

A

96

DISCOURSE

AGAINST

Transubstantiation.

By a Reverend Divine of the Church of England.

DUBLIN;

Re-Printed By Andrew Crook, and Samuel Hellsham,
For Joseph Hoxes at the Kings-Arms, and
Eliphal Dobson at the Stationers-Arms
in Castlestreeet, 1686.

A

DISCOUR

AGAINST

Advertisement.

IF this finds Acceptance, there will be Printed
several other Cases of the London Divines of
the Church of England against Popery.

DUBLIN;

Houses

A Discourse Against Transubstantiation.

Concerning the *Sacrament of the Lords Supper*, one of the two great positive Institutions of the Christian Religion, there are two main Points of difference between *Us* and the Church of *Rome*. One, about the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*; in which they think, but are not certain, that they have the Scripture and the words of our Saviour on their side: The other, about the administration of this Sacrament to the people in both kinds; in which we are sure that we have the Scripture and our Saviour's Institution on our side; and that so plainly, that our Adversaries themselves do not deny it.

Of the *first* of these I shall now treat, and endeavour to shew against the Church of *Rome*, That in this Sacrament there is no substantial change made of the Elements of Bread and Wine into the natural Body and Bloud of Christ; that *Body* which was born of the *Virgin Mary*, and suffered upon the Cross; for so they explain that hard word *Transubstantiation*.

Before I engage in this Argument, I cannot but observe what an unreasonable task we are put upon, by the bold confidence of our Adversaries, to dispute a matter of Sense; which is one of those things about which *Aristotle* hath long since pronounc'd there ought to be no dispute,

It might well seem strange if any man should write a book, to prove that an *Egg* is not an *Elephant*, and that a *Musket-Bullet* is not a *Pike*: It is every whit as hard a case, to be put to maintain by a long Discourse, that what we see and handle and taste to be *Bread* is *Bread*, and not the *Body of a Man*; and what we see and taste to be *Wine* is *Wine*, and not *Bloud*: And if this evidence may not pass for sufficient without any farther proof, I do not see why any man, that hath confidence enough to do so; may not deny any thing to be what all the World sees it is; or affirm any thing to be what all the World sees it is not; and this without all possibility of being farther confuted. So that the business of *Transubstantiation* is not a controversie of Scripture against Scripture, or of Reason against Reason, but of downright Impudence against the plain meaning of Scripture, and the Sense and Reason of Mankind.

It is a most Self-evident False-hood; and there is no Doctrine or Proposition in the World that is of it self more evidently true, than *Transubstantiation* is evidently false: And yet if it were possible to be true, it would be the most ill-natur'd and pernicious truth in the World, because it would

suffer nothing else to be true; it is like the *Roman-Catholick* Church, which will needs be the whole Christian Church, and will allow no other Society of Christians to be any part of it: So *Transubstantiation*, if it be true at all it is all truth; for it cannot be true unless our senses and the senses of all mankind be deceived about their proper objects; and if this be true and certain then nothing else can be so; for if we be not certain of what we see, we can be certain of nothing.

And yet notwithstanding all this, there is a company of men in the world so abandon'd and given up by God to the efficacy of delusion as in good earnest to believe this gross and palpable Error, and to impose the belief of it upon the Christian World under no less penalties than of temporal death and Eternal damnation. And therefore to undeceive, if possible these deluded Souls, it will be necessary to examine the pretended grounds of so false a Doctrine, and to lay open the monstrous absurdity of it.

And in the handling of this Argument, I shall proceed in this plain method.

I. I shall consider the pretended grounds and reasons of the Church of *Rome* for this Doctrine.

II. I shall produce our *Objections* against it. And if I can shew that there is no tolerable ground for it, and that there are invincible *Objections* against it, then every man is not onely in reason excused from believing the Doctrine, but hath great cause to believe the contrary.

I. First, I will consider the pretended grounds and reasons of the Church of *Rome* for this Doctrine. Which must be one or more of these *five*. Either 1st. The Authority of Scripture. Or 2ly. The perpetual belief of this Doctrine in the Christian Church, as an evidence that they always understood and interpreted our Saviour's words, *This is my Body*, in this sense. Or 3ly. The authority of the present Church, to make and declare new Articles of Faith. Or 4ly. The absolute necessity of such a change as this in the Sacrament to the comfort and benefit of those who receive this Sacrament. Or 5ly. To magnifie the power of the Priest in being able to work so great a Miracle.

1st. They pretend for this Doctrine the Authority of Scripture in the words of our Saviour. *This is my Body*. Now to shew the insufficiency of this pretence, I shall endeavour to make good these *two* things.

1. That there is no necessity of understanding those words of our Saviour in the sense of *Transubstantiation*.

2. That there is a great deal of reason to understand them otherwise.

First, That there is no necessity to understand those words of our Sa

A Discourse against Transubstantiation.

our in the sense of *Transubstantiation*. If there be any, it must be from one of these two reasons. Either because there are no figurative expressions in Scripture, which I think no man ever yet said: or else, because a Sacrament admits of no figures; which would be very absurd for any man to say, since it is of the very nature of a Sacrament to represent and exhibit some invisible grace and benefit by an outward sign and figure: And especially since it cannot be denied, but that in the institution of this very Sacrament our Saviour useth figurative expressions and several words which cannot be taken strictly and literally. When he gave the Cup he said, *This Cup is the new Testament in my blood, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of Sins*. Where first, the Cup is put for *Wine* contained in the Cup; or else if the words be literally taken, so as to signify a substantial change, it is not of the *Wine* but of the *Cup*; and that, not into the *Bloud of Christ* but into the *New Testament* or *new Covenant* in his *Bloud*. Besides, that his *Bloud* is said then to be shed, and his *Body* to be broken, which was not till his *Passion*, which followed the institution and first celebration of this Sacrament.

But that there is no necessity to understand our Saviour's words in the sense of *Transubstantiation*, I will take the plain concession of a great number of the most learned Writers of the Church of *Rome* in this Controversie. (a) *Bellarmino*, (b) *Suarez* and (c) *Vasquez* do acknowledge *Scotus* the great *Schoolman* to have said that this Doctrine cannot be evidently proved from Scripture: And *Bellarmino* grants this not to be improbable; and *Suarez* and *Vasquez* acknowledge (d) *Durandus* to have said as much. (e) *Ocham* another famous *Schoolman* says expressly, that the Doctrine which holds the substance of the *Bread* and *Wine* to remain after *Consecration*, is neither repugnant to Reason nor to Scripture. (f) *Petrus ab Alliaco* Cardinal of *Cambray* says plainly, that the Doctrine of the Substance of *Bread* and *Wine* remaining after *Consecration*, is more easy and free from absurdity, more rational, and no ways repugnant to the authority of Scripture; nay more, that for the other Doctrine, viz. of *Transubstantiation*, there is no evidence in Scripture. (g) *Gabriel Biel*, another great *Schoolman* and *Divine* of their Church, freely declares, that as to any thing expressed in the Canon of the Scriptures, a man may believe that the substance of *Bread* and *Wine* doth remain after *Consecration*: and therefore he resolves the belief of *Transubstantiation* into some other Revelation, besides Scripture, which he suppoeth the Church had

(a) de Euch. l. 3. c. 23.
 (b) in 3. dis. 49: Qu. 75. sect. 2:
 (c) in 3 part: disp. 18c.
 Qu. 75: art. 2:
 c. 15.
 (d) in Sent. l. 4. dis. 11:
 Qu. 1: m. 15:
 (e) in 4: Sent: Qu. 5: Q. 2:
 Quodl. 4: Q. 2:
 (f) in 4: Sent: Qu. 6: art. 2:
 (g) in canon. Miss. Lect. 4

(h) in Aquin.
3 part. Qu. 75.
art. 1.

had about it. Cardinal (h) *Cajetan* confesseth that the Gospel doth no where express that the Bread is changed into the body of Christ; that we have this from the authority of the Church; may, he goes farther, that there is nothing in the Gospel which enforceth any man to understand these words of Christ, this is my body, in a proper, and not a metaphorical sense; but the Church having understood them in a proper sense they are to be so explained; Which words in the Roman Edition of *Cajetan* are expunged by order of Pope (i) *Pius V* Cardinal (k) *Contarenus*, and (l) *Melchior Canus* one of the best and most judicious Writers that Church ever had, reckon this Doctrine among those which are not so expressly found in Scripture. I will add but one more of great authority in the Church, and a reputed Martyr, (m) *Fisher* Bishop of *Rochester* who ingeniously confesseth that in the words of the Institution there is not one word from whence the true presence of the flesh and blood of Christ in our Mass can be proved: So that we need not much contend that this Doctrine hath no certain foundation in Scripture, when this is so fully and frankly acknowledged by our Adversaries themselves.

