LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
NOV 20 1990
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

BV
825
.2
.C72
1825

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
NOV 20 1990
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

A

DEFENCE

OF THE

TRUE AND CATHOLICK DOCTRINE

OF THE

SACRAMENT OF THE BODY AND BLOOD OF OUR SAVIOUR CHRIST:

WITH A

CONFUTATION OF SUNDRY ERRORS CONCERNING THE SAME.

BY THE

MOST REV. THOMAS CRANMER,

LORD ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY.

TO WHICH IS PREFIXED

AN INTRODUCTION, HISTORICAL AND CRITICAL, IN ILLUSTRATION OF THE WORK; AND IN VINDICATION OF THE CHARACTER OF THE AUTHOR, AND THEREWITH OF

THE REFORMATION IN ENGLAND,

AGAINST SOME OF THE ALLEGATIONS WHICH HAVE BEEN RECENTLY MADE BY THE REV. DR. LINGARD, THE REV. DR. MILNER, AND CHARLES BUTLER, ESQ.

BY THE REV. HENRY JOHN TODD, M.A. F.S.A.

CHAPLAIN IN ORDINARY TO HIS MAJESTY, AND RECTOR OF SETTRINGTON, YORKSHIRE.

LONDON:

SOLD BY C. AND J. RIVINGTON; PAYNE AND FOSS; LONGMAN AND CO.; G. B. WHITTAKER; CADELL; R. H. EVANS; AND BALDWIN, CRADOCK AND JOY; AND BY J. AND G. TODD; WOLSTENHOLME; AND BARCLAY; YORK.

1825.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY R. GILBERT,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.

PREFACE.

WHERE doctrine is true, it will not be overthrown by railing accusation against the teachers of it, nor even by an exposure of their infirmities or sins. The Reformation in England is founded upon doctrines which are true. Of these Archbishop Cranmer considered his doctrine of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, in contradistinction to what is maintained upon this subject by the Church of Rome, as the chief; and he emphatically pronounces it "the true doctrine." Yet as endeavours have been made to weaken this doctrine, and calumnies against the teacher of it have been rendered subservient to these endeavours; any minister of the Reformed Church of England, however humble may be his power, is truly exercising his duty, while, in calling the attention of the publick to the great doctrine which chiefly distinguishes the Church of England from the Church

of Rome, he rescues also from reproach, where it is not deserved, the character of the great prelate who taught it. Such is the design of the following pages; in which the assertions of eminent scholars, who are opposed to the Reformation and its children, are sometimes challenged merely by the exercise, which seeks no lofty name, of referring to authorities. Ingenuity in selection, perspicuity of statement, and elegance of style, may lead us indeed delightfully along through a narrative, or a volume of history; but elegance of style, perspicuity of statement, and ingenuity in selection, without accuracy, change at once the captivating light of any point into a mournful gloom.

I have presumed, in citing the Strictures upon Southey's Book of the Church by J. Merlin, to name Dr. Milner as the author; Mr. Butler, in his Book of the Roman Catholic Church, having expressly stated, and others of the Romish communion having asserted, (while the internal evidence in the Strictures also leads to the same conclusion,) this learned Romanist as such. Yet I had rather that the in-

formation was unauthorized; as it is pitiable to find, in two editions of the Strictures, that the dishonesty of Bonner, in fabricating a speech for Cranmer, (the "grievous lie," as Strype indignantly calls it, Eccl. Mem. iii. 238,) and publishing it as if pronounced by the Archbishop, is stated as existing in Strype's Ecclesiastical Memorials "*from the Lambeth Records;*" when not a word is extant, or known to have been extant, in any record at Lambeth, relating to this matter; and, as I have said, (Introduct. p. cix,) no reference is made to such records by Strype. Let it never more be supposed, by the reference of Dr. Milner, that the Lambeth Records sustain the wicked fabrication of Bonner.

With his usual kindness, and condescension, his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury has allowed me, upon the present occasion, to examine the Records in Lambeth Library. And for admission to the State-Paper Office, and the examination of some documents there preserved respecting Cranmer, I have been greatly indebted to the very liberal permission of the

Right Honourable Mr. Secretary Peel; and to the obliging assistance of Robert Lemon, Esq. deputy-keeper of the Records in that Office. Nor may I omit this opportunity of saying, that to the care and zeal of Mr. Lemon the country is indebted for a most exact arrangement of innumerable historical papers in the Office, for the discovery of several hitherto unknown, and for his interesting remarks upon many of them. I have also gratefully profited by the inspection of the Registers of the Archbishops and of the Dean and Chapter of York; and in the Library of the latter I have discovered an unknown Manuscript of the celebrated Sir John Harington, from which I have gathered some important circumstances respecting the persecution of the Protestants in the reign of Mary. In this Manuscript there are also several curious illustrations of the reign of Elizabeth; some of which, as well as other original materials, I hope to copy, if health and opportunity favour me, into a vindication of the history of that time against some recent misrepresentations.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OF THE

INTRODUCTION.

PAGE

Account of Archbishop Cranmer's book i, ii, iii, xiii.
The connection of this book with our Church and State - - i, ii.
Protestant Constitution described - - iii.
The Reformation worth maintaining - - iii.
The Archbishop's conference with Ridley upon the subject of his book iv, v.
Character of Fox's Acts and Monuments - iv.
Dr. Milner's censure of Fox - - - - v.
Bertram's book upon the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper - - - v, vii.
The Archbishop's zeal for publishing books in the national language, in order to promote the Reformation - - viii.
Original letter of the Archbishop on the preceding subject - - ix.
Metrical psalmody - x.
The Archbishop's book attacked by Bp. Gardiner and Dr. Smith xi, xiv.
The Archbishop's fine defence of his book and of himself - - xii.
The Archbishop not a Lutheran or a Zuinglian xii, lxxi, lxxii.
Process against the Archbishop first printed from a manuscript in the Lambeth Library - xiv.
The Archbishop's letter to King Edward VI. xvi.
Manuscript remains of the

PAGE

Archbishop in the State Paper Office - xix, xx.
The Fathers and Schoolmen appealed to by the Archbishop - xx.
The study of them recommended, together with other good writers xxi, xxii.
The Fathers, and Bibles, the strongest arguments against Popery - xxii.
The sense of the Church of England as to the Real Presence xxii, xxiii.
The Archbishop's, and Ridley's, and Hooper's, assertions upon this subject - xxiii, xxiv.
Their martyrdom in defence of those assertions - - xxiv.
Mr. Butler unfairly cites Bp. Jeremy Taylor on the subject of Transubstantiation and the Mass xxiv, xxv.
Bp. Jeremy Taylor pronounces both Transubstantiation and the Mass as idolatrous - xxv.
Mr. Butler cites Bp. Gunning, but conceals what should have been added respecting him - xxvi.
Mr. Butler's remarks on

PAGE

the Article of our Church respecting Transubstantiation xxvii.
Answered - - xxix.
The Archbishop's sentiments upon universal redemption and regeneration in baptism xxx, xxxi.
The character of the Archbishop - xxxi, lxi, cxiii.
The slander upon the memory of Anne Boleyn considered - xxxii, et seq.
Sanders's, and Bayly's, and Phillips's notices of it - - xxxii.
Mr. Baddeley's notice of the same, with his railing against Cranmer xxxii.
Dr. Lingard's and Mr. Butler's notices of Anne Boleyn - - xxxiii.
Mr. Southey's notice of her story as blackened by the Romanists xxxiii.
Rastal's pretended book, upon which the calumny against Anne Boleyn is founded, considered - - xxxiv.
Character of Sanders xxxv, xxxvi.
Dr. Lingard's account of

PAGE

the elevation of the Archbishop to the see of Canterbury considered - xxxvi, et seq.

Dr. Lingard's remarks upon the Archbishop's protestation against the pope, together with Mr. Butler's, answered, xxxix, xl, xli.

The authority of the Archbishop's register as to this point - xli.

Misrepresentation of Sanders and Phillips on the subject - xli, et seq.

The Archbishop's own assertion as to this protest - - xliii.

Cardinal Pole's assertions not always to be relied upon - - xlv.

Dr. Lingard's account of the Archbishop's conduct, as to the divorce of queen Catherine, considered - xlv. et seq.

Original letter of the Archbishop on the subject - - xlvi.

Dr. Lingard and Dr. Milner ought to have seen this letter - xlvi, xlix.

Dr. Lingard's account of

PAGE

king Henry's union with Anne Boleyn - l.

Bishop Gardiner's opinion upon it the same as the Archbishop's - l, li, lii.

Dr. Lingard's description of the marriage of the King and Anne Boleyn in a garret, considered lv.

Dr Milner's observation on the marriage, corrected - - - lvi.

The Archbishop's notice of falsehoods, reported of him, omitted by Dr. Lingard in his citation of his Grace's letter - lvi.

Dr. Lingard's statement as to the king's supremacy - lvi, lvii.

Dr. Lingard's notice of the Archbishop upon this occasion, but his concealment of bishop Gardiner's having written a violent book against the pope's supremacy - lvii.

Dr. Lingard's reflection upon the learning or fanaticism of the Archbishop refuted lxi. et seq.

The title of Antichrist applied to the pope lxii, lxiii.

PAGE

Curious application of it in this view by the Romanists themselves - - lxiii.
Dr. Lingard's charge against the Archbishop, as to the trial and punishment of Lambert, answered - lxiv, et seq.
Dr. Milner and Mr. Butler agree with Dr. Lingard, and also as to the case of Anne Askew lxiv, et seq.
The Archbishop's aversion to cruelty - lxv.
Dr. Lingard refers to recantations of Anne Askew, which were denied by herself - - lxvi.
Bishop Gardiner the foremost in the proceedings both against Askew and Lambert - lxvii.
Dr. Milner's remark upon the Archbishop as a Lutheran, or Zuinglian, answered - - lxxi.
Original letter of the Archbishop in 1540, shewing his aversion to the Church of Rome lxxiii.
The Archbishop's opposition to the Act of the Six Articles lxxvi, et seq.

PAGE

Dr. Lingard's citation of a letter upon this subject, considered - lxxvii.
Mr. Butler's expostulation with Mr. Southey upon this subject considered - lxxix, lxxx.
Dr. Lingard's mis-statement as to the Archbishop in the discussion of this point - lxxxi.
The Archbishop's spirit in the cause of religion lxxxi.
Dr. Lingard's charge against the Archbishop in the case of Joan Bocher, answered lxxxiii.
Dr. Lingard's notice of the case of Van Parris lxxxiv.
Phillips's mis-statement of the cases both of Van Parris, and of Bocher - lxxiii, lxxxv.
Dr. Milner alleges the cruelty of the Archbishop to both by a reference to Burnet lxxxv.
The passage, referred to in Burnet, explained lxxxv, et seq.
Dr. Lingard's account of the Archbishop's behaviour, upon the accession of Mary to the

PAGE
throne, considered lxxxvii, et seq.
Dr. Thornden, one of the dissembling monks, who were enemies to the Archbishop lxxxix, et seq.
Conspiracy of the dissembling monks of Christ Church, Canterbury, against the Archbishop xc.
Character of several members of the Archbishop's cathedral - - xci.
Dr. Lingard's partiality to the bishops Gardiner and Bonner - xci, xcii.
Sir John Harington's manuscript narrative of Bp. Gardiner's cruelty xcii, et seq.
His description of Bp. Gardiner and Bp. Bonner - - xciv, xcv.
Cardinal Pole's character xcv, xcvi.
Dr. Lingard's suggestions that Bonner and Gardiner were not quite so guilty, as they have been represented - xcvii.
Dr. Lingard's mistaken relation of the Protestants who were burned in the reign of Mary xcvii.

PAGE
Bp. Bonner's character xcviii.
Dr. Lingard's relation of the code of ecclesiastical laws, compiled by the Archbishop and his associates - xcix, et seq.
The Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum explained - xcix, et seq.
Dr. Lingard's insinuation as to the Archbishop's and his associates' intention in these laws - c.
Mr. Butler's belief of the wish of the Archbishop and his associates - c.
The Archbishop and his associates defended - - ci.
The cruel persecution by Mary and her agents ci, cii.
Dr. Lingard's exhibition of the Archbishop in his last days - - cii.
Dr. Lingard mistakenly adds a seventh recantation to those which the Archbishop is said to have made - - ciii.
Strype's account of the six recantations - ciii, et seq.
Suspicious circumstances observable in them cv, et seq.
The order, by the Privy Council, for the Arch-

PAGE

bishop's recantation in the first instance to be burnt - - cvii.
The preparation of part of these recantations for the Archbishop obvious cviii, et seq.
The original copy of them dishonestly published by Bp. Bonner cviii, cix.
And dishonourably privileged by queen Mary cviii.
Dr. Lingard's observation upon the recantations considered - - cix.
Dr. Milner's strange reference to the Lambeth Records, in confirmation of these recantations, exposed - cix.
The real speech of the Archbishop at his martyrdom, instead of that prepared for him cx, cxi.
Account of the Archbishop's last moments cxi, cxii.
Observations on the Reformation in England, cxiii.
Milton's character of it cxiv.
Blackstone referred to in behalf of it - cxiv.
Concluding remark upon it in an Essay, honoured with the approbation of the University of Oxford - - cxv.

