

{Anno} 1552.

Mozeouer: And therefore (sayth hee) doing this we whet not our teeth to bite, but with pure faith we breake the holy bread, and distribute it, &c.

Augustinus.

It may not be sayde, that any such doe eate the body of Christ, because they are accompted amongst the members of Christ. Neither can they be both members of Christ, and members of an harlot, &c. Furthermore, when Christ sayeth: He that eateth my fleshe, and drinketh my blood; dwelleth in me, and I in him: hee sheweth what it is, not Sacramentally, but in deede to eate his body, and drinke his blood, which is, when a man so dwelleth in Christ, that Christ dwelleth in him. For so Christ spake those wordes, as if hee should saye: he that dwelleth not in me, and in whome I dwell not, let him not say nor thinke, that he eateth my body, or drinketh my blood.

August. De Ciuit. Lib 21. cap. 25. Iohn. 6.

Also in other places the sayde Austen affirmeth, that, to drinke is to liue: And sayth mozeouer: Why preparerth thou thy belly, and thy teeth? beleeue and thou hast eaten, &c.

All which kinde of speaking can not be sayd of the wicked and infidels, but only of the goodly and faithfull.

And thus briefly we haue runne ouer all the arguments and authorities of Peter Martyr in that disputation at Oxford, with Doctor Rocham, Chasley, and Morgan, before the Kings visitours about named. an. 1549.

Furthermoze, who so listeth more fully to be clarified and resolved in all the occurrences touching the matter of this Sacrament, let him reade the booke first of the Archbishop of Cammer against winchesser: Secondly, the translation of Peter Martyr made in Oxford, translated and extant in English: and thirdly the booke of Bishop Ridley made in prison, called A briefe declaration of the Lordes Supper.

The like disputation also about the same time was appointed and commended at Cambridge, touching the same matter of the Sacrament, the Kings visitours being directed hither for the same purpose by the King. The names of which visitours were these, Nicholas Ridley Bishop of Rochester, Thomas Bishop of Ely, John Cheeke the Kings Scholemaster, Doctor May Cuiiliar, and Thomas Wooddy the Kings Auditor. The conclusions in that disputation propounded were these.

The first disputation holden at Cambridge the 20. day of Iulie. an. 1549. before the Kings Maiesties Commissioners by Doctor Madew respondent, whose first conclusion was this.

Transubstantiation can not be proofed by the playne and manifest wordes of Scripture, nor can thereof be necessarily collected, nor yet confirmed by the consents of the ancient Fathers, for these thousand yeares past. Doctor Glin, M. Langedale, M. Segewike, M. Yong, opposerits.

Doctor Madew.

First of all (quoth he) I am very sorry, and do not a little lament the shortnes of time, to declare and discuss such weighty matters of Religion in, as these be. But that notwithstanding, if I had had more plenty of time indeed: yet you shall vnderstande, how that I haue euer both in heart and mind (if otherwise I could haue auoided it) abhorred all scholasticall disputations, and subtilie sophistications. In consideration whereof, I beseech those that are to dispute, not to alleage by using forth any dilaibred, or curled sentences, or wordes, as hath many times, but the whole and full sentences eyther of the Scriptures, or of the ancient Doctors: yea, and to amouch such Authors sayings, as are not suspected, or sayed, but such as be theyr owne very sayings indeed, which if they do, there is no doubt, but the cleare light of this one disputation, shall the sooner appeare, and be manifest to this auditoie. And for a further declaration of my part, you shall vnderstande that this my preface in my said former most catholique & godly conclusion shall consist in three principall points. 1. First, what thing it was that Christ gaue to his disciples. 2. Secondly, what season or time this transubstantiation did begin. 3. Thirdly, how many diuinish abominations haue ensued vpon that horrible and pestifer invention. As concerning the first, that is, what thing Christ gaue to his disciples, that may very well appeare euen by our owne naturall senses, as namely, by the sight, by the touching, by the tasting, whiche can not be deceived of their naturall iudgement. For the eye seeth nothing but bread and wine, the tasting saouereth nothing else, and the handes touch nothing else. He gaue also to their vnderstanding not only his holy and sacred doctrine, but also a speciall gift & pledge of his loue. He gaue the only materiall bread & wine sanctified, as the first ende and plaine elements or principles to allure them withall, but he gaue them the gift of his grace and heauenly doctrine, as the very things signified by the

