A Clear and Simple Treatise on the Lord's Supper

A Clear and Simple Treatise on the Lord's Supper

In Which the Published Slanders of Joachim Westphal Are Finally Refuted

Theodore Beza

Translated by David C. Noe
Introduced by Martin I. Klauber
Foreword by R. Scott Clark

REFORMATION HERITAGE BOOKS
Grand Rapids, Michigan

Reformation Heritage Books
2965 Leonard St. NE
Grand Rapids, MI 49525
616-977-0889 / Fax 616-285-3246
orders@heritagebooks.org
www.heritagebooks.org

Printed in the United States of America
16 17 18 19 20 21/10 9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Bèze, Théodore de, 1519-1605, author. | Noe, David C. (David Craig), translator.
Title: A clear and simple treatise on the Lord's Supper : in which the published slanders of Joachim Westphal are finally refuted / Theodore Beza ; translated by David C. Noe ; introduced by Martin I. Klauber ; foreword by R. Scott Clark.
Other titles: De Coena Domini, plana & perspicua tractatio. English
Description: Grand Rapids, Michigan : Reformation Heritage Books, 2016. | Includes bibliographical references and index.
Identifiers: LCCN 2016013407 (print) | LCCN 2016021121 (ebook) | ISBN 9781601784674 (hardcover : alk. paper) | ISBN 9781601784681 (epub)
Subjects: LCSH: Lord's Supper—History of doctrines—16th century. | Reformed Church—Doctrines. | Westphal, Joachim, 1510 or 1511-1574.
Classification: LCC BV823 .B4813 2016 (print) | LCC BV823 (ebook) | DDC 234/.163—dc23
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2016013407

For additional Reformed literature, request a free book list from Reformation Heritage Books at the above regular or e-mail address.

Translator's Dedication

For my uncle Rean Hodson,
faithful Christian, faithful Lutheran

Contents

Foreword

In the eighth century, Carolingian theologians at the Abbey of Corbie, Paschasius Radbertus (ca. 790–ca. 860) and Ratramnus (d. ca. 868) each wrote treatises on the Lord's Supper. Both were titled *On the Body and Blood of the Lord*. They first debated what is "true" and what is a "figure" in the Lord's Supper. Radbertus argued that the sign becomes the thing signified. In response, Ratramnus argued that if the sign becomes the thing signified, then we have no sacrament since Christ is received by faith, not sight; we would have no need of faith. If we have no faith, we have no Christ and no salvation. In the early sixteenth century, that debate was renewed by the Reformed and Lutheran theologians, with Lutherans republishing Radbertus and the Reformed, Ratramnus. Through the course of the debate, Lutheran confessionalists insisted that the only faithful interpretation of the institution of the Supper requires believers to confess that Christ's humanity is "in, with, and under" the consecrated elements.

In the present treatise, Theodore Beza (1519–1605) defended a view similar to the one advocated by Ratramnus seven centuries earlier: that in Holy Communion, believers do receive Christ's true body by faith through the mystical operation of the Holy Spirit. Like Calvin, in whose defense he wrote, Beza was content to leave a mystery how Christ's true human nature remains in heaven while the Holy Spirit truly feeds believers by it. Those who sympathize with the Reformed confession say that, in the language of the 1559 French Confession, "those who bring a pure faith, as a clean vessel, unto the Holy Supper of the Lord, do indeed receive that which the signs witness there,

i.e., the body and blood of Christ" (art. 37); and in the language of the Belgic Confession (1561) that in the Supper what is eaten and drunk by believers is the "proper and natural body and the proper blood of Christ" (art. 35). The language of the Heidelberg Catechism, question 75, echoes this same doctrine: "With his crucified body and shed blood he himself feeds and nourishes my soul to everlasting life as certainly as I receive from the hand of the minister and taste with my mouth the bread and cup of the Lord, which are given me as certain tokens of the body and blood of Christ."

Beza himself repeatedly defended this relation of the sign to the thing signified. In his own *Confession of Faith* (1560), he taught the sign and the thing signified to be "knit and joined together," yet "not confounded" (4.46). For Beza, as for Ratramnus, to confuse the two is to risk losing the substance of the Supper, Christ. He defended this view at Poissy in 1561 and in the present treatise.

Because Beza chose to refute Westphal chapter by chapter in the way Luther refuted Erasmus on predestination, his argument is hostage to Westphal's agenda. Nevertheless, because Westphal took the occasion to critique the Reformed beyond the Supper, addressing biblical hermeneutics, Christology, and worship, Beza responded to these criticisms also. Through these discussions one learns not only the outlines of the debate between two Reformation churches over the Supper but also about the nature of the relations between the two traditions.

If readers are expecting to find in this work the Beza portrayed in the older secondary literature, the epigone of Calvin and rationalist corrupter of the pure faith he taught, they are bound to be disappointed. Here, as in his other works, we find a happy warrior, fully imbued with the spirit of French humanism. The reader should not be misled by the title of the work. Though this treatise is "clear and simple," these adjectives should not be interpreted to signal "mundane" or "pedestrian." Beza was a vigorous and invigorating writer. His wit, his humanist learning, and his theological acumen are readily apparent. For those without a classical education, this work might even serve as a kind of tutorial in classical and humanist rhetoric. Readers can see for themselves why

Beza was treasured in his own time by his students and trusted by Calvin to serve as his roving ambassador.

Beza's pastoral and spiritual concerns are also evident throughout the work. He succeeded Calvin as the moderator of the Company of Pastors in Geneva, and in this work, as in his *Little Book of Questions and Answers* (1570), his *Confession of Faith*, and even in his much discussed *Summary of the Whole Christian Faith* (1555), his concerns were often quite pastoral, that is, for the spiritual well-being of the congregations in Geneva and beyond. For example, his motive for writing his defense of the preaching of the doctrine of predestination was not to argue for the doctrine but to argue for the spiritual and pastoral use of the preaching of the doctrine. He wanted the doctrine preached because he believed that it would strengthen the assurance of faith of believers who heard it taught correctly.

So, too, his spiritual concerns were clear as he dealt patiently with Joachim Westphal (c. 1510–1574), with whom much patience was required. Westphal demanded that the Reformed submit to his understanding of "is" (e.g., Luke 22:19), that a priori it must mean "in, with, and under," and he resisted all evidence and argument to the contrary. He also assaulted his opponents with crude epithets. To this Beza replied, "We should fight with sound arguments rather than with authority" and remonstrated with him about his insulting rhetoric. Remarkably, from the Reformed point of view, Westphal demanded what seemed to Calvin and Beza a rather wooden reading of a figure of speech in Scripture but refused to read Calvin literally (e.g., with respect to what is received in the Supper), even when that was Calvin's intent. In other words, not only did Westphal purport to understand our Lord's words better than Calvin and the Reformed but he claimed to understand Calvin and the Reformed better than they understood themselves. In such an argument, of course, there is little hope (apart from a special work of the Spirit) of winning over one's opponent, but an author hopes that other, less-biased readers will be persuaded to see at least that the Reformed were seeking to interpret Scripture honestly, faithfully, and in light of the great Christian tradition.

All those who are interested in the history of Reformed theology and who wish to read the sources for themselves owe thanks to the translator and editor, David Noe, and publisher, Reformation Heritage Books. David Noe has served us well and skillfully.

