

DAVID EUSTACHE

SERMON On the words of Chapter XXVI of Saint Matthew, verse XXVI.

Translated using AI by Confetti

TO THE READER

It is not long ago that a new Preacher came to Montpelier, where he was from the beginning followed by a very great number of listeners. At that time the zeal, or the curiosity to hear him, was extraordinary, and all the conversation of the town was nothing but on the subject of Religion. But all this devotion was nothing but a wind, which a sudden rain beats down in an instant. The results did not correspond to his beginnings, and the end made all the hopes of his followers vanish. He had exposed in a Sermon these words, THIS IS MY BODY, and because some of our people who were present there put on paper the principal reasons he had brought forward to refute our doctrine on this point, and because he promised to come to the Preaching the following Sunday, as he did, they obliged Master Eustache, who was on duty for the week, to take the same text, to which he consented, and in all his discourse he showed as much civility and respect as was due to an assembly, which was one of the most celebrated that had yet been seen in the Temple, because besides our own people, the principal Catholic Romans from all the bodies and Orders of the city were found there, and made themselves remarked with brilliance, both for their number and for their quality. It was in their presence that he expounded this same text, and that he responded to all that their preacher had said of most considerable [weight] against us. And this is what gave occasion to the publication of this Sermon, after which the adversary edified his followers so badly that it seemed as if he had been paid for it. If the Reader takes the trouble to read this Sermon with a disinterested spirit, I assure myself that he will find his satisfaction there.

SERMON ON THE WORDS of Chapter XXVI of Saint Matthew, verse XXVI. This is my body.

DEAR brothers, we are called next Sunday to the Communion of the Body and Blood of Jesus Christ. Two things are required to come worthily to the Table: knowledge of this divine mystery, and Christian devotion. One cannot participate in the benefits that this benign Savior presents to us in this Sacrament if one does not know its nature, and if the soul is without the suitable dispositions to feel the salutary fruits that are offered to us there. Levit. 21 v.18.

It was formerly forbidden to the blind and lame to approach the tabernacle. He who has his understanding blinded, and whose soul limps and is unable for the functions of piety, is unworthy to present himself at the table of Jesus Christ. It is true that naturally we are blinder than Bartimaeus, and more lame than Mephibosheth; but it has pleased God to give us his well-beloved Son, who has restored our eyes and feet to us, to know him, and to walk in Holiness and in Justice before his face.

In performing this marvel he has not healed us completely, not for lack of power, but because our carnal desires bring hindrance to it every day. This should oblige us to declare continual war against them, until we obtain a complete victory, and until by deliverance from sin and from death, we are led to the perfection that Heaven reserves for us. It is there where we will have knowledge without darkness, and devotion without coldness.

While awaiting this incomparable happiness, we should make use of the means that can advance in us this knowledge and this devotion. We will speak now of the former, on the subject of our communion with Jesus Christ, since the words of our text oblige us to it: and since the occasion is presented to us by the Sermon that was made these past days, where one attempted to prove by the same words transubstantiation, and the carnal eating of the body of Jesus Christ.

It is a great consolation to us that in such a celebrated assembly, and in the presence of the preacher, of several other Ecclesiastics, and of so many persons of condition, of one and

the other Religion, we have the liberty to defend our doctrine on a point that is so important. "King Agrippa, I esteem myself happy that I must respond today before you," said Saint Paul (Acts 26 v. 2.) . We say the same, that we have to sustain before you the cause of God. The evidence of the truth, which we will show to the eye, with the assistance of the Holy Spirit, and the respectful modesty and gentleness with which we will season our discourse, will be the recognition of what you honor us with your presences.

An ancient said that the Holy Spirit appeared in the form of a Dove, (Tertullian On Baptism) to show that it dwells only in those who have no gall, no more than the Dove, but who are filled with gentleness. It is by the lights of this divine Spirit that we will clarify this matter, with a soul empty of all passion, which proposes for its goal nothing but the glory of God and your own salvation.

For the understanding of these words, "This is my Body," it is necessary to examine three things: 1. what the pronoun "This" signifies. 2. What the verb "is" signifies. 3. what is the sense of his whole proposition "This is my body." We will respond according to the occasions to the objections that have been brought on this subject.

As for the pronoun "This," it signifies what Jesus Christ held in his hands, now he held bread in his hands, therefore it signifies bread, and in fact this pronoun can only refer to what precedes it, now it is the bread that precedes it. "And as they were eating, Jesus took bread, and after he had given thanks, he broke it, and gave it to his Disciples, and said, take, eat, This is my body." (Matt. 26) And therefore this pronoun can only refer to the bread.

From this comes that they have added to the Roman canon this causal conjunction "For this is my Body." Which shows that the pronoun "this" should only refer to what precedes it, which is the bread.

By this means transubstantiation is destroyed, because the bread cannot be the body of Christ except in figure, seeing that natural light constrains our adversaries to admit that of two things that are different in kind and in nature, one cannot be the other except by

figure, as when it is said, "the seven cows are seven years," "the seed is the word of God." "Christ is the vine."

Therefore the same must be said of this proposition, "This bread is my body," because the bread and the body are two substances, different in kind and in nature. The reason for all this is that the bread and the body are two individuals. The bread of the eucharist is not just any bread whatsoever, but this one which is consecrated, not that which Jesus Christ took and gave to the Apostles, but that which the Priest takes every day. The body also is not just any body whatsoever, but this body of Jesus Christ which died for us; and one will not say that the Priest takes the species or the genera.

Now two individuals cannot be said one of the other except by figure, for there are no individuals, even when they would be of the same species, who can be said one of the other without figure. Thus Alexander, Peter, and John being individuals who differ in number, one cannot be said of the other except by figure. Much less individuals who are of diverse species, like Peter, this laurel tree, this mountain, of which one cannot be said properly of the other.

We say the same if the individuals are under diverse genera, thus this man is under the genus of substance, and this whiteness is under the genus of accident, and one cannot say that one is properly the other, because no substance is properly an accident.

The disparity that exists between individuals of the same species is drawn from the fact that they differ in number. That which exists between individuals who are of diverse species is drawn from their definition and their diverse form by which they are what they are, and the individuals who are under diverse genera draw their disparity from the difference of their genera.

Now the bread and the body in the eucharist are not individuals of the same genus, because the bread is not under the genus of animal, like the body. Much less are they of the same species, and therefore it cannot happen that one be said of the other otherwise than by figure, since even when they would be of the same genus or species, one could not properly be the other, because it cannot happen that two individuals be one single and same thing.

This reason taken from natural light is so evident that it forces our adversaries to deny that the bread is called the body of Christ, because they know well that one could not be said of the other except by figure. They therefore want the pronoun "This" not to signify the bread. This is what was opposed these past days, it was said that this pronoun cannot signify the bread, because it is different in gender from the bread, one being of the neuter gender, and the other of the masculine.

But this reason cannot be received, otherwise when it is said according to the version of Louvain, "This now is bone of my bones," it would be necessary to say that because the pronoun "this" is of the neuter gender, it does not refer to the woman. (Gen. 2. v. 23 τοῦτο νῦν (this now)) who is of the feminine gender, of whom it was spoken before. Note also that according to the 70 interpreters, the pronoun is of the neuter gender. From which it follows that the pronoun "This" is the same as "this thing," and is taken as a substantive, in this manner: "this is bone of my bones," that is to say, "this woman is bone of my bones."

Thus in this proposition, "This is my body," the pronoun "this" should be taken as a substantive, "this," that is to say "this bread." As when it is said of the production of lice in Egypt, "This is the finger of God," where according to the 70 interpreters, there is "this is the finger of God," "this" that is to say, "this miraculous production." (Exo. 8 v. 19 δάκτυλος (finger)) Where you see that one gender is different from the other. One will say of a sign made of diamonds, "this is a present from my friend"; and this manner of speaking which is approved everywhere is the same as that which we are debating.

It was said that the pronoun "this" demonstrates neither the bread nor the body of Christ precisely, but in general a substance contained under the accidents. We say that this substance in general must be some substance in particular, since the generality of substance does not subsist except in individuals, as if one says "this odor," although one uses the term of odor in general, nevertheless one speaks of a particular odor, either of shadow or of musk or of the rose. Therefore if this word "this" is referred to a substance in general, it is because it signifies a substance in particular, either the bread or the body of Christ, not the body of Christ, because transubstantiation, according to Rome, is only accomplished by the complete pronounciation of the words of consecration; from which it follows that the bread was not yet transubstantiated when Jesus Christ said "this,"

therefore the word "this" signifies the bread. Also one does not point with the finger to a generality, but only to particular things designated by their circumstances.

We also condemn what some Doctors of Rome say, that by the pronoun "this," one can understand the species, or the accidents of the bread. We say in a word that these accidents cannot exist without the substance of the bread, since the words of Jesus Christ, by the force of which they say that this substance ceases to be, were not yet pronounced. And besides, these accidents being different in genus and in nature from the body of Jesus Christ, they cannot be the body of Jesus Christ except by figure.

We do not admit either what several say, that the pronoun "this" demonstrates nothing present, but what will be in an instant. It must therefore be said that if this word "this" signifies nothing present, the sense of these words, "this is my body," will be "nothing is my body," the most passionate will judge how absurd this would be. If one says that this word "this" signifies what will be after the words of consecration have been uttered, as when one draws a line, one says "this is a line," that likewise Jesus Christ said "this is my body," because in an instant that was to be his body. We refute this opinion by Bellarmine (Bellar. de Euchar. Lib. 1.chap. 12.) who says that when the pronoun "this" demonstrates a future thing, it is when there is nothing present, etc., and adds that the Lord took bread, and that he seems to have demonstrated the bread, which was present.

