

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

denying to God's people the one-half of the Lord's supper, to wit, the sacred cup, against the stream of scripture and all antiquity.

The vindicating of this blessed ordinance of God is my present work; and I cannot have a better ground to build upon than the words of the holy evangelist which are before you.

Wherein you may please to consider,

1. *The connexion*, "and;" that is, having immediately before taken bread, blessed it, and delivered to his disciples, in like manner he now takes the cup.

2. *The narration*.

(1.) *Of what our Saviour did*.—The ordinary actions of princes are observed; with what careful reverence then should we ponder this extraordinary action of the King of heaven, especially when he was at death's door! Three things he did: (i.) He took the cup. (ii.) He gave thanks. (iii.) He gave it to them. It was the practice of the Jews, (unto which certainly our Saviour had regard herein,) at the end of their feasts, for the master thereof to take a cup of wine, and, after a short thanksgiving, to drink a little thereof, and so the cup passed round the table; and this they termed, כוס הלל "a cup of thanksgiving." * This use He was pleased to translate and sanctify to be a sacred rite at the Lord's supper to the end of the world, as he did adopt their washing of their proselytes in the institution of baptism.

(2.) Here is an account of *what our Saviour said*, when, if ever, "his lips were like lilies, dropping sweet-smelling myrrh:" (Canticles v. 13:) where there is,

First. *A command*: "Drink ye all of it:" wherein you have,

(i.) *The thing commanded*: "Drink of it;" that is, by an usual figure, of the wine contained in this cup; or, as some translations (Dutch) read, "Drink out of it."

(ii.) *The persons intended*: "Ye all;" that is, "All ye my disciples," in the first place; who, upon occasion of celebrating the pass-over, they being our Saviour's ordinary family, were then alone with him at the table. But forasmuch as he commanded them to do this "in remembrance" of him, that is, when he was dead, and the apostle Paul declares, that this sacramental action must continue "until he come," and that by "all that are sanctified in Christ Jesus," that are able to "examine themselves;" (1 Cor. i. 2, with 1 Cor. xi. 28;) therefore the "all" in the text must neither be confined to the persons of the apostles, nor to them that succeed them in any particular office; but concludes all that are adult disciples of Jesus Christ to the end of the world.

Secondly. *A reason or argument* to urge the due participation thereof, drawn from the sacramental nature of that cup: "For this," to wit, the wine contained in this cup, "is my blood of the new testament:" or, as the evangelist Luke (xxii. 20) delivereth it, "This cup is the new testament in my blood," that is, "the new covenant sealed with my blood." For neither the cup, nor the wine in it, nor the blood of Christ, is properly the new covenant or testament; but by this that is contained in this cup, the new covenant, which is sealed and confirmed by the blood of Christ, is kept in remembrance. He saith in effect, "As covenants

* PAULUS FAGIUS in *Deut. viii. 10, ex Rabbis*.

used to be confirmed by the shedding of blood, so do I by my blood seal to you a new covenant,* far better than the old; which demanded perfect obedience, and denounced the curse for defect thereof; but this promiseth remission of sins: and a covenant far clearer than when it was administered under the shadows of the law, which hereby are abrogated. And therefore 'drink ye all of this,' that have an interest in that covenant, and that have need of this blood."

And this blood is illustrated,

(i.) *By a necessary adjunct to it; namely, "This cup doth represent my blood which is shed;"* which cannot be exemplified by eating the blood with the body, but as shed out of the veins; for "without shedding of blood there was no remission." (Heb. ix. 22.) And this our Saviour expreseth in the present tense, "is shed," to assure his disciples *then*, that it would certainly and suddenly be done, and to assure all true believers *now* of the reality of it, though it be past, as if it were now in doing.

(ii.) *By the finis cui, or "the persons for whom" it is shed: "For many;"* so this evangelist, and the next, that doth epitomize him. To show, 1. That he died not for himself, but for others; or perhaps, 2. By this restrained expression to exclude Judas; or rather, 3. "This blood is not only shed for you apostles, but for abundance more."† Which the evangelist Luke, and Paul after him, express in other terms, and say, "My blood shed for you," that each of them might apply it to themselves. So that all believers, for whom this precious blood was shed, have an undoubted right to drink of it.

(iii.) *By the finis cujus, or "the end for which" this blood is shed;* and that is expressly "for the remission of sins." This "Lamb of God" came and lived and died to "take away the sins of the world." For though sin was satisfied for by Jesus Christ, and so we are said to be redeemed; yet because no satisfaction was made by us, therefore we are said to be remitted. So then whosoever can triumph in the benefit of remission of sins, hath a just right to drink of this cup, which seals the new covenant, and the forgiveness of sins.

From these words thus explained I lay down this assertion or doctrine:—

DOCTRINE. *That every adult believer hath an undeniable right to the blessed cup in the Lord's supper.*

In the handling of which truth, I shall briefly,

I. *State the question.*

II. *Prove the position.*

III. *Refute the objections.*

IV. *Make application.*

I. For the right stating of the question, you may observe,

1. That our business is not to debate whether a man may or may not receive Christ and all his benefits under one element in the Lord's supper; for we acknowledge, that this may be done by the Spirit of God working faith in the heart, as with, so without, either of them.

2. We undertake not to prove, that to partake of both bread and wine

* So the word διαθήκη is most commonly taken; and so most properly in this place; as the epithet "new," which is adjoined, evinceth. † MALDONATUS *in loc.*

in the Lord's supper is absolutely necessary, and that to salvation. We affirm, that the spiritual eating of Christ's body and blood is absolutely necessary; but there is not the same necessity of feeding upon them sacramentally; and accordingly, that it is the wilful neglect, not the inevitable defect, thereof that is damnable. The divine command doth indeed impose a necessity of observance in all cases, where his providence doth not supersede the same; and therefore they that unwillingly are deprived of this entire ordinance may escape hell, but they that willingly neglect it cannot escape guilt. We only conclude, that there is the same necessity of communicating in the one element as in the other.

3. Our asserting the believer's right to the sacred cup doth not urge an obligation upon such as are naturally or irremediably disabled from participation thereof. If in an infant there be an incapacity to "discern the Lord's body;" (1 Cor. xi. 29;) if there be an incurable antipathy to the taste of wine; if, after receiving that sacred bread, death come between the cup and the lip, or the like; as our doctrine obligeth not to impossibilities, so "all laws that do intend a general obligation, yet do admit of some extraordinary and particular exceptions,"* especially when the lawgiver himself (as in such case he doth) creates the hinderances. Thus many have "a rightful interest" (*jus ad rem*) in things whereof they never have (*jus in re*) "the rightful possession."

4. Our doctrine is, that "both parts of the Lord's sacrament, by Christ's ordinance and commandment, ought to be ministered to all Christian men alike;"† that "Christ's ministers ought to take and break the bread, to take the cup, and to give both to the communicants;"‡ that "believers do receive what is given to them by the Lord's minister, and do eat the bread of the Lord, and drink the cup of the Lord;"§ that "both parts of the sacrament are given to the laity in the Lord's supper, because the sacrament was instituted not only for some part of the church, to wit, the priests."||

5. We affirm, that "no man can justly infringe this right, or deny to adult believers this blessed cup:"¶ that "the cup of the Lord is not to be denied to the lay-people;" that "the denial of the cup to the people is contrary to the institution of Christ:"** that "they are disallowed that withhold the one kind, to wit, the cup of the Lord, from the faithful;" yea, "they sin grievously against the Lord's institution, which saith, 'Drink ye all of it,' which he did not say so expressly of the bread:"†† that "no human authority ought to forbid the appointment of Christ, and the most received custom of the ancient church."‡‡

One would wonder how so clear an institution should ever come into question. Some few superstitious persons, and some heretics, did long ago choose to communicate in one kind; but they were still corrected by orthodox councils.§§ And afterwards, out of fear of shedding the blood of