HISTORICAL

AND

CRITICAL INTRODUCTION.

I. *An account of the Archbishop's work.* II. *The vindication of the Archbishop's character.*

I. The work of Archbishop Cranmer, which is reprinted in the following pages, has long ceased to be a book of frequent occurrence. Nearly three centuries have passed since it first appeared; since it was also afterwards embodied in the prelate's admirable vindication of it against Bishop Gardiner; and since it likewise was published in a Latin translation. Of its celebrity our theologians and ecclesiastical writers often speak. Over the pages of it no discerning reader will turn without finding abundant examples of irresistible argumentation, as well as impressive eloquence. And the indissoluble connection of it with our Church and State every Protestant will admit, when the learned

amongst them call to mind, and the unlearned are informed, that to the establishment of the Reformation in England this work in the highest degree contributed, and that it refutes the doctrine which chiefly distinguishes the Church of Rome from the Church of England.

That no reader may be interrupted in the perusal of this important treatise, the orthography of it in the following pages is that of our own time; the spelling of words in the time of Cranmer being so unsettled, as that in the same page, and even in the same line, a single expression presents often different forms. Sometimes an archaism, or a seeming vulgarism, which the recollection of the time excuses, is found in this discourse; but the words and reasoning all along are in unison with the prelate's own declaration of "[a] *making more clearly appear the light from the darkness.*" The contents of the martyr's book, like the publick tables that of old were hung up in temples and market-places, should be in characters so "[b] *plain, that he may run that readeth them;*" yes, and that he may mark them too; that he may mark them as forming much of the basis of that Protestant Constitution, "[c] under which we have enjoyed more

[a] Defence of the true Doctrine, &c. present edition, p. 35.

[b] Habakkuk ii. 2.

[c] Substance of the Speech of the Right Hon. Robert Peel in the House of Commons, May 9, 1817, on the Right Hon. Henry

liberty, we have acquired more glory, we possess more character and power, than hitherto has fallen to the lot of any other country on the globe;" and that hence he may mark them as proclaiming with a voice never to be silenced, we trust, that "[d] the Reformation was worth establishing," and therefore "it is worth maintaining."

The treatise before us, while it principally discusses the subject of Transubstantiation, and the Sacrifice of the Mass, delivers some excellent observations upon certain doctrines adopted by our Church, (besides that which concerns the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper,) agreeing also with the primate's decision upon such points in the publick formularies of our faith. They shall be noticed in the present Introduction. But I ought, in illustration of the work, first to state the history of it, and then shew how the difference in question between the Churches of Rome and England is marked, and how the great reformer determined upon other points.

"[e] During the time of king Henry the eighth, until the entering of king Edward, it seemeth

Grattan's motion, That the House should resolve itself into a Committee, to take into consideration the laws affecting the Roman Catholicks of the United Kingdom. Third edition, p. 40.

[d] Sermons and Charges by Bp. Barrington, p. 437. "If the Reformation was worth establishing, it is worth maintaining."

[e] Fox's Acts and Monuments.

that Cranmer was scarcely yet thoroughly persuaded in the right knowledge of the Sacrament, or at least was not yet fully ripened in the same; wherein shortly after being more groundedly confirmed by conference with bishop Ridley, in process of time did so profit in riper knowledge, that at last he took upon him *the defence of that whole doctrine*, that is, to refute and throw down, first, the corporal presence; secondly, the fantastical transubstantiation; thirdly, the idolatrous adoration; fourthly, the false error of the Papists, that wicked men do eat the natural body of Christ; and, lastly, the blasphemous sacrifice of the mass. Whereupon in conclusion *he wrote five books for the publick instruction of the Church of England:* WHICH INSTRUCTION YET TO THIS DAY STANDETH, AND IS RECEIVED, IN THIS CHURCH OF ENGLAND."

Such is the [f] faithful statement of Fox, the

[f] I have great pleasure in citing the following passage from the Preface to Dr. Wordsworth's Ecclesiastical Biography; assuring the reader also, that in numerous researches which it has been often my duty to make among ancient registers, and other records, the accuracy of Fox in such as he has applied to his purpose is indisputable. "I am well aware," Dr. Wordsworth says, "that by the extent to which I have availed myself of Fox's *Acts and Monuments*, I fall within the sphere of such censures as that of Dr. John Milner, in which he speaks of 'the frequent publications of John Fox's lying Book of Martyrs, with prints of men, women, and children, expiring in flames; the nonsense, inconsistency, and falsehoods of which.'

martyrologist, in respect to the work before us. Cranmer himself has also informed us, in his Profession of faith in 1555, that "[g] his book was made seven years ago;" and it was [h] about the year 1546, when Ridley, by reading the work of [i] Bertram concerning the Body and

he says, 'he had in part exposed in his Letters to a Prebendary.' I am not ignorant of what has been said also by Dr. Milner's predecessors in the same argument, by Harpsfield, Parsons, and others. *But these writings have not proved, and it never will be proved, that John Fox is not one of the most faithful and authentick of all historians.* We know too much of the strength of Fox's book, and of the weakness of those of his adversaries, to be further moved by Dr. Milner's censures, than to charge them with falsehood. All the many researches and discoveries of later times, in regard to historical documents, have only contributed to place the general fidelity and truth of Fox's melancholy narrative on a rock which cannot be shaken."

[g] Fox's Acts and Mon.

[h] Ridley communicated his thoughts upon Bertram's book to Cranmer about the year 1546. Strype's Life of Cranmer, B. 2. ch. 25.

[i] Bertram, who is also called Ratramnus, asserts our doctrine as expressly as we (Protestants) ourselves can do; delivering it in the same words, and proving it by many of the same arguments and authorities which we bring. See Bishop Burnet on the 28th Article. He was a monk of the Abbey of Corbey, in the ninth century. Mabillon says, that he had seen a manuscript of his work on the Eucharist eight hundred years old. Cave gives him the highest character as a man and a scholar, and adds, "*excepta lite Eucharistica, ab ipsis scriptoribus pontificiis summis elogiis ornatus.*" In the London edition of the *Catalogus Testium Veritatis*, 1686, all the objections

Blood of Christ, had been led to examine closely the prevailing opinion of the corporal presence; when, having found it much opposed in the ninth century, especially by this learned writer, he communicated the result of his inquiry to Cranmer. Henceforward, indeed, they both pursued the subject with more than ordinary care; and the Archbishop brought together their observations into the present *Defence of the* TRUE *doctrine,* as he has justly entitled his book. But a supposition that Ridley was the author of this book, or rather a wish to deprive Cranmer of the merit due to his own learning and research, appears to have been at the time expressed. "[k] How," said Secretary Bourne, in his examination of Ridley in the Tower, "how can you then make but a figure or a sign of the Sacrament, *as that book doth which is set forth in my Lord of Canterbury's name? I wiss you can tell who made it: Did not you make it?*"— "And here," Ridley himself relates, "here was much murmuring of the rest, *as though they would have given me the glory of writing that book:* —Master Secretary, quoth I, that book was made of a great learned man, and one who is able to do the like again; as for me, I assure

of the Romanists against this writer are learnedly and acutely refuted.

[k] Ridley's Life of bishop Ridley, (from Fox,) p. 440.

you, be not deceived, I was never able to do or write any such like thing: he passeth me no less than the learned master his young scholar: —But, Sir, methinks it is not charitably done, to bear the people in hand that any man doth so lightly esteem the Sacrament, as to make of it a figure only; but that *but* maketh it a bare figure without any more profit; *which that book doth often deny, as appeareth to the reader most plainly.*"

It is highly probable, that soon after the consultation of Cranmer and Ridley upon this subject, the Archbishop caused an English translation of Bertram's book to be published; a circumstance, which has been overlooked by the historians of the English Reformation. For in 1548[1], and in 1549, two editions of this plain, brief, and very useful discourse, made their appearance, royally privileged, with the following title: "The boke of Barthram, priest, intreatinge of the bodye and bloude of Christe, wrytten to great Charles the emperoure, and set forth seven hundred years ago." It is printed in a small form, but in types usually given to books of a larger size; as if it had been intended to gratify the eye of age, as well as youth. And this accords with the accustomed zeal of Cran-

[1] By T. Raynalde in 1548, and by A. Kitson in 1549. Ames, Hist. of Printing, p. 220. The copy however, which is now before me, is printed by Raynalde in 1549.

mer to exhibit the most valuable information in the national language: Witness his successful motion, almost immediately after his consecration, that the Scriptures should be translated into English, and his subsequent joy that the translation might be used by all: Witness his exertions also to bring into use prayer in the vernacular tongue, and thus to render publick devotion intelligible to all. Of this pious diligence, though many other instances might be given, all contributing to promote the Reformation, I will add only one which Burnet and Strype had not seen, but which Collier has with a slight alteration or two printed, and which presents to us the great prelate, in the pursuit of his noble object, employing the aids of metre and of musick. It is contained in an original letter, which appears to have been written subsequently to the "[m] Royal Mandate for publishing and using the prayers in the English tongue;" the King having observed, in this direction to the Archbishop, that "the people heretofore understood no part of such prayers or suffrages as were used to be sung and said." The whole of this Mandate, as Strype has well observed, runs in such a pious strain, as though none but Cranmer had been the suggester of it. It is printed entire in Burnet's History of the Reformation, and great part of it is copied by

[m] Burnet's Hist. of the Reformation, vol. i. Records, p. 264.

Strype in his Memorials of the Archbishop; and it is dated in June, 1544. In the succeeding August the Archbishop was also called upon by the Privy Council to appoint processions in the English tongue. The following is the Archbishop's letter, copied from the original now remaining in the State-Paper Office.

" It may please your Maiestie to be aduertised, that according to your Highnes' commandemente, sent vnto me by your grace's secretary Mr. Pagett, I haue translated into the English tongue so well as I coulde, in so shorte tyme, certeyne processions to be vsed vpon festiuall daies, yf, after due correction and amendemente of the same, your highnes shall thinke it so conuenient: In whiche translation, forasmoche as many of the processions in the Lattyn were but barren, (as me semed,) and litle frutefull; I was constrayned to vse more than the libertie of a translator: ffor in some processions I have alterid diuers wourdes, in some I haue added parte, in some taken parte awaie. Some I have lefte oute hole, either for bycause the matter apperid to me to be little to purpose, or bycause the daies be not with vs festiuall daies. And some procession I haue added hole, bycause I thought I hadd better matter for the purpose than was the procession in Latten: the iudgemente wherof I referre

holie vnto your Maiestie. And after your highnes hath corrected yt, yf your grace cōmande some devoute and solempne note to be made therevnto, (as is to the procession whiche your Maiestie hath alredie set furth in Englishe,) I truste it woll moche excitate and stirre the hearts of all men vnto deuotion and godlynes. But in myn opinion the songe[n] that shalbe made thervnto sholde not be full of notes, but as nere as may be for euery sillable a note, so that it may be songe distinctly and deuoutly, as be in the matens and euen song, *Venite*, the hymnes *Te Deum*, *Benedictus*, *Magnificat*, *Nunc Dimittis*, and all the psalmes and versicles, and the masse *Gloria in excelsis*, *Gloria Patri*, the Crede, the Preface, the *Pater noster*, and some of the *Sanctus* and *Agnus*. As concernyng the *Salve festa dies*, the Latin note (as I thinke) is sobre and distinct enoughe. Wherefore I haue trauailed to make the verses in Englishe, and have put the Latten note vnto the same. Neuertheles, thei that be connyng in syngyng can make a moche more solempne

[n] This passage leads us to believe, that metrical psalmody might at this time have been thought of by Cranmer, especially by what follows in the letter as to his English verses; and, it may be added, by the imitations of the Archbishop's endeavour, which soon followed in the stanzas of Sternhold, Hunnis, and others. So that the psalmody in question may seem to be of higher authority, than hitherto has been conceded to it.

note thereto. I made them only for a profe to see how Englishe wolde do in songe. But bycause myn Englishe verses lacke the grace and facilitie which I wolde wishe they hadd, your Maiestie may cause some other to make theym againe, that can do the same in more pleasante Englishe and phrase. As for the sentence, I suppose, [it] will serue well enough. Thus Almightie God preserue your Maiestie in longe and prosperous helth and felicitie. ffrom Bekisborne the vijth of October.

" Your grace's most bounden,
" chaplayne and bedisman,
" T. CANTUARIEN.