And in fact since Jesus Christ held bread in his hands, and he said "this is my body," it is quite manifest that the bread was a present thing, and that he demonstrated this bread, and not what was to be; no more nor less than if someone said of a book, "I give you this as an assurance of my affection." One would understand by the word "this" the book itself.

Thus this pronoun "this" does not mark a vague, indeterminate, and future substance; because a vague substance is considered according to the manner of the universal, now the universal does not receive any certain action, such as breaking, because such an action is only received in the singular individual. Since therefore this word "this" is said of a thing which suffers breaking (1 Cor. 10 vs 16), seeing that the Apostle says "the bread which we break," it follows that when Jesus Christ said "this," he demonstrated the bread, as appears from this argument. What is broken in the eucharist is what is called the body

of Christ in the institution; now the bread is broken in the eucharist, as Saint Paul says, therefore the bread is called the body of Christ in the institution. (1 Cor. 11 v. 26, 28)

Add that the same Apostle exposes this pronoun "this" by "this bread": "as often as you eat of this bread," etc. "Let each one eat of this bread," etc.(1 Cor. 15 v. 53). It is thus that Tertullian (Tertull. de resurr. carn. chap. 51), recognizing that it is the proper office of the demonstrative pronoun to signify a present thing, proves thereby against the heretics the resurrection of the flesh, founding himself on this pronoun which the Apostle uses when he says "it is necessary that this corruptible put on incorruption," etc. "He could not pronounce this," says this Doctor, "except of a present thing, except of a thing appearing, it is a word of bodily demonstration."

This exposition of the pronoun "this" by "this bread" shows that the verb "is" should be taken for "signifies," because the bread being different in genus and in nature from the body of Christ, cannot properly be the body of Christ. It is therefore without reason that it was said that here the verb "to be" is taken for a being of transubstantiation, instead of being taken only for a being of signification. It is true that this verb "to be" is taken in two ways. 1. Absolutely, and as an attribute of the enunciation, as in this proposition, "Louis XIV is," in which sense it always designates the existence of the thing. 2. It is taken for the middle which is between the subject and the attribute, and which binds them together, as when I say, "Louis XIV is just." In this second signification, the verb "is" is taken still in two manners. 1. Properly, when it designates a real conjunction of the terms, as in this proposition, "You are the Christ, the Son of the living God." (Matt. 16 v. 16) 2.

Figuratively, when it designates the existence of the thing, not real, but by some analogy, as when it is said, "the seven candlesticks that you have seen are the seven Churches (Apoc. 1 v.20)." In which sense the verb "is" must here be taken, that is to say, for "signifies."

It was said that in important points of faith and salvation, such as that of the Eucharist, Jesus Christ did not speak by figure, because figures by their obscurity open the way to error. That Jesus Christ spoke without figure in the institution of the eucharist, inasmuch as it was a matter of a testament, where the clauses should be clear.

We find many defects in this reasoning. **1.** If the points of faith are considered absolutely, Jesus Christ has proposed none that is not important, insofar as they concern either the salvation or damnation of sinners. Now it is established that in discourses of this nature, he has often spoken by figure. Here are some examples: "You will all be scandalized in me this night" (Matt. 26). Lucas Brugensis (Brugensis in chap. 5 Matthæi. 26) Matt. 26 says that this is a metaphor taken from stones against which one stumbles, and which are impediments to those who walk; and that scandals are stumbling stones to many. "My Father, if it is possible that this cup pass away from me" (Matt. 26). Maldonatus (Maldonatus in chap. 20, Matthæi v. 31. Luke 23 v. 46.) says that this is a metaphor drawn from the ancient custom that one had of presenting to those who were condemned to death a cup full of poison. When Jesus Christ says, "Father, I commend my Spirit into your hands" (Luke 23 v. 46), he speaks by figure, seeing that God does not properly have hands. There are an infinity of other examples of similar nature. **2.** If one considers the important points of faith comparatively, one remarks there various degrees, so that some appear to us more excellent than others. But one will not find that he has only spoken by figure in less important points; on the contrary one will see that he has also used figured expressions on the subject of others. Among which we place this beautiful mystery of which he treats in these passages: "I am the true vine, and my Father is the vinedresser. You are the branches" (John 15 v. 1, 5). Propositions which cannot be understood without figure. We could allege a great number of similar examples. **3.** As for the eucharist, it is quite manifest that in these words, "this cup is the New Testament in my blood" (Luke 22 v. 20), there is a figure, for the cup is not properly a testament, as we will say hereafter. Likewise in this passage, "the cup of blessing, which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ" (1 Cor. 10 v. 16), there is a quite evident figure, the container for the contained, the cup for the liquor that is within, seeing that it is not the cup, but the beverage it contains that is the Sacrament of our spiritual communion with the blood of Christ. As also in these other words of the Apostle, "the bread which we break," where those learned in the Greek language remark a new species of figure (ἀντὶ τοῦ ἄρτου ἐν κλῶμεν κοινωνία ἐστὶ (for the bread we break is communion)). **4.** We would be too long if we wished to gather all the prodigious figures with which our adversaries have disfigured on this subject the text of the Gospel. Can they say without figure that the pronoun "this" signifies "under these species," that the verb "is" is taken for "will be" or

"will become"? That these words, "this is my body, which is broken for you," they should be understood not of a breaking of the body, but of a breaking of the accidents. That Jesus Christ calls "fruit of the vine" what he drank, because it was wine before the conversion, or because it has the appearance of it? In conscience, to expound Scripture thus, is this not forging unusual figures, and contrary to the nature of this Holy action? **5.** To say that figures open the way to error is true of those improper and strange figures of which we have just spoken, but not of those which are legitimate and ordinary in Scripture. **6.** Moreover it is not he who proposes the usual figures in Scripture who opens of himself the way to error, but this is done by the vice of him to whom they are proposed, because he does not use them to know the truth. These words of Jesus Christ, "unless someone is born again, he cannot see the Kingdom of God" (John 3 v. 3), were to Nicodemus an occasion of error, seeing that he said, "How can a man be born when he is old? Can he enter again into his mother's womb and be born?" But this occasion of error proceeded from Nicodemus's defect, as appears from the reproach that Jesus Christ made to him: "You are a teacher in Israel, and do not know these things?" **7.** If figures, as has been said, are obscure, they are so in the same way that the Apostle says in general of the Gospel, that it is veiled to those who perish (2 Cor. 4 v. 3). But this does not present sent, to whom the God of this age has blinded the understandings. One must not esteem that a discourse is more obscure because it is figured than if it were without figure, provided that one uses usual and ordinary figures. Orators in their harangues, and Poets in their tragedies and comedies speak well to a troop of people who are for the most part ignorant, and use figures at every opportunity to make themselves better understood to the grossest, because they employ the most common and familiar figures. Therefore they ordinarily call them "Lights of Oration." If Philosophers do not use them as they do, it is because they speak to the Learned, towards whom they do not need these illuminations and clarifications (Quintilian, lib. 9, chap. 1).

8. It is therefore beside the point that it was said that Jesus Christ spoke without figure, inasmuch as it was a matter of a testament, where the clauses should be clear. For when he used figure it was to render the understanding of his discourse easier, to speak with more efficacy, and to make a stronger impression in the Spirits. A testament therefore does not cease to be clear, even though there are figured ways of speaking. This is not of the essence of a testament, to have no figured words, but to be the last will of the testator,

whether it be expressed by figured terms or not. Moreover since it was a matter of a Sacrament, Jesus Christ could not speak more clearly than to speak sacramentally, and according to the style used in all the Sacraments. **9.** Add that he explained himself as much as was necessary to make this figured locution understood which is in these words, "this is my body," when he said afterward, "do this in remembrance of me," showing that it was a Sacrament that he left to the Apostles, and to all the Church, to celebrate it in commemoration of him during his absence.

Let us show more particularly that this verb "is" is taken for "signifies" in this proposition, "this is my body." We prove it **1.** by scripture. **2.** by the custom of the Jewish Church. **3.** by common usage. **4.** by reason.

Scripture furnishes us with many examples of similar phrases, where the verb "is" is put for "signifies," as when it says that circumcision is the covenant of God (Gen. 17 v. 7), because it was the sign and seal of it. That the Lamb is the passover (Exod. 12), that is to say signifies it. That the rock was Christ (1 Cor. 10), where the Apostle speaks of the rock from which God made waters flow in abundance in the desert; and this rock was Christ only in signification, or insofar as it represented Christ. It says that the cows are seven years (Gen. 41 v. 7), that is to say signify them. And so that one does not quibble about the fact that the verb "are" is not in the Hebrew text, which nevertheless must be understood there, let one see the following verse, where it says, "the seven ears which will wither are seven years of famine" (v. 27).

This truth is so clear in Scripture that everywhere where it is a matter of sign, the word "to be" is taken for "to signify." Note that the Hebrew language for the word "to signify" has no other word than the word "to be." Why then does one not want to take this word "to be" in this proposition, "this is my body," in the same sense that it should be taken in other passages, where it is spoken of the nature of signs? When Saint Paul exhorts us to hold to the analogy of faith in proposing some doctrine (Rom. 12 v. 6), he shows thereby that the parts of Religion agree with one another. Why does one detach this passage, "this is my body," from the others where it is spoken of signs, and give to the word "is" a sense totally contrary to that which the nature of signs obliges one to give to the same word in other passages? Why does one want this word in this passage to be taken for a being of conversion, rather than in others, or why does one not allow it to be taken for a being of

signification, as in other passages, since the nature of the sign requires it in this one as well as in those others.

