

this behalfe, that this transubstantiation is of no antiquitie, but of a late invention; I wil also adioyne to this testimony of Iohan. Scotus, the iudgement and verdict of Erasme, lib. Annot. where he wyrteth in these wordes: In Synaxi transubstantiatione sero definitiue Ecclesia. Diu fatis erat credere siue sub pane consecrato, siue quocunq; modo adesse verum corpus Christi. &c. That is, In the sacrament of the communion, the church concluded transubstantiation but of late dayes. Long before that it was sufficient to beleue the true body of Christ to be present eyther vnder bread, or els by some maner. &c.

The second Article.

As touching the seconde Article, which debateth from the lay people the one halfe of the Sacramente, vnderstanding that vnder one kind, both partes are fully contained, for so much as the world wel knoweth that thys Article is but young, inuented, decreed, and concluded no longer since then at the Council of Constance, not past 200. yeres agoe: I shal not neede to make any long standing vpon that matter, especially for that sufficient hath bene laid thertof before in our long discourse of the Bohemians story, pag. 611.

First, lette vs see the reasons and objections of the aduersariies in restraining the Laitie from the one kynde of this Sacrament. The vse (say they) hath bene so of longe continuance in the Church. Wherunto we aunswere, that they haue no euident nor authentike example of anye auncient custome in the church, which they can produce in that behalfe.

Item, where they alledge the place of S. Luke, where Christ was known in breaking of bread. &c. citing mozeouer many other places of Scripture, wherein mention is made of breaking of bread; to aunswer therunto, although wee doe not utterly repugne, but that some of those places may be vnderstanded of the Sacrament, yet that beyng graunted, it followeth not therefore, that one parte of the Sacrament was only ministred to the people without the other, when as by the common vse of speech, vnder the naming of one part, the whole action is meant. Either doth it followe, because that breade was broken among the brethren, therefore the cuppe was not distributed vnto them. For so we finde by the words of S. Paule, that the vse of the Corinthians was to communicate not onely in breaking of bread, but in participating the cuppe also. The cup (sayeth he) which we participate. &c.

Also after the Apostles, in the tyme of Cyprian, of Hierome, of Belasius and other successiue after them, it is euident by both the kindes were frequented in the Church. First Cyprian in diuers places declareth that the sacrament of the blood was also distributed. How do we (sayth he) prouoke them to stand in the confession of Christ, by the shedding of their blood, if we deny vnto them the blood of Christ when they prepare themselves to the confict?

The wordes of Hierome are plaine. Priestes (sayth he) which minister the Eucharist, and deuide the bloude vnto the people.

In historia tripartita, it was sayde to Emperor Theodosius, how will you recieue the body of the Lord, with such bloody handes, or the cup of hys precious blood, with that mouth, which haue spilled so much innocent blood?

In the Canon of Belasius, and in the Popes own decrees, these words we read: We vnderstand that there be some which receauing onely the portion of the Lordes bodye, doe abstaine from the cuppe of hys sacrate blood, to whom we enioyne, that either they receaue the whole Sacrament in both the kindes, or els that they receaue neither: for the diuiding of that whole & one Sacrament cannot be done without great sacriledge, &c. So that thys decree of Pope Belasius being contradictorie to the council of Constance, it must follow, that either by pope did erre, or els the council of Constance must needes be a sacrilegious Council, as no doubt it was.

The like testimonie also appeareth in the Council of Tolcane, that the laitie did then communicate in bothe kindes, besides diuers other olde presidets, remaining yet in the churches both of Germanie and also of France, declaring likewise the same.

And thus it standeth certain and demonstrable by manifeste probations, how farre this newfound custome differeth from all antiquitie and prescription of vse and time. Again, although the custome therof were neuer so auncient, yet no custome may be of that strength to gainstand or countermaunde the open and expresse commaundement of God, which sayeth to all men: Bibite ex hoc omnes. Drincke ye all of this. &c.

Again, seeing the cup is called the bloude of the new testament, who is hee that dare or can alter the Testament of the Lorde, when none may be so hardy to alter the Testament of a man, being once approued or ratified?

