

Francis Turretin

ON CHRIST THE ROCK

1 Cor. 10:4

I. Since in the history of the entire pilgrimage of the Israelite people through the desert, hardly anything more illustrious and wonderful occurs, certainly nothing that is *μυστικώτερον* [more mystical], which outlines Christ and His salutary benefits more significantly than the remarkable Rock and flowing water by which God gave the Israelites drink. Thus, a meticulous examination of this miracle is necessary for the instruction and consolation of the faithful. In order that we may carry this out more easily, we will complete our discussion using two heads. First, we will give a literal account of history, and secondly, an explanation of the mystery hidden beneath it.

II. The words of Paul are extant in 1 Cor. 10:4, "and all drank the same spiritual drink. For they drank from the spiritual Rock that followed them, and the Rock was Christ." The object of the Apostle, as we have shown elsewhere, is no other than to identify the ancient sacraments with ours, showing them, if not as to the sign, then as to the matter signified. [He does this] lest the Corinthians, under the pretext of [having partaken of] the more important sacraments, promise themselves impunity for their sins, especially idolatry, from which he wishes to turn them away. Therefore, Paul shows that the Fathers were not inferior to us in this respect, but that they had the same sacraments as we, or similar to them, which corresponded to baptism and the Holy Supper. And indeed, he proves the similitude of baptism in the pillar of the cloud, and in the passage of the sea. As for the Supper, [he proves it] in observance of its two symbols: both the bread in the manna, and

the drink in the rock and the water springing from it; about which we are already discussing.

III. It is clear that the Apostle looks back to the history referred to in Exodus 17, where Moses relates that the people had barely been calmed from rebellion because of the lack of food narrated in the previous chapter, once again took the opportunity to grumble and quarrel against Moses after the waters died, verse 3, "Why did you bring us up out of Egypt, to kill us and our children and our livestock with thirst?" But God, in order to settle that outbreak and to succor the people's needs despite their ungrateful rebellion, commanded Moses to strike a rock with his rod, a certain rock in Horeb, from which water would flow forth abundantly to quench the thirst of the people. When this had been done, a great quantity of water immediately flowed out, which was not only abundantly sufficient to relieve their present thirst, but also in the future, with those waters following and accompanying the people through the desert. Looking at the Psalms, Psalm 78:15-16 says, "He split rocks in the wilderness and gave them drink abundantly as from the deep. He made streams come out of the rock and caused waters to flow down like rivers." And Psalm 105:41, "He opened the rock, and water gushed out; it flowed through the desert like a river." And Psalm 114, "who turns the rock into a pool of water, the flint into a spring of water." Nor do they belong to another, which is often said in Isaiah and other Prophets about waters springing up in the desert, as Isaiah 41:18 and 44:3.

IV. Since the rock struck by Moses is mentioned twice, not only in Exodus 17, but also in Numbers 20, the question is whether it is the same story? Or two? Some consider it to be the same miracle

mentioned twice by Moses, more briefly in Exodus, but more fully in Numbers; for it seems to be the same place in the wilderness of Sin, to which the same name of Massa and Meribah is applied. Nor is it likely that two places were so named by the murmur of the people, or that the people twice fell into the same sin. It is true that others think more correctly that they describe a similar, but not the same, history. For although the people murmured in both instances and God gave water from the rock, if the circumstances of the places, times, and persons are taken into account, it is easy to see that they disagree with each other.

(1) The places are different: for the former happened in Rephidim, that is, in the desert of Sin, which was on the border of Egypt, but the latter was in Cadesbarne, which was the neighboring region of Palestine towards the south. That place is called the desert of Sin, but this one Tsade. In that stopping place was eleventh of the people; but in this, one third.

(2) The time also varies, for the first murmuring occurred a little after the departure from Egypt, but the last towards the end of the pilgrimage, and already in the fortieth year, and after the death of Miriam.

(3) In it no mention is made of the unbelief of Moses and Aaron.

(4) The Rock struck on Mount Horeb is called this.

(5) There, when Moses was about to perform a miracle, he was ordered to take with him some of the Elders of Israel; here Moses and Aaron were ordered to gather the whole group of the children of Israel to the Rock. There Moses is commanded to smite the Rock, but here to

address it. There the Rock was smitten only once, here twice; There the place was called Massa and Meribah. Here, however, there is only a water dispute.

