

Transubstantiation

A peculiar

A R T I C L E

O F T H E

Roman Catholick Faith,

Which was never own'd by the

Ancient Church

Or any of the

Reform'd CHURCHES,

In Answer to a late DISCOURSE call'd

Reasons for Abrogating the

T E S T.

L O N D O N,

Printed in the Year. . 1688,

4/2
3/-
300-13

THE
P R E F A C E
TO THE
R E A D E R.

I Am very unfit to enter a Contest of so high a Nature, with a Person, who is infinitely my Superior in all sorts of Learning, that nothing can excuse the Attempt from being censur'd as Vanity or Presumption, but the cause of Wrong'd Truth, which all have indispensable Obligations to Vindicate. Every thing else, but the Injury offer'd to that, pleas'd me in the Bishop of Oxfords Discourse, who as he is a known Master of Language, Writes nothing but what is Polite, and Fine, and adorns that Learning which he possesses in a high degree, with all the charming Beauties of Eloquence. I hope I have preserv'd for him that Respect, which I owe to his Dignity, as well as to his Worth. If anything made me forget my self, and him, it was some little Indignation, to read with what Contempt he treated two Persons, for whom I have deservedly a high Veneration. This rais'd some Spleen, which made me smile a little in Disdain; and if then there bath dropt an unbecoming word, the Humour I was in, pleads for my Pardon.

Perhaps now thou expectest some wise and weighty Answer unto the Reasons for Abrogating the TEST; But

The Preface to the Reader.

it becomes not me to Judge of what are Affairs of the State; and therefore I wholly wav'd that Consideration. Wherein our common Reform'd Religion is concern'd, there I have Interest'd my self, and as it hath been Attag'd in two several places, 'tis only the first I have now stood to Guard; The other part, which is to Maintain the charge of Idolatry against the Worship of the Roman Church, may make me venture a second time, if some abler Pen than mine, is not provok'd to draw in the Quarrel. And now all the Favour I ask of thee, as some Recompence for so much Time which I have spent to give thee an hours Entertainment, is, that thou wouldest not enquire after the Name of a Man, who is very Inconsiderable; and who besides, assures thee, that it will be in vain, since he hath us'd sufficient care and precaution, never to be known.

Transub-

(1)

Transubstantiation

A peculiar

A R T I C L E

OF THE

Roman Catholick Faith,

In Answer to a late DISCOURSE call'd

Reasons for Abrogating the TEST.

I Have so little ambition to appear in any of the Disputes, which have created so many Quarrels among Christians, as I wish with all my Soul, that they who are call'd by that glorious Name, perfectly agreed in those Truths which were the Faith of the Apostles and the purest Ages of the Primitive Church. How Blessed would the Church of Christ have been in an undisturb'd Peace, if all the Errors, which first corrupted our Religion, had been stifled in their Birth, and so never impos'd by the Canons of pretended Councils as Articles of our Creed. But Interest first engag'd some Men to offer incredible Things unto the People to be believed, and they took the first opportunities to vent them in Times of such Darknes, that the poor people were blind, and so easily misled; and to tye the Muffler about their Eyes so fast, that it might never be unloos'd; the name of the *Catholick Church* was still made use of to Authorize strange Opinions which

which she never own'd; and to secure her Authority from ever being question'd, the pretence of Infallibility was Impregnable. Now least any more Inquisitive, than the rest of the Herd, should startle at the sight of what was new, and unseen before the noise of Antiquity was sufficient to silence all their questions; and in an ignorant Age, when few or none of those who were disinterested had wit enough to Judge of what was in present view, much less to look back with a discerning Eye on what was past at a far distance, the plausible Story could not easily be disprov'd.

Thus the Worshipping of Images first stole out into the World, and not long after, the Doctrine of Christs Bodily Presence in the Sacrament, was encourag'd to the Birth.

As long as People were dull enough to give an undoubted assent to all that their Priests told them, and were strongly prepar'd to swallow the hugest Contradictions, they all went down smoothly; But as Knowledge increas'd with the dawning of the Gospel, those gross Absurdities were discover'd in many things, (which the People had believ'd without ever examining them, and which the Darknes of preceding Ages had conceal'd) that it was necessary to give things a fairer appearance, to call them by softer Names, that they might both look and sound less affrighting. This is the Artifice which is now so much us'd and applauded by the Church of *Rome*, who it must be acknowledg'd, never wanted Address to disentangle her self, when her Errors are so expos'd that they are no longer defensible; and then the surest way to avoid the Blow, is to confound them with the contrary Truths, that her Doctrine may be as unknown as her own first Original. And indeed the best means to escape a Confutation, is to cast such a mist before our Eyes, as we cannot apprehend what it is she believes. In one Age, Transubstantiation is necessary to be believed to Salvation; now 'tis so indifferent, as 'tis disavow'd, that the Church ever appointed it an Article of Faith, or ever assign'd the Modus (pardon a word which I have but borrow'd) of the Real Presence; and thus a point so dear, and which not Two hundred Years past, cost the Blood of so many Martyrs, because they would not own their belief of it, is vanis'd in the mists of the Schools, and utterly lost in
the

the Dust rais'd by the Disputes of *Aquinas*, *Scotus*, and their Followers.

But the Author, who thus makes a new Creed for that Church, is too young a Profelyte to Comment on the Articles of her Faith, and one so lately initiated into the Holy Rites, may with good reason have his decisions suspected, as not being grounded on a sufficient knowledge in the Myteries of her Religion.

I know not how those who belong to that Communion will resent it, but it hath a very odd Aspect, that the Holy Catholick Church should be drawn so, as to resemble the Hereticks in the nearest likeness as her Picture can be taken. It intrenches on her Infallibility, to reconcile the principal parts of her Doctrine with such Articles as she always condemn'd of Herese; and which, as the most damnable Herese, she hath continually and most fiercely oppos'd. It was for *Transubstantiation* the great Heat began with *Luther*, though some other lesser matters first rais'd a Quarrel. This in its nicest Explications hath still been the Subject of the warmest Disputes. It was for this so many suffer'd as obstinate Hereticks, not fit to live, because they had liv'd too long to renounce the use of all their Senses and Reason in believing an open contradiction to them all. And yet now the cause of so many Disputes, Quarrels, and Blood, is cleverly convey'd away, and so many have flam'd at a Stake, and the ground been dyed with the Blood of slaughter'd Multitudes, only for some Niceties of the Schools. For if we will trust our Author's bare word, no Councils of the *Roman Church* have ever defin'd the manner of Christs Real Presence in the Eucharist, but left it to be wrangled out by Logicians and Sophisters, as they could best clear it by the Principles of *Aristotle's* Philosophy. Now it was the manner of that Presence which always kindled both the Zeal of that Church, and the Fires which consum'd Hereticks, who by consequence suffer'd not as Apostates from the Faith, but the Doctrines of the Infallible Stagyrite. This is to make the *Roman* Religion most barbarously cruel, in Burning and Damning Men merely as Hereticks in Philosophy; but though those who profess it are but little engag'd to him for representing it so odious;
yet

yet he has extraordinarily oblig'd all the Protestants, by creating them on a sudden true Sons of the *Roman* Catholick Church; we will now hope not only to be Sav'd our selves, but that all, who before us own'd the same Doctrines as we do, are in a very good condition, since he comprehends both us and them within her Bolome who appropriates to her self the Keys, and disposal of Heaven. We are all now of one Faith, and the Confessions of all the Protestant Churches exactly agree with the Decisions of the Great Council of *Trent*. They Assert the Real Presence, that Council, as our Author will have it, Determines no more; and how unreasonable then it is to make a Test to distinguish between *Roman* Catholicks and us, when we all believe the same thing. But however he boldly charges all the Wisdom and Authority of the Nation with a most ridiculous Impertinence, in forming a Test for the *Roman* Catholicks, which does not concern any point of their Faith, yet *Transubstantiation* was once a very good Test for the Hereticks; and time was, when their saying in general Terms, that they believed the Real Presence, was not sufficient to save them from the Fire. There must certainly be something more in the business, which our Author would not see, and the reconciliation is too new, and easie not to be suspected, nor can I ever imagine that the Church of *Rome* will admit us into her Communion upon such facile conditions.

It will then be worth while to Enquire into the Reasons which led him into an Opinion, wherein he is alone, and which (for all that I know to the contrary,) he may always boast as peculiarly his own. What is the Ground of his Assertion which is altogether so Extraordinary? Why! Truly a harmless Word lay in his way, as he was hastily running through some Authors, at which he unfortunately stumbled.

It is very well known, that in most of the Books, that are written on this Subject, *Christ* is affirmed to be really present in the Bread and Wine; and where ever our Author has met with this Real Presence, whether in the *Augustan*, or *Bohemian* Confessions; or in *Luther*, *Melancthon*, *Beza*, or *Calvin*, he fancy'd he saw the Body and Blood

of

of our Blessed *Saviour* in its full and true Proportion. This Fancy of his own, he hopes to persuade others to believe, though all the Arguments he urges, is only by playing with an Ambiguity impos'd on an honest plain-meaning Word.

To unravel therefore that confus'd heap of Citations, which swell up so many Pages, it will be necessary to Explain

1. In what Sense our great Redeemer is present to us in the Sacrament.

2. And then Secondly, It will be apparent, that all the Fathers of the Primitive Church, and all the Writers of latter Ages, till the Eighth Century was almost run out, never dropp'd a word that can tempt us to think that they believed *Christ* to be substantially present in the Sacrament; However, they frequently may assert, That he is really present, and exhibited to our Souls in the Elements of Bread and Wine: So far were they from confounding the Real Presence with the Substantial, of *Christ's* Body in its natural way of Existence, as our Author does.

And in the History, which by his Example I shall give, it will also be manifest, that the Opinion of the Substantial Presence never entered into the *Western Church*, till *Paschasius Robertus* first Invented it, who first made an Innovation in this Faith.

3. And then Thirdly, I shall prove that this New Opinion was at last adopt'd into the Faith of the Apostatiz'd Church of *Rome*, who in several Councils have not only confirm'd it, but chose the very Word *Transubstantiation*, as most proper to express it.

4. I will Evidence, that the Confessions of the *Protestant Churches*, who our Author Cites, and their Writers, both Foreign, and of the Church of *England*, though they express their Faith of the Real Presence, yet they mean it in a different Sense, from that which is determined by the *Roman Church*:

First, To clear it, that the Body and Blood of *Christ* may be Really present in the Bread and Wine, and yet not Substantially, an Enquiry will be needful into the End, for which our Blessed Lord appointed and commanded the Celebration of

this Holy Mystery; and if he is present to us in it, so as perfectly to satisfy the Design of his Institution, his Body and Blood are there in the greatest reality that can answer our *Saviour's* purpose, though not in their real Natures.

It was not to benefit our Bodies, but our Souls, that he Instituted this and all other Ordinances. He did not intend here in a Character of Honour to our Fleishly part, in conferring a privilege of handling him. How poor a favour would this be to any real purposes of our happiness? If we could suppose that he still lived among Men, so that we might not only touch his Sacred Body, but see it in the most Glorious appearance, which is more than the greatest Visionaries of the *Roman Church* will pretend, and quite contrary to what their Natural presence of his Body in their Sacrament entertains them with, where they do not, nor ever did see it, but only the Bread and Wine. If *Christ* were thus in his Humane Nature, the Object of all our Senses at once, what benefit in this particular should we enjoy more than what the wickedest Wretch living would equally share? We should be no more blessed barely in this respect, than the multitude who crowded upon him; Than *Judas*, who kissed and betrayed him; Than the Soldiers who crowned him with Thorns and clothed him in the mock Robes of a King; Than that Ring of an Impious Rabbell, who were Spectators of his being Crucified, and triumph'd in his Death. Nay, if we could renounce our Senses and Reason so far as to believe his Body Naturally present in the Sacrament, and that we receiv'd the very Substance of it into ours, and we could really think that we did so uncouth a thing, as to eat it, when by sight and taste we eat Bread: Yet how vain would this be to any real end of our Salvation, when as the greatest Villain, who has but a Mouth wide enough to take in the Consecrated Wafer, is as well a Partaker of *Christ's* Body in this sense, as the most Holy-disposed Soul. Thus insignificant would the Real substantial presence of *Christ's* Body and Blood, in the Sacrament, be to us, since he hath told us himself too, *That the Flesh profiteth nothing*: And therefore, if we will believe him, on his own Word, we cannot imagine he offers himself in that way, unless we can think, that when he intended us the greatest privilege of his Gospel, and which should do

us the most good, he would order the matter so, as in effect it should do us no good at all. We may then be sure of this, that however otherwise he meant to be present to us in this holy Supper, he never design'd to be there Corporally, that we might put him into our Mouths; and I am very apt to think, that when he ascended to Heaven, he never thought to remove thence again, only to be carried about the Streets and shewn.

Our *Saviour* then does not give his Body to nourish ours, nor pours out his Blood to be transfus'd into our Veins; both his Body and Blood are presented to us in the Bread and Wine, to profit our Souls; and therefore the Presence of them in those Elements, must be suitable to such Beings as our Spirits, and in a way proper to distribute into them, their Gracious Influences and Effects: It must be Real, but Spiritual; It is Spiritual, that is not Bodily: For what would that concern the benefit of our Souls, which are no more capable of a Corporeal good, than our Bodies can be nourish'd by the knowledge of things? It is Spiritual, that it may be suitable to the Operations of our Spirits, whose refin'd Nature makes the Substantial presence of a thing unnecessary to place it before them, and when I think of any Object, though past, or far distant, it is as really in the view of my mind, as what I see just at my Elbow.