Further, as concerning those places of Scripture be-

fore alledged, De fractione panis, that is, of breaking of bread, wherupon they thinke themselves so sure that the Sacrament was then ministred but in one kinde: To aunswere therunto, first we say, it may be doubted whether all those places in Scripture, De fractione panis, are to be referred to the Sacrament. Secondly, the same beyng genen vnto them, yet can they not inferre thereby, because one parte is mentioned, that the full Sacrament therfore was not ministred. The common maner of the Hebrew phasie is, vnder breaking of bread to signifye generally the whole feaste or supper: as in the Prophecie Esay, these wordes, Frange esurienti panem tuum, doe signifye as well geuyng drinke as bread, &c. And thirdly howsoeuer those places, De fractione panis be taken, yet it maketh little for them, but rather against them. For if the Sacrament were administrd amongst them in fractione panis. In breakinge of breade, they must they needes graūt, that if bread was there broken. Ergo, there was breade, forasmuche as neither the accidentes of bread without breade can be broken, neither can the naturall body of Christ be subiect to any fraction or breaking by the Scripture, which sayeth: And yee shall breake no bone of him. &c. Wherfore take away the substance of breade, and there can be no fraction. And take away fraction, how then do they make a Sacrament of this breaking, whereas neither the substance of Christs body, neither yet the accidentes without their substance can be broken, neither agayne will they admit any bread there remaining to be broken? And what then was it in thys their Fractione panis, that they did breake, if it were not Panis, that is, Substantia panis quæ frangebatur? To conclude, if they say that this fraction of bread was a Sacramentall breaking of Christs bodye, so by the like figure let them saye that the being of Christs naturall body in the Sacrament is a Sacramental being, and we are agrred.

Item, they obiecte further and say, that the church vpon due consideration may alter as they see cause, in rites, ceremonies and Sacraments.

Aunswer. The institution of this sacrament standeth vpon the order, example, & commaundement of Christ. This order he took: First he deuided the breade seuerally fro the cuppe, and afterward the cuppe seuerally from the breade. Secondly this he did not for any neede on his behalfe, but onely to geue vs example how to do the same after him, in remembraunce of his death to the wordes ende. Thirdly, beside this order taken, and example left, hee added also an expresse commaundement: Hoc facite, Doe thise. Bibite ex hoc omnes. Drinke ye all of this. &c. Against thys order, example, and commaundement of the Gospell, no Church nor council of men nor aungell in heauen hath any power or authority to change or alter, according as we are warned: If any bring to you any other Gospell beside that ye haue receiued, holde him accursed. &c.

Item, an other Obiection. And why maye not the Church (say they) as well alter the fourme of thys Sacramente, as the Apostles did the fourme of Baptisme, where in the Actes S. Peter sayth: Let euery one be baptised in the name of Iesu Christ. &c.

Aunswer. Thys text sayeth not, that the Apostles vsed thys fourme of baptising: I baptise thee in the name of Christ, &c. but they vsed many times this manner of speache, to be baptised in the name of Christe, not as expressing thereby the forinable words of baptising, but as meaning this, that they would haue them to become members of Christe, and to be baptised as Christians, entring into his baptism, and not onely to the Baptisme of Iohn: and therefore, although the apostles thus spake to the people, yet notwithstanding when they baptised any themselves, they vsed (no doubt) the forme of Christ prescribed, and no other.

Item, among many other obiections, they alledge certaine perils and causes of waight and importance, as spoiling, shedding, or shaking the blood out of the cuppe, or souering, or els sticking vpon mens beardes, &c. for the which they say it is wel provided, the halfe communion to suffice. Wherunto it is some aunswere, that as these causes were no let to Christ, to the Apostles, to the Corinthians, and to the brethren of the Primitive Church, but that in the publick assemblies they receiued all the whole Communion, as well in the one part as in the other: so neither be the sayd causes so important nooue, to adnull and euacuate the necessary commaundement of the Gospell, if we were as carefull to obey the Lorde, as wee are curious to magnifye oure owne deuises, to strayne gnattes, to stumble at strawes, and to seeke knottes in rushes, whych rather are in oure owne phantasies growing, then there where they are sought.

In fractions panis.

Exod. 12.

The natural body of Christ may not be broken. Accidentes no man can breake. No bread is there to be brokē: Ergo, there is nothing in the Sacrament broken.

An other obiection, agaynst both kindes.

Aunswere.

- 1. Order. 2. Example. 3. commaundement.

Galat. 1. An other obiection agaynst both kindes. Act. 2.

Aunswere.

The Apostles changed not the forme of Baptisme.

Mans curiosity in magnifying his owne deuises about Gods.

Erasme lib. Annot. in 1. Cor. cap. 7.

Serō.

The second article of both kindes.

Read afore pag. 611.

The reasons and objections of the Papistes against both kindes.

Luke. 24.

1. Cor. 10.

Cyprian lib. 1. Epist. 2. De laicis Martyribus Scribitur.

Hieronimus in Sophon cap. 3.

In Historia tripartita lib. 9.

De consecrat.

The Council of Constance a sacrilegious Council.

The forbidding of both kindes of the Sacrament hath no ground or auncient custome. No custome may derogate from the Lordes expresse commaundement. The Lordes testament ought not to be altered for any respecte.