As for the custom of the Jewish Church, it clearly proves the same. The Rabbis, and those who describe the ceremonies of the Jews which were observed in the time of Jesus Christ, say that in the celebration of the Passover, the father of the family before giving the bread, blessed it and said, "this is the bread of misery that your fathers ate in Egypt." There was no Jew, however stupid he might be, who thought that this bread that he ate was the same as that which the fathers of this nation had eaten in Egypt. Now Jesus Christ instituted the Sacrament of the Eucharist in place of the Passover, and celebrated it immediately after the Passover.

As therefore the word "is" in these words, "this is the bread of misery," was taken for "signifies," and this bread was the commemoration of the bread that the fathers of this people had eaten in Egypt; thus without any doubt the same persons who assisted at the action of the Passover, and immediately after, at that of the Eucharist, understood very well that the same word "is" in these words, "this is my body," should be taken for "signifies," and that the bread was called the body of Jesus Christ because it was the commemoration of it. Who does not see that Jesus Christ would have departed entirely from the manner of speaking of the Jews, if he had not given the name of the thing signified to the figure; and that those who today believe transubstantiation conceive a thing of which at that time there was neither shadow nor appearance.

Concerning common usage, it is certain that there is no phrase so used in all languages as this one, of honoring the sign with the name of what it signifies. In ours it is ordinary for us to say, "this is France, England, Spain," although one only shows the map of these Kingdoms. "This is Origen, Tertullian, Eusebius," speaking of their books. "This is the King, this is his order," although one sees only the portrait or the ribbon.

As for reason, it teaches us the same thing, because it posits as an infallible maxim that the nature and essence of the sign, insofar as it is a sign, consists in signification. Which is admitted by Bellarmine who says that the essence of a sign is signification (Bellar. de Euchar. lib. 1). Now since the Sacrament of the Eucharist is a sign, as all confess, and the nature of a sign is to signify, it is evident that in this proposition, "this is my body," the

word "is" can only be taken for a being of signification, and not of conversion. No more nor less than in this one, "baptism is the washing of regeneration" (Tit. 3 v. 5), because baptism signifies such a washing. The foundation of this is that every sign has a double being: an absolute and natural being, which is the substance of the thing, and a relative and significative being, which makes this substance become a sign, and makes it relate to another thing.

Thus in the tree of life, we consider the natural being, according to which it was a tree, like all the others in the garden of Eden; and also a significative being, which makes it called the tree of life, insofar as it was a Sacrament of immortality, and signified it; and by this it was distinguished from the other trees.

Likewise the water of Baptism has its natural being which is the substance, which makes it water like any other, but it has a relative and significative being, which makes it a Sacrament, that is to say a sign of the blood of Jesus Christ, and by this being it is distinguished from all other water.

The rock of which the Apostle says that it was Christ (1 Cor. 10) had a natural being, common with all rocks, beyond which it had a being of signification, insofar as it represented Jesus Christ, which distinguished it from other rocks.

Similarly the bread in the eucharist has its absolute and natural being, which is its substance by which it is bread, like any other, and its relative being, relative, and significative, which distinguishes it from all other bread, being the sign of the body of Jesus Christ. Now as the natural being of the bread necessarily posits the existence of the bread, also its relative being necessarily posits its signification. The sword by the tradition of which the Prince confers upon someone a great dignity, cannot have a being common with other swords without existing, and cannot be a sign of this dignity without signifying it. As therefore it would be to destroy its natural being to deny its existence, also it would be to destroy its relative being to take away its signification. These two beings remain very well together; and so far is it from the being of signification annihilating the natural being and the substance of the thing, that even if the thing did not have its natural being, it could not be a sign, because it would be nothing at all. It follows therefore, that the proper function of the sign being to signify, and Jesus Christ having instituted in the Eucharist a

sign of his body, saying "this is my body," that it is entirely certain that the verb "is" is taken for "signifies"; otherwise one would destroy the nature and essence of the sign.

It is easy to draw from the exposition of the pronoun "this" by "this bread," and from the exposition of the verb "is" by "signifies," the understanding of this whole proposition, "this is my body," in this manner: "this bread that I hold in my hands is the sign of my body." Where you will remark that these words, "my body," are understood of the proper body of Jesus Christ, that is to say of this solid substance of human nature, which the Son of God united personally to himself, which was crucified and buried, which is resurrected, and which has ascended to Heaven. Which is verified by the fact that Jesus Christ does not say, "this is a body," but "this is my body," showing that it is his proper body. As also Saint Paul declares it evidently, calling the bread "the communion of the body of Christ" (1 Cor. 10 v. 16). And in fact the body of Christ is either mystical or proper. The mystical is the Church, of which body Jesus Christ does not speak, not only because when the Church is called the body of Christ, it is never distinguished from its blood; but also because the Church was never given or broken for us, as it is said of this body, that it was given and broken for us (Luke 22 v. 19; 1 Cor. 11 v. 24).

After the particular exposition of the words, we will extend this matter further, because this exposition overturns transubstantiation and the carnal eating of the body of Jesus Christ in the eucharist. Which is the matter that we must briefly examine.

Transubstantiation cannot subsist except by taking the verb "is" of this proposition, "this is my body," for a being of conversion. We have shown that this exposition repugns the nature of the sign, and that it is full of absurdities. But it is no less contrary to these words, "which is broken for you"; because they exclude the local presence of the body of Christ in the eucharist, and consequently transubstantiation; for the body of Christ is in the Eucharist in the same way that it is broken there. Now it is only broken there in figure, and in fact Jesus Christ says in the present tense, "which is broken," and then this breaking could not be real, seeing that the real breaking of his body is his death; therefore the body of Christ is in the eucharist only in figure, that is to say in regard to the bread which is the Sacrament of it. Jesus Christ broke the bread, gave it to his Disciples, and said "take, eat, this is my body, which is broken for you" (Matt. 26 v. 1; 1 Cor. 11 v. 24). The sense of these words is: this broken bread signifies my broken body. For if the verb

"is" is taken for "signifies" in regard to the word "broken," why would it not be taken in the same way in regard to the word "my body," since it is relative as much to one as to the other. The substance of the bread relates to the substance of the body of Christ, and the breaking of the bread relates to the breaking of the body of Christ, now the relation of the bread and of its breaking being equal to the body of Christ and to its breaking, either the body of Christ must be really broken in the eucharist, if it is there really and with a local presence, or if it is not really broken there, it is certain that it is not there really.

This exposition is also contrary to these words, "do this in remembrance of me" (Luke 22). Jesus Christ speaks of commemoration and not of transubstantiation, now this commemoration implies the absence of his body, because commemoration is made of absent things, as Saint Augustine says, "no one remembers except what is not present to him" (Augustine in Psalm 37). Add that this commemoration presupposes the absence of the body of Jesus Christ, because it is founded on his departure, since he says, "I leave the world, I am no more in the world" (John 16 v. 28; 17 v. 11), and it is limited by his return, as the Apostle says, "you will proclaim the death of the Lord, until he comes" (1 Cor. 11 v. 26), that is to say until the last day, on which he will come to the earth as to the substance of his body. Which shows that when we have this body present, it will no longer be necessary to proclaim this death.

It was said that this commemoration does not exclude an invisible and insensible presence of the body of Christ. But by this reasoning one puts the body of Christ in the rank of spiritual substances; and yet Christ shows that his body is not like spirits: "a spirit has neither flesh nor bones, as you see that I have" (Luke 24 v. 39). It is true that memory does not exclude spiritual presence, and that every time it brings its objects back to the mind, it renders them present to it, and once a spiritual object is common to it, it is never rendered present to it except when it remembers it. Then commemoration is not opposed to presence, but to forgetfulness. In this way Scripture commands us to make memory of God. Although his essence is always and everywhere present, because it often happens to us to forget him, and not to think of his works. But memory excludes corporeal presence, whether visible or invisible, because it is as absurd to say that we take Jesus Christ under the species of bread in commemoration of him, until he comes, as if someone rendering to

his creditor in a purse the money that he had received from him, said to him: "this is the money that I owe you, take it in memory of this sum, until I pay it to you."

This exposition can no more agree with this passage, "this cup is the new Testament in my blood, which is shed for you" (Luke 22 v. 20). We use it to show that the verb "is" in the words that we are expounding to you, should be taken for "signifies"; for in the same way that Jesus Christ says that the cup is the New Testament, he says that the bread is his body; now what Jesus Christ says that the cup is the new Testament, is not that it is transubstantiated into testament, but it is that it is the sign and seal of the covenant that God has made with us through the blood of Jesus Christ. Therefore what Jesus Christ says of the bread, "this is my body," is not that the bread is transubstantiated into his body, but it is that it is the sign and seal of his body, which died for our sins.

Even if what is in the cup were properly the blood of Christ, this blood could not properly be the Testament of Christ, because blood is a natural thing, and testament is a moral and civil thing. It would be necessary to say that the Jesus Christ that one puts in the chalice is a testament, and thus that the testator and the testament are the same thing. It will also follow from there that the wine is transubstantiated into a testament. If what is in the cup is not the sign of the blood, but the blood itself, the proposition of Jesus Christ will be such: "this blood is the new Testament in my blood," and consequently "this blood is in my blood"; which is altogether ridiculous. If the blood of Jesus Christ had not been shed before his death, how does one want it to have been shed in the cup, since moreover one holds that it remained whole in the veins? If one says that it was shed under the accidents, is this not to say that they were very thick, since they hid an effusion of blood. However, even if this belief were as receivable as it is to be rejected, still the proposition of Jesus Christ would be figured, because the blood of Jesus Christ is not properly covenant, but is the meritorious cause of it, and thus it would be a figure by which the cause takes the name of its effect.

