

there is in the other also, this is my body, for the holy scrip- ture is a perfect rule not onely of doying, but also of bread- kyng, *Paul* called it bread three tymes, Ergo it is bread, &c. And *water* they drage so much this *Domoune* (illum) it is not in the Breake (anon which hath panem, bread, not panem illum, that bread. There was no transubstantiation in the *Manna*, Ergo, no; in this sacrament, for there is this article (ely) that can prouue transubstantiation as they suppose. And if *Manna* were a figure (say they) then this is not. This mysterie of Sacrament we hold to be true bread, and true meate. *Manna* gave life vnto them, as this doth vnto vs, yet was it but a figure. All euey sacra- ment there ought to be a certain analogie, both of the ma- terie and exteryne thing of the Sacrament, as *Augustine* sayth, writing to *Bonifacius*, but betwixt the formes of bread and wyne, and the body of *Christ*, there is no analogie at all, Ergo, they make not a Sacrament. As of many gaynes, &c. This multitude of *Paul* is spoken of in sub- stance of bread, not of the forme thereof, otherwise *Paul* should in vayne compare vs to bread. As in *Wapritime* there is materiall water, so in the sacrament of the *Eucha- rist* is materiall bread. *Dionysius* called the Sacrament of *Christes* bodye no otherwyse then bread. *Eusebius* in ec- clesiastica historia doth the same. *Tertullian*, lib. 4. against *Mar- cion*, sayth thus, He gaue hys body, that is (sayth he) a figure of type of hys body. *Cyprian* sayth, In his last supper he gaue bread and wyne, and hys body vpon the crosse. The same *Cyprian* epist. 6. lib. 1. and epist. 3. lib. 2. sayth, *Christ* brake bread wyne at his last supper, because he would rote out the heretic of certayne who onely used water in the minis- tration thereof. *Chrysolom*. 1. vpon *Matth*, sayth, That onely bread remaueth, &c. *Theodore* sayth in hys first dialogue, bread receaueth fill in hys flesh nature as be- fore. *Augustine* sayth, The bread doth not lose his flesh nature after the consecration, but receyue y another qualitie, whereby it differeth from common bread. The same *Aug- ustine*, lib. 3. agaynst *Marimimus* sayth: Sacramentes are figures, beying one thing in deede, and shewing forth an other thing: he speaketh of no transubstantiation here, Agayne, writing to *Bonifacius* he sayth, The Sacrament of the body of *Christ* is the body of *Christ*, and so is the sa- crament of wyne also, &c. The sacramentes of the olde and new law, are all one in substance of matter, notwithstanding they be diuers in figures: which Sacramentes, why should they not be one, why as they signified at one thing. The body of *Christ* when it was on the earth, was not in heauen, so now it being in heauen, is not on the earth, whereby it may appere, that transubstantiation is a most blasphemous, sacrilegious, and damnable erroure, and a most vayne, vnsauour, and diuelish papistricall inuention, defended and maintayned onely by the papistes, the pro- fessed and sworn enemies of all truth. Those who inuenge this doctrine of transubstantiation, are no new vyltaries, as the enemies of the truth the papistes beare the world in hand. But contrariy, those who maintayne this diuinitie doctrine, are new sprung by cocatrices, as *Manicheus*, *Furicus* and others. *Gelasius* sayth, The sacramentes which we receyue, are diuine thyngs, yet cease they not to bee bread and wyne in nature. Out of this puddle of transubstantia- tion, hath sprung by adolation of the sacrament, and in- duryng men to beleeue that *Christ* hath many bodyes,

There disputed agaynst him M. Parker, M. Pollard, M. Vauilfor, and M. Yong. Parker.

Christ whose wordes are to be heleneed, sayd, This is my body, he said not this bread is my body, or this bread, or vnder this bread, or by this bread, but sayd plainly, This is my body. And this be proued by these reasons: First, for that it was prefixed before. Secondly, for that it was promised. Thirdly, for that it was given. The transubstantiation of the bread was prefixed by the *Manna* which came downe from heauen, all that bread was heavenly, and without any earthly matter of substance admixed. Secondly, it was promised in those wordes of *Christ*, I bread that I will geue, is my flesh, &c. Thirdly, it was given by *Christ*, and exhibited in hys last supper, saying: Take, &c. this is my body.

Three vaine rea- sons, to proue the bread to be transubstantiated.

Here they were forced to breake of through the want of tyme, yet Parker replied thus agaynst Doct. Perne.