The Discourse of the Archbishop upon the Lord's Supper, almost immediately after the publication of it, was attacked by bishop Gardiner, then a prisoner in the Tower, in " An Explication and Assertion of the true Catholick Faith touching the most blessed Sacrament of the Altar, *with confutation of a book* [the Archbishop's] *written against the same*, 1551;" and printed, according to Strype, in France. Another opponent also, Dr. Smith, then at Louvain, published an answer to Cranmer. Both adversaries brought against the Archbishop the accusation of inconsistency. Finding in his Defence of the true Doctrine, that Consubstantiation, as well as Transubstantiation, was opposed, they

reminded the author that formerly he had been a Papist, then a Lutheran, and lastly a Zuinglian, in his sacramental profession. The Archbishop was instant in his reply° to both; confuting as well "the crafty and sophistical cavillation" of Gardiner, as such places in the puny book of Smith as "seemed any thing worthy the answer-

° It may be proper to extract, from the reply at large, the following words. "After it had pleased God," the Archbishop says, "to shew unto me by his word a more perfect knowledge of his Son Jesus Christ, from time to time, as I grew in knowledge of him, *by little and little I put away my former ignorance.* And as God of his mercy gave me light, so through his grace I opened my eyes to receive it; and did not wilfully repugn unto God, and remain in darkness. And I trust in God's mercy and pardon for *my former errors, because I erred but of frailness and ignorance.*" Answer to Gardiner, p. 402. He had just before ingenuously also said, after denying an allegation made by Smith, that he was "in the error of the real presence, and in divers other errors, &c. for lack of good instruction from his youth; the outrageous floods of papistical errors at that time overflowing the world; for the which, and other offences of his youth he daily prayed to God for mercy and pardon." And in the first part of his book he observes, in the same honourable spirit, "It is lawful and commendable for a man *to learn from time to time, and to go from his ignorance that he may receive and embrace the truth.* As for me, I am not, I grant, of that nature that the Papists for most part be, who study to devise all shameful shifts, rather than they will forsake any error, wherewith they were infected in their youth." Answ. &c. p. 62. As to the accusation of his being a Lutheran, or a Zuinglian, see the observation in a subsequent page on Dr. Lingard's similar opinion.

ing." This answer was eagerly expected, and well received; was printed in 1551; and again[p] in 1552, according to Ames, which Strype, however, has not noticed. And as a proof not only of the welcome which it had experienced, but of the high character which it maintained, it was republished in 1580. Archbishop Parker[q] indeed has said of it, that no controversy against the Papists was ever handled more accurately; and succeeding writers of distinction have bestowed their eulogy upon the language as well as the spirit of it, upon its acuteness as well as its zeal. Of his own confidence in the great doctrine, which he so learnedly and copiously maintained, he gave this solemn testimony in his last most impressive words: "As[r] for the Sacrament," said the venerable martyr as he approached the stake, "As for the Sacrament, I believe *as I have taught in my book against the bishop of Winchester;* the which my book teacheth so true a doctrine of the Sacrament, that it shall stand at the last day before the judgement of God, where the papistical doctrine, contrary thereto, shall be ashamed to shew her face." It is in this book that the *Defence of the true doctrine*

[p] Ames, Hist. of Printing, p. 227.

[q] Strype's Life of Cranmer, B. 2. ch. 25.

[r] Fox's Acts and Mon.

is incorporated[s]; the whole of which, together with the whole of Gardiner's attack upon it, is there reprinted, with additional observations. And it is this Defence, against which the indignation of Roman Catholicks was in vain exercised. In vain, as to silencing it, was it made an article[t] in the charges brought against the mighty prelate. In vain, as to weakening its effect, was it proposed to him by his cunning enemies as a theme for recantation. Gardiner indeed affected to answer it in Latin under a feigned name; when the Archbishop, though then in prison, vindicated his own work to a very great extent, and intended some addition to that vindication, if it might have been[u], "before his life," as he said, "were taken away, which he saw was likely to be within a very short space." After that event, the learned Peter Martyr indeed appeared as his acute and elaborate defender.

But as Gardiner, under the assumed title of M. A. Constantius, had so unfairly proceeded

[s] Now and then an amended reading may be observed in this reprint of the Defence, which I have followed by enclosing the reading in brackets.

[t] See the Process against him, first printed from the manuscript in the Library at Lambeth Palace at the close of the Oxford edition of Strype's Life of Cranmer, 1812. p. 1077, et seq.

[u] Strype's Life of Cranmer, B. 2. ch. 25. The work is supposed to be lost.

with Cranmer's book as to confound the method of it, and to disjoin and mangle passages in subserviency only to his own objections; the Archbishop was of opinion, that if learned foreigners saw his *Defence of the true doctrine* translated into the Latin tongue, (as the second attack of Gardiner was written in that language,) it would sufficiently vindicate him in their judgement and esteem. Sir John Cheke, an accomplished scholar, elegantly performed this service for the Archbishop; and the Defence in Latin, with some additions [x], appeared in 1553; as it also again appeared in 1557, with observations which had been made upon a review of this translation by the archbishop himself in prison, and which had fallen into the hands of the English exiles at Embden, who offered in this publication their grateful sense of duty to the memory of the martyred primate. Prefixed to this Latin translation is an epistle from Cranmer to King Edward VI, in which he says, that "it was his care of the Lord's flock committed to him, which induced him to renew and restore the Lord's Supper according to the institution of Christ: which was the reason that, about three years before, he had set forth a book in English against the principal abuses of the papistical mass." But the whole epistle is writ-

[x] Strype's Life of Cranmer, B. 2. ch. 25.

ten, as Strype observes, (who, however, has not copied it, nor has Burnet in his History of the Reformation,) with so much sharpness of wit, as well as in a pure and elegant style, as to render the insertion of it in the note below desirable[y]. Strype has mentioned a manuscript

[y] I copy the Letter from the edition of 1557, a book not often to be met with.

" *Illustrissimo ac nobilissimo Principi* Edvardo *Sexto, Angliæ, Franciæ, et Hiberniæ Regi, fidei defensori, et in terris secundum Christum Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ et Hibernicæ capiti supremo, Thomas Cantuariensis Archiepiscopus.*

" Pro cura Dominici gregis mihi commissa, in quo salutari pastu verbi Divini erudiendo omnem curam cogitationemque meam collocare debeo, Illustriss. Princeps, Cœnam Domini (quæ multis et magnis superstitionibus violata est, et ad quæstum translata,) renovandam ad Servatoris Christi instituta et redintegrandam putavi; et de vero ejus usu ex verbi Divini et veteris ac sanctæ Ecclesiæ authoritate commonefaciendos esse omnes judicavi, quorum cura, et instructio, ad officii mei authoritatem aliqua ex parte pertinet.

" Itaque ante triennium Missæ papisticæ abusus præcipuos (quibus non modo Ecclesia Anglica, sed etiam totus penè orbis fœdatus atque infectus fuerat,) *libello quodam Anglo* confutavi, et verum atque Christianum ejus usum restituendum docui. *Quo libro ita multi sunt ad sanam de ea re opinionem adducti,* ut veritatis vim, quanta esset, sentirem, et gratiæ Servatoris Christi beneficia intelligerem, ut ad veritatis lucem patefactam occæcati homines splendorem lucis acciperent, et (ut Paulus prædicante Anania) oculorum aciem perciperent. Hoc ità ægrè Stephanus Gardinerus, Wintoniensis tum Episcopus, tulerat, ut nihil sibi prius faciendum putarit, quàm ut librum tam utilem et plausibilem confutaret; ratus, nisi opera sua aliqua impedimenta objicerentur, nullos deploratæ jam et dere-

written by the archbishop, preserved in the library of Bene't College, Cambridge, entitled

lictæ penè sententiæ adjutores fore. Itaque eadem ipse lingua iisdem de rebus conscribit, et firmatam jam de vero Cœnæ usu sententiam evertere conatur, et papisticam opinionem, superstitionibus undique diffluentem, revocare conatur. Post hunc prodiit M. Antonius Constantius, Stephano Gardinero ita affinis et germanus, ut idem ipse esse videatur; tanta est ingeniorum subtilitas, scripturæ sophistices similitudo. Sed uterque idem tractat, alio tamen modo.

" Constantius enim libro Latinè scripto argumenta mea persequitur, ut sibi optimum videtur; et, ut causam juvet, sæpè truncata, sæpè inversa, sæpè disjecta, sic introducit, ut non magis à me agnosci potuerint, quàm Medeæ liberi in multa membra disjecti et deformati. Neque enim de hujusmodi corporis forma, neque de ulla re rectè judicare possumus, ubi tota species ante oculos proposita non est in quam intueri, quasi in Phidiæ Minervam, debemus; et non particulam aliquam, sicuti Momus crepidam Veneris, lacessere. Itaque ut melius mea de hac controversia opinione sententia teneretur, *librum meum de Anglo in Latinum convertendum curavi*, ut omnes intelligerent nos neque obscuram nostram sententiam, neque abditam esse velle, quam cum multis bonis et doctis viris communem habemus, et cum verbo Dei, et verbi defensatrice vera Ecclesia, consentientem.

" Nemo est autem ex omnibus dignior, in cujus nomine libellus hic appareat quàm in tuo. Es enim non modò Papistarum opinione Fidei defensor, (qui hoc non à seipsis protulerant, sed Deo per illos ad ipsorum perniciem præmonente,) sed etiam bonorum omnium authoritate dignus, in quem tantum Ecclesiæ munus conferatur. Es hujus Ecclesiæ Anglicæ et Hibernicæ supremus in terris moderator, sub quo quasi sub Moyse partem spiritus et magnam multorum curam atque administrationem commissam habeo. Es etiam non modò legibus nostris tanti

De re sacramentaria; and Burnet and Collier, as well as Strype, have printed other dispersed

regni Rex, sed etiam natura, quæ Majestatem tuam ita ad omnem excellentiam formavit, ut quæ singula in aliis exquisita sunt, ea in Majestate tua perfecta emineant. Video in regibus mediocre aliquid esse non posse, et authoritate veteris proverbii in eo confirmor, et gaudeo hanc excellentiam non modò ad meliorem partem, sed etiam ad optimam, esse translatam. Hæc non laudandæ Majestatis tuæ gratia, sed cohortandæ potiùs dico, ut res, in hac ætate tam illustres, uberrimos posthac et excellentissimos tantæ dignitatis splendores in constanti ætate ferant. Quanta enim ornamenta ingenii et doctrinæ, vel ab optima natura, vel bonis præceptoribus tribui poterant, eadem in te omnia excellentia sunt; et quod in primis laudabilissimum est, timor Dei, et veræ religionis studium, in quibus Majestas tua ea cum laude versatur, qua seipsum Rex et Propheta commendavit quum dixerat, Senibus se intelligentiorem esse, quia mandata Dei inquirebat.

" Hiis aliisque gravibus de causis commoveor, ut *hunc librum, jam Latinum factum,* nomini tuo offeram. Spero autem rei ipsæ satisfactum hoc libro esse, qui non modò summam veræ doctrinæ continet, sed omnia adversariorum argumenta, (quæ quidèm recitatu digna sunt) refutat. Sed quia nimis curiosi quidam sunt, et nulla, ne diligenti quidèm et plena rerum explicatione contenti, et eandem materiam argumentorum, (ne nihil dicere videantur,) in alias formas transmutant, et ordinem naturæ pro licentia ingeniorum confundunt; ideo *nostram ad Stephani Gardineri librum responsionem, Latinam factam, brevi in lucem educemus,* ut nullus (ne sophistis quidèm) ad contradicendum locus relictus sit: qua ratione putabo non modo uni, sed Gardinero etiam et Constantio quoque esse satisfactum; et quod de comœdiis ille dixit, hoc de personatis istis dicendum, Unum cognoris, ambos cognoris. Quod si quædam uno in libro pertractata sunt, quæ in altero prætermissa fuerint,

observations by Cranmer upon the same subject. To bring together whatever relates to the archbishop's inquiries, and determinations, as to this important doctrine, I may add, that in the State-Paper Office there remain, in the primate's hand-writing, a paper *De Sacramento Eucharistiæ;* another, *De Missa privata;* and in a thin folio (among discussions upon [z] other points) *De Eucharistia,* and *De Sacramentorum usu;* and

iisdem ego responsionem neam adjungam, ut adversarii, si qui relicti sint, vel non habeant quod objiciant, vel, si objecerint, videant quid responderi ad illa possit. Hæ sunt causæ, Rex nobilissime, quæ me *ad emittendum hunc librum* impulerunt, eumque sub majestatis tuæ autoritate divulgandum. Te spero ita hoc meum studium accepturum, quemadomodum et causæ æquitas fert, et officium meum postulat, et clementia tua in aliis honestis causis solet facere. Dominus Jesus majestatem tuam servet. Lambethæ, Idibus Martiis. M. D. LIII."