How can one conceive such an exposition, after these words of Jesus Christ, "I will not drink again of this fruit of the vine, until that day when I drink it new in the Kingdom of God" (Matt. 26; Mark 14)? For Jesus Christ designated what was in the cup by its substance, saying that it is fruit of the vine, after having called it his blood, and having given it to drink to his Disciples. Thus it was in substance wine, since it was fruit of the

vine, and it was his blood only in signification. We say also that Jesus Christ gave them bread in substance, and that this bread was his body only insofar as it signified it.

It was said that Saint Luke reports these words (Luke 22 v. 18). But it is evident that they were said as much of the cup of the eucharist as of that of the Passover, since Saint Matthew and Saint Mark speak only of the cup of the eucharist, and not of that of the Passover, and call it "fruit of the vine." Why does one want to correct Saint Matthew and Saint Mark by Saint Luke; and why will one not give equal faith to the three Evangelists, saying that Jesus Christ called each of these two cups "fruit of the vine." It is by this that one should reconcile the Evangelists, and say that Jesus Christ spoke twice of fruit of the vine, and that giving the cup of the eucharist, he repeated the same terms. For one cannot accuse any of the Evangelists of having spoken against the truth, nor of having perverted the order of the words of the Son of God, in an action so important, and where Saint Matthew was present. Does one want to depart from the belief of Pope Innocent III, who recognizes that Christ called the wine that he had consecrated "fruit of the vine" (*de mysteriis missae lib. 4, de Calice chap. 27*)?

This exposition can no more agree with these words of the Apostle, "the bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ" (1 Cor. 10 v. 16). Because they explain these words of the institution, "this is my body," and show that the pronoun "this" signifies the bread that Jesus Christ broke, and that this bread is the body of Christ by figure, seeing that in effect, bread is not properly the body of Christ, but insofar as it is the communion of it, and the Sacrament by which we participate in it. Which destroys transubstantiation, for the Apostle understands by bread true bread, and not the body of Christ, because he says that one breaks this bread, now the body of Christ cannot be broken; it does not break under the species, since our adversaries want it to remain whole under the species. Also because he says that this bread is the communion of the body of Christ. Now the body of Christ is not the communion of the body of Christ, because a thing is not the communion of itself; thus it is the bread that is the sacramental communion, and the means by which we truly have communion with the body of Christ.

It was said that this communion with the body of Christ is done corporally. But the Apostle proves our communion with the body of Christ by that which the faithful have together, inasmuch as, he says, "we who are many are one bread and one body" (v. 17);

now this communion which is between the faithful is only spiritual; it is therefore the same with our communion with the body of Christ. Note that the verb "to be" in these two passages, does not involve any transubstantiation. As therefore the faithful are not transubstantiated into bread, but are signified by one bread, inasmuch as several grains of wheat joined together make one bread; thus the faithful who are several make one body; likewise the bread is not transubstantiated into communion, or into the body of Christ, but the body of Christ is signified by the bread; the communion cannot therefore be corporeal. Also it is the style of the Apostle to take the verb "to be" for a being of signification, and not of conversion, as when he says in this same Chapter, that those who eat the sacrifices are partakers of the Altar, that is to say of him to whom the Altar is consecrated. "I do not want you to be partakers of devils." What? Were the symbols and ceremonies of the idol transubstantiated into idols and into devils? Not at all, but it is that the name of the thing signified is given to the sign and to the symbol, and therefore he who is participant of the sign and of the symbol is participant of the thing signified.

How can this exposition still subsist with what the Apostle says several times, that we eat bread (1 Cor. 11 v. 26, 27, 28, 29)? Now we only eat after the consecration, it follows therefore that it is bread after the consecration. If he called the Sacrament "body of Christ" as often as he calls it bread, there is no doubt that Rome would parade it and triumph over it as a won cause.

It was said that the Apostle calls the Eucharist bread because it is made of bread, as Eve is called bone of Adam, and the rods changed into serpents are still named rods; or because it was bread, as when it is said that the blind see. But the eucharist cannot have been made of bread, since according to our adversaries, no part of the substance of bread enters into the composition of the eucharist. For if by the eucharist they understand the species, they indeed say that they were accidents of bread, but not the bread itself. If they understand the body of Christ, which they put under these species, it was never bread. If the whole sacramental compound, according to them, of this species of bread and of this body, it is clear that this whole was never bread, having begun to be only after the bread ceased to be as to substance.

The examples that have been alleged are beside the point. Eve is called bone of Adam because the bone or rib of Adam is the matter from which she was made, and which

remained in her, though under a new form. But here the matter of bread, according to our adversaries, does not remain, and the host is not composed of it. The rod of Moses after having been changed into a serpent, is still named rod, because it had been a rod, and it was to return to being a rod. But the eucharist, or the body of Christ was never bread, and should not return to being bread. Scripture so calls this serpent a rod that it says openly that this rod had been converted into a serpent, so much so that besides the essence, it had the figure, life, and movements of it, so that Moses was frightened by it (Exod. 4). But here the bread is called simply bread, without it being said that it was converted into the body of Jesus Christ, and without it having the figure, life, and movements of a glorious body.

As for this example, that the blind see (Matt. 11 v. 5). Saint Matthew uses a word which signifies "to recover sight" (ἀναβλέπουσιν - they recovered sight). For if elsewhere the word "to see" is employed, we say that the blind are said to see, because in effect they are the same men who were blind and who now see; but in the eucharist, it is not the same substance, according to the doctrine of Rome, which was bread at the beginning and which is then the body of Christ, seeing that it believes that the substance of bread having entirely ceased to be, made place for that of the body of Christ.

The refutation of the carnal eating of the body of Christ depends on that of transubstantiation, for since the sense of these words, "this is my body," is that the bread is not transubstantiated into the body of Christ, but that it signifies the body of Christ, and since the Apostle says often that we eat bread, it follows that we receive with the mouth of the body the bread, and with the mouth of the soul, which is faith, the body of Jesus Christ. But because one has endeavored to prove this carnal eating, it is important to say something about it. Which we will do briefly, since we have already sufficiently long exercised your patience.

It was said that if in the eucharist one ate bread with the mouth of the body, and not the body of Christ, there would be no difference between the bread of the Supper and common bread. On the contrary we say that if the bread is changed into the body of Christ, and it ceases to be bread, one cannot show the difference between bread that no longer exists and common bread that is in the being of things. For one distinguishes two things that exist; thus one distinguishes two diamonds that are exposed to view, in that

one has more brilliance and is of greater price than the other; but if one presents only one of the diamonds, one cannot make this difference. If one says that the accidents of bread are in the Supper, we reply that the accidents of bread without the bread are not bread. As for us, we distinguish very well the bread of the eucharist from common bread, because that one is a sacramental bread, and is the sign and seal of the body of Christ, and not this one. Thus the manna which was kept in a golden jar, to be a memorial of the bread that God had made the Israelites eat in the desert, was distinguished by this particular use from common manna. The rock from which God made waters come forth, and which was a figure of Jesus Christ, was by this representation distinguished from common rocks. And the water of Baptism, employed to be the sign of the blood of Jesus Christ, is by this Holy use distinguished from common water. In this way the bread of the eucharist destined to be the Sacrament of the body of Jesus Christ, is thereby distinguished from common bread. Now as there was no need for a change of substance in the manna and in the rock, so that they might be distinguished from the manna and common rocks; and as today it is not necessary that the substance of water in Baptism cease to be, so that it may be discerned from common water, the particular use of all these things sufficing to make this difference; thus so that the bread of the Supper may be distinguished from common bread, there is no need for it to change substance, its use by which it becomes the sign and seal of the body of Christ, suffices to establish this difference.

It was also said that if in the eucharist the bread remained bread as to its substance, it would follow that the Sacraments of the Old Testament were more excellent than those of the New, because the manna which Scripture calls "the bread of Angels" was more exquisite, more delicate than the bread which is used in the Supper. We say that the manna was more excellent than bread as to its natural being, but that the bread of the eucharist is more excellent than the manna as to its significative being, because it represents much better than the manna the spiritual nourishment that our souls draw from the body of Christ; and in this regard all the other ancient Sacraments are inferior to that of the eucharist. And in fact those represented Jesus Christ to come, this one represents him as having come. Those proposed Jesus Christ and his graces under veils and figures much more obscure than this one does. The faithful who participated in the ancient sacrifices did not have a measure of grace as ample as that which we have in the eucharist, in proportion to the knowledge which is today clearer. It is thus that Saint

Chrysostom finds more excellence in the eucharist (Chrysost. homily on the betrayal of Judas) than in the Passover Lamb, saying that as painters first trace on their paintings certain lines, certain shadows, and then add to them the truth of colors; thus Christ on this table first traced the typical Passover, and then opposed the true one. And in effect Jesus Christ first showed the Apostles the Sacrament of the Passover, which was like a line and a shadow which obscurely represented spiritual nourishment, and then clearly expounded to them what was this true spiritual food and this true spiritual drink, represented by the Passover Lamb and by the other ancient figures, namely, his body broken for us, and his blood shed for the remission of our sins; of which he gave them bread and wine for signs and for assured pledges. Now as the first sketch of the portrait of the King, in the accomplished image are always images of the King, one nevertheless more obscure, and the other clearer; likewise the Passover and the eucharist are Sacraments representing the same Jesus, although the Passover is only like a very obscure sketch, and the eucharist like an image which has the truth of colors, that is to say the clear exposition of the Mysteries of our Salvation in Jesus Christ.

