

A BRIEF DECLARATION

OF

THE LORD'S SUPPER,

OR

A TREATISE

AGAINST THE

ERROR OF TRANSUBSTANTIATION,

WRITTEN BY

NICOLAS RIDLEY,

BISHOP OF LONDON,

DURING HIS IMPRISONMENT,

A.D. 1555.

UNDERSTAND, good reader, that this great clerk and blessed martyr Bishop Nicholas Ridley sought not (by setting forth this notable godly piece of learned work) the vain glory of the world, nor temporal friendship of men for his present advancement, much less he hunted hereby for Bishoprics and benefices, as all his adversaries (the enemies of Christ's truth and ordinance) the papists commonly do: but, having consideration of the great charge of souls committed unto him, and of the account thereof which the justice of God would require at his hands, intending therewithal to be found blameless in the great day of the Lord, seeing he was put apart to defend the gospel; he not only forsook lands, goods, world, friends, and himself withal, and testified the truth specified in this book by his learned mouth, in the presence of the world, but also (to leave a sure monument and love-token unto his flock) he hath registered it by his own pen in this form ensuing, and sealed it up with his blood. Forasmuch, then, as he hath approved himself no vain disputer, no weathercock, no hypocrite; seeing he hath willingly given

his life for the truth; and inasmuch also as his

love and most constant Christian conscience

speaketh freely unto thee, gentle reader,

I beseech thee, for Christ's sake

and thine own, lend him

thine indifferent heart

and patient

hearing.

A TREATISE
AGAINST THE
ERROR OF TRANSUBSTANTIATION,
MADE BY THE
REVEREND FATHER
NICOLAS RIDLEY,
BISHOP OF LONDON,
IN THE TIME OF HIS IMPRISONMENT.

MANY things confound the weak memory: a few places well weighed and perceived lighten the understanding. Truth is there to be searched, where it is certain to be had.

Though God doth speak the truth by man, yet in man's word (which God hath not revealed to be his) a man may doubt without mistrust in God. Christ is the truth of God revealed unto man from heaven by God himself; and therefore in his word the truth is to be found, which is to be embraced of all that be his. Christ biddeth us ask, and we shall have; search, and we shall find; knock, and it shall be opened unto us.

Therefore, O heavenly Father, Author and fountain of all truth, the bottomless sea of all true understanding; send down, we beseech thee, thy holy Spirit into our hearts, and lighten our understanding with the beams of thy heavenly grace.

We ask thee this, O merciful Father, not in respect of our deserts, but for thy dear Son our Saviour Jesus Christ's sake. Thou knowest, O heavenly Father, that the contro-
versy about the sacrament of the blessed body and blood of thy dear Son, our Saviour Jesus Christ, hath troubled, not of late only, thy church of England, France, Germany, and Italy, but also many years ago. The fault is ours, no doubt, thereof, for we have deserved thy plague.

The blessed
martyr's
prayers.

But, O Lord, be merciful, and relieve our misery with some light of grace. Thou knowest, O Lord, how this wicked world rolleth up and down, and reeleth to and fro, and careth not what thy will is, so it may abide in wealth.

Truth in
time of
affliction
hath few
friends.

If truth have wealth, then who are so stout to defend the truth as they? But, if Christ's cross be laid on truth's back, then they vanish away straight, as wax before the fire. But these are not they, O heavenly Father, for whom I make my most moan, but for those seely¹ ones, O Lord, which have a zeal unto thee: those, I mean, which would and wish to know thy will, and yet are letted, holden back, and blinded, by the subtilties of Satan and his ministers, the wickedness of this wretched world, and the sinful lusts and affections of the flesh.

Alas! Lord, thou knowest that we be of ourselves but flesh, wherein there dwelleth nothing that is good. How then is it possible for man without thee, O Lord, to understand thy truth indeed? Can the natural man perceive the will of God? O Lord, to whom thou givest a zeal for thee, give them also, we beseech thee, the knowledge of thy blessed will. Suffer not them, O Lord, blindly to be led, for to strive against thee, as thou didst those, alas! which crucified thine own dear Son: forgive them, O Lord, for thy dear Son's sake, for they know not what they do. They do think, alas! O Lord, for lack of knowledge, that they do unto thee good service, even when against thee they do most grievously rage. Remember, O Lord, we beseech thee, for whom thy martyr Stephen did pray, and whom thine holy
1 Cor. ii. Apostle did so truly and earnestly love, that, for their salvation, he wished himself accursed from thee. Remember, O
John xvi. heavenly Father, the prayer of thy dear Son our Saviour Christ upon the cross, when he said unto thee: "O Father, forgive them, they know not what they do." With this for-
Acts vii. givenness, O good Lord, give me, I beseech thee, thy grace, so here briefly to set forth the sayings of thy Son our Sa-
Rom. ix. viour Christ, of his Evangelists, and of his Apostles, that, in this aforesaid controversy, the light of thy truth, by the lantern of thy word, may shine upon all them that love thee.

Of the Lord's last supper do speak expressly three of the Evangelists, Matthew, Mark, and Luke; but none more

[¹ Seely—*hodie* silly, the original meaning of the word was happy, fortunate: from that signification it varied through the successive changes inoffensive, weak, or foolish, infirm in body, in which last sense it is even now used in the north of England. It is derived from the Saxon *ræliġ*, happy. Ed.]

plainly nor more fully declareth the same, than doth St Paul, partly in the tenth, but especially in the eleventh chapter of the First Epistle unto the Corinthians. As Matthew and Mark do agree much in form of words, so do likewise Luke and St Paul; but all four, no doubt, as they were all taught in one school, and inspired with one Spirit, so taught they all one truth. God grant us to understand it well. Amen.

Matthew setteth forth Christ's supper thus:

"When even was come, he sat down with the twelve, &c. As they did eat, Jesus took bread, and gave thanks, brake it, and gave it to the disciples, and said: Take, eat, this is my body. And he took the cup, gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying: Drink ye all of this; for this is my blood of the New Testament, that is shed for many for the remission of sins. I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine-tree, until that day when I shall drink that new in my Father's kingdom. And when they had said grace, they went out," &c.

Matt. xxvi.
26—30.

Now Mark speaketh of it thus:

"And, as they ate, Jesus took bread, blessed, and brake, and gave to them, and said: Take, eat, this is my body. And he took the cup, gave thanks, and gave it to them; and they all drank of it. And he said unto them: This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many. Verily, I say unto you, I will drink no more of the fruit of the vine, until that day that I drink that new in the kingdom of God."

Mark xiv.
22—25.

Here Matthew and Mark do agree, not only in the matter, but also almost fully in the form of words, *"saving that, for these words"* in Matthew, "gave thanks," Mark hath one word, "blessed;" which signifieth in this place all one. And, where Matthew saith, "drink ye all of this;" Mark saith, "and they all drank of it." And, where Matthew saith, "of this fruit of the vine;" Mark leaveth out the word "this," and saith, "of the fruit of the vine."

Now let us see likewise what agreement in form of words is between St Luke and St Paul. Luke writeth thus:

"He took bread, gave thanks, brake it, and gave it to

Luke xxii.

[² The words in Italics are not in the editions of this treatise subsequent to 1556. Ed.]

them, saying: This is my body, which is given for you: This do in remembrance of me. Likewise also, when they had supped, he took the cup, saying: This cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for you."

St Paul setteth forth Christ's supper thus:

"The Lord Jesus, the same night in the which he was betrayed, took bread, and gave thanks, and brake, and said: Take, eat, this is my body, which is broken for you. This do in remembrance of me. After the same manner he took the cup, when supper was done, saying: This cup is the New Testament in my blood. This do, as often as ye shall drink it, in the remembrance of me. For as often as ye shall eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye shall show the Lord's death until he come."

Here, where St Luke saith, "which is given;" Paul saith, "which is broken." And as Luke addeth to the words of Paul spoken of the cup, "which is shed for you;" so likewise Paul addeth to the words thereof, "This do, as often as ye shall drink it, in remembrance of me." The rest that followeth in St Paul, both there and in the tenth chapter, pertaineth unto the right use of the Lord's supper.

Thus the Evangelists and St Paul have rehearsed the words and work of Christ, whereby he did institute and ordain this holy sacrament of his body and blood, to be a perpetual remembrance until his coming again of himself (I say), that is, of his body given for us, and of his blood shed for the remission of sins.

But this remembrance, which is thus ordained, as the author thereof is Christ (both God and man), so by the almighty power of God it far passeth all kinds of remembrances that any other man is able to make, either of himself, or of any other thing: for whosoever receiveth this holy sacrament thus ordained in remembrance of Christ, he receiveth therewith either death or life. In this, I trust, we do all agree. For St Paul saith of the godly receivers in the tenth chapter of his First Epistle unto the Corinthians: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the partaking or fellowship of Christ's blood?" And also saith: "The bread which we break (and meaneth at the Lord's table), is it not the partaking or fellowship of Christ's body?"

Now the partaking of Christ's body and of his blood, unto the faithful and godly, is the partaking or fellowship of life and immortality. And again, of the bad and ungodly receivers, St Paul as plainly saith thus: "He that eateth of this bread and drinketh of this cup unworthily, is guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." ^{1 Cor. xi.}

Oh! how necessary then is it, if we love life and would eschew death, to try and examine ourselves before we eat of this bread and drink of this cup! for else, assuredly, he that eateth and drinketh thereof unworthily eateth and drinketh his own damnation, because he esteemeth not the Lord's body; that is, he reverenceth not the Lord's body with the honour that is due unto him.

And that which was said, that with the receipt of the holy sacrament of the blessed body and blood of Christ is received of every one, good or bad, either life or death; it is not meant, that they which are dead before God may hereby receive life; or the living before God can hereby receive death. For as none is meet to receive natural food, whereby the natural life is nourished, except he be born and live before; so no man can feed (by the receipt of the holy sacrament) of the food of eternal life, except he be regenerated and born of God before: and on the other side, no man here receiveth damnation, which is not dead before.

Thus hitherto, without all doubt, God is my witness, I say, so far as I know, there is no controversy among them that be learned among the church of England, concerning the matter of this sacrament, but all do agree, whether they be new or old; and to speak plain, and as some of them do odiously call each other, whether they be Protestants, Pharisees, Papists, or Gospellers.

