

Answerers and
disputers in
those disputatōs
at Cambridge.
Anno
1552.

In the third disputacion answered M. Berne. Against
whome disputed one M. Barke (not Doct. Math. Bar-
kar) M. Dollard, M. Nauisour, M. Yong.
At length the disputacions ended, the Bishop of Ro-
chester Doct. Nicolas Ridley after the maner of Scholes,
made this determination vpon the foresayde conclusions,
as here followeth.

¶ The determination of Doctor Nicolas Rid-
ley Bishop of Rochester, vpon the conclusi-
ons aboue prefixed.

There hath bene an ancient custome amongst you, that
after disputacions had in your common scholes, there
should be some determination made of the matters so dis-
puted and debated, especially touching Christian religion.
Because therefore it is seene good vnto these worshipfull
assistentes ioyned with me in commission from the Kings
Majestie, that I should performe the same at this tyme: I
will by your fauourable pacience declare, both what I do
thinke and beleue my selfe, and what also other, ought to
thinke of the same. Which thing I would that afterwarde
ye did with diligence way and ponder, every man at home
generally by himselfe.

The principal groundes or rather headsprings of this
matter are specially fiue.

The first is the authoritie, maiestie, and veritie of holy Scrip-
ture.

The second is the most certayne testimonies of the auncient
Catholicke Fathers, who, after my iudgement, do sufficiently de-
clare this matter.

The third is the definition of a Sacrament.

The fourth is the abominable heresie of Eutiches that may
enue of Transubstantiation.

The fift is the most sure beleife of the article of our fayth: He
ascended into heauen.

¶ The first grounde.

This Transubstantiation is cleane agaynst y wordes
of the scripture, and consent of the auncient Catholicke Fa-
thers. The scripture sayth: I will not drinke hereafter of this
fruite of the vine. &c. Now the fruite of this Wyne is wyne.
And it is manifest that Christ spake these wordes after the
Supper was finished, as it appeareth both in Mathewe,
Mark, and also in Luke, if they be well vnderstanded.
There be not many places of the scripture that do confirm
this thing, neither is it greatly materiall: for it is enough
if there be any one playne testimonie for the same. Neither
ought it to be measured by the number of Scriptures, but
by the authority, and by the veritie of the same. And the
maiestie of this veritie is as ample in one thort sentence of
the Scripture, as in a thousand.

Moreover, Christ tooke bread, he brake bread, he gaue
bread. In the Actes Luke calleth it bread. So Paule cal-
leth it bread after the sanctification. Both of them speaketh
of breakyng, which belongeth to the substance of bread,
and in no wyse to Chykses body, for the Scripture sayth:
Ye shall not breake a bone of hym. Christ sayth, Doe ye this in
my remembrance. Sainr Paule also sayth: Doe ye this in
my remembrance. And agayne, As often as ye shall drinke of
this cup, do it in the remembrance of me. And our Sainour
Christ in the 6. of Iohn, speakyng against the Capernaites,
sayth: Labour for the meat that perisheth not. And when they
asked: What shall we do that we may worke the workes of God?
He answered them thus: This is the worke of God, that ye
beleue in hym whom he hath sent. You see how he ephorteth
them to sayth, for sayth is that worke of God. Agayne, This
is the bread which came downe from heauen. But Chykses
body came not downe from heauen. Moreover, Hee that
eareth my flesh, and drinketh my bloud, dwelleth in me, and I in
hym. My flesh (sayth he) is meat in deede, and my bloud is drinke
in deede. When they heard this, they were offended. And
whilest they were offended, he sayd vnto them: What if ye
shall see the sonne of man ascend vp where he was before? wher-
by he went about to draw them from the grosse and carnal
eatyng. This body sayth he, shall ascend vp into heauen,
meaning altogether as S. Augustine sayth: It is the spir-
it that quickneth, the flesh profiteth nothing. The wordes that
I speake vnto you, are spirit and lyfe, and must be spiritually vnder-
stood. These be the reasons which perswade me to in-
cline to this sentence and iudgement.

¶ The second ground.

Now my second ground agaynst this transubstantia-
tion are the auncient fathers a thousand yeares past. And

so farre of is it that they do confirme this opinion of tran-
substantiation, that playne they seeme vnto me, both to
thinke and to teach the contrary.

Dionysius in many places calleth it breade. The pla-
ces are so manifest and playne, that it needeth not to recite
them.

Ignatius to the Philadelphians sayth: I beseech you bre-
thren cleaue fast vnto one sayth, and to one kynde of preachyng,
vying together one maner of thankesgeuyng: for the fleshe of
the Lord Iesu is one, and hys bloud is one which was shedde for
vs: There is also one bread broken for vs, and one cuppe of the
whole Church.

