

The euill receate not the Lordes Sacrament.

but the sacrament of the Lord, as Judas, who in deed eate not the true body of the Lord. Pollard. In the sacrament be three thyngs, to wit, an outward signe, the matter of the Sacrament, and the fruite of the same, the euill receyne the outward signe, and the subiect of the Sacrament, but not the fruite of the Sacrament, Ergo, there is somewhat els in the Sacrament than onely grace. Also ency Sacrament ought to haue a certaine similitude with the matter of the Sacrament, but the materiaill bread hath not such similitude with the body of Christ, which is the matter of the Sacrament, Ergo, materiaill bread is not a Sacrament. Perne. I deny your Maior, for materiaill breade doth so nourish the bodye, as the sicke of Christ doth the soule.

Here he beyng requested, gaue place to others.

M. Vauifor.

Thorough the shortnes of tyme I am so constrained, that neyther I can speake without losse of my reputation, nor yet hold my peace without offence to God. For in speaking (as I doe) without great premeditation before this honourable, worshipfull, and learned audience, I shall but shewe forth my childishnes herein, and if I should hold my peace, I myght be thought to betray the truth of Gods cause. And therefore whilste I can neyther speake for the breuete of tyme, nor yet hold my peace gods truth beyng in controuersie, I haue determined although with the impairing of my good name, to render a reason of my saye, which if I cannot assure probably in words, yet wyl I not faulke in sayeng nothyng at all, for it seemeth better that I be extreme altogether foolish and vnlearned, amongst so many graue learned Fathers & Doctors, then to forsake the iust defence of the truth, which euery good christian man throughout the world, hath euery holden inuolable. For who so forsaketh the manifest knownen truth, had neuer any true saye therein. Wherby thyng that I may ouerpasse in Scrogarius, Iuinglius, Decolampadius, and many others, who are certainly knowne to be of no lesse variance amongst themselves, then vncertain of theyr saye what to beleue. Iuinglius wyrteth thus of hymselfe. Although this thyng which I meane to intreate of doth lyke me very well, yet notwithstanding, I dare define nothyng, but only shew my pene iudgement abroad to others, that if it please the Lord, others may be thereby instructed by the spirit of God which teacheth all good thynges. In wayne doe I spende many wordes. You see playnely he dare not define anye thyng certainly, but doubteth whether it please God or not. Decolampadius wyrtynge to a certayne brother of hys, sayth thus: peace be with thee. As farre as I can coniecture out of the learned Fathers these wordes, John. 6. This is my body, befiguratiue locutions, &c. You see hereby how vncertaine they be of their opinions. They leane not to the Scriptures, to Doctors, nor yet to the truth, but to supposals and coniectures, who therefore hereafter wyl cleare vnto them? But nowe I come to your Quation, whose begynnyng pleased me very well, and whose progresse therein offended me not. But in the end you concluded in such sort, that you left the whole matter to me, as it were confirmyng my paces by the same. And herein you framed a Syllogisme after this maner. what Christ took, that he blessed, what he blessed, that he brake, what he brake that he gaue, Ergo, what he receyued he gaue. whereto I answer wyth a lyke Syllogisme out of the same. God took a ribbe out of Adams side, what hee took, he built, what he built that he brought, what he brought, that hee gaue to Adam to be hys wyfe, but hee took a ribbe, Ergo, he gaue a ribbe to Adam to wyfe, &c. Also in your sayd Quation, you shute much at those wordes of Ihu, where he calleth it bread to often, &c. But the Scripture in another place calleth it water, when in deede it was wyne, a rodde when it was a playne serpent.

Rocheff. You haue pretended great zeale & words inough, but what pith of substance your reasons will allowd, we shall see hereafter.

Vauifor. Christ gaue the same flesh to vs, that he receyued of the virgine, but hee took true and naturall flesh of her, Ergo, he gaue vs true and naturall flesh. My Maior I proue by August. vpon the 98. psalme.

Rocheff. M. Vauifor, you are in a wronge boxe, for y place maketh altogether for maintenace of adozation, if it make for any thyng.