R. Scott Clark
Professor of Church History and Historical Theology
Westminster Seminary California

Translator's Preface

The reader may be interested to know something of my engagement with Theodore Beza and his works, inasmuch as I believe my story is illustrative of broader trends in the study of the Reformation and Reformed scholasticism in the twentieth century. As an undergraduate I was exposed to some standard threads of the story of the sixteenth century. I learned the typical distinction between the supposedly warmer, more pious approach of John Calvin in his *Institutes*, and the dry, heady, and intellectualist treatment of the Christian faith to which his successor Beza subjected his thought. The only works of Beza that I heard mentioned at that time were his *Tabula Praedestinationis*, or Chart of Predestination, and the biography of Calvin, the *Vita Calvini*. I quickly formed the impression that Beza had hijacked the salutary direction of Calvin's reformation and turned it back into the channels of a Thomistic enterprise in which faith was carefully dissected by logical categories and then drained of its warmth and feeling. Since that time I have encountered the thought of Richard Muller, among others, and learned to question and reject many of these assumptions.

After finishing the Junius translation in the spring of 2014, I asked R. Scott Clark if there were works of Beza that he believed should be rendered into English, and I was not entirely sure what to expect. He was quick to suggest those treatises that dealt with sacramental controversy. I decided upon the present polemic against Westphal, and, providentially, Joel Beeke was eager to see Beza in print. Once the current treatise was finished, we decided to add to it his *Lex Dei* (1577), a short work that provides the reader with a systematic and clear presentation of which

parts of the Pentateuch Beza believed should fall under Calvin's threefold categorization of the law. A talented Calvin College undergraduate, Lia E. Gelder, labored in the summer of 2014 to render the first English construal of this short treatise. The basis of the work is hers. I added some corrections and improvements. Last, it seemed appropriate to include as well the *Summa Doctrinae De Re Sacramentaria* that Beza had written in the midst of this controversy (1562) as a succinct statement of his and Calvin's doctrine and of the practice of the Geneva churches. Another outstanding Calvin College Latin student, Christopher M. Sanicola, completed the first and second drafts of this work under my supervision, and then together we edited it into its final state.[1]

Students of Latin and devotees of sixteenth-century style (*utinam omnes sint*) may be interested to know how Beza's Latin differs from Junius's, for example. Beza's Latin bears all the marks of his aristocratic upbringing and poetic skill. Although polemic is a different genre from the precise and elevated, philosophical approach of Junius in *On True Theology*, there are some clear differences in skill and preference that transcend the strictures of genre. Junius seems to have a more limited vocabulary than Beza, which is lacking in the same breadth of reference to classical authors.

Beza, on the other hand, not only constructs his periods and cola with relish but he also clearly enjoys illustrating a point with an allusion to Vergil, Homer, and company. In an interesting fashion, early in the work he cites pagan authors, carefully subordinating them to the authority of Scripture, as proof that even in religious matters metonymy and other figures of speech are common. The point he draws is that Westphal, if he cannot learn from the Scriptures, should at least seek to be as wise as the pagans. This statement, as well as a few later jokes at Westphal's expense (including a dripping reference to the German penchant for beer drinking), shows quite clearly that Beza is a consummate wit. It

1. Those who would like to understand my philosophy of translation, to use a more elevated phrase than the case requires, are invited to read my preface to *A Treatise on True Theology*, by Franciscus Junius (Grand Rapids: Reformation Heritage Books, 2014). I discuss my intent to convey from Latin, the language of origin, to English the meaning and not the mere words. I have used the same approach with this treatise.

also seems to me, after carefully studying both authors for an extended time, that Beza achieves a level of clarity and precision that is more difficult for Junius to attain. Beza has a broader and more bombastic register, even making allowances for the previously mentioned differences in genre. I will not burden the reader here with Latinate examples, but it is my hope that this brief discussion will spark interest in the language that underlies this translation with such sturdy and aesthetic appeal.

But to return now to the question of Beza's alleged dryness and deadening effect on true religion: I found nothing of the sort. Quite to the contrary, Beza is an extremely skilled and careful exegete of Scripture and takes more than one opportunity to draw the point between reliance on the philosophical authorities and biblical preeminence. His style, apart from the pattern of his thought, is not really classifiable as scholastic. This is because he is often concerned with ornamentation and giving delight. In other words, there is more alluring rhetoric in his style than one finds in an author solely intent on prosecuting a scholastic methodology devoid of appeal. Once again, of course, we must make allowances for the difference in times and the fact that this was meant as a polemical treatise, a sort of epistolary broadside in a very public dispute. Beza's method bears all the marks of a tremendously consistent logician, capable of extended syllogistic reasoning. His citation of the thought of Paul and many other biblical authors is exhaustive.

In the closing section of the treatise, wherein Beza appeals for greater irenicism between Lutherans and Reformed on all the things they share, he even waxes poetic. His emotions in defending the character and reputation of his good friend Calvin, as well as the reputation of Calvin's family, run hot, and they show the true devotion of a loyal servant and lieutenant. Beza is everywhere concerned to maintain devout worship and expresses notable moderation with respect to the specific form that this worship should take. He is quite eager that some freedom be left to individual pastors and congregations in matters of admission to the Lord's Supper while seeking to maintain emphasis on a true and simple confession of faith as the prerequisite for that admission (these and other topics are better surveyed in Martin Klauber's capable introduction than here). In sum, I was gratified to find in Beza none of the

arid and dispassionate, supposedly Stoic attitude toward the faith which I had been led to believe was the hallmark of his thought. Instead, the qualities both of his style and his philosophical approach to theology that emerge are consistency, rigor, and wit. In truth, this should not be at all surprising to those who know the history of Beza's education and his skill as a poet and pamphleteer.

It remains for me to thank those persons who have helped me so much with this project. First, R. Scott Clark deserves my gratitude both for suggesting I work on Beza's view of the Lord's Supper and for generously contributing the foreword. The director of publishing at RHB, Jay Collier, has been patient and helpful throughout in managing a large number of disparate details. Calvin College and its Board of Trustees generously granted me a sabbatical in the fall of 2014, during which time I was able to put the finishing touches on much of this translation. My colleagues in the Classics Department—Young Kim, Mark Williams, and Jeff Winkle—offered encouragement and support. My emeritus colleague Ken Bratt generously read and critiqued the entire treatise on the Lord's Supper and provided valuable insight and emendation. Without his efforts, this work would be far inferior. My student assistants Lia E. Gelder and Christopher M. Sanicola dutifully tracked down multiple bibliographical citations and copyedited the work more than once as well as contributed their own draft translations. Chris Sanicola spent countless hours proofreading and improving the text by checking on all of Beza's manifold citations. I wish to thank also Kevin Klopfenstein, John Muether, Danny Olinger, and David Van Drunen for their encouragement. I am also grateful to the distinguished scholars who have generously agreed to provide endorsements for this book. Before concluding with a word about the dedication, I want to thank my wife, Tara, and each of my four children as well. They are the ones who must suffer through my endless table-time discourses on the *minutiae* of translating Beza and other theological authors, and they do so with great humor and service, always ready with a listening ear, helpful comments, coffee, and encouragement.

I have dedicated this work to my uncle Rean Hodson, who is by confession a member and elder of the Lutheran Church Missouri Synod.