V. If it is asked further, to what history does Paul refer? It may indeed be answered, not unsuitably, to which one he particularly looked [Numbers 20], although both were types of that mystery. It may be inferred that he was first particularly intent on [emphasizing] the punishment in the latter verse [of 1 Cor. 10] which is said to follow this murmuring, as well as those verses which precede it; and also from the fact that the Rock is said to have followed them [Numbers 20:8] which corresponds to the waters accompanying the people in their journey through the desert.

VI. It is further asked, What was that Rock from which they drank? And why is it called spiritual? Some want to be so designated κατά το ρετιον [according to the saying], and properly, the mystical Rock, of course, Christ Himself, from whom all Believers derive their salvation, and who, by His divinity, was always present with them and never absent, and who accompanied them throughout the whole journey while granting them various favors. Or God himself, who is often called the Rock and the Cliff in Scripture, by whose favor they obtained this drink, as the preposition εκ denotes not a material cause, but an efficient one, as it does elsewhere more than once. Thus, εκ Πέτρας, that is, from the Rock, or God, or Christ, who was the guide of the people in the wilderness, and the author of the water thereof. But this is said less aptly because it should be said that the Rock goes before, rather than that which follows, since Christ went before as a Leader, and did not follow as a companion, Numbers 9:17. It cannot be said that after they

all drank from the Rock they all became partakers of Christ with true faith. Indeed, it is said that God was not pleased in many things. Much more correctly, therefore, by Rock is meant the material rock of the desert of Horeb, which pours out the waters struck by Moses' rod, from which the people are said to have drunk, because they drink from what flows out of it, just as someone is said to drink from a cask from which the wine is poured, a metonymy of the efficient cause, or of the subject. But it is called spiritual, not by nature or use, but by signification, as before [when called spiritual] food and drink, because it was a symbol of the spring of Christ's rock, from which flowed the salutary waters of grace.

VII. But the rock is said to follow, ἀκολουθούσης, not because the rock itself followed them instead of being moved, as some Rabbis have absurdly concluded. Or either because it obeyed the desire of the Israelites by supplying them with drink, as Photius wished, because it accompanied them in their wanderings in the desert, not actually, but in effect by rivers flowing from the rock. And this is related to what is said in Psalm 78:15, "He split the rocks in the wilderness and gave them water as abundant as the seas." Hence Isaac Abarbanel, "There is no doubt that such a quantity of water burst forth, that rivers and torrents of water were derived from it," etc. Thus, it is rightly said the rock followed, pursuing them with streams of water flowing from the rock, which were gathered in pools wherever they were encamped. Whence the Prophets often, speaking of the outpouring of the Holy Spirit and his graces under the symbol of water, say that God will give "pools of water in the wilderness," alluding to Isaiah 35:6 and 44:3. And although these rivers, flowing from the rock, followed them, sometimes God suffered them to dry up, either to punish the ingratitude of the people,

or to exercise their faith and give place to a new miracle, which He had decided to do by renewing the previous benefit temporarily withdrawn.

VIII. Furthermore, since in the latter miracle mention is made of the sin of Moses and Aaron, Numbers 20:12, because of which they were excluded from entering Canaan, it may be asked what it was they did because the Holy Spirit tells so few things about them. Could such a punishment not be inflicted, except for some great reason? This question certainly exercised the talents of the interpreters, both Hebrews and Christians, who were divided into different opinions. Some of the more recent think Moses did not sin, and if there are passages of Scripture which seem to teach that he sinned, there are others on the contrary which teach that he was not punished for his sin, as Deut. 3:26, "But the Lord had been angry with me because of you," and Psalm 106:32, "They had also angered him by the waters of Meribah, and it was bad for Moses himself because of them." And if the sin is attributed to him, when it is said, "You were rebellious and transgressed, you did not believe, you did not sanctify me," that is similar to what is said, Joshua 7:1, about the sin of Achan, which is attributed to the whole nation, although it was his alone, "But the children of Israel committed a trespass in the accursed thing." But the sacred text itself is contradictory, which repeatedly and so expressly ascribes this sin to Moses and Aaron in particular, distinctly from the people, Numbers 20:12, "You believed me not to sanctify me before the people." Thus, in Numbers 27:14 they are said to have "rebelled," and Deut. 32:51, and Psalm 106:33, "They exasperated the spirit of Moses," therefore, "he spake ill-advisedly with his lips," that is, he hesitated through distrust, or he spoke in his exasperation, that is, little in accordance with his duty. Although the occasion for the punishment

of Moses was the contention of the people, from which it is said that God was angry with Moses because of them, this does not prevent him from being punished for his own sin.