Secondly, If there be no necessity of understanding our Saviour's words in the sense of *Transubstantiation*, I am sure there is a great deal of reason to understand them otherwise. Whether we consider the like expressions in Scripture; as where our Saviour says he is *the door*, and *the true Vine* (which the Church of *Rome* would mightily have triumph'd in, had been said, *this is my true body*.) And so likewise where the Church is said to be *Christ's body*; and the *Rock* which followed the *Israelites* to be *Christ* 1 Cor. 10. 4. *They drank of that rock which followed them, and that rock was Christ*: All which and innumerable more like expressions in Scripture every man understands in a figurative, and not in a strictly literal and absurd sense. And it is very well known; that in the *Hebrew Language* things are commonly said to be that which they do signify and represent; and there is not in that Language a more proper and usual way of expressing a thing to signify so and so, than to say that it is so and so. Thus *Joseph* expounding *Pharaoh's* dream to him, Gen. 41. 26. Says, *the seven good Kine are seven years, and the seven good ears of corn are seven years, that they signified or represented seven years of plenty; and so Pharaoh understood him, and so would any man of sense understand the like expressions; nor do I believe that any sensible man, who had never heard of Transubstantiation being grounded upon these words of our Saviour, th*

is my Body, would upon reading the institution of the Sacrament in the Gospel ever have imagin'd any such thing to be meant by our Saviour in those words; but would have understood his meaning to have been, *this Bread signifies my Body, this Cup signifies my Blood*; and this which you see me now do, do ye hereafter for a Memorial of me. But surely it would never have entered into any mans mind to have thought that our Saviour did literally hold himself in his hand, and give away himself from himself with his own hands.

Or whether we compare these words of our Saviour with the ancient Form of the Passover used by the Jews from Ezra's time, as (n) Justin Martyr tells us, *ὅτι οὗτος ὁ ἀγάλματός ἐστιν ἡμῶν καὶ ἡ καταγωγή ἡμῶν, this Passover is our Saviour and our refuge*: not that they believed the Paschal Lamb to be substantially changed either into God their Saviour who delivered them out of the Land of Egypt, or into the Messias the Saviour whom they expected, and who was signified by it: But this Lamb which they did eat did represent to them, and put them in mind of that Salvation which God wrought for their Fathers in Egypt, when by the slaying of a Lamb, and sprinkling the blood of it upon their doors, their first-born were passed over and spared; and did likewise forethow the Salvation of the Messias, the Lamb of God, that was to take away the sins of the World.

(n) Dialog. cum Tryph. p. 297: Edit. Paris. 1639.

And nothing is more common in all Languages than to give the name of the thing signified to the sign. As the delivery of a Deed or Writing under hand and Seal is call'd a conveyance or making over of such an Estate, and it is really so; not the delivery of mere wax and parchment, but the conveyance of a real Estate; as truly and really to all effects and purposes of Law, as if the very material houses and Lands themselves could be and were actually delivered into my hands: In like manner the names of the things themselves made over to us in the new Covenant of the Gospel between God and man, are given to the Signs or Seals of that Covenant.

By Baptism Christians are said to be made partakers of the Holy Ghost, Heb. 6. 4. And by the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper we are said to communicate or to be made partakers of the Body of Christ which was broken, and of his Blood which was shed for us, that is, of the real benefits of his death and passion. And thus St. Paul speaks of this Sacrament, 1 Cor. 10. 16. *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?* But still it is bread, and he still calls it so, v. 17. *For we being many are one bread and one body; for we are partakers of that one bread.* The Church of Rome might, if they pleased, as well argue from hence that all Christians are sub-

stantiably changed first into Bread, and then into the natural Body of Christ by their participation of the Sacrament, because they are said thereby to be *one bread*, and *one body*. And the same Apostle in the next Chapter, after he had spoken of the consecration of the Elements, still calls them the *Bread and the Cup*, in three verses together, *As often as ye eat the Bread, and drink this cup*, v. 26. *Whosoever shall eat this bread and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily*, v. 27. *But let a man examine himself, and let him eat of this bread and drink of that cup*, v. 28. And our Saviour himself when he had said, *this is my blood of the new Testament*, immediately adds, *but I say unto you, I will not henceforth drink of this fruit of the Vine until I drink it new with you in my Father's Kingdom*, Matth. 26. 29. That is, not till after his resurrection, which was the first step of his exaltation into the Kingdom given him by his Father, when the Scripture tells us he did eat and drink with his Disciples. But that which I observe from our Saviour's words is, that after the consecration of the *Cup* and the delivering of it to his Disciples to drink of it; he tells them that he would henceforth drink no more of the fruit of the Vine, which he had now drank with them till after his Resurrection. From whence it is plain that it was the fruit of the Vine, real wine, with our Saviour drank of and communicated to his Disciples in the Sacrament.

Besides, if we consider that he celebrated this Sacrament before his Passion, it is impossible these words should be understood literally of the natural body and blood of Christ; because it was *his Body broken* and *his blood shed* which he gave to his Disciples, which if we understand literally of his natural body broken and his blood shed, and these words, *this is my body which is broken*, and *this is my blood which is shed*, could not be true, because his Body was then whole and unbroken, and his blood not then shed; nor could it be a *propitiatory Sacrifice* (as they affirm this Sacrament to be) unless they will say that propitiation was made before Christ suffer'd: And it is likewise impossible that the Disciples should understand these words literally, because they not onely plainly saw that what he gave them was *Bread and Wine*, but they saw likewise as plainly that it was not his Body which was given, but his Body which gave that which was given; not his *body broken* and his *blood shed*, because they saw him alive at that very time and beheld his body whole and unpierc'd; and therefore they could not understand these words literally: If they did, can we imagine that the Disciples who upon all other occasions were so full of questions and objections, should make no difficulty of this matter? nor so much as ask our Saviour, *how can these things be?* that they should not tell him, we see this to be Bread and

A Discourse against Transubstantiation.

that to be Wine, and we see thy Body to be distinct from both ; we see thy Body not broken, and thy Blood not shed

From all which it must needs be very evident, to any man that will impartially consider things, how little reason there is to understand those words of our Saviour, *this is my body*, and *this is my blood*, in the sense of *Transubstantiation* ; nay on the contrary, that there is very great reason and an evident necessity to understand them otherwise. I proceed to shew,

2^{ly}. That this Doctrine is not grounded upon the *perpetual beliefe of the Christian Church*, which the Church of Rome vainly pretends as an evidence that the Church did always understand and interpret our Saviour's words in this sense.

To manifest the groundlessness of this pretence, I shall, 1. shew by plain testimony of the *Fathers* in several Ages, that this Doctrine was not the belief of the ancient Christian Church. 2. I shall shew the time and occasion of its coming in, and by what degrees it grew up and was establish'd in the *Roman Church*. 3. I shall answer their great pretended Demonstration that this always was and must have been the constant belief of the Christian Church.

1. I shall shew by plain Testimonies of the *Fathers* in several Ages, for above five hundred years after Christ, that this Doctrine was not the *belief of the ancient Christian Church*. I deny not but that the *Fathers* do, and that with great reason, very much magnifie the wonderfull mystery and efficacy of this Sacrament, and frequently speak of a great Supernatural change made by the divine benediction ; which we also readily acknowledge. They say indeed, that the Elements of Bread and Wine do by the divine blessing become to us the Body and Blood of Christ : But they likewise say that the names of the things signified are given to the signs ; that the Bread and Wine do still remain in their proper nature and substance, and that they are turn'd into the substance of our Bodies ; that the Body of Christ in the Sacrament is not his natural Body, but the sign and figure of it ; not that Body which was crucified, nor that Blood which was shed upon the Cross ; and that it is impious to understand the *eating of the flesh of the Son of man* and *drinking his blood* literally : all which are directly opposite to the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* and utterly inconsistent with it. I will select but some few Testimonies of many which I might bring to this purpose.