The Body and Blood of *Christ* then, as represented in the Signs, the Bread and the Wine, are as really present to our Faith contemplating them, as any thing can be present to the acts of our Minds. And the outward signs themselves are not more truly before our Eyes, than the things signify'd are before our Thoughts, which upon the notice which the Sign gives, instantly view and consider, what 'tis ordain'd to represent. And Faith, which acts the greatest part in making us Partakers of the Genuine blessings of this Sacrament, hath in the Word of God this Office appointed to it, that it realizes, or makes present to us, things that are far distant. It is call'd *the Substance of Things hoped for, and the Evidence of Things not seen*; what is descry'd in a far Prospect by our Hopes, Faith brings so near, that it sets them before us, as if we held them in our hands and solidly possess'd them.

Heb. 11. 1.

And therefore *Christ's* Body and Blood, are not merely brought to our remembrance by the outward Signs, as Figures of them, but with them are deliver'd to us, to all the intents and purposes wherein they can do us good. Thus in receiving the Bread and Wine, we receive *Christ's* Body and Blood too, as far as they can be given into our possession; and *Christ* design'd them for us. We have all, for which that Body was broken, and his Blood pour'd out, the pardon of Sin, and Peace, and Reconciliation with an offended God, and his favour confirm'd to us. And therefore we really receive that Body and Blood, since we effectually receive them to all their gracious Ends. And what real Presence of them can we desire more? I am certain this is as much as can be truly beneficial to our Souls, and the Sacrament aims at nothing farther.

Nor are we to think that the blessed Effects only of *Christ's* Body and Blood are presented to us with the Elements, which *Christ* has therefore instituted in Signs and Seals of this unvaluable Gift: But all gracious Influences are communicated to us, our Grace increas'd, and spiritual Strength improv'd, and the heavenly Life supplied with fresh force and vigour. This is the blessed Efficacy of *Christ's* Body and Blood, which as really are present in the Sacrament to nourish and sanctifie our Souls, as the Bread and Wine are to feed and refresh our Bodies.

Thus *Christ* is really present in the Sacrament, that is, Spiritually so unto our Souls in such a manner, as is most effectual to Influence and Bless them, and yet he is not there in his Natural Being. So that according to this Explication of it, there will be vast difference between his Real and Substantial Presence: And all the Authors which are Cited, as Asserting both; yet all they indeed express, is only this, That *Christ* is Truly and Really Present in the Sacrament: Which they might very well affirm in the Sense I have given, and yet never have a thought of his being Substantially there.

I could

I could not but wonder to find it affirm'd, with so great Assurance, and bold Appeal, to all that are but ordinarily Conversant in Ecclesiastical Learning, That the Ancient Fathers from Age to Age, Asserted the Real and Substantial Presence, in very high and Expressive Terms. And yet all that is brought to prove it, is nothing but the bare mention of some Greek and Latine words, which are of a very general and doubtful Signification, and may be apply'd to a hundred things sooner than to what they are made to design. If it were in an Age like that of which *Erasmus* gives so pleasant a Character; That it was so devoutly Ignorant, as it was accounted a Heresie to understand Greek; then no Man could know but these hard Words might be unanswerable Arguments: but now the Sense of them is easie enough to be found out, that they Import nothing to the present purpose, and that they do not at all mean the Real and Substantial Presence, as the Author Translates them.

And as easie it is to clear the Ancient Fathers from what he would impose on them; and to prove that they are so far from asserting the Real and Substantial Presence in High and Expressive Terms, that there is not the least Expression in any of them to favour that Opinion. And though indeed they say that *Christ* is Really present in the Bread and Wine, and they phrase it often in Magnificent and flourishing words; yet they mean it in the Sacramental and Spiritual sense, not the Natural manner of Being.

It will be unnecessary, after the great Volumes which have been writ to this purpose, to swell these few Sheets with numerous Citations: I shall only select some few that will more nearly concern the present Debate.

If the Fathers call the Elements of Bread and Wine, the Types, or Figures, or Signs of *Christ's* Body and Blood; it will unavoidably follow, that they never understood any other Real Presence of them, than such as is Attributed to the Thing signifi'd, when it is offer'd and exhibited to our Minds by the Sign which denotes it; and therefore are not Substantially there, but only in a clear and lively representation to our Faith.

Reasons
for Abro-
gating the
Test. pag.
13. 1st. Ed.

Faith. And yet nothing is more common in their Writings than such Expressions, Tertilian against Marcion, speaks clearly to this purpose in so many words, ^a That Jesus Christ made the Bread his Body, in saying, This is my Body; that is to say, the Figure of my Body. And ^b that our Lord put on the Bread, the Figure of his Body. And St. Augustin calls it a Sign, in these words; ^c Our Lord did not scruple to say, This is my Body, when he gave the Sign of his Body.

^a Revellian contra Marcionem, Lib. 4. c. 40. ^b Ibid. L. 3. c. 19.

^c Augustin Eusebii Bishop of Caserea, speaks plainly the same Language, such a Harmond was there, not only in their Faith, but their Tongues. ^d He himself (speaking of our Lord Jesus Christ) deliver'd to his Disciples, the Symbols of the Divine Dispensation; Exhorting them to represent the Image of his Body. And in what they were to do it, he explains at but two Lines distance. He prescrib'd to them, that they should use the Bread as the Symbol of his Body.

It will not be improper to add a Testimony to the same purpose out of the Liturgy of St. Basil, especially since the Author of the Reasons, &c. lays a great Weight on this Prayer us'd in the Greek form of Consecration. Make this Bread the Precious Body of thy Christ; and that which is in this Cup, the Precious Blood of thy Christ: which Words are taken out of the Liturgies of St. Chrysostom and St. Basil. And if they are, they must not be understood as he would have them, unless he will allow a greater Contradiction in the Liturgy it self; where in the Prayer which the Priest makes just before the Consecration, there are these Words: He left to us the Monuments of his Passion that Saves us, even these which by his Command, we now set before you. And the same he calls after the Consecration, The Antitypes of the Holy Body and Blood of Christ. But how could the Bread and Wine be the Types, or Signs, or Images of Christ's Body and Blood, if they were chang'd into their Substance, and so became one and the same thing with them?

κατὰ τὴν ἑνὴν τὴν ὁμοιωματικὰ τὰ ὅσα ἡμεῖς ἀνομοιωτῶμεν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἡμεῖς ὡς αὐτὸς ἔσμεν.

It will not be improper to add one Testimony more, which coming from one of the Popes, carries with it the greater Authority, and must claim Credit on the score of Infallibility. It is Gelasius, who lived about the end of the Fifth Century,

who

who speaks like as a rank Sacramentarian, as Peter Martyr or any of them all. Certainly (says he) the Sacraments which we take of the Body and Blood of Christ, are a Divine Thing, for which reason we by them 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 likeness of Christ's Body and Blood are celebrated in the Action of these Mysteries.

Gelasius de duabus nat. in Christo in Biblioth. Parr. 2. Tom. 4. p. 522. Ed. 5. Bini.

And these Instances are a sure and sufficient Evidence, that the Ancient Fathers never appropriated any thing else to the Bread and Wine but the signs of Christs Body and Blood, and therefore could understand no more Real Presence than what agrees to a Thing as represented by its sign.

And to our receiving that Body, and that Blood, together with the outward Elements, they meant no more by it, than that all the Heavenly Influences, Spiritual Blessings, and Effects of Christ's Body and Blood, are Communicated and confirm'd to us in this Sacrament; I will produce two or three Witnesses to prove it, and the first shall be St. Cyprian, who in his Discourse of the Lords Supper, thus expresth himself: An Immortal Nourishment is given different from common Food retaining the Appearance of Corporal Substance, but by an Invisible Efficacy manifesting the presence of the Divine Power. And he further Explains his meaning in these words. That common Bread chang'd into Flesh and Blood, procures Life and Growth to our Bodies, and therefore by this usual Effect of things, the weakness of our Faith being help'd, is taught by a sensible Argument, that the Effect of Eternal Life is in the visible Sacraments. Agreeable to this, is what Saint Austin says in his Comment on the 98th Psalm, where he introduces our Saviour to remove the offence which his Disciples had taken at his Words in John 6. 53. thus speaking to them, You are not to eat this Body which you see, nor to drink that Blood, which those who will Crucifie me, shall shed; I have commended a certain Sacrament to you, which Spiritually understood, will give you Life.

S. Cyprianus de carnal. Domini.

Lib. 4. de Sacramentis. I will mention but two more, the first shall be *St. Ambrose*, who speaking of the Sacrament hath these Words. *The substance of the Bread is not taken away, but the Grace of the Body of Christ is superadded to the Bread, and thence it hath the Name of that Body given to it.* By the Grace of Christ's Body, nothing else can be meant, but all the gracious Effects and Blessings which are procur'd to us by his Death and Blood, and which the Bread and Wine exhibit and present to us.

Homil. 45. in S. Job. The next shall be *St. Chrysostome*, who expressly refutes our eating Christ's Body in the Natural Substance of it. *Mysteries (Cysbe) are not Carnally, but with our inward Eyes, that is Spiritually to be considered and contemplated, for this is the nature of Mysteries.* And a little after. *As in Baptism, by the sensible Element of Water, the intelligible gift of Regeneration is conferr'd, so this Intelligible gift of the Body and Blood of Christ, is not perceiv'd by any Corporeal, or sensible Action, but by the Spiritual understanding of Faith in the Soul and Mind.*

Now these Expressions are so clear, that the sense of them may be discern'd at first sight, and therefore can more surely direct us to a full and plain understanding of the Mind of the Fathers, than Metaphors and Figures of Eloquence, or than general ambiguous Phrases, which may promiscuously be applied to signifye an hundred diuerent Things. It is indeed very well known, that they often express themselves in high and glorious Terms; but we are to reflect upon the fair occasion that they had to do so, and on what was their design. It was an Early and Just Complaint in the Church, that many of those who were admitted to the participation of this Holy Mystery, had too slight Thoughts of it, and did not approach it with a becoming Reverence. They had not an awful sense, and therefore receiv'd the Sacrament as if they eat only Common Bread and Wine; The ordinary Entertainments of a Love Feast, and the ties of Christian Charity and Fellowship, for so was Eating together accounted among the Ancients. Of this the Apostle gives us a large account in his first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, & grievously complains; and writes, not only with the greatest earnestness, but in the highest Language could be used, to alarm them with the danger of their stupid negligence. He therefore roundly tells them, that they were guilty of Profaneness towards the Body and Blood of Christ, and do eat and drink Damnation, because they discern'd not the Lord's Body.

Because

Because they took the Bread and Wine without regard to the sacred Institution, not looking on them as the Symbols which *Christ* had appointed to represent his Body and his Blood, and so were guilty of neglecting them, because they did not by Faith see them spiritually exhibited in the outward Signs. And to the same intent he speaks so gloriously of this Ordinance in the preceding Chapter, where he honours the Bread and Wine which went round the holy Assembly with no lower Title, than the Communion of the Body and Blood of *Christ*: That so they might not have such poor Apprehensions of this Blessed Feast, that in it they Eat and Drank together, only as the Bond and Token of Christian Communion; but they ought to penetrate the recesses of this glorious Mystery, and discern the inestimable Blessing unseen and cover'd under it. They had not merely Communion one with another in Assembling to Eat together, but they Communicated in the same Body of Christ, since all the Effects, Influences, and Efficacy of his Body and Blood was distributed with the Bread and Wine to every Holy Soul in the Assembly, who worthily receiv'd. Such high and magnificent words did the Apostle think necessary, which by applying all the Glory and Majesty of the Things signified to the Signs, might procure it due Veneration. By the same proportion we are to measure the intended meaning of the Fathers, when they say, that the Bread and Wine, are Chang'd, Transform'd, Transelemented, &c. into the Body and Blood of *Christ*. They thought they could not speak too loftily on this Subject, to advance its Dignity; and therefore employ'd all the Flourishes of Eloquence, of which they were great Masters, to describe it to the People in the most Glorious and Heavenly Shape it could be drawn. They design'd to raise the thoughts of the Communicants, to consider there was a great deal more in this solemn act of their Religion, than what was barely offer'd to their sense; and that the visible matter of the Sacrament was not vain and empty Signs, but as Instituted and Commanded by our Lord *Christ*, were follow'd with his Blessings, and accompanied with the Life and Spirits of his Body and Blood to all gracious purposes.

And on this account, as our *Saviour* himself did not, so neither did they make any difficulty to honour the Bread with the name of his Body: Nay, sometimes in the heat and rapture of their Zeal, to inflame Peoples Affections, and warm their Devotions, they would use the most high and expressive Terms.

The *Greek* Fathers, those of *μεταβολη, μετατροποις, μετασκευασις, μεταποισις, μετασχημασις.* And the *Latines* agreeable Abrogating, with the *Greeks*, *Conversion, Transmutation, Transformation, Trans-* *figuration,*

figuration, Transfementation, (*Transubstantiation* only excepted, which the Author of the Reasons, &c. puts in among the rest, and yet it is not to be found in any of the Ancients,) by all which they express'd nothing less than the Real and Substantial Presence in the Eucharist, unless he will fasten so Invidious a Character on the Fathers of the Church, as to accuse them of Writing against themselves. And contradict themselves they must, if those Words of theirs are Explain'd of the conversion of the substance of the Bread, (and any other change besides Substantial will signify nothing to the purpose) into the Substance of Christ's Body. For nothing can be more contrary than such a real Conversion to all their other Expressions concerning the Supper of our Lord, wherein they call the Bread and Wine, Signs and Figures of Christ's Body and Blood; of which I have before given some few, when I might have innumerable Instances.