Some might think that since the present work is a polemic against the Lutheran view, or at least the Gnesio-Lutheran view, that there is something untoward or even antagonistic about such a dedication. My intention is quite the opposite. I think it is clear from Beza's arguments, specifically the concluding ones, that although he believes the Lutheran view of the true presence mistaken, he does not consider it beneath argument or arising from unbiblical motives. Quite the contrary: Beza believes there is more that unites the Lutheran and Reformed than divides them, and I hold that those who are Reformed ought to have the greatest admiration for confessional Lutherans who seek to maintain consistency of doctrine and practice against a modernist tide of general unbelief. It is with gratitude to my Uncle Rean and the godly example of sincere Christian faith he set for me when I worked on the farm with him so many years ago and in subsequent interactions that I dedicate this work to him.

Introduction

Theodore Beza's *Clear and Simple Treatise on the Lord's Supper, in Which the Published Slanders of Joachim Westphal Are Finally Refuted* (1559) is an often-overlooked treatise that marked some of the major differences between the Reformed and the Lutheran movements during the so-called second generation of the Reformation. Its translation into English from the original Latin provides a wider opportunity for those interested in these movements to learn more about some of the substantial issues of the period. Sacramental theology was at the forefront of the original break with Rome and prevented the various Protestant movements from uniting.

As John Calvin's successor at Geneva, Beza served as the head of the Academy of Geneva, one of the major Reformed educational institutions that trained generations of pastors for ministry within French-speaking Europe, especially France, during the Wars of Religion. He also served as the moderator of the Genevan Company of Pastors. Active in almost every issue that faced Reformed Protestantism, Beza, in part, oversaw the consolidation of the French Reformed movement.

Beza was born into a noble family in Vézelay, Burgundy, in France, and his uncle Nicholas took him to Paris and then to Orleans so he could receive a formal education. He was trained in Orleans by the famous humanist scholar with Lutheran leanings, Melchior Wolmar, and then he followed his teacher to Bourges. Beza's move to Wolmar's home was so significant in his life that he referred to it as his second birthday. Following the crackdown on Protestants precipitated by the Affair of the Placards in 1534, Wolmar returned to Germany, while Beza, with the

prodding of his father, went back to Orleans to study law from 1535 to 1539. It was not until 1546, however, that Beza himself made the move to the Reformed faith. This conversion was significant because it meant that he had to resign his benefices who were financing his education. Beza and his wife, Claudine Denoese, went to Geneva in 1548, and the next year the Reformer Pierre Viret persuaded Beza to move to the neighboring city of Lausanne, where he would take the position as professor of Greek at the Protestant Academy, a position he held for ten years.[1]

While at Lausanne, Beza entered into the eucharistic fray, attempting to negotiate an agreement between the German and Swiss churches with the help of Guillaume Farel. They drafted a compromise statement at Göppingen, but it was not precise enough for the leader of the Reformation in Zurich, Heinrich Bullinger. The problem was that the more nebulous the definition, the more room theologians had for their own opinions. So a precise definition was inherently more divisive.

In 1558, Calvin called Beza to Geneva as professor of Greek, and when the Academy of Geneva was opened in 1559, Beza was named the rector. He spent the rest of his career there preaching regularly and was named professor of theology upon Calvin's death in 1564. Soon after his arrival in Geneva, Beza was called to answer the attacks made by the Lutherans Joachim Westphal and Tilemann Heshusius against aspects of Calvin's position on the Eucharist. Beza continued to defend the Reformed position in his participation in the Colloquy of Poissy (1561), arranged by Catherin de Medici, the regent for her son Charles IX, both of whom were present. Beza, as the spokesman for the Reformed faith, and Peter Martyr Vermigli were in attendance as well as Diego Lainez and Charles de Guise, Cardinal of Lorraine. When Beza explained that in the Lord's Supper Christ's body "is as far removed from the bread

1. The major biography of Beza is Paul F. Geisendorf, *Théodore de Bèze* (Geneva: Labor et Fides, 1949). In addition, Jill Raitt's book on Beza's eucharistic theology is an important source. Jill Raitt, *The Eucharistic Theology of Theodore Beza: Development of the Reformed Doctrine*, AAR Studies in Religion 4 (Chambersburg, Pa.: American Academy of Religion, 1972). Another key work by Scott Manetsch focuses on Beza's role in shaping the French Reformed churches. Scott M. Manetsch, *Theodore Beza and the Quest for Peace in France, 1572–1598* (Leiden: Brill, 2000).

and wine as the highest heaven is removed from the earth," the Roman Catholic prelates cried out that he had uttered blasphemy.[2]

Beza went on to engage in many additional controversies and colloquies concerning the Eucharist. He debated the Lutheran Jacob Andreae, one of the principal architects of the Formula of Concord (1577), at the Colloquy of Montbéliard in 1586 and also defended Calvin against the Lutherans Tilemann Heshusius and Joachim Westphal.[3]

Joachim Westphal (1510–1574) represented the so-called true or Gnesio-Lutheran movement that attempted to preserve the purity of Luther's thought against the alleged compromises of the Philippists, those who followed the lead of Philip Melanchthon. As the superintendent of the state church in Hamburg, Westphal was well positioned to enter the fray of theological disputes over issues such as the nature of adiaphora and, of course, the nature of Christ's presence in the Lord's Supper.[4]

For the Gnesio-Lutherans the issue of Christ's physical presence in the Lord's Supper was of paramount importance. The formula borrowed from Luther was that the body and blood of Christ are truly and substantially present "in, with, and under" the consecrated elements. Those who partake, believers and unbelievers alike, receive the true body and blood of Christ Himself. This is a form of belief in the "real presence" of Christ in the Eucharist and is referred to as the "sacramental union." This so-called union is often referred to as "consubstantiation," although Luther did not use the term in order to distinguish it from the Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation. In order to explain how this works, Luther used the analogy of placing a rod of iron into the fire. Both the rod and the fire are united, but they remain distinct in the red-hot iron.[5]

---

2. David Nugent, *Ecumenism in the Age of Reformation: The Colloquy of Poissy* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974), 100.

3. Jill Raitt, *The Colloquy of Montbéliard: Religion and Politics in the Sixteenth Century* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1993).

4. For more details on Westphal's life and career, see Irene Dingel, "Westphal, Joachim," in *Theologische Realenzyklopädie* 35 (2003), 712–15.

5. Robert Kolb, *Martin Luther as Prophet, Teacher, and Hero: Images of the Reformer, 1520–1620* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1999), 105–20.

Preferring to hold that Christ's words of institution "This is My body" should be taken in the most simple and literal sense, Westphal considered those who attempted to spiritualize these works to denigrate Christ's physical presence in the elements as *schwärmer*, or sacramentarians. This was a derogatory term used to label a wide range of groups he considered to be radical such as the Zwickau prophets, Anabaptists, or individuals whom he believed carried the Reformation to extremes such as Karlstadt. He also included the Reformers Ulrich Zwingli and Johannes Oecolampadius in this category.[6]

Luther agreed to a meeting with Zwingli, the leader of the Reformation in Zurich, at the Colloquy at Marburg in 1529. The landgrave Philipp of Hesse had called the colloquy in order to forge an alliance between the followers of Luther and those of Zwingli. A wide range of early Reformers attended, including Martin Bucer, Melanchthon, and Oecolampadius. The participants drafted a consensus of fourteen points of agreement but differed on the fifteenth, the mode of Christ's presence in the Lord's Supper. Zwingli argued that the bread and the wine were mere symbols of the actual body and blood of Christ, who was seated at the right hand of the Father in heaven. The Eucharist for Zwingli was, therefore, a memorial to remind believers of what Christ had done for them on the cross. The key verse for Zwingli was John 6:63: "It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing." Therefore when Christ uttered the words "This is My body," He really meant, "This signifies My body." Luther famously wrote these words of institution in chalk on a velvet cloth, which he kept in front of him as a reminder to take the words of Christ literally. After all, in His resurrected state, Christ was able to walk through doors and, as the second person of the Trinity, would retain the divine attribute of ubiquity and, therefore, could be physically present in many places at the same time. For Zwingli, Luther's view was too close to the Roman Catholic view of transubstantiation and denigrated the human nature of Christ in His resurrected state. Luther believed that Zwingli's view denigrated the divine nature of the