* *Jura constituenda esse in iis quæ epî το πλειστον, accidunt, non quæ εκ παραλογου, ex inopinato; nec in singulas personas, sed generaliter, constituit.*—Reg. Jurisconsult. † Article 30. ‡ *Confessio Anglic.* cap. 29. § *Confess. Helvet.* cap. 21.

|| *August. Confess.* So the Saxon, &c. ¶ Article 30. ** *Confess. Anglic.* cap. 29. †† *Confess. Helvet.* cap. 21. ‡‡ *Confess. August.* §§ *Comperimus quid quidam, sumptis tantummodo corporis sacri portione, a calice sacri crucis abstinent: qui proculdubio, quoniam nescio quid SUPERSTITIONE docentur astringi, aut integra sacramenta percipiant, aut ab integris arceantur; quia divisio unius ejusdemque mysterii*

Christ, there were some that, being loath to lose either element, did use to dip the consecrated bread in the wine; and this some councils did allow to persons that were infirm. (*Concilium Turonense.*) But it was about fourteen hundred years after the institution, before ever any public contradiction was made thereunto; and then the council of Constance, (*anno 1414,*) then that of Basil, (*anno 1431,*) and lastly that of Trent, (*anno 1545,*) forbade the use of the cup, not only to the people, but to the priests also; except to him only that for the time officiates. They at Constance say, "Though Christ did administer this venerable sacrament to his disciples under both the kinds of bread and wine, yet, notwithstanding this, the custom of communicating under one kind only is now to be taken for a law." Again: "Though in the primitive church this sacrament was received by the faithful under both kinds; yet, notwithstanding this, the custom that is introduced of communicating under one kind only for the laity is now to be taken for a law." (Sess. xiii.) They at Basil, not many years after, being warned by a learned man, (Johannes Gerson,) who was employed to put a better face on so foul a matter, left out those strange and presumptuous "notwithstanding," and thus made their canons or decrees, that "the laity, as also the clergy who do not consecrate, are not bound by the Lord's command to receive both kinds." Again: "The church hath power to order how the sacrament shall be ministered; and, so that people do communicate according to the appointment of the church, whether under one or both kinds, it is sufficient for the salvation of the worthy receiver." (Sess. xxx.) Then come they at Trent, and, notwithstanding all the instances of Christian princes and the arguments of great divines there to the contrary, they declare, that "the laity, and clergy that do not consecrate, are bound by no divine precept to receive the eucharist under both kinds;" and do "accuse" all those that affirm the contrary. Again: They declare, that "though at the beginning of Christianity both kinds were frequently received, yet that custom, for good reasons, being altered, the church now approves of communion in one kind, which custom no man can lawfully change without the authority of the church;" and do "accuse" all such as do affirm, that they do err herein. (Sess. xxi.) And this is the true state of this matter, and thus we fall at variance.

II. And now you shall see *the proof of our doctrine and position*, which is the second thing incumbent on me; and that will be sufficiently done by these arguments:

ARGUMENT I. *From the institution of this sacrament, and our Saviour's command annexed thereunto.*—For sacraments depend merely upon their institution; hence doth their being result, and upon this their matter and signification do depend. "The institution with the element makes the sacrament;" * and so the only rule and balance for them must needs be their institution. This being the ground of this ordinance, no man or angel may violate, under a fearful curse. (Gal.

sine grandi sacrilegio provenire non potest.—GELARIUS Papa, dist. ii. de Consecr. anno 492. For a translation of this passage, see the last sermon in this volume, sect. vii. of Doctrines taught before Luther.—EDIT.

* Vide CYPRIANI *Epist. lxxiii. ad Cæcil.*

i. 8.) And, indeed, if men's will or wisdom might alter and change the revelation of God, nothing would abide firm in religion. It is true, the laws of men may be corrected or annulled, because they foresee not their inconveniences; but our Saviour certainly, when he appointed this ordinance, well knew what was necessary and useful for his church to the end of the world. And for this reason the apostle Paul, when some disorders were broken into the church of Corinth in the use of the Lord's supper,—he recalls them to the institution, and endeavours by that straight rule to rectify their irregularities: "For I have received of the Lord," &c. (1 Cor. xi. 23.) By which place it is evident, that there is no such way to obviate any mistake which in after-times creeps upon God's own ordinance, as by going back to the spring, by considering the institution: * insomuch as the same apostle, for their violating Christ's institution in their administration of this ordinance, saith, "This is not to eat the Lord's supper." (1 Cor. xi. 20.)

Now you may plainly see our Saviour's institution in this text: "And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying," &c. (Matt. xxvi. 27.) And, in Luke xxii. 20, the evangelist comes with a "likewise:" "Likewise also the cup after supper," &c.; that is, "As he gave the bread, in like manner he gave the cup." They have an equal ground in their first institution; and so ought to be given to and received by the faithful, the one as well as the other: what Christ hath joined together, no man ought to put asunder.

I shall give the substance of the opposition which is made to this branch of this argument. To the antecedent, one saith, that "Christ did institute many things in the church, but not with a design to oblige every man to the use of them; it being sufficient that some in the church do one thing, and some another:"† that "God, in instituting marriage, did not intend to oblige every one to marry."‡

To this I answer, that the design of our Saviour is best known by the command which did accompany the institution, which is, "Drink ye all of it;" and by the use the cup was expressly designed unto in the sacrament, which was to keep "in remembrance" his death, and his blood-shedding therein; both which relating to all believers alike, do make it plain, that the intent of the institution was to oblige all believers.

Others do say, that "though Christ did institute this sacrament in both kinds, yet the church hath power to alter his institution;" alleging that "the like was done in the case of baptism, which, being appointed to be administered in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, was afterwards done only in the name of the Lord Jesus."§ (Acts xix. 5.)

To which I answer, that the Holy Ghost doth not, in the place specified, describe the manner how baptism was celebrated, but sheweth that they there were "baptized in the name," that is, according to the doctrine

* *Indignus est Domino, qui aliter mysterium celebrat, quàm ab eo traditum est. Non enim potest devotus esse qui aliter præsumat quàm datum est ab Authore.*—AMBRONIS in 1 Cor. xi. "He who celebrates the sacrament otherwise than it was delivered by the Lord, is unworthy of Him. For he cannot be devout who presumes to celebrate it in a manner different to that in which it was given by its Author."—EDIT. † BELLARMINUS De Euchar. lib. iv. cap. 25. ‡ ESTIUS in lib. iv. Sent. dist. xi. sect. 8. § ROFFEN- sis in refut. art. xvi. Lutheri.

and appointment, "of the Lord Jesus." It no more intends, that they were baptized only in Christ's name, than St. Paul's styling himself "the servant of Jesus Christ" excludes the Father and the Holy Ghost. And thus it is understood not only by the ancients, but by divers of the learnedest of the Roman church themselves.*

To make sure the consequent, that our Saviour did institute this sacrament in both kinds for all believers, I add hereunto the command of our Saviour at the institution of it: "Drink ye all of it." (Matt. xxvi. 27.) "This do ye as oft as ye drink it." (1 Cor. xi. 25.) The institution is dogmatical, lays down the law; but this is preceptive, and charges the execution of it. Which command could not be terminated in those present apostles, but extendeth to all believers to the end of the world; for so saith the apostle, By so doing, "ye do show the Lord's death till he come." (1 Cor. xi. 26.) And without doubt, if one of the elements be sequestered from believers, then must by the same reason the other also; for the apostle saith, "After the same manner also he took the cup, and delivered it," and commanded the same use of it, just as he had done before of the bread.

I shall not stand upon that observation of the express mentioning of "all," when the cup was given; the like not added when the bread was delivered; as if our Saviour had on set purpose added that word, to confute the sacrilege which he foresaw would be committed about it. It is sufficient, that here is a plain command, to all that had eaten the bread, to drink in like manner of the cup. And if this do not indispensably oblige both the apostles there present, and also all believers after them till Christ come again, there is no ground for the administering of either element to any whomsoever at this day; which is directly contrary to the apostle's inference from hence, (1 Cor. xi. 26,) and to all men's sentiment, that have not quit both their religion and reason.

