fire; with part thereof he eateth flesh; he roasteth the rest, and is satisfied: yea, he warmeth himself, and saith, Aha, I am warm, I have seen the fire: and the residue thereof he maketh a god, even his graven image: he falleth down unto it, and worshippeth it, and prayeth unto it, and saith, Deliver me; for thou art my god:" in like manner do the idolatrous Papists by this bread: part thereof they take into their mouths, and grind with their teeth, and eat it; and part of it (as in the case of the rats and worms eating the consecrated bread) they cast into the fire and burn it; and part thereof they reserve for their god, and carry it about, and fall down to it, and worship it, and pray to it, as to their saviour, to save them from their sins.

2. *I proceed to prove, that the Papists' thinking this bread to be the body of Christ, doth not excuse them from idolatry.*—This is evident; for God's law being sufficiently revealed, man's wilful ignorance thereof cannot extinguish the obligation of it, nor alter the nature of that sin which is a breach of that law. The Heathens' worshipping the sun is idolatry, though they think it to be God; so the Papists' worshipping the wafer is idolatry, though they think it to be the body of Christ with his soul and Godhead; as to kill the saints of God, is murder and persecution, though the enemies may think they do therein God service. (John xvi. 2.)

INFER. II. *Hence see under what characters we are to look upon Papists.*—We are told what names some of their flatterers have given to some of their popes. In the council of Lateran, it is said of the pope, "All power in heaven and earth is given to thee;" and Panormitan saith, "The pope can do all things that God can do." The ambassadors of Sicily cried to one pope, "Thou that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us;" and saith a bishop, in a profane quibble, of pope Leo, "Behold the Lion of the tribe of Judah! We have waited for thee, O most blessed Leo, to be our saviour!" (See Brightman on Rev. xiii. 3.) And we know, "His Holiness" is the name given him by the Papists; and the Romish church doth arrogate the name of "the only holy catholic church." But if we will give the Papists a name from their religion and practice, we must give them three characters.

First. *They are an idolatrous people;* as appears by what I have now said, and as is made known to you by more arguments from other hands; and therefore we need not envy their grandeur and kingdom upon earth,

* Sem. i. cap. 4, 5.

seeing the apostle assures us, that "no idolaters have any inheritance in the kingdom of God." (1 Cor. vi. 9, 10.)

Secondly. *They are a most uncharitable and cruel people.*—And though their Schoolmen do ingeniously plead, that charity or love is the most excellent of all graces, and measure the worth of other graces, and the evil of all sins, by charity; yet are they a most inhuman and barbarous people. And this is not only evident by all the blood of the saints that lies crying at their doors for vengeance; but also that they will have all men cursed and damned who will not, in defiance of God and scripture and reason and sense, say that bread is no bread, and who will not believe that the God of truth doth speak all the hideous contradictions in their doctrine of transubstantiation; as if, having usurped the keys of hell and death, they had decreed that all believers shall be damned, and that none but atheists and infidels shall be saved.

Thirdly. *A perjured people;* in that they impose, and many of them take, this oath: "I, N. N., do swear, that this conversion, which the catholic church doth call 'transubstantiation,' is made in the eucharist, without the belief of which no man can be saved." What horrid perjury is this,—to swear that bread is no bread, and wine is no wine; and that all the contradictions in the doctrine of transubstantiation are true, and that all are damned who do not believe the same!

INFER. III. *Hence we see, that there is no communion to be had with the church of Rome.*—For except we will all renounce our present Christianity, and profess that we are no members of the church of God till we are in union with the pope, and so proclaim ourselves, and all Christians in the world who are not Papists, to be a generation of dissembling knaves; and except we first turn atheists, and believe that God speaks lies and contradictions; we cannot turn Papists.

INFER. IV. *Hence see what a dreadful slavery it is to be the servants and slaves to the devil, who engageth his servants to debauch their consciences, and rack their wits, and to spend their precious time and parts and learning, to spread and defend nonsense and lies.*—Bellarmine saith, he spent fifteen years about controversies in religion: * a fearful thing, that a man of so great learning and parts should waste a great part of his age, and much of it in contradicting God and the truth and himself! But though I will not judge any one that is gone into the eternal world; yet I would warn all to take heed especially how they venture to sin in print, lest their books should be speaking for the devil on earth, when they themselves are tormented with the devil in hell.

INFER. V. *Be faithful to the truths of God, and let them not be held in unrighteousness in your judgments, but let them rule in your hearts and lives.*—If truth prevail to make you holy, then though seducers may make merchandise of your estates, yet they shall never make merchandise of your souls; but if you will not love the truth, and walk in the truth, all our arguments cannot secure you from the temptations of the devil and seducers, nor keep God from being angry with you, and from giving you up to strong delusions to believe lies.

INFER. VI. *Lastly. Bless God for your religion; that your religion comes from the grace of God by his word, to make you holy here, and*

* *Epistola Sexto V.*

happy hereafter ; and not from the devil and pope, to feed your lusts, and damn your souls, and to make you go ignorantly and quietly to hell. *And bless God that you have in this nation the true doctrine of the sacrament of the Lord's supper ;* which, as I said in the beginning of this discourse, so I say again in the conclusion, is clearly and fully delivered from the mind of Christ in these words, and which hath been sealed by the blood of those blessed martyrs in our own land who have been sacrificed to death for the service of your faith, whose blood was of more value than all the popes' that ever usurped supremacy over the church and body of Christ.

SERMON XXIII. (XXII.)

BY THE REV. RICHARD STEELE, A.M.

OF ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

THE PAPISTS GO PRESUMPTUOUSLY AGAINST THE INSTITUTION OF CHRIST, AND CHANGE AND CORRUPT HIS ORDINANCE, AND ARE INJURIOUS TO THE PEOPLE, IN DENYING THE USE OF THE CUP TO THEM IN THE LORD'S SUPPER.

THE RIGHT OF EVERY BELIEVER TO THE BLESSED CUP IN THE LORD'S SUPPER.

And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it ; for this is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for many for the remission of sins.—Matthew xxvi. 27, 28.

THE declared will of God being the most certain and happy rule of man's practice, especially in those duties which have no foundation save in divine revelation, it is the greatest arrogance and affront to the wisdom and will of our Lawgiver to contradict him therein : but when our blessed Redeemer hath in his institutions plainly consulted our benefit and comfort ; when he hath stooped so low, to raise us up so high ; to cross and correct him therein, is the strangest folly and ingratitude that is imaginable.

Yet hereof we have a sad instance in the present church of Rome, in the business of the Lord's supper ; where nothing can be more plain than our Saviour's institution on the one side, nor more palpable than their corruption of it on the other : wherein is evident the lamentable degeneracy of the human nature, together with the power of prejudice, and the mischief of a wilful obstinacy, especially when accompanied with the worldly interest of profit or honour.

It hath been indeed the more ordinary humour of that church to invent and add burdensome superfluities to other of God's ordinances ; but they whose consciences will permit them to add, will easily adventure also to diminish, when it serves their turn ; as appears in their