We geue thee thanks most holy father, that thou hast hid these thyngs from the wyse and prudent, and hast reuealed them to babes, for wyse is the frute of al herelies warforouer. And on the other side, to acknowledge our owne infirmitie and imperfection, is the first steppe to the true vnderstanding of the truth. *Agostinus* the hereticke affirmed, that there were two persons in *Christ*, one that was man, another that was *God*, therefore he sayd that in the *Eucharist* was contrayned true flesh, but onely of hys pure manhood. Agaynst hym did the council of *Epheusus* conclude, saying: That there was the real fleshe of the sonne of *God*, &c. This he proued by the wordes of *Christ*, My flesh is meate in deede, and what flesh that is, he reas- ceth vpon the first of *John*, that is, quoth he, the flesh is cometh to the dettie, and quickened by the holy *Ghost*, &c. Now that that fleshe is in the Sacrament, it is plainly by *Hillarius*, lib. 8. de *Trinitate*, he proued the same alio out of *Chrysolome*, homil. 45. vpon *John*. we are one bodye with hym, members of his flesh, and bones of his bones, &c. Agayne in the same homilie, we are ioyned to hys flesh, not onely by faith and loue, but also in very deede, and truly. And agayne it pleased me to become your brother, and by the same thyngs wherein *Christ* was ioyned to you, haue I geuen my selfe agayne vnto you, &c.

Hillarius, lib. 8. de trinitate. Christof. ho. 45.

Perne. I graunt vnto you that *Christ* is in the sacrament truly, wholly, & verely, after a certaine proprietie & maner: I deny not hys presence, but hys real and corporall presence I utterly deny, for doubtles hys true and natural body is in heauen, and not in the sacrament: notwithstanding he dwellecth with vs, and in vs after a certaine maner. And also in the 6. chapter of *John*, he speaketh not of the fleshe of *Christ* crucified, &c.

Christ is in the Sacrament really after a truly.

Parker. The fleshe of *Christ* as it is in the sacrament, is quick and generally lyfe, Ergo, hys real and substantiall fleshe is in the sacrament.

Perne. The fleshe of *Christ* in that it is united to the dettie, doth vniue, and generally lyfe, but not otherwyse.

Rochest. *Christ* dwellecth in vs by faith, and by faith we receiue *Christ* both *God* and man, both in spirit and flesh, that is, this sacramentall eating is the meane and waye whereby we attayne to the spiritual eating, and in deede for the strenghtening of vs to the carrying of this spiritual foode, was this sacrament ordeyned. And these wordes This is my body, are ment thus, by grace it is my true body, but not my fleshy body, as some of you suppose.

How Christes fleshe geueth lyfe.

How these wordes, this is my body are ment.

Parker. We are ioyned to *Christ*, not onely by faith, but also in very deede, Ergo, &c.

Rochest. we are ioyned to *Christ* that is, we are made partakers of his fleshe and of immortalitye. And so lyke case is there a union betwene man and woman, yet is there no transubstantiation of eyther, or both, &c.

Pollard. The sacrament is not bare bread and nothing els, onely because it is called bread so often in the Scriptures, and that I prouue by three reasons. First, it is called bread because of the similitude. Secondly, because of the mutation. Thirdly, for the matter whereof it is made and compact, as the Angels are called men, the holy ghost a touge, the rod of *Aaron* a serpent, and such lyke. The wordes of *Christ* do teach the same thing, as appereth in the healing of the woman of *Sanaana* daughter, *Fairus* sonne, and many others, &c. Ergo, &c. Then he proued agaynst *Rochester*, that somewhat els was in the Sacrament besides power and grace by this reason. The euill receyue the body of *Christ*, as is playue out of *Augustine*, homil. 1. de verbis domini, but the euill and wicked receyue not the dettie or grace. Ergo, there is not onely grace and verue in the sacrament.

Rochest. The euill do not receyue the Loge in Sacrament,

Why it is called bread so often.

The declaration of the sayd M. Perne in the 2. conclusion.

Matthew, *Mark*, *Luke*, and the apostle *Paul*, call it a commemoration or remembrance of *Christes* body and blood. And *Paul* to the *Corinthians* sayth: By one oblation once offered, are we made perfect to eternall saluati- on, &c. By hym therefore do we offer by the sacrifice of laud and praye to *God*, that is the fruit of the tipes, &c. It is called the *Eucharist*, because we offer to *God* praye and thankesguyng, with devout myndes, and it is called the cup of thankesguyng, because we geue thanks to *God* thereby also. You shall prech for the *Lordes* deathe, &c. that is, you shall geue thanks & be myndfull of his deathe, &c. Beue your bodies a quils and luyng sacrifice, &c. The sacrifice of praye and thankesguyng, shall honour me, &c. *Chrysolome* sayth, The wyse men offered three kyndes of sacrifices, gold, frankensence and myrthe, but we doe alio, namely vertue, praye, and almes deedes. These be the sac- rifices wherewith *Christ* is pleased. And *Augustine* sayth there are no other sacrifices of the praye, praye and thankesguyng, &c. *Chrysolome* homil. 45. vpon *John* sayth, to be conuerted or turned into *Christ*, is to be made partaker of hys body and blood.

They thought to be a certaine analogie in euey Sacrament betwene the thing that signifieth, & the thing tharis signified.

Cyprian epist. 6. Cyprian epist. 6. lib. 1. epist. 3. lib. 2.

Aug. li. 3. contra Maximianum.

Transubstantia- tion a most blasphemouse erroure.

Why it is called the eucharist.

No other sac- rifices, but only praye, and thankesguyng.