

IN TRANSLATIÖNE

De Brès versus Richardot: A Sixteenth-Century Debate Regarding the Lord's Supper

HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION

The Reformed faith came to the Low Countries (present-day Netherlands, Belgium, and parts of France and Germany) in the 1540s. It arrived via Geneva and France. Calvinism took hold in large cities and towns throughout this region, appealing to a broad cross-section of society. Persecution, however, soon became a reality. As a result, at some time or another, nearly every Reformed believer had to choose between exile or martyrdom. The Spanish were in control of the Netherlands in this era and being staunchly Roman Catholic, they were usually unwilling to tolerate the existence of religious dissent. This was the world of Guy (Guido) de Brès.

De Brès was born in 1522 in Mons in the present-day region of south-western Belgium. He was converted to the Reformed faith in 1547. Because of persecution in the Low Countries, in the years following, he was often on the run or in exile. De Brès spent time in England, Germany, Switzerland, and France. During his years in England and in Switzerland (Lausanne and Geneva), he received an excellent theological training. He became proficient in the original biblical languages, in Reformed theology, and in patristics. He would become best remembered as the author of the 1561 Belgic Confession.

After wandering back and forth between the Low Countries and France, de Brès finally returned to his home region

GUY (GUIDO) DE BRÈS (1522–1567). The debate between de Brès and François Richardot was first published in *Procédures tenues a l'endroit de ceux la religion du pais bas* (Geneva: Jean Crespin, 1568) 277–332. Translation and Introduction by Wes Bredenhof, Th.D.

1. Most of this biographical information comes from the articles on Richardot in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation* (OER), ed. Hans J. Hillerbrand (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1996) and *Cyclopedia of Biblical, Theological, and Ecclesiastical Literature*, ed. John McClintock and James Strong (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1981 reprint). The only biography of Richardot is Leon Dufloy's *Un orateur du XVIe siècle: François Richardot, évêque d'Arras* (Geneva: n.p., 1971).

2. See L. A. Van Langeraad, *Guido de Bray: Zijn Leven en Werken* (Zierikzee: S. Ochtman & Zoon, 1884), 82. In a footnote, Van Langeraad quotes Edmond Pouillet (in his *Correspondance du Cardinal de Granvelle*): "C'était un de des hommes les plus éloquent de l'époque."

in July of 1566. De Brès was to pastor the Reformed churches in Valenciennes, Lille, and Tournai. He was not home long when iconoclasm broke out in Valenciennes. The city was declared guilty of rebellion and besieged for several months. The city capitulated on March 23, 1567 and in the midst of the confusion, de Brès managed to elude capture. However, just five days later, together with one other Reformed pastor, de Brès was betrayed and delivered into the hands of the Spanish authorities. Initially imprisoned at Tournai, on April 11th they were transferred to a prison in Valenciennes. This prison, nicknamed *Brunain* ("Ol' Brownie"), was essentially a dark sewer deep in the bowels of a government or military building. From time to time de Brès would be called up to a more sanitary room and there he would have visitors who would try to persuade him to return to the Roman Catholic faith. Among those visitors was François Richardot.

Richardot was born in 1507 in the eastern part of France.¹ He joined the Augustinian order at a young age, and eventually received a doctorate in theology at the University of Paris. His connections to the Low Countries began early on when he was appointed to teach theology in Tournai (the birthplace of the Belgic Confession) sometime in the 1520s. He also taught in Paris and there developed a reputation as a gifted rhetorician. However, eventually suspicions began to arise regarding his orthodoxy and under that cloud he fled to Italy where he became a chaplain for Renée of France at Ferrara, Italy. This appears to have taken place in the late 1530s or early 1540s.

Richardot was a fairly well-known figure by this time. He certainly was known by John Calvin. Calvin was a spiritual advisor to Renée of France—many letters passed between the two. Under Calvin's guidance, the French princess had developed some Reformed convictions. The appointment of Richardot as her chaplain is therefore rather odd. When Calvin heard about Richardot's appointment, he felt compelled to write to her and warn her about him.

Calvin acknowledged Richardot's oratorical gifts. Another author noted that he "was one of the most eloquent men of the age."² Of course, Calvin's concern was not Richardot's rhetorical abilities, but rather the way he used those gifts and the doctrine he held. Calvin wrote:

... when I perceive that any one, owing to an ill-informed conscience, sets himself to overthrow the word of the Lord, and to extinguish the light of Truth, I could by no means pardon him, even were he my own father a hundred times over. As for this same individual, I have been aware, from having long known him, that whatsoever small understanding of the Scripture God has vouchsafed him, he has always made subservive his own profit and ambition, preaching wherever he saw that it would be a help to gratify his avarice, forbearing to preach wherever

he found that it would be troublesome to him; and then for all that, as often as he could procure hearers, persons of credit to countenance him, and the wealthy to fill his wallet or his purse, who required him to give glory to God, he has taken the trouble to satisfy them by almost always selling them his word. On the other hand, again, wherever he met with any trouble or persecution, he had always his denial ready to escape from it, to such a degree, that one could not know in regard to him whether the holy and sacred word of God was but a sport and mockery; insomuch that he turned it into a farce, playing at one time one character, and at another the part of another, according to the pastime he finds in it.³

Calvin went on to mention the efforts that he had made in times past to bring Richardot to the Reformed faith. Most of the time Richardot displayed “horrible obstinacy and hardness of heart,” but on one occasion Calvin claimed that he agreed that the mass was a “gross abomination.” However, Calvin regarded his word as nothing more than the “chattering of a magpie.”⁴ Assuming the honesty of his report, Calvin’s assessment proved correct since Richardot was now in Ferrara trying to persuade Renée that the mass was entirely lawful.

As it happens, things did not work out very well for Richardot in Ferrara either. He was imprisoned for a time (perhaps for heresy), and then returned to France. He served as a bishop in Nicopolis, Granvelle, and then finally in Arras (27 miles southwest of Lille). In 1562 he was involved with the founding of a university in Douai and became a professor there of biblical studies. On November 11, 1563 he was called upon to deliver the opening sermon at the twenty-fourth session of the Council of Trent. His career was at its peak. In 1567, the same year that he met de Brès, Richardot published four sermons in which he explicitly instructed Roman Catholics how to debate with Reformed believers on the topic of the mass.⁵

From Calvin’s correspondence with Renée, we know that Richardot had experience in that area. He came to the prison in Valenciennes as a 60 year old man with years of discussions with Reformed theologians behind him. He came also with probably the best understanding of the Bible that could be expected from a Roman Catholic theologian in the sixteenth century. Finally, he was equipped with excellent speaking and debating skills. Richardot was the most important figure in the Roman Catholic Church in the Low Countries and it reflects on the importance of de Brès that it was he who came to the prison on that May 18th of 1567.

The debate was first published in 1568 by Jean Crespin of Geneva.⁶ It was included as part of a 404 page book (*Procedures*) which provided other debates of de Brès, as well as some of his last letters, and the account of his martyrdom. Crespin is most well-known, not only as a prominent Reformed

publisher, but also as the first Reformed martyrologist. Beginning in 1570, his *Histoire des Martyrs* reprinted some of the material from *Procedures*, including the debate between de Brès and Richardot.⁷ In 1911, S. Cramer and F. Pijper republished *Procedures* (including this debate) in a critical edition as part of the series *Bibliotheca Reformatoria Neerlandica*. Some of their notes have been helpful in preparing this translation.⁸

This is not the first English translation of this debate. In the Hekman Library at Calvin College/Seminary in Grand Rapids, Michigan there is a typewritten manuscript of a translation of *Procedures*. Unfortunately, this anonymous translation leaves much to be desired and periodically leaves substantial original material untranslated. Nevertheless, it was constantly referred to in the preparation of this new and improved critical translation.⁹

This debate is important for two main reasons. First of all, it provides insight into the polemics between sixteenth-century Reformed and Roman Catholic theologians on the question of the mass. We have documents portraying extended written exchanges from both sides, but there are few examples of recorded debates held in person. Second, it gives us more insight into the author of the Belgic Confession, Guido de Brès. This debate (and the others in *Procedures*) reflects the rigour of his theological training and especially his knowledge of patristics. With good reason, the Roman Catholic Church regarded de Brès as one of its foremost opponents in Europe, and definitely its foremost opponent in the Low Countries.¹⁰ If Richardot had brought de Brès back to Rome, it would have been a major coup. However, as will become evident below, de Brès was well-settled in the doctrines of the Bible. Nine days later, on May 31, 1567, he gave his life for the doctrine of the Son of God. He was hung by order of the magistrate for

3. *Letters of John Calvin* (Vol. 1), ed. Jules Bonnet (New York: Lenox Hill, 1972 reprint), 298–299.

4. *Letters*, 299–300.

5. François Richardot, *Quatre Sermons du Sacrement de L’Autel* (Louvain: Jean Bogard), 1567.

6. *Procedures tenues a l’endroit de ceux la religion du pais bas* (Geneva: Jean Crespin, 1568). The debate between de Brès and Richardot is found on pages 277 to 332.