I begin with *Justin Martyr*, who says expressly, that *our blood and Flesh are nourished by the conversion of that food which we receive in the Eucharist* : But *that* cannot be the natural body and blood of Christ, for no man will say that *that* is con-

The Second is *Irenæus*, (*Lib. 4. c. 34.*) who speaking of this Sacrament says, that the bread which is from the earth receiving the divine invocation is now no longer common bread, but the Eucharist (or Sacrament) consisting of two things, the one earthly, the other heavenly. he says it is no longer common bread, but after invocation or consecration it becomes the Sacrament that is, bread sanctified, consisting of two things an earthly and a heavenly the earthly thing is bread, and the heavenly is the divine blessing which by the invocation or consecration is added to it. And elsewhere he hath this passage, (*Lib. 5. c. 2.*) when therefore the cup that is mix'd (that is, of Wine and Water) and the bread that is broken receives the word of God, it becomes the Eucharist of the blood and body of Christ, of which the substance of our flesh is increased and consists: but if that which we receive in the Sacrament do nourish our bodies, it must be bread and wine, and not the natural body and blood of Christ. There is another remarkable Testimony of *Irenæus*, which though it be not now extant in those works of his which remain, yet hath been preserv'd by * *Oecumenius* and it is this; when (says he) the Greeks had taken some Servants, of the Christian Cathecumeni (that is, such as had not been admitted to the Sacrament) and afterwards urged them by violence to tell them some of the secrets of the Christians, these Servants having nothing to say that might gratify those who offered violence to them, except onely that they had heard from their Masters that the divine Communion was the blood and body of Christ, they thinking, that it was really blood and flesh, declar'd as much to those that questioned them. The Greeks taking this as if it were really done by the Christians, discovered it to the others of the Greeks; who hereupon put *Sansus* and *Blandina* to the torture to make them confess it. To whom *Blandina* boldly answered, How would they endure to do this, who by way of exercise (or abstinence) do not eat that flesh which may lawfully be eaten? By which it appears that this which they would have charg'd upon Christians, as if they had literally eaten the flesh and blood of Christ in the Sacrament, was a false accusation which these Martyrs denied, saying they were so far from that that they for their parts did not eat any flesh at all.

The next is *Tertullian*, who proves against *Marchion* the Heretique that the body of our Saviour was not a mere phantasm and appearance, but a real body, because the Sacrament is a figure and image of his Body; and if there be an image of his body he must have a real body, otherwise the Sacrament would be an image of an image. His words are these, * the bread which our Saviour took and distributed to his Disciples he made his one body, saying this is my

* *Advers. Marcionem*, l. 4. p. 57.
 Edit. Rigalt. Paris
 1634.

body, that is, the image or figure of my body. But it could not have been the figure of his body, if there had not been a true and real body. And arguing against the Scepticks who denied the certainty of sense he useth this Argument: That if we question our senses we may doubt whether our Blessed Saviour were not deceived, in what he heard, and saw and touched. (Lib. de Anima, p. 319.) He might (says he) be deceived in the voice from heaven, in the smell of the ointment with which he was anointed against his burial; and in the taste of the wine which he consecrated in remembrance of his blood. So that it seems we are to trust our senses, even in the matter of the Sacrament; and if that be true, the Doctrine of Transubstantiation is certainly false.

Origen in his Comment on Matth. 15, speaking of the Sacrament hath this passage, (Edit. Huetii.) That food which is sanctified by the word of God and prayer, as to that of it which is material, goeth into the belly and is cast out into the draught, which none surely will say of the Body of Christ. And afterwards he adds by way of explication, it is not the matter of the bread, but the word which is spoken over it, which profiteth him that worthily eateth the Lord, and this (he says) he had spoken concerning the Typical and Symbolical body. So that the matter of bread remaineth in the Sacrament, and this Origen calls the Typical and Symbolical body of Christ; and it is not the natural body of Christ which is there eaten, for the food eaten in the Sacrament, as to that of it which is material, goeth into the belly and is cast out into the draught. This testimony is so very plain in the Cause that Iustus Senensis suspects this place of Origen was depraved by the Heretiques. Cardinal Perron is contended to allow it to be Origen's, but rejects his testimony because he was accused of Heresie by some of the Fathers, and says he talks like a Heretique in this place. So that with much ado this testimony is yielded to us. The same Father in his Homilies upon Leviticus (Cap. 10) speaks thus, There is also in the New Testament a letter which kills him who doth not Spiritually understand those things which are said; for if we take according to the Letter that which is said, EXCEPT YE EAT MI FLESH AND DRINK MI BLOOD, This Letter kills. And this also is a killing Testimony, and not to be answered but in Cardinal Perron's way, by saying he talks like a Heretique.

St. Cyprian hath a whole Epistle (Ep. 63.) to Cecilius against those who gave the Communion in Water onely without Wine mingled with it; and his main argument against them is this, that the blood of Christ with which we are redeemed and quickened cannot seem to be in the Cup when there is no Wine in the Cup by which the Blood of Christ is represented; and afterwards

he says, that contrary to the Evangelical and Apostolical Doctrine water was in some places offer'd (or given) in the Lord's Cup, which (says he) alone cannot express (or represent) the blood of Christ. And lastly he tells, us that by water the people is understood, by Wine the blood of Christ is shewn (or represented) but when in the Cup water is mingled with Wine the people is united to Christ. So that according to this Argument Wine in the Sacramental Cup is no otherwise chang'd into the blood of Christ than the Water mixed with it is changed into the People, which are said to be united to Christ.

I omit many others, and pass to St. Austin in the fourth Age after Christ. And I the rather insist upon his Testimony, because of his eminent esteem and authority in the Latin Church; and he also calls the Elements of the

Sacrament the figure and sign of Christ's body and blood. In his

Book against Adimantius the Manichee we have this expression

* Aug: Tom. 6.
p. 187. Edit.
Basil. 1569.

* our Lord did not doubt to say, this is my Body, when he gave the

Sign of his body. And in his explication of the third Psalm

speaking of Judas whom our Lord admitted to his last supper

† Enarrant. in
Psal. Tom. 8.
p. 16.

in which (says he) † he commended and delivered to his Disci-

ples the figure of his body; Language which would not be cen-

sured for Heresie in the Church of Rome. Indeed he was never

accus'd of Heresie, as Cardinal Perron says Origen was, but he talks as like

one as Origen himself. And in his Comment on the 98 Psalm speaking of the

offence which the Disciples took at that saying of our Saviour, except ye

eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, &c. he brings in our Sa-

vour speaking thus to them, (Id. Tim. 9. p. 1105.) ye must understand Spi-

ritually what I have said unto you; ye are not to eat this body which ye see, and

to drink that blood which shall be shed by those that crucifie me. I have com-

mended a certain Sacrament to you, which being Spiritually understood will

give you life. What more opposite to the Doctrine of Transubstantiation, than

that the Disciples were not to eat that Body of Christ which they saw, nor

to drink that blood which was shed upon the Cross, but that all this was to

be understood spritually and according to the nature of a Sacrament; For

that body he tells us is not here but in heaven, in his Commen-

upon these words, me ye have not always. * He speaks (says he)

of the presence of his body; ye shall have me according to my pro-

vidence, according to Majesty and invisible grace; but according to

the flesh which the Word assumed, according to that which was born of the Vir-

gin Mary, ye shall not have me: therefore because he conversed with his Di-

sciples forty days, he is ascended up into heaven and is not here.

* Id. Tract:
50. in Johan.

In his 23d. Epistle; (Id. Tom. 2, p. 93.) *if the Sacraments (says he) had not some resemblance of those things whereof they are Sacraments, they would not be Sacraments at all; but from this resemblance they take for the most part the names of the things which they represent. Therefore as the Sacrament of the body of Christ is in some manner or sense Christ's body, and the Sacrament of his blood is the blood of Christ; So the Sacrament of faith (meaning Baptism) is faith. Upon which words of St. Austin there is this remarkable Gloss in their own Canon Law; || the heavenly Sacrament which truly represents the flesh of Christ is called the body of Christ; but improperly: whence it is said, that after a manner, but not according to the truth of the thing but the mystery of the thing signified; So that the meaning is, it is called the body of Christ, that is, it signifies the body of Christ: And if this be St. Austin's meaning, I am sure no Protestant can speak more plainly against Transubstantiation. And in the ancient Canon of the Mass before it was chang'd in compliance with this new Doctrine, it is expressly call'd a Sacrament, a Sign an Image and a figure of Christ's body. To which I will add that remarkable passage of St. Austin cited by * Gracian, that as we receive the similitude of his death in Baptism, so we may also receive the likeness of his flesh and blood; that so neither may truth be wanting in the Sacrament, nor Pagans have occasion to make us ridiculous for drinking the blood of one that was slain.*

|| De Consecr. dist. 2. Hoc est.