[z] The book is indorsed, " a boke conteyning dyvers Articles, &c.," and contains discussions

De unitate et trinitate personarum.
De peccato originali.
De duabus Christi naturis.
De Justificatione.
De Ecclesia.
De Baptismo.
De Eucharistia.
De Penitentia.
De Sacramentorum usu.
De ministris Ecclesiæ.
De ritibus ecclesiasticis.
De rebus civilibus.
De corporum resurrectione et extremo judicio.

in English, *What a Sacrament is.* These were, no doubt, composed before the *Defence of the true doctrine* had been written; and with other theological observations have been preserved, bearing an indorsement upon one of them, (the whole having been contained in a bundle,) "*Most of*[a] *these papers Archbishop Cranmer's hand.*"

The Defence of the true doctrine, as Fox has already told us, and as Strype has repeated the information, was written on purpose for the publick instruction of the Church of England. Written too as it was by Cranmer in his mature age, after all his great reading, and all his diligent study of the fathers and ecclesiastical writers, with whose judgments and opinions in the doctrine he thus became intimately acquainted; it is, as Strype has justly[b] concluded, the more to be valued. And yet the use which Cranmer made of the fathers and schoolmen, in appealing to their authority for confutation of the Romanists, in his dispute with them, has been strangely undervalued by[c] some; as if with the Roman-

[a] The other separate papers, which I inspected at the State Paper Office, are the following:

De Sacerdotum et Episcoporum ordine ac ministerio.

De potestate ac primatu Papæ: indorsed 1537.

De Fide.

De veneratione sanctorum, et imaginibus: two loose books.

[b] Strype's Life of Cranmer, b. 2. ch. 25.

[c] Dr. Glocester Ridley, in his valuable life of Bishop Ridley, censures very justly the inconsiderate observation of Mr. Gil-

ists any argument could be more effectual, than that which laid open the weakness of pretences under which they sheltered themselves from the efficacy of scriptural arguments alone; or as if the archbishop might have been content to give merely a rational account of his faith; and, by disavowing the authority of the fathers as insufficient, have [d] acknowledged that he held opinions contrary to the Church through all ages! No: the archbishop knew the value of the authority in question; and accordingly in Injunctions, given by King Edward the Sixth, in the first year of his reign, to the Dean and Chapter of York, (and to the governours also of other cathedrals,) of which Cranmer no doubt was the author, especial attention is directed to this point. "[e] Item, they shall make a librarie in some convenient place within their churche, within the space of one yeare next en-

pin in his life of Latimer, that Ridley and Cranmer should have avoided appealing to the fathers. The strongest arguments that can be produced against Popery, as Atterbury has observed, are the Fathers and Bibles.

[d] See Ridley's Life, ut supr. p. 493.

[e] Register of the Dean and Chapter of York, fol. 46. a. Burnet mentions this register, but I think that he had never seen it. See his History of the Reformation, vol. 3. under the year 1547. If he had examined it, he would surely have extracted from it some of the valuable information which it contains, as applicable to the noble purpose in which he was engaged.

suyng this visitation, and shall have in the same Saynte *Augustynes, Basill, Gregorie Nazianzene, Hierome, Ambrose, Chrisostome, Cipriane, Theophilact, Erasmus,* and other good writers' workes." But more powerfully, than in a mere recommendation of the study of the fathers, Cranmer has illustrated the [f] obligations of his cause to them in his *Defence of the true doctrine;* and upon the copiousness, as well as the accuracy, of citations in it from their works, the reader may fix his attention without fear of contradiction, and with full confidence in their value.

Of Cranmer, and Ridley, and the rest of the Protestant Clergy, who framed the *Communion Service* in 1548, which the Defence before us illustrates throughout, and which is our liturgical rejection of Transubstantiation, it has however been lately asserted, that they believed somewhat equivalent to Transubstantiation in what they taught, and asserted, of the [g] real pre-

[f] Just as it is said of our Established Church generally: "She has produced *the strongest arguments against Popery*— Fathers and Bibles." Atterbury, Preface to his Answer to some Considerations on the spirit of Martin Luther, &c. See also a preceding note.

[g] It will be proper here to recite the words of Cranmer in the Preface to his book against Gardiner, with which Archbishop Sharp has closed his excellent discourse upon *the sense of the Church of England as to the real presence in the Eucharist.* This passage "of the most learned Archbishop Cranmer," Dr. Sharp truly affirms, "may go further than any other

sence of Christ in the Sacrament. Now the fact is, that they positively disowned any material presence of Christ's body, or any part of it, either by conversion, substitution, or union; and believed no other than a figurative presence of Christ's body properly so called, yet affirming the Eucharist to be a true and real communication of the virtues and benefits of his body, not merely a figurative commemoration of them. And Cranmer, and Ridley, and Hooper, not to

man's *for the ascertaining, and clearing, the sense of our Church in this matter, since he had the principal hand in compiling both our Liturgy and our Articles.*"—"When I say and repeat many times in my book," Cranmer says, "that the body of Christ is present in them that worthily receive the sacrament; lest any man should mistake my words, and think that I mean, that although Christ be not corporally in the outward visible signs, yet he is corporally in the persons that duly receive them: this is to advertise the reader, that I mean no such thing: but my meaning is, that the force, the grace, the virtue, and benefit, of Christ's body that was crucified for us, and of his blood that was shed for us, be really and effectually present with all them that duly receive the sacraments; BUT ALL THIS I UNDERSTAND OF HIS SPIRITUAL PRESENCE; of the which he saith, *I will be with you until the world's end.* And, *Wheresoever two or three be gathered together in my Name, there am I in the midst of them.* And, *He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.* Nor no more truly is he corporally or really present in the due ministration of the Lord's Supper, than he is in the due ministration of Baptism;" that is to say, in both spiritually, by grace. Abp. Sharp's Serm. vol. 7. p. 370.

mention other learned Protestants, have left us their ample [h] assertions and their full belief in proof of this, and in vindication of the honour of our Reformed Church; and with their blood sealed the truths which they taught. But the author, who would involve these great men in the very error of their adversaries, betakes himself also to other expedients, in connection with his pretence; and brings forward the celebrated Jeremy Taylor, "[i] the bishop of Down; *than whom the whole Protestant Church boasts no fairer name;* who had fully examined Transubstantiation and the Mass, and declared, after his examination of them, that the doctrine of the Catholick Church upon them was not idolatrous." But was this really the *full examination* of bishop Taylor upon the subject? Not so: the few lines from "The Liberty of Prophesying," which are adduced, were the observation of Taylor in his younger days, and were published in 1647; but in "The Dissuasive from Popery," pub-

[h] I have printed in the Appendix to this volume, the opinions and assertions of Ridley and Hooper, upon this important subject.

[i] The Book of the Roman Catholic Church, 1825, by Charles Butler, Esq. p. 321; and the Enquiry as to the Declaration against Transubstantiation, &c. published anonymously in 1822, but of which Mr. Butler avows himself the author in the Book of the Roman Catholic Church, and copies it into the eighteenth letter in that recent work.

lished by him, when reading and judgment were matured, in 1664, the masterly, and learned, and eloquent pages throughout denounce Transubstantiation and the Mass as absolutely idolatrous. The learned remarker upon [k] Cranmer, and Ridley, and Taylor, knows that I am correct in my assertion; and he knows, or ought to know, that a very vigilant prelate of the English Church long since noticed the endeavour, which the remarker has stated, made by Taylor in his "Liberty of Prophesying" to free the Papists from formal idolatry; the prelate adding, "[l] but the same Dr. Taylor afterwards, in his Dissuasive from Popery, fully *confutes Dr. Hammond*, (who would have the papistical worship of the host to be only material idolatry,) *and himself;* and truly proves, that the popish adoration of the host in the Eucharist is properly idolatrical." Now can the remarker upon Cranmer, and Ridley, and Taylor, himself a scholar of indefatigable research, not have known this latter work of a man *than whom the whole Protestant Church boasts no fairer name?* Or can he hope to content the reader with a meagre extract from Taylor, afterwards over-ruled by himself, and present *that* as the solemn and only decision, upon

[k] Book of the Rom. Cath. Church, p. 324.

[l] Bp. Barlow's Remains, p. 203. I have printed in the appendix an extract from Taylor's own book.

the subject, of a man *than whom the whole Protestant Church boasts no fairer name?* Is the suppression of truth the way to promote any inquiry, civil or religious? And is a compliment to the name of a great divine a compensation for withholding the mention of his illustrious services to the Protestant Church, in the elaborate and unanswerable *Dissuasive from Popery?* And is the whole truth proclaimed, when Mr. Butler also [m] cites another prelate of the English Church in his behalf, because that prelate said in the House of Lords, when the Declaration against Transubstantiation was enacted by the law of the land, "[n] that the Church of Rome was not idolatrous?" This is all that Mr. Butler tells of Dr. Gunning, bishop of Ely. But what was the conduct of this bishop? He had reflected, no doubt, on the hastiness of his saying; and though he had also said that he could not take that test against Popery, "[o] yet as soon as the Bill was passed, he took it." How Mr. Butler may digest this practical answer of one of his own witnesses, it is not easy to say; but it may be easily seen why he himself, accomplished in the science of the law, has not brought forward this evidence. But besides these appeals to

[m] Book of the Rom. Cath. Ch. p. 327.

[n] Burnet, Hist. of his own Times, under the year 1678.

[o] Ibid.

Protestant divines in favour, as it is pretended, of Transubstantiation; Mr. Butler has also directed his readers to the Articles of the Church of England, one of which, as it had been drawn up by Cranmer, was altered in the reign of queen Elizabeth, and rendered "[p] so comprehensive," he says, "as to let in the believers of Transubstantiation." Now let our Protestant countrymen be more fully informed as to this allegation. And in order to this, the old paragraph of Cranmer's article is first to be observed: "[q] Since the very being of human nature doth require, that the body of one and the same man cannot be at one and the same time in many places, but must of necessity be in some certain and determinate place; therefore the body of Christ cannot be present in many different places at the same time: and since, as the holy Scriptures testify, Christ hath been taken up into heaven, and there is to abide till the end of the world; it becometh not any of the faithful to believe, or confess, that there is a real or corporal presence, as they (the Papists) phrase it, of the body and blood of Christ in the holy Eucharist." This was omitted in the Articles established as they now stand. And why? "The design of the government was at that time much turned to *the drawing over the body of the nation to the Refor-*

[p] Book of the Rom. Cath. Ch. p. 324.

[q] Articles of Religion, 1552. Art. XXIX.

mation," (bishop Burnet, in his History of the Reformation, and especially in his Exposition of the Thirty-nine Articles, has well observed,) " in whom the old leaven had gone deep; and no part of it deeper than the belief of the corporal presence of Christ in the Sacrament. Therefore it was thought not expedient to offend them by so particular a definition in this matter; in which the very words *real presence* were rejected. It might, perhaps, be also suggested, that here a definition was made that went too much upon the principles of natural philosophy; which, how true soever, might not be the proper subject of an article of religion. Therefore it was thought fit to suppress the old paragraph; *(it was thought enough to condemn Transubstantiation, Hist. Ref. ann.* 1559;) though the paragraph was a part of the Article that was subscribed. Yet it was not published. But the paragraph, *The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten in the Supper, only after an heavenly and spiritual manner,* &c. Art. 28th, this paragraph was put in its stead, and was received and published by the next Convocation; which upon the matter was *a full explanation of the way of Christ's presence in the Sacrament;* that *he is present in a heavenly and spiritual manner, and that faith is the mean by which he is received.* This seemed to be more theological, and IT DOES INDEED AMOUNT TO THE SAME THING;" that is, the declaration in the old para-

graph against Transubstantiation. And we see, Burnet continues, "what was the sense of the first Convocation in queen Elizabeth's reign: *it differed in nothing from that in king Edward's time:* and therefore, though the old paragraph is now no part of our Articles, yet we are certain that the clergy at that time did not at all doubt the truth of it. We are sure it was their opinion; since they subscribed it, though they did not think it fit to publish it, at first; and though it was afterwards changed for another *that was the same in sense.*" (Burnet on the 28th Article.) So much for the circumstance of *letting in*, as Mr. Butler calls it, *those who believed in Transubstantiation.* But unless they professed what the Article [r] delivers, they were *let in* to no other purpose than self-congratulation on their mental reserve, or than the jesuitical pretence of conforming to what they did not believe. If indeed they had been *let in* without the security of this profession when required, there is no knowing to what extent a feigned submission to Protestantism might have carried them.