And as all do agree hitherto in the aforesaid doctrine, so all do detest, abhor, and condemn the wicked heresy of the Messalians, which otherwise be called Euchites, which said, that the holy sacrament can neither do good nor harm: and do also condemn those wicked Anabaptists, which put no difference between the Lord's table and the Lord's meat, and their own. And because charity would, that we should (if it be possible, and so far as we may with the safeguard of good conscience, and maintenance of the truth)

Luke xxii.
19, 20.

1 Cor. xi.

1 Cor. xi.
23-25.

1 Cor. x.

agree with all men; therefore, methinks, it is not charitably done, to burden any man (either new or old, as they call them) further, than such do declare themselves to dissent from what we are persuaded to be the truth, and pretend thereto to be controversies, whereas none such are in deed; and so to multiply the debate, the which, the more it doth increase, the further it doth depart from the unity that the true Christian should desire.

Charity will belie no man.

And again, this is true that the truth neither needeth, nor will be maintained with lies. It is also a true common proverb, "that it is even sin to lie upon the devil: for though by thy lie thou dost never so much speak against the devil, yet in that thou liest, indeed thou workest the devil's work; thou dost him service, and takest the devil's part."

What it is to lie.

The Papists do belie the preachers of the Gospel.

Now, whether then do they godly and charitably, which either by their pen in writing, or by their words in preaching, do bear the simple people in hand, that those which thus do teach and believe, do go about to make the holy sacrament, ordained by Christ himself, a thing no better than a piece of common baken bread? or that do say, that such do make the holy sacrament of the blessed body and blood of Christ nothing else, but a bare sign, or a figure, to represent Christ, none otherwise than the ivy-bush doth represent the wine in a tavern; or as a vile person gorgeously apparelled may represent a king or a prince in a play: alas! let men leave lying and speak the truth every one, not only to his neighbour, but also of his neighbour, for we are members one of another, saith St Paul.

Ephes. iv.

The controversy (no doubt), which at this day troubleth the church (wherein any mean¹ learned man, either old or new, doth stand in²), is not, whether the holy sacrament of the body and blood of Christ is no better than a piece of common bread, or no; or whether the Lord's table is no more to be regarded than the table of any earthly man; or whether it is but a bare sign or figure of Christ, and nothing else, or no. For all do grant, that St Paul's words do require that the bread which we break is the partaking of

[¹ Moderately learned. En.]

[² Doth stand in—doth agree. En.]

the body of Christ: and all also do grant him, that eateth of that bread or drinketh of that cup unworthily, to be guilty of the Lord's death, and to eat and drink his own damnation, because he esteemeth not the Lord's body. All do grant that these words of St Paul (when he saith, "If¹ we eat, it advantageth us nothing;" or, "if we eat not, we want nothing thereby") are not spoken of the Lord's table, but of other common meats.

1 Cor. viii.

Thus then hitherto yet we all agree. But now let us see wherein the dissension doth stand. The understanding of that wherein it chiefly standeth is a step to the true searching forth of the truth. For who can seek well a remedy, if he know not before the disease?

Wherein the controversy consisteth.

It is neither to be denied nor dissembled, that in the matter of this sacrament there be divers points, wherein men counted to be learned cannot agree: as, Whether there be any transubstantiation of the bread, or no? Any corporal and carnal presence of Christ's substance, or no? Whether adoration, only due unto God, is to be done unto the sacrament, or no? And whether Christ's body be there offered in deed unto the heavenly Father by the priest, or no? Or whether the evil man receiveth the natural body of Christ, or no? Yet nevertheless, as in a man diseased in divers parts, commonly the original cause of such divers diseases, which is spread abroad in the body, doth come from one chief member, as from the stomach, or from the head; even so, all five aforesaid points do chiefly hang upon this one question, which is, What is the matter of the sacrament, whether it is the natural substance of bread, or the natural substance of Christ's own body? The truth of this question, truly tried out and agreed upon, no doubt will cease the controversy in all the rest. For if it be Christ's own natural body, born of the Virgin; then assuredly (seeing that all learned men in England, so far as I know, both new and old, grant there to be but one substance), then, I say, they must needs grant transubstantiation, that is, a change of the substance of bread into the substance of Christ's body: then also they must grant the carnal and corporal presence of Christ's body: then must the sacrament be adored with the honour due unto Christ himself, for the

unity of the two natures in one person: then, if the priest do offer the sacrament, he doth offer indeed Christ himself; and finally, the murderer, the adulterer, or wicked man, receiving the sacrament, must needs then receive also the natural substance of Christ's own blessed body, both flesh and blood.

Now, on the other side, if, after the truth shall be truly tried out, it be found that the substance of bread is the material substance of the sacrament; although, for the change of the use, office, and dignity of the bread, the bread indeed sacramentally is changed into the body of Christ, as the water in baptism is sacramentally changed into the fountain of regeneration, and yet the material substance thereof remaineth all one, as was before; if (I say) the true solution of that former question, whereupon all these controversies do hang, be, that the natural substance of bread is the material substance in the sacrament of Christ's blessed body; then must it follow of the former proposition, (confessed of all that be named to be learned, so far as I do know in England,) which is, that there is but one material substance in the sacrament of the body, and one only likewise in the sacrament of the blood, that there is no such thing indeed and in truth as they call transubstantiation, for the substance of bread remaineth still in the sacrament of the body. Then also the natural substance of Christ's human nature, which he took of the Virgin Mary, is in heaven, where it reigneth now in glory, and not here inclosed under the form of bread. Then that godly honour, which is only due unto God the Creator, *may* not be done unto the creature without idolatry and sacrilege, *is* not to be done unto the holy sacrament. Then also the wicked, I mean the impenitent, murderer, adulterer, or such-like, do not receive the natural substance of the blessed body and blood of Christ. Finally, then doth it follow, that Christ's blessed body and blood, which was once only offered and shed upon the cross, being available for the sins of all the whole world, is offered up no more in the natural substance thereof, neither by the priest, nor any other thing.

But here, before we go any further to search in this matter, and to wade, as it were, to search and try out, as

we may, the truth hereof in the Scripture, it shall do well by the way to know, whether they, that thus make answer and solution unto the former principal question, do take away simply and absolutely the presence of Christ's body and blood from the sacrament, ordained by Christ, and duly ministered according to his holy ordinance and institution of the same. Undoubtedly, they do deny that utterly, either so to say, or so to mean. Hereof if a man do or will doubt, the books, which are written already in this matter of them that thus do answer, will make the matter plain.

Now then you will say, what kind of presence do they grant, and what do they deny? Briefly, they deny the presence of Christ's body in the natural substance of his human and assumed nature, and grant the presence of the same by grace: that is, they affirm and say, that the substance of the natural body and blood of Christ is only remaining in heaven, and so shall be unto the latter day, when he shall come again in glory, accompanied with the angels of heaven, to judge both the quick and the dead. And the same natural substance of the very body and blood of Christ, because it is united in the divine nature in Christ, the second Person of the Trinity, therefore it hath not only life in itself, but is also able to give, and doth give life unto so many as be, or shall be partakers thereof: That is, that to all that do believe on his name, which are not born of blood, as St John saith, or of the will of the flesh, or of the will of man, but are born of God—though the self-same substance abide still in heaven, and they, for the time of their pilgrimage, dwell here upon earth; by grace (I say), that is, by the gift of this life (mentioned in John) and the properties of the same meet for our pilgrimage here upon earth, the same body of Christ is here present with us. Even as, for example, we say the same sun, which, in substance, never removeth his place out of the heavens, is yet present here by his beams, light, and natural influence, where it shineth upon the earth. For God's word and his sacraments be, as it were, the beams of Christ, which is *Sol justitiæ*, the Sun of righteousness.

Thus hast thou heard, of what sort or sect soever thou be, wherein doth stand the principal state and chief point of

What kind of presence is to be granted in the Lord's Supper.

Matt. xxiv.

John vi.

John i.

John vi.

Mal. iv.

all the controversies, which do properly pertain unto the nature of this sacrament. As for the use thereof, I grant, there be many other things whereof here I have spoken nothing at all. And now, lest thou mayest justly complain and say, that I have, in opening of this matter, done nothing else but digged a pit, and have not shut it up again; or broken a gap, and have not made it up again; or opened the book, and have not closed it again; or else, to call me what thou listest, as neutral dissembler, or whatsoever else thy lust and learning shall serve thee to name me worse;—therefore here now I will, by God's grace, not only shortly, but also clearly and plainly as I can, make thee to know, whether of the aforesaid two answers to the former principal state and chief point doth like me best. Yea, and also I will hold all those accursed, which in this matter, that now so troubleth the church of Christ, have of God received the key of knowledge, and yet go about to shut up the doors, so that they themselves will not enter in, nor suffer other that would. And, for mine own part, I consider, both of late what charge and cure of souls hath been committed unto me, whereof God knoweth how soon I shall be called to give account, and also now in this world what peril and danger of the laws (concerning my life) I am now in at this present time: what folly were it then for me now to dissemble with God, of whom assuredly I look and hope by Christ to have everlasting life! Seeing that such charge and danger (both before God and man) do compass me in round about on every side; therefore (God willing) I will frankly and freely utter my mind; and though my body be captive, yet my tongue and my pen, as long as I may, shall freely set forth that which undoubtedly I am persuaded to be the truth of God's word. And yet I will do it under this protestation, call me a Protestant who listeth, I pass not thereof¹. My protestation shall be thus: that my mind is and ever shall be, (God willing), to set forth sincerely the true sense and meaning (to the best of my understanding) of God's most holy word, and not to decline from the same, either for fear of worldly danger, or else for hope of gain.

I do protest also due obedience and submission of my

[¹ I pass not thereof. I care not for it. Ed.]

A protestation.

judgment in this my writing, and in all other mine affairs, unto those of Christ's Church, which be truly learned in God's holy word, gathered in Christ's name, and guided by his Spirit. After this protestation, I do plainly affirm and say, that the *second answer, made unto the chief*² question and principal point, I am persuaded to be the very true meaning and sense of God's holy word; that is, that the natural substance of bread and wine is the true material substance of the holy sacrament of the blessed body and blood of our Saviour Christ: and the places of Scripture whereupon this my faith is grounded, be these, both concerning the sacrament of the body, and also of the blood.

Answer to the chief question.

First, let us repeat the beginning of the institution of the Lord's supper, wherein all the three Evangelists and St Paul almost in words do agree; saying, that "Jesus took bread, gave thanks, brake, and gave to the disciples, saying, Take, eat, this is my body." Here it appeareth plainly, that Christ calleth very bread his body. For that which he took was very bread (in this all men do agree); and that which he took, after he had given thanks, he brake; and that which he took and brake, he gave it to his disciples; and that which he took, brake, and gave to his disciples, he said himself of it: "This is my body." So it appeareth plainly that Christ called very bread his body. But very bread cannot be his body in very substance thereof. Therefore it must needs have another meaning, which meaning appeareth plainly, what it is, by the next sentence that followeth immediately, both in Luke and in Paul.