* De consecrat. dist. 2. Sect. Utrum.

I will mention but one Testimony more of this Father, but so clear a one as it is impossible any man in his wits that had believed Transubstantiation could have utter'd. It is in his *Treatise de Doctrina Christiana; (Lib. 3. Tom. 3. p. 53.)* where laying down several Rules for the right understanding of Scripture, he gives this for one. *If, (says he) the speech be a precept forbidding some heinous wickedness or crime, or commanding us to do good, it is not figurative; but if it seem to command any heinous wickedness or crime, or to forbid that which is profitable and beneficial to others, it is figurative. For example, Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink his blood, ye have no life in you: This seems to command a heinous wickedness and crime, therefore it is a figure; commanding us to communicate of the passion of our Lord, and with delight and advantage to lay up in our memory that his flesh was crucified and wounded for us. So that according to St. Austin's best skill in interpreting Scripture, the literal eating of the flesh of Christ and drinking his blood would have been a great impiety; and therefore the expression is to be understood figuratively; not as Cardinal Perron who would have it, only in opposition to the eating of his flesh and blood in the gross appearance*

of flesh and blood, but to the real eating of his natural body and blood under any appearance whatsoever: For St. *Austin* doth not say, this is a Figurative speech wherein we are commanded really to feed upon the natural body and blood of Christ under the *species* of bread and wine, as the *Cardinal* would understand him; for then the speech would be literal and not figurative: But he says, that this is a figurative speech wherein we are commanded Spiritually to feed upon the remembrance of his Passion.

To these I will add but *three* or *four* Testimonies more in the *two* following Ages.

The first shall be of *Theodoret*, who speaking of that Prophecy of *Jacob* concerning our Saviour, (*Gen. 49. 11.*) *he washed his garments in Wine and his cloths in the blood of grapes*, hath these words, (*Dialog. 1.*) *as we call the mystical fruit of the Vine* (that is, the Wine in the Sacrament) *after consecration the blood of the Lord*, so he, (*viz. Jacob*) *calls the blood of the true Vine* (*viz. of Christ*) *the blood of the grape*: but the blood of Christ is not literally and properly but onely figuratively the blood of the grape, in the same sense as he is said to be the true Vine; and therefore the Wine in the Sacrament after consecration is in like manner not literally and properly but figuratively the blood of Christ. And he explains this afterwards, saying that *our Saviour changed the names, and gave to his Body the name of the Symbol or Sign, and to the Symbol or Sign the name of his Body*; thus when he had call'd himself the Vine, he call'd the Symbol or Sign his blood; so that in the same sense that he call'd himself the Vine, he call'd the Wine, which is the Symbol of his blood, his blood: For, says he, *he would have those who partake of the divine mysteries not to attend to the nature of the things which are seen, but by the change of names to believe the change which is made by grace*; for he who call'd that which by nature is a body wheat and bread, and again likewise call'd himself the Vine, he honour'd the Symbols with the name of his body and blood: not changing nature but adding grace to nature. Where you see he says expressly, that when he call'd the Symbols or Elements of the Sacrament, *viz. bread and Wine his Body and blood*, he made no change in the nature of the things, onely added grace to nature, that is, by the Divine grace and blessing he raised them to a Spiritual and Supernatural virtue and efficacy.

The Second is of the same *Theodoret* in his second Dialogue between a *Catholique*, under the name *Orthodoxus*, and an *Heretique* under the name of *Eranistes*; who maintaining that the Humanity of Christ was chang'd into the substance of the Divinity (which was the Herisie of *Eutyches*) he illustrates the matter by this Similitude, *As, says he, the Symbols of the*
Lord's

Lord's body and blood are one thing before the invocation of the Priest, but after the invocation are changed and become another thing; So the body of our Lord after his ascension is changed into the divine substance. But what says Catholique Orthodoxus to this? why, he talks just like one of Cardinal Perron's Heretiques, *Thou art*, says he caught in thy own net: because the mystical Symbols after consecration do not pass out of their own nature; for they remain in their former substance, figure and appearance and may be seen and handled even as before. He does not onely deny the outward figure and appearance of the Symbols to be chang'd but the nature and substance of them, even in the proper and strictest sence of the word substance; and it was necessary so to do, otherwise he had not given a pertinent answer to the similitude urg'd against him.

The next is one of their own Popes, *Gelasius*, who brings the same Instance against the *Eutychians* * surely, says he, the Sacraments which we receive of the body and blood of our Lord are a divine thing, so that by them we are made partakers of a divine nature, and yet it ceaseth not to be the Substance or nature of bread and Wine; and certainly the image and resemblance of Christ's body and blood are celebrated in the action of the mysteries, that is, in the Sacrament. To make this Instance of any force against the *Eutychians*, who held that the body of Christ upon his ascension ceas'd and was chang'd into the substance of his Divinity, it was necessary to deny that there was any substantial change in the Sacrament of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ. So that here is an infallible authority, one of their own Popes expressly against Transubstantiation.

* Biblio. Patr. Tom: 4.

The last Testimony I shall produce is of *Facundus* an African Bishop, who lived in the 6th. Century. Upon occasion of justifying an expression of one who had said that *Christ also received the adoption of Son*, he reasons thus. * *Christ vouchsafed to receive the Sacrament of adoption both when he was circumcised and baptized: And the Sacrament of Adoption may be called adoption, as the Sacrament of his body and blood, which is in the consecrated bread and cup, is by us called his body and blood: not that the bread, says he, is properly his body and the cup his blood, but because they contain in them the mysteries of his body and blood, hence also our Lord himself called the blessed bread and cup which he gave to his Disciples his body and blood.* Can any man after his believe, that it was then, and had ever been, the universal and received Doctrine of the Christian Church, that the bread and wine in the Sacrament are substantially changed into the proper and natural body and blood of Christ?

* Facund. P. 144. edit. Paris 1670.

By these plain Testimonies which I have produced, and I might have brought a great many more to the same purpose, it is I think evident beyond all denial that *Transubstantiation* hath not been *the perpetual belief of the Christian Church*. And this likewise is acknowledged by many great and learned men of the *Roman Church*. (a) *Scotus* acknowledgeth, that this Doctrine was not always thought necessary to be believed, but that the necessity of believing it was consequent to that Declaration of the Church made in the Council of *Lateran* under Pope *Innocent* the III. And (b) *Du*

(a) *In Sent.*
l. 4. Dist. 11.
Q. 3.

randus freely discovers his inclination to have believed the contrary, if the Church had not by that determination obliged men to believe it, (c) *Tonstal* Bishop of *Durham* also yields, that before the *Lateran Council* men were at liberty as to the manner of *Christ's* presence in the Sacrament. And (d) *Erasmus*, who lived and died in the communion of the *Roman Church* and that whom no man was better read in the ancient *Fathers*, doth confess that it was late before the Church defined *Transubstantiation* unknown to the *Ancients* both name and thing. And (e) *Alphon*

(b) *In Sent.*
l. 4. dist. 11.
Q. 1. n. 15.

(c) *de Euchar.*
l. 1. p. 146:

(d) *In 1. Epist.*
ad Corinth. c. 7.
citante etiam
Salmerone,
Tom. 9. Tract.
16. p. 108.