But will someone say that because the Sacraments of the New Testament are more excellent than the old, or that if God communicates more abundantly his Spirit through the Sacraments of the Christian Church than through the Sacraments of the Jewish Church, this advantage destroys the natural substance of the bread of the Eucharist? Not at all. As the water of Baptism always remains water as to its substance, although God accompanies it with greater efficacy of his Spirit to wash our souls, than he accompanied the act of circumcision; thus although God accompanies with a greater virtue of his Spirit the eating of bread in the eucharist to unite us to Jesus Christ, than he did the eating of the paschal lamb under the Law; yet the bread does not remain any less bread, in regard to its substance in the eucharist, than the lamb remained lamb as to its substance in the Passover of the Old Testament. The difference that exists between our sacraments and the Sacraments of the Israelites does not change the nature of the sign, neither in the ones nor in the others, and does not prevent the essential act of the sign from being to signify.

One has alleged for proof of the carnal eating of the body of Christ these words: "Truly, truly I say to you that if you do not eat the flesh of the Son of man, you will not have life in yourselves" (John 6 v. 53). It was said that Jesus Christ would not have employed the

oath if he had not understood by this word of eating a corporeal eating. But we find that Jesus Christ has often used the same manner of speaking in figured expressions, as when he says, "Truly I say to you, that if you are not changed and do not become like little Children, you will not enter into the Kingdom of Heaven," etc. "Truly I say to you, that whatever you bind on earth will be bound in Heaven," etc. "Truly, truly I say to you, unless someone is born again, he cannot see the Kingdom of God." "Truly, truly I say to you, that I am the door of the sheep" (John 10 v. 7). If one must take the word "to eat" literally because of this form of oath, one must also take all these passages literally, since the same oath is expressed there; now who would dare to say that we are properly changed into little Children, that the Apostles bound and unbound properly on earth, that our sanctification is done properly by a corporeal birth, that Jesus Christ is properly the door of the sheep. This oath therefore is only to affirm the truth of the similitude, by which under the terms of eating and drinking Jesus Christ, he represented the efficacy of the communion that we should have, through his Spirit and through faith, with his flesh and his blood.

One has also alleged these words, "my flesh is truly food, and my blood is truly drink" (John 6 v. 55), and it was said that they imply a corporeal eating and drinking, because of the word "truly." But on the contrary this word shows, according to the style of Scripture, that they should not be understood corporeally; because it is accustomed to call things "true" when it wants to distinguish things signified from signs, spiritual things from corporeal ones, eternal things from temporal ones. Thus Jesus Christ is called the true light (John 1 v. 9), in comparison to that of the Sun, which sets every day, which does not always shine equally, its light being sometimes intercepted by a cloud or by fog, which sometimes suffers eclipse, which is only a creature that cannot give sight; and therefore this word "true light" serves rather to conclude that Jesus Christ is not a visible Sun, than to infer the contrary. Thus Jesus Christ says that he is the true vine (John 15 v. 1). Because he communicates to all those who are grafted into him an efficacious and perpetual virtue, so that they bear fruit, and that their fruit be permanent (v. 16). Whereas the corporeal vine only sends sap to the branches in certain season, and for little time, and does not have the virtue to preserve them in life, nor to preserve itself there for very long. Would one therefore be so stupid as to say that Jesus Christ is a corporeal vine, such as we see in our vineyards. It is in this way that Jesus Christ says that his flesh is truly food, that is to

say that all other food is perishable and of little virtue, that the life which depends on it is of the same nature, that it passes like lightning, without being able to be long maintained in the same state by this nourishment. Whereas his flesh is so efficacious that to whoever receives it, it gives a life that is eternal and incorruptible. It is in vain that it was said that the flesh of Christ is called "truly food," and not "true food"; for besides that several ancients like Saint Chrysostom and others have read "true food," and not "truly food" (Chrysost. homily 46 in John; John 4 v. 42), the word "truly" does not exclude the metaphorical sense any more than the word "true." And in fact Scripture uses one as well as the other in figured expressions, as when it says, "we know that this one is truly the Christ" (John 4 v. 42), that is to say the anointed one, because what he is called anointed can only be by figure, seeing that he was not anointed corporeally.

Whoever considers closely all this chapter 6 of Saint John will find enough to sufficiently refute this carnal eating. We will content ourselves with producing some proofs. Our adversaries hold that Jesus Christ in this chapter speaks only of the bread of the eucharist, and of corporeal eating only from verse 51 onward (Bellar. de Euchar. lib. 1, chap. 5), and that in the preceding verses, he speaks of spiritual eating. Without debating whether Jesus Christ speaks of the eucharist or not, we say that he reiterates the same words that he had employed before the aforesaid verse, and which one admits should be understood of eating by faith. For what he says at verse 58 (where Bellarmine says that corporeal eating is spoken of): "this is the bread descended from Heaven, not as your Fathers ate the manna and are dead; he who eats this bread will live eternally"; this is the same thing that he had said before, as appears from verses 32, 33, 34, 40, 50, where Bellarmine says that spiritual eating is spoken of. For what reason therefore does one want the words of verse 58 and of the other verses, where Jesus Christ says that his flesh is truly food, and that he who eats it will have eternal life, to be understood rather of corporeal eating than those which precede verse 51? This also shows that it is a very absurd thing to invent that the last part of this chapter 6 speaks of corporeal eating, and not of spiritual eating, like the preceding part, seeing that Jesus Christ speaks only of one same spiritual bread which descended from Heaven, and continues one same discourse through this bread. But besides this, is it possible to want to establish another eating than by faith, after these words, "I am the bread of life, he who comes to me will not hunger, and he who believes in me will never thirst" (John 6 v. 35)? Since Jesus Christ takes as equivalent things

coming to him and eating him. For if one understands by eating a corporeal eating, one must also say that by coming to Jesus Christ one should understand a coming of the feet of the body. As therefore one comes by faith to Jesus Christ, likewise it is by faith that one eats him, which is why the Lord explains there coming and eating by believing.

Is it possible that one does not see the force and evidence of these words, "it is the spirit that gives life, the flesh profits nothing" (v. 63)? from which follows this argument: of Jesus Christ, what gives life, and not what profits nothing, enters into us. Now it is the Spirit that gives life, and the flesh profits nothing; therefore of Jesus Christ, it is the Spirit, and not the flesh that enters into us. It was said that the flesh of Jesus Christ profits nothing alone, but that it gives life being joined with the Spirit. This is contrary to the words of our Lord, for he does not say, the flesh and the Spirit give life, as if the flesh and his Spirit should together enter into us; but he opposes the Spirit to the flesh, "it is the Spirit that gives life, the flesh profits nothing"; attributing to the Spirit the virtue of giving life, and denying it to the flesh. It is true that the flesh of Christ profits us in quality of meritorious cause, insofar as it is the victim that was sacrificed for us, and which acquired for us Salvation and life; but this cause having its action outside of us, namely in the oblation of the cross, would profit nothing entering into us, and would not give us life in quality of efficient cause, which having its action within us, can be nothing other than his Spirit who to give us life dwells in our hearts. It is this Spirit alone who applies to us the effects of the merit of the flesh of Christ, and in this regard he gives us life alone in the form of efficient cause.

It was also said that Jesus Christ saying that the flesh profits nothing, speaks of flesh cut, broken, and chewed. But if Jesus Christ had intended to give his flesh whole to eat with the mouth of the body, he would not have removed the cause of the astonishment of the Capernaïtes, who were scandalized that he had told them to eat his flesh: "How can this man give his flesh to eat?" The absurdities that they pretended to make arise from the words of Jesus Christ did not proceed from this difficulty, whether it was necessary to eat his flesh whole, or cut, broken, and chewed, but in general whether one should swallow human flesh, which they found so strange that they said, "this word is hard, who can hear it?" And therefore to solve this difficulty, he says of his Spirit that it gives life, and that the flesh profits nothing, which is to say that we eat him by the sole entrance of his Spirit

within us, to the exclusion of his flesh. Otherwise the astonishment of those who believed that he spoke to them of carnal eating could not have ceased, because it is a discourse very hard to the ear, to speak of swallowing with the mouth of the body human flesh, whether whole or cut. Also Jesus Christ does not oppose to the flesh a whole flesh, when he says that the flesh profits nothing; but he opposes the Spirit, that is to say two substances of diverse nature; saying therefore that it is the Spirit that gives life, he means that it is the Spirit alone that enters into us to apply to us Salvation and life, and not the flesh, whatever it may be, whole or cut. From which it follows that if carnal eating, such as the Capernaïtes imagined, according to our adversaries, is condemned, theirs is also, seeing that it is always carnal eating, whatever restriction they bring to it. And in fact what reason would there be to want to call carnal eating that by which one would pretend to break and chew the flesh of Christ, and not that flesh of which it is said that one swallows without breaking it. Who does not see that **carnal eating** is every kind of eating that is performed by a carnal organ? The mouth of the body being a carnal organ, it is evident that every kind of eating through the mouth is carnal, whether it breaks the food, or only swallows it.