I come now to the notice of some important passages in the *Defence of the true doctrine*, which relate to established articles of our faith, and agree with the decisions of Cranmer upon the subjects in our national confession. They are

[r] See the present Articles of Religion, Art. 28, throughout.

his sentiments upon the doctrines of universal redemption through Christ, and of regeneration in baptism: the former being in the preface, as now before the reader, p. 1, where he describes the reason of Christ's coming into the world, and again in the work, p. 234, from his representation of Christ as our "high bishop," until "he took all men's sins unto himself;" and the latter in p. 74, where the sentence begins with "Forasmuch as the same is a most holy sacrament," and closes with "wine is signified;" and again in p. 191, where "The sum of Damascene" commences, and "feed the soul" concludes, the valuable observations. See also p. 243. So desirous was Cranmer, from first to last, to maintain the belief of universal redemption, that in the Necessary Erudition of a Christian Man, published in 1543, which is admitted to be his work; in the Royal [s] Injunctions of 1547, which (as I have before said) are believed to be drawn up by his pen; and in the Defence now before us of 1550; he is uniform, animated, per-

[s] One of the anthems, directed to be sung in these injunctions, is this: "Lyke as Moyses lifte uppe the serpent in the wildernes, even so was our Savyoure Jesus Christe lifte uppe upon the crosse, that whosoever belevethe in him shulde not perishe, but have joye for ever: ffor God so loved the worlde, that he gave his onelie begotten Sonne, that such as beleve in him shulde not perishe, but have life everlasting." Regist. D. and Ch. of York, fol. 47. b.

spicuous, and encouraging to every true penitent. And with this confidence he closed his days in 1556: "'The great mystery that God became man," he said, "was not wrought for little or few offences. Thou didst not give thy Son, O heavenly Father, unto death for small sins only, but for all the greatest sins of the world, so that the sinner return to Thee with his whole heart, as I do here at this present."

II. From what has been said respecting the Archbishop's book, and other works connected with it, I proceed to a vindication of his character and conduct in regard to circumstances, which elsewhere have been detailed, not without misrepresenting the history both of himself and of the Reformation; and which, in the depreciation of both, have endeavoured to exalt the adversaries of Protestantism. That the character of Cranmer will not allow deductions, he must be an injudicious advocate who should pretend. I might indeed introduce his failings as pleading, considering his difficult station, for some remission of severe judgment upon them: I might plead his virtues as far outweighing those failings. But my object in these pages is only to examine certain statements and insinuations,

[1] Fox, Acts and Mon.

brought against him and his cause, in a tone of confidence as if not to be shaken, and as if defying contradiction; as if it were just to condemn another, and take little or no notice of facts that acquit him; as if the eloquence of declamation might bid inquiry seek no further. Hence, if I may here advert to the [u] revived slander upon the memory also of Cranmer's early friend, the early friend too of the Reformation, the celebrated [x] Anne Boleyn,

[u] That the ribaldry, scandal, and inconsistence, which are found in the pages of Bayly and of Phillips upon the subject of Anne Boleyn, should in these times be revived, is hardly credible. The refutations of these malignant reflections are numerous; as I shall presently recount. Phillips, who was a Canon of Tongres, half a century since followed Sanders, whom about half a century before Bayly also followed; and they are accompanied by another ecclesiastick of their communion, in bringing forward again the report of Anne Boleyn being the daughter of Henry. See a Sure way to find out the True Religion, &c. by the Rev. T. Baddeley, 12mo. Manchester, 3d. ed. 1823. p. 29. But this is the person, who, in speaking of Cranmer, bestows upon him every infamous name which the imagination can form, and the pen describe, p. 72. and then in a note, with unparalleled effrontery, appeals to the biography of Dr. Lempriere, a Protestant Clergyman, as if confirming all he says; when Dr. Lempriere in fact is the eulogist of the Archbishop.

[x] "All the account of Anne Boleyn by Sanders is so palpable a lie, or rather a complicated heap of lies, and so much depends on it, that I presume it will not offend the reader to be detained a few minutes in the refutation of it. For if it were true, very much might be drawn from it, both to disparage king

who is not concerned to find that, to their notice of the calumny, Dr. Lingard and Mr. Butler have not distinctly subjoined the references to authors who have refuted it? that they talk only of "[y] an attempt" to refute it, of its being "*problematical*," and of a probability in favour of the accused? that to "[z] the powerful arguments of Le Grand," and "the strong assertions of Sanders," as they are called, many eminent names, as of [a] Camden, and Herbert, and Ridley, and others, besides that of Burnet, have not been opposed? that the [b] questionable

Henry, who pretended conscience to annul his marriage for the nearness of affinity, and yet would after that marry his own daughter. It leaves also a foul and lasting stain both on the memory of Anne Boleyn, and of her incomparable daughter, queen Elizabeth. *It also derogates so much from the first reformers, who had some kind of dependance on queen Anne Boleyn, that it seems to be of great importance for directing the reader in the judgment he is to make of persons and things, to lay open the falsehood of this account.*" Burnet, Hist. of the Reformation, vol. i. p. 42, which see. Hence Dr. Southey has adverted to "the fiendish malignity, with which her story has been blackened by the Romanists." Book of the Church, vol. ii. p. 37. "With characteristick effrontery they asserted, that her mother and sister had been both mistresses of the king, and that she was his own daughter!" Ibid. p. 38.

[y] Lingard, Hist. of Eng. vol. vi. p. 153.

[z] Butler, Book of the Rom. Cath. Church, p. 191.

[a] See Lord Herbert's Hist. of K. Hen. VIII. p. 259. And Burnet's Hist. of the Ref. vol. i. p. 42, 43. And Appendix, p. 278, 279.

[b] "A book of one Rastal, a judge, that was never seen by

existence of the very authority, upon which Sanders founded his tale, has not been stated?

any other person than Sanders." Burnet, Hist. Ref. vol. i. p. 42. And pretending no other existence, it may be added, than what a marginal note in Sanders's book exhibits: "hæc narratio à Gulielmo Rastallo judice, in vita Thomæ Mori." There is no printed life of Sir Thomas More by Rastal. Wood indeed mentions a life of More by this person, as a manuscript; but evidently upon report, and not upon the sight of it. See Ath. Ox. ed. 1691, vol. i. col. 115. Rastal was a Romanist, the son of John Rastal, who married the sister of Sir Thomas More, and who, according to Wood, "was a zealous man for the Catholick cause, and *a great hater of the proceedings of K. Hen. VIII. as to his divorce, and for his ejecting the pope's power from the nation.*" Ath. Ox. i. col. 38. Some hasty report, some fabricated malignity, from such a parent, and in such times, the son perhaps had heard, and again reported, and even committed to writing; but if he did thus much, where is any contemporary authority to sanction the slanderous tale? And why slumbered it, so gratifying as at an earlier period the knowledge of it must have been to the enemies of the Reformation, for more than half a century? About thirty years after the first appearance of Sanders's book, the calumny reappeared with a pretence by the narrator of it, that he had *understood* from several persons, while he was in England, just what Sanders relates; with which he introduces into his pages whatever may further vilify her name, in statements most absurd, and in the grossest language. And his motive too, like that which inserted the tale in Sanders, sprung from revenge of the darkest character: it is found in a rare book, entitled, Examen Catholicum Edicti Anglicani, quod contra Catholicos est latum auctoritate Parliamenti Angliæ, Anno Dom. 1606, &c. "Is enim rex [Henricus]—in eam dementiam est prolapsus, ut eam, quam olim adulter ex Bolenii Vicecomitis

and that their cold and circumlocutory avowal of not believing the tale, (without the proper guidance, however, to the testimonies that expose the wickedness and silence the effrontery of the charge,) should yet be accompanied with the declaration of one of these gentlemen, that "[c] he cannot think the historians, who have asserted it, deserving the epithet of *fiendish malignity*, which Dr. Southey has bestowed upon them in his Book of the Church?" How gratifying might it have been, if, instead of this, the able pen, which wrote it, had severely reprehended Sanders, the leader of these historians, and

> ——————"[d] to the *fiend*
> Made answer meet, that made void all his wiles:
> So fares it, when with truth falsehood contends!"

---

uxore, Annam (Sanderus docet, et ab Anglis plurimis anno præterito, dum in Angliâ essem, *intellexi*) procreaverat prolem, in matrimonium, repudiatâ legitimâ et sanctissimâ conjuge, duxerit." Ed. Paris, 1607, fol. 5. The wretched scribbler then proceeds to state, in words which I will not copy, that Anne Boleyn, not content to indulge her vicious propensities at home, went into France for similar purposes; and after her return to England, he says, "fit filia pro conjuge, scortum pro uxore!" His subsequent ribaldry as to queen Elizabeth would be laughable, if it were not malicious. So much for impartial narratives!

[c] Butler, Book of the Roman Cath. Church, p. 191.

[d] Milton, Par. Reg. It is to be lamented that the term is applicable, which has been given to Sanders's calumny. "The

But I hasten to what immediately concerns the archbishop. And I shall pursue the recent observations of Dr. Lingard step by step; occasionally joining to them the corresponding remark, made by other learned writers of the Romish Church. Nor will I "set down any thing" without a careful appeal to the evidences, which substantiate what I relate.

The elevation of Cranmer to the see of Canterbury is thus described. "I know not why Burnet is so anxious to persuade his hearers, that Cranmer was unwilling to accept the archbishoprick, and found means to delay the matter six months. There were few instances of the see of Canterbury being filled so soon after a vacancy. Six months indeed elapsed before his consecration; but that arose from the negociation with Rome to procure his bulls. He must have given his consent at least three months before." Lingard, Hist. of England, 2d edit. vol. 6. pp. 253, 254. Ought not Dr. Lingard here to have given Cranmer's own account of his declining the archbishoprick? And is not Burnet right in believing the solemn asseveration of the primate, made in the presence of his ene-

authority of our countryman, Sanders, a man so famous for *veracity*, that if Captain Lemuel Gulliver had not supplanted him, we might use the proverbial phrase, *It is as true as if Sanders had said it!*" Jortin, Additions to Neve's Remarks on Phillips, p. 563.

mies? "[e] *I protest before you all,*" said Cranmer, "*there never was man came more unwilling to a bishoprick, than I did to that;* insomuch that when king Henry did send for me in post that I should come over, I prolonged my journey by seven weeks at the least, thinking that he would be forgetful of me in the mean time." To the insinuation of Dr. Martin, in his answer to this manly avowal, that there was a base compact between the king and the archbishop, the latter replied, with all the firmness of insulted veracity: "You say not true!" Dr. Lingard, however, having omitted this self-defence of Cranmer, is opposed to it, as we have seen, in saying that *there are few instances of the see of Canterbury being filled so soon after a vacancy as in six months;* as if the delay of Cranmer had been only in conformity to custom, and the time in question a portion absolutely requisite to complete the forms of his elevation; and that therefore Cranmer is not to be believed. Now the predecessors of Cranmer, for more than a century at least, were certainly not thus impeded in their approach to the primacy. We inquire after the dates of vacancy and succession in the [f] cases of

[e] Fox, Acts and Mon.

[f] Archbishop Bredwardin died Aug. 26, 1349. *Islip* was his successor, by the papal bull, dated Oct. 7, 1349, published in the chapter-house at Canterbury, Dec. 18, and he was consecrated the 20th. Le Neve's Fasti Eccl. Angl. p. 6. Arch-

Islip, and Chichelé, and Stafford, and Kemp, and Bourchier, and Dean, from 1349 to 1501, and find all the formalities of the bull, and the reception of the pall, and the consecration, *within* the time named. Then why should six months be required for the negociation with Rome, in Cranmer's case, to procure *his* bulls? Have we not the answer in the archbishop's own declaration? And yet Dr. Lingard says, that "the necessary bulls for Cranmer were expedited with *unusual dispatch*." Yes; *after* the see had long remained vacant, owing to the endeavour of Cranmer to decline it, *then* came the

bishop Arundel died Feb. 19, or 20, 1413. *Chichelé* was his successor, by translation, March 4, 1413; received his temporalities in May, and his pall in July following. Le Neve, p. 7. Chichelé died April 12, 1443. *Stafford* was his successor, by the papal bull, dated May 15, 1443, received the temporalities in June, was consecrated in August, and inthronized in September. Le Neve, p. 7. Stafford died in June, or July, 1452. *Kemp* was his successor, by the bull, dated July 21, 1452. The bull of his translation reached Canterbury Sept. 21, the next day was read in the chapter, and the same day he received his cross. Le Neve, p. 7. Kemp died March 22, 1543. *Bourchier* was his successor, elected April 22 following, and received the bull of confirmation August 22. Le Neve, p. 8. Langton died Jan. 27, 1500, that is, 1500-1. *Dean* succeeded him; elected in April following, and confirmed by the papal bull May 26. Le Neve, p. 8. Abundance of similar examples, as to time, in the cases of prelates of other sees, might be added.

papal bull, [g] bearing the protracted date; and still the primate elect delayed his consecration another month.