(e) *De Heres.*
l. 8.

sus a Castro says plainly, that concerning the *Transubstantiation* of the bread into the body of *Christ*, there is seldom any mention in the ancient *Writers*. And who can imagin that these learned men would have granted the ancient Church and Fathers to have been so much Strangers to this Doctrine, had they thought it to have been the perpetual belief of the Church? I shall now in the

Second place, give an account of the particular time and occasion of the coming in of this Doctrine, and by what steps and degrees it grew up and was advanced into an Article of Faith in the *Romish Church*. The Doctrine of the corporal presence of *Christ* was first started upon occasion of the Dispute about the *Worship of Images*, in opposition whereto the *Synod of Constantinople* about the year *DCCL* did argue thus, That our Lord having left us no other image of himself but the Sacrament, in which the substance of bread is the image of his body, we ought to make no other image of our Lord. In answer to this Argument the second Council of *Nice* in the year *DCCLXXXVII* did declare, that the Sacrament after Consecration is not the image and antitype of *Christ's* body and blood, but is properly his body and blood. So that the corporal body of *Christ* in the Sacrament was first brought in to support the stupid worship of *Images*: And indeed it could never have come in upon a more proper occasion, nor have been applied to a fitter purpose.

And here I cannot but take notice how well this agrees with * *Bellarmino's* Observation, that none of the Ancients who wrote of Heresies, hath put this error (viz. of denying Transubstantiation) in his Catalogue; nor did any of the ancients dispute against this error for the first 600 years. Which is very true, because there could be no occasion then to dispute against those who denied Transubstantiation; since, as I have shewn, this Doctrine was not in being, unless amongst the *Eutychian* Heretiques for the first 600 years and more but † *Bellarmino* goes on and tells us, that the first who call'd in question the truth of the body of the Lord in the Eucharist were the *ICONOMACHI* (the opposers of images) after the year DCC in the Council of Constantinople; for these said there was one image of Christ instituted by Christ himself, viz. the bread & wine in the Eucharist, which represents the body & blood of Christ. Wherefore from that time the Greek Writers often admonish us that the Eucharist is not the figure or image of the body of the Lord, but his true body, as appears from the VII. Synod which agrees most exactly with the account which I have given of the first rise of this Doctrine, which began with the corporal presence of Christ in the Sacrament and afterwards proceeded to Transubstantiations.

And as this was the first occasion of introducing this Doctrine among the Greeks, so in the Latin or Roman Church *Paschasius Radbertus* first a Monk and afterwards Abbot of Corbey, was the first broacher of it in the year DCCCXVIII.

And for this, besides the Evidence of History, we have the acknowledgment of two very Eminent Persons in the Church of Rome, *Bellarmino* and *Sirmondus*, who do in effect confess that this *Paschasius* was the first who wrote to purpose upon this Argument.

* *Bellarmino* in these words, This Author was the first who hath seriously and copiously written concerning the truth of Christ's body and blood in the Eucharist: And † *Sirmondus* in these he so first explained the genuine sense of the Catholique Church, that he opened the way to the rest who afterwards in great numbers wrote upon the same argument: But though *Sirmondus* is pleased to say that he onely first explain'd the sense of the Catholique Church in this point, yet it is very plain from the Records of that Age which are left to us, that this was the first time that this Doctrine was broached in the Latin Church; and it met with great opposition in that Age, as I shall have occasion hereafter to shew. For *Rabanus Maurus* Arch-Bishop of Mentz about the year DCCCXLVII reciting the very words of *Paschasius* wherein he

* De Eucharist. l. 1. c. 1.

† ibid.

* De Scriptor. Eccles.

† In vita Paschasi.

¶ Epist. ad
Heribaldum.
c. 33

he had deliver'd this Doctrine, hath his remarkable passage concerning the novelty of it; || *Some, says he, of late, not having a right opinion concerning the Sacrament of the body and bloud of our Lord, have said that this is the body and bloud of our Lord which was born of the Virgin Mary, and in which our Lord suffered upon the Cross and rose from the dead: which error, says he, we have oppos'd with all our might.* From whence it was plain, by the Testimony of one of the greatest and most learned Bishops of that Age, and of eminent reputation for Piety, that what is now the very Doctrine of the Church of Rome concerning the Sacrament, was then esteem'd an Errour broach'd by some particular Persons, but was far from being the generally receiv'd Doctrine of that Age. Can any one think it possible, that so eminent a Person in the Church both for piety and learning, could have condemn'd this Doctrine as an Errour and a Novelty, had it been the general Doctrine of the Christian Church, not onely in that but in all former Ages; and no censure pass'd upon him for that which is now *the great burning Article* in the Church of Rome, and esteem'd by them one of the greatest and most pernicious Heresies?

Afterwards in the year MLIX, when *Berengarius* in France and Germany, had rais'd a fresh opposition against this Doctrine, he was compell'd to recant it by Pope *Nicholas* and the Council at Rome in these words, * *that the bread and wine which are set upon the Altar, after the consecration are not onely the Sacrament but the true body and bloud of our Lord Jesus Christ; and are sensibly, not onely in the Sacrament but in truth, handled and broken by the hands of the Priest, and ground or brused by the teeth of the faithfull.* But it seems the Pope and his Council were not then skilfull enough to express themselves rightly in this matter; for the *Gloss* upon the Canon Law says expressly, † *that unless we understand these words of BERENGARIUS (that is in truth of the Pope and his Council) in sound sense, we shall fall into a greater Hereſie than that of BERENGARIUS; for we do not make parts of the body of Christ.* The meaning of which *Gloss* I cannot imagine, unless it be this, that the *Body of Christ*, though it be in truth broken, yet it is not broken into parts (for we do not make parts of the body of Christ, but into wholes: Now this new way of breaking a Body, not into parts but into wholes (which in good earnest is the Doctrine of the Church of Rome) though to them that are able to believe *Transubstantiation* it may

* Gratian. de consecrat. distinct. 2.
Lanfranc. de corp. & sang. Domini. c. 5;
Guilmund: de Sacram. l. 1.
Alger. de Sacram. l. 1. c. 19

† Gloss. De-eret. de consecrat. dist. 2. in cap. Ego Berengarius.

for any thing I know appear to be *sound sense*, yet to us that cannot believe so, it appears to be *solid non-sense*,

About XX years after, in the year MLXXIX Pope Gregory the VIIth began to be sensible of this absurdity; and therefore in another Council at Rome made Berengarius to recant in another Form, * Waldens. Tim 2. c. 13 viz, * that the bread and wine which are placed upon the Altar are substantially changed into the true and proper and quickning flesh and bloud of our Lord Jesus Christ, and after consecration are the true body of Christ, which was born of the Virgin, and which being offered for the Salvation of the World did hang upon the Cross, and sits on the right hand of the Father.

So that from the first starting of this Doctrine in the second Council of Nice in the year DCCI XXXVII, till the Council under Pope Gregory the VIIth. in the year MLXXIX, it was almost three hundred years that this Doctrine was contested, and before this mishapen Monster of Transubstantiation could be lick'd into that Form in which it is now settled and establish'd in the Church of Rome. Here then is a plain account of the first rise of this Doctrine, and of the several steps whereby it was advanced by the Church of Rome into an Article of Faith. I come now in the

Third place, to answer the great pretended Demonstration of the impossibility that this Doctrine, if it had been new, should ever have come in, in any Age, and been received in the Church; and consequently it must of necessity have been the perpetual belief of the Church in all Ages: For if it had not always been the Doctrine of the Church, whenever it had attempted first to come in, there would have been a great stir and bussle about it, and the whole Christian World would have rose up in opposition to it. But we can shew no such time when first it came in, and when any such opposition was made to it, and therefore it was always the Doctrine of the Church. This Demonstration Monsieur Arnauld, a very learned Man in France, pretends to be unanswerable: whether it be so or not, I shall briefly examine. And

First, we do assign a punctual and very likely time of the first rise of this Doctrine, about the beginning of the ninth Age; though it did not take root nor was fully settled and establish'd till towards the end of the seventh. And this was the most likely time of all other, from the beginning of Christianity, for so gross an Error to appear; it being, by the confession and consent of their own Historians, the most dark and dismal time that ever happened to the Christian Church, both for Ignorance, and Superstition, and Vice. It came in together with Idolatry, and

was made use of to support it: A fit prop and companion for it. And indeed what *tares* might not the Enemy have sown in so dark and long a Night; when so considerable a part of the Christian World was lul'd asleep in profound Ignorance and Superstition? And this agrees very well with the account which our *Saviour* himself gives in the Parable of the *Tares*, of the springing up of Errours and Corruptions in the field of the Church. (Matth. 13. 24.) *While the men slept* the Enemy did his work in the Night, so that when they were awake they wondred how and whence the *tares* came; but being sure they were there, and that they were not sown at first, they concluded *the Enemy had done it*.