IX. Others, like Abarbanel, maintain that Moses and Aaron were indeed punished for their sins, but Aaron indeed for the sin of the calf, and Moses for the business of the spies in the land of Canaan, because Moses, in sending them out, added counsel of his own, which neither the Israelites had asked for, nor had God commanded, "That they might consider the people who dwelt in the land, whether there were strong among the weak, few or many, and what kind of cities they dwelt in," Numbers 13:3, 19-20. Because this is a clear objection to the Holy Spirit, who whenever this punishment is discussed, he expressly refers the sin of Moses and Aaron which was against the law in regard to the waters, to indicate it was committed on this occasion, not on any other: Numbers 20:12 and 27:14; Deut. 1:37 and 3:26 and 32:51. Others, less correctly, place the sin in him, or that he struck the rock, but did not speak to it as the Lord had commanded; for it was for no other reason that He said to Moses, 'take the rod,' except that he might strike while speaking. Or that the rocks did not of themselves, and of their own accord, bring forth their waters. For since they did this very thing at the command of God, how could it be imputed to them as sin? On the contrary, they would have sinned grievously if they had tested Him regarding this command.

X. This sin, then, is more properly referred to unbelief and distrust, which, conceived in the mind, is betrayed outwardly by some sign, or face, or gesture, or speech. Not so much that they doubted divine power, as they doubted in the will and affection: Would God be willing

to give water to such a rebellious people? However, God promised this with absolute certainty, not conditionally. But this distrust is indicated both by words and deeds, indeed by words, when he says in Numbers 20:10, "Hear now, ye rebels; must we bring you water out of this rock?" Which are the words of the doubter, when he should have absolutely and simply said, *waters out of the rock*. Therefore, in Psalm 106:33, it is said he spoke ill-advisedly with his lips, that is, he uttered the words of God differently than they were to be uttered, doubting that which should have been easily asserted as having been promised by God. Then, in the repeated smiting of the rock, they witnessed the hesitation of Moses, and perhaps God, in order to test their faith, had not immediately given the waters to the first smiting. Be that as it may, it is certain that Moses did not give glory to God, not only with his tongue and work, but especially with his heart, in which there can be no doubt that he looked down upon God with a hidden unbelief. And so it is said that he did not sanctify the Lord before the children of Israel, that is, he gave the people reason to doubt His power and truth. Yet by recalling to their memory past miracles, the people ought rather to have been confirmed in the faith by such great miracles. And although Aaron is said to have said or done nothing here, yet he accompanies his brother in sin because he kept silent, nor did he rise and rebuke the sinner himself.

XI. But in order to proceed to the mystery which the Holy Spirit particularly wants us to pay attention to here, we must now inquire into what is hidden under this shell. For if Paul did not expressly teach there were some *μυστηριάδες* [mysteries] here, the very nature of the events sufficiently demonstrates it. For if God had proposed nothing else to Himself than restoring His people to health, could He not have

either sent down the waters of heaven, or brought them down to a place to be irrigated with springs and waters? What was the need, either to select a rock specially for this purpose, or to use a rod to strike it, so that the waters would spring from it?

(2) Because the very fact that Moses promised to establish himself on this Rock until the miracle is accomplished shows quite clearly that none other than the Son of God, who was the leader of the people, did this whole work, nor did Moses look to any other for all these things.

(3) It is added that since, according to the opinion of the Jews, Christ is the end and goal of the whole Scripture, in which all the promises are made and the truth of its type obtains, it is not probable that this miraculous work, such an extraordinary benefit conferred on the people, had no *σχέσιν* [relationship] to Christ when everything else was mystical: the exodus from Egypt, the passage through the sea, the desert, the manna, the pillar of cloud, and other things that happened to the people, which, of course, was sufficient to convince the Jews there was some memorable mystery hidden here. But it is wrong for Christians, after the Apostle's testimony, to still doubt him.