Christ calleth very bread his body.

And that is this: "Do this in remembrance of me." Whereupon it seemeth to me to be evident, that Christ did take bread, and called it his body, for that he would thereby institute a perpetual remembrance of his body, specially of that singular benefit of our redemption, which he would then procure and purchase unto us by his body upon the cross. But bread, retaining still its own very natural substance, may be thus by grace, and in a sacramental signification, his body: whereas else the very bread, which he took, brake, and gave them, could not be in any wise his

Argument. Luke xxii. 1 Cor. xi.

[² The words in Italics are wanting in the editions subsequent to 1556. Ed.]

natural body, for that were confusion of substances. And therefore the very words of Christ, joined with the next sentence following, both enforce us to confess the very bread to remain still, and also open unto us, how that bread may be, and is thus, by his divine power, his body which was given for us.

Objection. But here I remember, I have read in some writers of the contrary opinion, which do deny, that that, which Christ did take, he brake. For, say they, after his taking, he blessed it, as Mark doth speak; and by his blessing he changed the natural substance of the bread into the natural substance of his body: and so, although he took the bread and blessed it, yet because in blessing he changed the substance of it, he brake not the bread, which then was not there, but only the form thereof.

Answer. Unto this objection I have two plain answers, both grounded upon God's word. The one I will rehearse; the other answer I will defer, until I speak of the sacrament of the blood. Mine answer here is taken out of the plain words of St Paul, which doth manifestly confound this fantastical invention, first invented, I ween, of Pope Innocentius', and after confirmed by that subtle sophister Duns, and lately renewed now in our days with an eloquent style and much fineness of wit. But what can crafty invention, subtilty in sophisms, eloquence or fineness of wit, prevail against the unfallible word of God? What need have we to strive and contend what thing we break? For Paul saith, speaking undoubtedly of the Lord's table: "The bread, saith he, which we break, is it not the partaking or fellowship of the Lord's body?" Whereupon followeth, that after the thanksgiving it is bread which we break. And how often, in the Acts of the Apostles, is the Lord's supper signified by breaking of bread? "They did persevere," saith St Luke, "in the Apostles' doctrine, communion, and breaking of bread." And, "They brake bread in every house." And again, in another place, "When they were come together to break bread, &c." St Paul, which setteth forth the most fully in his writings both the doctrine and the right use of the

It is meant of a book first set forth under the name of Marcus Antonius Constantius, and afterward of Stephen Gardiner, Bishop of Winchester.

Acts ii.

Ibidem.

Acts xx.

Lord's supper, and the sacramental eating and drinking of Christ's body and blood, calleth it five times, "bread," "bread," "bread," "bread." ^{1 Cor. x.} ^{1 Cor. xi.}

The sacramental bread is the mystical body: and so it is called in Scripture, as it is called the natural body of Christ. But Christ's mystical body is the congregation of Christians. Now no man was ever so fond, as to say, that that sacramental bread is transubstantiated and changed into the substance of the congregation. Wherefore no man should likewise think or say, that the bread is transubstantiated and changed into the natural substance of Christ's human nature. ^{The second reason.} ^{1 Cor. x.}

But my mind is not here to write what may be gathered out of Scriptures for this purpose, but only to note here briefly those which seem unto me to be the most plain places. Therefore, contented to have spoken thus much of the sacramental bread, I will now speak a little of the Lord's cup.

And this shall be my third argument, grounded upon Christ's own words. The natural substance of the sacramental wine remaineth still, and is the material substance of the sacrament of the blood of Christ: therefore it is likewise so in the sacramental bread. ^{The third argument.}

I know, that he that is of a contrary opinion, will deny the former part of my argument: but I will prove it thus, by the plain words of Christ himself, both in Matthew and in Mark. Christ's words are these, after the words said upon the cup²: "I say unto you (saith Christ), I will not drink henceforth of *this* fruit of the vine-tree, until I shall drink that new in my Father's kingdom." Here note, how Christ calleth plainly his cup the fruit of the vine-tree. But the fruit of the vine-tree is very natural wine. Wherefore the natural substance of the wine doth remain still in the sacrament of Christ's blood. ^{Matt. xxvi.} ^{Mark xiv.}

And here, in speaking of the Lord's cup, it cometh unto my remembrance the vanity of Innocentius his fantastical invention, which by Paul's words I did confute before,

[² Λέγω δὲ ὑμῖν ὅτι οὐ μὴ πῖω ἀπ' ἄρτι ἐκ τούτου τοῦ γεννηματος τῆς ἀμπέλου ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ἐκείνης ὅταν αὐτὸ πίνω μεθ' ὑμῶν καινὸν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ τοῦ πατρὸς μου. Matth. xxvi. 29.]

[¹ Innocent III., in the fourth Lateran Council, held A.D. 1215. Ed.]

and here did promise somewhat more to speak; and that is this: If the transubstantiation be made by this word "blessed" in Mark, said upon the bread, as Innocentius, that Pope, did say; then surely, seeing that word is not said of Christ, neither of any of the Evangelists, nor in St Paul, upon the cup, there is no transubstantiation of the wine at all. For where the cause doth fail, there cannot follow the effect. But the sacramental bread, and the sacramental wine, do both remain in their natural substance alike; and if the one be not changed, as of the sacramental wine it appeareth evidently, then there is not any such transubstantiation in neither of them both.

All, that put and affirm this change of the substance of bread and wine into the substance of Christ's body and blood (called transubstantiation), do also say and affirm this change to be made by a certain form of prescript words, and none other. But what¹ they be that make the change either of the one or of the other, undoubtedly even they, that do write most finely in these our days, almost confess plainly that they cannot tell. For although they grant to certain of the old doctors, as Chrysostom and Ambrose, that these words, "This is my body," are the words of consecration of the sacrament of the body: "yet," say they, "these words may well be so called, because they do assure us of the consecration thereof, whether it be done before these words be spoken, or no." But, as for this their doubt (concerning the sacrament of the body), I let it pass.

Let us now consider the words which pertain to the cup. This is first evident: that, as Matthew much agreeth with Mark, and likewise Luke with Paul much agreeth, herein in the form of words; so, in the same, the form of words in Matthew and Mark is diverse from that which is in Luke and Paul. The old authors do most rehearse the form of words in Matthew and Mark, because, I ween, they seemed to them most clear. But here I would know, whether it is credible or no, that Luke and Paul, when they celebrated the Lord's supper with their congregations, did not use the same form of words at the Lord's table, which they wrote, Luke in his Gospel, and Paul in his Epistle. Of Luke,

[¹ But which be the words. Ed.]

because he was a physician, whether some will grant that he might be a priest or no, and was able to receive the order of priesthood, which (they say) is given by virtue of these words said by the Bishop, "Take thou authority to sacrifice for the quick and the dead," I cannot tell. But, if they should be so strait upon Luke, either for his craft, or else for lack of such power given him by virtue of the aforesaid words: then, I ween, both Peter and Paul are in danger to be deposed of their priesthood; for the craft either of fishing, which was Peter's, or making of tents, which was Paul's, were more vile than the science of physie. And, as for those sacramental words of the order of priesthood, to have authority to sacrifice both for the quick and the dead, I ween, Peter and Paul (if they were both alive) were not able to prove, that ever Christ gave them such authority, or ever said any such words unto them. But I will let Luke go: and, because Paul speaketh more for himself, I will rehearse his words. "That (saith Paul) which I received of the Lord, I gave unto you: for the Lord Jesus, &c.:" and so setteth forth the whole institution and right use of the Lord's supper. Now, seeing that Paul here saith; that, which he received of the Lord, he had given them; and that, which he had received and given them before by word of mouth, now he rehearseth and writeth the same in his Epistle: is it credible that Paul would never use this form of words upon the Lord's cup, which (as he saith) he received of the Lord, that he had given them before, and now rehearseth in his Epistle? I trust, no man is so far from all reason, but he will grant me that this is not likely to be.

Now then, if you grant me that Paul did use the form of words which he writeth, let us then rehearse and consider Paul's words, which he saith Christ spake thus upon the cup: "This cup is the New Testament in my blood; this do as often as ye shall drink it in the remembrance of me."

Here I would know, whether that Christ's words, spoken upon the cup, were not as mighty in work, and as effectual in signification, to all intents, constructions, and purposes (as our Parliament men do speak), as they were, spoken upon

Peter and Paul were no priests of the popish order.

1 Cor. xi.

Winchester in the answer to the 48th objection.

With what words the popish priesthood is given.

the bread? If this be granted, which thing, I think, no man can deny, then further I reason thus: but the word "is" in the words spoken upon the Lord's bread, doth mightily signify (they say) the change of the substance of that which goeth before it, into the substance of that which followeth after; that is, of the substance of Christ's body, when Christ saith, This is my body. Now then, if Christ's words, which be spoken upon the cup, which Paul here rehearseth, be of the same might and power both in working and signifying; then must this word "is," when Christ saith, "This cup is the New Testament, &c." turn the substance of the cup into the substance of the New Testament. And, if thou wilt say, that this word "is" neither maketh nor signifieth any such change of the cup, although it be said of Christ, that this cup is the New Testament, yet Christ meant no such change as that; marry, Sir, even so say I, when Christ said of the bread which he took, and after thanks given, brake, and gave them, saying, "Take, eat, this is my body;" he meant no more any such change of the substance of bread into the substance of his natural body, than he meant of *the change and transubstantiation of the cup into the substance of*¹ the New Testament.

And, if thou wilt say, that the word ("cup") here in Christ's words doth not signify the cup itself, but the wine, or thing contained in the cup, by a figure called *metonymy*, for that Christ's words meant, and so must needs be taken; thou sayest very well. But, I pray thee by the way, here note two things: first, that this word ("is") hath no such strength and signification in the Lord's words, to make or to signify any transubstantiation: secondly, that, in the Lord's words, whereby he instituted the sacrament of his blood, he used a figurative speech. How vain then is it, that some so earnestly do say, as if it were an infallible rule, that in doctrine and in the institution of the sacraments Christ used no figures, but all his words are to be strained to their proper signification; when as here, whatsoever thou sayest was in the cup, neither that, nor the cup itself (taking every word in its proper signification), was the New Testament:

[¹ These words are found in the edition of 1556, but not in those subsequent. Ed.]

but in understanding that, which was in the cup, by the cup, that is a figurative speech. Yea, and also thou canst not verify, or truly say of that (whether thou sayest it was wine or Christ's blood) to be the New Testament, without a figure also. Thus, in one sentence spoken of Christ in the institution of the sacrament of his blood, the figure must help us twice: so untrue is it that some do write; that Christ useth no figure, in the doctrine of faith, nor in the institution of his sacraments.