7. See Jean Crespin, *Histoire des Martyrs* (Vol. 3), ed. Daniel Benoit and Matthieu Lelievre (Toulouse: Société des Livres Religieux, 1889). The debate is found on pages 554 to 566.

8. *Bibliotheca Reformatoria Neerlandica* (Vol. 8), ed. S. Cramer and F. Pijper (S-Gravenhage: Martinus Nijhoff, 1911). The debate is found on pages 593 to 614.

9. A word of thanks also to R. Andrew Myers for his help with some of the more difficult French phrases.

10. A painting made shortly after de Brès’ death portrays him as one of the Roman Catholic Church’s arch-enemies. De Brès was included there with Luther, Calvin, Zwingli, Beza, and others. For this painting and further explanation, see Nicolaas H. Gootjes, *The Belgic Confession: Its History and Sources* (Grand Rapids: Baker Academic, 2007), 52–58.

celebrating the Lord's Supper according to the manner that had been re-formed according to the Scriptures.

DEBATE BETWEEN GUY DE BRÈS AND FRANÇOIS RICHARDOT, BISHOP OF ARRAS

Disputes held May 22, 1567, at Valenciennes prison between Richardot, bishop of Arras, and Guy de Brès, native of Mons in Hainaut, held prisoner at Valenciennes for the doctrine of the Son of God.

About eight o'clock in the morning of May 22, the bishop of Arras came to me for the second time, accompanied by a great number of priests, churchmen, and others.¹¹ After every one greeted one another, the bishop approached me at the table and I was seated face to face with him and all the others were seated around the room. They had much to say

11. In a letter to the Reformed congregation of Valenciennes dated April 18, 1567, de Brès states that he is still eagerly waiting for a visit from Richardot "to do you know what" ("... *pour quoy faire vous le sauez ...*" *Procedures*, 37). Richardot came with a Carmelite monk named Cordelier on April 18. For the record of that encounter, see *Procedures*, 190–210. The letter must have been written and sent out before his visit that day.

12. Johannes Oecolampadius (1482–1531) was a German-born Reformer, mostly active in Basel. In 1525 he published his opinions on the Lord's Supper in his *Genuina Expositio* (also known as *De Genuina Verborum Domini*). "For the first time had made his 'symbolic' view of the Lord's Supper clear and argued that the bread and wine signified the body and blood of Christ, which were eaten spiritually." (OER 3, 170). His views appear to be similar to those of Zwingli.

13. Andreas Bodenstein von Karlstadt (1486–1541) was a German radical Reformer. Initially a close associate with Martin Luther, during the 1520s they began to drift apart theologically. In the late 1520s, "At Basel several additional tracts by Karlstadt on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper were published; in these works Karlstadt repudiated Luther's doctrine of the real presence of Christ's blood in the wine." (OER 1, 179). According to Ronald Sider, "He developed a purely symbolic understanding of the eucharistic presence of Christ and denounced every vestige of the sacrament as a means of grace." *Karlstadt's Battle With Luther: Documents in a Liberal-Radical Debate*, ed. Ronald J. Sider (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1978), 72. Sider provides an English translation of Karlstadt's 1524 tract, *Concerning the Anti-Christian Misuse of the Lord's Bread and Cup ...* (72–91). In that tract, Karlstadt sets forth his memorialist view of the sacrament. In his 1524 *Dialogue or Discussion Booklet on the Infamous and Idolatrous Abuse of the Most Blessed Sacrament of Jesus Christ*, he clearly rejects the Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation. See *The Essential Karlstadt: Fifteen Tracts by Andreas Bodenstein (Karlstadt) from Karlstadt*, ed. and trans. E. J. Furcha (Waterloo: Herald Press, 1995), 269–316.

14. The sixteenth-century consensus was that Hebrews was written by the Apostle Paul. This is also reflected in article 4 of the 1561 Belgic Confession. Some later editions (i.e. from the Canadian Reformed Churches) have dropped this.

15. The Reformers commonly considered Roman Catholicism to be another religion. This viewpoint is also found throughout the other writings of de Brès.

on the topic of the Mass and the Supper. Their strategy was to put all this before my eyes so that I would approve their doctrine and then after their triumph they would use that to destabilize the weak in the faith, to have them abandon the true and ancient doctrine which I preached to them. At least that is what they hoped to do.

The Bishop: Well, Guy, since we last talked together, how have you been? Are you in the same situation and holding the same opinion? Have you thought about our last talk together?

Guy: Sir, I praise my God and Father that it pleases him to bestow his fatherly mercy on me, consoling me and fortifying me in a marvelous way in my bonds and afflictions. I see and feel the strength and faithfulness of his promises for which I thank him with all my heart, praying to him to continue until the end of my life. As for the rest, I still feel the same and my situation is the same.

The Bishop: What? I hoped to find you completely changed, according to the hope which I expressed last time. Don't you want to draw near and embrace an encounter with the truth? O Guy, my brother and friend, I beg you not to be stubborn in your sentiments and not to prefer your judgment to the judgment of the whole church and of the many learned persons who were before us.

Last time we dealt with the sacrifice of the body and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ in the Mass, which the fathers have said was in use in the time of the apostles. They said often, "We offer," speaking of the Eucharist. It is a wonder how you prefer to believe a doctrine which began about forty years ago, produced and set forth by Oecolampadius¹² and Karlstadt,¹³ who were its first authors. It seems better to me to believe the fathers who say the Eucharist is a sacrifice, than these others who say something to the contrary. I know exactly how you will respond to me. You will say that St. Paul said to the Hebrews¹⁴ that Christ offered himself only once. But my response is that in the Mass we do not make another sacrifice than the one he has already made. We do not make one today and tomorrow another. It is always the same one which we offer, not as he offered himself on the cross, for there he offered himself by presentation of merit, but we offer as ministers and executors of his will by application of that merit. I am surprised how you find that so strange. We say that we offer Jesus Christ to God the Father for our sins. In your Supper, do you not present Jesus Christ to God for your sins? Do you pray that he will apply to you the merits of the death and suffering of his Son? Guy, my brother and friend, I beg you not to embrace your opinion. I am looking out for your salvation and your well-being. I desire everything good for you. I am certainly not blood-thirsty, but one who wants to deal with you in all gentleness and moderation.

Guy: Sir, I do not know what hope you conceived for me last time. If you have hoped to win me over to your religion,¹⁵

I cannot help that. At any rate, I do not think that you have been given occasion for that hope. It's not like you think. As I have said before and say it again, I have never been stubborn and close-minded against clear thinking and reason. But if anyone can show me from the Word of God that I have been in error, I am completely ready to give up. Up to the present there has been nothing of all that I have heard that would make me leave the certain for the uncertain. I still hold the same position that I did at the time when, by quick testimony from the Word of God, you made me appear to be contrary. As I have said, I am not stubborn, and do not prefer my judgment to the judgment of the Church. But I do certainly prefer with clear thinking and just cause the ancient and early Church in which the apostles set up all things according to the ordinance of Christ. I prefer that to the church of our time which is loaded with a vast number of human traditions, and which has degenerated itself in a remarkable way from the early Church. With good reason, I say, I hold to that which the apostles first received. For Jesus Christ, in Revelation 2, says to those in Thyatira that they should beware of the profound trickeries of Satan, to beware of false doctrine.¹⁶ He says, "I will put on you no other burden, only that which you have already, hold fast to this until I come."¹⁷ He would not have spoken thus if it would have been necessary to receive all the novelties which the Roman church has fabricated and daily put forth as a divine commission. Indeed, I honor greatly the learned and holy persons who have preceded us, but especially the apostles and prophets, and their testimony is certain and indubitable.

Moreover, speaking about the sacrifice of the Mass, which you claim that the fathers say to have been in use at the time of the apostles, I have read the fathers who were nearest the time of the apostles, but I do not have any memory of reading what you mentioned. I beg you, sir, name me just one who has said what you say and you will give me something to think about. I know full well that Irenaeus, the bishop of Lyons, who is the earliest after the apostles, in book 4, chapter 34,¹⁸ says that "we offer to God the things which are his, proclaiming continually the communication and unity of the flesh and the spirit. For when the calling of God proceeds from the earthly bread, it is then no longer regular bread, but the Eucharist consisting of two things: earthly and heavenly. Thus our bodies which receive the Eucharist are then no longer corruptible, having the hope of the resurrection. We offer to him not as one who is poor, but giving thanks for his rule, and sanctifying the creature." That is what Irenaeus says. He calls the bread of the Supper, "the Eucharist," which is to say an act of thanksgiving. This is not to say that it is an act of thanksgiving in itself, but the instrument by which we give thanks. Thus it is a sacrament for giving thanks to God for these blessings, as Christ has done, giving us the example

and the command to do it. The fathers called it "the Eucharist" figuratively. This sacrament was instituted not to offer and sacrifice the body and blood of Jesus Christ to God the Father for the forgiveness of sins; rather, this holy sacrament was ordained for giving thanks to God for the sacrifice which was already made on the cross once for all.