XII. In order that this mystery may be opened: (1) The force of the expression which is here used must be calculated; (2) Its meaning will be demonstrated by the collation of type and *του τυπωθέντος*. As to the former, the words of the Apostle are so clear in themselves, when he says, *ἡ πέτρα δὲ ἦν ὁ Χριστός* [and that Rock was Christ], that it scarcely needed an explanation, unless the importunity of our adversaries forced us to dwell a little here, who, as a force of argument, that what we extract from this oracle is the true sense of the words of the sacramentals, they decline, and try to obscure the truth by the

great weight of his proposition, by turning the subject into the predicate, and the predicate into the subject. As if it should not be read as the words of Paul are placed, "and that Rock was Christ," as the natural disposition of the words implies, but "and Christ was that Rock," that is, all the things signified by the Rock, so as to indicate that the Rock from which the Israelites drank was not that Rock of Horeb, from which the waters flowed, but a mystical and invisible one who accompanied them and helped them in all their needs, that is, Christ, who at that time was present to the people, as the guide of the journey: So Bellarmine, book 1, *On the Eucharist*, chap. 11, Perron. *On the Eucharist*, Estius, Justinian, and not a few others.

XIII. But this sense cannot agree, either with the object of the Apostle, or with the series of discourse, or with the very words of which we are speaking. For (1) the aim of the Apostle is to deter the Corinthians from idolatry, fornication, and other similar sins, following the example of the ancient people who were severely punished for similar sins. And lest they promise themselves impunity, because of the privileges granted in the New Testament, especially because of the salutary pledges of God's love, Baptism, namely, and the Holy Supper, teaches that in this respect they are not inferior even to the Ancients, who also had their Baptism and their Supper, yet God did not spare those who sinned. Then either the argument of the Apostle does not proceed, or it is necessary that by food and drink and spiritual rock, signs given to the Ancients should be understood as corresponding in kind to the bread which we break and the cup which we bless.

(2) The reason for the Rock must be the same as for the other signs mentioned above, for example, the sea, the cloud, and the manna. But

all agree these are to be understood materially. Therefore, also the Rock from which they drank.

(3) He speaks of that Rock from which all the Israelites drank. But drinking from Christ could not be a common benefit to both the good and the bad. For Christ could not be drunk under the Old Testament except by faith, which the wicked do not have. Nor would it help to answer, as Gerhard does, that this description should be understood as the ungodly drank only in type, but the pious drank both in type and faith. For what is "drinking in type," but "the very type of drink?" Therefore, the Apostle speaks of that Rock as a type, and, indeed, of that alone, since he mentions only one rock, not two.

(4) The very words of the Apostle sufficiently teach, without inversion, they are to be understood as arranged, for the article "and that Rock" clearly shows to what he αναφορικός [refers], for he does not allude to any other rock than that which he had just mentioned, the one from which the Israelites drank in the desert.

(5) The adversaries themselves are compelled to admit that Rock was the material figure of Christ, and the water springing from it the figure of his blood. "We do not deny," says Bellarmine, "that Rock was the material figure of Christ, and the water flowing from it the figure of his blood, just as we do not deny that the appearances of bread and wine are signs of the Body and Blood of Christ, but we deny that these words, 'and the Rock was Christ,' designate this figure." But since there is no other place of Scripture from which it can be proved, it is either invented at will, or is necessarily inferred from this place.

XIV. Nor should we be moved here by the two reasons which are brought forward by the adversaries to confirm their opinion: that which

is called spiritual, and which is said to follow the Israelites, cannot be a material rock. For we have already intimated that this spiritual rock is to be called in the same sense as manna is called spiritual food, not by substance, but by "signification, because of the intelligible signification of both," as Augustine says, tract. 26 and 45 in John. And if it is said that it followed the Israelites, this must not be understood as if the Rock itself followed them, or was portable in the bosom of Miriam, as some Rabbis dreamed, but rather with respect to the streams which fed and accompanied their camp, so that the Rock left a watery trail [behind them, which followed them wherever they went] as says Tertullian, *On Suffering*.