This leads us to the difficulty, as Dr. Lingard terms it, which occurred at this solemnity. "By what casuistry could the archbishop elect, who was well acquainted with the services expected from him, reconcile it with his conscience to swear at his consecration canonical obedience to the pope, when he was already resolved to act in opposition to the papal authority? With the royal approbation he called four witnesses into St. Stephen's chapel at Westminster, and in their presence [h] declared, that by the oath of obedience to the pope, which for the sake of form he was obliged to take, he did not intend to bind himself to any thing contrary to the law of God, or prejudicial to the rights of the king, or prohibitory of such reforms as he might judge useful to the Church of England. Thence he proceeded to the altar: the ceremony was performed after the usual manner: and the pontifical oath was cheerfully taken by the new prelate, both before his consecra-

[g] Warham died Aug. 23, 1532. The bull for Cranmer to succeed him was dated Feb. 22, 1532-3, and he was consecrated March 30 following. Le Neve, p. 8. Strype's Life of Cranmer, b. i. ch. 4.

[h] Strype and Collier have printed the protestation, copied from the register of Abp. Cranmer.

tion, and at the delivery of the pallium." Lingard, Hist. vol. 6. p. 254. . So Mr. Butler: "Although, when he was consecrated Archbishop of Canterbury, Cranmer took the customary oath of obedience to the see of Rome, did he not, just before he took it, retire into a private room, and protest against it? Was this honourable?" Book of the Roman Catholick Church, p. 216. No; certainly such conduct would deserve a contrary epithet; as the calling *four witnesses only*, before whom he was to swear, would be pronounced a suspicious and unjustifiable act. But the suspicious and dishonourable privacy has been only pretended. Proof is yet wanting. They, who have concurred with it in Phillips's [i] Life of Cardinal Pole, have withheld the replies to it by the distinguished [k] writers who rose immediately in the cause of Protestantism, and reviewed that insidious biography with all the accuracy requisite to detect its numerous misrepresentations. By them, and by Burnet and Strype before them, the truth has been minutely drawn from authentick documents. The scruples of Cranmer, concerning the legality of the customary oath, had been communicated to the best canonists and civilians. By their advice he was led to protest

[i] See Phillips's 2d edit. vol. ii. p. 210.

[k] Dr. Neve, Dr. Ridley, Mr. Stone, &c.

against it; *not, however, in a private room,* but publickly and repeatedly[l]; first, in the chapter-house of the church in which he was to be consecrated; and then before those, by whom he was consecrated, at the altar of the church. The [m] register of the archbishop commences with the declaration to succeeding times, (and yet exists,) that his protestation was thus made [n] *openly* and *publickly,* before witnesses specially and officially named, and doubtless in the presence of many other unnamed. It has been rightly [o] considered as surprising, that Phillips, the modern narrator of the pretended clandestinity, should have confidently asserted it, when the refutation of it by Fuller in particular, whom he cites soon afterwards, was before him. Phillips silently, and as if ashamed of his predecessor, partly follows indeed Sanders, who says that Cranmer protested only to a notary, that he unwillingly took the oath of obedience to the pope; when before him other testimonies also were

[l] Burnet, Hist. of the Ref. vol. i. p. 129. And Strype, Life of Cranmer, b. i. ch. 4.

[m] In the library of MSS. at Lambeth Palace.

[n] In Dei nomine Amen. Coram vobis autentica persona, et testibus fide dignis, hic presentibus, Ego Thomas in Cant. Archiep. electus dico, allego, et in hiis scriptis *palam, publicè,* et *expressè* protestor, &c. The Archbishop's Protestation, Reg. fol. 4.

[o] Stone's Remarks upon Phillips's Life of Pole, 2d edit. p. 233.

open, which deny any privacy. To the oath itself, it may be observed, the coeval abjuration of Gardiner has been assimilated. He had taken the same oath to the pope, and then refused the supremacy maintained in it, with a declaration, "[p] that an engagement against right is by no means binding." But still that is an after-act, and indefensible. Cranmer, before he took the oath, declared the limitations by which he secured himself in his allegiance to the king, and in his determination to reform the church, against a power which would admit neither the supremacy of the former, nor the necessity of alteration in the latter. Even the jurist, Dr. Martin, the enemy of Cranmer, is opposed to "the *secret protest*," as Dr. Lingard calls it; and admits the publicity of the fact, while he commented indeed severely, and in part falsely, upon the occasion of it.

"[q] Martin. Did you not swear obedience to the see of Rome?

"Cranmer. Indeed I did once swear unto the same.

"Martin. Yea, that you did twice, as appeareth *by records and writings here ready to be shewn.*

[p] From Gardiner's Oratio De Vera Obedientia. See Ridley's Review of Phillips's Life of Pole, p. 308. Fox has adverted to the perjury of Gardener, and of Bonner, with irresistible strength of reasoning, in his Acts and Mon.

[q] Fox, Acts and Mon.

"Cranmer. But I remember, *I saved all by protestation that I made by the counsel of the best learned men I could get at that time.*" So that here also we see the Archbishop believing his own sincerity, which at first led him to declare his entire repugnance to the oath, uninjured by taking it, after his consultation with those who advised the protest; a belief, which, in the conference with Dr. Martin, he solemnly repeats. Dr. Lingard adds an observation, made by a correspondent of Burnet, (and admitted in the Appendix to the third volume of the History of the Reformation,) who says, he had two manuscript letters of Cardinal Pole, in which the Cardinal charges Cranmer with having made his protestation only in a private manner. The Cardinal is said to *charge* the Archbishop with the matter in question: but it is not alleged that he *substantiated* the charge. Of the letters, in which this charge is brought forward, no account is given by Phillips, the eulogist of Pole, and the slanderer of Cranmer. No verification appears in a note either from the letters of Pole, published by Quirini; or from any other work, which relates to the character and conduct of Pole. Not a whisper is uttered as to the page or volume, manuscript or printed, whence the precious information has been stolen. But Phil-

lips may be traced to [r] Sanders; and perhaps he was also indebted to the correspondent of Burnet, who adds that Pole "[s] branded the alleged proceeding of Cranmer with such expressions as he was unwilling to transcribe." But no transcript of this indignation has yet descended to us. To this concealed authority alone Dr. Lingard refers; leaving Sanders, and the published letters of Pole, and even Phillips, "[t] by whose aid (weak masters though they be) he has bedimmed" occasionally the light of history, unsummoned in its behalf. Nor has the observation of Martin, the civilian, in his conference with Cranmer, been noticed as it deserves. For there he appeals, yet certainly with no friendly voice, to the record; and there, as we have seen, *the repetition of Cranmer's oath* connects with it *the repeated protestation*, which Martin indeed denies not; but, by the abuse with which he loads it, confirms the fact. Collier,

[r] Sanders says, that Cranmer protested to a single notary, that he took the oath against his will; when, in fact, he neither protested only before a single notary, nor that he took the oath unwillingly; but, as Dr. Lingard says, he took it "*cheerfully*;" cheerfully, I suppose, upon the belief that by the publick protestation he had satisfied his own mind. See Burnet, Hist. Ref. 1. Records, p. 284. and Sanders De Schismate, &c. ed. 1585, fol. 58. b. ed. 1586, p. 83.

[s] Burnet, Hist. Ref. vol. 3. Append. p. 309.

[t] Shakspeare, Tempest.

in his Ecclesiastical History, to [u] which Mr. Phillips and Dr. Lingard often refer with approbation, has not thought the denial of the publicity in question worthy a single remark. Perhaps he considered, as doubtless every liberal inquirer after truth will consider, that the objurgatory words of Pole should have been produced; as the reader might then see whether reason had given place to railing, and whether the circumstances stated might in any respect be impugned. The charges, made by Pole, have not escaped at all times the suspicion of [x] fabrication. And if the correspondent of Burnet had lived to read the masterly vindications, by Neve and Ridley in particular, of the publicity which the accusation in his manuscript letters is said to contradict, he would, I am persuaded, have joined his voice to the absolving voices of them and of Burnet.

The divorce of Catherine next occasions Dr. Lingard to introduce the Archbishop as a gross hypocrite. "As soon as the convocation had separated," (after the debate on this subject,) "a *hypocritical farce was enacted between Henry*

[u] Collier was indeed a protestant, and a man of great learning; "but such a one as protestants generally, and justly, regard with suspicion." See Catholicus's Episcopal Oath of Allegiance to the Pope, &c. p. 30.

[x] See Burnet, Hist. Ref. 1. Append. p. 282. "This was a forgery of Cardinal Pole's, which Sanders greedily catched to dress up the scene."

and Cranmer. The latter wrote a most urgent letter to the king, representing the evils to which the nation was exposed from a disputed succession, and begging, for the exoneration of his own conscience, and the performance of his duty to the country, the royal licence to examine and determine the great cause of the divorce." Hist. of Eng. ut supr. vol. 6. p. 256. It had been well if Dr. Lingard had exhibited this letter of the Archbishop. It would at least have rectified one mistake of Dr. Milner, who also, in his reflections upon Cranmer, says, that "[y] he began an hypocritical and collusive letter to the King, *dated March* 11, 1533, representing to him the scandal taken at the undecided state of the divorce;" while the reader also would have been again enabled to form his own judgment. I will therefore give this letter, as it still exists, in the hand-writing of the defamed prelate, among other [z] original documents respecting him in the State-Paper Office.

"Please yt your highnes, that wher your grace's grete cause of matrimony is (as it is thought) thorough all Christianytie divulgated,

[y] Strictures on Southey's Book of the Church, p. 57.

[z] There is a copy of this and of other letters written by the Archbishop, among the Lansdowne MSS. in the British Museum; some of which have been printed in the Christian Remembrancer, 1820. vol. 2. p. 661, et seq.

and in the mowthes of the rude and ignoraunte comon people of this your grace's realme so talked of, that fewe of theym do feare to reporte and saye, that therof ys likelyhode herafter to ensue grete inconuenience, daunger, and perill to this your grace's realme, and moche incerteintie of succession, by whiche things the saide ignoraunte people be not a litle offended: And forasmoche as yt hathe pleased Almightie God and your grace, of your habundant goodnes to me shewed, to call me (albeyt a poure wretche and moche unworthie) unto the high and chargeable office of primate and archebisshope in this your grace's realme, wherein I beseche Almightie God to graunte me his grace so to use and demeane myself, as may be standing with hys pleasure, and the discharge of my conscience, and to the weale of this your grace's said realme; and considering also the obloquie and [a] brute which dailye doth spring and increase of the clergie of this realme, and speciallie of the heades and presidents of the same, because they in this behalve do not forsee and prouide convenient remedies as might expell and put out of doubt all such inconveniences, perilles, and daungers, as the saide rude and ignoraunte people do speke and talke to be ymynent; I your moost humble orator and bedeman am, in consideration of the premisses, urgently constrayned

[a] Bruit, i. e. noise, rumour.

at this tyme most humbly to beseche your most noble grace, that wher my office, and duetie, is by you and your predecessours sufferaunce and graunts to directe and ordre causes spirituall in this your grace's realme according to the lawes of God and holye churche, and for relief of almaner greves and infirmities of the people, Goddes subjects and yours, happening in the said spirituall causes, to provide suche remedie as shalbe thought most convenient for their helpe and relief in that behalf; and because I wolde be right lothe, and also it shall not becom me (forasmoche as your grace ys my prince and souereigne) to entreprise any parte of my office in the said weightie cause, without your grace's favour obteigned and pleasure therin first knowen; it may please the same to acerteyn me of your grace's pleasure in the premisses, to th'entent that the same knowen I may procede for my discharge, afore God, to th'execution of my saide office and duetie, according to his calling and your's: Besechyng your highnes most humbly uppon my knees to pardon me of thes my bolde and rude letters, and the same to accepte and take in good sense and parte. ffrom my Manor at Lamhith the xjth day of Aprile in the first yere of my Consecration.

" Your highnes' most humble
" bedisman and Chaplain,
" Thomas Cantuar."

Now the observations of Dr. Lingard and Dr. Milner, and of other writers, upon this transaction, have been gathered *from the answer of the King to the Archbishop, which has been published;* not from the preceding letter, which should [b] never be kept from the eye of the reader of English history. Lord Herbert had probably never examined it; for he says no more, in correcting an untrue assertion of Sanders upon the subject, than that "[c] the records which I have seen mention only that Cranmer demanded and obtained leave of the King to determine the matter, since it caused much doubt among the common people, and fears of great inconvenience in the matter of succession." Burnet, and Collier, and Strype, would not have overpassed the humility and the piety, observable in it, if they had seen this letter. And though, as Strype has related, the Archbishop by pronouncing the sentence of divorce drew upon himself an implacable hatred from the pope and emperor abroad, as well as from the papists at home; every candid Romanist would at least concede to this letter the character of judicious caution, and perhaps be led to believe the assertion of one of Cranmer's biographers, that his being placed in this cause of the divorce at the head of other

[b] A transcript from the copy of this letter, with some variations, is in the Christian Remembrancer, vol. 2. p. 662.