So Irenaeus explicitly says that we offer to God in this sacrament, not as presenting something of our own to him (thus strengthening the argument), but to give thanks to him for his gifts. By that he clearly shows that he did not intend that this sacrament should be a sacrifice in which we offer the body and the blood of the Lord for the forgiveness of our sins. Thus it is only a sacrifice of praise, which is made for having received the blessings of God. And the name "Eucharist," which means "thanksgiving" is given to the bread and shows well which sacrifice has been made. So the Supper was not ordained for the offering of the body and the blood of Jesus Christ to God the Father, but for the purpose that the body and the blood of the Son of God should be offered for us to be food and drink for our souls. Then it is well said that we offer the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving. For one does not present himself at this holy table to give something to God who lacks nothing. Rather, we who are poor and needy come to take and receive that which God presents and offers to us. Then he receives as agreeable the sacrifice of praise which we offer to him. There you have a good summary of what that holy person Irenaeus said.

But what does that do for the Mass? Absolutely nothing—for it is all to the contrary. Therefore, sir, if you can point out any of the fathers living near the time of the apostles who said that the apostles sacrificed the body of Christ, or that we sacrifice the body of the Lord for the forgiveness of sins in the Supper, if you can point them out you would do me a great favour. For I have carefully read Irenaeus, Justin, Tertullian and Origen—they are the earliest fathers.¹⁹ But I have never

16. Revelation 2:18–29.

17. Revelation 2:24–25. Though occasionally he used the French translation produced by Pierre Robert Olivetan (and more rarely that of Jacques Lefèvre d'Étaples), most of the time de Brès provided his own translation from Hebrew or Greek. In this instance his translation is close to that of d'Étaples.

18. Irenaeus (d. 202) was the bishop of Lyons and an early church father. The reference is to *Against Heresies*; see Ante-Nicene Fathers (ANF), Vol. 1, 486. De Brès identifies this quote as coming from book 4, chapter 34. The book/chapter reference in ANF is 4.18.5–6. While it is possible that de Brès was mistaken, the difference is likely to be attributed to different editions and their different systems of dividing Irenaeus' work. ANF follows the system in place since at least the early nineteenth century. Thanks to Chris Coldwell for help in tracking the source of this quote.

19. De Brès apparently had great facility with the church fathers. This is evident in his other works, especially in his *Le baston de la foy chretienne*. That work consists mostly of quotations from Scripture

read anything about what you are saying. Then you say that I follow Oecolampadius or Karlstadt, who lived about 40 years ago.²⁰ I know well that one should not think that a great servant of God is being innovative when he seeks to conform all the practice of the Church to what the apostles taught in the early church and wants to avoid all the novelties that people have invented. I say that such a man should not be regarded as any more of an innovator than the prophets, the kings (like Josiah and Hezekiah), and others who abandoned idolatries and again put forth the ancient teachings. When you say that one ought rather to believe the fathers than us others who have come so many hundreds of years after them, I honestly confess that one ought rather to believe in them than in you others. Properly speaking, our debate is in this, that I say that I hold to the ancient mode of teaching which was received in the early church; while you say to the contrary, namely that I should believe the doctors who have come so many hundreds of years after the apostles. These doctors have taught an all-new doctrine which was unknown to the apostles. In that new doctrine we find, for instance, transubstantiation. This was decreed at the Lateran Council by Pope Innocent III. About 300 years ago, he added this to the Apostles' Creed as the thirteenth article of faith.²¹ And there were other such novelties.

and the church fathers in order to refute key Roman Catholic errors. Likely de Brès received his training in patristics either in Lausanne (with Pierre Viret) or in Geneva (with John Calvin and the Genevan academy). De Brès spent some time in both places receiving theological training.

20. De Brès may have read the works of Oecolampadius or Karlstadt. His library contained at least one book of Oecolampadius, but we do not know for sure whether he had any works by Karlstadt. See the report of the government commissioners who discovered the library of de Brès in Tournai in Gootjes, *The Belgic Confession: Its History and Sources*, 197.

21. Transubstantiation became official Catholic doctrine at the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215. The first canon of this Council made this doctrine an article of faith: "The body and blood of Jesus Christ in the sacrament of the altar are truly contained under the species of bread and wine, the bread being, by the divine omnipotence, transubstantiated into his body, and the wine into his blood."

22. John Chrysostom (347–407) was the archbishop of Constantinople and one of the pre-eminent early fathers.

23. The reference is to Hebrews 13:10, "We have an altar from which those who serve the tent have no right to eat." The Greek word referred to by the bishop is θυσιαστηριον.

24. *Sacerdos* = priest (Latin).

25. Justin Martyr (103–165) was an apologist of the early church. Born in Palestine and travelling widely, he eventually settled in Rome.

26. Ante-Nicene Fathers (ANF), Vol.1, 215.

27. De Brès seems to invent a French word here, "*Nous eucharistisons...*" The Latin edition of Justin Martyr has "gratias agamus Deo," which is a more idiomatic way of translating the original Greek, εὐχαριστοῦμεν. De Brès' choice here strongly suggests that he originally read Martyr in Greek, rather than in Latin.

28. Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers (NPNF), Series 1, Vol. 4, 261. At

You say that as a minister of God you offer Jesus Christ in the Mass, and by application of merit. I shall respond to that shortly at the appropriate moment. Right now I want to speak to the last point of your lecture where you ask if we offer Jesus Christ in our Supper. We certainly do not offer him, but God offers him to us for our spiritual nourishment. Sir, I beg you once more, if you have any evidence that the apostles have called the Supper a sacrifice or that they have said, "We offer Christ to God his Father" or that any of the ancient doctors have spoken thus—if you have the evidence, put it before me.

The Bishop: I have not had the leisure of browsing through the books of the fathers; nevertheless it can be found that they call the Supper a "sacrifice," and among others there is Chrysostom.²² When it comes to the apostles, I have not found that they called it a "sacrifice." They were afraid of scandalizing the Christians and they thought that it might mix the sacrifices of the Law with the Gospel. There you have the reason why, it seems to me, that they had difficulty in calling it by that name. However, St. Paul in Hebrews 13 calls the table of the Supper the Greek name *Tisiasirion* which means "altar."²³ And certainly it seems to me that it was in vain that the fathers called the ministers of the church *Sacerdotes*,²⁴ i.e. those who offer sacrifices, if they did not do that thing in the church.

Guy: Sir, I very well know that some of the fathers have called the Supper by the name of "sacrifice." However, it is in the meaning I mentioned before, because one offers it as an act of thanksgiving and also because in receiving the bread and the wine (which are the sacrament of the body and blood of the Lord), it is done in memory and recollection of the sacrifice which was once made on the cross. Among the fathers, I can produce several. One of them is Justin Martyr and he is one of the earliest.²⁵ The offering, says he, is given as one that is offered by a person who has been cleansed from leprosy.²⁶ This is speaking figuratively about the bread of the Eucharist, which our Lord Jesus Christ commanded to be done in remembrance and commemoration of his passion. He suffered that to cleanse men and their souls from all vices, so that we together eucharistize,²⁷ which is to say we give thanks to God because he created the world with all things in it for mankind, and because he delivered us from our vices and sins in which we were, and by a perfect destruction he has destroyed the principalities and powers to which we were liable, according to his counsel. Here we have this very ancient person who says that the offering of the cleansed leper should be a figure of the bread of the Supper which the Lord commanded to be received and taken in remembrance and commemoration of the sacrifice which he has offered for us to be cleansed from our sins, and therefore he says, "We eucharistize," which is to say, we give thanks to God. He does not say, "We offer Jesus Christ to the Father for our sins." St. Augustine, writing in *Against Faustus* (book 20, chapter 18),²⁸

says, "The Hebrews sacrificing brute beasts practiced this in prophecy. Jesus Christ offered the sacrifice that fulfilled this, and now Christians in the offering and communion of the body of Jesus Christ celebrate the memory of the already complete sacrifice." He does not say that they really offer Jesus Christ to God for sins, but only that in the communion commemoration is made of the already complete sacrifice.

Then afterwards the same Augustine says in *Against Faustus* (book 20, chapter 21), "The flesh and the blood of this sacrifice were promised before it happened through the animals slain in the similitude.²⁹ In the passion of Christ, they were given through the truth of the same. After the ascension of Christ, they are celebrated through the sacrament of remembrance."³⁰ When he says that it is celebrated through the sacrament of remembrance, he shows clearly that the true flesh and the true blood of the Lord was spread out indeed on the cross, but in the Supper, it is done through memory and not physically. This opinion seems to be very clear to me.