XV. But to affirm the assertion of the truth of this Proposition, we must explain further, How that Rock was Christ. But this is not to be understood literally by conversion or transmutation, but sacramentally and metonymically, by mere signification and relative signification, not as a proper expression, but the thing itself cries out as a figurative trope. When things are essentially different in kind, not comparable, such as Christ and the rock, they cannot properly be predicated on each other, which the adversaries themselves admit. Therefore, if nothing else, the Rock was Christ, is that which Christ signified, or that Christ was the sign, for it is the same whether the trope is placed in a conjunction or in a predicate, for the matter returns to the same thing, so that by means of metonymy the sign is given the name of the thing signified, and also because of analogy, and also because of its union by the ordination of God giving its legitimate usage. Nor did the Ancients understand otherwise: Tertullian, *On Suffering*, "That Rock was Christ," that is, "it signified Christ." Augustine often repeats this question in Leviticus, q. 57, "The Rock was Christ, because it signified Christ." And

Epistle 102, "The Rock was Christ, because it signified Christ." Also, book 18, City of God, c. 42, and Against the Adversaries, c. 6, tract. 63 in John, and elsewhere more than once. Basil recognized this, *On the Holy Spirit*, c. 14; Ambrose in Psalm 38; Theodoret in Exodus 9:28; Primasius in 1 Cor. 10, and not a few others. Nay, the more sane of the adversaries do not doubt this, Lyra, "the rock was Christ, namely figuratively, in the manner of speaking in which the image of Herculis is called Hercules." The Interlinear gloss, "spiritual rock," is interpreted as that, "which signifies Christ," and the Marginal gloss, "and the rock, the thing which signifies, is usually called by the name of the thing which it signifies, the rock Christ." [Turretin cites numerous other exegetes.] Nor in any other way did Luther himself say to the Waldenses, "This faith constrains me, as the Word is an interpreter, it signifies," in this way, "The body of Christ is signified by the rock of Moses."

XVI. That this is the genuine meaning of the expression is clearly gathered from several other expressions of the same kind which cannot admit of any other meaning. There is nothing more common in Scripture than the words used for "signifies," as "the seven candlesticks *are* the seven churches," Rev. 1. "The field *is* the world, the seed *is* the word," Matt. 13. "The seven cows *are* seven years," Gen. 41. "These bones *are* the house of Israel," Ezekiel 37, and throughout parables and similes. But especially whenever the meanings of the sacraments are discussed, the Holy Spirit loves to speak in no other way, nor could He speak better and more appropriately than in tropes. Thus "circumcision is called a covenant," Gen. 17:10, that is, the sign of the covenant, by God Himself, the interpreter, verse 11, and Romans 4:11; "the Passover Lamb," Exodus 12:11, that is, His memorial, Exodus 13:9; "the baptism of the washing of regeneration," Titus 3; "The Cup of the New

Testament," Luke 22, etc., which either have no sense or require a figure and trope.

XVII. And from this it is invincibly shown what must be the sense of the most troublesome sacramental words, *This is my body*. For as a rock is called Christ by its signification, so likewise is Bread, which is designated by this pronoun, so these two expressions do not agree any less with each other than one egg does with any other egg. I know that here Cornelius a Lapide with Bellarmine and Jacobus Tirinus, who follows them, bring some distinction, that "in truth a rock cannot refer to Christ except typically and signifyingly, because they are disparate, and cannot properly be predicated of themselves. But in this statement Christ does not say, Bread is My Body; but, This is my body, using the demonstrative pronoun This, so that there is nothing inconsistent or disparate with the body of Christ, since it denotes indeterminately that which is hidden under the species of bread, which can be, by divine power, both the Body of Christ and the substance of the bread; whence Christ's body can be taken, and indeed *must* be taken when affirming Christ, because it is predicated on this." See how well they establish that which is disparate cannot be predicated on that which is disparate, so it is certain they confirm our opinion, since this cannot be understood of any other matter than bread.

(1) Because nothing else can be understood by this than what Christ had taken in His hands, which He had blessed, which He had broken, and which He handed over to His disciples. It was bread, and nothing else. Whence Paul, 1 Cor. 10:16, "the bread which we break," and chap. 11:28, he wants everyone to prove himself every time he eats that bread, etc.

(2) The same is proved by the analogy of other Sacraments, where the exchange of names is often done. That the name of the signified is often given to the sign, and vice versa, the name of the sign to that signified, as already seen.