But what tho the Fathers never explain'd themselves in any other than these Words, which the Author Assigns as a valid proof, that they believed the Real Substantial Presence, yet from Words which are of so doubtful a sound, no Argument can be form'd to make it good, unless it could be prov'd they were determin'd to signify a change of Substance, and could Import nothing less. And for this I dare Appeal to him, or any other, to produce a Sentence out of any of the Fathers, or any other Authors of Fame for the Propriety of those two Languages, wherein any of these Words are accepted in that peculiar meaning he is pleas'd to put upon them.

And yet I will give several Instances as well out of the Fathers, as prophane Writers, that these words are made use of to express such Things, wherein it would be perfect Non-sense to understand any Change of their Being or Substance.

And first for the Word *μεταβολή*, if we may believe *Suidas*, it signifies in general all Change whatever, as well in Quantity, Quality, and Place as Substance, and so may be indifferently us'd in respect of them all. And accordingly *Gregory Nyssen*. expresseth by it the Change that is wrought in us in Regeneration, and what passeth, on us by Baptism, which no Man will say moulds us into a new Substance.

Nor will the next Words serve his Design more successfully. For *μεταρρύθμισις*, means no more than the Reformation, or Amendment of a Thing. Thus *Xenophon* introduces the Master of a Family visiting his Servants in their several Employments in the Fields,

Suidas in voce *μεταβολή*.

Greg. Nyssen. Orat. Catech. Tom. 3. p. 108. Τὸ ἐστὶ ἀναγεννησάτω καὶ τὴ μεταβολὴ τῆς φύσεως ἡμῶν πρὸς σωτηρίαν περὶ ἀναμάρτητων γίνεσθαι πιστῶν πρὸς τὸ ἡγῶν ἐστὶ καὶ paulo post ἡ δὲ τῶ βαπτισματὸς σφραγὶς τῶ κρείττονος μεταβολῆς.
Xenophon Oecomon. pag. 495. Opt. Ed. Gr. Ἡ δὲ ἐστὶ μεταρρύθμισις ὡς ἐδὲν ἕκαστὸν τῶ βέλτιον, τὸ πρεσβύτερον.

Fields, and having diligently survey'd them all, says he, *if I see any thing that I judg may be better done, I amend it.* And in the same sense *Aristotle* uses the Word, speaking of reclaiming the vicious from a lewd course of Life, who were acted only by Passion, or Pleasure, and such, says he, *what Reason can correct or reform.* And *Clemens Alexandrinus* when he says, *That Learning doth adorn and accomplish a Man by the Improvement of his Nature*, expresseth it by the same Word. And yet all this is done without metamorphosing a Man into some other Creature.

But let us try what the other *μετασκευασμός* will do for the cause. It properly signifies to make a thing change its place: But it is us'd by *Senefius* to express the alteration of a State, or course of Life, and yet a Man may pass from one place to another, or alter his way of living, and continue the same unchang'd in his Being, *μεταποιήσις* signifies the Change of a thing too, but such as may well be together with the sameness of its Substance. Since *Justin Martyr* makes this word to explain the Restoration of all things at the last day of the World, which yet he never could imagine would be turned into a new one for Substance. And *Gregory Nyssen*. has the same Word to express the Change of our Life after Regeneration.

The great Contest is for the next Word *μετασχηματισμός*, which according to *Suidas* is the turning of any thing into another Figure and Shape, and if we take this Signification of it from him, it will do very little good in the present case, since the most zealous Assertors of the real Substantial Presence, were never yet to abandon'd of Sense, as to say that the Figure of the Bread is chang'd into that of Christ's Body, since the Figure is one of the Accidents of Bread and Wine, which they affirm to remain after the Consecration. But if we should suffer the word to be rendred as the Author pleases, to signify Transfementation, yet even thus it could never signify a Conversion of one Substance into another; unless he will say, that we are transfubstantiated

Arist. de Moribus. lib. 10. Tom. 3. Op. pag. 186. Ed. Duvallii, Τὸς δὲ ἡσολοῖστος τῆς ἀν' λόγου μεταρρυθμῶσαι.

Clemens Alexandr. Strom. lib. 4. p. 534. Ed. Paris 1629. Κι δὲ ἡ ἀδελφὴ μεταρρυθμῶσαι τὸ ἀποθεῖται.

Senefius in Epist. pag. 58. Edit. Gr. Turnebi. Καίσις τῶ ἀν' ἀδελφῶν ἢ τῶ ἡσολοῖστος μεταρρυθμῶσαι τῶ ἀποθεῖται τῶ μεταρρυθμῶσαι τῶ ἀποθεῖται.

Justin Martyr Quaest. 1. ad Graecos. Οὐδὲ τῶ ἀδελφῶν ἢ τῶ ἀποθεῖται μεταρρυθμῶσαι τῶ ἀποθεῖται τῶ ἀποθεῖται.

Greg. Nyssen. Orat. Catech. Tom. 3. p. 108. Ἡ δὲ τῶ ἀδελφῶν μεταρρυθμῶσαι τῶ ἀποθεῖται.

Suidas in voce *μετασχηματισμός*.

Cyrl Alexand. de Adorat. lib. 17. Ο (sc. Christus) πάντα πρὸς ἑαυτὴν ἡ μετασχηματισμῶν.

Cyrl Alexand. in Joh. 3. in Catech. διὰ τὸς ἁγίων ἁγίων ἀνεργείας τὸ αἰδιονότῳ ἰδωσ πρὸς εἶπεν τίνα αἰ ἀπὸρρίσθον ἡ ἐξουσιάζειται διὰ τὴν ἀνεργεία τὴ λαοῦν τὸς ἐν οἷς ἐν γένει.

when our Natures are renewed by Grace : For *Cyrl* of *Alexandria* expresses it by this word. And if *Gregory Nyssen.* and *Theophilact* use the term μετασχηματισμῶν with respect to the Bread and Wine, they must yet mean by it some other Change, than that of Substance. For it will hardly be acknowledg'd, that the Water in the other Sacraments of Baptism is transubstantiated, yet this Phrase μετασχηματισμῶν is as well brought in by *Cyrl* of *Alexandria*, when he speaks of the Waters of Baptism, as it is by *Nyssen* and *Theophilact* in discoursing concerning the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist, and if it must express a substantial Conversion of the Elements in one Sacrament, with equal Reason it must import the same in the other. But if it is granted that all the Change

of the Baptismal Water is only as to its designation to a holy Use and Blessing, then neither will there be any other alteration of the Sacramental Bread and Wine, than their being consecrated to a peculiar and sacred use, so that they are no longer common things, but hallow'd by our Lord's Institution.

So now all that can be infer'd from these Greek Expressions is only this, That the Bread and Wine after the Words of Blessing are pronounc'd are chang'd; but how? not into other Substances, but in respect of their Appointment to a solemn and sacred Office. They were before the common Food of our Bodies, now they are the lively Signs of Christ's Body and Blood. Thus poor Fishermen were by God's peculiar designation turn'd into Apostles, and yet the Nature of Men continued in them the same.

* Such as Conversion, Transmutation, Transformation, Transfiguration, Transfiguration.

For the same Reasons the Latin Words used by the Fathers who wrote in that Language *, will as little advantage the business of the real Substantial Preference, since their signification is as general and unrestrained as the other. They mean some change indeed to be in the holy Materials of the Eucharist; but it may be such an one as I have assign'd, merely as to condition and usage, since no other is determin'd by the sense of the Words as used in any Author.

So vain is it to argue from an uncertain found of words, which have a general unlimited sense, since 'tis against all the Rules of Reason to fix a particular meaning on those Expressions, which are deliver'd in general terms, and so may be understood many ways.

Indeed, if the Learned Author of the Reasons, &c. could have employ'd the word μετασχηματισμῶν, it would have done excellent service, since this perfectly deciphers a conversion of Substance, and exactly answers Transubstantiation. But he very well knew, that the one is no more to be found among the Greek Fathers; than the other among the Latins. If all the Fathers from Age to Age, asserted the Real and Substantial Preference, in very high and expressive terms, as the Author says they did; How unluckily did they miss this word μετασχηματισμῶν, which was most proper and full to have explain'd such a meaning. The Church of Rome hath made sufficient provision, that none may doubt of Hers, by inventing a very high and expressive term indeed, Transubstantiation, which I must confess, has a sense particular, and very decisive.

We are by this inform'd what was the Belief of the Church in this Article till the fifth Century, and none presum'd to remove this Foundation of the Faith, till the middle of the Seventh. *Ephrem* Patriarch of *Antioch*, who lived in the beginning of the Sixth; *Facundus* an *African* Bishop, who flourish'd about the middle of the same Age; and *Isidore* Bishop of *Sevil* in *Spain*, who wrote in the first Years of the seventh Century, express'd themselves, concerning the Eucharist, exactly in the same manner as all the Fathers before them. *Ephrem* in a Discourse against the *Eutychians*, (of which *Photius* hath given us an abstract) to prove the Distinction of the two Natures in Christ, takes an Instance from the Bread in the Eucharist, which he asserts to retain its proper Substance; and that the Body of Christ is present only to our Minds, and in respect of that Grace which is exhibited with the Signs. And accordingly he draws a comparison between that Sacrament, and Baptism; which tho it is wholly Spiritual, yet preserves the Property of its sensible Substance, the *Water*, which loseth nothing of what it was made.

Photius in Biblioth. p. 794. Ed. Roem. 1652.

Facundus says plainly, That neither the Bread is properly Christ's Body, nor the Wine his Blood, but that they are called so, because they contain in them the Mystery of his Body and Blood.

Isidor. Hist. de Offic. Eccl. lib. 1. being cap. 18.

being both of them sanctified by the Holy Spirit, are turn'd into the Sacrament of the Divine Body.

I might add a great many other, since there is no one Writer of these Ages, which explain'd their thoughts of the Real Presence in any other terms. So constant and agreeing was the belief of the Church in this Article, till two Greek Monks began to express it in different and suspicious words.

The first, whose way of writing had any Aspect looking toward the Real Substantial Presence was *Anastasius*, a Monk of Mount *Sinai*. He was the first who denied the Bread and Wine in the Sacrament, to be the Signs or Types of the Body and Blood of Christ, and affirm'd them to be the Things themselves. And he wrote about the middle of the seventh Century.

The other was a Monk of *St. Sabas in Palestine*, who lived in the Eighth. And the occasion of his receding from the Ancient Doctrine of the Church, and advancing this new Opinion, was the Contest which began in the Greek Church about the Worship of Images.

Leo Isauricus, who succeeded *Artemius*, or *Anastasius the 2d*, in the Throne of the Grecian Empire, by a publick Edict commanded, that Images should be broken down in all Churches; which was executed, tho not without some resistance from the superstition of the People. The two great Zealors, who inflam'd, and animated the fury of the Rabble against their Emperor, were *German* the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, and this Monk of the Monastery of *St. Sabas in Palestine*, who from his Grand-father had the Name of *Manfur*; but that by which he was then usually call'd, and by which he is now most known, is *John Damascene*. because he was of an Ancient and Illustrious Family in *Damascus*. He was very active in writing Circulatory Letters in defence of Images, to rekindle the mad Devotion of the People, and to excite them, in defiance unto their Prince's Order, to set them up again. Upon this followed

horrible Confusions and Disorders in the Government; which to appease, the next Emperor *Constantine Copronymus* assembled a Council at *Constantinople*, who by their Decisions might quiet these Differences and Heats, wherein no less than 338 Bishops agreed, with one consent, to condemn Image-Worship, and to establish the true Faith concerning the Eucharist upon that occasion. It was of

so many as 338 that Council consisted, as appears by the number recorded in the Decree of that Council, which is extant entire in the seventh Act of the second *Nicene*. Which great Number, tho the *Annalist* bewails as a dismal Sign of the Corruption and Apostacy of the

the Eastern Church, yet it were rather an Indication how pure the Faith had been hitherto preserv'd as to the Eucharist: since all these Fathers, with one Voice, not only determin'd the *Worship of Images to be a revival of the old Idolatry of the Heathens*; but they also defin'd the Sacrament to be the proper Figure which Christ had given us of his Body. Because the most plausible Argument for the use of Images was, that Christ as Man might be represented; and so his picture being his Likeness, be reverenc'd, they declar'd, in answer to it, That to describe the Person of Christ in a Picture, or a Statue, was either with *Nestorius* to divide his Humane Nature from his Divine, of which no Resemblance could be made; or else it would, as *Eutyches*, confound them together. And farther, to shew how unnecessary and impertinent it was to frame an Image of Christ, they produced the Eucharist as the true Image which himself had appointed, to represent his Body and his Blood to the exclusion of all other.

They also particularly Excommunicated *Germain* the Patriarch, *George* Bishop of *Cyprus*, and *John Damascene*, which three had with great heat asserted the Adoration of Images. And the last of the three they mark'd with the black Character of an Idolater, one injurious to Christ, and a Teacher of Impiety. This was enough to make his Blood boil, and to alarm him unto a fierce opposition of the Councils Decrees against his Opinion; which he thought himself now as much oblig'd in Honour, as by Inclination to defend. To vindicate his dear espoused Cause, it was needful to remove the Objection which the Council had rais'd concerning the Eucharist, which they affirm'd to be the sole Image of his Body, that Christ had recommended to us. To cut this off throughly, he scruples not to assert, what none had ever done before him, That the Bread, and Wine, and the Water, by the Invocation and coming down of the Holy Ghost, are supernaturally changed into the Body and Blood of Christ; and so now they are no longer two distinct, but one and the same thing. And a little after he hath these words; The Bread, and the Wine, are not the Types and Figures of the Body and Blood of Christ; God forbid, but they are the Deified Body it self of our Lord; since he himself hath said, This is not the Type or Figure of my Body, but my Body; not the Figure of my Blood, but my Blood. Thus according to the common Observation, that one Error is maintained by bringing in the Aid of another: This Monk calls in the Real Substantial Presence as an Auxiliary to defend the Worship of Images.