With regards to Chrysostom, the opinion that you wish to adduce as evidence is written in homily 17 on the letter to the Hebrews. There he says, "Do we not make offerings each day? And certainly we do offer, but we make it in commemoration of his death. And this sacrifice is one, and not many. And because this sacrifice has been offered only once; it was offered in the most holy place. This sacrifice is an example and a figure of that."³¹ And a little afterwards he says, "Our great high priest is he who has offered for us the cleansing sacrifice, and this is offered by us, which was then offered, and which cannot be exhausted. This we do then in remembrance of what was then done, for he says, 'Do this in remembrance of me.' We do not make another sacrifice as the high priest [has done], but we offer always the same, or to say it better, we make a commemoration of the sacrifice which has been made."³²

Theophylact³³ writing on the tenth chapter of Hebrews says as much, "We have one offering and not many, this is the same as what was offered the one time. We always offer the same one, or rather we commemorate his offering, as if he were offered now at the present time. By this it appears that our sacrifice is one, and that under the Law there were many offerings, that the people might profit often from them. But ours is unique and offered one time."³⁴

St. Cyprian³⁵ also works in our favour in book 2, epistle 3 to Caecilius, saying that it is the passion of Jesus Christ which we offer.³⁶ I ask you: who is the man so ignorant that he does not well know that the suffering of the Lord is not present there within the hands of the minister? It was a long time ago that he endured it, but it is the memory and record of it which takes place. Then thanksgiving is offered for the great gift.

Prosper³⁷ in his *Sententia* says, "The heavenly bread which is the flesh of Christ, according to its manner and mode is called the body of Christ. Indeed, it is in truth the Sacrament

of the body of Christ. And that which is performed by the hands of the priest is called the immolation [offering] of the flesh and suffering, the death and crucifixion of Christ, not actually, but signified by mysteries."³⁸

All of the sentences of the doctors of the early church are very clear, and have no need for explanation. In our Supper, we do as they did. We receive the sacrament of the body and

first glance, it appears de Brès is mistaken when he quotes Augustine as saying "... celebrate the memory of the already completed sacrifice." The italicized words do not appear in the translation of NPNE ("This sacrifice is also commemorated by Christians, in the sacred offering and participation of the body and blood of Christ.") However, the original Latin reads, "Unde iam Christiani, peracti eiusdem sacrificii memoriam celebrant, sacrosancta oblatione et participatione corporis et sanguinis Christi." Cf. Migne, *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina*, Vol. 42, Cols. 382–283. In 4.18.10 of the 1559 *Institutes*, John Calvin quotes this exact passage of Augustine to make the same point. The French edition reads almost exactly the same as de Brès' rendition, suggesting that de Brès may have picked this up from Calvin (cf. Jean Calvin, *Institution de la Religion Chrestienne*, Vol. 2 (Paris: Librairie de Ch. Meyrueis et Compagnie, 1859), 556). Calvin's Latin edition reads almost exactly the same as the Latin text of Augustine in Migne, "... Christiani iam peracti sacrificii memoriam celebrant sacrosancta oblatione et participatione corporis Christi." (cf. *Corpus Reformatorum*, Vol. 30, col. 1058). All of this is to say that de Brès and Calvin were better Latinists than the translator of Augustine's *Contra Faustum* in NPNE.

29. De Brès: "par les victims des similitudes."

30. NPNE, Series 1, Vol. 4, 262.

31. NPNE, Series 1, Vol. 14, 449.

32. NPNE, Series 1, Vol. 14, 449.

33. Theophylact was the archbishop of Ochrid, metropolitan of Bulgaria. Born and educated at Constantinople, he died circa 1112.

34. Migne, *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Graeca*, Vol. 125, cols. 317–320.

35. Cyprian (d. 258) was a bishop of Carthage in northern Africa. One of the most important of the early fathers, he died as a martyr for the faith.

36. ANF, Vol. 5, 363. De Brès' reference to "book 2, epistle 3" is to a contemporary edition of Cyprian's writings.

37. Prosper of Aquitaine (390–455) was a disciple of Augustine.

38. I have thus far been unable to identify the exact location of this quote in Prosper's *Sententia*; cf. Migne, *Patrologiae Cursus Completus, Series Latina*, Vol. 51, cols. 427–496. However, these words are attributed to Augustine (via Prosper) in Gratian's *Decretum*. Gratian quotes Prosper: "Sicut ergo coelestis panis, qui vere Christi caro est, suo modo vocatur corpus Christi, quum revera sit sacramentum corporis Christi, illius videlicet, quod visibile, palpabile, mortale in cruce est suspensum, vocaturque ipsa immolatio carnis, quae sacerdotis manibus fit, Christi passio, mors, crucifixio, non rei veritate, sed significante mysterio: sic sacramentum fidei, quod baptismus intelligitur, fides est." See *Corpus Juris Canonici* (Vol. 1): *Decretum Gratiani*, ed. Emile Ludwig Richter (Leipzig: Bernhard Tauchnitz, 1839), cols. 1163–1164 (Part 3, distinction 2, section 48). Cf. Supplement to Gibson's *Preservative from Popery: Being Important Treatises on the Romish Controversy* (Vol. 3): *Birckbek's Protestant's Evidence* (London: British Society for Promoting the Religious Principles of the Reformation, 1849), 126. It is likely that de Brès took this quote from Prosper via Gratian. Thanks to Chris Coldwell for help in tracking this down.

blood in memory and commemoration of the sacrifice which was once made on the cross. By this means not only are the body and blood of the Lord applied to us, but also the merits of his death and suffering. Consider then whether we do not do as Christ commanded, saying of his Supper, "Do this in remembrance of me," and not, "Sacrifice this for your sins," and whether we do not entirely follow the early church step for step. Look, the fathers called the Supper "Sacrifice," but that is very different from that which the Roman church does today, saying, "We offer the very body and blood of Christ in actual flesh and blood for the remission of sins." Then afterwards, you give as an excuse that the apostles did not call the Supper, "Sacrifice," for fear of offending the faithful, and because they thought that they would mix the sacrifices of the Law with the Gospel. I do not see any reason in that. See how St. Paul had no difficulty in calling baptism by the name of circumcision, because it had come in its place.³⁹ He did it to hold the Colossians in the faith, rather than from fear of offending anyone. The false apostles told the people that they could not be saved if they were not circumcised. St. Paul told them the opposite, that they were circumcised with a circumcision made without hands, which is the circumcision of Christ and not of Moses, and that the foreskin of the flesh is not cut, since the body of sin is cast off there. The name of circumcision given to baptism was of great service to the Colossians. How much more would the name sacrifice have served if given to the Lord's Supper if an actual sacrifice of the body of Christ had been made according to his commandment? This name of sacrifice was used by the Jews and among the Gentiles, for their divine worship consisted in sacrifices, and the name was definitely pleasant and agreeable. That is why it is not true that the apostles had difficulty in calling the Supper a sacrifice for fear of offending anyone with the name. But they recognized that the Supper was not a sacrifice, for their Master had said to them, "Take, eat," and not, "Take and sacrifice." They did not wish to give it that name, for it is not credible that the apostles would ever have sacrificed Jesus Christ. They were not sacrificers and they had no command or example for doing this. And if they had done it, they would not have forgotten to put it in writing in a great work so profitable and necessary for salvation, which we would still be speaking about today.

I freely admit that the apostle in Hebrews 13 says, "We have an altar whereof they have no right to eat who serve the tabernacle." However, I see no reason for understanding this "altar" for "the table of the Supper." Moreover, that same passage contradicts your conjecture that the apostles did not dare to call the Supper "sacrifice" for fear of offending someone. Was there any more danger in calling it sacrifice than calling the table on which it was celebrated "altar"? Certainly

39. Colossians 2:11–12.

40. Imprecisely = *improprement*.

this is self-contradictory! But it seems to me that the Apostle in that passage was not speaking of the Supper. For by "altar," he means all the worship which we do for Christ, in which worship those who were detained under the ceremonies of the Law had no part. That this should be the true sense is shown by what follows after. For he used the name "altar" as a metaphor, he shows of what worship he intends to speak: at the end he shows that he does not intend to speak of a fleshly worship. He says, "We offer then the sacrifice of praise continually to God," which is to say, the fruit of their confession of his name. After this he mentions alms as sacrifices; so look, by "altar" he does not mean that one offers and sacrifices Jesus Christ on it. As the sacrifice of praise is a spiritual thing, so also should the altar be.

And when some of the fathers called the ministers of the Church *Sacerdotes*, which is to say "sacrificers," I believe that they did it for the same reason that they called the Supper "sacrifice" and the table "altar," that is, imprecisely.⁴⁰

The Bishop: But the statement of Chrysostom should be well noted; for he would not have said, "We offer daily," if there would not have been such a real sacrifice that the Church made daily.

Guy: I confess that Chrysostom spoke thus in his statement; but consider, I ask you, how he corrects it then later. He says that the "sacrifice" that is made is the example and type of the one that Jesus Christ had made one time. Then he says that we offer the same which was once made for us. This is that which we do, he says, in remembrance of that which already has been done; for he says, "Do this in remembrance of me." We do not make another sacrifice like the one of the sacrificer; we always make the same one. Then afterwards he adds an explanation of his hyperbole, which is to say his manner of speaking excessively: "to say it better, we do it in remembrance of the sacrifice which has been made." And in truth, in our Supper we offer a similar sort of sacrifice, we do it in memory and commemoration of the sacrifice of Jesus Christ which was made on the cross for us, just as he commanded us, "Do this in remembrance of me," which is to say, in eating and drinking we do it in his memory.