sensible elements, which thing playnly appeareth by the wordes of Christ our sauour, Non bibam. &c. I will not drinke hereafter of the fruite of this vine, vntill I drinke it new with you in the kingdome of God. Nowe this fruit or iuice of y vine is nothing els but wine, as Chrysostome saith. And mozeouer to proue the same true, if it be refered after the consecratio for a time, it becommeth softer, and taste, therefore it is but wine. And as touching the bread, S. I. saul sayth thus, is not the bread which we breake, the communion, or participation of Christs body? hec brake breade, therefore it was but bread, whiche he gaue them: for the body of Christ is not broken, as the scripture sayth of y same, os non cominuitis ex eo, you shall not breake a bone of him. Also he sayth, this is my bodye, not that the bread was his body, and the wine his blood; but he spake those wordes, as of his owne morall bodye, there sitting amongst them at supper, or hec spake per doubtfully as thus: this signifieth my body, it is one thing, whiche is leane, but it is an other thing which is vnderstande: for y which is seen hath a bodely form, but y which is vnderstood thereby hath a spirituall forme. S. Austen sayth. Let the word haue access to the element, so is it made a sacrament: marke, he sayth, let the word haue access, and not successe. Nowe the thing that hath access to an other thing, doth not quench the thing that it cometh to, no moze doth it here, ergo it is bread and wine still as before, howe be it sanctified, and holy: what sauy you yesterday (sayth S. Austen) vpon the auget? I thely bread and wine, whiche your owne eyes can witness he said he, what playnet testimonye can be had of so auuncient a father as he was, and of so rare knowledge in the scriptures of God? Seeing then y oure eyes doe behould nothing, but bread and wine, it must needs follow that it is so in deede, or els our senses be deceived in their owne proper obiecte, which cannot be by any reason, or naturall philosophy. And per notwithstanding some papistes dreame and phantisie such a corporall, reall, and grosse presence of Christs body in the sacrament as they affirme it to be there euen as verily, as it was vpon the Crocfe. Iudgede the bread is changed after a certain maner into Christs bodye: for Christ gaue not bys owne naturall bodye to his Disciples at his last supper; but an onely signe or figure thereof. Christs body is there with the bread: our senses cannot be deceived about the substance of bread, but they doe iudge there to be but one body, that is of bread, Ergo loquitur. Also the very definition of a sacrament doth playnly repugne vnto transubstantiation. Bread nourisheth the substance of Christs body, but the accidents doe not so. Ergo the substance doth remaine of the bread that nourisheth: it is also called bread in the Actes, and in diuers other places of the scriptures, wherefore it is so, but in deede after a sorte more holy then before: what gaue he in the supper: bread which is the body, that is to say, an holy signe of his body, as Austen doth witness saying: hee doubted not to say this is my bodye, wher it was but a signe of his body. The vntaunted bread was but a bare and naked signe of Christs bodye, and so is this bread the same body, euen as baptisme is. Nowe indeede there be two maner of signes, one that signifieth onely, the other that doth exhibite the thing it self. The first is applyed to the old lawe chiefly, the other to the lawe of grace. The old fathers & learned fathers, did neuer see to speake of the substantiall change, for because that all the mutatio on is but conditionall, not substantiall, nor we deeme not the bodely substance sacramentally, but yet we saye that this proposition (that is my bodye) is but a figuratiue speache, and no proper speache, as some doe deeme. But it is as muche to saye, as this signifieth my bodye, or els thus, this is a sacrament of my bodye, for the bodely bread, and Christs bodye are not containyd in place locally but mystically. This pointenouse and monstrous transubstantiation began first to enter, when the poppish prelates, & priestes began to vnderstand this said proposition (this is my bodye) of the carnall and reall presence of Christs body, as hugo de sancto victore, Gratian, Peter Lombard and Innocent, & the very pestilent poppon of al Christen religion, vnto whome we haue of long season, yea althas too long gener credit: vnder the which Innocent the said deuilish terme, or vocable of transubstantiation began anno. 1175. And Boniface after him Bishop of Rome made the sayde mad blinde transubstantiation to be the article of the sayth, full wisely no doubt, where as an other bishop of Rome after him affirmed plainly against yestoz the heretike that bread remaineth there still, whose name was Beldinus. Now as touching y most shamefull and detestable inconueniences which must needs follow this diuinish terme or vorable of transubstantiation, you shall vnderstand the first is, that then such papistes will haue Christs body still prostituted, and receaued euen of the wicked