Baronii Annal. To. 9. ad Annum 787. pag. 402, 403. & cap. 5. Act. 6. Secundi Niceni Conc. in collect. Labbei Tom. 7.

Joan. Damascen. de Orthodoxa Fide. Lib. 4. c. 14.

And

Anastasi. Sinaita in "Odywá, cap. 23.

Baronii Annal. To. 9. ad Annum 727. pag. 86, & 90. Ed. Plant. 1612.

Baron. Ibid. ad Annum 754. pag. 221.

Baron. Ibid. ad Annum 787. pag. 402, 403. & cap. 5. Act. 7. Secundi Niceni Concilii in collect. Labbei Tom. 7.

And thus the beginnings of Transformation were form'd, till by degrees it grew up to that monstrous Opinion, which now frightens all our Senses and Reason. It was first introduced, because thought necessary for the support of Idolatry, and for the same Reasons the Church of *Rome* at last adopted it, and so zealously continues it. It must be confess'd, that *Damascens* Expression is not precisely the same with Transubstantiation, nor speaks he out so broadly as the Church of *Rome* does; yet it hath a very suspicious Face, which looks that way, and imports the same thing, though not in express terms. For to say that the Bread and Wine are so chang'd into Christ's Body and Blood, as they are no longer distinct, but one and the same thing, is in effect to assert, that the first are transubstantiated into the last.

However, these two Greek Monks left at least the old Expressions concerning the Eucharist, if not quite abandon'd the Faith; and they were the first whose new Mode of speaking began to be suspected in this Article.

Baronius, Ibid. Tom. 9. ad Annum 787. pag. 391. Act. 5. secundi Niceni Concilii in Collect. Concilii Labbei. Tom. 7.

It was from this Great Champion of Image-Worship, that the second Council of *Nice*, (which was conven'd by the Empress *Irene*, in the Year 787, to rescin'd the Acts of the former, and to re-establish Images) in their fifth Session examin'd this same Argument which the Fathers of that same Council at *Constantinople* had urged against Images to prove them needless and frivolous, since Christ in the Eucharist had instituted the Image of his Body as sufficient to represent him, without any other.

And it is very remarkable, that the Answer which they made to it, they borrow entirely from *Damascene*: For they declare almost in the same words as he had done above thirty Years before, *That neither Jesus Christ, nor the Apostles, nor the Fathers, have ever call'd the unbloody Sacrifice offer'd by the Priests an Image, but they nam'd it the Body it self, and the Blood it self. The Gifts are call'd, piously, Antitypes, by some of the Fathers, before the Consecration is perfected; but after the Consecration, they are call'd properly, they are really, and are to be believed to be the Body and Blood of Christ, because, if it be the Image of his Body, it cannot be the same Divine Body.*

But

But tho' *Damascene*, and the second Council of *Nice* started this new, and unto former times unknown Opinion about the Eucharist; yet the ancient Faith was still preserv'd in this Point, and few, or none embraced the Innovation. *Bede* who liv'd in the same Age retains the names of Signs or Figures in the Sacrament, when he says, that *Our Lord gave us the Sacrament of his Body and Blood under the figure of Bread and Wine, and that he gave to his Disciples the figure of his Body, and of his Blood. And Charles the Great, who survived long after this Council, writing to his Preceptor Alcuinus. Our Lord, says he, supping, broke the Bread, and gave them the Cup for the Figure of his Body, and his Blood, and gave them a great Sacrament for our profit.*

Bede in Luc. c. 22. Item in Psal. 3.

De Rat. Septuag. ad Alcuin.

As two Greek Monks were the first who started this Notion of the real substantial Presence in the Eastern, so a Monk of *Corbie* in 818. was the first Inventor of this unintelligible Mystery in the Western Church. It was *Paschasius Ratbertus* who affected a new way of expressing himself, different from all of the former and of his own Age, denying the Bread and Wine to be Signs of Christ's Body, but that the first were changed into the Substance of the other. To him therefore is due the Honour of hammering out the Notion, tho' not of coining the word Transubstantiation. And so He, not *Berengarius* first made the Eucharist a Controversie, by disputing against what was before generally receiv'd, viz. The real Presence in the Bread and Wine not substantially, but as in the Signs, and Sacraments of them, and thus created a Contest, which was very warm in his own time, and hath since distract'd all *Christendom*. And he was the first original of this Mischief; for tho' *John Damascene*, and the second Council of *Nice* declared the same thing in Effect, yet besides that, neither the new Language of the one, nor the Decisions of the other were much regarded, or thought worthy of notice: This Monk of *Corbie* spoke out more plainly, and alarm'd all this part of *Europe* with the Strangeness of a new Opinion unheard before, and contrary to the perpetual Belief of the Church in all Ages. And that he was the first Father of this now so great Article of Faith, both *Bellarmino* and *Sirmondus* frankly own. *That Author* (says the famous Cardinal) *was the first, who profess'dly wrote of the Reality of Christ's Body and Blood in the Eucharist. And he first of all prefix'd ejus* (says the other Learned Jesuit) *hath so explained the true*

Bellarmino de Scripturis Ecclesiasticis. In Paschasio Ratberto.

Sirmondus in vita Paschasii prefixa ejus Oper. Impr. Paris.

Sense of the Catholick Church, that he open'd the way to all others, who have since wrote of the same matter.

And that his Opinions were new, and founded oddly in the Church, is evident from the rough Entertainment both they and their Author found. If we will believe himself, he was despis'd as a phantastical Young-man, who with a rash Boldness advanc'd new Opinions; or as a wild Visionary, who would impose his Dreams on the rest of Mankind. For what other occasion than this could move him to write in such terms as these to his intimate Friend? *You have* (says he) *at the end of the Book* (meaning his own Discourse of the Body and Blood of Christ) *the Sentiments of the Catholick Fathers; which I have briefly marked, that you may know it is not by Enthusiasm, or an Inspiration of Raliness, that I have had these Visions, when I was but yet a young Man.* To what end should he thus express himself, were it not to efface those reproachful Aspersions, which were commonly thrown upon him? And how can we imagine all the learned and good Men of his time would have thus upbraided him, if his Opinions had been consonant to the Faith of the Church? Or, if indeed he delivered nothing but what was generally believed among Christians; what means he by these words to the same Friend, propounding some Difficulties concerning his Doctrine, *You question me* (says he) *upon a thing, of which a great many doubt?* So far was it from being any part of the Catholick Creed. And in his Comment on the 26th of *Matthew*, he speaks his own diffidence how his Opinions were entertain'd. *I have treated* (says he) *of these things more at length, because I understand that some reprove me, as if in my Book of the Sacraments, which I have published, I gave to the words of Christ more than the Truth would permit.* So that he seems in the whole Conduct of this Affair to manage himself like a Man, who designed to set up himself as the Author of a new Hypothesis in Religion, and agreeably uses all Addresses and Arts of Insinuation to gain Credit unto his Assertions, that they might be accepted.

And now what was the dear Opinion, with which he was so enamour'd, and which he so studiously endeavour'd to promote? I will give it in his own words. *Though* (says he) *there is the Figure or Appearance of Bread and Wine, yet we must absolutely believe, that it is no other after the Consecration, than*

Paschasius Rabertus Epist. ad Frudegardum.

Paschasius Rabertus Ibid.

In Biblioth. Patr. Tom. 6. p. 285. Ed. 3. d. iiii.

Paschasius Rabert. de Corp. & Sang. Domini, c. 1. in Biblioth. Patr. Ibid. 247.

the Body and Blood of Christ: For which Reason Truth it self said to his Disciples, It is my Flesh for the Life of the World. And to speak something more admirable (observe how he applauds the rarity of his Notion) It is not at all any other Flesh, than what is born of the Virgin Mary, which suffered on the Cross, and is risen from the Grave. This, I must confess, is to assert the Real and Substantial Presence in high and expressive terms: But herein he is alone, since none ever before him, but two Greek Monks, and the Conventicle at *Nice*, offer'd any thing resembling; nor had he above two or three of his Contemporaries to follow him. I am sure all the Learning and Piety of the Times wherein he lived, vigorously oppos'd him; and how much they differ'd from him, let us but hear from himself, After having repeated the words of the Institution, *Take, eat, this is my Body*, he adds, *Let those who will extenuate this term of Body saying, that it is not the true Flesh of Jesus Christ which we celebrate in the Sacrament, nor his true Blood, but hear these words: They feign I know not what, as though there was in the Sacrament, only a certain vertue of the Flesh and Blood of Christ in such manner that our Savior must have spoke false, and that it is not indeed the true Flesh, and the true Blood, &c.* When he broke and gave the Bread to his Disciples, he said not, *This is, or there is in this Mystery a certain Vertue, or a Figure of my Body, but he hath said, This is my Body.* And a little after, *I am amaz'd at it, that some now will say it is not the reality of the Flesh and Blood of Christ in the thing it self, but in the Sacrament, a certain Efficacy of the Flesh, and not the Flesh; a Vertue of the Blood, and not the Blood; a Figure, and not the Reality; a Shadow, and not the Body.*

And this Doctrine, which all believed but himself, is perfectly agreeable to what was the Faith of the Antient Church, and is now the Faith of the Protestant Churches.

So upon the whole, That Catholick Church which hath in all Ages, according to the Author of the Reasons, &c. asserted the Real and Substantial Presence is no where as yet to be found but in this poor Monk of *Corbie*, or two or three deluded by him, since all the rest of *Christendom* asserted the Real Presence no otherwise than as in the beginning of the Discourse I explained it, and have prov'd it to be the meaning of the Fathers, and general Consent of the Church, till this unhappy Age, wherein *Rabertus* in his Melancholy Cell hammers out

Paschasius Rabertus Comment. in Mat. 26. pag. 290. Ibid.

a Notion, which hath fill'd the World with Disputes, and puzzled the best Wits of the Church of *Rome* to make it out.

No sooner had this Innovator thus begun to change the Doctrine of Faith, than a Holy Zeal for the Truth warm'd the greatest Men of the Age wherein he liv'd, to draw their Pens against him, and some of them were heated to a little Indignation.

Rabanus Maurus was the most considerable Person of his Time for Learning and Wit: As a Poet he is prais'd by *Antoninus*, that he excelled all who lived with him; and in all respects *Tribemius* adorns him with this high Elogy, That *Italy* never saw any thing resembling him, nor *Germany* ever produc'd his equal. From a Monk of the Monastery of *Fuld* a City on the Frontiers of *Franconia*, he was created Abbot of it; from whence his Merits remov'd him to the Arch-bishoprick of *Mentz*, where, by the command of *Lewis* the Second, Emperor, he conven'd a Synod, which Decreed several things useful for the Reformation of that Church. So that his Character gives him more Authority to support him, than a private Monk. He through all his Writing asserts the true and ancient Faith of the Church, in opposition to what *Ratbertus* had newly vented, and calls his, a wicked Opinion.

Walafridus Strabo, who, by the account *Antoninus* gives of him, was Scholar to him I have mentioned, joyn'd with him in defending the same Truth against this dangerous Innovation. To these I might add a great many others, *Amalarius*, and *Heribodus*; and the one Arch-bishop of *Treves*, the other Bishop of *Auxerre*, both of them Famous for Learning and Wisdom, which recommended the latter of them to the Favour of his Prince, *Charles the Bald*. And with these *Prudentius* Bishop of *Troys*, and *Florus* Deacon of *Lyons*, united in the same Zeal to overturn the Novel Tenents of this Monk.

But there were two of greater Name, who professedly wrote against him by the particular Command of *Charles the Bald*, who, sensible of the Divisions which this Novelty in Religion had made among his Subjects, to stop the growing Disorder, employ'd the two Men who had the highest Reputation for Learning to refute it. These two were *Joannes Scotus Erigena*, and *Bertram*. The first of them was admir'd as the most accomplish'd in all kind of Knowledge; for whom,

as

as the Emperor had a peculiar esteem, so he consulted his Judgment, especially in this new-raisd Controversie about the Prefence of Christ's Body in the Eucharist, and order'd him to confute *Ratbert*. In Obedience to which Command (as appears by an Epistle of *Berengarius*, extant in the Collections of *D'Achery*) he compos'd that Discourse of the Sacrament, which was afterward judg'd Heretical, and condemn'd to be burnt by the Council which was called at *Vercelli* against *Berengarius*. But however the Book afterward met with this hard Fate, yet in this Age neither that, or its Author were ever question'd; and tho' that Learned Man, for some uncommon Opinions which he held, had rais'd himself great Enemies, and amongst the rest, *Remy* Arch-bishop of *Lyons*, and *Florus* the Arch-deacon, who treated him with sharpness enough, yet they never accus'd him of any Error as to the Eucharist, which they would never fail'd to have done, if he had advanc'd any Opinion contrary to the general Faith. He liv'd and died in the favour of the two greatest Princes of that Age, *Alfred*, and *Charles* the Emperor, who would certainly have disowned him, if he had been tainted with Heresie. He possess'd Employments in the Church, to which he would never have been admitted, if he had in the least been blacken'd with so invidious a Character. He left the Emperor's Court upon the Invitation he had from *Alfred* into *England*, that he might be the Principal Ornament of the new-founded Univerity at *Oxford*; and to him he also trusted the Education of his Children. And yet this Man so much admir'd and courted by two Kings, must be an Apostate from the Faith, and an Heretick, and *Paschasius* be the only true Catholic. He after this was chosen to read Divinity in the Monastery at *Malmsbury*, where by the young Scholars, at the Instigation of the Monks, he was stab'd; and afterwards (as *Antoninus* tells us) was accounted a Martyr: And as *Lesly* the Scottish Historian reports it, 'Twas by the Authority of the Pope he was enroll'd in that Catalogue. And besides the Testimony of these two Historians, the same thing is manifest by his Epitaph, extant in *William* of *Malmsbury*:

Here lies John the Holy Philosopher, who in his Life was enriched with admirable Learning, and at last had the Honour to pass through Martyrdom to the Kingdom of Heaven.