But some say: if we shall thus admit figures in doctrine; then shall all the articles of our faith, by figures and allegories, shortly be transformed and unloosed. I say, it is like fault, and even the same, to deny the figure where the place so requireth to be understood, as vainly to make it a figurative speech, which is to be understood in its proper signification.

The rules, whereby the speech is known, when it is a figurative, and when it is not, St Augustine, in his book called *De Doctrina Christiana*, giveth divers learned lessons, very necessary to be known of the student in God's word. Of the which one I will rehearse, which is this: "If²" (saith he) "the Scripture doth seem to command a thing which is wicked or ungodly, or to forbid a thing that charity doth require; then know thou (saith he) that the speech is figurative." And, for example, he bringeth the saying of Christ in the 6th chapter of St John: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, ye cannot have life in you." It seemeth to command a wicked or an ungodly thing. Wherefore it is a figurative speech, commanding to have communion and fellowship with Christ's passion, and devoutly and wholesomely to lay up in memory that his flesh was crucified and wounded for us."

And here I cannot but marvel at some men, surely of much excellent fineness of wit, and of great eloquence, that

[² Si autem flagitium aut facinus videtur jubere, aut utilitatem aut beneficentiam vetare, figurata est. "Nisi manducaveritis (inquit) carnem filii hominis, et sanguinem biberitis, non habebitis vitam in vobis." Facinus vel flagitium videtur jubere: figura est ergo, præcipiens, passioni Dominicæ communicandum, et suaviter atque utiliter recondendum in memoria quod pro nobis caro ejus crucifixa et vulnerata sit. S. Augustini de doctr. Christ. lib. iii. c. 16. Op. Ed. Ben. Par. 1679, vol. ii. col. 52. Ed.]

Note well the papists' error confuted.

Aug. de doct. Christiana, lib. iii. c. 16.

are not ashamed to write and say, that this aforesaid saying of Christ is (after St Augustine) a figurative speech indeed, howbeit not unto the learned, but unto the unlearned. Here let any man, that indifferently understandeth the Latin tongue, read the place in St Augustine: and, if he perceive not clearly St Augustine's words and mind to be contrary, let me abide thereof the rebuke.

This lesson of St Augustine I have therefore the rather set forth; because, as it teacheth us to understand that place in John figuratively, even so surely the same lesson with the example of St Augustine's exposition thereof teacheth us, not only by the same to understand Christ's words in the institution of the sacrament, both of his body and of his blood, figuratively, but also the very true meaning and understanding of the same. For if to command to eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and to drink his blood, seemeth to command an inconvenience and an ungodliness; and is even so indeed, if it be understood, as the words do stand in their proper signification, and therefore must be understood figuratively and spiritually, as St Augustine doth godly and learnedly interpret them; then surely Christ, commanding in his last supper to eat his body and to drink his blood, seemeth to command, in sound of words, as great and even the same inconvenience and ungodliness, as did his words in the 6th chapter of St John; and therefore must even by the same reason be likewise understood and expounded figuratively and spiritually, as St Augustine did the other. Whereunto that exposition of St Augustine may seem to be the more meet, for that Christ in his supper, to the commandment of eating and drinking of his body and blood, addeth: "Do this in the remembrance of me." Which words, surely, were the key that opened and revealed this spiritual and godly exposition unto St Augustine.

But I have tarried longer in setting forth the form of Christ's words upon the Lord's cup, written by Paul and Luke, than I did intend to do. And yet, in speaking of the form of Christ's words spoken upon his cup, cometh now to my remembrance the form of words used in the Latin mass upon the Lord's cup. Whereof I do not a little marvel, what should be the cause, seeing the Latin mass agreeth with the Evangelists and Paul in the form of words said upon the

Gardiner in his answers to the 161st and 226th objection.

Words of the Latin mass.

bread, why, in the words upon the Lord's cup, it differeth from them all; yea, and addeth to the words of Christ, spoken upon the cup, these words, *mysterium fidei*, that is, "the mystery of faith;" which are not read to be attributed unto the sacrament of Christ's blood, neither in the Evangelists, nor in Paul, nor (so far as I know) in any other place of holy Scripture. Yea, and if it may have some good exposition, yet, why it should not be as well added unto the words of Christ upon his bread, as upon his cup, surely I do not see that mystery.

And, because I see in the use of the Latin mass the sacrament of the blood abused, when it is denied unto the lay people, clean contrary unto God's most certain word; for why, I do beseech thee, should the sacrament of Christ's blood be denied unto the lay Christians, more than to the priest? Did not Christ shed his blood as well for the lay godly man as for the godly priest? If thou wilt say, Yes, that he did so; but yet the sacrament of the blood is not to be received without the offering up and sacrificing thereof unto God the Father, both for the quick and for the dead; and no man may make oblation of Christ's blood unto God, but a priest, and therefore the priest alone (and that but in his mass only) may receive the sacrament of the blood: and call you this, my masters, *mysterium fidei*?

The abuse of the Sacrament in the Latin mass.

Alas! alas! I fear me, this is before God *mysterium iniquitatis*, the mystery of iniquity, such as Paul speaketh of in his Epistle to the Thessalonians. The Lord be merciful unto us, and bless us, and lighten his countenance upon us, and be merciful unto us; that we may know thy way upon earth, and among all people thy salvation.

2 Thess. ii. Ps. lxxvii.

This kind of oblation standeth upon transubstantiation, its german cousin, and do grow both upon one ground. The Lord weed out of his vineyard shortly (if it be his will and pleasure) that bitter root!

To speak of this oblation; how much it is injurious unto Christ's passion, how it cannot but with high blasphemy, and heinous arrogance, and intolerable pride, be claimed of any man, other than of Christ himself; how much and how plainly it repugneth unto the manifest words, the true sense and meaning, of holy Scripture in many places, especially in the

The mass sacrifice injurious to Christ's passion.

Heb. ix.

Epistle to the Hebrews; the matter is so long, and others have written of it at large, that my mind is now not to entreat thereof any further.

For only in this my scribbling I intended to search out and set forth by the Scriptures (according to God's gracious gift of my poor knowledge), whether the true sense and meaning of Christ's words in the institution of his holy supper do require any transubstantiation (as they call it), or that the very substance of bread and wine do remain still in the Lord's supper, and be the material substance of the holy sacrament of Christ our Saviour's blessed body and blood. Yet there remaineth one vain quiddity of Duns in this matter, the which, because some that write now do seem to like it so well, that they have stripped him out of Duns' dusty and dark terms, and pricked him and painted him in fresh colours of an eloquent style, may therefore deceive the more, except the error be warily eschewed.

Duns saith in these words of Christ, This is my body, "This pronoun demonstrative, meaning the word 'this,' if ye will know what it doth shew or demonstrate, whether the bread that Christ took or no, he answereth, no; but only one thing in substance it pointeth, whereof the nature and name it doth not tell, but leaveth that to be determined and told by that which followeth the word, 'is,' that is, by *predicatum*, as the logician doth speak:" and therefore he calleth this pronoun demonstrative "this," *individuum vagum*, that is, a wandering proper name, whereby we may point out and shew any one thing in substance, what thing soever it be.

That this imagination is vain and untruly applied unto those words of Christ, "This is my body," it may appear plainly by the words of Luke and Paul, said upon the cup, conferred with the form of words spoken upon the cup in Matthew and Mark: for as upon the bread it is said of all, "This is my body;" so of Matthew and Mark is said of the cup, "This is my blood." Then, if in the words, "This is my body," the word ("this") be, as Duns calleth it, "a wandering name," to appoint and shew forth any one thing, whereof the name and nature it doth not tell; so must it be likewise in these words of Matthew and Mark upon the

Lord's cup, "This is my blood." But, in the words of Matthew and Mark, it signifieth and pointeth out the same that it doth in the Lord's words upon the cup in Luke and Paul, where it is said, "This cup is the New Testament in my blood, &c." Therefore, in Matthew and Mark, the pronoun demonstrative ("this") doth not wander to point out only one thing in substance, not shewing what it is, but telleth plainly what it is, no less in Matthew and Mark unto the eye, than is done in Luke and Paul, by putting too this word "cup" both unto the eye and unto the ear.

For taking the cup, and demonstrating or shewing it unto his disciples by this pronoun demonstrative "this," and saying unto them, "Drink ye all of this;" it was then all one to say, "This is my blood," as to say, "This cup is my blood," meaning by the cup, as the nature of the speech doth require, the thing contained in the cup. So likewise, without all doubt, when Christ had taken bread, given thanks, and broken it, and giving it to his disciples, said, "Take;" and so demonstrating and shewing that bread which he had in his hands¹, to say then, "This is my body," and to have said, "This bread is my body." As it were all one, if a man, lacking a knife, and going to his oysters, would say to another, whom he saw to have two knives, "Sir, I pray you lend me the one of your knives;" were it not now all one to answer him: "Sir, hold, I will lend you *this* to eat your meat, but not to open oysters withal:" and "Hold, I will lend you *this knife* to eat your meat, but not to open oysters?"

This similitude serveth but for this purpose, to declare the nature of speech withal: whereas the thing that is demonstrated and shewed, is evidently perceived, and openly known to the eye. But, O good Lord, what a wonderful thing is it to see, how some men do labour to teach, what is demonstrated and shewed by the pronoun demonstrative, Gardiner to the 13th objection. "this," in Christ's words, when he saith: "This is my body;" "this is my blood:" how they labour (I say) to teach what that "this" was then in deed, when Christ spake in the beginning of the sentence the word "this," before he had pronounced the rest of the words that followed in the same sentence; so that their doctrine may agree with

[¹ Subaudi—it is all one. Ed.]

Gardiner in the answer to the 15th objection.

their transubstantiation: which indeed is the very foundation wherein all their erroneous doctrine doth stand. And here the transubstantiators do not agree among themselves, no more than they do in the words which wrought the transubstantiation, when Christ did first institute his sacrament.

Innocentius
III. Epist.
lib. v. ep.
121.

