

wicked and naughty people, which is cleane contrary to that place of our sauour Christ, where he sayth: Whosoever eateth my fleshe and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him. Nowe it is plaine, that euill persons dwell not in Christ, nor Christ in them, wherefore they receive not his body therein at all. For S. Austine tract. 8. super Iohannem saith, that it is but bread which is scene after the Consecration, Ergo, the substance of bread is there still. 2. The seconde inconuenience that groweth heereof, is the sonde and superstitious reservation of the sacrament in pipes, boxes, and such like, with vaine tabernacles ouer the alter, where oftentimes it did purifie for all their foolish honour, which began in Honorius daies the third Bishop of Rome of that name, which corruption declarerth it to be but onely bread, say all Papists what they list. 3. The third inconuenience that must needs followe Transubstantiation, is adoration, which is too plaine Idolatry, as the Papists do knowe themselves if they list, but they are so stiffnecked, that they will not know it, and so both haue, and yet also will keepe the world in blindness still if they might be suffered. But to be short with you, euen as we are changed into Christ by receiuing the sacrament, so is the bread changed into the body of Christ. But our substance is not changed into Christs substance, Ergo, the substance of the bread is not changed into Christs body. And to be shorte and playne with you (most honourable audience) the whole vniuersall world hath bene, and yet is fore decreaded and deluded about the estimation of this Sacrament. Wherefore this is most true, when we do receaue the sayd Sacrament worthely, then are we ioyned by faith spiritually to Christ our sauour. And thus much haue I said in this first matter.

The second matter to be disputed of is this.

That in the Lords Supper is none other oblation or sacrifice, then one onely remembrance of Christs death, and of thankesgiuing.

In this conclusion, I will be much shorter, and more compendious then in the first. In consideration whereof, you shall vnderstande, that the same is a very goodly, and true catholique proposition. For to offer Christ, and to exhibit the same, is all one thing, for in that that he is offered, he is set forth for to eat, there is no difference at all betwene the maker of the sacrifice, or offerer, and the thing that was offered, which both were one Christ. The Lorde did commaund saying, Do this in remembrance of me, hee made mention of the remembrance only, wherefore it can be none other sacrifice, but only that. The Apostle doth declare the manner of the thing doing, saying thus: He tooke bread in his hands, he blessed it, he brake it, and gaue it to his disciples. What gaue he to them? forsooth bread, which was the sacrament, and not his body. No earthly creature nor heauenly, did euer offer by Christ at any time, but he himselfe once for all, upon the crosse, Ergo, he can not, nor ought not to be offered many times, and often, though that Pighius with all the blinde rabble of Papists say the contrary. For truly in this point especially they knowe not what they say, being so led by the old pharisaicall blindness. But to the purpose. You shall vnderstand good auditors, that the pure and cleane oblation and sacrifice spoke of by the Prophet Malachy, is nothing else, then deuoute, and faithfull prayer, and thankesgiuing, as Tertullian sayth in his third booke contra Marcionem expounding the psalme, where it is sayd thus: The sacrifice of laude, and praye shall honor mee. So doth S. Hierome, Irenzus, and S. Austen say also vpon Malachy. where also they denie that Christ is essentially in the sacrament. Yea and S. Austen Epistola 95. ad Paulinum witnesseth, that the mortifying of our earthly members is our true sacrifice that be Christians. And all the aunciente fathers do call prayers by the name of sacrifices. And for this purpose, whosoever list to reade that most excellent and famous Clarke Zwinglius ca. 18. de articulis, shall finde the same confirmed of him by most grounded reasons, whatsoeuer the Papists do barke against it. Thus I haue declared my mind in both matters now disputable. And if my further declaration be required through the vehemency of argumentes, I will perforce the same in my answering thereunto.

Where disputed against this defendant Doctour Glin, M. Langedale, M. Segewike, and M. Yong, Students in Diuinitie.