Is it still possible that one would not allow himself to be overcome by the force of these words: *Does this offend you? What then if you should see the Son of Man ascending to where He was before?* As if Jesus Christ were saying: How much greater then would be your scandal? For since you represent to yourselves no other eating than that which is bodily, which requires food to be bodily present, you would be far more astonished at what I said to you—that you must eat My flesh—since it is not possible for you with the mouth of your body on earth to eat the flesh of the Son of Man who is in heaven.

From this it is easy to infer that He is speaking here of another kind of eating of His flesh, namely, that which is done by faith—such an eating that neither places nor times could hinder.

Not places—for although the faithful are on earth, nevertheless their conversation is in heaven, where Jesus Christ is, as it is written in Philippians 3:20: *And from there we await the Savior on the last day.*

Not times—for the Lord has at all times been the spiritual nourishment of the faithful, who has given them life from the beginning of the world, and who will give them life until the end. Now, if it had been necessary that this be done by a bodily communion, how then could the faithful before the incarnation of the Son of God—that is to say, while He was in heaven and not yet manifested in flesh on earth—have been able, with the mouth of the body, to draw nourishment from a flesh that was not yet in the being of things? Can the organs of the body extend themselves to things that are not?

II. There is nothing but faith, which is a subsistence of the things hoped for, and consequently of things to come, that can unite the faithful to their Savior. Thus, when Jesus Christ speaks of His Ascension into heaven, where He was beforehand, He shows clearly how He has been the nourishment of the faithful before the Law and under the Law, and how He will be so until the end of the world—not by a bodily communion (that being altogether impossible), but by His Spirit and by faith.

It has been said that Jesus Christ meant this: since He will perform so great a miracle as to raise up His flesh, one should not think it strange that He can cause His flesh to enter into our bodies. But since Jesus Christ Himself has said that the flesh profits nothing, what reason is there for Since He excludes His flesh from entering into us, one cannot therefore conclude affirmatively that it ought to enter into us.

If then He alleges His Ascension into heaven, it is to show that there is no incongruity in what He had said about eating His flesh—because He was speaking of a **spiritual eating**, which subsisted even with the distance of His body.

As for this Ascension, the Jews did not doubt that it was very possible, since it had already happened with Enoch and with Elijah. Therefore Jesus Christ did not wish to prove the possibility of His flesh entering into our bodies by this miracle; otherwise, He would have been proving something unheard of by something that had already occurred in certain persons. That would be as if one were to prove that it is not strange that fire should be cold like ice, since water sometimes rises in order to avoid a vacuum—that is to say, as if one were to prove a falsehood by something extraordinary.

And indeed, one does not find any reason to be scandalized at the Ascension of Christ, as if it were the same as making the flesh of a man pass through our mouths and descend into our stomachs in order to give us eternal life.

Thus we show, by a powerful argument drawn from this passage, that the flesh of Christ does not at all enter into us, from Jesus Christ—that which was to be lifted from the earth and carried up into heaven does not enter into us. Now, it is the flesh which was to be lifted from the earth and carried up into heaven; therefore, of Jesus Christ, the flesh does not enter into us.

It must therefore be necessarily concluded that it is His Spirit which enters into us—because He leaves to His own His Spirit until the end of the world. And thus we say that of Jesus Christ, what remains upon the earth until the end of the world is that which enters into us. Now, it is His Spirit that remains upon the earth until the end of the world, as He says in Saint John, that His Spirit will abide with His own forever, and that He will be in them. Therefore, of Jesus Christ, it is His Spirit that enters into us.

We entreat the most passionate to consider that since our hunger is a hunger of the soul, our eating can only be done by the soul. Since we see Him only with the eyes of faith, we cannot eat Him otherwise than by faith. Since it is spiritually that we taste, as it is written: *“Taste and see that the Lord is good”* (Psalm 34:8–9), and since we clothe ourselves with Him spiritually (Galatians 3:27), we cannot eat Him except spiritually.

It has been said that by this means our eating is only in imagination, and not in effect. But is it not true that we see here Jesus Christ only with the eyes of the Spirit? You yourselves, who take issue with our doctrine, confess the same.

And will you say that we see Him only in figure and by imagination alone? Do you believe that when we are washed in His blood, that washing is imaginary—and would you dare to say that this washing is anything other than spiritual?

Thus also this eating is spiritual, and at the same time truly real. Oh, if you had truly felt the power of faith, you would not speak of it so unworthily! Oh, how poorly you treat the whole of the Christian faith, which, according to your maxim, would be nothing but a pure imagination—since it is entirely spiritual!

But what? Do you not fall into contradiction? Can you deny that there are many of the faithful who are deprived of the sacrament and of sacramental eating? And will you say that those persons eat Jesus Christ only in imagination, and that they are fed with His flesh only in figure and not in reality? Are you not compelled to confess that the actions of the soul supply the lack of those of the body?

Now, when it is a matter concerning the body, the body does its duty; and since here it is a matter of the soul, the soul also must do its own. If the body must be healed, we take bodily medicines; and since it is necessary to heal the soul, it must take the saving remedies that its Savior presents to it.

Do you not cover the Son of God with reproach, when mortal creatures claim to lodge His precious body in their stomachs, amidst filth and corruption? Is that the bridal chamber where He celebrates His nuptials with the faithful souls?

It has been said in reply to this, that the body of Jesus Christ can be in the body of a mouse, and not only in the body of a man, without defilement—just as the divinity is everywhere without being stained or infected by the most foul things.

But the divinity is not a body; it is a spiritual essence, immense, infinite, immaterial, and therefore cannot be defiled. On the contrary, the flesh of Christ is a true body, which cannot be in the body of a mouse without touching it, and consequently without being defiled by it.

Is it not then to expose Jesus Christ to disgrace, to enclose His body in a host that is subject to being poisoned? Thus it was that the Emperor Henry VII (according to *Moulin, Pol. 1.5*) died for having taken a poisoned host (*Annal. 1.7*).

Now, when that happens, what is it that is poisoned? Is it the body of Christ, or the accidents of the bread, or the bread itself? Not the body of Christ, which is unalterable and incorruptible. Not the accidents of the bread—for is it not absurd to say that lines and surfaces can be poisoned? And since poison is a substance, must one then say that accidents carry a substance, or that they are the subject of it—whereas substance is the subject of accidents? And can a substance be mixed and incorporated with accidents? By no means.

It must therefore necessarily follow that it is the very substance of the bread, and that consequently it remains after the consecration. Thus, one eats bread in the Eucharist, and not the body of Christ with the bodily mouth.

It has been said that the body of Christ, which is glorious, cannot be poisoned. We grant it; but that does not answer our argument.

It has further been added, that if one pierces the host with a pin, there is no change of substance in the pin. But this also is beside the point, and the force of our reasoning still remains. For either the pin pierces the body of Christ, or the accidents of the bread, or the bread itself.

Not the body of Christ—for it is said to be in the host only “under a point,” which is impossible. Not the accidents of the bread—for one cannot pierce lines and surfaces. Therefore, it is the bread itself which is pierced in its substance, which is contrary to the doctrine of our adversaries.

Moreover, if the pin remains in its substance, what then is it that bears this substance of accidents? For neither lines nor surfaces can bear it. Nor can the bread, since they say that it is no longer there.

Still, not the body of Christ, since it is said that the pin does not pierce it; and thus it would necessarily have to fall to the ground while the priest held it in his hands.

Otherwise, it would follow that the substance of the bread sustains it, and consequently that it remains after consecration. Yet it is a great reproach to the body of Christ to place it in a host along with poison, a pin, or some other vile and contemptible thing.

Experience also shows that the bread of the Eucharist does not change in substance, and consequently that the carnal eating of the body of Christ is imaginary; for the consecrated bread nourishes the body just as any other bread, and if it were taken in large quantity, it would satisfy the body.

As Thomas Aquinas, Suarez, and others have said (*Summa*, pars 3, qu. 77, art. 6; Suarez, t. 3), one cannot doubt that this is true bread, since it has the quantity, the qualities, the virtues, and the dispositions of bread. And indeed, it is not the body of Christ that

produces this effect upon us; for to nourish us, it would need, by our natural heat, to be converted into the very substance of our body—which cannot be, since it is incorruptible, and Rome requires that it remain indivisibly in the sacrament, and in the manner of a spirit.

Nor is it the accidents of the bread, which nourish the body, for the accidents themselves have no action; they are only simple beings, and not mixed bodies, as food must be, and therefore they cannot be a proper flesh for our bodies.

It is therefore the bread of the Sacrament which can nourish the body—no more and no less than any other bread.

It has been said that God substitutes, by creation or otherwise, a new matter in place of the body of Christ which was under the species, when they come to be corrupted; this matter receives the form that the natural action of our bodies would have imprinted upon it through digestion into the matter of the bread, if we had eaten it without it having been consecrated, just as when He creates the soul in the body of each man who is begotten. But all of this is mere fiction of the human brain.

Scripture teaches us that God creates the soul of man, and for this reason it is called *Father of Spirits* (Hebrews 12:9). And this fiction is not repugnant. Whereas the proposition that God creates a new matter in the Eucharist to nourish our bodies is constrained by Scripture and by reason.

Moreover, it is agreed that this soul which is created in the body of man was not there beforehand; but it does not follow that this matter, which is claimed to be created by God in the consumption of the sacramental species, was not before under these species. And thus it is to cite an example that is entirely dissimilar.