6. Robert Kolb, *Martin Luther: Confessor of the Faith* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009), 144.

risen Christ. As a result, there would be no alliance between the Zwinglians and the Lutherans, although many theologians, such as Bucer, did attempt to come up with a compromise that would satisfy all parties.[7]

Calvin was one who attempted such conciliation with his view that although Christ is not present physically in the bread and in the wine, He is present spiritually. The sacrament would not, therefore, be an empty sign. Calvin followed Augustine closely when he said that the sacrament is a visible sign of a sacred thing. Since the sacraments are closely intertwined with the word of God, they are the seals of the promises God has made in Scripture; namely, that those who partake of the Lord's Supper truly partake in the body and blood of Christ. The elements, therefore, are more than mere symbols, and the Holy Spirit lifts the believer up to heaven to commune with the risen Christ seated at the right hand of the Father. Christ does not, therefore, descend to us, but we ascend to Him in a spiritual sense. With this view the believer can have fellowship with the body and blood of the risen Christ. However, the physical body and blood of Christ are not locally present in the elements.[8]

One other aspect of Calvin's view differed from the Lutheran position. If, as the Lutherans believed, Christ is physically present "in, with, and under" the elements, both believers and unbelievers who participate in the Eucharist partake of the body and blood of Christ. Unbelievers, however, eat and drink to their own condemnation. Calvin argued, by contrast, that only believers truly partake of the body and blood of the Lord. He posited this position in the *Institutes* as well as in his *Petit traicté de la saincte cène* (1541).[9]

To some extent, Calvin modified his position with the Consensus Tigurinus, ratified in 1549 and published in 1551. The Consensus is a document in which the Swiss theologians from Zurich and Geneva attempted to bring together their respective views on the sacraments,

7. Kolb, *Martin Luther*, 147–50.

8. For more on Calvin's views of the Lord's Supper, see Brian A. Gerrish, *Grace and Gratitude: The Eucharistic Theology of John Calvin* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1993).

9. John Calvin, *Petit traicté de la saincte cène de nostre Seigneur Jesus Christ* (Geneva: Jean Girard, 1541).

and most particularly the Lord's Supper. Its major participants were Calvin and Heinrich Bullinger, Zwingli's successor in Zurich. Both sides displayed evidence of compromise. Calvin compromised on his previous statement that the sacraments are instruments of God's grace, modifying it to say that the sacraments are testimonies to God's grace. Another change for Calvin was to the statement "Whoever rightly and faithfully uses the sacrament receives Christ, since he is offered there to us, along with his spiritual gifts." This was amended to read, "All who in faith embrace the promises offered there receive Christ spiritually, with his spiritual gifts." This was a subtle change which shows, according to Paul Rorem, "not that the sacrament is a means of receiving Christ, but that faith in the promise there offered and illustrated is a means of receiving Christ spiritually."[10]

On the other hand, Calvin did achieve some modifications from Bullinger in order to show the Lutherans that there is a sense of spiritual communion with the risen Christ. The Consensus reads: "In the Lord's Supper we eat and drink the body and blood of Christ, not, however, by means of a carnal presence of Christ's human nature, which is in heaven, but by the power of the Holy Spirit and the devout elevation of our soul to heaven."[11] In addition, the Consensus contains a clear rejection of both transubstantiation and the Lutheran position of sacramental presence, considering both to be "absurd." According to Wim Janse, in the Consensus, Calvin moved closer to the Zwinglian position than he had previously, and, as a result, Westphal called him out for changing his view and moving further away from any possibility of conciliation with the Lutherans on the subject.[12]

10. Paul E. Rorem, "The Consensus Tigurinus (1549): Did Calvin Compromise?," in *Calvinus Sacrae Scripturae Professor: Calvin as Confessor of Holy Scripture*, ed. Wilhelm H. Neuser (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1994), 86.

11. An English translation of the text of the Consensus Tigurinus can be found in John Calvin, *Selected Works of John Calvin: Tracts and Letters*, ed. Henry Beveridge and Jules Bonnet, vol. 2, *Tracts*, ed. and trans. Henry Beveridge (Edinbugh: Calvin Translation Society, 1849; repr., Grand Rapids: Baker, 1983), 211–20.

12. Wim Janse, "Calvin's Eucharistic Theology: Three Dogma-Historical Observations," in Herman J. Selderhuis, ed., *Calvinus sacrarum literarum interpres: Papers on*

Westphal reacted against the publication of the Consensus, but he was also concerned about the growing number of Reformed refugees from Marian England who were settling in the German cities because they tended to agree with Calvin. When John á Lasco published a series of sermons critical of Luther's view of the Lord's Supper, Westphal was spurred to action.[13]

Seizing on the publication of the Consensus, Westphal began to criticize it publicly, which initiated the so-called second sacramental war between the Lutherans and the Reformed. Starting in 1552, his initial targets also included Melanchthon, even though he had been Westphal's teacher and early supporter. The break with Melanchthon had become exacerbated with his compromises at the Augsburg Interim of 1548, which Westphal compared to Aaron's worship of the golden calf.[14]

Westphal initially composed three treatises critical of the Consensus: *Farrago of Confused and Divergent Opinions on the Lord's Supper Taken from the Books of the Sacramentarians* (1552), *Right Belief concerning the Lord's Supper* (1553), and *Collectanea* (1555), which was a collection of writings on the subject of the sacraments by Augustine.[15] The word "farrago" implied a hodgepodge of different opinions and included a chart showing over twenty different interpretations of the words of institution.

---

the International Congress on Calvin Research (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2015), 41.

13. Esther Chung-Kim, *Inventing Authority: The Use of the Church Fathers in Reformation Debates over the Eucharist* (Waco, Tex.: Baylor University Press, 2011), 61.

14. Wim Janse, "The Controversy between Westphal and Calvin on Infant Baptism," *Perichoresis* 6, no. 1 (2008): 3–43; J. N. Tylenda, "The Calvin-Westphal Exchange: The Genesis of Calvin's Treatises against Westphal," *Calvin Theological Journal* 9 (1974): 182–209; J. N. Tylenda, "Calvin and Westphal: Two Eucharistic Theologies in Conflict," in *Calvin's Books: Festschrift Dedicated to Peter de Klerk on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*, ed. W. H. Neuser (Heerenveen: J. J. Groen, 1997), 9–21.

15. Joachim Westphal, *Farrago confusanearum et inter se dissidentium opinionum De Coena Domini, ex Sacramentariorum libris congesta* (Magdeburg: Christian Rödlinger, 1552); Joachim Westphal, *Recta fides de Coena Domini, ex verbis Apostoli Pauli, et Evangelistarum demonstrata ac communita* (Magdeburg: Lotther, 1553); Joachim Westphal, *Collectanea sententiarum divi Aurelii Augustini Episcopi Hipponensis de Coena Domini. Addita est confutatio vindicans a corruptelis plerosque locos, quos pro se ex Augustino falso citant Sacramentarii* (Ratisbon: Ioannnis Carbonus, 1555).