And yet behold what subterfuges they that would be mad with reason have found out to avoid our Lord's command!

OBJECTION I. First, they say, "This only imports a liberty given hereby; such as that, 'Increase and multiply,' which lays no obligation upon every one to marry for the increase of the world."† Or, as others, "This is only an invitation, such as that, 'Receive ye the Holy Ghost;' but no command."‡ Which comments do not only deprive the people of the blessed cup, but do release both ministers and people from both elements; for (the fate of both being just the same) where there is no command or law, there is no transgression. And were it but an invitation, yet, as they manage it, it is not very civil. For the priest saith, "Drink ye all of it;" and when he hath so said, he drinks it all himself. If it be said, that "all others did drink in and by the apostles, and now do drink in and by the priest," it must needs follow, that in their eating, all others do eat, and then there is no need of either.

OBJECT. II. They say, that "this command did only concern them that were present; or at furthest, that it only concluded with the apostles' successors."§

* PROTH *Bibliotheca*, p. 1603, ex EULOGIO; ESTIUS *in lib. 10. dist. 111. sect. 4*; FABR. PAULUTUS *in Act. xix.*; DOMINICUS A SOTO *in Tertiam, dist. xlii. art. 6.* † JACOBI A S. MARIA *Serm. vii. de Solen. Corp. Christi.* ‡ SUAREZ *De Sacr. disp. lxxl.* § BEL-LARMINUS *De Euchar. lib. iv. cap. 25.*

ANSWER. A poor refuge. For then, "Take, eat," only concerned them also; and so they give the other element to the people without any warrant. And so also will they exclude even their priests themselves, that do not administer, from the cup; whereas, for all that, they pretend to be successors to the apostles; for the apostles at that time did not administer, and so did rather represent the people, or non-officiating ministers, than any else. But we affirm, Whoever succeeds the apostles in their faith, though they succeed them not in their office, have a right to the blood of Christ in the sacrament; forasmuch as they all have a right in the new covenant or testament, whereof that cup is a seal, and are all commanded to "drink it in remembrance" of his death, "till he come."

OBJECT. III. They say, that "this is an affirmative precept, and therefore binds not always, but when there is a necessity; but in the church of Rome there is no such necessity; for there they are all content without it."*

ANSWER. But to this we answer: The command for consecrating the bread and wine is also affirmative; which yet to omit, they hold a crime. So also is the precept of receiving the bread affirmative; yet by this rule there would lie no obligation from the precept on any, in either of these cases. Affirmative commands do always bind, though not to the performance of them at all times: and it were a strange way to evade them, by making a law on earth, that none should desire to fulfil the laws of heaven.

OBJECT. IV. They allege, that "our Saviour said not at the giving of the cup, 'Do this;' nor the apostle Paul; but, 'As oft as ye drink it;' that is, 'When ye do drink it,' 'do it in remembrance of me.'"[†] And thus they triumph in, as a wonderful providence of God in so describing it.[‡]

ANSWER. But the answer is easy. 1. This word "as oft as" is also applied to the bread, as well and in the same manner as to the cup: "As oft as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup." 2. The command of "doing this" is clearly implied in saying, "As oft as ye do it:" for he that commands to do it worthily, doth imply a command to do it. And, 3. If "do this" were not included in, "As oft as ye do it," there would be no ground to administer the cup to any person at all in the church.

It remains then, that by virtue of our Saviour's institution a right accrues [to], and by virtue of his command an obligation lies upon, believers to partake of the blessed cup in the Lord's supper.

ARG. II. The second argument is taken *from the example and appointment of the apostles*.—Their example is plain: "And they all drank of it." (Mark xiv. 23.) Though the blood of Christ was yet in his body, yet they plainly followed the institution, and stood not upon the notion of concomitance. And lest any should say, that their drinking of that cup gives no right or ground for us to do the like, I add conjunctly therewith the direction and appointment of the great apostle of the Gentiles: "This do ye as oft as ye drink it," &c.; (1 Cor. xi. 25;)

* CAJETANUS in *Tertium Thomæ*, quest. lxxx. art. 12.
dist. xi. sect. 7.

† ESTIUS in *lib. iv. Sent.*
; BELLARMINUS *De Euchar.* lib. iv. cap. 25.

where drinking of the cup is joined with eating the bread five or six times in five verses together.

And this order is considerable, if we mark, 1. *From what hand the apostle received it*; which you may see in verse 23: "For I have received of the Lord that which also I have delivered unto you." Could he have had it from a better and surer hand? This he received of the Lord: let others consider of whom they have received the contrary. Yea, this came from the Lord Jesus when he was in heaven: they that bring another doctrine, surely had it delivered from hell. Mark, 2. *Unto whom this order is directed*; and these were, the body of the church of Corinth, not the ministers only: yea, and not only to that church, but "to all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord," as you may see in 1 Cor. i. 2. And though every thing in that epistle was not intended for every one, yet this must needs be intended to regulate all those that were guilty of that disorder, or in danger to be corrupted by it; and those were the ordinary members of that church, and others after them. And he was no novice that thus argues from the twenty-eighth verse: "He that is bound to 'examine himself,' is bound also to 'drink of that cup:' But not the ministers only, but the people, are bound to examine themselves: They therefore are bound to drink of it."* And mark, 3. *To what end the institution is here described and urged*; which though it was not to prove this point in question, yet it was to regulate another disorder which was grown among the Corinthians; and this he doth by reducing them to the first standard, and therefore cannot be imagined to be either defective or superfluous in his description. It is but weakly said, that "the apostle did not command this practice, but delivered it;"† whereas he delivered the command of our Saviour Christ, and that is enough.

I find but two objections worth the naming against this argument.

OBJECTION I. That "the apostle doth leave the cup in some indifference; forasmuch as he saith once, 'Whosoever shall eat this bread or' (for so it is in the Greek) 'drink this cup of the Lord unworthily.'"‡ (Verse 27.)

ANSWER. But it is most evident that this "or" is used here in a copulative sense; only that word was fitter here, not to untie the two elements, which the apostle had bound together by so many copulatives in the text, but to show that an equal care and reverence should be showed in both. It is as if he had said, "If a man do either eat the bread or drink the cup unworthily, he is guilty." And of this genuine acceptance a multitude of instances may be given in the scripture. (Matt. xviii. 8, &c.)

OBJECT. II. Others do grant, that "it was the custom at Corinth, to celebrate this sacrament in both kinds;" but they say, that "this prescribes not to others; for that the church may abrogate such a custom upon sufficient reasons, her power being not inferior to the apostles'."§

ANSWER. But to this we say, that this was the rule that St. Paul received from Jesus Christ, and which he left for the direction of the

* RIVETI *Cathol. Orthod.* p. 119.

† ESTIUS *in lib. iv. dist. xi. sect. 7.*

† BELLARMINUS *De Euchar.* lib. iv. cap. 25.

§ SALMERO, tom. ix. tract. 34.

church of God until Christ shall come; and this was then the practice of the universal church: and themselves grant, that no man can dispense, 1. In the laws of nature; nor, 2. In articles of faith; nor, 3. In the sacraments of the New Testament.*

It remains then, that, according to the example and appointment of the apostles, who were guided by the Holy Ghost himself, the sacred cup was as plainly intended for all Christian men as the holy bread.

ARG. III. The third argument is taken *from the proper end of this ordinance of the Lord's supper*; which is, to keep up the "remembrance," or to "show the Lord's death till he come." (1 Cor. xi. 25, 26.) They who are bound to the end, are also bound to the means: Every adult believer is bound to show the Lord's death, which is the end: Therefore every adult believer is bound to partake of the cup in the Lord's supper, which is the means to that end. For so the apostle saith expressly, "This do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me;" and, "As oft as ye drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come." (Verses 25, 26.)