This is the true exposition of these words: *This is my body*, and the refutation of **transubstantiation** and of the carnal eating of the body of Christ in the Eucharist. Cease then, O you who until now have drunk from so bad a doctrine, from approaching these impure breasts. If you continue to drink from them, you will suffer as did Sisera, who died after having drunk the milk presented to him by Jael (*Judges 4:19*).

Cease receiving a doctrine which destroys the truth of the human nature of Jesus Christ, because it forces you to believe that the body of this glorious Savior is invisible under the sacramental species, and that it is in an infinity of places at once. This is what has been said recently, and which we shall briefly refute.

Jesus Christ shows that His glorified body is visible, saying, after His resurrection: “*See my hands and my feet, for it is I myself; touch me and see, for a spirit has not flesh and bones as you see that I have*” (Luke 24:39).

Why then is it said that His body exists in the host indivisibly, under a point, invisible and impalpable? Either the body of Christ is invisible by faith, or by accident—not by itself—there being only God and the spirits, which are invisible, is false reasoning. If it is invisible by accident, it is in the sense that, being visible by faith, it can be hidden from sight by some external cause that prevents us from seeing it. Thus, being visible in heaven, it is invisible to those who are on earth. In this way, a treasure hidden in the ground is invisible; the spies whom Rahab hid were invisible. The sun that shines in one hemisphere is invisible to those in the other. Birds, as they fly far from those who see them, eventually become invisible to them.

Now, as to what has been said—that the body of Christ is invisible under the sacramental species—this is not so, because we have shown that His body is not there, and that the bread of the Eucharist does not change in nature.

It is further added that if one wishes the body of Christ to be invisible by faith, one destroys its nature, because it is then equated with spirits. And since nothing that is in itself visible is invisible, and the body of Christ is colored, it is therefore not invisible by faith. Color is the proper object of the eye, just as sound is the proper object of hearing; and therefore it is necessary that all that is colored be seen. If then the body of Christ is colored—as cannot be denied—then to say that the body of Christ is not a human body, since color is the proper attribute of a body; it follows that the body of Christ is seen by faith.

As for what has been said—that the body of Christ is in an infinity of places at once—we shall propose only this single argument to refute that claim, because time does not allow

us to elaborate further. If a body is present in several places, then it must begin to exist where it was not before, either by generation, as when a man, who was not, is formed and exists in the womb of a mother, or by local movement, as when the rising sun ascends on the horizon.

Now, a body that is present in several places does not begin to exist where it was not before, in either of these ways: not by generation, since what is generated did not exist before; but if a body is present in one place and then in several, necessarily it was in that place before it was in several; nor by local movement, since everything that moves locally leaves the place where it was in order to go to another. Here, however, it is claimed that the body does not leave the place. It follows therefore that a body cannot be in several places at once.

It is said that the body of Christ begins to be on the altar, not by generation, nor by local movement, but by **transubstantiation**, in the same way as the soul, when the body grows, begins to exist where it was not before—not by generation, nor by local movement—or as God, when something comes into the world, begins to be in it, and yet it is neither generated nor moves locally.

But note that we are disputing about all bodies, and not only about that of Jesus Christ, for Rome holds that other bodies and even spirits can be in several places.

And what shall we say about also making this occur by transubstantiation? This is denied, since it is said that only the body of Christ is present in one place in several by transubstantiation; one must then confess that other bodies—indeed even spirits—cannot be in several places at once. The example of the soul is beside the point, because the soul is not in the body as a thing is in a place, but as form is in matter.

We say the same of God, about whom one cannot say that He is in any place.

It is therefore superfluous to say that the body of Christ is present in one place in several by some transubstantiated product, and that if it is not generated—since it existed beforehand—nevertheless it is as if newly produced by the virtue of consecration, which into the body of Christ. This is absurd, because, aside from the fact that in our argument it is spoken of **generation**, and that it is not the same thing to be generated as to be

“produced,” how can Jesus Christ thus be produced by the consecration, since He was already generated from the Blessed Virgin?

It is a maxim of certain certainty, that everything which comes into being was not before it was made. The heavens and the earth did not exist before they were created. The rod of Moses was not changed into a pre-existing serpent; nor was the wife of Lot turned into a statue of salt that existed before; nor the water of the wedding at Cana turned into wine that existed prior to that conversion.

Therefore, since the body of Christ has existed for more than sixteen hundred years, how can it be claimed that it is today newly produced by a change of bread into this same body, which has existed for so long?

It is in vain that some appeal to **adductive transubstantiation**, for this is the opinion of some Doctors of Rome, which contradicts the preceding argument, saying that the body of Christ is not produced in the host, but is brought there. To bring a thing is to draw it from the place where it was and put it in another where it was not, making it pass successively through the spaces in between. But will one then say that the body of Christ is said to be drawn from heaven, where it is, and to traverse by local movement all the celestial spheres and all the regions of the air, in order to come to dwell under the sacramental species. Even if it were brought there, it would have to be with all the properties of a true body and with all its glory, to the place where it is to be, yet without these properties and without this glory. That it occupies no place, that it occupies no space, that it has no extension, that all its parts are under a single point, and that the feet and the head in the host differ in no situation—this leads one to believe that if someone had dipped a pin into the consecrated chalice, the body of Christ would be entirely in the drop that remained at the tip of the pin.

And in such a state, what glory can it have? Since, if it falls, it does not have the power to lift itself up. Suppose also it were thus brought from heaven—when it ceases to be in the priest’s stomach, after the consumption of the species—where is it then taken? Is it again carried up into heaven, or what becomes of it?

Here is where even the subtlest reasoners are greatly distressed, being unable to resolve this difficulty, nor the many others which arise from a doctrine so thorny.

As a last refuge, one retreats into the fort of the omnipotence of God, and It is said that God can make the body of Jesus Christ be in infinite places at once. But He speaks to us by His Word, which tells us that Jesus Christ is like us in all things, except sin. Now, one does not say of any believer's body that it is capable of being at the same time in an infinity of places. His Word tells us that Jesus Christ has ascended into heaven, that He is seated at the right hand of God, where He will be until the last day.

One must not add by faith to those who say that Christ is here, or that He is there, that He is in cupboards, or in ciboria (*Matthew 24:1, 23; 26:7, 6; 2 Corinthians 5*). His Word commands us to go to heaven, where He is, and not to make Him come to the earth where we are. It tells us that while we are here below, we are absent from the Lord.

Now, the doctrine which teaches that by the omnipotence of God the body of Christ is in infinite places at once is contrary to all this. To appeal to the power of God in support of it is to use it to overturn His Word. Moreover, it diminishes the power of God under the pretense of exalting it, because it is demanded that He do what is contradictory. Against this infallible axiom, it is impossible that two contradictory things are both true, as when one says "man, not man."

Now, if God can make the body of Christ be in several places at the same time, that is to say, He can make a head which is one, should not be one; that a presence should not be presence; that a body should not be a body—these are entirely contradictory things, no less than saying that heaven remaining heaven could be made earth, or that earth remaining earth could be made heaven; or that the present time could be the past, or the past be the present; or that Aaron had not been High Priest, or that Solomon had not been King. Indeed, in fact, one calls "one" that which is not divided from itself and which is divided from all else.

Now, if the body of Christ is in diverse, separate places, not being in between them, it is divided in itself, which is so contrary to unity that it cannot belong to any thing, whether body or spirit. It is impossible that God lies, since He has appropriated a body to His Son

(*Hebrews 6:18, 10*) and wills that a body be one. To say that He can make a body which is one, not be one, is to attribute to Him contradictory things, which are repugnant to nature—which is such that it cannot lie—and to the nature of things, which is such that it is impossible for a body which is one not to be one at the same time.

Thus the truth of our doctrine shines with vivid light on the subject of the Eucharist; and may God grant that it carry its reasons far into the soul of those who have previously been taught otherwise regarding materially necessary. And because they defer greatly to the testimony of the Fathers, we will give their deposition on this point, of this great multitude of witnesses who lived after the Apostles. We will produce only a few, because we would need more time than remains to us to make a fuller account. If their names were suppressed, the most passionate would judge that it is Geneva speaking, since Justin reports their doctrine entirely in accordance with ours.

Justin Martyr says that Jesus Christ caused the bread of the Eucharist to be made in commemoration of the passion which He suffered for those whose souls are purged of all malice of men (*dialogues against the adversaries, Trypho, p. 82*). This commemoration presupposes the absence of the body of Jesus Christ.

Irenaeus says that when the chalice is mixed and the bread is broken, received with the Word of God, the Eucharist of the body and blood of Christ is made (*Irenaeus, Book II, ch. 5*). Now what is the Eucharist of the body of Christ, if not the Sacrament, or the sacred sign of the body of Christ?

Clement of Alexandria says that Jesus Christ, having taken the wine, for He was also man, said: “Take, drink, this is my blood, the blood of the vine,” calling allegorically a holy liquor of life, the Word which was poured out for many in remission of sins, etc. Now, what had been blessed was wine; He showed this again, saying to His disciples: “I will no longer drink of this fruit of the vine, until I drink it anew with you in the kingdom of my Father.” Note that he recognizes an allegory in these words of Jesus Christ, calling the wine His blood; for if the wine is called blood by allegory, it is not by transubstantiation.

Also note that he proves that Jesus Christ drank wine in the Eucharist when he cites His words, as they are in St. Matthew and St. Mark, where He calls what He drank the fruit of the vine (*Marcionem, c.19*).

Tertullian speaks in these terms: “God thus revealed in your Gospel, calling the bread His body, so that by this you understand that He gave the bread to be the figure of His body.” Could anything be expressed more clearly? The same of the saying that one should truly eat His flesh—these are His own words, where He takes the word *carnis* truly, properly, and corporeally.