"Sacramentarian" was a disparaging term that Luther had used to label those whom he believed held unorthodox beliefs concerning the Eucharist. Westphal's opponents were the so-called sacramentarians, and he lumped together a wide range of Reformers including Karlstadt, Zwingli, Oecolampadius, Bucer, and Calvin.[16] Westphal spared no words in his attack on his "godless" opponents and their "satanic blasphemies." He accused his opponents of viewing the elements as "empty signs." He also noted Calvin's so-called compromises in the Consensus and quoted liberally from Calvin's *Petit traicté de la saincte cène* and his other treatises to show how far the Reformer had drifted from his original positions.[17]

Calvin did not become aware of Westphal's criticism until 1554, when Bullinger brought it to his attention. He was otherwise occupied with a host of issues including the Servetus affair, but he told Bullinger that he would respond. He did so in 1555, although he believed that Westphal's *Farrago* was a "light-weight book" and not worthy of a personal response. However, Calvin became aware that many of the Marian refugees were being forced to leave Lutheran territories, in part at Westphal's urging.[18]

But Calvin decided to take the matter upon himself in his *Defense of the Sound and Orthodox Doctrine of the Sacraments*,[19] in which he became an even more resolute supporter of the so-called sacramentarians of Zurich, and the literary war was on.[20] In this work Calvin made repeated references to Augustine as one of the major sources for his own views, providing detailed explanations of Augustinian passages. He did not mention Westphal by name, hoping for peace with the Lutherans, especially since he had garnered Melanchthon's support.[21]

16. Westphal, *Farrago*, C1, D4.

17. Westphal, *Farrago*, D1; Wim Janse, "Joachim Westphal's Sacramentology," *Lutheran Quarterly* 22 (2008): 137–60.

18. Chung-Kim, *Inventing Authority*, 62–63.

19. John Calvin, *Defensio sanae et orthodoxae doctrinae de sacramentis, eorumque natura, vi, fine, usu, et fructu, quam pastores et ministri Tigurinae ecclesiae et Genevensis antehac brevi consensionis mutuae formula complexi sunt, una cum refutatione probrorum quibus eam indocti et clamosi homines infamant* (Geneva: Oliva Roberti Stephani, 1555).

20. Chung-Kim, *Inventing Authority*, 59–98.

21. See Richard C. Gamble, "Calvin's Controversies," in *The Cambridge Com-*

Westphal responded in 1555 with his *Just Defense against the False Accusations of a Certain Sacramentarian*.[22] The "certain sacramentarian" was obviously Calvin, even though Westphal did not call him by name. Prior to 1555, Westphal had said that Calvin was "less dangerous" than the Zwinglians, but with this new defense, Westphal called him "the most prominent defender of the accursed Zwinglian error" and "the terrifying giant of the Philistines." Calvin responded in 1556 with his *Second Defense of the Pious and Orthodox Faith concerning the Sacraments in Answer to the Calumnies of Joachim Westphal*.[23] This work was much more vituperative and personal than the first, and Calvin denied that he had made the sacrament an empty sign, saying that he was in agreement with the Augsburg Confession. Although he asserted his admiration for Zwingli, Calvin made it clear that there were significant distinctions between their views of Christ's presence in the Lord's Supper.[24]

Calvin railed against Westphal's "stupidity" and "dishonesty" and said he was dishonest for accusing him of criticizing Luther for being fickle and contentious.[25] Calvin also contended that it was vicious for Westphal to attack the Reformed position at a time when so many Huguenots were being persecuted in France.[26] As in his previous essay, Calvin relied heavily upon Augustine as a patristic authority with very few references to other church fathers.[27]

Westphal in turn responded in 1557 with his *Confession of Faith on the Sacrament of the Eucharist, in Which the Ministers of the Church of Saxony Defend the Presence of the Body and Blood of the Lord Jesus Christ in the Supper by Solid Arguments of Sacred Scripture in Answer to the Book*

panion to John Calvin, ed. Donald K. McKim (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2004), 195.

22. Joachim Westphal, *Adversus cuiusdam Sacramentarii falsam criminationem, iusta defensio* (Frankfurt: Brubacchius, 1555).

23. John Calvin, *Secunda defensio piae et orthodoxae de sacramentis fidei, contra Ioachimi Westphali calumnias* (Geneva: Ioannis Crispini, 1556).

24. Calvin, *Secunda defensio*, 11.

25. Calvin, *Secunda defensio*, 20.

26. Calvin, *Secunda defensio*, 24.

27. Calvin, *Secunda defensio*, 31.

Dedicated to Them by John Calvin.[28] Calvin then answered in 1557 with *The Last Admonition of John Calvin to Joachim Westphal Who if He Heeds It Not Must Henceforth Be Treated in the Way Which Paul Prescribed for Obstinate Heretics*.[29] Here he complained that Westphal had overreacted by accusing him of treating him less mercifully than he did the Papists, Anabaptists, and Libertines. In fact, he considered Westphal to be a hypocrite because he was unrivaled in his "atrocious" treatment of the Reformed. Any real attempt at accord was lost when Calvin accused Westphal of stupidity and impudence. It would have to be left to Calvin's colleagues, such as Beza, to attempt to repair the rupture.[30]

In true form Westphal responded in 1558 with two works, including his *Defense of the Lord's Supper against the Errors and Calumnies of John Calvin*.[31] This is a lengthy volume covering a host of topics including infant baptism, private absolution, and festival days, but the Eucharist figures by far the most prominently. He started the work with a chapter on the vocabulary of the sacrament. Westphal disputed Calvin's notion that the Eucharist should be understood sacramentally and said that the term "sacrament" is ambiguous, preferring what he believed is the more biblical expression of "mystery." When Calvin argued that Christ's presence in the elements should be understood sacramentally, it lent credence to the argument that a sacramental presence is somewhat different from a physical presence. When one says that the Lord's presence should be understood as a divine mystery, it would support the

28. Joachim Westphal, *Confessio fidei de Eucharistiae Sacramento, in qua Ministri Ecclesiarum Saxoniae solidis Argumentis sacrarum Literarum astruunt Corporis et Sanguinis Domini nostri Iesu Christi, praesentiam in Coena sancta, et de libro Ioannis Calvini ipsis dedicato respondent* (Magdeburg: Ambrosium Kirchner, 1557).

29. John Calvin, *Ultima admonitio Ioannis Calvini, ad Ioachimum Westphalum, cui nisi obtemperet, eo loco posthac habendus erit, quo pertinaces haereticos haberi iubet Paulus, refutantur etiam hoc scripto superbae Magdeburgensium et aliorum censurae, quibus caelum et terram obruere conati sunt* (Geneva: Jean Crespin, 1557).