Now although our Saviour's choice of this means for this end be sufficient to evince the necessity and fitness thereof, where it may be had; yet *ex abundanti* ["over and above"] it is easy to show the same from the thing itself. For, the death of our Redeemer coming with the pouring out of his blood, how can that death be showed sufficiently without drinking that cup poured out in the sacrament? For the breaking of the bread doth in no wise represent the effusion of the blood; that must be done by communicating in the cup.

I find but two pleas entered against this argument, and they are these:—

OBJECTION I. They say, that "'Do this,' refers not to the people's drinking of the cup; but to the ministers' consecrating it, whereby Christ's death is sufficiently showed."† Or, as others, "These words did consecrate them to be priests, and so enable to celebrate this ordinance."‡

ANSWER. That the words "Do this," are a sufficient ground for the ministers' consecrating and distributing both the elements, is very true; but that hereby they were constituted in that office, is wholly groundless; this being another business our Saviour was now about, and there being more plain and formal passages elsewhere in the New Testament for that purpose. (Matt. xxviii. 19; John xx. 21—23.) And then, as to the other conceit, that this only obligeth the minister to consecrate both elements, it neither stands with *reason* nor *construction of speech* to make that interpretation of it. *Not with reason of the thing*; for how shall the people, who are here directed, show the Lord's death by the priest's consecrating the cup? *Not with good construction*; for, the blessing and delivering being mentioned or supposed before, "Do this" must needs refer to both; or if but to the one, rather to the latter, than the former. And if the minister must deliver both, the people then are bound to receive them.

OBJECT. II. They say again, that "either of the elements is suffi-

* AQUINAS, quodlibet iv. art. 13; SALMERO, *ubi supra*.
ALBERTUS PIGHIUS, *Colloq. Ratiab. vii.*

† CAJETANUS, *ubi supra*;

‡ *Conc. Trid. sess. xiii. cap. 1.*

cient to commemorate the death of Christ; inasmuch as it is said of either of them apart, 'Ye do hereby show the Lord's death.'"*

ANSWER. It is easily granted, that we may commemorate the death of Christ by either of them, yea, without either of them; but we urge, that they were both instituted to this end, and therefore that it cannot be sufficiently showed by one of them. He that saith meat is designed for the maintaining of life, denies not drink also to be requisite to the same end: yea, though we should grant that the blood might be received in the bread, yet, by such receiving, the death of Christ by the effusion of his blood for us could in no wise be showed forth; which being the principal end of the sacrament, it is the people's duty as well as the ministers' to do it, and that till our Saviour come again.

ARG. IV. The fourth argument is taken from the people's right in the thing signified by the sacred cup in the Lord's supper.—And this is used by our Saviour himself: "Drink ye all of this; for this is my blood," &c. (Matt. xxvi. 27, 28.) So that, look, what benefit a man would be robbed of in being deprived of Christ's blood, that comfort he is robbed of that is deprived of this cup. And that "a right to the thing signified creates a right to the sign" is so great a truth, (*Cui signatum, ei signum*,) that the apostle Peter grounds his practice upon it, where there was no express rule: "Can any man forbid water to these that have received the Holy Ghost?" &c. (Acts x. 47.) It is true, where there lies a present incapacity to receive the outward ordinance, for want of a requisite condition that is annexed thereunto, (as there is in infants, and such-like, that cannot yet "discern the Lord's body," nor "examine" themselves,) in that case their right is suspended; but no mortal man can lawfully forbid, to those that have an interest in that which the cup signifies, the liberty of drinking of it.

Now what is signified and exhibited by the sacred cup? The apostle saith, "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ?" (1 Cor. x. 16.) And every believer that hath a right to the body of Christ, hath also a right to the blood of Christ: they that have union with Christ by faith, have a clear right to the communion of his blood. Again: in the institution, "This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you:" (Luke xxii. 20:) for whom the blood is shed, to them the cup must be given; and the rather, in that it was appointed to assure a poor believer thereof, who may say, "Doth the covenant of grace belong to me? Was his blood shed for such a poor sinner as I am?" Now Jesus Christ comes in this ordinance to seal and apply to every particular soul the general promise and mercy; and in effect saith, "Behold, sinner, this blood was shed for thee, for the remission of thy sin."†

There are but two, and they very weak, objections found against this argument.

OBJECTION 1. They say, that "abstemious persons that can drink no wine, that infants within the church, yea, that all men, have a title to

* *ESTIUS in lib. iv. dist. xl. sect. 8.* † *Si, quotiescunque effunditur sanguis Christi, in remissionem peccatorum effunditur, debet illum semper sumere, ut semper peccata mihi demittantur.*—*GRATIANUS De Consecr. dist. 2.* "If, as often as the blood of Christ is shed, it is shed for the remission of sins, I ought always to partake of it, that my sins may always be taken away."—*EDIT.*

Christ's blood, in that he shed it for all men ; and yet these may not partake of the cup in the Lord's supper."*

ANSWER. This objection was prevented before, by observing, that in the cases of infants and abstemious persons, God himself hath by his providence at present hindered them from participation hereof, and that by a natural incapacity. And for any others out of the church, as they can pretend no right to his blood till they acknowledge his person, so they cannot "discern the Lord's body" or blood, or "examine" themselves.

OBJECT. II. They tell us, that "they who have the thing signified, need not to strive so much about the sign ; he that hath the money promised by the bond, is not solicitous at all for the bond."†

ANSWER. This indeed is the ready way to cast off all sacraments and ordinances at once ; but our Saviour, that knew our weakness of faith and love, did institute both these external elements to strengthen and comfort us. We are made partakers of Christ by baptism, by the word, by faith ; but infinite wisdom and love did concur to appoint this method for the church's good. And who are we, to correct our blessed Saviour, or to intimate that his institutions are needless ?

Seeing therefore that to all true believers doth belong the thing signified by the cup in the sacrament, and *that* by God's ordinance, no man can or ought to forbid them the sign or seal thereof.

I might easily multiply arguments from the sacred nature of testaments, especially of this new testament, which was sealed with the blood of the Testator. For "though it be but a man's covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth or addeth thereto ;" (Gal. iii. 15 :) that is, no man can do it without the greatest injury and sacrilege : how much greater is the injury that is offered to our Saviour, who said, "This is the cup of the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you ;" and who did bequeath both the sign and the thing signified !

As also from the unwarrantable mutilation that they who withhold the cup do make in the sacrament. For it is not an entire sacrament when one integral part is wanting, no more than a man is a perfect man when one arm or eye is defective ; nature always ordaining those parts to be double, though both serving to the same use ; and implying thereby, that their operation is more complete in both, than it can be in one only. And, with the like wisdom, no doubt, our blessed Redeemer appointed these two elements of bread and wine for the entire refreshment of the soul. But especially when one essential part (as the cup is, being part of the matter) is taken away, one may truly say, "This is not to eat the Lord's supper." (1 Cor. xi. 20.) And, besides, nothing is more plain than Christ's intention to appoint a refection to the soul like that of the body. All men know, that this is by drink as well as by meat, the one whereof quenches thirst, and the other repels hunger ; and therefore both these must be used to signify a perfect feast or refreshment, such as our Saviour provides for his people.

I had also thought to have spread before you the universal and uncontrolled practice of the church of God from the apostles' time for one thousand three hundred years and more downwards, for the use of the

* BELLARMINUS *De Euchar.* lib. iv. cap. 25.

Idem, *ibid.* cap. 27.

blessed cup by all true believers in the Lord's supper; and not only of their use thereof, but of their arguments for its use. At least I intended to have produced one undoubted testimony in each century of years to have witnessed hereunto; but only, that this would swell this discourse beyond the prescribed limits, and that it is done already by many learned men.*

Thus much shall suffice for the second thing, to wit, the proof of our doctrine or position.