We call the discourse of Jesus Christ an allegory of meats. Now allegory is opposed to the proper and literal sense. He describes the eating of the flesh of Christ through these expressions: to feed the appetite of the Word, to devote the ear, to ruminate with the understanding, and to digest through faith. All of this can only be done spiritually.

Origen calls that which is received in the Eucharist a symbolic or figurative body, which cannot be reconciled with transubstantiation (*Origen, Commentary, Book 15*).

St. Cyprian, having said that the waters in the Apocalypse signify the peoples, speaking of these waters on which the harlot sits (*Epistula, lib. 3*), adds: we see that in the water the people is understood, and in the wine is shown the blood of Christ. In the same manner, when he says that the water is the people, he says that the wine is the blood of Christ. Now it is utterly absurd to say that the water was transubstantiated into the people; hence it is no less absurd to say that this Doctor believed that the wine was transubstantiated into the blood of Christ.

Athanas. St. Athanasius condemns the carnal eating in the Eucharist and says regarding these passages of St. John (*Evangelium, chapter 6*), that Jesus Christ calls the Spirit “life,” as if He were saying that what is shown and given to the world is given as food so that it may be given to each spiritually, and may be a preservative of eternal life to all.

Theodoret says that Jesus Christ in the Eucharist honored the signs that were seen as the name of His body, not by changing the nature, but by adding grace to the nature. Could one more clearly refute transubstantiation?

Augustine. St. Augustine is no less formal on this point, saying: the Lord did not make it difficult to say “this is my body” when He gives the sign of His body (*Adversus Difficillimam*).

Idem. He does not take literally these words of Jesus Christ: “*Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, you have no life in yourselves.*” It seems, he says, that this commands some wickedness or wrongdoing. Therefore, it is a figure, enjoining that we must participate in the Passion of the Lord and remember vividly and fittingly that His flesh was crucified for us (*lib. 3, c. 15*).

St. Chrysostom says that when Jesus Christ gave the mysteries, He gave wine, which excludes the change of wine into the blood of Christ (*homilia 82 in Matth.*).

In the Code of Canons of the African Councils (*Can. 37*), it is said that in the sacred service nothing is offered but the body and blood of the Lord—that is to say, nothing but bread and wine mixed with water.

The same canon is repeated in the **Council of Trullo** (*Can. 3*). This is the exposition that a council gives to these words “my body and my blood”: that is, bread and wine mixed with water.

The **Council of Ancyra** forbids priests who have sacrificed to idols from offering bread or the chalice. The **Council of Neocaesarea** similarly prohibits priests, without the presence of a bishop or city priest, from giving bread or the chalice (*Can. ante-penult*). These are two councils that call “bread and chalice” what is distributed in the Eucharist.

The **Council of Constantinople**, held in the year 756 and composed of 338 bishops, condemning images, speaks incidentally of this Sacrament. It says, “the image of this body” (*vinifiant*). And shortly afterward, it calls the substance of bread an image of the body of Jesus Christ. This is entirely contrary to transubstantiation.

On this matter, we will close with the words found in the gloss of the Roman decree (2. *Romain*), which are entirely formal on this point. The heavenly Sacrament, which veritably represents the flesh of Christ, is called the body of Christ—but improperly, as it is thus also said in this manner, yet not in the reality of the thing, but in the mystery: it

signifies. In other words, it is called the body of Christ in the sense that it is signified. After this, what will become of transubstantiation?

Nevertheless, let us consider ourselves fortunate, my brothers, that it has pleased God to give us the true knowledge of this mystery, as with all the other mysteries of the Religion. It only remains that, with an ardent devotion, we respond to the excellence of this knowledge, so that when we come to the sacred table of Jesus Christ, we may be made participants of the graces He there offers us—graces that are presented and revealed only to those touched by the zeal of the the house of God.

If He does not give us at this table the delicious foods that the flesh desires, it is to compel us to elevate our minds to the mystery that He reveals to us. If the appearance of this Sacrament is not pompous and magnificent, the mystery is incomparable. Just as the crowns given to victors in the Olympic games were made of a lowly material, yet in their signification they were so excellent that they were to be preferred over crowns of gold or precious stones—because among the Greeks they were the symbol of great glory—so too this Sacrament, in its material, is of little account, but in its signification it is to be valued above all the treasures of the earth, since it is the sacred symbol of the body of Jesus Christ and of our communion with Him, which is the highest honor that can ever befall us. Therefore, the more excellent it is, the more we ought to demonstrate devotion and zeal when we approach it.

As for you, who are in another communion, we ask you to carefully examine what we have just presented, and you will find that it is far better, without comparison, to contemplate Jesus Christ in Heaven, seated at the right hand of God, clothed in splendor and light, attended by thousands of Angels, governing the world, instructing, consoling, and sanctifying His Church, than to see Him on earth in a piece of bread, in the hands of a man, in a weaker condition than when He conversed visibly with the world; for then He performed miracles, whereas in the host He cannot defend Himself from the slightest injury or violence. Is there not more consolation in preparing the mouth of the soul than that of the body to receive Him? Is there not greater satisfaction in feeling Him in our hearts, living and vivifying our consciences, than in feeling Him in the stomach, without life and without effect?

The Apostle, who once said that the God who made the world and all that is in it, that He is Lord of Heaven and Earth, does not dwell in temples made by human hands, nor is He served as if in need of anything (Acts 17:24–25). What would you say if you saw today the Lord among Christians enclosed in a ciborium, carried through the streets, and borne like a thing deprived of life and movement? If you saw that we, who seek Him only in Heaven and adore Him in His true temple, find nothing here on earth capable of housing the Lord of glory but the soul and the conscience—and yet we say that it would be unworthy of this honor if it were given had chosen it for His dwelling, if you saw that we are despised and hated because we do not serve Him as the pagans do. These things would be enough to bend your hearts if you were not held fast by the allurements of the world, whose honors are like these golden apples that divert you from the race to which Jesus Christ calls you.

It would grieve Him that you hesitate to leave Egypt to come into the desert, and yet the manna that God makes to rain down is incomparably better than the garlic and onions of Egypt.

We cannot sufficiently express the sorrow of our spirit, which is very keenly aware of seeing so many beautiful souls running along such a bad path. This makes it difficult for us to believe that God has brought you into the world only to leave you forever in this state; yet the qualities we see in you seem to make us hope that His infinite mercy will soon bring you out.

What has held you back until now is the splendor and pomp that accompany your religion, like the shadow is to the body. But just as when the sun rises it effaces the brilliance of the stars, so when it pleases God to raise upon you the light of His Gospel, it will make vanish before your eyes all this worldly glory charmed you up to now. You perform miracles, or open your eyes to see the great marvel that God makes manifest among us, upholding the truth of our doctrine amid so many contradictions. You seek the peace of the earth, and we propose to you that of Heaven. The honors of the world are traps, in which you take pleasure in being ensnared. But they cost the very lives of those whom God would deliver to you if you were joined to His Church.

You prize this pomp of ceremonies, which elevates, in appearance, your religion; but you will find among us the truth, of which you possess only shadows. You have chapels for your saints, and we have souls for God; you have images with which you adorn your temples, and we have the Christian virtues with which we adorn our Spiritual Temples. You have stone altars, upon which you offer a forbidden sacrifice; and we have the altars of the heart, upon which we present to God the commanded sacrifices.

You have incense, and we have prayers; you have relics of the dead, which you worship, and we have the noble examples of the Prophets and the Apostles, whom we invite to imitation. You have candles, and we have the lights of the Gospel. You have oils; and we have the graces of the Holy Spirit. You invoke creatures, and we invoke the Creator. You have the Saints as intercessors, and we have Jesus Christ alone. You go on pilgrimages to Rome, and we make the journey to Heaven. Your devotions kiss the earth, and we honor the Son. You fast from meat, and we fast from sin. You celebrate feasts condemned by God, and we sanctify the true day of rest, as ordained by Jesus Christ. You sing litanies in honor of the Saints, and all our hymns are solely in honor of God. Judge whether all these things are not preferable to the great pomp of your ceremonies.

You naturally love light. Our Church is like the house of that Roman, which was so open that everyone could see what was being done inside. Divine service is conducted there in a language that all people understand, and the mysteries of the Gospel are clearly explained, whereas your Church resembles a dark private prison, where the service is conducted in a language unknown to the people, the Holy Scriptures are hidden on the pulpit, and the legends of your Saints are preached rather than the mysteries of faith, where the precepts of the Gospel are concealed, and the relics of the dead, displayed, are adored.

One should not doubt that the exterior of our Church, which lacks splendor, might turn you away from communion. Do you not see that nature encloses rare things in small bodies—like pearls in oysters? She has so wisely distributed the anemones that they represent the beauty of the sun far better than the thick forests, all covered with trees. In this way, God has enclosed His richest treasures and most sublime mysteries beneath the outward simplicity of the religion we profess. May the good God make what we have

spoken to you not be in vain, and may you reap from it a salutary fruit, all that we sincerely wish for you.

As to what your preacher reproached us for—that we have neither city, nor army, nor cannons—we are content to tell him that it suffices for us to have the protection of God, the favor of the King, our Church for city and army, and the two Testaments for cannons, which would utterly strike down falsehood and lies, and hurl the thunderbolt of heaven, were it not for the truth. We pray that he not be concerned merely with words, but that he may rather illuminate his understanding and kindle in his heart a true zeal for the service of God.