[c] Hist. of Hen. VIII. ed. 1649. p. 347.

commissioners, (among whom indeed was the active bishop Gardiner,) "[d] gave great offence to the Queen, and shocked the Archbishop himself." Convinced, however, that it was his duty to determine the King's cause, yet knowing that his judgement could have no effect without the royal permission; therefore it was that the Archbishop, "[e] as the most principal minister of his majesty's spiritual jurisdiction within the realm," solicited and obtained the necessary consent, the King "saving to himself his pre-eminence over him as his subject."

"But what, it was then asked, must be thought of the King's present union with Anne Boleyn? How could he have proceeded to a new marriage before the former had been lawfully annulled? Was the right of succession less doubtful now than before? To silence these questions, Cranmer held another court at Lambeth; and, having first heard the King's proctor, officially declared that Henry and Anne were and had been joined in lawful matrimony; that their marriage was and had been publick and manifest; and that he moreover confirmed it by his judicial and pastoral authority." Lingard, Hist. ut supr. vol. 6. p. 258. Such also was the professed opinion, at the time, of Gardiner, the admired prelate of the Romanists,

[d] Gilpin's Life of Abp. Cranmer.

[e] Burnet, Hist. Ref.

(though overpassed by Dr. Lingard,) who "[f] published the King's divorce and second marriage to be done by the undoubted word of God, the censures of the most famous Universities of the world, the judgement of the Church of England, and by Act of Parliament; whereof he himself was the procurer in the Universities, and in all points *a principal doer*." Or as another prelate, not unbefriended also by the pen of Dr. Lingard, Edmund Bonner, in his Preface to Gardiner's printed Oration, has related it: "[g] In this Oration *De Vera Obedientia*, that is, concerning true obedience,—he (Gardiner) speaketh of the King's marriage; which by the ripe judgement, authority, and privilege of the most and principal Universities of the world, and then with the consent of the whole Church of England, he contracted with the most clear and most noble lady, queen Anne: after that, touching the King's title as pertaining to the supreme head of the Church of England: lastly of all, of the false, pretensed supremacy of the bishop of Rome in the realm of England, most justly abrogated." How changed in the time of Mary was this fellow-commissioner with Cranmer!

[f] Michael Wood's Translation of Gardiner's De Vera Obedientia, a book of extraordinary rarity, having been supposed to be suppressed by Romanists where possible; printed at Rouen in 1553. Pref. sign. A. 3. b.

[g] M. Wood, ut supr. sign. b. ii. b.

" *Now* he layeth all the fault to the Archbishop of Canterbury, as though it had been that Archbishop's only deed. *Then* he brake the queen's head, in procuring and affirming her to be illegitimate: *now* he giveth her a plaster with recanting, and saying, she is legitimate!" But as the business of the divorce has been called " a hypocritical farce," why is not Gardiner also said to have " [h] *enacted*" a part in it? We might have admitted even a complimentary address to him upon the occasion, such as, " [i] my lord, you played once,—and were accounted a good actor." And of the eulogium too, bestowed by Bonner upon his learned compeer, we might have expected some notice. But neither Bonner, nor Gardiner, is introduced into the pages of Dr. Lingard with any ridicule, or reprehension, upon the conduct of either in re-

[h] Shakspeare, Hamlet, and Dr. Lingard. See before, p. xlv. Indeed, as Strype observes, " though Cranmer pronounced the sentence, he was but the mouth of the rest, (the bishops of Winchester, London, Bath, Lincoln, &c.) *and they were all in as deep as he.*" Life of Cranmer, b. 1. ch. 4. And thus correctly Shakspeare, Hen. VIII.

———— " By the main assent
" Of all these learned men she was divorc'd."

Burnet is careful that the reader should not lose sight of *Gardiner* in the business; for to his description as a bishop he adds *his* name; but distinguishes other prelates by the names only of their sees. Hist. Ref. 1. p. 131.

[i] Shakspeare, Hamlet.

gard to the divorce. For an obvious purpose it was sufficient to aim at the conviction only of one, and to leave uncensured the "[k] fellows of his (pretended) crime."

Cranmer held another court at Lambeth, Dr. Lingard says in the preceding extract. He did: and there in general words, no reason being given in the sentence, confirmed the marriage of the king with Anne Boleyn. But before he proceeded to this confirmation, and immediately after pronouncing the sentence of divorce upon queen Catherine, he exercised his usual judgment in addressing the king upon this important point. The letter, in his [l] own hand-writing, still exists in the State-Paper Office.

"Please yt your highnes to be aduertised, that this xxiij day of this present moneth of May I haue gyven sentence in your grace's grete and weightie cause, the copy wherof I haue sent vnto your highnes by thys berar, Richard Watkyns. And when I was by the letters of Thurlebye, your grace's chapleyne, aduertised of your grace's pleasure that I shulde cause your grace's counsaile to conceyve a procuracye concernyng the seconde matrymony, I haue sent the said letters vnto theym, and required theym to do

[k] Milton, Par. Lost.

[l] This letter is also found among the copies before-mentioned, and with variations.

according to the tenore therof; most humbly beseching your highnes, that I may knowe your grace's ferther pleasure concerning the same matrymony, assone as your grace with your counsaile shalbe perfectly resolved therin. ffor the time of the coronation is so instaunte, and so nere at hande, that the matter requireth good expedition to be hadd in the same. And thus our Lord haue your highnes evermore in his blessed tuition and gouernance. ffrom Dunstaple, the xxiij. day of May.

" Your highnes' most humble
" Chaplain and bedisman,
" Thomas Cantuar."

The *procuracy*, mentioned by the Archbishop, is the instrument, by which a person delegated his proctor to represent him in any judicial court or cause. The proctor, upon the present occasion, appeared in order to assert, that the marriage had been solemnized with Anne Boleyn in the preceding January. And now let us for a moment revert to this fact. " On the 25th of January, at an early hour, Dr. Rowland Lee, one of the royal chaplains, received an order to celebrate mass in a garret at the western end of the palace of Whitehall. There he found the King attended by Norris and Heneage, two of the grooms of the chamber, and Anne Boleyn accompanied by her train-bearer Anne Savage,

afterwards lady Berkeley.—Burnet treats this account as one of the fictions of Sanders: but it is taken from a manuscript history of the divorce, presented to queen Mary thirty years before the work of Sanders was printed. See Le Grand, ii. 110." Lingard, Hist. ut supr. vol. 6. pp. 250, 251. That the marriage was private, is not to be doubted; but that the King of England should condescend to the celebration of it *in a* [m] *garret*, a circumstance seeking in vain the corroboration of Sanders, and of any other writer, and exhibited (as it is said) only in a solitary unknown manuscript, is what even the "[n] smith, with open mouth swallowing a tailor's news," would hardly credit. Lord Herbert describes with accuracy the time and the circumstances of the marriage, except as to the presence of Cranmer; who himself has told us in a letter to Hawkyns, ambassador at the Emperor's Court, upon the subject of Anne Boleyn's coronation, "[o] You may nott ymagin that

[m] Sanders mentions the secrecy of the marriage, but evidently had no knowledge of its being celebrated in a garret. For after Lee had consented to proceed with the ceremony, "annuente rege," Sanders only says, "vertit se *ad altare*:" De Schism. ed. 1586. pp. 90, 91. But would he not gladly, and sneeringly, have added, *in contignatione tegulis proximâ*, or some such expression, if there had been any rumour of the kind to bear him out?

[n] Shakspeare, King John.

[o] Archæologia, vol. xviii. And Ellis's Letters illustr. of English Hist. 1824. vol. 2. p. 39.

this coronacion was before her marriage, for she was maried muche about sainte Paules daye last. Notwithstandyng yt hath byn reported thorowte a great parte of the realme *that I married her; whiche was playnly false, for I myself knewe not therof a fortenyght after yt was domne.* AND MANY OTHER THYNGES BE ALSO REPORTED OF ME, WHICHE BE MERE LYES AND TALES." Dr. Lingard has cited the self-defence of the Archbishop, so far as it rectifies the mistake of Lord Herbert, and after him of Burnet, and of Strype, and of Dr. [p] Milner too, that he was one of the witnesses at the marriage. But it has not been denied, that the duke of Norfolk, the earl and countess of Wiltshire, and the brothers of the Queen, were present at the ceremony. It may lead the reader often to pause, when the story of Cranmer meets his eye, if he regards the conclusion of the defence, which I have just cited, and which he will not find in the pages of Dr. Lingard.

To the King's supremacy, as it is stated by Dr. Lingard, our attention is next required. "The spiritual supremacy of a lay prince was so repugnant to the notions to which men had

[p] Dr. Milner is mistaken not in this respect alone; for he says, that Cranmer "stood witness to the monarch's nuptials with Anne Boleyn, on Nov. 14, 1532." Strictures on Southey, p. 58. Cranmer was not a witness, we see by his own testimony; and the time was not in Nov. but in January.

been habituated, that it was every where received with doubt and astonishment. To dispel these prejudices Henry issued injunctions, that the word *pope* should be carefully erased out of all books employed in the publick worship;—that all clergymen, from the bishop to the curate, should on every Sunday and holiday teach, that the King was the true head of the Church, and that the authority hitherto exercised by the popes was an usurpation, tamely admitted by the carelessness or timidity of his predecessors. Cranmer, as the first in dignity, gave the example to his brethren, &c." (that is, as a preacher upon the subject.) Hist. ut supr. vol. 6. p. 283. And yet Dr. Lingard has not here informed the reader, that Gardiner *even wrote a book, violent against the supremacy of the pope.* The supremacy was invested in the King, as Lord Herbert relates it, "[q] by the approbation of his parliament. The universities and bishops of this kingdom did not a little second him; and *particularly Stephen Gardiner in his Latin Sermon* [r] *De Vera Obedientia, with the Preface of Dr. Bonner.*"

[q] Hist. of Hen. VIII. ed. 1649, pp. 389, 390.

[r] There is a copy of this book in the library of York Cathedral, viz. Stephani Wintoniensis Episcopi de Vera Obedientia Orat. 4to. Hamburgi, 1536. On the first page is a remark in MS. the coeval hand-writing, apparently, of some amazed or offended Romanist: "*Apostatæ Gardineri excusatio.*" Throughout the book are scorings and other marks, as if implying the detestation or astonishment of the penman.

Dr. Lingard indeed ingeniously observes, that Henry "[s] called on the most loyal and learned prelates to employ their talents in support of his new dignity: and the call was obeyed by Sampson and Stokesley, Tunstal and Gardiner: by the former, as was thought, from affection to the cause, by the latter through fear of displeasure." Stimulated by fear, "*as was thought,*" behold Gardiner then, as well as Cranmer, *giving an example* to his brethren, and to the whole kingdom; and introduced, with a commendatory analysis of the product of his fear, by the obsequious Bonner; who concludes his address to the reader with observing, "[t] if thou at any time heretofore have doubted either of true obedience, or of the King's marriage or title, or of the bishop of Rome's false pretensed supremacy;—having read over this Oration, (which, if thou favour the truth, and hate the tyranny of the bishop of Rome and his devilish fraudulent falsehood, shall doubtless wonderfully content thee,) throw down thine error, and acknowledge the truth now freely offered thee at length." But before we copy a syllable from the timid prelate's Oration, let us not fail to observe him represented by Dr. Lingard as merely "[u] con-

[s] Hist. ut supr. vol. 6. p. 284.

[t] M. Wood, Transl. of Bp. Gardiner's Oratio, &c., and of Bonner's preface, sign. b. iiii. b.

[u] Hist. ut supr. vol. 6. p. 349.

senting, in order to avoid the royal displeasure, to renounce the papal supremacy;" not as reprobating it with all the learning and accuracy which he possessed, and which he well knew were *rightly* so employed. The title of "[x] supreme head of the Church of England," Gardiner accordingly asserts, "is granted to the King by free common consent in the open court of Parliament:—wherein there is *no*[y] *newly invented matter* wrought: only their will was to have the power, pertaining to a prince of God's law, to be the more clearly expressed with a fit term to express it by; namely for this purpose, to withdraw that vain opinion out of the common people's heads, which the false pretensed power of the bishop of Rome had, for the space of certain years, blinded them withal, to the great impeachment of the King's authority." The zeal of Gardiner, and not his fear, is noticed in a manner, deserving particular attention, by one of

[x] M. Wood, Transl. ut supr. fol. xviii.