That does not take place in the mass, for inasmuch as it is said that it is not a type, but the true Lord Jesus Christ, how could one offer Jesus Christ in memory and record of Jesus Christ and his death? The commemoration of a thing is something else other than the thing which is being commemorated.

If according to Chrysostom you offer the same sacrifice in the Mass, your sacrifice would be bloody, which would be entirely contrary to the distinction which you make between the *sacrificium cruentum et incruentum*, which is to say, the bloody and the unbloody sacrifice. You say that the sacrifice which was made on the cross was bloody, but that which you make in the Mass is unbloody, and you listen when

Chrysoſtom ſays that they offer the ſame ſacrifice which has been made one time, which was a bloody one. And then to ſhow clearly his meaning he ſays, “Or to ſay it better, we do it in remembrance and commemoration in the communion.”

And Proſper in his *Sententia* ſays that what the prieſt does is called offering of the fleſh, the ſuffering, the death and crucifixion of Chriſt, not actually, but ſignified by myſtery; it follows that the office of the prieſt is the ſame.⁴¹ And from this I ſay that the Church has its ſacrifice to make, namely the Sacrament of the body and blood of the Lord in the reception of which one commemorates the ſacrifice which he made one time.

In connection with this, ſir, you know that the fathers uſed the word “offer” for “preſent”, like St. Cyprian, in his ſermon *De Lapsis*, ſays that the deacon ſhould offer the chalice to the people who would be preſent.⁴²

And St. Auguſtine in the Epiſtle to Januarius (epiſtle 118) ſays that, ſhould anyone wiſh, for a certain apparent reaſon, on a fixed day of the year (the day the Lord inſtituted the ſupper), it was permiſſible that the body and blood of the Lord ſhould be offered and received after ſupper for a more notable commemoration.⁴³ “To offer” here means to preſent and give to the people.

And *The City of God* book 10 witnesses that all the works by which we are united and associated with God are called ſacrifice in the churches.⁴⁴ Look at how the fathers often uſed the word “to offer” for “to preſent” to the people, and not to offer to God. By the ſame token, I do not think that you take the word “ſacrifice” in your Maſs in its proper meaning.

The Biſhop: I confeſs that the fathers have called “ſacrifice” all the operations by which we are united to God, but that does not prevent the church from having a real ſacrifice of the body of the Lord. It is not that the word “ſacrifice” ſhould be taken in its literal meaning, for it means “to kill.”⁴⁵ Now we do not kill Jeſus Chriſt in the Maſs, and this is the reaſon why the fathers have called our ſacrifice, “the ſacrifice without blood.”

Guy: It is very certain that the fathers have ſpoken of a ſacrifice without blood, but one ſhould know their meaning. They ſpoke thus wiſhing to ſhow the nature of ſacraments, and had no trouble in ſaying that a ſacrifice without blood ſhould be offered in ſacrifice here to diſtinguiſh the ſign from the truth. How can one make this agree with what the Roman church ſays, namely that in its offering the true natural blood and body are contained? I know full well that you will reſpond that the ſacrifice is ſaid to be without blood becauſe Jeſus Chriſt is not put to death, and that his blood is not ſhed there. However, you kill that which you ſacrifice, and a ſacrifice is not made without blood. For you ſay that in the ſacrifice the blood is contained corporeally, with the body, therefore it is not an offering without blood. And beſides you ſay that you do not uſe the word ſacrifice in its proper

meaning in the Maſs, for you ſay, to ſacrifice is to kill. Now the giſt of the argument is thus: the word “ſacrifice” means “to kill.” in the Maſs you ſacrifice Jeſus Chriſt to God his Father, therefore it follows that you kill him in the Maſs. Now you reſpond that you do not kill him. And about that I ſay with you that to ſacrifice is to kill. You do not kill Jeſus Chriſt in the Maſs, therefore you do not make a ſacrifice.

The Biſhop: It is a marvel how you find evil ſuch a holy work ſo praiſeworthy and profitable to the church. When I celebrate the Maſs, I pray to God that it will pleaſe him to receive the body and blood of his Son which I offer there at the altar, and that he will receive him for all our ſins. We would be doing wrong if we did not do this in preſenting the well-beloved Son to the Father. Why do you find this evil?

Guy: I would always find it very holy and good to do what you do, if God had commanded us to do it, but to do things according to our whim, when it is a queſtion of the worſhip of God, this is not holy, but a profanation of the holy ſacraments, as it was well-ſaid to Saul (1 Samuel 15). He wiſhed to make a ſacrifice that God had not commanded him. Samuel ſaid to him, “Does the Lord take pleaſure in burnt offerings and ſacrifices as much as obedience to his voice? Look, obedience is better than ſacrifice, and to liſten is better than the fat of rams. For rebellion is as the ſin of diviners, and tranſgreſſion is iniquity and idolatry.”⁴⁶ All of that is to ſay that to follow one’s own ſenſe and opinion againſt the Word of God is no leſs ſin than the ſin of idolaters and diviners.

Now in the Supper, look, it is Chriſt who commands, ſaying, “Take, eat...” And ſome find it better to do otherwiſe, namely to take and ſacrifice without any ordinance of God. What was ſaid to Saul has a place here, againſt all thoſe who do otherwiſe than what Chriſt has done and commanded. You ſay that in the Maſs you pray to God that he will receive Jeſus Chriſt, whom you offer to him for the ſins of men. We could ſoon agree if you could ſhow me that you have a charge and commandment to do this. Up to the preſent you have preſuppoſed always to be true that what the prieſt offers in the

41. As with the previous quotation from Proſper, I have been unable to identify the exact location of this reference. However, ſee note 38.

42. ANF, Vol. 5, 444.

43. NPNF, Series 1, Vol. 1, 303. “There are, indeed, ſome to whom it has ſeemed right (and their view is not unreaſonable), that it is lawful for the body and blood of the Lord to be offered and received after other food has been partaken of, on one fixed day of the year, the day on which the Lord inſtituted the Supper, in order to give ſpecial ſolemnity to the ſervice on that anniversary.”

44. NPNF, Series 1, Vol. 2, 183.

45. Strictly ſpeaking this is not true. The word comes from Latin and combines *sacer* (that which is conſecrated) + *fico/facere* (to make). The act of ſacrificing *may* imply killing, but it is not neceſſarily ſo. Nevertheless, ſee how de Brès, in his reſponſe, ſhows the irrationality of this argument.

46. 1 Samuel 15:22–23.

mass is the real and natural body of Christ. Whereas I hold that the bread and wine of the Supper remain. It follows then, that when you offer and sacrifice, that you are sacrificers. Then I would really like to know: whose order do you belong to? For in Scripture, both in the Old and the New Testament, I can find only two sorts of sacrificers: namely, of the order of Melchizedek, and of the order of Levi. Tell me, I beg you, if you are one of these two sorts, or of another, a third order of which mention is not made in Scripture.

Inasmuch as you say that the mass is the Supper of the Lord Jesus Christ, I really want to know why the priest does other than what Christ has done and commanded to be done. Christ was seated at the table with his disciples. He preached and admonished from the Word of God. He was not at all disguised in a get-up like a priest. He did not speak in an unknown language. He took the bread and after having given thanks to God, he broke it and distributed it to his disciples. And likewise the cup, saying, "Drink from it all of you." He did not have an altar, but a table. He did not sacrifice, but ate and commanded to eat. I beg you to give me a response to these three points.

The Bishop: You put forward three questions to which I will give you a response.

First, whether you should hold that the bread and the wine remain. However, I do not believe that you are of the opinion that these are naked signs, since they have with them that which they signify. And therefore one should not stop offering the body and blood of Jesus Christ, inasmuch as the sign is not separated from the reality. Let us leave transubstantiation there without going into it further.

Second, you question regarding the order of sacrificers to which we belong. I tell you that it is not according to the order of Melchizedek, nor according to the order of Levi, which has been abolished. For Jesus Christ alone entered the order of Melchizedek, and before him and after him no one else has entered it. He is the only sacrificer according to the order of Melchizedek, as God swears to him in Psalm 110.⁴⁷ And regarding this man, St. Paul says in Hebrews 7 that he is without

father, without mother, and without genealogy, without beginning of days or end of life.⁴⁸ This order of sacrificers did not come at all by succession, nor through inheritance like that of Levi. He is alone in this order of sacrificers—even though Hosius says that he has entered from Levi in like manner.⁴⁹ But Scripture is certainly not agreeable with him, and with due respect, this opinion is to be rejected. But moreover we are ministers of holy things...⁵⁰

And I beg you, give me your ear and attend to what I wish to say. Really, do you not know that St. Paul calls Jesus Christ in Greek *Archiereus*, which is to say, prince of priests and sovereign sacrificer?⁵¹ Now it would not be possible for him to be the sovereign sacrificer if there were not others under him who are less and inferior to him. For the words "head," "principal" and "sovereign" presuppose that there are others under him. I ask you: who are these sacrificers who are under Christ, and of whom Christ is the sovereign? It can certainly be well-said that these are the ministers of the church.