Before I come to answer the objections made against this doctrine, I should have set before you the confessions of the adverse party, where very many learned men do acknowledge both the first institution and primitive practice to be in both kinds;† but having heard already the verdict brought-in for us herein by one of their own councils, I shall only add the observation of a most sober and learned person, that lived and died in the communion of the church of Rome, who writes to this purpose: "Concerning the administration of the holy sacrament of the eucharist, it is sufficiently known, that the universal church hath to this day, and the Western or Roman church for above a thousand years after Christ, especially in their solemn and ordinary dispensing of this sacrament, given both bread and wine to all the members of Christ's church; a thing that is manifest by innumerable testimonies both of the Greek and Latin ancients. And they were induced so to do, first, by the institution and example of Christ, who gave this sacrament of his body and blood to his disciples, then representing the persons of believers," &c. And after: "Wherefore it is not without cause that the best and most learned Catholics do most earnestly desire and contend, that they may receive the sacrament of Christ's blood together with his body, according to the ancient custom continued in the universal church for many ages."‡

Behold here an acknowledgment so plain and full, that I wonder with what countenance men can resist so manifest a truth, and withhold it in unrighteousness: and yet here they muster up the best strength they have, and will not yield an inch of what they have once established, be it right or wrong.

III. We shall reduce their *objections* that are either alleged in their councils, or produced by their writers, to these four heads; which is the next thing to be done.

1. *Pretence of scripture.*
2. *Pretence of reason.*
3. *Pretence of reverence.*
4. *Pretence of authority.*

OBJECTION 1. *The scriptures* which they produce for communion under one kind are such as these:

(I.) "The types and figures of the eucharist in the Old Testament signify eating under one kind: as the tree of life in Paradise; the paschal lamb;

* CHEMNITICUS, CHAMIERUS *De Euchar.* lib. viii. cap. 9.

† ESTIUS in *lib. iv. dist. xi. sect. 7*; TOLETUS in *Johan. vi. annot. 27*; *Olim per multa secula apud omnes Catholicos usitatum esse, ex multorum sanctorum scripturis didicimus.*—ALPHONSUS A CASTRO *Advers. Hares.* ult. de *Euchar.* "That formerly for many ages this was the customary practice among all Catholics, we learn from the writings of many of the saints."—EDIT.

‡ CASSANDRI *Consult.* art. 22.

the manna ; the shew-bread ; the sacrifices, where the flesh was to be eaten, but the blood was not drunk." *

ANSWER. The weakness of this objection would be obvious if it were put into an argument ; but it is not worth that trouble. It is sufficient to answer,

1. That none of these were types or figures of the Lord's supper, and so their whole force is lost in reference unto that. For types are shadows to represent the substance ; but it is uncouth divinity, to make one figure the type of another. And our Saviour is plainly called "the Paschal Lamb," and calls himself "the Manna that came down from heaven," &c. (John vi. 51.) And,

2. If there were some types that only intimated eating, yet there were others that do imply drinking also. Was there a tree of life in Paradise ? So are there rivers of Paradise. Was there bread from heaven ? So were there waters flowing from the rock. And divers of the fathers will produce a clearer figure of both than any of these ; and that was of Melchizedek, who brought forth both bread and wine to feast faithful Abraham. And the apostle tells us : as they "did all eat the same spiritual meat," so "they all drank the same spiritual drink ;" (1 Cor. x. 3, 4 ;) and Chrysostom saith upon it : "As thou eatest the body of our Lord, so they did eat manna ; and as thou drinkest the blood of our Lord, so they drank the water of the rock. To them he gave manna and water ; to thee he gives his body and blood." (*In loc.*)

(II.) The second pretence of scripture is from John vi., where Christ saith, "I am the bread which came down from heaven." (Verse 41.) And, "This is the bread which came down from heaven, that a man may eat thereof, and not die." (Verse 50.) And, "If a man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever." (Verse 51.) "By all which passages he teacheth one kind to be sufficient to salvation, especially when, in the same chapter, verse 11, our Saviour multiplied the bread, but not the drink." †

ANSWER 1. Though divers of the ancients did apply this scripture to the business of the sacrament, yet properly it cannot intend that, the sacrament not being instituted till above a year after this discourse of his ; but plainly enough by "bread" he means himself : it was He, not the sacramental bread, "that came down from heaven." It is a spiritual feeding on him by faith, not merely partaking of bread in the sacrament, that will make a man "live for ever." And he speaketh so often of bread, only in pursuance of the manna which he had begun to speak of ; as in John iv. he pursues the same thing under another shadow, to wit, of water, to the woman of Samaria.

2. But if this place were meant of the Lord's supper, we cannot have a stronger argument for the necessity of the cup therein, than from verse 53, where Christ saith, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you : " the like in verses 54, 56. And then for the miracle : as there is no ground to affirm that that miracle had any mystical reference in it to the Lord's supper ; so, if it had, we might infer as well, that his multiplying the wine in Cana (John ii.) doth as strongly prove, and both alike, that we must communicate in wine only.

* BELLARMINUS *De Euchar.* lib. iv. cap. 24.

† Idem, *ibid.*

(III.) The third pretence of scripture is from Luke xxiv. 30, 31, where it is said, that our Saviour, as "he sat at meat, took bread, and blessed it, and brake, and gave it to them. And their eyes were opened, and they knew him, and he vanished out of their sight." "Here," say they, "was the sacrament; here was only breaking of bread; here could be no partaking of the cup, for that he vanished immediately out of their sight." *

ANSWER 1. Here is no direct proof of the sacrament; no saying, "This is my body," "Do this in remembrance of me," which they grant to be necessary to a sacrament.† In other scriptures, as Matt. xiv. 19, and xv. 36, where there was no thought of a sacrament, our Saviour took bread, and gave thanks, and gave it. Nay, here is great probability to the contrary; for this was in an inn, their meeting and eating there not at all intended sacramentally, no wine consecrated, which, the opponents say, is necessary.‡ That "their eyes were opened, and they knew him" in the breaking of bread, is no proof that it was the sacrament; but rather, that then they did more steadfastly look upon him; and that breaking of bread noteth the time when, not the cause by which, they knew him; or possibly by his usual manner of giving thanks, and breaking of the bread, they discerned who he was. And according to the sense of this answer do speak many learned expositors even of their own.§

2. Though it should be granted, that here the Lord's supper was administered, yet it is apparent by the former answer, that here is no full description of the celebration of it: so that the cup might as well be given, though not expressed, as that those disciples did drink at their meal, though no such thing be there mentioned. Neither is the relation of an example in an extraordinary case sufficient to cancel a direct precept and clear example with it. The sound use of the notion of concomitance would here do well; to wit, that if this phrase do denote the Lord's supper, then both kinds, by an usual synecdoche, are meant, when only one is mentioned.

(IV.) The fourth pretence of scripture is from Acts ii. 42, 46, and xx. 7; where it is said, the disciples "continued in the apostles' doctrine and fellowship, and breaking of bread;" and that "they were daily breaking bread from house to house;" and that "they met on the first day of the week, to break bread:" "In which places the Lord's supper is described only by breaking of bread, not a word of the cup." ||

ANSWER 1. It is not certain that under these expressions is meant the celebration of the Lord's supper; (the more inconsiderate they who affect to term the Lord's supper nothing but breaking of bread, when the scripture hath given it a more specifical and honourable name;) for some of the learned understand several of those places of distributing their provision to those that were in want, or of their common refectation together.¶ "Their communion," saith Chrysostom, "was with the apostles, not only in prayers, but also in doctrine and civil conversa-

* BELLARMINUS *De Euchar.* lib. iv. cap. 24. † ESTIUS in *lib. iv. dist. viii. sect. 11.*
 ‡ Vide SUAREZ *De Sacr. disp.* 71. § DIONYSIUS CARTHUSIANUS in *loc.*; JANSENII
Conc. Evang. cap. 146. || BELLARMINUS *De Euchar.* lib. iv. cap. 24. ¶ CAJE-
 TANUS in *loc.*; BEZA in *loc.*

tion." * Or else of their *agapæ*, or "love-feasts," which were frequently held at the end of their assemblies.