Which

Antonin.
Chron. part.
2. Tit. 16. c. 2.
p. 601. *Lesly*
de Rebus Ge-
stis Regum
Lib. 5.
Guilielmus
Malmsbur. de
Gestis Regum
Angl. lib. 2.
cap. 5.

Antonin.
Chron. part.
2. Tit. 14. c.
5. pag. 423.
Ed. Junt. Lug.

Tribem. in Ca-
tal. Script.
Eccles.

*Rabanus Mau-
rus* in peni-
tent. cap. 33.
de Eucharist.

Antonin. Ibid.
p. 454.

*Robert. Aristo-
dor.* *de* *don.*
Chron.
citantur Uffe-
rio de Eccles.
Sucess. c. 2.

Cofni Hift.
Tranfubftant.
Papal. cap. 5.
fct. 32.

(26)

Which makes the Conjecture of the Learned Bishop of *Durham* probable, that the occasion of his Murther was, becaufe fome fuperftitious Monks of that Monaftery, who were infected with *Ratbert's* wild Notions, could not bear to hear him refute them in his Lectures, and fo urg'd the young Scholars to affaffinate him. And therefore with reafon might he be judged a Martyr, as dying for defence of the Truth, againft the Innovations of the *Corbician* Monk.

It is a great unhappinefs that his Book is loft, being unjuftly branded with Herefie, and burnt by the *Vercellian* Council, when Death had removed the Author far enough out of their reach. We may yet be certain, that he affirm'd the Bread and Wine to be Signs of Chrifft's Body and Blood, fince *Berengarius*, as he profefs'd to have had this Doctrine from him, fo he pleaded the Name of this Great Man in his defence. And by this we may be affur'd too, that he denied the Real fubftantial Prefence, fince his laft Writing was compos'd exprefly againft *Pafchafius Rabertus*, who had newly broach'd that Opinion.

I will not fay much of the other excellent Perfon employ'd by *Charles the Bald* in the fame Work with *Joannes Scotus* : By whose Order he compil'd againft *Ratbert* that incomparable Difcourfe of the Body and Blood of Chrifft, which, to the great benefit of the Church, had a better deftiny than that of *Erigena*, and ftill hath furviv'd. Of which, becaufe newly tranflated into our own Language, I need fay the lefs, fince every one who hath but the curiofity, may fee what Doctrine was taught in thofe days ; and that it was indeed the fame for which *Berengarius* in the Apoftacy of following Times, almoft Two hundred years after, was falfly convicted of Herefie. I will only add this concerning *Bertram*, or *Ravram*, that he was not only in great favour with his King, but of fo high efteem in the Church, that he was chosen by all the Clergy of *France*, to write in defence of the Latin Church againft the Greek.

And this is enough to convince, that the Doctrine of *Pafchafius* concerning the Real fubftantial Prefence, was not only new, and unknown, but detefted by all the worthy men of his Age ; and indeed I fhould have wondred by what ftrange Infatuation it obtained amongft any in the following Century,

Century, and fo by degrees grew into credit amongft many of the Priefts ; if I did not reflect what grofs Ignorance darken'd all the Times intervening, between the condemnation of *Berengarius*, and the Death of *R. Maurus*, *J. Scotus*, *Bertram*, &c. As if the laft fmall remains of Piety and Learning, had expired with the Breath of thofe Great Men, and forfook the World when they left it. It is then no wonder, if in the fucceeding age, grofly ftupid, and which had an unaccountable Devotion to Adoration of Images, and Invocation of Saints ; the moft unreafonable Affertion that was ever offered to Mens Minds, was embraced : And in an Age, that began to be fo frangely addicted to Idolatry, it is not to be admired, if a Doctrine was readily received, which might be thought ferviceable to promote it : Since, as I before obferved, it was to defend the Worfhip of Images, which induc'd *Damascene*, and the fecond Council of *Nice*, to give birth to this Notion of the Real Subftantial Prefence of Chrifft's Body in the Sacrament.

But as yet this Opinion of *Pafchafius Rabertus* was not eftablifhed by the Authority of the Church, fince the two Popes, *Nicholas* the Firft, and *Adrian* the Second, were filent Spectators of the new raifed Quarrel, without interefting themfelves. And though the Novelty, for the Reafons I have mentioned, pleas'd many of the Priefts, and in time acquired fome number of followers, yet through the Ninth and Tenth Centuries, the greateft part of the Church ftill retained the Ancient Faith ; and it was the ordinary bufinefs of their Difputes, to hunt down this new-ftarted Opinion.

Thus when *Odo Severus* was Archbishop of *Canterbury*, in the Year 950. there was a great conteft among his Clergy concerning the Eucharift ; fome affirming the former Subftance to continue, and that it was only the Figure, or Sign of Chrifft's Body and Blood. And all that the Archbishop alleaged in folution of the Argument, was only the Inftances of ftrange incredible Miracles wrought by the Sacrament. for this was the courfe they took to fpread the belief of the Real Subftantial Prefence among the People.

The Priefts, by feveral Impoftures, and lying Miracles, which they afcrib'd to the Hoft, endeavour'd to perfwade them, that it was really Chrifft's Body, fince they could not think

Baleus Script.
Brit. Cent. 2.
pag. 128.
Ed. 1557.
Et *Guliel.*
Malmfbur. de
Geftis Pontif.
Angl. Lib. 1.

that

that any other was capable of doing such prodigious things. But only the Ignorant were obnoxious to be so grossly abused by vain frivolous Stories; and among the Wife and Learned, few Profelytes were gain'd; for they still exprest themselves the old way, contrary to *Paschasius*.

Of these numerous Instances might be given, as of *Ælfric* Abbot of *Malmesbury*, (whose Saxon Homily is cited to this purpose by the most Pious and Learned *Usher*) of *Wulfine* Bishop of *Sherburn*, *Heringerius* Abbot of *Lobes*, *Rathervus* Bishop of *Verona*, *Lutheric* Archbishop of *Sens*, *Fulbert* Bishop of *Chartres*, and innumerable others of the Tenth and Eleventh Centuries.

But *Paschasius Rastri's* Doctrine of Christs substantial Presence getting ground among the Vulgar by the Artifices of the Priests, in the Eleventh Age *Brunon* the Bishop, and *Berengarius* the Arch-Deacon of *Angers* disdain- ing to see the Error spread so fast, were more than ordinarily zealous in opposing it. But it was more en- dear'd to the Clergy by the awe and veneration which they found the Belief of it had procured to them among the People, who could not but reverence, almost to Adoration, Persons who had such extraordinary power: As first, to make their God, and then to carry it about in their hands. They were highly alarm'd, that any should attempt to dis- abuse the poor Creatures, and therefore the honest endeavours of *Brunon* and *Berengarius* set all the Priesthood on a flame who raised a dismal cry against the good Bishop, and his Archdeacon, as Heretics, and Enemies of the Church.

It was *Leo IX.* who then sat in the Papal Chair, a Man of Honesty and Integrity, but good-natur'd and easie, and Governed by the Councils of *Humbert* and *Hildebrand* whom he created Cardinals. It was no difficulty for the Enemies of *Berengarius* to make him believe any thing they had a mind he should, & therefore they soon possess'd him with a prejudice against the Archdeacons Doctrine, and obtained of him to call a Synod at *Rome* to stop that which they called a most Pestilent Heresie. Here *Berengarius* was condemned absent and unheard, without their so much as knowing what his Opinion was, but as it was odiously represented by his sworn Adversaries, much less examining, and debating it. And *Lanfrank* himself who was afterward the man which wrote with the greatest bitterness against him

was

Answer to a Je-
suit. p. 54. last
Ed. 1686.

Platina in vi-
ta Leon. IX.

Lanfrancus de
Sacramento.
In Bibliotheca
patr. Tom. 6.
Ed. 3. Binnii,
pag. 302. &c.
Baron. Annal.
Tom. 11. ad
An. 1050.
Baronius Ibid.
Lanfrancus
Ibid.

was suspected as a favourer of his Opinions, and probably not without reason, since there was some intimacy of friendship between them, as appears by the Letters of *Berengarius* to him, wherein he freely com- municated his Thoughts which Letters being Intercepted brought him into suspicion, and he was required to purge himself by openly protest- ing against him and his Doctrine; which he did. This Council was Celebrated at *Rome* in 1050.

Brunon was cooled by the fear of his powerful opposers, but *Beren- garius* stood firm, and was not so much disheartened as animated by this Judgment of the Council, to make a more vigorous defence, and by the force of his reasons, and the instances he produced from Antiquity, which countenanced his Doctrine, it so admirably spread, that there were few in all *France* which did not entertain it; so little were they Influenced by the decrees of the *Roman* Council.

Upon this the Pope thought it necessary to renew against him the Thunder of the Church, and in the latter end of the same year assem- bled another Council at *Vercelli*, and that the proceedings of this might look fairer than those of the former, they summoned *Berengarius* to appear, who came not in person, but sent two of his Clergy to act his cause for him. But he was as speedily condemned in this Council as the former, and with him *Joannes Scotus Erigena* tho' dead long before suffered the same Fate, and his Book against *Paschasius Rastrius* order'd to be burnt.

Now *Paschasius* his opinion was strengthened by the Authority of the Church; and as interest governs a great part of Mankind, it is no wonder, if that which before had but few assenters, now was by many zealously embraced, when backed with Power, and recommend- ed by advantage. And yet still the proscribed *Berengarius* had many Advocates who stood up in his defence, and all that was yet done, rather fomented than extinguished the heat of the Dispute.

Victor the Second, who was *Leo's* Successor, in the papal Dig- nity convenes another Council at *Tours* in *France*, which next followed that at *Vercelli*. The Author of the Reasons, &c. makes one to meet at *Paris*, that number might not be wanting, but upon what grounds I know not, unless on the Authority of *Durandus*, Abbot of *Troarn* in *Normandy*, who speaks of a Council called at *Paris* by *Henry* the first; but the little credit of the Story is sufficiently expost by that great Church Antiquary *Monfieur Larroque*. It was in 1055, that *Victor* summoned this Council at *Tours*, where *Berengarius* freely appears, when he could do it now with safety of his Person. In this Council *Hildebrand* who was afterward *Gregory* the Seventh, presides as the Pope's Legate

E

Math. Paris,
Hisor. Anglie
pag. 17. Ed.
Prima, Lond.
1571.

Lanfrancus I.
bid. pag. 303.

Baronius An-
nal. Tom. 11.
ad Annum.
1055.

Histoire de
l'Eucharistie
part. 2. Chap.
17.

Guaimundus de Sacramento. l. 3. in Bibl. Patr. Tom. 6. pag. 368. Ed. 3. *Vinait.*
Lanfranc. de Sacramento. l. 1. bid. pag. 203.
Lanfranc. Ibid.

in France, who if we will believe *Guaimundus*, soon convinced *Berengarius*, and prevailed with him to subscribe his Recantation, and that, if *Lanfranc* says true without speaking a word in his own Defence. But besides that we have but little reason to trust his professed Adversaries who breathe the greatest Passion and fierceness against him, *Lanfranc* contradicts *Guaimundus* when he tells us that all his Recantation was only an acknowledgment, that he professed the common Faith of the Church, which he might very well do without renouncing his own Doctrine, since it was perfectly agreeable. He might indeed disclaim what he never affirmed, that the Bread and Wine in the Sacrament, are empty, naked Signs and Figures unaccompanied with any Spiritual Efficacy, but this was to explain his Faith, and to vindicate it from their mistaken Prejudices, not to deny it.

However he resolutely persisted in asserting his Doctrine, and all these Councils had very little availed to suppress it. Nor were his Enemies satisfied in the former profession of his Faith at *Tours*. It was not enough for him to deny the Elements of the Eucharist to be mere Signs, but they will have him to assert the real Presence in all the gross Terms wherein themselves explained it, as any Man may read them in the Discourses of *Lanfrancus* *Guaimundus* and *Algerius* concerning the Sacrament. They will therefore oblige him to sign a new Confession, which might be fully expressive of the corporal Presence. To this purpose they prevail with *Nicholas* the second to convocate a fourth Council against him, which he did in the Lateran at *Rome*, in the year 1059.