Secondly, I have shewn likewise that there was considerable opposition made to this *Errour* at its first coming in. The general Ignorance and gross Superstition of that Age rendred the generality of people more quiet and secure, and disposed them to receive any thing that came under a pretence of mystery in Religion and of greater reverence and devotion to the Sacrament, and that seem'd any way to countenance the worship of *Images*, for which at that time they were zealously concern'd. But notwithstanding the security and passive temper of the People, the most eminent for piety and learning in that Time made great resistance against it. I have already named *Rabanus* Arch-Bishop of *Mentz*. who oppos'd it as an Errour lately sprung up and which had then gained but upon some few persons. To whom I may add *Heribaldus* Bishop of *Auxerrers* in *France*, *Io. Scotus Erigena*, and *Ratramus* commonly known by the name of *Bertram*, who at the same time were employed by the Emperour *Charles the Bald* to oppose this growing Errour, and wrote learnedly against it. And these were the eminent men for learning at that time. And because Monsieur *Arnauld* will not be satisfied unless there were some stir and bustle about it, *Bertram* in his Preface to his Book tells us, that they who according to their several opinions talked differently about the mystery of *Christ's* body and bloud were divided by no small Schism.

Thirdly, Though for a more clear and satisfactory answer to this pretended *Demonstration* I have been contended to untie this knot, yet could without all these pains have cut it. For suppose this Doctrine had silently come in and without opposition, so that we could not assign the particular time and occasion of its first Rise; yet if it be evident from the Records of former Ages, for above *D.* years together, that this was not the ancient belief of the Church; and plain also, that this Doctrine was afterwards received in the *Roman* Church, though we could not t

now and when it came in, yet it would be the wildest and most extravagant thing in the world to set up a pretended Demonstration of Reason against plain Experience and matter of fact, This is just *Zeno's* Demonstration of the impossibility of motion against *Diogenes* walking before his Eyes. For this is to undertake to prove that impossible to have been, which most certainly was. Just thus the *Servants* in the *Parable* might have demonstrated that the *tares* were *wheat*, because they were sure none but good seed was sown at first, and no man could give any account of the punctual time when any *tares* were sown, or by whom; and if an Enemy had come to do it, he must needs have met with great resistance and opposition; but no such resistance was made, and therefore there could be no *tares* in the *field*, but that which they call'd *tares* was certainly *good wheat*. At the same rate a man might demonstrate that *our King*, his Majesty of great Britain, is not return'd into *England*, nor restor'd to his Crown; because there being so great and powerfull an Army possess'd of his Lands, and therefore obliged by interest to keep him out, it was impossible He should ever come in without a great deal of fighting and blood-shed: but there was no such thing, therefore he is not return'd and restor'd to his Crown. And by the like kind of Demonstration one might prove that the *Turk* did not invade *Christendom* last year, and besiege *Vienna*; because if he had, the most *Christian King*, who had the greatest Army in *Christendom* in a readiness, would certainly have employed it against him; but Monsieur *Arnauld* certainly knows, no such thing was done. And therefore according to his way of Demonstration, the *matter of fact*, so commonly reported and believed, concerning the *Turks Invasion of Christendom* and *besieging Vienna* last year, was a perfect mistake. But a man may demonstrate till his head and heart ache, before he shall ever be able to prove that which certainly is, or was, never to have been. For of a l sorts of impossibles nothing is more evidently so, than to make that which hath been not to have been. All the reason in the world is too weak to cope with so tough and obstinate a difficulty. And I have often wonder'd how a man of Monsieur *Arnauld's* great wit and sharp Judgment could prevail with himself to engage in so bad and baffled a Cause; or could think to defend it with so wooden a *Dagger* as his *Demonstration of Reason* against certain *Experience* and *matter of Fact*: A thing, if it be possible of equal absurdity with what he pretends to demonstrate, *Transubstantiation* itself. I proceed to the

Third pretended ground of this Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*; and that is, *The Infallible Authority of the present Church to make and declare new Articles of Faith.* And this in truth is the ground into which the most of the learned men of their Church did heretofore, and many do still resolve their belief of this Doctrine: And, as I have already shewn, do plainly say that they see no sufficient reason, either from *Scripture* or *Tradition*, for the belief of it: And that they should have believed the contrary had not the determination of the Church obliged them otherwise.

But if this Doctrine be obtruded upon the world merely by vertue of the Authority of the *Roman Church*, and the Declaration of the *Council* under Pope *Gregory* the VIIth. or of the *Lateran Council* under *Innocent* the III. then it is a plain Innovation in the Christian Doctrine, and a new Article of Faith impos'd upon the Christian World. And if any Church hath this power, the Christian Faith may be enlarged and changed as often as men please; and that which is no part of our Saviour's Doctrine, nay, any thing though never so absurd and unreasonable, may become an Article of Faith obliging all Christians to the belief of it, whenever the Church of *Rome* shall think fit to stamp her Authority upon it: which would make Christianity a most uncertain and endless thing.

The *Fourth* pretended ground of this Doctrine is, *the necessity of such a change as this in the Sacrament to the comfort and benefit of those who received it.* But there is no colour for this, if the thing be rightly consider'd: Because the comfort and benefit of the Sacrament depends upon the blessing annexed to the Institution. And as *Water* in *Baptism* without any substantial change in that Element, may by the Divine blessing accompanying the Institution be effectual to the washing away of Sin, and Spiritual Regeneration; So there can no reason in the world be given why the Elements of *Bread* and *Wine* in the *Lord's Supper* may not, by the same Divine blessing accompanying this Institution, make the worthy receivers partakers of all the Spiritual comfort and benefit designed to us thereby, without any substantial change made in those Elements, since our Lord hath told us, that *verily the flesh profiteth nothing.* So that if we cou'd do so odd and strange a thing as to eat the very natural flesh and drink the blood of our Lord, I do not see of what greater advantage it would be to us than vvhhat vve may have by partaking of the Symbols of his body and blood as he hath appointed *in remembrance of him.* For the Spiritual efficacy of the Sacrament doth not depend upon the nature of the thing received, supposing vve receive vvh

our Lord appointed and receive it with a right preparation and disposition of mind, but upon the supernatural blessing that goes along with it, and makes it effectual to those Spiritual ends for which it was appointed,

The *Fifth* and last pretended ground of this Doctrine is *to magnify the power of the Priest in being able to work so great a Miracle.* And this with great pride and pomp is often urg'd by them as a transcendent instance of the Divine wisdom, to find out so admirable a way to raise the power and reverence of the Priest; that he should be able every day, and as often as he pleases, by repeating a few words to work so miraculous a change, and (as they love most absurdly and blasphemously to speak) *to make God himself.*

But this is to pretend to a power above that of God himself, for he did not, nor cannot make himself, nor do any thing that implies a contradiction, as *Transubstantiation*, evidently does in their pretending *to make God.* For to make that which already is, and to make that *now* which *always* was, is not onely vain and trifling if it could be done, but impossible because it implies a contradiction.

And what if after all *Transubstantiation* if it were possible and actually wrought by the Priest, wou'd yet be no Miracle? For there are two things necessary to a Miracle, that there be a supernatural effect wrought, and that this effect be evident to sense. So that though a supernatural effect be wrought, yet if it be not evident to sense it is to all the ends and purposes of a Miracle as if it were not; and can be no testimony or proof of any thing, because it self stands in need of another Miracle to give testimony to it and to prove that it was wrought. And neither in Scripture, nor in profane Authors, nor in common use of speech, is any thing call'd a Miracle but what falls under the notice of our senses: *Miracle* being nothing else but a *supernatural effect evident to sense*, the great end and design whereof is to be a sensible proof and conviction to us of something that we do not see.