2. But if any of those places do point out the Lord's supper, we answer, that, by a common synecdoche, the one kind is put for both; nothing being more usual in scripture than to denote a complete sustenance by eating of bread; (Isai. lviii. 6, 7; Luke xiv. 1;) which may the rather convince our opponents, in that their council of Constance, as they urged none of these places to this purpose, so they expressly yield, that this sacrament was both instituted and used in the primitive church in both kinds: and it must be a clear and certain evidence that must cross the institution. Some few more scriptures are pretended, but being wholly inconsiderable to this purpose, I think [them] not worth the answering.

OBJECTION II. The second plea that is brought for communion in one kind, is from a *pretence of reason*. "For," say they, "the whole essence of a sacrament is comprised in one kind; † and whole Christ, who is the fountain of all grace, (both his divinity and humanity being now inseparably united together,) is by way of concomitance, his blood being now in his body, exhibited in one kind; ‡ so that there is no spiritual fruit to be reaped by both, that is not to be received by partaking of one kind; and therefore there is no need of both." §

ANSWER I. We deny that the whole essence of the Lord's supper is comprised under one kind; for there is neither the whole sign,—the cup being wanting, which signifies Christ's blood,—nor the whole thing signified, which is such an entire refreshment of soul, as bread and wine are of the body. || The Lord's supper is the sacrament of Christ's body and blood: But bread is not the sacrament of Christ's body and blood: Therefore bread alone is not the Lord's supper.

2. The doctrine of natural concomitance presupposeth Christ's natural body to be contained carnally under the form of bread, which will not only be denied, but plainly disproved. Where Christ's natural human body is, there, we grant his blood and soul and Divinity also are; but that body is now only in heaven.

3. They who urge this conceit yet do grant, that, by virtue of the sacramental words, only Christ's body is contained under the form of bread; ¶ and then we conclude, that whole Christ is not therein sacramentally. Christ's body is not sacramentally signified by the wine; ** neither is the communion of Christ's blood in this sacrament a work of nature, but depends merely on the institution and promise of Christ, and [is] to be measured thereby.

4. Though his body be now accompanied with blood in heaven, yet this sacrament was instituted to show the passion of Christ when he was on earth, which was with the pouring out of his blood; and blood

* *In loc.* serm. vi. † BELLARMINUS *De Euchar.* lib. iv. cap. 22. † Idem, *ibid.* cap. 21. § *Ibid.* cap. 23. || BONAVENTURA *in lib. iv. dist. xi. p. ii. art. i.* quæst. 2.

¶ AQUINATIS *Pars Tertia*, quæst. lxxvi. art. 2. ** *Corpus Christi non est sacramentaliter sub specie vini, nec sanguis sacramentaliter sub specie panis. Ergo, ut sacramentaliter sumatur Christus, necesse est ut sumatur sub duobus speciebus.*—ALEXANDER HALENNIS *in Partem Quartam*, quæst. xi. m. 2. "The body of Christ is not sacramentally contained under the form of wine, nor his blood sacramentally under the form of bread. Therefore, in order to sacramentally partaking of Christ, it is necessary that he should be received under two kinds."—EDIT.

poured out of the veins cannot be said to accompany or be conjoined to the body. Our Saviour would represent himself here not as a Lamb, but a Lamb sacrificed, and therefore the blood is severed from the body : as the money is not a prisoner's ransom while it lies in the chest, but when it is paid ; so the blood of Christ as shed is our ransom. And though now his blessed body and blood cannot be severed asunder, yet the signs of them are by his own appointment severed, and no man can drink the blood of Christ in eating of the bread : "The bread we break is the communion of his body," and "the cup we bless is" still "the communion of his blood." (1 Cor. x. 16.) And themselves affirm, that "their efficacy is but commensurate to their significancy ;" * and it is manifest, that the bread doth only signify the body of Christ, the wine only his blood.

5. Though no more profit were to be received by partaking of one kind than of both, (which yet some of their own deny, who say, that more devotion is raised, more faith exercised, and a more complete refreshment obtained by both than by one,†) yet more humble obedience is expressed to the will of the Lawgiver, who appointed both, and thereby showed the use and need of both.

OBJECTION III. The third objection that is made against the people's use of the sacred cup, is *pretence of reverence to the blood of Christ*, which by the promiscuous use of the cup might easily be spilt, especially where there is but one dispenser of the sacrament, and many communicants ; that it would be lost on the long beards of the laity ; that, being kept long, it would grow musty ; and that to impropriate it to the clergy, would at the same time preserve a great reverence both to it and to them also in the eyes of the vulgar.‡

ANSWER 1. God forbid that any of us should conceive or express any thing irreverently of our dear Redeemer's blood ; no, nor of the outward sign thereof. But doth not this objection reflect upon the Author of this sacrament that did so institute it, and upon all the ancient church that so used it, and yet such danger in it, yea, who communicated, and that in great numbers, at the least, every Lord's day ? And may not the sacred bread fall down and perish in like manner ? But this pretence many of the fathers in their own Trent council smiled at ; § well knowing that the church for above a thousand years, in her greatest straits and persecutions, kept-up a due reverence together with the constant use of this sacred cup.

But the second part of the objection is not so easily answered ; namely, that, by this restraint, the honour of the clergy, who are one time or other partakers of it, may more shine forth : for it is easier to answer ten arguments, than one corrupt affection. But this is the wrong way of contracting reverence and respect ; for men thus to seek their own glory, is not glory ; nor can any man expect, that God will bless those methods

* VASQUEZ in *Tertiam*, tom. iii. disp. ccxv. cap. 2. † *Illa tamen quæ est sub duabus est majoris meriti tum ratione augmentationis devotionis, tum ratione fidei dilata-tionis actualis, tum ratione sumptionis completioris.*—ALEXANDER HALENSIS in *Partem Quartam*, quæst. xi. m. 2. "That, however, which is presented under two forms is of greater merit, as well on account of the augmentation of devotion, as by reason of the actual enlargement of faith, and with regard to a more complete participation."—EDIT. So VASQUEZ. ‡ BELLARMINUS *De Euchar.* lib. iv. cap. 24. § *Historia Concil. Trident.* p. 585.

that do so plainly cross his will. And indeed this very thing, the clergy's honour, and that proud fear of being thought fallible in any thing, lest truth should get further ground, together with their ill-naturedness, that therefore will deny a thing because others desire it, are the greatest reasons of the present church of Rome for this their sacrilege.

OBJECTION IV. The fourth pretence they have is *of authority*.—They say, that “the custom of communicating under one kind being rationally introduced and long observed, the church, having now a greater liberty than the church had under the law, though she have no power to alter things of a moral, but only such as are of a positive, nature, hath fixed it as a law in several councils; and therefore it is to be so received and obeyed. And in case of disobedience, the secular arm is to be called in,”* which one of them confesses in this case to be the most necessary argument.†

ANSWER 1. That such a custom of communicating under one kind is crept into some part of the church, is certainly true; but that it was rationally introduced, or hath been anciently used, is certainly false. For how can that be ushered in with any reason which is directly against Christ's command? Whenas also every succeeding council is ashamed of the grounds their predecessors went upon; and one might refer it to any man that is not drunk with prejudice, whether there be one good reason for this alteration among all the number.‡ And that it hath been for a long time used is so false, that authentic writers in every age of the church stand ready at a call to evince, that the ordinary and public celebration of this sacrament was still in both kinds; the Roman cause being most indefensible in this point, even by their own usual weapons.