30. Calvin, *Ultima admonitio*, 3–4.

31. Joachim Westphal, *Confutatio aliquot enormium mendaciorum Ioannis Calvini, secuturae Apologiae adversus eius furores* (Ursellis: Nicholaus Henricus, 1558); Joachim Westphal, *Apologia confessionis de Coena Domini, contra corruptelas et calumnias Ioannis Calvini scripta* (Ursellis: Nicholaus Henricus, 1558).

idea that His physical presence is beyond the human ability to comprehend.[32] Westphal went on to discuss the words of institution at length and attempted to show that the best form of interpretation would be to take them literally and thereby to defend the traditional Lutheran view of the Eucharist.[33]

Westphal's *Defense of the Lord's Supper* served as the subject of Beza's treatise. The responsibility fell upon Beza primarily because Calvin, who had clearly had his fill of Westphal after composing three rebuttals, decided not to continue the literary battle. Calvin did, however, strengthen his section on the sacraments in the revised editions of the *Institutes* as a result of his debates with Westphal. Beza, whose predisposition was to soften the hostility between the two sides, responded to Westphal in his *De Coena Domini plana et perspicua tractatio*.[34] Some of Beza's biographers have argued that this work was less harsh in its attacks on Westphal than one might have expected, but Beza clearly displayed a self-righteous indignation in his response when he said that Westphal had "vomited" insults against the "holy martyrs of the Lord."[35] Beza also complained that Westphal had been far too personal in his attacks on Calvin, insinuating that he was a drunkard and a glutton and that his mother had been the mistress of a parish priest.[36]

As one reads Beza's treatise, several emphases are apparent. First, Beza responded chapter and verse to specific arguments and chapters of Westphal's work. Second, Beza was tireless and unapologetic in defense of Calvin, especially in his assertion that the Lord's Supper is not a bare symbol and that in it we have true communion with the risen Christ. Third, Beza made great use of the concept of metonymy, or a figure of speech, in his interpretation of the words of institution. Scripture, he argued, was full of such expressions, such as when the lamb is called the

32. Westphal, *Apologia confessionis de Coena Domini*, 5.

33. Westphal, *Apologia confessionis de Coena Domini*, 35–56.

34. Theodore Beza, *De Coena Domini plana et perspicua tractatio in qua Ioachimi Wesphali calumniae postremum editae refelluntur* (Geneva: Robert Estienne, 1559).

35. Henry Baird, *Theodore Beza: The Counsellor for the French Reformation, 1519–1605* (New York: Putnam, 1899), 273.

36. Baird, *Beza*, 274. See also Beza, *De Coena Domini*, 162–64.

Passover meal or when Christ called the cup the covenant in His blood. He asked how the wine can be wine and blood at the same time without a figure of speech. Fourth, like Calvin, Beza referred extensively to the church fathers, especially Augustine, in defense of his position. Finally, at the end of the treatise, Beza pled for some degree of accord between the two sides by showing all the areas they had in common compared to few topics of disagreement. Ultimately his attempt at reconciliation would fall short as the gap between the Lutheran and Reformed views of the Eucharist was simply too vast.

Martin I. Klauber
Affiliate Professor of Church History
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School

A Clear and Simple Treatise on the Lord's Supper

In Which the Published Slanders of Joachim Westphal Are Finally Refuted

A Preface to the Following Treatise against the Slanders of Joachim Westphal

When you had first begun, Joachim, to attack so irritably those who had deserved no such thing for their treatment of the church of God nor for their treatment of you privately, even if it was painful to read the inscription of your little book, nevertheless we read it carefully.[1] It was painful to read because it was not difficult to understand at whom your attempts were aimed—no doubt so that you might shake the foundations of peace and harmony. Certainly we read it in such a spirit that if you were offering any new argument with which you could uncover any error of ours, we would rather migrate to your position than stubbornly defend our own. But since we discovered in that little book of yours nothing other than the greatest ignorance of the very argument which you had undertaken to discuss, and we observed that your ignorance was joined with the highest degree of ill will toward us, erudite and pious men have deservedly thought that they were permitted to guard the truth with much better justification than you had in allowing yourself to take up pen against us to attack that truth. For, to pass over other reasons, they had not abandoned all hope (as appears from their response, in which they even wanted to spare your name) that you would recognize just how delirious you were both in explaining our position and in defending your own. They still hoped that you would prefer to keep quiet or, certainly, if that were not sufficient for you, that you would adopt a plan somewhat more mild than that of stirring up again those unfortunate tragedies which had, for the most part, already been put to rest. But when this hope had so disappointed us that we saw you were not rendered more temperate by the rather passionate address

1. The basic chronology for the various sacramental disputes in which Beza engaged is given by Jill Raitt, *The Eucharistic Theology of Theodore Beza: Development of the Reformed Doctrine*, AAR Studies in Religion, no. 4 (New York: Oxford University Press, 1972), 39ff.: 1. *Plana et Perspicua Tractatio de Coena Domini*, the present volume (1559); 2. *Confessio Christianae Fidei* (1560), written in French in 1559 and addressed to his father, then translated into Latin; 3. *Summa Doctrinae De Re Sacramentaria* (1561); 4. *Apologia Prima contra Claude des Sainctes* (1567, 1570, 1577); 5. *Quaestionum et Responsionum Christianarum Pars Altera Quae est de Sacramentis* (1576); 6. *De Controversiis in Coena Domini* (1593).

of Calvin[2] or by the very kind response of Bullinger,[3] but instead you were even spreading these flames broadly, what else could we do than what Paul orders—that is, keep away from you entirely, obdurate man?[4] For what agreement could we have with you since you seem to have decided long since to arouse hell itself[5] rather than go forward even one step together? This was the one reason, Westphal, not for driving you out from the fellowship of the church (an action that was not even in our power), but for deciding that we would not fight with you any longer. For just as you imagine, we hoped that by our warning you would then fall silent—if only you yourself had not long since acted in such a way that we gave up hoping for your silence![6]

Indeed, will you even stop here since your supporters are, as it were, exhausted, however much you have been inflamed? But I ask, if you are able, that you consider with me a little more moderately how you are being attacked with good reason. How many times have you, along with your faction, railed against us as heretics, as more degenerate than even Papists, Turks, and Anabaptists? How many times have you said that we ought to be punished not with the pen but with the magistrate's sword, that we should be cast out from the world or certainly be

2. John Calvin, *Defensio Sanae Et Orthodoxae Doctrinae De Sacramentis* (Geneva: Robert I. Estienne, 1555). John Calvin (1509–1564) was a leader of the Reformed movement and the leading influence on Beza's theology.

3. Heinrich Bullinger, *Consensio Mutua in Re Sacramentaria Ministrorum Tigurinae Ecclesiae, et D. Joannis Calvini Ministri Genevensis Ecclesiae, Jam Nunc Ab Ipsis Authoribus Edita* (Geneva: Jean Crispen, 1551). Heinrich Bullinger (1504–1575) was a Swiss Reformer and the successor of Zwingli.

4. See Titus 3:10.

5. Literally, Acheron. Cf. Vergil, *Aeneid*, 7.312, ed. R. A. B. Mynors, in *P. Vergili Maronis Opera* (Oxford: Oxford Classical Texts, 1969).

6. For a contemporary Lutheran evaluation of Westphal, see Charles Arand, *The Lutheran Confessions: History and Theology of the Book of Concord* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2012), 233: "The issue between Westphal and his opponents revolved around the definition of the true presence of Christ in the sacrament. Calvin believed that the person of Christ is truly present in the Lord's Supper even though his philosophical presuppositions regarding the relationship between spirit and matter prevented him from believing that Christ's body and blood could actually be consumed along with bread and wine."

banished beyond the ends of the earth?[7] How often would you all have done this very thing if the kindness of the most illustrious princes had not stopped you, as well as the fairness of those theologians who surpass you in every respect in wisdom and righteousness and learning? Yet even if we always proclaimed frankly what we thought, yet how were we using even the slightest semblance of bitterness when you suddenly emerged like a son of the earth to challenge us?[8]

But although the truth was defended more sharply than you wanted, what of that bitterness did you read, even in the responses themselves? At the end, Calvin recently threatened you not with the lightning bolt of excommunication, as you say, not with the sword or exile, but by saying that he would hereafter have no dealings with you. You are not able to endure this. What then shall we do, Joachim? If we respond to your charges, you seem to complain by some prerogative, as it were, if we do not keep silent first. If we threaten that we will keep silent, you cannot even bear that with a calm mind. Instead, that restraint of yours, which alone you say you set against our "insults," has dragged you to such a point that you dare to name Calvin "the most blessed pope," when you yourself know that there is no one alive today who attacks papal tyranny more fiercely or more readily than he. And so what can that vitriol of yours stir up other than laughter? Indeed it makes you utterly ridiculous among those who have hailed the writings of Calvin from the start or have even once encountered Calvin himself in person.