Vauifor. I know it very well, and therefore I alledge it as the ground of my reason. These bee Augustines wordes, Christ of the earth receyued earth, and of the flesh of Mary, he receyued flesh, acknowledge his substance therefore?

Rocheff. I acknowledge it. Vauifor. And in the very same flesh he walked here vpon the earth, acknowledge his substance.

Rocheff. I acknowledge it. Vauifor. And the very same flesh he gaue vs to eate, acknowledge hys substance.

Rocheff. I acknowledge not hys reall substance to be there, but the proprietie of hys substance.

Vauifor. Then Vauifor recited the place, to the ende hee myght proue that hys reall substance ought to be acknowledged as well in the last place, as in the first and second, affirmyng it out of Saint Augustine, who sayeth thus. The Disciples of Christ appoehyng the Lordes table, by sayth dranke the same blood which the commenters most cruelly spilt, &c. but the commenters spilt no figure of blood, Ergo, &c. this place will not permit the other to be illuded.

Rocheff. It is no illusion good M. Vauifor, but surely you would moue a Saint with your impertinent reasons.

Vauifor. I beseech your fatherhood to pardon my rudenes, for surely I cannot otherwyse speake without breach of conscience.

Perne. What place of Augustine is to be understood of a spirituall kynd of eatyng.

Vauifor. I demand whether the saythfull may receyue spiritually, so as they neede not to receiue sacramentally.

Perne. They may.

Vauifor. Then thus to you: To the spirituall eatyng, there is no need to come to the Lordes table, for so it is the meat of the soule, not of the teeth, but the saythfull come to the Lordes table, Ergo that place is to be understood of a sacramentall eatyng. And agayne, Augustine sayth, that he caried hymselfe in hys hands.

Rocheff. Augustine thewerth a little after, what he meaneth thereby, where he sayeth he caried hymselfe in his owne hands, after a certayne sort of maner.

Vauifor. True it is that after one maner he sat at the table, and after another maner was in the sacrament.

M. Yong here disputeth agaynst Perne, as followeth.

Yong.

I vnderstand the meanyng of this worde Proprietas, proprietie, well enough, for in Hillarie and Eusebins, it signifyeth not the vertue or power of any substance or beyng, but rather a naturall beyng or substance.

Rocheff. I commend your great diligence in searchyng of authors, but in diuinitie the matter standeth not so, for the proprietie of essence in the deitie, is the very essence, and what soeuer is in God, is God.

Yong. Thus it is (most reuerend father) that this worde Proprietas, proprietie, in Hillary in hys 8. booke de Trinitate, intecaryng there of the diuinitie of the father, of the sonne, and of the holy ghoft, is so meant and taken, but the same Hillary alnost in the same place speaketh of our communion and vnitie wyth Christ, &c. Tertullian also wyrtynge of the resurrection of the flesh, affirmeth that the fleshe of our sauour is that wherof our soule is allied to God, that is it which causeth that our soules are ioyned to hym, but ourselfe is made cleane, that the soule may be purged, our flesh is annoyured, that the soule may be made holy, the flesh is sealed, that the soule may be comforted, the fleshe is shadowed with the imposition of the handes, that our soule may be lightened with the glozy of the spirite. Our flesh is clothed with a body and blood, that the soule may be fed and nourished of God.

Rocheff. The fleshe in deede is fed with the body and the blood of the Lord, when our bodies by mortification are made lyke to his body. And our body is nourished when the vertue and power of the body of Christ doth feede vs. The same Tertullian is not afrayd to cal it flesh, and blood, but he meaneth a figure of the same.

Yong. Then by your leaue it should follow by good consequence, that where anye mortification is, there must needes be a sacramentall communion, which cannot be. Ergo, &c.

Here endeth the third, and last Disputation holden at Cambridge. 1542.

This disputation continued thre dayes. In the first dayd answer Doctour Madox, Agaynst whome disputed Doctour Blinne, M. Langdale, M. Segewike, M. Young.

In the second disputation did answer Doctour Blinne. Agaynst whome disputed M. Brindall, M. Berne, M. West, M. Wilkinson.

Anno. 1549.

Vncertainty amongst the Doctors.

An vnfauery comparifon.

August. sup. psal. 98.

When our bodies be fed with the bodye and blood of Christ.