(3) The situation of the Apostles does not require any other meaning; they saw Christ reclining at the table, and having the bread in His hands, they saw two very different subjects, one of which, therefore, could not properly be the other. They had heard many similar trope expressions used by Christ, *I am the vine, the door*, etc., which he repeated from time to time in His parables. In the celebration of the Passover a multifaceted expression occurs in the Lamb [the Lamb of God] and in the unleavened bread [I am the bread of life]. How much more, then, are we to understand the phrase, *This is my body*, in a similar fashion?

XVIII. (4) The body of Christ cannot be understood by 'This', for apart from the fact that the body of Christ must be hidden under the species of bread before the utterance of the verb ['is'] by which finally transubstantiation takes place, contrary to their hypothesis, the sense of the proposition will be absurd, namely to be resolved into this, 'this,' that is, "my body is my body." Then the words themselves will be speculative and for showing off, not practical and creative, as they wish.

(5) That which is hidden under the species of bread cannot be indeterminately signified, because in order for the true attribute to correspond to the subject in the declaration the subject itself must be definitively expressed or designated. No one, I think, will deny that since nothing [visible] occurs here, so the species is either bread or the body of Christ, which are mere accidents [visible properties or

characteristics], and cannot constitute the declared subject, nor can the body, as already said, necessarily be understood as bread. What some here dream of a vague indivisible entity is so absurd that it scarcely needs refutation. For it could not be designated by the demonstrative pronoun, 'This,' which necessarily indicates something which is indivisible and defined. And although an indivisible entity may sometimes be vague with respect to us, it can never be so with respect to itself, because it must be a definite and defined substance. But since it cannot be the body of Christ, it must be of another property, which, since it is not really the body of Christ, can only be figuratively and metaphorically called the body of Christ, just as a rock is not called Christ except in a signifying way.

XIX. For a fuller illustration of this truth, a consideration of the various rules from which the literal meaning can be distinguished from the metaphorical, and the metaphorical from the literal, will be most helpful because no one can ignore the value of its use in various theological questions, and especially in the doctrine of the Sacraments. For it is not without great danger that proper and literal expressions are changed into metaphorical and figurative ones. Thus, there is no less danger of changing metaphorical expressions into proper and literal ones, as seen in the Anthropomorphites who took the words of Scripture literally about the human members attributed to God, when, however, the words *ανθρωποπαθως* [anthropathetically] should be understood *θεοπρεπως* [divinely]. The same error is seen in the Jews who particularly believe the Messiah will usher in a literal worldly secular kingdom on earth, when, in fact, His kingdom is to be understood mystically and figuratively. By following certain rules, we can sweep aside this obstacle placed before us.

(1) Whenever the nature of the epistle introduces a contradiction or an obvious impossibility, the words are to be understood figuratively. Since the human mind cannot conceive that a thing is and does not exist at the same time, nor is able to reconcile those things which are opposed to each other, it is obliged to take refuge in a figure, according to which it can assign a suitable meaning to words. From this rule it is evident that the sacramental words were figures. For when taken literally they involve a manifest contradiction, namely that which is bread is the body of Christ, and that which is rock is Christ, because our intellect is unable to form a single one from these two ideas of bread and body, rock and Christ, it is compelled to resort to a figure, so that a comfortable and rational sense may be had.

XX. (2) The second rule is Augustine, book 3, *On Christian Doctrine*, chap. 16: "When an expression appears to command an atrocious deed, it is figurative," so by applying it to the sacramental words which Christ said, "'Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of man and drink His blood, you have no life in you,' it appears to command an atrocity, therefore, it is a figure." When, therefore, something occurs in the literal sense, which is either against the commandments of God, or an injury to the majesty of God and Christ, it is necessary to resort to the figure, because the word of God can have nothing that does not befit His holiness, and that only befits His majesty and glory. Already in this argument, to say that the bread is literally the body of Christ, and the rock is literally Christ, is an idea that is quite inappropriate, and if formed in our minds detrimental to the holiness and majesty of Christ; for if it is said to be Christ, that which is insensible and inanimate, and the body of Christ, which is eaten up indiscriminately by both the good

and the bad, and is exposed to innumerable circumstances befalling it, they are completely unworthy of the Son of God.