But still, though you greatly disapprove, we shall follow Calvin's judgment, and I predict that finally we shall cease trying to call you back to yourself, because it is shameful and irksome for us to keep scrubbing Ethiopians.[9] Nevertheless we will not hesitate, meanwhile, to keep setting out the very truth. This I have now decided to do, and indeed in

7. I.e., *extra Scythas*, "beyond the Scythians."

8. The reference is to Hercules's contest with the giant Antaeus, a *terrae filius*, whose strength in wrestling, though sapped by Hercules, was restored whenever he touched his mother, the earth. Cf. Apollodorus, *Bibliotheca*, trans. Sir James George Frazer (London: William Heinemann, 1921), 222–23.

9. Beza's reference is to Jeremiah 13:23, in which the prophet asks the rhetorical question, "Can the Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots?"

a way that follows your tracks in the order and arrangement of your disputation so that you may know that we want to please you. But now you should remember, Joachim, that I am answering your arguments in this way so that I may not so much take account of you as of those who, I trust, will apply much more judgment and fairness to the task of weighing these arguments than you have in thinking out what we have now decided to refute.

A Response to Chapter 1 of That Treatise Published by Joachim Westphal concerning the Term "Sacrament" and Sacramental Terminology

I pass over the prefatory comments Westphal provided concerning Karlstadt[10] as well as Oecolampadius[11] of blessed memory, since these serve a different purpose. The topic of our disputation, then, is as follows: how many times these words of our Lord are thrown up against us, "This is My body"; and how often is urged the essential meaning of the word "is." Indeed, we are not accustomed to object to this one word, but nevertheless we do object to this especially, which we think nobody can deny: obviously that the words ought to be explained in accordance with the subject matter. Next, because these words are stated concerning sacraments, we conclude that "body" is not said of bread in a manner different from what the nature of the sacraments can bear. Finally, we affirm that this is the nature of the sacraments: that they are certain

10. For Karlstadt's life and works, see Amy Burnett, *Karlstadt and the Origins of the Eucharistic Controversy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2011), 58: "Karlstadt did not openly adopt a symbolic view of the sacrament in his treatise, but he was certainly close to doing so. In this respect, his silence was more significant than his clear statements. In contrast to his earlier works on the mass, he said very little about the elements, and he never referred to them as Christ's body and blood. More pointedly, he condemned priests for wanting to attribute a cleansing achieved by Christ's blood to bread made by a baker or wine from a winepress. Alluding to John 6:32–33, he distinguished between the heavenly bread that came down from heaven, which was Christ, and the bread and wine that grew upward as fruit of the earth."

11. For Oecolampadius's life and works, see Hans J. Hillerbrand, *The Oxford Encyclopedia of the Reformation* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996).

signs of those things which they have been instituted to signify and to connect to our external senses.

They are signs, I say, not at all as meaningless as the things that are usually represented by painters. But instead they are efficacious to this extent: that because we see those things with our eyes, touch them with the hand, receive and swallow them with the mouth, nothing is more certain or more true than that whatever these represent to us is truly and surely offered to us by God, of course the true body and true blood of the Lord. We will deal with this topic more later on. We claim, finally, that it is established from these considerations that "body" is not spoken concerning bread differently than "sacrament" is spoken sacramentally concerning the substance—that is, the substance is truly signified, but yet by an external sign and symbol. Furthermore, the name of the thing signified is to be attributed to the sign by metonymy[12] when bread is said to be the "body."

In this argument do I in fact grant what Westphal finally charged me with? First he cries that we resort to a trivial expression, and one indeed obscure and ambiguous. But why does he say ambiguous? "Because," he says, "the expression 'sacrament' means one thing to Latin authors, and another to theologians." But if that reasoning ought to prevail, why does it not apply to the word "faith" as well? Therefore let us listen to another explanation. "It is employed by theologians," he says, "with ambiguous meaning." Is that so? But then, I ask, what follows? In how many different ways are the terms "spirit" and "flesh" understood in sacred literature? Yet who, on that account, prevents us from resorting to that ambiguity? But let us hear how he proceeds. "In one context," he says, "spirit and flesh are understood as a mystery, in another as a sign." Let us grant that. Why, then, are we not allowed a practice which was commonly employed by all the ancient writers? Instead, if this word's meaning is so ambiguous, why has Westphal not long since rejected it? But let us listen to where all these things are heading. If we should understand the term "sacrament" as mystery, not only does Westphal confess that this is a sacramental expression—that is, mystical—but he also holds us by this

12. μετωνυμικῶς.

reasoning ensnared in his nets. "For," he says, "faith perceives the mysteries of God. The Lord's Supper is a mystery; therefore it is understood by faith alone. Likewise, the mysteries of the Lord's Supper are not to be measured according to philosophy nor judged according to human reason. It is human philosophy or wisdom to maintain that the body of Christ cannot be contained in one place and in many. Therefore, we should not judge concerning the presence of Christ's body in the Holy Supper on this basis." I ask you, reader, when you hear this reasoning, even though it is such a serious subject, can you refrain from laughter? As if indeed the Lord's Supper could be termed a mystery by no other reason than this one which Westphal maintains.

We confess that whatever here is symbolized to us truly and effectively through external signs is a mystery—that is, hidden—and indeed incomprehensible to human senses. For what sense will comprehend that boundless wisdom and goodness of God which shines forth in our redemption and in some way is set before our eyes in this activity?[13] Who will conceive that closely bound conjoining of members which are on earth with their Head, which is in the heavens, by another reasoning than by faith? Moreover, because the Lord Himself declares that it is not possible for the body of the Lord to be in many places at the same time; because the apostles testify to it; and because the whole ancient church, in condemning Marcion, Eutyches, and those like him, announced it with continual agreement, even if human reason should not disagree, certainly it is not human philosophy but divine wisdom which not only does not prevent the Lord's Supper from being a mystery[14] but even absolutely confirms it. For if the body and blood of the Lord is in many places at the same time, what is miraculous if He is perceived by any who have hands and mouth? But if, however, He is in one place, and, nonetheless, because He has so promised, the separation of places does not prevent Him from truly introducing Himself into His own members so that He might infuse them with eternal life—is not this truly a mystery or hidden matter, immense and comprehensible to faith alone?

13. I.e., the Lord's Supper.
14. μυστήριον.

Therefore, maybe Westphal can see which of these two suppositions profanes the mystery of the Lord's Supper.

Let us come to the other meaning of sacrament which Westphal treats as different from the previous one, although truly it is one and the same, if you should exempt this one which he did not understand. The noun μυστήριον more often clearly designates the whole action itself. But the term "sacrament" generally signifies the sacred symbols themselves which are employed in the action, obviously the bread and the wine at the Lord's Supper or even the actual rituals—as if we should say that the breaking of the bread is the sacrament of the sorrows which our Lord fully suffered.