Irenaeus writeth thus: Euen as the bread that commeth
of the earth receauyng Gods vocation is. nowe no more com-
mon breade, but Sacramentall breade, consistyng of two na-
tures, earthly and heauenly: euen so our bodies receauyng the
Eucharist, are now no more corruptible, hauyng hope of the re-
surrection.

Tertullian is very playne, for he calleth it a figure of the
body, &c.

Chrysostome writyng to Celsarius the Monke, albeit
he be not receyued of dyoces, yet wyl I read the place to
fasten it more deeply in your myndes: for it seemeth to
shewe playnely the substance of bread to remayne. The
wordes are these.

Before the bread is sanctified, we name it bread: but by the
grace of God sanctifying the same thorough the ministry of the
Priest, it is deliuered from the name of breade, and is counted
worthy to beare the name of the Lordes body, although the ve-
ry substance of bread notwithstanding doe still remayne ther-
in, and now is taken not to be two bodies, but one body of the
Sonne, &c.

Cyprian sayth: Bread is made of many graynes. And is that
naturall bread, and made of wheate? Yea it is so in deede.

The booke of Theodoret in Greke, was lately printed
at Rome, which if it had not bene his, it should not haue
bene set forth there, especially seeyng it is directly agaynst
transubstantiation: For he sayth plainely, that bread shill
remayneth after the sanctification.

Gelasius also is very playne in this manner. The Sacra-
ment (sayth he) which we receyue of the body and bloude of
Christ, is a diuine matter: by reason whereof we are made par-
takers by the same of the deuine nature, and yet it ceaseth not stil
to be the substance of bread and wyne. And certes, the repre-
sentation and similitude of the body and bloud of Christ be ce-
lebrated in the action of the mysteries, &c.

After this he recited certayne places out of Augustine
and Cyrill, which were not noted.

Isichius also confelleth that it is bread.
The iudgement of Bertram in this matter, is verye
playne and manifest. And thus much for the second ground.

The third ground.

The third grounde, is the nature of the Sacramente,
which consisteth in three things, that is, Vnitye, Nutriti-
on, and Conuerſion.

As touchyng vnitye, Cyprian thus writeth: Euen as of
many graynes is made one bread, so are we one mysticall bodye
of Christ. wherfore bread must needes still remaine, or els
we destroy the nature of a Sacrament.

Also they that take away nutrition, which cometh by
bread, do take away likewise the nature of the sacrament.
For as the body of Christ nourisheth the soule, euē so doth
bread likewise nourish the body of man.

Therefore, they that take away y graynes or the vnion
of the graynes in the bread, and deny the nutrition or sub-
stance thereof, in my iudgement are Sacramentaries: for
they take away the similitude betwene the bread & the bo-
dy of Christ. For they which affirme transubstantiation
are in deed right Sacramentaries and Capernites.

As touchyng conuerſion (that lyke as the bread which
we receyue, is turned into our substance, so are we turned
into Chykses body) Irenaeus and Chrysostome are wit-
nesses sufficient.

The fourth ground.

They which say that Christ is carnally present in the
Eucharist, do take from him the veritie of mans nature. Eutiches
granted the diuine nature in Christ, but his humane
nature he denied. So they that defend transubstantiation
ascribe that to the humane nature, which ouely belongeth
to the deuine nature.

The fift ground.

The fift ground is the certayne perswasion of this Ar-
ticle

The determina-
tion of D. Nic.
Ridley vpon the
disputacions.

5. Princypall
groundes to take
away transub-
stantiation.

Transubstantia-
tion agaynst the
Scripture.

Scripture to be
measured not by
number but by
authoritie.

Exod. 12.
1. Cor. 11.

Iohn. 6.

Iohn. 6.

The second
ground agaynst
transubstantia-
tion.

Dionysius
Eccle. Hier-
rat.
Ignatius ad
Philadel-
ph.

Irenaeus
lib. 4.
cap. 34.

Tertullia-
nus.

Chrysost.
ad
Celsarium.

Cyprian.
Lib. 1. E-
pist. 6.
Theodore-
tus.

Gelasius in
Epist. de
duabus na-
turis in
Christo.

Isich. Lib.
cap. 8.
Bertram.

The third
ground.

Cyprian.
Three
things in a
Sacrament.

1. Vnitye.
2. Nutritio.
3. Conuer-
ſion.

Conuerſio.

4. Ground.
The reall
presence in
the Sacra-
ment stan-
deth not
with the
truth of
Chrifies
humanitye.