The papists
themselves
do not a-
gree.

Wherein Innocentius^a, a Bishop of Rome, of the latter days, and Duns (as was noted before), do attribute the work unto the word *benedixit*, "he blessed:" but the rest for the most part to *hoc est corpus meum*, "this is my body." Duns, therefore, with his sect, because he putteth the change before, must needs say, that "this," when Christ spake it in the beginning of the sentence, was indeed Christ's body. For in the change the substance of bread did depart, and the change was new done in "benedixit," saith he, that went before. And therefore, after him and his, that "this" was then indeed Christ's body, though the word did not then import so much, but only one thing in substance, which substance, after Duns, the bread being gone, must needs be the substance of Christ's body. But they, that put their transubstantiation to be wrought by these words of Christ, "This is my body," and do say, that, when the whole sentence was finished, then this change was perfected, and not before: they cannot say, but yet Christ's "this" in the beginning of the sentence, before the other words were fully pronounced, was bread indeed. But as yet the change was not done, and so long the bread must needs remain: and so long, with the universal consent of all transubstantiators, the natural substance of Christ's body cannot come; and, therefore, must their "this" of necessity demonstrate and shew the substance, which was as yet in the pronouncing of the first word "this" by Christ, but bread. But how can they make and verify Christ's words to be true, demonstrating the substance, which, in the demonstration, is but bread, and say thereof, "This is my body," that is, as they say, the natural substance of Christ's body; except they would say, that the verb "is" signifieth, "is made," or "is changed into?" And so then, if the same verb "is" be of the same effect in Christ's words spoken upon the cup, and rehearsed by Luke and Paul; the cup, or the wine in the cup, must

^a See note A. at the end of the volume.

be made or turned into the New Testament, as was declared before.

There be some among the transubstantiators, which walk so wilyly and so warily betwixt these two aforesaid opinions, allowing them both, and holding plainly neither of them both, that methink they may be called neutrals, ambidexters, or rather such as can shift on both sides. They play on both parts: for, with the latter, they do all allow the doctrine of the last syllable; which is, that transubstantiation is done by miracle in an instant, at the sound of the last syllable ("um") in this sentence, *hoc est corpus meum*: and they do allow Duns' fantastical imagination of *individuum vagum*, which demonstrateth (as he teacheth) in Christ's words one thing in substance, that being (after his mind) the substance of the body of Christ.

Winchester
is become
neutral.

A marvellous thing, how any man can agree with both those two, they being so contrary the one to the other. For the one saith; The word ("this") demonstrateth the substance of bread: and the other saith; "No, not so; the bread is gone, and it demonstrateth a substance, which is Christ's body." "Tush," saith the third man, "ye understand nothing at all: they agree well enough in the chief point, which is the ground of all; that is, both do agree and bear witness, that there is transubstantiation."

Gardiner to
the 8th ob-
jection.

They do agree, indeed, in that conclusion, I grant: but their proofs and doctrine thereof do even as well agree together, as did the false witnesses before Annas and Caiaphas against Christ, or the two wicked judges against Susanna. For against Christ the false witnesses did agree, no doubt, to speak all against him. And the wicked judges were both agreed to condemn poor Susanna: but, in examination of their witness, they dissented so far, that all was found false, that they went about; both that wherein they agreed, and all those things which they brought for their proofs.

God-makers
agree among
themselves.

Thus much have I spoken, in searching out a solution for this principal question: which was; What is the material substance of the holy sacrament in the Lord's supper? Now, lest I should seem to set by mine own conceit, more than is meet; or less to regard the doctrine of the old ecclesiastical writers, than is convenient for a man of my poor learning

The consent
of the old
authors.

and simple wit for to do; and because also I am indeed persuaded, that the old ecclesiastical writers understood the true meaning of Christ in this matter; and have both so truly and so plainly set it forth in certain places of their writings, that no man, which will vouchsafe to read them, and without prejudice of a corrupt judgment will indifferently weigh them, and construe their minds none otherwise than they declare themselves to have meant: I am persuaded (I say), that, in reading of them thus, no man can be ignorant in this matter, but he that will shut up his own eyes, and blindfold himself. When I speak of ecclesiastical writers, I mean of such as were before the wicked usurpation of the See of Rome was grown so unmeasurably great, that not only with tyrannical power, but also with corrupt doctrine, it began to subvert Christ's Gospel, and to turn the state, that Christ and his Apostles had set in the church, upside down.

For the causes aforesaid, I will rehearse certain of their sayings: and yet, because I take them but for witnesses and expounders of this doctrine, and not as the authors of the same; and also for that now I will not be tedious, I will rehearse but few: that is, three old writers of the Greek church, and other three of the Latin church, which do seem unto me to be in this matter most plain: the Greek authors are Origen, Chrysostom, and Theodoret: the Latin are Tertullian, St Augustine, and Gelasius.

I know, there can be nothing spoken so plainly, but the crafty wit, furnished with eloquence, can darken it, and wrest it quite from the true meaning to a contrary sense. And I know also that eloquence, craft, and fineness of wit, hath gone about to blear men's eyes and to stop their ears in the aforesaid writers, that men should neither hear nor see what those authors both write and teach so plainly, that, except men should be made both stark blind and deaf, they cannot but of necessity, if they will read and weigh them indifferently, both hear and see what they do mean, when eloquence, craft, and fineness of wit, have done all that they can. Now let us hear the old writers of the Greek church.

Origen.
Ecccl. Hist.
Lib. vi. cap.
3.

Origen, which lived above twelve hundred and fifty years ago; a man, for the excellency of his learning, so highly

esteemed in Christ's church, that he was counted and judged the singular teacher, in his time, of Christ's religion, the confounder of heresies, the schoolmaster of many godly martyrs, and an opener of high mysteries in Scripture: he, writing upon the 15th chapter of St Matthew's Gospel, saith thus: "But if any thing enter into the mouth, it goeth away into the belly, and is avoided into the draught. Yea, and that meat which is sanctified by the word of God and prayer, concerning the matter thereof, it goeth away into the belly, and is avoided into the draught. But, for the prayer which is added unto it, for the proportion of the faith, it is made profitable, making the mind able to perceive and to see that which is profitable. For it is not the material substance of bread, but the word, which is spoken upon it, that is profitable to the man, that eateth it not unworthily. And this I mean of the typical and symbolical (that is, sacramental) body." Thus far go the words of Origen; where it is plain, first, that Origen, speaking here of the sacrament of the Lord's supper, as the last words do plainly signify, doth mean and teach, that the material substance thereof is received, digested, and voided, as the material substance of other bread and meats is: which could not be, if there were no material substance of bread at all, as the fantastical opinion of transubstantiation doth put.

Origen in
Matt. xv.

It is a world to see the answer of the Papists to this place of Origen.

In the disputations, which were in this matter in the parliament house, and in both the universities of Cambridge and Oxford, they that defended transubstantiation said, that this part of Origen was but set forth of late by Erasmus, and therefore is to be suspected. But how vain this their an-

The disputations in the parliament house and in the universities.

[*Πάν τὸ εἰσπορευόμενον εἰς τὸ στόμα εἰς κοιλίαν χωρεῖ καὶ εἰς ἀφεδρῶνα ἐκβάλλεται καὶ τὸ ἀγιαζόμενον βρῶμα διὰ λόγου Θεοῦ καὶ ἐντενξέως, κατ' αὐτὸ μὲν τὸ ὑλικόν, εἰς τὴν κοιλίαν χωρεῖ καὶ εἰς ἀφεδρῶνα ἐκβάλλεται κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἐπιγνωμένην αὐτῷ εὐχήν, κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως ἀφέλιμον γίνεται, καὶ τῆς τοῦ νοῦ αἴτιον διαβλέψεως, ὀρῶντος ἐπὶ τὸ ὠφελοῦν, καὶ οὐχ ἡ ὑλὴ τοῦ ἄρτου, ἀλλ' ὁ ἐπ' αὐτῷ εἰρημένος λόγος ἐστὶν ὁ ὠφελῶν τὸν μὴ ἀναξίως τοῦ κυρίου ἐσθίοντα αὐτόν.* Orig. Op. Ed. Ben. Par. 1783, vol. iii. pp. 499, 500. In Matth. Comment. Hom. xi. Ed.]

swer is, it appeareth plainly. For so may all the good old authors, which lay in old libraries, and are set forth of late, be by this reason rejected: as Clemens Alexandrinus, Theodoretus, Justinus, Ecclesiastica Historia Nicephori, and other such.

Another objection.

Another answer they had, saying: that Origen is noted to have erred in some points; and, therefore, faith is not to be given in this matter unto him. But this answer, well weighed, doth minister good matter to the clear confutation of itself. For indeed we grant that in some points Origen did err. But those errors are gathered out and noted both of St Hierome and Epiphanius, so that his works (those errors excepted) are now so much the more of authority, that such great learned men took pains to draw out of him whatsoever they thought in him to be written amiss. But, as concerning the matter of the Lord's supper, neither they nor yet ever any other ancient author did ever say, that Origen did err.

Gardiner to the 166th objection.

Now, because these two answers have been of late so confuted and confounded, that it is well perceived, that they will take no place; therefore some, which have written since that time, have forged two other answers, even of the same mould.

The former whereof is, that Origen in this place spake not of the sacrament of bread or wine of the Lord's table, but of another mystical meat, of the which St Augustine maketh mention, to be given unto them, that were taught the faith, before they were baptized. But Origen's own words in two sentences before rehearsed, being put together, prove this answer untrue. For he saith, that "he meaneth of that figurative and mystical body, which profiteth them that do receive it worthily:" alluding so plainly unto St Paul's words, spoken of the Lord's supper, that it is a shame for any learned man once to open his mouth to the contrary. And that bread, which St Augustine speaketh of, he cannot prove that any such thing was used in Origen's time. Yea, and though that could be proved, yet was there never *bread at any time called a sacramental body*¹, saving the sacramental bread of the Lord's table, which is called of Origen the typical and symbolical body of Christ.

[¹ The words in Italics, though found in the edition of 1556, are not in those subsequent. Ed.]