And for want of this Condition, *Transubstantiation*, if it were true, wou'd be no Miracle. It would indeed be very *supernatural*, but for all that it would not be a *Sign* or *Miracle*: For a *Sign* or *Miracle* is always something sensible, otherwise it could be no *Sign*. Now that such a change as is pretended in *Transubstantiation* should really be wrought, and yet there should be no sign and appearance of it, is a thing very wonderful, if not to sense; for our senses perceive no change, the Bread and Wine in the Sacrament to all our senses remaining just as they were before: And

that a thing should remain to all appearance just as it was, hath nothing at all of wonder in it we vnder indeed vwhen vve see a strange thing done, but no man vvonders vwhen he sees nothing done. So that *Transubstantiation*, if they will needs have it a Miracle, is such a Miracle as any man may work that hath but the confidence to face men down that he works it and the fortune to be believed: And though the Church of Rome may magnify their Priests upon account of this Miracle, which they say they can worke every day and every hour, yet I cannot understand the reason of it; for when this great work (as they call it) is done, there is nothing more appears to be done than if there were no Miracle: Now such a Miracle as to all appearance is no Miracle I see no reason why a Protestant Minister, as well as a Popish Priest, may not vwork as often as he pleases; or if he can but have the patience to let it alone, it vvill vvork it self. For surely nothing in the world is easier than to let a thing be as it is, and by speaking a few words over it to make it just what it was before. Every man, every day, may work ten thousand such Miracles.

And thus I have dispatch'd the *First* part of my Discourse, which was to consider the pretended grounds and *Reasons* of the Church of Rome for this Doctrine, and to shew the weakness and insufficiency of them. I come in the

II. SECOND place, to produce our *Objections* against it. Which will be of so much the greater force, because I have already shewn this Doctrine to be destitute of all Divine warrant and authority, and of any other sort of Ground sufficient in reason to justify it. So that I do not now object against a Doctrine which hath a fair probability of Divine Revelation on its side, for that would vweigh dovn all objections vwhich did not plainly overthrow the probaility and credit of its Divine Revelation: But I object against a Doctrine by the mere vvill and Tyranny of men impos'd upon the belief of Christians, vvithout any evidence of *Scripture*, and against all the evidence of *Reason* and *Sense*.

The Objections I shall reduce to these *two* Heads. *First*, the infinite scandal of this Doctrine to the Christian Religion. And *Secondly*, the monstrous and insupportable absurdity of it.

First, *The infinite scandal of this Doctrine to the Christian Religion*. And that upon these *four* accounts. 1. Of the stupidity of this Doctrine. 2. The real barbarousness of this Sacrament and right of our Religion upon supposition of the truth of this Doctrine. 3. Of the cruel and bloody consequences of it. 4. Of the danger of Idolatry; vwhich they are certainly guilty of, if this Doctrine be not true.

1. Upon account of the stupidity of this Doctrine. I remember that Tully, who was a man of very good sense, instanceth in the conceit of eating God as the extremity of madness, & so stupid an apprehension as he thought no man was ever guilty of. *When we call, says he, the fruits of the earth Ceres, and wine Bacchus, we use but the common language; but do you think any man so mad as to believe that which he eats to be God?* It seems he could not believe that so extravagant a folly had ever entred into the mind of man. It is a very severe saying of Averroes the Arabian Philosopher (who lived after this Doctrine was entertained among Christians) and ought to make the Church of Rome blush, if she can; *I have travell'd, says he, over the world, and have found divers Sects; but so sottish a Sect or Law I never found, which is the Sect of the Christians; because with their own teeth they devour their God whom they worshiped.* It was great stupidity in the people of Israel to say, *Come let us make us Gods;* but it was civilly ridicul'd of them, *Let us make us Gods that may go before us,* in comparison of the Church of Rome, who say, *Let us make a God that we may eat of him.* So that upon the whole matter I cannot but wonder that they could chuse thus to expose Faith to the contempt of all that are endued with Reason. And to speak the plain truth, the Christian Religion has never so horribly expos'd to the scorn of Atheists and Infidels, as hath been by this most absurd and senseless Doctrine. But thus it was foretold that *the Man of Sin should come with power and Signs and Lying Miracles, and with all deceiveableness of unrighteousness,* (2. Thess. 2. 10.) with all the Legerdemain and juggling tricks of falsehood and imposture; amongst which this of Transubstantiation, which they call a *Miracle*, and we a *Cheat*, is one of the chief: And in all probability those common juggling words of *hoc est corpus*, are nothing else but a corruption of *hoc est corpus*, by way of ridiculous imitation of the Priests of the Church of Rome in their trick of Transubstantiation. Into such contempt by this foolish Doctrine and pretended Miracle of theirs have they brought the most sacred and venerable Mystery of our Religion.

2. It is very scandalous likewise upon account of the real barbarousness of this Sacrament and Rite of our Religion, upon supposition of the truth of this Doctrine. Litterally to eat the flesh of the Son of man and to drink his blood, St. Austin, as I have shewed before, declares

to be a great *Impiety*. And the impiety and barbarousness of the thing is not in truth extenuated, but onely the appearance of it, by its being done under the *Species of Bread and Wine*: For the thing they acknowledge is really done, and they believe that they verily eat and drink the natural flesh and blood of Christ. And what can any man do more unworthily towards his Friend? How can he possibly use him more barbarously, than to feast upon his living flesh and blood? It is one of the greatest wonders in the world, that it should ever enter into the minds of men to put upon our Saviour's words, so easily capable of a more convenient sense and so necessarily requiring it, a meaning so plainly contrary to Reason, and sense, and even to Humanity it self. Had the ancient Christians owned any such Doctrine, we should have heard of it from the Adversaries of our Religion in every page of their Writings; and they would have desired no greater advantage against the Christians than to have been able to hit them in the teeth with their feasting upon the the natural flesh and blood of their Lord, and their God, and their best Friend. What end'less triumphs would they have made upon this Subject? And with that confidence would they have set the cruelty used by Christians in their *Sacrament*, against the God *Saturn's* eating his own Children, and all the cruel and bloody Rites of their Idolatry? But that no such thing was then objected by the *Heathens* to the *Christians*, is to a wise man instead of a thousand Demonstrations that no such Doctrine was then believed.

3. It is scandalous also upon account of the *cruel and bloody consequences* of this Doctrine; so contrary to the plain Laws of Christianity, and to one great end and design of this Sacrament, which is to unite Christians in the most perfect love and charity to one another. Whereas this Doctrine hath been the occasion of the most barbarous and bloody Tragedies that ever were acted in the World. For this hath been in the Church of *Rome* the great *burning Article*; and as absurd and unreasonable as it is, more Christians have been murder'd for the denial of it than perhaps for all the other Articles of their Religion. And I think it may generally pass for a true observation that all Sects are commonly most hot and furious for those things for which there is least Reason; for what men want of Reason for their opinions, they usually supply and make up in Rage. And it was no more than needed to use this severity upon this occasion; for nothing but the cruel fear of death could in probability have driven so great

part of mankind into the acknowledgement of so unreasonable and senseless a Doctrine.

O blessed Saviour! thou best Friend and greatest lover of mankind, who can imagin thou dost ever intend that men should kill one another for not being able to believe contrary to their senses; for being unwilling to think, that thou shouldst make one of the most horrid and barbarous things that can be imagin'd a main Duty and principal Mystery of thy Religion; for not flattering the pride and presumption of the Priest who says he can make God, and for not complying with the folly and stupidity of the People who believe that they can eat him?

4. Upon account of the danger of *Idolatry*; which they are certainly guilty of if this Doctrine be not true, and such a change as they pretend be not made in the Sacrament; for if it be not, then they worship a Creature instead of the Creator God blessed for ever. But such a change I have shewn to be impossible; or if it could be, yet they can never be certain that it is, and consequently are always in danger of idolatry: And that they can never be certain that such a change is made, is evident; because, according to the express determination of the Council of *Trent*, that depends upon the mind and *intention of the Priest*, which cannot certainly be known but by Revelation, which is not pretended in this case. And if they be mistaken about this change, through the knavery or crossness of the Priest who will not *make God* but when he thinks fit, they must not think to excuse themselves from idolatry because they intended to worship God and not a Creature; or so the *Persians* might be excus'd from Idolatry in worshipping the *sun*, because they intend to worship God and not a Creature; and so indeed we may excuse all the Idolatry that ever was in the world, which is nothing else but a mistake of the Deity, and upon that mistake a worshipping of something as God which is not God.

II. Besides the infinite scandal of this Doctrine upon the accounts I have mentioned, *the monstrous absurdities* of it make it insupportable to any Religion. I am very well assur'd of the grounds of Religion in general, and of the Christian Religion in particular; and yet cannot see that the foundations of any revealed Religion are strong enough to bear the weight of so many and so great absurdities as this Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* would load it withall. And to make this evident, I shall not insist upon those gross contradictions, of the

same Body being in so many several places at once ; of our Saviour giving away himself with his own hands to every one of his Disciples, and yet still keeping himself to himself ; and a thousand more of the like nature : but to shew the absurdity of this Doctrine I shall only ask these few Questions.