When it comes to the third point of your proposition, I say that the mass is such a wonderfully praiseworthy thing, that every time that it is said, that communion is held, I eagerly desire it. And if anyone should ask for it, it should not be refused him. If there should be a priest who has the devotion to celebrate it, should he be prevented from this blessing because there are no other communicants? That would not at all be reasonable. And certainly you are greatly to be condemned for cruelty and inhumanity. Pardon me that I speak thus about your refusing the sacrament for the poor sick, which is a thing totally repugnant to brotherly charity and to the manner of the early church, who allowed it to be taken to the sick. There you have what I wish to say.

Guy: Sir, will you give me permission to speak and will you give me your ear?

The Bishop: Yes, that is reasonable. Speak, I will listen to you.

Guy: First, you say again that I believe that the bread remains bread and the wine remains wine and that nevertheless I do not hold them to be naked symbols, but that they have their reality conjoined with them. Then one who has the sacrament in his hand to make the sacrifice has Jesus Christ who is the reality. I confess that the signs of the sacrament are not merely naked, but that God shows and gives us the truth in them, by representing it through what it signifies to us. However, I am not of the number of transubstantiators, nor am I of the number of consubstantiators, for I believe that the body and blood of Christ remain the true body and true blood in all their properties. So also the bread and the wine remain. The body is not enclosed, attached, or hidden under the bread or within the bread. It is not there to be raised, lifted, or lowered in order to enter in us through the mouth. But the body of Christ, without leaving heaven where it is, communes

47. Psalm 110:4.

48. Hebrews 7:3.

49. Hosius of Cordoba (c. 257–359), also known as Osius or Ossius, was a bishop of Cordoba and a champion of orthodoxy in his day. I was unable to trace the source of this reference.

50. The critical notes in *Bibliotheca Reformatoria Neerlandica* suggest that something may have fallen out of the text at this point. Perhaps whoever was recording this debate missed the rest of Richardot's thought here.

51. The word ἀρχιερεὺς (high priest) is used a number of times in Hebrews to describe the Lord Jesus. See Hebrews 2:17, 3:1, 4:14, 5:10, 6:20, 7:26, 8:1, and 9:11. The word is not actually used in the writings unanimously attributed to Paul, but Richardot (like de Brès) believed that Paul wrote Hebrews.

with us to be the spiritual nourishment for our souls, as the bread nourishes our bodies. And even if the body should be in the bread, it does not follow that it would be there to be sacrificed, for there is no example or command to do this.

When it comes to the second point that I raised, that is, according to which order you are sacrificers, you answered that it is not according to the order of Melchizedek, because Jesus Christ alone entered that order. Further, it is not according to the order of Levi, because with the coming of Jesus Christ, that was abolished. Instead, you are ministers of God and of holy things. And then you say that Jesus Christ is called sovereign or our great sacrificer, and from that you infer that there ought to be sacrificers who are lesser, otherwise Christ would not be sovereign or high priest. But I respond that it does not follow that there should be lesser sacrificers. For example, we say that God is our sovereign God. Does it follow that we have small gods and those who are lesser than him? Of course not. Moreover, we should note to whom the apostle wrote the Epistle to the Hebrews. It is certain that he wrote to the Jews, who had a sovereign sacrificer, and other lesser sacrificers, who made their sacrifices. And the apostle, wishing them to put away their sovereign sacrificer and their sacrifices, shows them that Jesus Christ is their sovereign sacrificer, and that they should have no difficulty leaving the type with the result that they take hold of the reality. So the apostle speaks of a sovereign sacrificer with regard to the Jews who had one, just like he speaks also of their sacrifices. But one should not conclude that we others who are Gentiles and who have none of the things that the Jews had, should now have lesser sacrificers. That was properly in reference to the Jews to whom he wrote.

But in this it seems to me that there is a large contradiction in your words. For you said that in the order of Melchizedek, into which Jesus Christ has entered, he entered it alone, and there is no one else in this order. Nor is there anyone in the order of Levi, which you say was abolished. Therefore in the order of Melchizedek, in which Christ alone has entered, there could not be found a sovereign sacrificer, according to what you say, because he is the only one and that a great and sovereign sacrificer presupposes that there should be lesser ones under him. The sovereign sacrificer in the Law was of the Levitical order, and Christ is not of that order, nor are the priests. Also, I would like to know how Christ is according to the order of Melchizedek, and you others are not at all. Yet you are sacrificers under him. That certainly cannot be reconciled. Likewise, the offering that Jesus Christ made himself, was made in the sacrificial office according to the order of Melchizedek. In order to offer in the Mass the offering that Jesus Christ offered in this order, it is necessary that you should be sacrificers according to the order of Melchizedek, which you deny to be—for this offerer does not have a part in

this order. It is true that you say that you are ministers of God and of holy things. St. Paul in 1 Cor. 4 speaks in sort of the same way, saying, "Let men esteem us as ministers of Christ and dispensers of the secret things of God."⁵² But before this can serve your argument, you must prove that a minister of Christ can be called a sacrificer. That one can never prove. For St. Paul does not say, "Let men esteem us as sacrificers of Christ and dispensers of the secret things of God." Nothing of the sort. So that will not help you. And you do not find the word *sacerdos*, which is to say, sacrificer, in the entire New Testament. Thus I desire to know, with good reasons provided, according to what order you are sacrificers, so that I may be confident regarding your calling. You say that you are not according to the order of Melchizedek, nor according to the order of Levi. And the entire Bible does not speak of anything besides these two orders in the Old and in the New Testament. It follows then that your order has not been ordained at all by God, and the divine Scriptures have no witness for it at all. Rather, this is a third order invented by men outside of Holy Scripture. So what confidence do you have then regarding your calling?

If you are a New Testament minister of God, you know that this office is not for sacrificing, but for administering the Word of God and the holy Sacraments in purity without adding anything or taking anything away, and for making prayers and intercessions. And there you have the charge of a minister according to the Holy Scriptures. In doing thus, one applies the merits of Christ to the people who will receive the Sacraments, when they receive them in faith.

When we come to the third point, which is that the priest does something altogether different in the Mass than what Christ did in the Supper, you say that it is a praiseworthy thing that the communion take places when the Mass is said, and that the people receive the sacrament with the priest. It is not a question of whether it would be praiseworthy or not, nor whether you distribute it rightly. But the question is if it is permissible to do it that way. For it is certain that when Christ said in instituting his Supper, "Do this," that he did not do as the priest does, but a thing entirely opposite, as I have already said. Christ, in the table of the Supper, offers and presents his body and his blood to his disciples for their spiritual nourishment. The priest at his altar offers and presents to God the body and the blood of Christ, as he says, for the forgiveness of sins. This is entirely repugnant to the intention of the Master. And certainly when the priest eats alone in his Mass, this is not only an indecent thing, but also a total deviation from the nature of this holy Sacrament. St. Paul calls it "communion" in 1 Cor. 10.⁵³ Now there can be no communion where there

52. 1 Corinthians 4:1.

53. 1 Corinthians 10:16.

is only one who communes. Jesus Christ proclaimed loud and clear, "Take, eat, all of you."⁵⁴ He did not say, "Take and eat for all the others."⁵⁵ The fathers called the Supper "*synaxis*" in Greek, which is to say a communion of several.⁵⁶ And St. Paul writing to the Corinthians rebukes them for not waiting at all for each other, for each one eats the Supper by himself.⁵⁷ And the same apostle says, "This is not the Supper of the Lord."⁵⁸ He reminds them of the institution of the Master, saying, "As for me, I have received from the Lord that which I have also given to you."⁵⁹ And the Greeks still today have the Mass only on Sundays and feasts, and then all the people commune in the sacrament taking the two elements with the minister. Today all that is overturned. The people receive the sacrament by proxy, the priest eating and drinking at the altar for the people who are present. And just as the priest cannot receive the sacrament of baptism for another, so also he cannot receive the Supper for another. I cannot live if another person eats for me, so also I cannot receive any profit if another receives the sacrament for me. And I ask you, how far is it beyond sense and reason to see twenty or thirty priests in a church, and each taking the Supper (if you can call it that) by himself, and each in his chapel eating all alone? What would St. Paul say if he should see that, he who so strongly rebuked the Corinthians for eating by themselves?

And the corruption has come so far that in the parish mass in which the people commune through the priest, there is not much difference from the private masses which began during the time of Gregory. And you have nicely said that the priest must not be prevented from communing in the Mass all by himself, even though the people would not approach him to commune. For the intention of the Lord Jesus Christ condemns all that, just as the very good St. Cyprian, the very old doctor and martyr of Christ taught in the third Epistle, book 2, to Caecilius. Says he:

In the sacrifice of Christ, it is necessary to follow Christ, for certainly we should hear and do that which Christ has done and commanded to be done. See what he says in his gospel: 'If

54. Matthew 26:26. Like the Greek original, de Brès here employs the second person plural in French.

55. "Take and eat" here is second person plural in the French.