Glin. Notwithstanding right worshipfull Maister Doctour, that you haue so exquisitely declared your mind and opinion in euery of these matters now in contention before this honorable and learned audience, and also though iust occasion be ministered to me to infringe your positions in both conclusions, yet I will not inuade the same as now

indirectly with contractions and vaine wordes to occupie the small time which is appointed vs for the triall of the same, but we will go forthwith to the thing it selfe, which contenteth in it matter enough. It is but folly to vse many wordes where fewe will serue our purpose, as sayeth the maister of the Sentences. All wordes may signifie at pleasure and commonly there bee moe things then vocables, like as sometimes there was variance amongst learned men of the vnicite of two substances in one personage of Christ God and Man. So is there now in our dayes variance of Transubstantiation of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, wherefore I do require you first to shewe me heare openly what the said Transubstantiation is, that we go not from the thing it selfe, which is our first and chiefest ground.

Madew. As for that I neede not to shewe you, for euery man knoweth it.

Glin. peradventure it is not so good Maister Doctour. And I am perfectly assured that euery man doth not knowe it indeede: for it is not so light a matter as you make it to be. Madew. Forsooth you knowe it your selfe, and so do all men else.

Glin. well, yet I pray you shewe me what thing Christ did demonstrate and shew forth by that article of the newter gender, where he said, This is my body. what did he appoint in that article this? for if he meant by that, the bread, then Christ in the Sacrament is not onely of two natures, but of three natures, as of the nature of bread, of the nature of man, and of the diuine nature, which to say, were blasphemie. The argument is good, and doth hold by that text, He spake the word, and it was done, he commaunded, and they were created. Moreover, if he should meane by that article of the newter gender (this the material bread, then he woulde haue sayd, This bread is my body, so making the article of the newter gender: or else he woulde haue sayd thus, Heere with this bread is my body, to haue auoyded euer after all heresies, errors, and schismes. But he saide not so, but spake the article of the newter gender, saying, This is my body, that is to saye, the thing or substance conteyned vnder the forme and kind of bread, which you see not with your bodily eyes is my body, according to my promise made to you before, that I woulde geue you my very fleshe to eat, Iohn. 6. In like maner when he gaue the cup of his blood, he sayd not this in the newter gender, as he woulde haue done if he had meant the material creature of wine to haue remained, but he saide then in the masculine gender, This is my blood: that is to say the thing conteyned vnder the forme of wine whiche you see not with your bodily eyes is my blood. For truly the holy Ghost came downe to leade vs into all truth and veritie, and not to deceiue vs in so notable a point of our faith. But out of doubt he should haue decreaded in this matter, if so be he had geuen vs onely material bread and wine in stead of his body and blood, and not haue fulfilled his promise made Iohn 6. where he promiseth thus. The bread whiche I will geue is my fleshe, which I will geue for the life of the world. Heere be two giuings spoken of, with two relatines, whereof the first with his relatine, must needs be referred to his gift in the last supper, and the second giuing of the same fleshe of his, with his relatine, must be applied of necessitie vnto his giuing of his body vpon the Crosse. For we do finde in the whole Scripture, where Christ did fulfill his sayde promise made in vs. of Iohn, but at those said two times. Wherefore if we be deceiued in this matter of Transubstantiation, we may well say, O Lord thou hast decreaded vs. But God forbid that we should once thinke such wickednes of him. He must also be vniust of his promise if it be not performed at any season, as it is not indeede, if it were not at both the said times. Then if it were performed (as the Catholique Church of Christe dothe holde, deterrmine, and beleue) then must it needs be graunted, that he gaue at his last Supper his owne body and fleshe indeede and verely which he gaue vpon the Crosse for the life of the world, though not in so fleshy a manner and bloudie, yet the very same fleshe and blood really after an vnbloudy sort, and spiritually. He said not This bread is my body, nor yet heere with the bread is my body, but, This is my body, which shall be geuen for you. For he said not, this wine is my blood, nor with this wine is my blood, whiche circumstance of plaine speech he would haue used, if the pure creatures should haue remained, but he sayde, This is my blood, which is shed for you and for many for the remission of sinnes, that is to say, the substance hidden vnder these visible formes of bread and wine, are my very proper fleshe and blood. I pray you where do you finde in the whole body of the Scripture expressed, or iustly vnderstanded, that Christ gaue but only a bare and naked signe, figure, or sacrament? Or where finde you that he gaue his body wyth bread,