2. The universal church of God hath no authority to prohibit what God commands. In alterable circumstances, she may wisely and modestly use her power; but to change the testamentary institution of Christ, her Lord and Husband, she will not dare: what the Master commands, the good servant will not forbid. St. Paul saith, “The church is subject to Christ,” (Eph. v. 24,) and therefore may not oppose herself to Christ; for that (as Augustine §) “he always determines aright, but ecclesiastical judges, as men, are often mistaken.” The ministers of Christ are indeed the dispensers of the mysteries of God, but not lords to dispense with them and alter them at their pleasure; but must dispense them according to Christ's institution. And then for the church's liberty, it consists in having fewer and more easy ordinances than under the law, and grace to make her members willing to perform them; but it consists not in an uncontrolled power to add, alter, or diminish the institutions of Christ. He that breaketh the least command, and teacheth so, hath no place in the kingdom of heaven. (Matt. v. 19.) The Roman Priest may not alter or omit one ceremony in the Mass; and must they adventure to omit this sacred symbol of Christ's appointment?

3. The determination of the church of Rome is nothing to the universal church; being not a fourth part thereof, nor having any jurisdiction over other churches by any law of God. These pretended councils, that

* BELLARMINUS *De Euchar.* lib. iv. cap. 28.
chism. Rom. pars ii. p. 201.

† GERSON.

‡ Vide *Cate-*

§ *Contra Cresconium*, lib. ii. cap. 21.

have so boldly determined against the plain word of God, have also herein opposed former councils ; * in which case themselves tell us, that if councils are at odds with one another, and their definitions irreconcilable, we ought to take part with the ancient against the latter.† And as for that at Constance, which first determined this case, it was neither a general council, no bishop from the eastern church being there, nor wholly approved by the Romanists themselves, who do some of them profess, that it did decree against the order of nature, manifest scriptures, and all antiquity, in other cases ; ‡ and who then would heed them in this ? The like may justly be said of that at Basil ; § save only that they were more kind than their successors were, in granting upon some conditions the cup to the Bohemians.

And thus you see the utmost strength of our opponents in this point, —a heap of mere pretences, neither grounded on scripture, reason, nor antiquity ; but merely supported by feeble arguments and strong power.

IV. I now proceed to the fourth thing promised, and that is some application of all this to ourselves.

USE 1. *See here the abundance of our Saviour's love and care toward his church.*—He was not content only to die for us, but he ordained for our comfort this thankful memorial of his death, and that on purpose to help our faith and comfort ; and to this end appointed not only his flesh but his blood to be given, that if one kind did not sufficiently quicken and strengthen us, the other should be presently applied to perfect that good work in us : for he knew that we were dull of apprehension, and hard to be wrought upon. To see his body bruised for a poor sinner, *that* may work compunction, and erect a staggering faith : but to see again his blood, wherein is a man's life, poured out ; and to drink this also as an assuring pledge that he died in the sinner's stead ; how will this fill the believing soul with joy and comfort ! The blood of God,—*that* will surely expiate the sin of man. To support a poor beggar with a piece of bread, *that* is kindness ; but to quench his thirst also, that is double mercy. This is the mercy of our Redeemer. He calls, "Come, eat of my bread, and then drink of the wine that I have mingled." Not only, "Eat, O friends," but, saith he, "Drink, yea, drink abundantly, O beloved." (Canticles v. 2.) O love without comparison ! the same hands that have been lifted up against him, the same mouth that hath dishonoured him, shall yet taste that blood, one drop whereof is of more value than heaven and earth. When Alexander the Great was married to Statira, the daughter of Darius, he had six thousand guests, and gave to each of them a cup of gold ; but here are more guests to be served, and richer gifts that are bestowed. Here our dear Redeemer opens a wide fountain for a world of sinners ; and it is only "Wash, and be clean." (2 Kings v. 13.) That blessed truth is unquestionably here confirmed : "The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin." (1 John i. 7.)

* Concilia, Nicænum, Chalcedonense, Ancyranum, &c. See DR. FEATLEY'S "Grand Sacrilege," p. 172. † GRATIANUS, dist. 50. ‡ BELLARMINUS *De Concil.* cap. 7 ; ALBERTUS PIGHIUS.

§ *Hujus concilii nihil est ratum et probatum, nisi quedam dispositiones circa beneficia.* Concilium verò ipsum reprobatur in concilio Lateranensi ultimo, sess. xi.—BELLARMINUS *De Conc.* cap. 7. "Nothing enacted by this council is approved and confirmed, except certain arrangements respecting benefices. But the council itself is condemned in the last Lateran council."—EDIT.

Thus he hath chosen by two things, wherein it is impossible to lie, to exhibit a bleeding Saviour to cure a bloody sinner. (Heb. vi. 18.)

USE II. *See here the presumptuous sacrilege and injustice of the church of Rome.*—To corrupt Christ's last will, and to serve his family by the halves ; to darken so clear an institution, and defeat so plain a command : how will our dear Saviour resent so great a wrong ! He so free in shedding his blood, they so cruel in refusing it ! He so careful to make and seal his blessed testament, they so studious to deface it ! The Master of the house appoints such provision for his children ; the steward withholds the one half, and then thinks to appease their appetites with distinctions. He that takes so kindly "a cup of cold water" given to a disciple, (Matt. x. 42,) must needs take it unkindly when his own "cup of blessing" (1 Cor. x. 16) is denied them. What article of religion can be safe in such hands ? What intelligent man will embark himself in such company, that will overturn all scripture and antiquity to establish their conceits, that will privily tax Christ himself of weakness, and openly wrong his whole church at a blow ?

Indeed, if this device had had any tendency to promote love to God, or true piety ; if it had been bred and born in the church time out of mind ; their zeal and fondness for it might the sooner be forgiven : but to struggle so hard for a tenet that can no way pretend to promote true religion, a tenet that was never publicly owned in any church for one thousand four hundred years ; to deny the wine in the sacrament to the people, and yet the very vessels still extant in some of their vestries by which they conveyed it to the people's mouths ; to make such a bare-faced error tantamount to an article of faith, and then to accurse them from Christ that shall endeavour after his blood ; what shall we say to these things ? Yea, to say, as one of their cardinals * did in the college, that to yield the cup to the laity was to offer them poison instead of physic ; (he had not forgotten that wretched monk, Bernard, that poisoned a Christian emperor, Henry VI., with the cup at the sacrament ;) to declare that to ask the cup savoured of heresy, and was, in short, a mortal sin, as some of them said in the meeting at Trent : † these things do raise their guilt to a very great height, and would enforce all considering men to bless themselves from such a society.

The usual refuge of these men, when they are baffled by the scriptures, is to shelter themselves in tradition, under councils, or among the fathers ; but in this point the more ingenuous of them do confess that all are against them, and the more impudent make but feeble defences from them. Divers of their own bishops, in the very council of Trent, argued and voted for the truth ; several princes of that religion interceded for it, and afforded the cup to their subjects : ‡ and a great prelate, when no good would be done therein, writes to Cæsar, that no relief was there to be expected, where voices were always numbered, never weighed. § And is not the force of truth very great, when it extorts an approbation, even from the party that opposeth it ? And it is not long since a con-

* Cardinal St. Angelo.—*Hist. Conc. Trid.* p. 516.

Preval.—*Hist. Conc. Trid.* p. 637.
the duke of Bavaria, the king of Poland.

† Richardus de Verelli, Abbé
‡ The emperor Ferdinand, the king of France, the

§ DUDITHIUS, episcopus Quinqueeclesiensis,
in Epist. ad Maximilianum II.

cession of both kinds was signified to this very nation, on condition that we would come over to them : * thus God himself shall not have his will, unless withal they may have theirs.

And yet this is that church which so many extol, that is set out by such alluring beauty, and wherein so many blind souls are herded : a fit religion for those that resolve to have none, and for such children who will renounce a true Father to obey a false and cruel mother !