The second of the two new-found answers is yet most monstrous of all other, which is this. "But let us grant (say they) that Origen spake of the Lord's supper, and by the matter thereof was understood the material substance of bread and wine: what then?" say they. "For though the material substance was once gone and departed by reason of transubstantiation, whilst the forms of the bread and wine did remain; yet now it is no inconvenience to say, that as the material substance did depart at the entering in of Christ's body under the aforesaid forms, so, when the said forms be destroyed and do not remain, then cometh again the substance of bread and wine. And this," say they, "is very meet in this mystery, that that which began with a miracle, shall end in a miracle." If I had not read this fantasy, I would scarcely have believed, that any learned man ever would have set forth such a foolish fantasy; which not only lacketh all ground either of God's word, reason, or of any ancient writer, but is also clean contrary to the common rules of school divinity; which is, that no miracle is to be affirmed and put without necessity. And, although for their former miracle, which is their transubstantiation, they have some colour, though it be but vain; saying, it is done by the power and virtue of these words of Christ, "This is my body:" yet to make this second miracle, of returning the material substance again, they have no colour at all. Or else, I pray them shew me, by what words of Christ is the second miracle wrought? Thus ye may see, that the sleights and shifts, which craft and wit can invent, to wrest the true sense of Origen, cannot take place. But now let us hear one other place of Origen, and so we will let him go.

Origen, in the seventh Homily, *super Leviticum*, saith, ^{The second authority of Origen.} ²that there is also even in the four Gospels, and not only in the Old Testament, a letter (meaning a literal sense),

[² Est enim in Evangeliiis litera quæ occidet, non solum in veteri testamento occidens litera deprehenditur. Est et in novo testamento litera quæ occidet eum qui non spiritaliter quæ dicuntur adverterit. Si enim secundum literam sequaris hoc ipsum quod dictum est "Nisi manducaveritis carnem meam et biberitis sanguinem meum," occidit hæc litera. Orig. Op. Ed. Ben. Par. 1783, vol. ii. p. 225. Hom. sup. Levit. vii. Interp. Ruf. Ep.]

which killeth: for, if thou follow (saith he) the letter in that saying, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, &c." this letter doth kill. If in that place the letter doth kill, wherein is commanded the eating of Christ's flesh; then surely in those words of Christ, wherein Christ commandeth us to eat his body, the literal sense thereof likewise doth kill. For it is no less crime, but even the same and all one in the literal sense, to eat Christ's body, and to eat Christ's flesh. Wherefore, if the one do kill, except it be understood figuratively and spiritually; then the other surely doth kill likewise. But, that to eat Christ's flesh doth kill, so understood, Origen affirmeth plainly in his words above rehearsed. Wherefore, it cannot be justly denied, but to eat Christ's body, literally understood, must needs (after him) kill likewise.

The answer that is made to this place of Origen of the Papists is so foolish, that it bewrayeth itself without any further confutation. It is the same, that they make to a place of St Augustine, in his book *De Doctrina Christiana*, whereas St Augustine speaketh in effect the same thing that Origen doth here. The Papists' answer is this: "To the carnal man the literal sense is hurtful, but not so to the spiritual." As though to understand that in its proper sense, which ought to be taken figuratively, were to the carnal man a dangerous peril, but to the spiritual man none at all.

Lib. iii. cap.
16.

Chrysostom,
in opere
imperfecto.
Hom. xi. in
Matt.

Now to Chrysostom, whom I bring for the second writer in the Greek church. He, speaking of the unholy using of man's body, which, after St Paul, ought to be kept pure and holy, as the very temple of the Holy Ghost, saith thus: "If it be a fault (saith he) to translate the holy vessels (in

[Si ergo vasa sanctificata ad privatos usus transferre, sic periculosum est, in quibus non est verum corpus Christi, sed mysterium corporis ejus continetur; quanto magis vasa corporis nostri, quæ sibi Deus ad habitaculum præparavit, non debemus locum dare Diabolo agendi in eis quod vult.

S. Chrysostomi Op. Latin. Op. Imperfect. in Matth. Hom. xi.

Ed. Ben. Par. 1724. in fine tomi sexti } in brackets, and with
p. lxxiii. } a side-note, indicating

Ed. Antwerp Nomeceius vol. ii. (of the } a doubt of its genuine-
Commentary) p. 35. Ed.] } ness.

the which is contained not the true body of Christ, but the mystery of the body) to private uses; how much more offence is it to abuse and defile the vessels of our body?"

These be the words of Chrysostom: but, I trow, that here many foul shifts are devised to defeat this place.

"The author," saith one, "is suspected." I answer, but in this place never fault was found with him unto these our days. And whether the author were John Chrysostom himself, the archbishop of Constantinople, or no, that is not the matter: for of all it is granted, that he was a writer of that age, and a man of learning. So that it is manifest, that this which he writeth was the received opinion of learned men in his days: or else, undoubtedly in such a matter his saying should have been impugned of some that wrote in his time, or near unto the same.

"Nay," saith another, "if this solution will not serve, we may say, that Chrysostom did not speak of the vessels of the Lord's cup, or such as were then used at the Lord's table, but of the vessels used in the temple in the old law." This answer will serve no more than the other. For here Chrysostom speaketh of such vessels, wherein was that which was called the body of Christ, although it was not the true body (saith he) of Christ, but the mystery of Christ's body. Now of the vessels of the old law, the writers do use no such manner of phrase; for their sacrifices were not called Christ's body: for then Christ was not, but in shadows and figures, and not by the sacrament of his body revealed. Erasmus, which was a man that could understand the words and sense of the writers, although he would not be seen to speak against this error of transubstantiation, because he durst not, yet in this time declareth plainly, that this saying of the writer is none otherwise to be understood.

Gardiner to
the 198th ob-
jection.

"Yet can I," saith the third Papist, "find out a fine and subtle solution for this place, and grant all that yet is said, both allowing here the writer, and also that he meant of the vessels of the Lord's table. For (saith he) the body of Christ is not contained in them, at the Lord's table, as in a place, but as in a mystery." Is not this a pretty shift, and a mystical solution? But, by the same solution, then Christ's body is not in the Lord's table, nor in the priest's hands, nor in

Gardiner in
the same
place.

the pix: and so he is here no where. For they will not say, that he is either here or there, as in a place. This answer pleaseth so well the maker, that he himself (after he had played with it a little while, and sheweth the fineness of his wit and eloquence therein) is content to give it over and say, "But it is not to be thought, that Chrysostom would speak after this fineness or subtlety:" and therefore he returneth again unto the second answer for his sheet anchor, which is sufficiently confuted before.

Another short place of Chrysostom I will rehearse, which (if any indifference may be heard) in plain terms setteth forth the truth of this matter. "Before the bread," saith Chrysostom, writing *ad Cæsarium^a monachum*, "be hallowed, we call it bread: but, the grace of God sanctifying it by the means of the priests, it is delivered now from the name of bread, and esteemed worthy to be called Christ's body, although the nature of bread tarry in it still." These be Chrysostom's words, wherein I pray you, what can be said or thought more plain against this error of transubstantiation, than to declare, that the bread abideth so still? And yet this so plain a place some are not ashamed thus shamefully to elude, saying: "We grant the nature of bread remaineth still thus, for that it may be seen, felt, and tasted; and yet the corporeal substance of the bread therefore is gone, lest two bodies should be confused together, and Christ should be thought impanate."

What contrariety and falsehood is in this answer, the simple man may easily perceive. Is not this a plain contrariety, to grant that the nature of bread remaineth so still, that it may be seen, felt, and tasted, and yet to say, the corporeal substance is gone, to avoid the absurdity of Christ's impanation? And what manifest falsehood is this, to say or mean that, if the bread should remain still, then

[¹ Sicut enim antequam sanctificetur panis, Panem nominamus, divina autem illum sanctificante gratiâ, mediante Sacerdote, liberatus est quidem appellatione panis, dignus autem habitus est dominici corporis appellatione, etiamsi natura panis in eo permansit. S. Chrysostomi Op. Ep. ad Cæsarium Monachum. Ed. Ben. Par. vol. iii. p. 744.—1717. Ed.]

[^a See note B. at the end of the volume. Ed.]

must follow the inconveniency of impanation? As though the very bread could not be a sacrament of Christ's body (as water is of baptism), except Christ should unite the nature of bread to his nature, in unity of person, and make of the bread God.

Now let us hear Theodoretus, which is the last of the Theodoret. three Greek authors. He writeth in his Dialogue *contra* Dial. 1. *Eutychem* thus: "He that called his natural body corn and bread, and also named himself a vine tree; even he, the same, hath honoured the symbols (that is, the sacramental signs) with the names of his body and blood, not changing indeed the nature itself, but adding grace unto the nature."

What can be more plainly said than this, that this old writer saith? That although the sacraments bear the name of the body and blood of Christ, yet is not their nature changed, but abideth still. And where is then the Papists' transubstantiation?

The same writer, in the second dialogue of the same Dial. 2. work against the aforesaid heretic Eutyches, writeth yet more plainly against this error of transubstantiation, if any thing can be said to be more plain. For he maketh the heretic to speak thus against him that defendeth the true doctrine, whom he calleth Orthodoxus: "³As the sacraments of the body and blood of our Lord are one thing before the invocation, and after the invocation they be changed, and are made another; so likewise the Lord's body (saith the

[² Ὁ γὰρ δὴ τὸ φύσει σῶμα σίτον καὶ ἄρτον προσαγορεύσας, καὶ αὖ πάλιν ἐαυτὸν ἄμπελον ὀνομάσας, οὗτος τὰ ὀρώμενα σύμβολα τῆ τοῦ σώματος καὶ αἵματος προσηγορία τετίμηκεν, οὐ τὴν φύσιν μεταβαλὼν, ἀλλὰ τὴν χάριν τῆ φύσει προστεθεικώς. Theod. Dial. 1. Op. Ed. Par. 1642, tom. iv. p. 18. Ed.]

[³ Ἐραν. Ὡσπερ τοίνυν τὰ σύμβολα τοῦ δεσποτικοῦ σώματος τε καὶ αἵματος ἄλλα μὲν εἰσι πρὸ τῆς ἱερατικῆς ἐπικλήσεως, μετὰ δὲ γε τὴν ἐπικλήσιν μεταβάλλεται καὶ ἕτερα γίνεται οὕτω τὸ δεσποτικὸν σῶμα, μετὰ τὴν ἀνάληψιν, εἰς τὴν οὐσίαν μετεβλήθη τὴν θείαν.

Ορθόδοξος. Ἐάλως αἷς ὕφηνες ἄρκυσι· οὐδὲ γὰρ, μετὰ τὸν ἀγιασμόν, τὰ μυστικά σύμβολα τῆς οικείας ἐξίσταται φύσεως· μένει γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς προτέρας οὐσίας καὶ τοῦ σχήματος καὶ τοῦ εἶδους, καὶ ὀρατά ἐστὶ καὶ ἀπτά, οἷα καὶ πρότερον ἦν. Theod. Dial. 2. Op. Ed. Par. 1642, tom. iv. p. 85. Ed.]

heretic) is, after the assumption or ascension into heaven, turned into the substance of God:" the heretic meaning thereby, that Christ, after his ascension, remaineth no more a man.