Berengius Ar. nal. To. 11. ad Annum 1059. *Algerius* de Sacramento. l. 1. c. 19. in Bibli. Patr. To. 6. p. 419.
Lanfranc. de Sacramento. l. 1. bid. p. 301.
 In Chron. Cassin. Lib. 3. c. 31. *Sigornus* de Regn. Italiae Lib. 9. pag. 211. Ed. Wechelii.
Passerius Misfontius Annal. Franc. Lib. 3. pag. 236. Ed. Paris. Quarto.

wherein himself was present with a Hundred and thirteen Bishops. Hither *Berengarius* comes in person upon the Summons. But he did not at the very first abjure without pleading any thing in defence of his Faith, as *Lanfranc* relates the matter, who scruples not to report, that he dur'd not defend his doctrine, but presently resigned himself to the Judgment of the Council, ready to believe whatever they would have him, and therefore asked that they would compose a Formulary for him, which he might subscribe. On the contrary the controversy was warmly disputed, and *Berengarius* was not wanting to employ in his cause all that Learning and Eloquence for which he was justly famous. And so Invincible is the force of Truth with such succours to aid it that as *Leo* the Cardinal of *Ostia*, and *B. Sigornus* tell us he bore down all before him, and not a Man in the Council could withstand the Strength of his Discourses, only *Alberic* the Cardinal Deacon, a Man Learned and Eloquent coped with him, but with unequal ability, and was reduced to demand eight days time to frame an Answer against him. It may therefore very much be suspected, that more sensible Arguments than

Reasons,

Reasons were made use of to force him to abjure, and that they failed not to employ all that might be effectual to conquer the weakness of a Man. However he did now make a full Recantation, and because they would be sure to have it in all respects ratified, it was by order of the Pope and Council drawn by the Cardinal *Humbert* in these terms, as now extant in *Lanfrancus*, and *Algerius*, and *Gratian*, from whom I will transcribe it; for the Author of the Reasons, &c. hath given it very imperfect.

This then is the Form of the Abjuration: I *Berengarius* the unworthy Deacon of *St. Maurice*, of the Church of *Angiers*, knowing the true Catholick and Apostolical Faith, Anathematize all Heresy, especially that for which I have *Liberto* been defamed; which endeavours to maintain, that the Bread and Wine which are placed upon the Altar, are after the Consecration only a Sacrament, and not the true Body and Blood of our Lord *Jesús Christ*; nor that he can, unless Sacramentally only, be sensually handled or broken with the Hands of the Priest, or be broken or grinded between the Teeth of the Faithful. But I consent to the Holy Roman and Apostolic Sees; and with Mouth and Heart, I profess that I hold the same Faith concerning the Sacraments of the Lord's Table; which *Nicholas* the Lord and venerable Pope, and this Holy Synod, with Evangelical and Apostolical Authority hath delivered and confirmed to me to be held, viz. That the Bread and Wine which are put upon the Altar after the Consecration, are not only the Sacrament, but the true Body and Blood of our Lord *Jesús Christ*, and sensually not only Sacramentally, but in reality is handled and broken by the Hands of the Priests, and grinded with the Teeth of the Faithful; swearing by the Holy and Consustantial Trinity, and by these most Holy Gospels of *Christ*. But those who shall oppose this Faith, I pronounce to be worthy of eternal Anathema, together with their Opinions and Followers. But if I my self at any time presume to think or declare any thing against this, I must submit to the severity of the Censures. To this read and perfected, I have freely subscribed,

This is what was forced on *Berengarius* to subscribe, which we cannot doubt but was done against the inward sense of his own *Lanfranc. lib. 3.* mind; since *Lanfranc* himself upbraids him that his Abjuration P. 300. was dissimble, and only in shew, not in the sincerity of his heart.

And *Berengarius* himself as soon as out of their power writes a Book to retract his Abjuration. No sooner is he out of the noise of their Threats, and his own silenced fears permitted his strain'd Soul to return to its natural posture; but he writes against the Pope and Council in the sharpest Expressions, which the Indignation of a wronged, and abused Conscience could dictate. He affords them no better name than a *Church of Malignants, a Council of Vanity, not Apostolical, but the Seat of Satan*. He grievously complains that this Recantation was extorted from him either by threats, or more violent methods, and that it was not to be Interpreted his Act, so much as *Humberts*, who compos'd the Form of it for him, and forced his hand to subscribe it. And these just Reproaches *Lanfrancus* makes it his great care to wipe out.

Apud Lanfrancum
ibid. p. 312.

Hil. p. 300.

And yet the Pope, and his Council accounted it a great Victory, which they gained over him, and in Triumph sent the Copy, which he assumed with the name of *Gregory VII.* In the seventh year of his Popedom, and 1079, of our Redemption he calls a Synod at *Rome*, where *Berengarius* now fourscore years old, being summoned a second time, appears. Here when his Controverſie came to be debated, the Bishops of the Council were divided, and he had many of them, who disputed on his side. And it would seem as if the Council was almost equally parted between the Pope and *Berengarius*. If what the Cardinal *Berno* reports be true, that *Gregory* appointed a Fast to all the Cardinals, that God might manifest by a sign from Heaven who was most Orthodox in the Faith, He, or *Berengarius*. This looks as though a good number of his Bishops stood so firm for *Berengarius*, that nothing less than a Miracle could shake them. At least the Opinion in those times of the Popes Infallibility was very mean, since it needed to be strengthened by some Divine Oracle. But as God did not speak in the Council, so the whole Affair was decided without him, and the poor old *Berengarius* was a second time obliged to abjure though in a different Form, then that imposed on him in the preceding Council.

In Act. Concil.

Berno Card. in
vita Hildebr.

It runs in these Terms.

I *Berengarius* believe with my heart, and confess with my mouth, *Berarius* An. that the Bread and Wine which are placed upon the Altar, and Tom. 11. by the Mystery of Consecration, and the words of our Redeemer substantially changed, into the true, and proper, and quickning Flesh and Blood of Jesus Christ our Lord, and that after the Consecration it is the true Body of Christ which was born of the Virgin, and which Offered for the Salvation of the World did hang on the Cross, and which sits at the right hand of the Father, and the true Blood of Christ, which was poured out from his side, not only by a sign and virtue of the Sacrament but in the propriety of Nature, and truth of substance, as is contained in this brief; and I have read, and you understand, so I believe, nor will I farther teach contrary to this Faith. So help me God, and these Holy Gospels of God.

This was his last * Abjuration, which he did not long survive; whether he recovered his true Faith again is variously reported by Historians, but if we will credit one who lived in his time, and so was capable of giving the best account of him, he to his latest breath continued in the Belief, and maintaining of his true Doctrine. But almost all agree in honouring him with a very Glorious Character, as a person every way Excellent, Learned above all of his time, and of most strict and exemplary holiness. And when broken with so many troubles, he retired from the World; he distributes a large Estate, which he possessed, among the Poor; his deserved Reputation made him lov'd and admir'd, and the truth of his Doctrine managed with his admirable wit perswaded great numbers to embrace it, so that as † Historians assure us, it was become the General Faith, and his Enemies could not otherwise have run it down but by Force and Power.

Nor did his Doctrine expire with his Life. We have the Testimony of one of our own Historians, that in the year 1163, almost an hundred after his death, all *France, Spain, Italy* and *Germany*, was filled with his Disciples.

* *Bertold.* constant. Chron. An. 1083, Apud Urstefii Histor. Illuſtr. German. Anton. Chron. part 2. Tit. 16. c. 1. sect. 28. pag. 507. Ed. Jun. † *Mss. Paris* Hist. Angl. pag. 17. Ed. Lond. prima. 1571. Antoninus lb. *Gullicmus Neubrig* de Rebus Anglicis sui Temp. Lib. 2. cap. 13. *Wernerus Rolewink.* Fascic. Temporum ad Annum 1054. Apud pistor. Tom. 2. Germ. Scriptor.

And though the opinion of *Paschasius Rabertus* thus stamp'd with the pretended Authority of the Church in five several Councils pass'd more currantly among some now than before, when it was left to be debated by Arguments; yet it was not admitted by all, and in defiance to these decisions the Doctrine of *Berengarius* was considerable both for the number and quality of those who openly maintained it. For *Urban* the second, the Successor of *Gregory* the Seventh thought it necessary to assemble another Council at *Piacenza* in *Italy*, in the Year 1095. to renew the Condemnation of that Doctrine. And yet this was not strong enough to enforce a General Renunciation; for those who were most famous in Learning and Piety in the next Century still preserved and vindicated the ancient Faith, and among the rest, *St. Bernard* in 1120. most clearly explains his Sense agreeable to it, when he discourses of the Elements in the Eucharist as visible Signs, which convey to us Invisible Grace and Blessings. And *Rupert Abbot of Duitz*, near *Cologne*, (which instance the Author of the Reasons he himself assigns) tho' he had a notion peculiar to himself at that time of a natural Union between Christ and the Bread, yet contrary to what these Councils had decreed, he denied the substantial Conversion of one into the other. And *Peter Lombard* himself, the Father of the Schoolmen, who wrote his Book of Sentences about 1140. tho he thinks it consonant to the Mind of the Fathers, that there is a change of the Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, (which none will deny to be understood in a tolerable Sense) yet he was not so strong in the new Faith, as to be certain whether the Change was substantial, but leaves it as a doubt. He indeed exercises all the Skill which he had in Philosophy to evince the being of Accidents without a Subject, and to explain how Christ's Body might be broken into Parts, to save as well as he could the credit of *Pope Nicholas* the Second and his Council, in the Form of Abjuration imposed by them on *Berengarius*.

It is needless to give any more Instances, Monsieur *Larroque* hath done it sufficiently in his History of the Eucharist, and since that excellent Book is in *Englis*, any one may satisfy himself, that tho' the governing and interested part of the Church of *Rome*, had run down *Berengarius*, yet they could not his Doctrine, tho' they attempted it with the greatest Industry and

Bertholl. Constant chron. ad 1095 apud Illitium ibid.

Bernardus de cena domini

Rupertus Tuitienfis in Exod. lib. 2. cap. 10.

Lombard. sent. lib. 4. dist. 10.

Ibid. dist. 11.

L'Histoire de l'Eucharistie part. 2. ch. 18.

and Violence. A multitude of People in the Southern Provinces of *France*, first called *Abigenes*, and afterward *Waldenses* professed the same Faith, as that learned Man proves out of many Authors, and amongst the rest, from the Chronicle of *St. Tron*, in the Country of *Leige*, he gives this evidence of it: That *Rodolphus* the Abbot of that Monastery, to which he was preferred in 1125. and Author of the Chronicle, assigns this to be the Reason, which diverted him from an intended Journey into a certain Country which he names not; *That he heard it to be all infected with the ancient Heresy of the Body and Blood of Christ*. And there was indeed an entire Country so infected, if there be any Contagion in Truth, and the fiercest proceedings could not stop its spreadings, and tho' *Peter de Bruis*, as the first Martyr that protested against Transubstantiation was publicly burnt at *St. Giles*'s in *Languedoc*; yet the Doctrine which he taught, as if scattered with his Ashes, was dispersed more than ever, nor was their Cruelty to *Arnald of Bress* more successful, whom they burnt alive at *Rome* in the year 1155, and threw his Ashes into the *Tyber*; for many began to suspect that to be a Truth, which before they had not so well considered; when they saw these Men suffer for it with so admirable Constancy. Such examples at least raised a Commiseration of the unfortunate, if they did not convince.

But tho' the new Church of *Rome* was so zealous for her late adopted Article of Faith, as to sacrifice Mens Lives to support it, yet she wanted a fit name by which the Invention might be called, till the middle of the twelfth Century. It is doubted who first blessed the World with so charming a word as Transubstantiation. The Author of the Reasons, &c. would ascribe the word to *Paschasius Rabertus*, who first best out the Notion, or at least makes him a doubtful Rival with *Petrus Blesensis* in the Honour. But there is not the least Character of this wonderful word in the writings of *Paschasius*, and therefore the Glory would belong entirely to *Blesensis*, if *Stephen* Bishop of *Autun* were not brought on the Stage to dispute it with him. This is sure enough that they both use the Expression, but which of them was the Father of it is dubious, nor is it indeed very important to know.

It is certain the Word had the Good fortune to please, so that *Innocent* the III. who succeeded *Celestine* the III. in the Papacy made it Sacred, and inviolable by placing it in the Decree of his

Apud d'Acherium. Tom. 7. Specieg.

Otto Frising. in Frider. lib. 2. c. 20. apud Urstium German. Rer. script.

Blesensis Episc. 140.

Stephan. Eudensis de Sacra. Alt. in Bibliotheca. patrum Tom. 6. ed. 3. Binnii p. 476.

Lateran

Platina in ejus *Lateran* Council. He was but thirty years of Age, when he mounted the Chair, and active, and brisk, in the heat of his youth, he meditated nothing but Greatness, and a Spiritual Monarchy. He designed nothing less than to Conquer the World by the power of the Keys, as the Old *Romans* had subdued it with their Swords, and to make that City as great in Spiritual Dominion, as her Ancient Citizens by their Courage had made her in Temporal, it is easie to describe him by the Picture, which himself hath drawn, and he sufficiently expresses the Ambition of his Spirit, when he Arrogates to himself that Commission which was given to the Prophet. *To me (says he) it is spoken in the*

Ser. 1. 10.
Innocen. III.
Serm. 2.

Prophet, I have appointed thee over Nations, and Kingdoms, that thou mayst root out, destroy, and ruine, build, and plant. To me also it is said in the person of the Apostle, to thee I will give the Keys of Heaven, for I am constituted in the midst between God and Man, below God but above Man; yes, then Man I am greater, who can judge of all things, but be judged by none. And it is a very pleasant comparison that he makes between the two Great Lights, which God Created in the

Epist. ad Imp.
Constantinop.
Extra de Ma-
goric. & obed.
c. 6.

Matth. Paris
Hist. Angl.
In vita Joh. an.

Heaven, and Himself, and Kings. *As much difference as there is (says he) between the Sun and the Moon, so great is that between the Bishops of Rome and Kings.* Suitable to this Character which he gives of himself is that by which our own Historian represents him. *He was Ambitious and Proud (says Matthew Paris) above all other Mortals, and prone and ready to all wickedness, for any reward either given or promised.* None could be a fitter Man then this to impose Transubstantiation both thing and name on the Faith of the Church, since upon that Authority he had assumed to himself, he might venture to obtrude the highest absurdities and contradictions without any fear of their being Questioned. He accordingly in a Council conven'd by him in the *Lateran* at *Rome* stroke the strongest blow to fasten this strange Article into the *Roman* Creed, which the Council at *Constance* in condemning *Wickliff's* Doctrine, farther confirmed, and the Council at *Trent* so irreversibly established, that it is become as necessary a part of Faith as the belief of the Trinity, or of Christs Incarnation. And this is the true History of the Original, and progress of Transubstantiation, which now hath insensibly led me to the Third thing I propounded to prove, which is, that this odd Doctrine both in the notion and name hath been determined by the Church of *Rome* as a necessary Article of Faith.