1. Whether any man have, or ever had greater evidence of the truth of any Divine Revelation than every man hath of the falshood of *Transubstantiation* ? Infidelity were hardly possible to men, if all men had the same evidence for the Christian Religion which they have against *Transubstantiation*, that is, the clear and irresistable evidence of sense. He that can once be brought to contradict or deny his senses, is at an end of certainty ; for what can a man be certain of if he be not certain of what he sees ? In some circumstances our senses may deceive us, but no Faculty deceives us so little and so seldom : And when our senses do deceive us, even that error is not to be corrected without the help of our senses.

2. Supposing this Doctrine had been delivered in Scripture in the very same words that it is decreed in the Council of *Trent*, by what clearer evidence or stronger Argument could any man prove to me that such words were in the Bible than I can prove to him that bread and wine after consecration are bread and wine still ? He could but appeal to my eyes to prove such words to be in the Bible, and with the same reason and justice might I appeal to several of his senses to prove to him that the bread and wine after consecration are bread and wine still.

3. Whether it be reasonable to imagine that God should make this a part of the Christian Religion which shakes the main external evidence and confirmation of the whole ? I mean the Miracles which were wrought by our Saviour and his Apostles, the assurance whereof did at first depend upon the certainty of sense. For if the senses of those who say they saw them were deceived then there might be no Miracles wrought ; and consequently it may justly be doubted whether that kind of confirmation which God hath given to the Christian Religion would be strong enough to prove it, supposing *Transubstantiation* to be a part of it : Because every man hath as great evidence that *Transubstantiation* is false, as he hath that the Christian Religion is true. Suppose then *Transubstantiation* to be part of the Christian Doctrine, it must have the same confirmation with the whole, and

that is Miracles : But of all Doctrines in the world it is peculiarly incapable of being proved by a Miracle. For if a Miracle were wrought for the proof of it, the very same assurance which any man hath of the truth of the Miracle he hath of the falsehood of the Doctrine, that is, the clear evidence of his Senses. For that there is a Miracle wrought to prove *that what he sees in the Sacrament is not bread but the body of Christ*, there is onely the evidence of sense; and there is the very same evidence to prove *that what he sees in the Sacrament is not the body of Christ but bread*. So that here would arise a new Controversie, whether a man should rather believe his Senses giving testimony against the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, or bearing witness to a Miracle wrought to confirm that Doctrine; there being the very same evidence against the truth of the Doctrine, which there is for the truth of the Miracle: And then the Argument for *Transubstantiation* and the Objection against it would just balance one another; and consequently *Transubstantiation* is not to be proved by a Miracle, because that would be, *to prove to a man by some thing that he sees, that he doth not see what he sees*. And if there were no other evidence that *Transubstantiation* is no part of the Christian Doctrine, this would be sufficient, that what proves the one doth as much overthrow the other; and that Miracles which are certainly the best and highest external proof of Christianity are the worst proof in the world of *Transubstantiation*, unless a man can renounce his senses at the same time that he relies upon them. For a man cannot believe a Miracle without relying upon sense, nor *Transubstantiation* without renouncing it. So that never were any two things so ill coupled together as the Doctrine of Christianity and that of *Transubstantiation*, because they draw several ways, and are ready to strangle one another; because the main evidence of the Christian Doctrine, which is Miracles, is resolved into the certainty of sense, but this evidence is clear and point-blank against *Transubstantiation*.

4 And *Lastly*, I would ask what we are to think of the Argument which our Saviour used to convince his Disciples after his Resurrection that his Body was really risen, and that they were not deluded by a Ghost or Apparition; Is it a necessary and conclusive Argument or not? *And he said unto them, why are ye troubled? and why do thoughts arise in your hearts? Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I my self; for a Spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have.* (Luke 24. 38, 39.)

But

But now if we suppose with the Church of *Rome* the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* to be true, and that he had instructed his Disciples in it just before his death, strange thoughts might justly have risen in their hearts, and they might have said to him ; Lord, it is but a few days ago since thou didst teach us not to believe our senses, but directly contrary to what we saw, *viz.* that the bread which thou gavest us in the Sacrament, though we saw it and handled it and tasted it to be bread, yet was not bread, but thine own natural body ; and now thou appealest to our senses to prove that this is thy body which we now see. If seeing and handling be an unquestionable evidence that things are what they appear to our senses, then we were deceived before in the Sacrament ; and if they be not, then we are not sure now that this is thy body which we now see and handle, but it may be perhaps bread under the appearance of flesh and bones, just as in the Sacrament, that which we saw and handled and tasted to be bread was thy flesh and bones under the form and appearance of bread. Now upon this supposition, it would have been a hard matter to have quieted the thoughts of the Disciples : For if the Argument which our Saviour used did certainly prove to them that what they saw and handled was his body, his very natural flesh and bones, because they saw and handled them, (which it were impious to deny) it would as strongly prove that what they saw and received before in the Sacrament was not the natural body and blood of *Christ*, but real bread and wine : And consequently, that according to our Saviour's arguing after his Resurrection they had no reason to believe *Transubstantiation* before. For that very Argument by which our Saviour proves the reality of his body after his Resurrection doth as strongly prove the reality of bread and wine after Consecration. But our Saviour's Argument was most infallibly good and true, and therefore the Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* is undoubtedly false.

Upon the whole matter I shall onely say this, that some other Points between us and the Church of *Rome* are managed vvith some kind of wit and subtilty, but this of *Transubstantiation* is caried out by mere dint of impudence and facing down of Mankind.

And of this the more discerning persons of that Church are of late grown so sensible that they would now be glad to be rid of this odious and ridiculous Doctrine. But the Council of *Trent* hath fasten'd it to their Religion, and made it a necessary and essential Point of their

Belief,

belief, and they cannot now part with it if they would; it is like a mill-stone hung about the neck of Popery which will sink it at the last. And though some of their greatest Wits, as Cardinal *Perron*, and late Monsieur *Arnaud*, have undertaken the defence of it in great volumes; yet it is an absurdity of that monstrous and massy weight, that no humane authority or wit are able to support it; It will make the very Pillars of *St. Peter's* crack, and requires more Volumes to make it good than would fill the *Vatican*.

And now I would apply my self to the poor deluded People of that Church. if they were either permitted by their Priests, or durst venture without their leave to look into their Religion and to examine the Doctrines of it. *Consider, and shew your selves men.* Do not suffer your selves any longer to be led blindfold, and by an implicit Faith your Priests, into the belief of non-sense and contradiction. Think it enough and too much to let them rook you of your money for extended Pardons and counterfeit Reliques, but let not the Authority of any Priest or Church persuade you out of your Senses. Credulity is certainly a fault as well as Infidelity: and he who said, blessed are they that have not seen and yet have believed, hath no-where said, blessed are they that have seen and yet have not believed, much less blessed are they that believe directly contrary to what they see.

To conclude this Discourse. By what hath been said upon this Argument it will appear, with how little truth and reason, and regard to the interest of our common Christianity, it is so often said by our Adversaries, that there are as good arguments for the belief of *Transubstantiation* as of the Doctrine of the *Trinity*: When they themselves do acknowledge with us that the Doctrine of the *Trinity* is founded upon the Scriptures, and that according to the interpretation of them by the consent of the ancient Fathers: but their Doctrine of *Transubstantiation* I have plainly shewn to have no such ground; and that this is acknowledged by very many learned men of their own Church. And this doctrine of theirs being first plainly proved by us to be destitute of all Divine Warrant and Authority, our Objections against it from the manifold contradictions of it to Reason and Sense, and so many Demonstrations of the falsehood of it. Against all which they have nothing to put in the opposite Scal but the Infallibility of their Church, for which there is even less colour of proof from Scripture than for *Transubstantiation* it self. But so fond are they of their

own Innovations and Errours, that rather than the Dictates of their Church, how groundles and absurd soever, should be call'd in question; rather than not have their will of us in imposing upon us what they please, they will overthrow any Article of the Christian Faith, and shake the very foundations of our common Religion, A clear evidence that the Church of Rome is not the true Mother, since she can be so well contented that Christianity should be destroyed rather than the Point in question should be decided against her.

THE END.