To this Orthodoxus answereth thus, and saith to the heretic: "Thou art taken (saith he) in thine own snare; for those mystical symbols or sacraments, after the sanctification, do not go out of their own nature, but they tarry and abide still in their substance, figure, and shape; yea, and are sensibly seen, and groped to be the same as they were before, &c."

At these words the Papists do startle; and, to say the truth, these words be so plain, so full, and so clear, that they cannot tell what to say: but yet they will not cease to go about to play the cuttles, and to cast their colours over them, that the truth, which is so plainly told, should not have place. "This author wrote" (say they) "before the determination of the church." As who would say, whatsoever that wicked man Innocentius, the Pope of Rome, determined in his congregations with his monks and friars, that must needs be (for so Duns saith) holden for an article, and of the substance of our faith.

Some do charge this author, that he was suspected to be a Nestorian: which thing, in Chalcedon council, was tried, and proved to be false. But the foulest shift of all, and yet the best that they can find in this matter, when none other will serve, is to say, that Theodoret understandeth by the word substance accidents, and not substance indeed. This gloss is like a gloss of a lawyer upon a decree, the text whereof beginneth thus: *Statuimus*, that is, "we decree." The gloss of the lawyer (after many other pretty shifts there set forth, which he thinketh will not well serve to his purpose), therefore at the last, to clear the matter, he saith thus: "after the mind of one lawyer, *vel dic*" (saith he) "*statuimus, id est, abrogamus*," that is, as expounded, "we do decree, that is, we do abrogate or disannul." Is not this a worthy and goodly gloss? Who will not say, but he is worthy in the law to be retained of counsel, that can gloss so well, and find in a matter of difficulty such

[¹ The words "vel dic" do not occur in the passage. *Decreta Gratiani*. Ed. Par. 1585, p. 14. Ed.]

fine shifts? And yet this is the law, or at the least the gloss of the law. And therefore who can tell what peril a man may incur to speak against it; except he were a lawyer indeed, which can keep himself out of the briers, what wind soever may blow?

Hitherto ye have heard the writers of the Greek church, not all what they do say, for that were a labour too great for to gather, and too tedious for the reader, but one or two places of every one. The which how plain, and how full and clear they be against the error of transubstantiation, I refer it to the judgment of the indifferent reader. And now I will likewise rehearse the sayings of other three old ancient writers of the Latin Church, and so make an end.

And first I will begin with Tertullian; whom Cyprian, the holy martyr, so highly esteemed, that, whensoever he would have his book, he was wont to say, "Give me the master." This old writer, in his fourth book against Marcion, the heretic, saith thus: "'Jesus made the bread, which he took and distributed to his disciples, his body, saying, This is my body: that is to say (saith Tertullian), a figure of my body.'" In this place it is plain that, after Tertullian's exposition, Christ meant not, by calling the bread his body and the wine his blood, that either the bread was his natural body or the wine his natural blood: but he called them his body and blood, because he would institute them to be unto us sacraments, that is, holy tokens and signs of his body and of his blood; that, by them remembering and firmly believing the benefits procured to us by his body, which was torn and crucified for us, and of (by) his blood which was shed for us upon the cross, and so with thanks receiving these holy sacraments according to Christ's institution, (we) might by the same be spiritually nourished and fed to the increase of all godliness in us here in our pilgrimage and journey, wherein we walk unto everlasting life. This was undoubtedly Christ our Saviour's mind, and this is Tertullian's exposition. The wrangling, that the Papists do make to elude this saying of Tertullian, is so far out of frame, that it even

[¹ *Acceptum panem et distributum discipulis corpus suum illum fecit, "hoc est corpus meum" dicendo: id est, figura corporis mei.* Tertul. Adv. Mar. lib. iv. c. 40. Op. Ed. Par. 1641, p. 571. Ed.]

The cuttle is a sea-fish which casteth as it were an ink about her, and so by making the water black escapeth taking. Plin. lib. ix. cap. 4.

So answered D. Moreman in the Convocation House.

Distinc. 4. cap. Statuimus.

Tertullian.

Adv. Marc. lib. iv. cap. 40.

Gardiner to
the 16th ob-
jection.

wearieth me to think on it. "Tertullian writeth here (say they) as none hath done hitherto before him, neither yet any other catholic man after him."

This saying is too manifestly false: for Origen, Hilary, Ambrose, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, St Augustine, and other old authors likewise, do call the sacrament a figure of Christ's body. And where they say, that Tertullian wrote this when he was in a heat of disputation with an heretic, coveting by all means to overthrow his adversary; as who should say, he would not take heed what he did say, and specially what he would write in so high a matter, so that he might have the better hand of his adversary; is this credible to be true in any godly wise man? How much less then is it worthy to be thought or credited in a man of so great a wit, learning, and excellency, as Tertullian is worthily esteemed ever to have been?

Tertullian,
lib. i. cap.
14, contra
Marcion.

Likewise this author in his first book against the same heretic Marcion writeth thus: "'God did not reject bread, which is his creature; for by it he hath made a representation of his body.'" Now I pray you, what is this to say, that Christ hath made a representation (by bread) of his body, but that Christ had instituted and ordained bread to be a sacrament, for to represent unto us his body? Now, whether the representation of one thing by another requireth the corporeal presence of the thing which is so represented or no, every man that hath understanding is able in this point (the matter is so clear of itself), to be a sufficient judge.

St August-
tine.

The second doctor and writer of the Latin church, whose saying I promised to set forth, is St Augustine, of whose learning and estimation I need not to speak. For all the church of Christ both hath and ever hath had him for a man of most singular learning, wit, and diligence, both in setting forth the true doctrine of Christ's religion, and also in defence of the same against heretics.

This author, as he hath written most plenteously in other

[¹ Sed ille quidem usque nunc nec aquam reprobavit creatoris quâ suos abluit, nec oleum quo suos unguat, nec mellis et lactis societatem quâ suos infantat, nec panem quo ipsum corpus suum repræsentat. Tertul. Cont. Mar. lib. i. c. 14. Op. Ed. Par. 1641, pp. 439, 440. Ed.]

matters of our faith, so likewise on this argument he hath written at large in many of his works so plainly against this error of transubstantiation, that the Papists love least to hear of him of all other writers; partly for his authority, and partly because he openeth the matter more fully than any other doth. Therefore I will rehearse more places of him, than heretofore I have done of the other.

And first, what can be more plain, than that which he writeth upon the 98th Psalm, speaking of the sacrament of the Lord's body and blood; and rehearsing (as it were) Christ's words to his disciples, after this manner? "²It is not this body, which ye do see, that ye shall eat, neither shall ye drink this blood, which the soldiers that crucified me shall spill or shed: I do commend unto you a mystery, or a sacrament, which spiritually understood shall give you life." Now, if Christ had no more natural and corporal bodies, but that one which they then presently both heard and saw, nor other natural blood, but that which was in the same body, and the which the soldiers did afterward cruelly shed upon the cross; and neither this body nor this blood was (by this declaration of St Augustine) either to be eaten or drunken, but the mystery thereof spiritually to be understood; then I conclude (if this saying and exposition of St Augustine be true), that the mystery, which the disciples should eat, was not the natural body of Christ, but a mystery of the same, spiritually to be understood.

For as St Augustine saith, in his 20th book, "³Christ's flesh and blood was in the Old Testament promised by similitudes and signs of their sacrifices, and was exhibited in deed and in truth upon the cross: but the same is celebrated by a sacrament of remembrance upon the altar."

[² Non hoc corpus, quod videtis, manducaturi estis; et bibituri illum sanguinem, quem fusuri sunt qui me crucifigent. Sacramentum aliquod vobis commendavi; quod, spiritualiter intellectum, vivificabit vos. S. Aug. in Psal. xcvi. Op. Ed. Ben. Par. vol. iv. col. 1066. Basil Edit. vol. viii. col. 1105. Ed.]

[³ Hujus sacrificii caro et sanguis ante adventum Christi per victimarum similitudinem promittebatur, in passione Christi per ipsam veritatem reddebatur, post adscensum Christi per sacramentum memoriae celebratur. S. Aug. cont. Faust. lib. xx. c. 98. Op. Ed. Ben. Par. tom. viii. col. 348. Ed.]

August. in
Ps. xcvi.

Aug. contra
Faustum,
lib. xx. cap.
21.

De Fide, ad Petrum, cap. 19. And in his book *De Fide ad Petrum*, cap. 19, he saith, that "In these sacrifices, (meaning of the old law,) it is figuratively signified what was then to be given: but in this sacrifice it is evidently signified, what is already given (understanding in the sacrifice upon the altar), the remembrance and thanksgiving for the flesh, which he offered for us upon the cross:" as in the same place evidently there it may appear.

Another evident and clear place, wherein it appeareth, that by the sacramental bread, which Christ called his body, he meant "a figure of his body," is upon the third Psalm, where St Augustine speaketh thus in plain terms: "Christ did admit Judas unto the feast, in the which he commended unto his disciples *the figure of his body*." This was Christ's last supper before his passion, wherein he did ordain the sacrament of his body, as all learned men do agree.

St Augustine also in his 23rd Epistle to Bonifacius teacheth how sacraments do bear the names of the things whereof they be sacraments, both in baptism and in the Lord's table; even as we call every Good Friday the day of Christ's passion, and every Easter Day the day of Christ's resurrection; when, in very deed, there was but one day wherein he suffered, and but one day wherein he rose. And why do we then call them so, which are not so indeed, but because they are in like time and course of the year, as those days were wherein those things were done? "Was Christ

[¹ In illis enim carnalibus victimis figuratio fuit carnis Christi, quam pro peccatis nostris ipse sine peccato fuerat oblaturus, et sanguinis quem erat effusus in remissionem peccatorum nostrorum; in isto autem sacrificio gratiarum actio atque commemoratio est carnis Christi quam pro nobis obtulit et sanguinis quem pro nobis idem Deus effudit. Fulgentius, Edit. Lug. 1633.]