There would need no more to evidence it than the former History

story of *Berengarius*, since the Decrees of so many Councils against him issue all in this, to define the manner of the Real Presence in the Sacrament to be by the conversion of the Bread and Wine into the Body and Blood of Christ, and therefore nothing would satisfy till he had abjured in the plainest words they could find most suitable to express this Sense. This appears by that Form I have before given out of *Gratian*, wherein it was not thought enough to say that the Bread and Wine after Consecration are the true Body and Blood of Christ, but in what manner they are so, is pronounced in high, and gross terms, that Christs Body is Senually, and not merely as in a Sacrament, handled by the Priest broken into parts, and grinded by the teeth of the Faithful.

Gratian Loc.
antea citato.

If this does not very grossly determine the *Modus* of the Real Presence, I know not what can. And yet this is done by Pope *Nicholas* the II. and his Council called by him at *Rome*, and imposed on poor *Berengarius* to be believed under pain of the severest Curses and Punishments; nor was it only forced on him, but declared to be a Rule of Faith to all other Men. And therefore *Lanfrancus*, and *Algerus*, in writing against him Appeal to the decision of this, and of the other Councils as the sure Standard, and Measure of Catholick Truth, it is accordingly placed in the Decretals of *Gratian*; and *Lombard* thought himself engaged to defend it, which he does very poorly; The expressions indeed are so rude that they far exceed all that the Impudence of the Schools ever delivered in their most nice and boldest Disputes, and therefore at last when no tolerable account could be given of their meaning, from pure shame they disclaimed them. The Author of the Gloss on *Gratian*, when he comments on those words handled, and broken by the hands of the Priests, &c. tells us that those words, if not understood in a right sense, will lead us into a greater Heresie than that of *Berengarius*.

Lombard. Sent.
Lib. 4. dist. 12.

The next Council therefore under *Gregory* the Seventh waves such offensive terms, but yet decides the manner of Christs Presence in the Eucharist as plainly and openly, tho' not in such harsh Expressions. Nay they designed to explain the *Modus* as decisively as possibly they could, to oblige *Berengarius* to renounce a new way he had of explaining his opinion, which was as *Swinus* reports it that Christs Body is substantially present, but together with the substance of the Bread and the Wine, which remain in their Natures unchanged, which is the same with the Lutheran Consubstantiation. Now this clearly enough expresses

Swinus concil.
Tom. 3.

the real Presence, and that the Bread and Wine were not mere Signs: and yet this would nor do, nothing will serve, but he must declare his Belief of the Real Presence in that manner as they would be pleased to define it. And how that was you may see in the second form of Abjuration, forc'd on *Burengarius*, (which I have given before) which precisely determines the *Modus* of Christ's Body being present in the Eucharist to be by the change of the Elements into the true and proper Flesh and Blood of Christ. And it was because the Church of *Rome* had thus decreed it to be in this peculiar manner and no other, which made it be received; since many of the Schoolmen plainly avow, that they would rather have embraced Consubstantiation as more Rational, had not the Authority of the Church interposed in defining another manner of Christ's substantial Presence. This *Occam* and *Petrus Abencassis* freely profess: The later of which argues for Consubstantiation, as being less obnoxious to Objections and Absurdities, and easier to be conceived than Transubstantiation, which puts Accidents without a Subject, &c. And therefore he assigns the determination of the Church, as the only reason which way'd him to assent to this later *Modus* of Christ's Real Presence rather than to the other, which yet he judged in it self to be more Rational.

And tho' these Councils did not make use of a hard word which was not invented, yet they as certainly assigned the manner of the thing, as if they had expressed it by Transubstantiation. But that the very Term as well as the Notion might be determined, *Innocent* the Third in a Council, which he assembled in the Lateran at *Rome* in 1215. confines this Article to this peculiar Expression, that those whom they called Hereticks might not, to avoid their Inquisition, conceal their true meaning under cover of general ambiguous Terms. And no word was thought more capable of speaking the manner of the Conversion of the Elements into Christ's Body and Blood after Consecration, than this, which says that the one are transubstantiated into the other. And therefore the Decree against the *Albigenses* is compiled in these words.

There is one universal Church of the Faithful, out of which none is saved. In which Jesus Christ the Priest is himself the Sacrifice, whose Body and Blood in the Sacrament of the Altar are truly contained under the Species of Bread and Wine, the Bread being transubstantiated into the Body, and the Wine into the Blood by the Divine Power, that to perfect the

Occam in lib. Quarto Sen. qu. 5. *Petrus de Allaco* in Quarto lib. sent. qu. 6. Art. 2.

Speculum concin. Anali Baron. Tom. 1. ad Annum 1215.

Decretal. Gregor. Lib. 1. de summ. Trinitat. & Fide Catholice. Tit. l. c. 1. *Mystery of our Union with him, we may receive that of his, which he*

assumed of ours. What more defining of the signification of the Word the Author of the *Reasons* expects in the Canon of a Council, I cannot imagin, unless he would have had the Fathers to shew themselves good Grammarians in criticizing upon Etymologies. For in telling us *that the Body and Blood are truly contained under the Species or Accidents of Bread and Wine, the last being transubstantiated into the first*; they say enough to explain their Meaning to be, that the Substance of the Bread passeth into that of the Body of Christ, which the Council of *Constance* in 1415. clearly explains, when they condemn *Wickliff* as Heretical in his Faith concerning the Eucharist, because forsooth he asserted the *Substance of the Bread and Wine materially to remain in the Sacrament of the Altar, and that the Accidents of the Bread and Wine are not in the same Sacrament without their Subject.* Now this is a Philosophical Disquisition of the manner, which yet the Author says was never decided but in the Schools. Pag. 23

The *Trent* Council is yet more express in defining the *Modus* of the real Presence to be by the Change of the whole Substance of the Bread into the Substance of the Body of Christ, which had sufficiently determined Transubstantiation, though they had not added the Word it self, which means no more nor less than they declare in this whole Sentence, and to prove the contrary, it will be necessary to derive that Word from some other Language than the Latin. But that nothing might be wanting to a full Decision, they appoint this Name Transubstantiation to signify this Conversion of one Substance into another, and so determine the manner of the thing, as well as explain the meaning of the Word. The Title of the fourth Chapter of their Thirteenth Session, is of Transubstantiation; and it is composed

Concil. Trid.
Sess. 13. c. 4.

fed in these Expressions. *Because Christ our Redeemer truly said that to be his Body which he offered under the Species of Bread, therefore the Church of God always were persuaded of this, and this holy Synod now at last declares, that by the Consecration of the Bread and Wine, there is made a Conversion of the whole Substance of the Bread into the Substance of the Body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole Substance of the Wine, into the Substance of his Blood, which Conversion is conveniently and properly called by the holy Catholick Church, Transubstantiation.* By which they appropriate the Word, as full and expressive to signifie the manner how the Body of Christ is really present in the Eucharist. And for this reason it is objected against their Decree in Father Paolo's History, that they contradicted themselves. For in the first Chapter of this Session they had said of the manner of the real Presence, yet it could not be expressed, and here they say that Transubstantiation is a most proper and convenient Word, and so undertake to express by it, what before they had said was ineffable. But whose Fault is it, if the Council contradicts it self? *Sforza Pallavicino* in the History of the same Council, which he wrote to destroy, if he could, the established Credit of this great celebrated Historian, endeavours to wipe off this Reproach from the Council: He, and the Author of the *Reasons*, &c. from him, return this Answer unto the Objection; that though the ancient Fathers acknowledged the Proceſſion of the second Person in the Trinity from the Father to be ineffable, and that the Union between God and the Humanity of Christ is ineffable, they yet made use of the words, eternal Generation, and hypostatical Union to express them. 'Tis true, they did so, and yet in a consistency with themselves, which the Council of

Historia del
concilio, Tri-
dentino. Lib.4

Pallavicino
Historia del
concilio di
Trento. Part.
1. L. 12. c. 7.
Pag. 985. Ed.
Rom.
Pag. 26.

Sess. 13. c. 1. *Trent* is not.

For this first tells us, that Christ is really

all

ally and substantially present in the Eucharist; but that how he is so, is inexplicable, and yet in the fourth Chapter, they undertake not only to explain the manner how Christ's Body is really present under the Accidents of the Bread, which is by the Conversion of the Substance of this into that; but they chose the Word Transubstantiation as most accomodate to declare properly this *Modus* of the thing; whereas the ancient Church, because she knew, and had pronounced the Trinity, and the Union of the two Natures in Christ to be an ineffable Myſtery, never made any Inquisition how they could be, nor indeed used those words of eternal Generation, and hypostatical Union with any purpose, by them to express the manner of the thing, which yet the *Trent* Council does, as to Transubstantiation, and so contradicts its own Decree in the first Chapter of this thirteenth Session.

And that the Design was particularly to determine the *Modus* of the Real Substantial Presence, to the exclusion of any other, appears from the Canons of the same Session: In the Second they pronounce an *Anathema*, against all those, who should explain the manner of the Presence by Consubstantiation, tho' that saves the substantial and real Presence as well as any other; but to believe Christ to be really and substantially present in the Eucharist, was not enough to avoid the imputation of Heresie; if they do not fully assent to the manner how he is there by Transubstantiation, which they had decided, they are as perfectly curs'd as those in the first Canon, who affirm'd the Bread and Wine to be naked Signs of Christ's Body and his Blood. And then in the Third Canon they nicely and Philosophically dictate, how Christ's Body and Blood is contain'd under the *Species*, so as to be all under them single, and all in every part of them, which is as subtle a Disquisition as ever was made by the Schoolmen in any of their Disputes.

'Tis granted indeed, what our Author would make so much of, That when the *Dominicans* and *Franciscans* fell into Philosophical Disputes, they would not be admitted: But their Disputes were not about the *Modus* of the Real Presence, which was already strongly confirm'd by the Churches Authority; and all agreed, that it was by Transubstantiation; but they disagreed, what *Hypothesis* would be best to make it look most plausible. The *Dominicans* were very earnest to have it, that the Substance of the Bread passed by an alteration into the Body of Christ. The *Franciscans* were very hot, that the Body of Christ was brought into the room of the removed Substance of the Bread, which civilly withdrew to give it place. The *Council*, which was always

Conc. Trid.
Sess. 13. can. 22.

Pag. 25.

very

Very jealous of having its Decrees examin'd or discuss'd by Reason, in this unintelligible Mystery was sure to be most careful to avoid it; well knowing that Philosophical Notions would but more confound them, and expose the Absurdities, which could not be excus'd, or defended, and they very well knew that sublime Nonsense is most obscure, when wrapt in Clouds, and never becomes more intolerably nauseous than by Endeavours to explain it

And however the Schoolmen might wrangle about a hundred curious Questions concerning the Body of Christ in the Sacrament, yet they all agreed, that the manner of his being there, was by Transubstantiation: This was Matter of Faith, in which they submitted to the Churches Authority; and therefore this was laid as a common Principle conceded by all, though they differed in the manner of their Sophistical Talk about Matter and Form, and the Difference of Accidents from their Subjects, &c. And perhaps that which made the Philosophy of Aristotle so acceptable, was, because they found it would be most serviceable to Transubstantiation. And therefore the Cartesian Philosophy is forbid to be taught in the Schools, because it denies that Accidents are Beings distinct from Substance; and upon these Principles they think Transubstantiation not to be so well deensible. And this is a known Objection which is made use of in the Discourses against him, and which he and his Followers are so studious to evade.

The Fourth and last thing which I come now to consider, is the boasted Consent of the Protestant Churches; where in, says the Author of the *Reasons*, &c. we shall find the same Harmony of the Faith, and Discord of Philosophy as in the Church of Rome. But on the contrary, I shall evince, that the Protestants never owned the same Faith of the Real and Substantial Presence with that Church.

The first which he cites, is, the famous *Ausburgh* Confession; wherein yet there is not the least Syllable of the Substantial Presence, but only an express Assertion of the Real, which those whom he calls *Zuinglians* and *Sacramentarians* will not deny in the Sense which I have stated at the beginning of this Discourse. But in the Latin Edition, the Author has foisted in these Words, *are there present indeed*: whereas nothing more is expressed, than the Body and Blood of Christ are really exhibited; which all will subscribe to. In the German Edition indeed it is worded, *they are truly present*: But if the Author had himself compos'd them, and put in all that he cites them to prove, yet how little evidence to the purpose would they even then give; For all Christendom knows that the *Lutheran* Faith

concerning Consubstantiation, is vastly distant from the Substantial Presence, which I prov'd the *Roman* Church in her Councils to have determin'd; and as I have clear'd it by the Fourth Canon of the Thirteenth Session at *Trent*, they are all adjudg'd to be accus'd Heretics, though they speak out Real and Substantial never so plain and often, if they do not learn to pronounce another hard Word, which our Author says neither can nor ought to be understood, and yet it is a Point of their Faith; so much is it for their Glory to believe they know not what. I will then grant him that in many of the Protestant Confessions, Christ is said to be really and substantially present; and that *Melancthon* in his Apology for that of *Ausburgh*, chuses the very Word, out of a Zeal he had to compose the Quarrels of Religion, as far as he could without prostituting Freedom of Conscience, and the innocence of his Mind. But the effect was very much different from what the good Man hop'd. He did not consider he had to do with a Church, who professeth it as an Honour due to her infallibility, not to abate the least Punctilio's, which have once had the mark of her Authority. And therefore those of that Church, were so far from being courted into any concession, by these Compliances and Overtures made for Peace, that they became the more haughty and treated the Doctrine of the *Lutherans*, which asserted the substantial Presence as an insufferable Heresy, because they would not express the manner of it to be by Transubstantiation. A clear Instance of it, is the Confutation of the *Augustan* Confession, presented and read to the Emperor *Charles V.* and the Princes of *Germany*, wherein it is declared, That the Tenth Article in that Confession concerning the Real and Substantial Presence could not be admitted as satisfying, but with this necessary addition, *that they believe the the Church determining the Substance of the Bread to be changed into the Body of Christ in the Consecration of the Eucharist, as it was decreed by the General Lateran Council under Innocent the Third.*

That which further manifests the same thing, is, that in all the Conferences of Religion, between those of the Roman Church, and the Reformers, they could never agree in this Article of the Eucharist, no more than in any other, but they always quarrel'd that the Protestants would not express the manner of this Substantial Presence, as the Romish Councils had deliver'd it.