Nevertheless, come, let us pardon Westphal for his ignorance of this distinction, and let us consider the actual issue. He acknowledges that circumcision in the Scriptures is called a sign but denies that the Lord's Supper is a sign. But how can Westphal accomplish this unless he first shows that circumcision and the Lord's Supper do not belong to the same *genus*? Soon, however, he grants that the fathers attributed the terms "sacrament" and "sign" to the Lord's Supper. "But," he says, "they do so in such a way that they do not leave room for tropes, symbols, and signs." For he wants it indeed to be a sign, but of the body as present, not absent. Yet who will grant this to Westphal? For if the body and blood of the Lord is present in this way, when it is either under or in[15] the bread and wine, as Westphal wants (for we do not deny that the body and blood are present to us in some measure, as will be explained in its proper place), what need was there for a sign at all? Surely is it not so that the horror of a carnal manducation would be removed? Indeed, Theophylact[16] says this. But Augustine speaks quite differently when he writes that the statement "unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man"[17] is figurative. "For," he says, "otherwise Jesus would seem to

15. Beza here anticipates the argument he will develop at greater length later, employing the familiar Lutheran terminology of Christ's presence as *in*, *sub*, and *cum*, i.e., in, with, and under the bread.

16. For his life and works, see Alexander P. Kazhdan, *The Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991).

17. John 6:53.

command something shameful."[18] Likewise, "you will not consume this body which you see, nor the blood which they will pour out. What I tell you is a mystery which, if you understand it spiritually, will give you life."[19] Again, he says elsewhere, "We must understand figuratively that Christ is said to have given us His own flesh to chew and His blood to drink because it would seem a more serious outrage to eat flesh than to kill it and to drink blood than to pour it out."[20]

But even if we were to grant to Westphal that the bread is a sign of the present body of the Lord in the very sense in which he contends that it truly is, could it not also by these words be incontestably demonstrated that "body" is stated as regards the bread no differently than in fact some substance that is present but nevertheless has been signified with a sign? What reason is there, then, why he should rail so emphatically against this interpretation, "'This' or 'this bread' is the body, that is, it truly signifies the body"? And why does he not instead demand that we should add, "This present body, however, not an absent one, is signified"? This very thing we would also easily grant if there were agreement among us about the mode of the presence.

In whatever direction, therefore, Westphal turns, whether he claims that we accept "sacrament" instead of "mystery," or "sacramentally" instead of "mystically," or "sacrament" in place of a "sign," it will be obvious that this principle is established: we understand it sacramentally, that is, indeed truly; but nevertheless those aspects must be taken figuratively

18. Beza frequently mentions the works of Augustine of Hippo (354–430). Augustine's prolific writings range from polemic to didactic and are taken by the Western Christian tradition as highly authoritative. See *De Doctrina Christiana*, ed. K. D. Daur (Turnholti: Typographi Brepols, 1962), 3.16.24. For an English translation, see *De Doctrina Christiana*, trans. R. P. H. Green (New York: Oxford University Press, 1996). Translations in this work, unless otherwise noted, are original. Although these citations represent a full translation of the cited work, they are not the source of the translations in this volume.

19. Augustine, *Expositions on the Book of Psalms*, vol. 8 of *Nicene and Post-Nicene Fathers: First Series*, ed. Philip Schaff, trans. A. Cleveland Coxe (New York: Christian Literature Co., 1888), 485–86.

20. Augustine, *Contra Adversarium Legis Et Prophetarum*, vol. 8 of *Sancti Aurelii Augustini Hipponensis Episcopi Opera Omnia*, ed. Jacques-Paul Migne (Paris: apud Garnier fratres, 1865), 2.9.

and by signification which are predicated concerning the conjunction of the symbols and the actual substances.[21] Nor are we resting on one novel and ambiguous little expression, but upon the truth itself.

There is one small point remaining on this topic. Westphal grants what Calvin writes concerning the analogy of the sacraments—that we must rise up from the external and earthly sign to the heavenly reality—provided that Calvin should grant only that the heavenly reality is understood as the body of Christ, but not as His power alone. If this truly is the case, what then is he arguing about? For how many times does Calvin press home the point that the very gifts of Christ flow down to us no differently than if Christ Himself should particularly be joined with us and we with Him through faith? Or, if Westphal does not trust Calvin, why does he not at least trust these words of Peter Martyr? For he writes as follows on chapter 11 of the second letter to the Corinthians: "If you should ask what we gain through Communion, some have said that we gain the merits and the benefits of the death of the Lord. This answer does not displease me. But, I add, that we also have the Lord Himself, who is the source of these good things. For we do not doubt that He is present to us in some way with respect to His divinity. Truly, even if His body and blood are in heaven with regard to their physical and natural condition and are kept in their proper place, nevertheless in a spiritual way,[22] and reckoning they are embraced by faith, I say, and by the soul. And so in some fashion they can be said actually to be with us since our faith is not reduced to things that are false and deceptive."[23]

What more, then, does Westphal demand from us? Surely that we confess that the body and blood are in, with, or under the bread. But these we want to seek by faith nowhere else than in the heavens. Why, moreover, does he insist on this? Evidently because he does not believe

21. *de symbolorum et rerum coniunctione*.

22. Vermigli selects a somewhat unusual word here, *via*, rather than a form of *modus*.

23. Peter Martyr Vermigli, *In selectissimam Sancti Pauli Priorem ad Corinth. Epistolam Commentarii Doctissimi* (Tiguri: Christophorus Froschouerus, 1551), 301–2. Peter Martyr Vermigli (1499–1562) was an Italian Reformer who left Italy for Switzerland.

that otherwise it is possible that the body of the Lord could truly be given to us except as a sign. Will Westphal preach to us his own faith any longer?[24]

A Response to the Second Chapter on the Basis of Faith in the Matter of the Eucharist

In this whole chapter Westphal insists that the word of the Lord ought to be self-authenticating[25] among all Christians. Of course he would gladly persuade inexperienced men that we are little or no different from Turks or Papists, as though we would subordinate the word of our Lord to our understanding and not, on the contrary, all of our understanding to one Word of God. But it is well known that the man's insolence is refuted both by countless books and by the topic itself. Certainly it would be poor treatment of our churches unless from some other source than those poorly stitched rags of Westphal we had learned that all things ought to be referred to the Word of God. And on the rest of the main points of the Christian faith, it is remarkable that such a man has indeed dared to accuse us of such great disbelief.[26] Moreover, how wrongly he acts in this very argument—when he complains that we do not attribute as much to the Word of God as is proper—is partly from those comments which we made just a moment ago and will be even much more evident from what we will produce in their proper place.

A Response to the Third Chapter on the Figure of Speech in the Words "the Lord's Supper"

That the bread is the body of our Lord is indeed stated truly, but yet not without a figure of speech. Indeed, we demonstrate this, as in fact it seems to me, by sure arguments that are consistent with the Word of God.

---

24. This rhetorical question is a biting conclusion to Beza's argument in this section. In other words, Westphal charges Calvin and Beza with a lack of faith because they do not believe that the Scriptures teach the body and blood are *in, cum, vel sub pane et vino*. Beza rejoins that Westphal is guilty of too little faith because he does not believe that Christ can give His body to us spiritually while remaining physically in heaven.

25. αὐτόπιστον.

26. ἀπιστίας.