The Liber ad Petrum de Fide is a work not of Augustine, but of Fulgentius. In the Benedictine Edition of St Augustine, printed at Paris, 1679, the book is prefaced with an Admonitio commencing thus: Liber "de fide ad Petrum" inter Augustini opera olim impressus est, veterum aliquot manuscriptorum auctoritate, verum non esse Augustini probe monstravit Erasmus ex ipsâ phrasi, aliisque argumentis quæ hic referre superfluum putamus. Nam indubitatus ejus auctor a nemine jam ignoratur Fulgentius. Ed.]

[² Cum adhibuit ad convivium in quo corporis et sanguinis sui figuram discipulis commendavit et tradidit. S. Aug. in Psal. iii. Op. Ben. Ed. Par. vol. iv. col. 7. Ed.]

(saith St Augustine) offered any more but once? And he offered himself. And yet in a sacrament or representation, not only every solemn feast of Easter, but also every day to the people he is offered. So that he doth not lie, that saith, 'He is every day offered.' For if sacraments had not some similitude or likeness of those things, whereof they be sacraments, they could in no wise be sacraments: and, for their similitudes and likeness, commonly they have the names of the things whereof they be sacraments. Therefore, as after a certain manner of speech the sacrament of Christ's body is Christ's body, the sacrament of Christ's blood is Christ's blood; so likewise the sacrament of faith is faith³."

After this manner of speech, St Augustine teacheth in his question, *Super Leviticum et cont. Adamantum*, it is "said in Scripture, that seven ears of corn be seven years; and 'the rock was Christ;' and 'blood is the soul⁴:' the which last saying (saith St Augustine in his book *cont. Adamant.*⁵) is understood to be spoken in a sign or figure; for the Lord himself did not stick to say, 'This is my body,'

[³ Nonne semel immolatus est Christus in seipso? et tamen in sacramento non solum per omnes Paschæ solemnitates, sed omni die populis immolatur, nec utique mentitur qui interrogatus eum responderit immolari. Si enim sacramenta quamdam similitudinem earum rerum quarum sacramenta sunt, non haberent, omnino sacramenta non essent; ex hac autem similitudine plerumque etiam ipsarum rerum nomina accipiunt. Sicut ergo, secundum quemdam modum, sacramentum corporis Christi corpus Christi est, sacramentum sanguinis Christi sanguis Christi est; ita sacramentum fidei fides est. S. Aug. Epist. xxxiii. Op. Ed. Ben. Par. 1679. vol. ii. col. 267. F. Ed.]

[⁴ Solet autem res quæ significat ejus rei nomine quam significat nuncupari, sicut scriptum est, septem spicæ septem anni sunt; non enim dixit, septem annos significant. Septem boves septem anni sunt, et multa hujusmodi. Hinc est quod dictum est, Petra erat Christus; non enim dixit, Petra significat Christum, sed tanquam hoc esset quod utique per substantiam non hoc erat, sed per significationem. Sic et sanguis quoniam propter vitalem corpulentiam animam significat in sacramentis, anima dictus est. S. Aug. Quæst. 57. lib. iii. Op. Ed. Ben. Par. vol. iii. col. 516. Ed.]

[⁵ Nam ex eo quod scriptum est sanguinem pecoris animam ejus esse, præter id quod supra dixi, non ad me pertinere quid agatur de pecoris animâ, possum etiam interpretari præceptum illud, in signo esse positum; non enim Dominus dubitavit dicere, "Hoc est corpus meum," cum signum daret corporis sui. S. Aug. Epist. cii. c. 12. sect. 3. Op. Ed. Ben. Par. vol. iii. col. 124. Ed.]

Augustine in Ps. iii.

Augustine, Ep. 23.

Quest. 57, lib. iii.

Ep. 102, cap. 12, § 3.

when he gave the sign of his body." "For we must not consider in sacraments (saith St Augustine in another place) what they be, but what they do signify. For they be signs of things, being one thing in themselves, and yet signifying another thing¹." "For the heavenly bread (saith he), speaking of the sacramental bread, by some manner of speech is called Christ's body, when in very deed it is the sacrament of his body, &c."

What can be more plain or more clearly spoken, than are these places of St Augustine before rehearsed, if men were not obstinately bent to maintain an untruth, and to receive nothing, whatsoever doth set it forth? Yet one place more of St Augustine will I allege, which is very clear to this purpose, that Christ's natural body is in heaven, and not here corporally in the sacrament, and so let him depart. In his 51st Treatise, which he writeth upon John, he teacheth plainly and clearly, how Christ, being both God and man, is both here after a certain manner, and yet in heaven, and not here in his natural body and substance which he took of the blessed Virgin Mary, speaking thus of Christ, and saying, "By his divine majesty, by his provi-

[¹ Hæc enim sacramenta sunt, in quibus non quid sint, sed quid ostendant semper adtenditur, quoniam signa sunt rerum, aliud existantia, aliud significantia. S. Aug. cont. Max. lib. ii. c. 22. Op. Ed. Ben. Par. vol. viii. col. 725. Ed.]

[² Accipiant hoc et boni, sed non sint solliciti; loquebatur enim de præsentia corporis sui. Nam secundum majestatem suam, secundum providentiam, secundum ineffabilem et invisibilem gratiam, impletur quod ab eo dictum est, "Ecce ego vobiscum sum usque in consummationem sæculi." Secundum carnem vero quam Verbum assumpsit, secundum id quod de virgine natus est, secundum id quod a Judæis prehensus est, quod ligno confixus, quod de cruce depositus, quod linteis involutus, quod in sepulchro conditus, quod in resurrectione manifestatus, non semper habebitis vobiscum. Quare? Quoniam conversatus est secundum corporis præsentiam quadraginta diebus cum discipulis suis, et, eis deducuntibus videndo, non sequendo, adscendit in cælum, et non est hic. Ibi est enim et sedet ad dexteram Patris, et hic est: non enim recessit præsentia majestatis. Aliter, secundum præsentiam majestatis, semper habemus Christum: secundum præsentiam carnis, rectè dictum est discipulis, "me autem non semper habebitis." Habuit enim illum Ecclesia secundum præsentiam carnis paucis diebus; modo fide tenet, oculis non videt. S. Aug. Tract. li. in Johan. Ev. c. 12. Op. Ed. Ben. Par. 1679, tom. iii. pars iii. col. 634. Ed.]

dence, by his unspeakable and invisible grace, that is fulfilled which he spake, 'Behold, I am with you unto the end of the world.' But as concerning his flesh which he took in his incarnation; as touching that which was born of the Virgin; as concerning that which was apprehended by the Jews, and crucified upon a tree, and taken down from the cross, wrapped in linen clothes, and buried, and rose again, and appeared after his resurrection; as concerning that flesh, he said, 'Ye shall not ever have me with you.' Why so? For, as concerning his flesh, he was conversant with his disciples forty days; and, they accompanying, seeing, and not following him, he went up into heaven, and is not here. By the presence of his divine majesty, he did not depart; as concerning the presence of his divine majesty, we have Christ ever with us: but, as concerning the presence of his flesh, he said truly to his disciples, 'Ye shall not ever have me with you.' For, as concerning the presence of his flesh, the church had him but a few days: now it holdeth him by faith, though it see him not."

Thus much St Augustine speaketh, repeating one thing so often; and all to declare and teach how we should understand the manner of Christ's being here with us, which is by his grace, by his providence, and by his divine nature; and how he is absent by his natural body which was born of the Virgin Mary, died, and rose for us, and is ascended into heaven, and there sitteth, as it is in the articles of our faith, on the right hand of God, and thence, (and from none other place, saith St Augustine) he shall come on the latter day, to judge the quick and the dead. At the which day, the righteous shall then lift up their heads: and the light of God's truth shall so shine, that falsehood and errors shall be put unto perpetual confusion. Righteousness shall have the upper hand, and truth that day shall bear away the victory; and all the enemies thereof be quite overthrown, to be trodden under foot for evermore. O Lord, Lord, I beseech thee, hasten this day. Then shalt thou be glorified with the glory due unto thy holy name and unto thy divine majesty; and we shall sing unto thee, in all joy and felicity, laud and praise for evermore. Amen.

Here now would I make an end: for methinks St Augus-

Contra
Maximi-
num, lib. ii.
cap. 22.

Aug. Tract.
51, in Johan.
Evan. cap.
12.

tine is in this matter so full and plain, and of that authority, that it should not need, after this his declaration, being so firmly grounded upon God's word, and so well agreeing with other ancient authors, to bring in for the confirmation of this matter any more. And yet I said, I would allege three of the Latin church, to testify the truth in this cause. Now, therefore, the last of all shall be Gelasius, which was a bishop of Rome; but one that was bishop of that see, before the wicked usurpation and tyranny thereof spread abroad and burst out into all the world. For this man was before Bonifacius, yea, and Gregory the First, in whose days both corruption of doctrine and tyrannical usurpation did chiefly grow, and had the upper hand.

Gelasius.

Gelasius, in an epistle of the two natures of Christ, (*contra Eutychem,*) writeth thus: "The sacraments of the body and blood of Christ, which we receive, are godly things, whereby, and by the same, we are made partakers of the divine nature; and yet, nevertheless, the substance or nature of the bread and wine doth not depart or go away¹." Note these words, I beseech you; and consider, whether any thing can be more plainly spoken, than these words against the error of transubstantiation; which is the ground and bitter root, whereupon spring all the horrible errors before rehearsed.

Wherefore, seeing that the falsehood hereof doth appear so manifestly and by so many ways, so plainly, so clearly, and so fully, that no man needeth to be deceived, but he that will not see, or will not understand; let us all that do love the truth embrace it, and forsake the falsehood. For he that loveth the truth is of God: and the lack of the love thereof is the cause why God suffereth men to fall into errors, and to perish therein; yea, and, as St Paul saith, why he sendeth unto them illusions, that they believe lies, unto

their own condemnation: "because (saith he) they loved not the truth."

This truth, no doubt, is God's word: for Christ himself saith unto his Father, "Thy word is truth." The love John xvii. and light whereof Almighty God our heavenly Father give us, and lighten it in our hearts by his holy Spirit, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Vincet Veritas.

[¹ Certe sacramenta, quæ sumimus, corporis et sanguinis Christi, divina res est; propter quod et per eadem, divinæ efficimur consortes naturæ: et tamen esse non desinit substantia vel natura panis et vini; et certe imago et similitudo corporis et sanguinis Christi in actione mysteriorum celebrantur. Gelasii Op. adv. Eutychem. et Nest. de duab. Christ. Natur. in Bibliotheca Patrum, Colon. 1618. Sec. v. Part III. p. 671. Ed.]