It was this made the Issue of a General Diet so unsuccessful, which *Charles V.* conven'd at *Ratisbone* in 1541, with great Zeal and earnestness, to make an accord between the Protestants and Catholics: And he took all politick Measures to bring the two Parties to

a con-

Apud chytra-
um in Hi. Au-
gust. confess.
pag. 179, 180.

p. 28,

Extat. in corp.
confess. par. 2.
p. 13.

Apud Chytra-
um Hiit. Aug.
Confess. p. 83.
& in. 4to.
Tom Oper.
Luth. Fol. 162.
2d. Germ.

con-

a condescending Temper, that by Concessions on both sides, the differences might be accommodated. He influenced the Popes Legate, Cardinal *Contarini*, a Man famous for Wisdom and Learning, and persuaded him, that for the Peace and unity of the Church, he would manage things with a soft and yielding Spirit. The Cardinal was so moderate, as to smooth several Articles which sounded too harsh to the Protestants; and so to qualify the Terms, as to make them be more easily received.

* For this he incurred the Popes high displeasure; † who had given him Instructions not to obate any thing, and if he saw the Emperor so urgent on him to make healing Concessions that he could not avoid it, he had orders instantly to leave the Diet, tho' not the Court of the Emperour. But he moved more by his own natural Moderation, than the instructions of the Court of *Rome*. And at the Emperor's desire reviewed the Articles of Coucord, which were presented to him by *Granville* the great Favourite, and Minister of State. He carefully read them over, and corrected them to the mildest and most favourable Expressions. The writing thus form'd as they thought, so that both the contending Parties might agree to it: It was proposed to the Assembly, where the principal deputed to act on behalf of the Catholicks were *Eckius*, *Flugius*, and *Gropperus*, and the Protestants were *Melancthon*, *Bucer*, and *Pistorius*. The Conference at first succeeded very happily, they all consenting in these Articles: *viz. of Faith, of Works, of Bishops, and of Baptism*. But the first subject of Dissention, was (as *Pallavicini* tells us out of the Cardinal's own Letters) the great Controversy of the Eucharist. The *Lutherans*, as high Asserters as they were of the Real Presence, refused the word Transubstantiation. The Cardinal, tho' so compliant in other Points, was in this firm and unmoveable, and refused to make the least alteration. And tho' some counselled him to do it, and insinuated to him that it was a meer question about words: yet he had other thoughts, since he apprehended that the rejecting the word, would at last introduce the denial of the thing signified by it. And thus after a Months debate the Conference was broken up, because they could never be brought to a consent in this Article.

The second Example I shall produce is the Conference, which which was in appearance for the same design of Peace, assembled at *Passy* in *France* in the Year 1561. with as little success. There the great Debate was concerning the Real Presence in the Sacrament. *Peter Martyr*, *Beza*, and *Martorat* were the most considerable, who managed the Dispute for the Protestants. And here *Beza* was so far from receding from

from the Confession of their Faith, which four Years before he had presented at *Worms*, (Though the Author of the *Reasons, &c.* accuses him as guilty of a base Peravication.) As on the contrary he freely and plainly professeth their Faith to be, that the Bread is the Communion of the Body, and the Wine of the Blood of Christ, which was shed for us, and that in the same Substance, which he assum'd in the Womb of the Virgin, but yet he renounces Transubstantiation, as that which contradicts the Truth of Christ's Humane Nature, and of his Ascension into Heaven. And when by the Queen Mothers Command, the Bishop of *Valence* and *Despencaus* for the Catholicks, and *Beza* and *des Gallares* for the Protestants, consulted together to find an Expedient to accord all Differences as to this Article, they all Four of them at last consented in this Formulary: *We believe that in the use of the Lord's Supper, the true Body and Blood of Christ is truly, and really, and substantially; that is, in the Substance it self, and in a spiritual and ineffable manner is exhibited and taken by the believing Communicants.* Tho' all this was high and expressive enough of the reality of Christ's Presence, yet it was not satisfactory; the Cardinal spoke fiercely against it, engag'd the greatest Party of the Bishops to decry it as Insufficient and Heretical, and they soon fram'd another contrary, which might import Transubstantiation. And so this Conference was dissolv'd with as little effect as the other, because no other manner of Real Presence would be admitted, than that which is by the Transubstantiation of the Bread into the Body of Christ.

Thus it fully appears, that tho' these Expressions of Real and Substantial were necessarily to be understood in their strictest meaning, when ever us'd in the Confessions of Faith, or by *Melancthon*, *Bucer*, *Beza*, &c. yet even by what the Catholicks themselves have own'd, they do not signify what is the true Faith of their Church, concerning Christ's Presence in the Eucharist, and so are in vain press'd by the Author for the Service he design'd them.

But the Invalidity of these Citations unto this Purpose, will enough demonstrate it self, if we do but examine the true Sense of these words, as they who make use of them explain what they meant. 'Tis true indeed that many of the Confessions, and among the rest that of *Wittenberg* in 1536. say; *that the Body and Blood of Christ are truly and substantially exhibit-*

Page 53-54
Popliniere r
Histoire de
France, Tom.
1. l. 7. p. 272.

D'Aubigne p
Histoire Uni-
vers. Part. 1.
l. 2 chap. 24.

Popliniere i-
bid. p. 274. &
d' Aubigne.
part. 1. lib. 2.
chap. 24.

* Paul. Soave
hist. del concil.
Trident. lib. 1.
p. 103. Ed. 4.
† Pallavicini
no Historia
del Concilio di
Trent. part. 1.
lib. 11. cap. 13
p. 401.

Pallavicini. ibid
p. 407.

Steidanius
comment. lib.
14. p. 285.
Ed. in fol.

ed. But the latter word may be only exegetical of the former, and signifie no more than indeed and in truth, and most real Effects in opposition to meer Notion, and Fancy. For they thought they could not in too lively terms express how far off they were from the opinion of the German Anabaptists, who would own the Eucharist to be nothing more than a meer Sign and Memorial of Christ's Death, and to have no other Effect on us, than to put us in mind of it. When therefore the true Orthodox Protestants would obviate these Mistakes, they speak of Christ's Presence in the most amplifying Expressions, as if his Body in its natural Substance were present, and offer'd to us, when as they meant it only in the reality of Grace and Blessing. I will mention but one or two, who to this purpose explain their own sense of the words.

That formulary of Concord which was drawn out of the *Wittemberg* Confession, for the *Helvetian* Churches to subscribe, and was compos'd on purpose to soften the harsh sound of some expressions in that Confession which were offensive. That form of Concord expresseth the Bread to be the Body of Christ only in respect of the Sacramental Union between them, which is the Relation between them as a Sign, and thing signified. And this is subscribed by *Luther*, *Melancthon*, *Mycanuis*, *Bucer*, and others. And so for the Saxon Confession which is cited by the Author of the Reasons, &c. the words immediately following which he hath omitted, express the Substantial Presence of Christ by the happy Effects. *Christ testifies that he is in them (that is, in the worthy Receivers) and that he makes them Members to himself, and hath wash'd them with his own Blood.*

And *Bucer* himself at his return to *Strasbourg* explaining to them the formulary of Concord, explains that word substantially to mean no more than that there is a true Exhibition of Christ himself in the Sacrament.

To produce but one more, which is the Declaration that the Reformed Churches of *Poland*, in an Assembly at *Thorns* made, that as concerning the Sacrament of Christ's Body and Blood, they assented to the Faith of the *Augustan* and *Bohemian* Confessions, which express the Substantial Presence. But then in their special Declaration they explain how they understand it, that the Bread and Wine are truly, and are called so, the

Body

Body and Blood, not Substantially, that is, not corporally, but Sacramentally, and Mystically, and the Body and Blood of Christ they speak to be Christ, and his Benefits that are really exhibited and offer'd to us.

And now to come to our own Church of *England*, the expresses indeed the real Presence, as the Reformed Churches assert it, but not in the sense as 'tis received in the Roman Church for an Article of Faith.

Nor does the Account which the best Historian of this Age gives of *Cramer* from a Manuscript of the learned Dr. *Stillingfleet*, make that Archbishop a Sacramentarian, as the Author angrily accuses him. For all that *Cramer's* Answer recorded in the Manuscript imports, is, only his renouncing a nonsensical Notion of Christ's being offer'd by the Priest as a real Sacrifice to God in the Mass.

To call in question the credit of the Manuscript itself, is to accuse the sincerity of that worthy Person to whom it is owing; and for any Man to question a Reputation so well established, is to forfeit his own. And indeed, by the same reason as he would overthrow the Authority of this Writing, he may that of all Ancient Records in the World, whose Credit depends very much on the Integrity and Learning of him who first produceth them: How he would more have the Paper prov'd and warranted, I cannot imagine, unless he would have the Man who wrote it, conjur'd from the Dead, to be the Authentick Witness. What certain Conveyance of Tradition does he require, unless it is necessary to know the Names of all the Persons from whom it hath been successively delivered. But to know whether a Writing be genuine, our Author has found out a new way of tryals, by examining its Genealogy, and whether it was lawfully begotten, and what were its great Ancestors. And that we may know hereafter what is the legal descent of a writing in Manuscript, the Learned World would be extremely obliged to him, if he would but bless it with the discovery, how many *Ap's* must precisely go to make up the gentile Pedigree of a Paper. But he is so mistrustful of being deceived, that he will believe nothing more than what he sees, which yet is very inconsistent with that Religion, of which he hath so lately undertaken the defence:

But

Reasons for A-
brigating, &c.
p. 47.

Pag. 50.

Extat apud
Chytræum
Hist. August.
Confes. p. 680.

Pag. 31. 32.

Ibid. p. 511.
& Corpus
Confess. par.
2. pag. 73.

In Corp. Con-
fess. part. 2.

But to return to the Argument, all that he brings to prove that the Real and Substantial Presence hath been the constant Doctrine of the Church of England, is as little convincing as all the former Instances he hath assigned to prove the same of the Foreign Churches.

Page 51.

As for the form of words retained in the new Office of the Communion drawn by *Cranmer*, and the Form prescribed in the first Liturgy of *Edward* the Sixth, and that Kings own Injunctions, they express no more than the rankst Sacramentarian would do. I am sure *Peter Martyr*, whom he dignifies with that Title, says as much an hundred times.

Page 53.

As for the Alteration made in the fifth Year of that King's Reign, the Articles might be as well framed by *Cranmer* and *Ridley*, as by a private Cabal of *Dudleys*, or a Club of poor Laicks. It is a very improbable Calumny, for who can once imagine that a Parliament would ratifie that by a Law, which if it had so mean and pitiful a descent as he insinuates, was unworthy the least notice of Authority, unless to punish the impudent Deceit.

Page 60.

But in the beginning of *Queen Elizabeth's* Reign, says our Author, all this was recalled again; *And ever since that time, the most eminent Divines in the Church have successively, from Age to Age, been the most zealous Asserters of the Real and Essential Presence.* Ay, but not in the Roman Sense, and therefore will never come over to his Side.

Consi Hist.
Transubst.
c. 2.

It would be endless to consider particularly the several Authors he mentions. Most of them may be seen in the History of Transubstantiation written in Latin by the late learned Bishop of *Durham*, who cites them for a purpose very contrary to his. I will content my self with retorting that Example upon himself, which he thinks is most strong to support his Assertion, and that is *Poinet* Bishop of *Winchester*, whose Dialecticon was written in 1561. with a design of Peace, to reconcile, if possibly, all the Differences which this Controverfie of the Eucharist hath created. He says indeed in that Discourse that *the Eucharist is not only the Figure of the Body of our Lord, but comprehends in it the Truth it self, the Nature and Substance.* But he requires that we should understand this in a spiritual Sense, according to the common and agreeing Interpretation of the ancient Fathers; and what that was is well known, and therefore we cannot be ignorant what was this Learned Bishop's Mind. I might in like manner shew, that tho the other learned Men of this Church, as Bishop *Fewel*, *Bilsen*, *Andrews*, *Montague*, &c. may on this occasion have expressed themselves in high and ample terms, yet it was in a different meaning than what the Author of the Reasons would make us believe they owned.

Thus I have in Zeal for the Truth, which I could not see blemished with false Shadows without some Indignation, employed my poor Abilities to vindicate it. And now I pray God with all my Soul, that the Truth which I would love and value above all things, may not suffer any thing from the weakness of this Discourse, and that those Disabilities, of which I am conscious to my self, may not prejudice the Cause which I have attempted to defend.