(3) When the subject in question is not only able to admit the figure, but necessarily demands it, because concepts and words must follow the nature of things and are assumed to denote them. Thus, when a sign is given the name of the thing it signifies, it is given to the pledge of the name for whose confirmation it is given, and is commonly called by the name of the thing which it communicates to us. No one doubts these expressions are figurative, as Augustine observes more than once, Epistle 102: "The thing which signifies takes the name of the thing which it signifies; thus, the Holy Spirit is called a dove, and the rock Christ." I have already noted the sacrament of the Eucharist is not only a sign which represents the body of Christ, an external and visible pledge which confirms its invisible and spiritual possession, but also as a means by which it communicates to us its power which is brought forth in us. But all these σχέσεις [relationships] of sign, pledge, and means are said to be joined together, in the similitude which it has with the body of Christ figuratively, it is only said because of the meaning of the thing.

XXI. (4) When we see that the figurative expression is used in subjects similar to that of the controversy in question, we may certainly conclude that the same figurative expression occurs in the very controversy in question, because like judges like, just as men undoubtedly judge when speaking of the same things. Thus, since circumcision is called the covenant of God, because it was His sign, and the Passover lamb, or Passover, because it was His memorial; when we hear the Jews speaking of the bread which they ate at the Passover, in

place of which the Holy Supper was substituted, this is the bread of suffering which your Fathers ate in the desert; or will it seem strange that Christ said that bread is His body, and Paul that Christ is the Rock? Thus, Augustine against Adimantus, chap. 12, to find the true meaning of that phrase, "Blood is the soul," he returns to examples of figurative expressions in which signs take the names of the things they signify, and these give the expression a metaphorical meaning, namely that blood is a sign of the soul, and Paul said, The rock is Christ," because it signified him, "And Christ did not hesitate to say, This is my body, when he gave us a sign of his body."

XXII. (5) Chrysostom, who in his homily on these words, *Father if it is possible*, etc., says that we should not limit the boundary [of its meaning], but that we should consider the purpose of the speaker, the cause and occasion of his speech, and seek the hidden meaning, to which we add the condition and state of the audience to whom the speech is made; for if all these things lead us to a figure, there is no doubt the expression is figurative. Now, if we consider the sacramental words and the circumstances, we shall immediately discover the aim and intention of the speaker, taking into consideration the cause and occasion of the speech, and the disposition of the audience in using the figure. For Christ sets no other target for Himself than to give the Church the sacrament of His communion with the faithful; for which, indeed, a certain presence of the object is required, not only for contemplation, but also exposed to the consciousness, so that it may be received, but not a physical presence as to substance, inasmuch as flesh and blood are the principles of salvation, peace, and life, not in the kind of physical cause which acts by contact as well as by distance, but in the general sense of a meritorious and moral cause, which

operates not only when it is present, but also when it is absent, nay, when it does not yet exist in the nature of things. The institution of the Holy Supper in the place of Passover was also an occasion where various figurative expressions of speech occurred. Finally, the state of the disciples was such that they could not explain the words of Christ in any other way, as we have shown elsewhere in my *Institutes of Elenctic Theology*, Vol. 3, Topic 19, Q. 26.

XXIII. And from these above the sense of the Pauline statement is quite clear, as well its identity with the sacramental words. Now in a few words the meaning and mystery hidden in that rock must be opened. At first it should not seem surprising that Christ is depicted as a Rock, for other than the symbolism of the sacrament, God is most often designated under this symbol, not only with respect to Himself, because of the eternal firmness and duration of His nature, but also because He is a stronghold and a fortified place against enemies, Psalm 18:2 and 31:3, and the invincible and immovable foundation of the Church, το εἶναι και μενεῖν ασάλευτος [abiding and unshakeable] which He gives to her, Isaiah 28:16, Romans 9:33, 1 Peter 2:6, so that the gates of hell cannot prevail against the Church built upon this Rock, Matt. 16:18. Hence Paul calls Christ the foundation of 1 Cor. 3:11, and Psalm 118:22, "the corner stone," which Bernard explains in the excellent sermon 61 in the Song of Solomon, "What is not good," he says, "in this rock? Exalted in the rock, secure in the rock, firmly established in the rock, I stand safe from the enemy, strong despite danger. And in fact, where is the strength and safety of the weak, except in the wounds of the Saviour? The more secure the dwelling is, the more powerful He is to save, the world roars, the body perishes, the Devil lies in wait, I do not fall, for I am established on a firm rock."