56. The word *συνάξις* broadly refers to a gathering or assembly. Lampe notes that this word was indeed often used in patristic literature to particularly describe the Eucharist. See the entry for this word in *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*, ed. G. W. H. Lampe (Oxford: Oxford UP), 1961.

57. 1 Corinthians 11:21.

58. 1 Corinthians 11:20.

59. 1 Corinthians 11:23.

60. ANF, Vol. 5, 362. Again, it should be noted that de Brès' reference to book 2, epistle 3, is to a contemporary edition. ANF does not follow that system of reference.

61. 1 Corinthians 11:23.

62. Matthew 19:4.

you do what I command you, I shall not call you my servants anymore, but my friends.' And that Jesus Christ only should be heard, the Father in like manner has rendered witness from heaven, saying, 'This is my beloved Son in whom I take pleasure. Listen to him.' If Christ only should be heard, we certainly should not give regard to what some one who was before thought good to do. Rather, we should give the highest regard to the one who was before all, namely Christ. For one should not follow the custom of a man, but the truth of God. See what he says through his prophet Isaiah, 'They honour me in vain, teaching ordinances and doctrines of men.' And the Lord repeats the same in his gospel, saying, 'You reject the commandment of God to establish your ordinance and tradition.' But again he says in another place, 'Whoever breaks one of the least of these commandments and shall teach thus to men, he will be least in the kingdom of heaven.' It is not lawful to break the smallest of the commandments of God. How much less shall it be lawful to transgress those which are so great, so excellent, and so clearly related to the sacraments, likewise to the suffering of the Lord and our redemption, or to change them by human ordinance and tradition to something other than those things which were divinely instituted.⁶⁰

There you have what this good person says against those who corrupt the institution of this holy sacrament. And never should one excuse it. And in order to correct all these abuses one should do like St. Paul. When he wished to correct the Corinthians in the abuse of this sacrament, he said to them, "I have received from the Lord that which I also delivered to you."⁶¹ He reformed it according to the first institution of the sacrament. First Corinthians 11 echoes Christ when he wanted to correct the abuse of marriage with regards to the granting of divorces: "From the beginning it was certainly not so. Have you never read that the one who created man in the beginning created them male and female?"⁶² And also to reform the abuse of the mass, it is necessary to set forth the ordinance of the Supper, as Christ and his apostles have taught us.

As for you accusing us of inhumanity for not giving the sacrament to the sick, I confess that it has been done some times before. But whether it is lawful, based on what I have said, I cannot see a good reason. It is not a sacrament designed to be given to just one person, since it is a communion of many who should receive it together, and not just one. However, I would not be too strict if some believer being sick requested to receive this sacrament and if several others were prepared to receive it with the one making the request, and if it were the custom of the church, I would not, I say, condemn such a custom.

The Bishop: On our first point you say that you cannot hold to transubstantiation. And certainly I am good and ready to confess to you that if I wanted to believe my own judgment and reason, I would not believe it either. And it may seem that those who do not believe in it are approaching more closely

the truth, and they seem to agree better with Holy Scripture. But so what? Since the church has determined and settled the matter, one ought simply to believe it. And certainly I have worked hard all my life to take all my feelings captive and to believe and hold what the Roman church believes, to hold that which a thousand others have studied.

And on your second point, I willingly confess that the name *Sacerdos*, which is to say sacrificer or priest, is not in the entire New Testament. But it does not follow from that that we should not sacrifice the body and blood of Jesus Christ. You ask who commanded us to do this. But I ask you, will you not willingly agree with me, that our Lord Jesus Christ has ordained and commanded us to do the same as what he did in the institution of this holy sacrament, if I show you what he offered when he instituted it?

Guy: Certainly, sir, you would do me a singular good, and I would easily agree with you and be yours. I pray you, sir, show me.

The Bishop: I will show you. Listen. You know well that the early fathers had the custom of never partaking of a solemn feast, signifying a religious thing, without offering the first part to God. That can be shown from a host of passages from Scripture. I can mention to you the good man Job and the feast he had with his children. He did not have it without sacrificing for them. When Jacob departed and said farewell to his father-in-law Laban, that was not done without a sacrifice. When Moses and his father-in-law Jethro feasted, was this done without making a sacrifice? Take a look at the custom of the fathers at their banquets. I think that you would not deny that Melchizedek did the same when he came to meet Abraham and his people with bread and wine. I shall not debate the meaning of the Hebrew verb *Hosi*, which Scripture uses there, the verb which means to offer and to present.⁶³ It is not believable that Melchizedek in such a religious act would have forgotten his duty and the office of sacrificer. That, I say, cannot be denied without being clumsily opinionated. Likewise Scripture calls him sacrificer of the Most High God, to show that his office was not that of sutler,⁶⁴ baker, or butler, but that of sacrificer. And neither Abraham nor the others would have partaken of that which was brought to them unless first God had been served by the ministry of this great sacrificer, by means of oblation, benediction, and thanksgiving. I maintain that this holy sacrificer made his oblation by thanksgiving and by his benediction, recognizing this bread and this wine as gifts of God, and invoking his holy name upon them that they might be profitable to those who received them with praise and gratitude. Otherwise how could he have performed his priestly office in this presentation of bread and wine? And why should Abraham have given a tenth of all the spoils which they had brought back, if he had not recognized him to be a sovereign priest of God, and if he had not recognized that

which was performed for a sacerdotal work, in which Abraham prophetically recognized the sacrifice of Jesus Christ our true Melchizedek, and the offering of his body and his blood under the species of bread and wine? Melchizedek was to the patriarch Abraham as a pledge and surety of the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, who was himself called sacrificer according to the order of Melchizedek. Certainly we have too little sense of the sacerdotal dignity of our redeemer Jesus Christ, if we do not believe that in the institution of this holy sacred banquet, which he instituted for all his church, he has done the same which was done by this great priest Melchizedek. So we would have no argument with the Scriptures, to believe that Jesus Christ, as our great priest and sacrificer, has, before all things, in the institution of this Sacrament offered to God that which he was going to distribute to his disciples. Therefore it is more than reasonable that we hold with certainty that it is an excellent and respectable thing to guard the order and usage of the holy fathers, seeing that he has done the same in this sacrament which was done with the Passover lamb, which was immolated before it was eaten. Think also of the words used by the evangelists [gospel authors]: thanksgiving, blessings, and breaking of bread. Undoubtedly, these are intended to be understood as the sacrifice made to God of Christ's body and blood, a sacrifice through his death and suffering for the remission of sins. And moreover he says, "This is my body" which is delivered for you. He then began the holy sacerdotal action, and the oblation/offering of his body and his blood, which he accomplished in his death.

And coming back to the third point, you say that the priest eats all alone of the Sacrament, the people receive it by proxy. I deny this, for there is communion by faith.

Guy: Sir, I am joyful to hear what you said on our first point, that your feeling and judgment loathe transubstantiation and that those who do not believe it seem to more closely follow the Scripture—and this is true. But you say that one should believe it simply because the church has determined it. I know that there are several of your doctors who speak thus. And certainly I am greatly surprised to hear you speak in this way. You admit that transubstantiation cannot be proven by holy Scripture, nor by human reason, but nevertheless it is necessary to simply believe it, because the church has thus determined it. In Romans 10 St. Paul has taught me that faith comes by the hearing of the Word of God, and you say that one must believe simply because of the decree of the church.⁶⁵ From that it follows

63. Richardot is here referring to the word הוֹסִיָּא in Genesis 14:17, the hiphil perfect of הָסַח. The word is never used in the Old Testament to refer to the offering of sacrifices.

64. Sutler = a person who followed an army or maintained a store on an army post to sell provisions to soldiers.

65. Romans 10:17.

the faith comes from the decree and ordinance of the church. But I say that the church can determine nothing when it comes to the faith apart from the holy Scripture. Now this doctrine of transubstantiation is entirely new, ordained by Pope Innocent III at the Lateran Council about three hundred years ago.⁶⁶ And it added to the twelve articles of faith a thirteenth one, something certainly entirely repugnant to the holy Scripture and to the ancient doctors of the church. Look, here is what the Evangelists say with common consent: that as they were eating Jesus took bread, and after having given thanks, he broke it and gave it to his disciples and said, "Take, eat, this is my body." He made no mention of the bread being transubstantiated into the natural body of Christ. And of the cup the Scripture says that Christ called what the apostles drank the fruit of the vine, saying, "I will drink no more henceforth of this fruit of the vine." In Acts 2 it is said that the disciples persevered in the doctrine of the apostles, and the communion and breaking of bread, and in prayer.⁶⁷ We hear that the Scripture says that it is bread, that it is wine. In Acts 20, we read "On a Sabbath day we were assembled to break bread."⁶⁸ And Paul says in 1 Cor. 10, "The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? We who have eaten of one bread, we are one bread and one body in the Lord."⁶⁹ And 1 Cor. 11 calls it bread three times.⁷⁰ The Scripture speaks thus and we will not be deceived: it is bread and definitely nothing else. And

the ancient doctors say it in clear language: that it is bread and wine after the consecration.