USE III. *See here the folly of such among us who deprive themselves both of the sacred bread and cup in this ordinance.*—While we are vindicating one part of this sacrament, how many are slighting the whole !

1. Some do live in this sin of omission *out of an atheistical and profane principle*, having no sense of duty or conscience of religion at all : the table of the Lord is contemptible to them. Thus many hundreds and thousands of adult persons never did once taste of these gospel-dainties. Jesus Christ saith, "Take, eat : this is my body ;" "Drink ye all of this cup of blessing ;" but they flatly refuse their Redeemer's command. Alas, poor souls ! will ye never have any need of him ? Can you satisfy the justice of an offended God by your own imperfect righteousness ? With what face can you crave atonement by that blood which you have despised ? How can you be ever cleansed by that blood which you have refused to drink ? Bethink yourselves. The blood you condemn is nobler than any that runs in your veins : it is the blood of the Son of God, to whom the stoutest of you must flee, first or last : and if you now turn the deaf ear to his gracious calls, how justly may he refuse your cries in the day of your misery ! "Be wise, therefore ; and kiss the Son, lest he be angry, and ye perish in the way." (Psalm ii. 10, 12.)

2. Others neglect this ordinance *out of a supine negligence*, neither knowing their duty, nor caring for any of these things. (Acts xviii. 17.) One would wonder how stupidly men do hear their duty pressed upon them in this particular, [as if] not at all concerned. They hold their estates and credits by another tenure. Lands and houses pass not by the covenant of grace, nor are sealed with the seals thereof. They imagine that to prepare for and partake hereof will somewhat dis-ease them, and oblige them to the difficult and dreaded work of self-examination and godly sorrow ; and so they sleep quietly in this notorious disobedience. Hunger will haste to meat, guilt to pardon, pain to ease sorrow to comfort : but where there is no sense of the former, there is no haste to the latter !—O that such would read and consider that fearful sentence in a like case : "The man that is clean, and is not in a journey, and forbeareth to keep the passover, even the same soul shall be cut off from among his people : because he brought not the offering of the Lord in his appointed season, that man shall bear his sin." (Num. ix. 13.) And never imagine that grace or comfort will be found in Christ without the use of his own ordinances, or the end attained without the means.

3. Others do frequently deprive themselves of the Lord's supper *for the sake of some sin or other*, (if the truth were known,) *which they are loath to leave.*—Thus stomachs that are clogged with noisome humours,

* CAMDEN'S "Elizabeth," p. 59.

quite take away the appetite. If anger, malice, envy, unruly passions, if sensual delights, be cherished within, or be not heartily hated and mortified, there will be no room for the blood or grace of Jesus Christ. But, sirs, do you mean to live, and consequently die, in these sins? What then will become of you? If you do desire to leave and conquer them, why do you avoid the means? Will any of these sins excuse your present omissions? Not at all: one sin can never excuse another. What child or servant will be excused from coming to meat when you call them, by saying, their hands are unclean, and they have no mind to wash them? Do you conceit that there is more real sweetness in your sins than in Christ? in the filth and dregs of the world, than in the Maker and Glory of the world? "Taste and see how good the Lord is," (Psalm xxxiv. 8,) and let "the love of Christ constrain" you to your undoubted duty. (2 Cor. v. 14.)

4. Others again do deprive themselves of the Lord's supper *out of a superstitious fear of approaching to it*; the rather, because the scripture saith, that the unworthy receiver becomes "guilty of the body and blood of the Lord," and withal "eateth and drinketh his own damnation." (1 Cor. xi. 27, 29.) Now a religious fear there ought to be, which should not only oblige a man to prepare himself for this ordinance, but for every other. If it were a well-governed conscience that ruled them, it would make them as careful of praying and hearing, as of communicating; and it is most certain, that whoso cannot rightly partake, can neither rightly pray nor hear. And the danger of miscarriage is much the same in the one as in the other: for, to have the word become a savour of death, and a man's prayers to become sin, differs nothing in effect from being guilty of Christ's death, or of eating "judgment," (which that word, *κριμα*, doth properly import,) that is, deserving God's anger, and the effects of it to a man's self.

A grievous sin, this unworthy receiving, no doubt; but not unpardonable, nor such as should discourage the weakest child of God from sincere endeavours, and then a cheerful communicating. For this sacrament was never intended to seal our perfection, but to help our imperfection. If a wife were lovingly invited to feast with her husband, or a child by a father, would it not lay an imputation of an unsufferable severity in the husband or father, or else of secret guilt, ignorance, or want of love in the wife or child, to refuse to come, lest they should not be duly qualified? Even so in this case: Our blessed Redeemer most lovingly calls us to his supper: what other construction can be made of our refusal, but that either he is rigorous, or we faulty? In this case we cannot do better than like wise Abigail, when David sent to take her to him to wife: "She arose, and bowed herself on her face to the earth, and said, Behold, let thy handmaid be a servant to wash the feet of the servants of my lord." (1 Sam. xxv. 41.) Here is a due sense of her own unworthiness. But in the next verse, 42, she "hasted, and arose, and went after his messengers, and became his wife." Keep-up a due sense of your own unworthiness; but let not that hinder you from going when he calleth you. If you perish, yet perish in a way of duty. How many do we meet with on their death-beds grievously troubled in conscience for their neglect herein! If you are unfit for the Lord's supper,

you are unfit to die; and how dare you live in a condition altogether unfit to die? O remember that stinging scripture: "If a man keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all." (James ii. 10.)

USE IV. Lastly. *Let us all take care to improve this legacy, the blessed cup of Christ's blood, that this point lie not, like grounds long in suit, barren and unprofitable.*—While there is such stickling for the sign, let us strive after the thing signified. Shall we contend so earnestly for this jewel, and then not wear it? Shall we venture so hardly for this water of Bethlehem, and then pour it out when we have done? O, no. Let us squeeze all possible virtue out of this sacred cup; let us go up by the stream to the spring; having opened the shell, let us feed upon the kernel: let us remember Christ's bitter death and passion for us. Is thy heart impenitent? Steep it in the blood of this Scape-goat. Is thy faith weak and fainting? Here is sense to help thy faith: Apply the mouth of thy faith to his wounds, and "be not faithless, but believing." (John xx. 27.) Is thy conscience unquiet? Bring it to be there sprinkled with the merit of his blood. Are thy sins as many as the sands? His blood is as large as the ocean, to overflow them all. When this blessed cup is poured out, let thy eyes pour down a flood of tears mixed of grief and joy: to see such a person pouring out his life by thy procurement,—this should melt thee with grief: to see the price paid by that blood for thee, should lift thee up into a trance of joy. When thou takest that cup of salvation, think, "'What shall I render to the Lord for this his benefit to me?' (Psalm cxvi. 12.) 'Who is this that comes with dyed garments from Bozrah? how glorious is he in his apparel!' (Isai. lxiii. 1.) How bitter was his passion! how sweet his compassion to poor sinners! 'Be ye lift up, O my everlasting doors, and let the King of glory come in.'" (Psalm xxiv. 7.) Bring him into thy soul, and there feed upon him by faith, and let his fruit be savoury to thy taste. (Canticles ii. 3.) Inward communion is the crown of an ordinance; it is "the cup of the new testament in Christ's blood, which was shed for you;" (Luke xxii. 20;) receive it with reverence, receive it with thankfulness, receive it with application: remember his death, remember his love more than wine. (Canticles i. 2.)

Let us not only defend the truth, but improve it. If we feel no virtue or comfort in the blood of Christ, we shall be tempted to throw away the cup as well as others. When we find no marrow in the bone, we throw it away. He that profits by ordinances will best value them; he that is refreshed by wine will never cry down the vine: but a formal partaker will easily be weaned; and when the children do but play with the drink, the father may justly take away the cup from them.