XXIV. But since Paul particularly chooses that rock from which the waters flowed, the reason for the analogy with it must be attended to here alone, which can be complex. For since a rock is especially chosen by God to supply water to the people, which not only does not contain water within itself, but to which nothing is more repugnant in appearance as water giving, for indeed, water can be drawn from other bodies, but not from stone or rock. Thus, nothing seemed more absurd to the flesh than to ask salvation from the Crucifix, that is, life from death, happiness from misery, blessing from cursing. Hence, Christ is called a stumbling block to the Jews, foolishness to the Greeks, but [for us] called the wisdom and power of God.

(2) Again, from a rock the waters flowed; Thus, Christ becomes to His own people a fountain springing into eternal life, who pours out from Himself the waters of grace and salvation in great abundance. Whence the salutary benefits of Christ and the gifts of the Holy Spirit are often outlined in the Prophets under the symbol of waters, Isaiah 41 and 44; Ezek. 36; Zech. 13; John 4 and 7.

(3) But as a rock did not yield water unless it was struck, and once struck, the Israelites fled to the fountain of water, by which they were refreshed. Thus, blood and water flowed from the side of the crucified Christ, with which believers are refreshed in the desert of the world, striving for the land of promise, that is, heaven. For since God could not forgive the sinner anything, unless He was appeased by the satisfaction of the Son, He first had to be smitten and afflicted, that the chastisement of our peace might be laid upon Him, and that we might obtain salvation as a consequence.

(4) But as the rock was struck by the rod of Moses, so Christ was not only struck by the Jews, whose figure Moses bore, but especially by the rod of the Law, of which he was the Minister, that is, by the curse and punishments denounced by the Law, Isaiah 53:4-5; Gal. 3:13.

(5) When the rock was struck, it poured out a great quantity of water which was abundantly sufficient for the people. Thus Christ, who is the inexhaustible source of salvation, in whom is the fullness of all grace, pours out these saving waters in abundance, that is, the gifts of the Spirit, which are abundantly sufficient not for one or the other, but for the whole Church, John 1:16, 4:14, 7:37. Hence, it is said that wisdom, justice, etc., have been made for us by the Father, 1 Cor. 1:30, and to be all in all, Col. 3:11.

(6) So, then nothing could be sweeter to the Israelites in the desert and in those hot places, than springs of sweet gushing water, by which they could quench their thirst. Thus, there is nothing more wholesome, nothing more pleasing to the faithful in the dry and hot desert of the world, than to have a spring of flowing water close at hand, by which they may be refreshed in the heat.

XXV. (7) As a rock poured out waters, not for a moment, which afterwards dried up, but perpetually, as long as the people wandered in the desert, whence it is said that it followed the people, that is, by the trail of rivers flowing from it. Thus, may the blood of Christ and the gifts of grace pervade all times and places, and never dry up and fail, but always accompany the faithful in the desert of this world to sustain them. He is not only present to His faithful by the gifts with which He abundantly supplies them, but He Himself dignifies them with His presence, for He follows, accompanies and presides over them, lest the

redeemed should lack anything in the way. The two greatest privileges of the faithful are designated here, the grace of perseverance and the perpetuity of the gifts of God, and the presence of Christ Himself, according to which He promises to be with us until the end of the ages, Matt. 28:29. It is true that sometimes, in order to chastise ingratitude and exercise the faith of His people, these salutary waters may be withdrawn for a time, as in the desert. However, He never absolutely denies them, but wants us to draw them out by our prayers, as if striking Him, as it were, with the earnestness of faith and repentance.

XXVI. Moreover, multiple differences can also be observed here. The rock of Moses was inanimate and αλόγος [irrational], but Christ is a living Rock, and He will give life to the rational. The rock had no water within, but Christ is the fountain of life, from whose fullness we all draw grace for grace, John 1:16. It could quench their bodily thirst for a time, but not forever. But Christ may give us such a drink of His saving water, that whoever drinks of it once will no longer thirst, but will become in Him a fountain, springing up into eternal life, John 4:14, Γενωιτο [may it be].

The End