Take Origen,⁷¹ who is closest to the time of the apostles. Here is what he says on chapter 15 of St. Matthew, expositing these words, "All that enters into the mouth goes into the stomach and is cast out...": "This food, which is sanctified by the word of God, and by prayer, because it is material, enters into the stomach and is cast out." And suddenly after he says, "It is not the material of the bread which profits, but the word which is pronounced over it." And to the end that one would hear these words to be speaking of another bread, which is that of the Supper, he says, "This should be said of the mystical and symbolic body."⁷² Origen was never noted for having a bad understanding of the Supper. Therefore he spoke according to what the Church of his time held. This sentence shows us very clearly that the substance and the matter of the bread remain in the Supper according to the doctrine of the ancient Church.

Tertullian is also very early and in his first book against Marcion he writes: "Christ has not at all disdained the bread by which he has presented his body."⁷³ And in his fourth book against that heretic, he says that he took the bread and distributed it to these disciples, doing it with his body and saying, "This is my body," which is to say, the sign of my body. Besides, something empty and vain (which is an illusion) cannot be received as a sign.⁷⁴

St. Cyprian, the martyr for Christ, in the third epistle to Caecilius, book two, says that the blood of the Lord is represented in the wine.⁷⁵ Elsewhere in the same work he says, "It was wine which the Lord said to be his blood."⁷⁶ I beg you, sir, note this well. From the same work again: "Water cannot represent the blood of Christ."⁷⁷ Likewise we see that the people are meant with the water, and that the blood of Christ is represented with the wine. It follows that the wine remains then, so that it can represent and stand for the blood.

And Bertramus⁷⁸ speaks similarly and in like fashion, saying in a book about the body and blood of the Lord, "If this wine which is sanctified by the office of the minister, is converted corporeally into the blood of Jesus Christ, it is necessary also that the water, which is added, in parallel manner be converted corporeally into the blood of the believing people. For where there is not a sanctification, it is not an operation, and where there is a parallel reason, there follows also a parallel mystery. Now we see that in the water there is nothing changed according to the body, consequently therefore there is manifestly nothing corporeal in the wine. This water which signifies the body of the people is to be understood spiritually: it is then necessary to understand spiritually that which is represented of the blood of Christ in the wine."

Continued on Page 299.

66. See note 21 above.

67. Acts 2:42–46.

68. Acts 20:7.

69. 1 Corinthians 10:16–17.

70. 1 Corinthians 11:23, 26, 27. There is a fourth mention in verse 28.

71. Origen (c. 185–254) was an important early theologian in Alexandria. He wrote extensively and his notable works include commentaries and homilies on almost the entire Bible.

72. ANF, Vol. 10, 443.

73. ANF, Vol. 3, 281.

74. ANF, Vol. 3, 418.

75. ANF, Vol. 5, 362. "... in the wine is showed the blood of Christ."

76. I have been unable to find this exact quotation in the third epistle to Caecilius.

77. Again, this exact quotation was not found in the third epistle to Caecilius. However, it does accurately represent Cyprian's argument in ANF, Vol. 5, 362. In Cyprian's context, water and wine were mingled at the Lord's Supper. The wine could only represent the blood of Christ, whereas the water could only represent the people.

78. Bertramus was a common Reformation-era way of referring to Ratramnus of Corbey, an Aquitanian monk who lived during the first half of the ninth century. Ratramnus was an opponent of Paschasius Radbertus, to whom the formulation of the doctrine of transubstantiation is ascribed. De Brès' quote comes from Ratramnus' *Liber de Corpore et Sanguine Domini*. The quote can be found in translation in *Du Corps & du Sang de nostre Seigneur Jesus-Christ* (n.p., 1562), 38–39. Though de Brès might have had access to that French translation, he appears to have given his own.

on this subject might have massive implications for the training of theological students at the present time. If true theology in our seminaries today were defined in terms of communion with all three Persons in the Godhead, together with the rebirth of the human personality, how would this change the atmosphere in which ministers are trained? How would it change the theological curriculum? How would it alter theological writing? How would it transform the ministry in Reformed Churches? We need a learned ministry that has been thoroughly educated in the schools, but that has been taught by the Triune God as well. We need more ministers who are capable theologians, and we need more theology produced by ministers and for the profit of the Church. Perhaps the most vital lesson to glean from Owen is that we need seminaries whose existence and task is defined by Scripture in service to the Church. ■

In Translatiōne. Continued from Page 262.

Bishop: What? What are you saying? Does St. Cyprian say all that you are saying here?

Guy: Not all, sir. But I have said how Bertramus treats these words of St. Cyprian, and expositis them thus word for word, just as I have recited them. But St. Cyprian says, in some pointed words against the Aquarii, that if wine is not in the chalice, then the blood of Christ is not able to be drunk there and cannot be understood to be there.⁷⁹ If the wine is transubstantiated, it ceases to be wine. And thus according to St. Cyprian, the blood of Christ is not to be understood. The same doctor in the sermon *De Coena Domini* says that the sanctified bread enters into the polluted mouth.⁸⁰ Likewise in his sermon *De Lapsis* he says, speaking of the young girl who vomited the sacrament, “The drink sanctified in the blood of the Lord exited the polluted innards.”⁸¹ He does not say “the bread and the drink that was transubstantiated,” but “the bread and the wine sanctified in the body and blood of the Lord.” And likewise Theodoret who lived during the time of Cyril, and who was with him at the Council of Ephesus and Chalcedon, a very learned man, in his book which was printed at Rome in Greek, says it in the first dialogue, setting it up between two persons, the faithful and the heretic.⁸² The faithful says, “Our Saviour himself changed the names of the bread and the wine, and to his body assigned the name of the symbol, and the symbol that of his body. So, after calling himself a vine, he spoke of the symbol as blood.” Then the heretic responds: “But I wish to know well and good the reason the names are changed.” The faithful responds: “To them that are initiated in divine things the intention is plain. For he wished the partakers in the divine mysteries not to give heed to the nature of the visible objects, but, by means of the variation of the names, to believe the change wrought of grace. For He, we know, who spoke of his natural body as

wheat and bread, and, again, called Himself a vine, dignified the visible symbols by the appellation of the body and blood, not because He had changed their nature, but because to their nature He had added grace.” Then in the same place he says again, “The mystical symbols do not change their nature after sanctification. For they remain in their original substance, figure and form, and can be seen and touched as before.”⁸³ He does not say in the first sentence that the bread and the wine are transubstantiated, but that the bread and the wine are transformed and changed when it comes to their names. They are called the body and blood of Christ, which they were not called before. And he says that the nature of the bread has not changed, only that grace is added to the nature. That shows as clear as day that the bread remains in the Sacrament, and likewise the wine. ■

Editorial. Continued from Page 2.

we had initially anticipated. Even if most of the articles fail to match the length of some of the material in past issues, we are pleased to have more than a dozen contributions this year, as well as another fine Reviews section. I will simply note that we continue our regular departments in addition to the main sections. Bridging from last year’s *Psallo* entry on Psalm 42, the Rev. Todd L. Ruddell offers up a rendering of Psalm 43. For *In Translatiōne*, Wes Bredenhof provides a translation of the Reformation martyr Guy de Brès’ debate with François Richardot regarding the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper.

Antiquary this year contains the results of my investigation into one aspect of what S. W. Carruthers styled the “everyday work” of the Westminster Assembly of Divines. Many of the divines were far away from their homes and their libraries, and they made it clear to the Parliament that they felt disadvantaged by this. The fact that many of the assemblymen still managed to write significant treatises during this time raises the question of where did they find their books for research? I attempt to shed light on various answers to this question in “Westminster Abbey Library and Other Theological Resources of the Assembly of Divines (1643–1652).” In the balance of this

79. ANF, Vol. 5, 361. The Aquarii were an early sect who used water in the place of wine in the Lord’s Supper.

80. This writing was often attributed to Cyprian. However, in a 1520 edition of Cyprian’s works, Erasmus categorized it as a work falsely attributed to him. In 1611, the first librarian of the Bodleian Library at Oxford University, Thomas James, proved that *De Coena Domini* was written by Arnold, abbot of Bonneval, in the mid-twelfth century. It appears that de Brès was either unaware of Erasmus’ scholarship or dissented from his opinion. See *The History of the University of Oxford, Vol. 3: The Collegiate University*, ed. James McConica (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1986), 323.

81. ANF, Vol. 5, 444.

82. What follows here can be found in NPNE, Series 2, Vol. 3, 167–168.

83. Cf. in second dialogue, NPNE, Series 2, Vol. 3, 200–201.