[y] The statute that declares the supremacy "is, as the common lawyers term it, *statutum declarativum*, not *introductivum novi juris*; as doth clearly appear by the preamble, which hath these words: Albeit the King's Majesty justly and rightfully is and ought to be taken and accepted supreme head of the Church of England, and so is recognised by the Clergy in their Convocation; yet nevertheless, for corroboration and confirmation thereof, Be it enacted, that the King shall be taken and accepted supreme head, &c." Dr. Hakewill's Answer to Dr. Carier, &c. 1616. p. 47.

our most learned divines at the beginning of James the first's reign: "[z] The Clergy were the forwardest in persuading the King to accept and assume the title of supreme head of the Church, as may appear in the treatises of divers bishops; as namely, Stephen Gardiner's discourse of true obedience with Bonner's preface annexed to it; Longland's sermon; and Tunstal's letter to Cardinal Pole: and surely he that shall observe their vehement protestations, *specially of Gardiner, whom I hold the most sufficient among them for learning*, and withal the soundness and weight of the reasons which they enforce against the pope's jurisdiction, will easily believe that they thought in very deed as they wrote, that their minds and their pens concurred in one." Of short duration was the concurrence, however, (if there were any concurrence,) in the pens and minds of Gardiner and of Bonner. "[a] What man," says the indignant and accurate Fox, "what man reading this book of Winchester *De Vera Obedientia*, with Bonner's preface before the same, would ever have thought any alteration could so work in man's heart to make

[z] Dr. Hakewill, as in the preceding note, pp. 153, 154. He was the author of that most ingenious, entertaining, and learned book, An Apology, or Declaration of the Power and Providence of God; as also of other useful works; and was Archdeacon of Surrey.

[a] Acts and Mon.

these men thus to turn the cat, as they say, in the pan, and to start so suddenly from the truth so manifestly known, so pithily proved, so vehemently defended, and (as it seemed) so faithfully subscribed! If they dissembled all this that they wrote, subscribed, and sware unto, what perjury most execrable it was before God and man! If they meant good faith, and spake then as they thought, what pestilent blindness is this, so suddenly fallen upon them, to make that false now which was true before, or that to be now true which before was false!"

But while Dr. Lingard has not obtruded upon the reader more respecting Gardiner, on this occasion, than what illustrates the pretended fear of that prelate; he scruples not to speak of Cranmer, as though the archbishop were a fanatick, and not a man of learning; when, in truth, where Cranmer has been considered in the characters of a scholar and a divine, his profound learning has ever been the object of admiration; and his composure of temper has ever been regarded in opposition to wild notions of religion. "Cranmer, as the first in dignity, gave the example to his brethren; and zealously inculcated from the pulpit, *what his learning or fanaticism had lately discovered*, that the pontiff was the antichrist of the Apocalypse (Poli Ep. i. p. 444.): an assertion, which then filled the Catholick with horror, but at the present day excites no-

thing but contempt and ridicule." Lingard, Hist. ut supr. vol. 6. pp. 283, 284. What? that Cranmer had *lately discovered* this assertion, when Dr. Lingard knows that what Cranmer inculcated had, long before his time, and in the song of the poet, as well as in the disquisition of the theologian, been a frequent theme. "[b] As if his Holiness," says the admirable writer whom I just now cited, "had never been graced with the title of Antichrist *before Henry assumed his title of supreme head!*" Dr. Lingard will allow me to refresh his memory, and to subtract from his notices of Cranmer the imputed discovery, in referring to authors with whom he is well acquainted. I am not about to expatiate upon the correctness of the discovery: I profess only to shew, historically, that the title was not coined by Cranmer. Wicliffe, a century before the archbishop, [c] believed the pope to be Antichrist. Chaucer, his contemporary, the father of our poetry; and Dante, his senior, the famous poet of Italy, [d] asserted the same of the Romish Church. At the opening of the sixteenth century, the title was so often applied to the papal

[b] Dr. Hakewill, ut supr. p. 154.

[c] Fox, Hist. Ecclesiastica, Argent. 1564. fol. 178. Baber's Life of Wicliffe, prefixed to his valuable republication of Wicliffe's New Test. p. xvi.

[d] See Dr. Warton's notes on Pope, edit. Bowles, vol. v. p. 143.

power, that Julius II. forbad the Clergy even to speak of the coming of Antichrist. The Romanists saw the tendency of this application in our own country at the time when Dr. Lingard speaks of "the discovery;" the pope being then (in 1533) "[e] *reckoned among many as the Antichrist;*" and accordingly, "[f] by fabulous and ridiculous stories of Antichrist, they *endeavoured to cast a mist before men's eyes, that they should the less believe and understand the pope to be him.*" Of this ingenious device Strype has presented us with a [g] specimen, entitled, A Popish Discourse of Antichrist. Now Warburton says, that "[h] on this common principle, *that the pope, or church of Rome, was the very Antichrist foretold,* was the Reformation begun and carried on: on this was the great separation from the Church of Rome conceived and perfected." So that the wonder diminishes, when we find the title considered as the child of fanaticism, and as an ambidextrous weapon in theological warfare.

Upon the trial of Lambert very observable are the words of Dr. Lingard. "Of all the prosecutions for heresy, none excited greater interest than that of Lambert, alias Nicholson, a

[e] Strype's Eccl. Memorials, vol. i. p. 163.

[f] Ibid. p. 164.

[g] Ibid. Appendix, p. 122.

[h] Serm. on the Rise of Antichrist.

clergyman in priest's orders, and a schoolmaster in London. Nor is it the least remarkable circumstance in his story, *that of the three men who brought him to the stake*, Taylor, Barnes, and Cranmer, two professed, even then, most certainly later, the very same doctrine as their victim, and all three suffered afterwards the same, or nearly the same, punishment." Hist. ut supr. vol. 6. p. 367. Has Dr. Lingard been able, then, to prove that Cranmer brought Lambert to the stake? He pretends no proof. The particulars of the examination of Lambert, he admits, have not been preserved. But he follows the assertion of Phillips, who [i] says that Cranmer had consented to Lambert's and Anne Askew's death. Dr. Milner and Mr. Butler [k] join in asserting the especial instrumentality of the archbishop to that effect. Now from the court of the archbishop, before which he had been brought, Lambert appealed to the king. And by the king he was heard, overpowered in the disputation, and condemned to the stake. "[l] We do not find," an amiable biographer of Cranmer says, "that the archbishop *took any part in his death*." Another defender of Cranmer, against the present and other assertions of

[i] Life of Cardinal Pole, ut supr. vol. ii. p. 208.

[k] Strictures on Southey's Book of the Church, pp. 32. 60; and the Book of the Rom. Cath. Church, p. 217.

[l] Gilpin's Life of Cranmer.

Phillips, observes, that "[n] Fuller acknowledges the consent which Phillips has alleged; but I cannot see for what reason; as it is not authenticated by any historian that I can meet with. Henry had disputed with Lambert, and ordered him to be burnt, or retract his opinion: and chancellor Wriothesley prosecuted Askew, and put her to the rack:—*but it no where appears that Cranmer's advice, or consent, was asked upon either of them.*" Cranmer at that time believed the corporal presence; the disbelief of which was the crime of Lambert and of Askew. To Vadian, a learned foreigner, however, who had written a book denying transubstantiation, and who wished to find a patron of it in Cranmer, the refusing reply evidently marks, in the strong expression of "[o] *hæc tam cruenta controversia,*" the archbishop's aversion to cruelties which [p] had been practised, in consequence of such disputes. But while these circumstances are stated, who would not wish to find, instead of them, the testimony either of Cranmer's oppo-

[n] Stone's Remarks on Phillips, &c. ut supr. p. 240.

[o] See the whole letter in Strype's Appendix to his Life of Cranmer, No. XXV. The date of it is believed to be 1537.

[p] Alluding, most probably, to the cases of Frith and Hewet, which Cranmer mentions in the letter to Hawkyns, before cited; the former of whom he endeavoured to save by persuasion. See Lingard, vol. vi. p. 366. And Ellis's Original Letters, &c. vol. ii. p. 40.

sition to the proceedings, or his interference in behalf of the persons whom they affected? As for the truly mournful tale of the martyr, Anne Askew, Dr. Lingard indeed refers to it only in a note, in which he [q] says, she was, after two recantations, condemned to the flames by Cranmer and other bishops. And yet this injury to the fame of the lady is repelled in her own words, which Fox has preserved in her *Answer against the false surmises of her recantation.* "[r] I have read the process," says the noble-minded woman, "which is reported, *of them that know not the truth*, to be my recantation. But, as the Lord liveth, I never meant thing less than to recant. Notwithstanding, this I confess, that in my first troubles I was examined by the bishop of London about the sacrament. Yet had they no grant of my mouth, but this; that I believed therein, as the Word of God did bind me to believe: *more had they never of me.* Then he made a copy which is now in print, and required me to set thereunto my hand. But I refused it. Then my two sureties did will me in no wise to stick thereat; for it was no great matter, they said. Then with much ado, at the last I wrote thus: I Anne Askew do believe this, if God's Word do agree to the same, and the true catholick church. Then the bishop be-

[q] Hist. ut supr. vol. vi. p. 458.

[r] Acts and Mon.

ing in great displeasure with me, *because I made doubts in my writing*, commanded me to prison, where I was a while; but, afterwards, by the means of friends, I came out again. *Here is the* [s] *truth of that matter.* Anne Askew."

In the foreground of these melancholy proceedings should stand Gardiner, and not Cranmer. But that arrangement has not been thought expedient in the pages of Dr. Lingard. With Lambert the Archbishop had, before his trial, expostulated [t] mildly on the maintenance of his alleged error; nor in the publick disputation with him was he harsh or overbearing, but appeared as it were checked by the arguments of his opponent; (or as Fox describes it, "[u] himself entangled, and all the audience amazed;") when Gardiner, "[x] being drowned with malice against the poor man, without the king's commandment, observing no order, *before the Archbishop had made an end*, unshamefacedly kneeled down to take in hand the disputation." So in the case of Askew, while Bonner [y] attempted

[s] Entries, respecting the examination of this lady, appear to have been falsely made in the Register of bishop Bonner. Fox, Acts and Mon.

[t] See Gilpin's Life of Cranmer, p. 58.

[u] Acts and Mon.

[x] Ibid.

[y] Ibid. Bonner lastly waited upon her in Newgate, in company with M. Rich. And there, the persecuted lady says, "M. Rich and the Bishop of London, with all their

to inveigle her in disputation, Gardiner waspishly called her a parrot; for "[z] she made some smart repartees upon this bishop of Winchester;" and to his severer remarks she replied, "[a] she was ready to suffer all things at his hands; not

power and flattering words, went about to persuade me from God: but I did not esteem their glosing pretences. Then came there to me M. Nich. Shaxton, and counselled me to recant as he had done. I said to him, that it had been good for him never to have been born." Ibid.—Shaxton had been bishop of Salisbury, and favoured the Reformation; resigned his bishoprick, and was in danger of suffering as a heretick: but he recanted; and to complete this apostasy, preached the sermon at the burning of Anne Askew, and wrote a book in defence of articles to which upon his recantation he subscribed; a transaction which escaped not the vigilance of a warm opponent to the Romanists, who in these articles considers the spirit of Gardiner to be very apparent: "I call these articles your's, because you subscribe to them, and set them forth under your name. But if I were required to say my conscience, I could not deny but I think them Winchester's workmanship; because they agree so well with his doctrine, &c." See the Confutation of xiii Articles whereunto N. Shaxton, late bishop of Salisbury, subscribed, and caused to be set forth in print, the year of our Lord 1546, when he recanted in Smithfield at London at the burning of Mrs. Anne Askew." By R. Crowley. Address to Shaxton, sign. A. ii. What became of Shaxton in king Edward's time, Burnet says, he cannot tell; but he found that, in the reign of Mary, he was a cruel persecutor and burner of Protestants; yet that by the Romanists he was still little considered, and raised no higher than to be bishop suffragan of Ely.

[z] Burnet, Hist. Ref. vol. 1. p. 341.

[a] Fox, Acts and Mon.

only his rebukes, but all that should follow besides; yea, and all that gladly." The name of Cranmer, throughout the narrative of this lady's sufferings, is [b] not once introduced either by Fox, or Lord Herbert, or Burnet, or Strype, or Collier. Upon her, it is highly probable, the sentence of condemnation was pronounced by [c] Bonner, bishop of London, in whose register proceedings against her were recorded. Upon Lambert, indeed, Cromwell, the Vicar-General, [d] delivered the cruel judgement.

With the case of Lambert, Dr. Lingard has embodied his own opinion of Cranmer's theological tenets, as to the doctrine of the sacrament. "Cranmer's promptitude to reject the doctrine of the real presence, when he could do it with safety, has provoked a suspicion that he

[b] Upon no other authority, than what is contained in the following exclamation, Dr. Milner says, that "Cranmer was *publickly* reproached with causing Askew's death, by her companion and friend, Joan Bocher, when, subsequently, he was on the point of pronouncing the same sentence on the latter woman: It is not long ago, she said, since you condemned Anne Askew for a piece of bread; and now you are ready to condemn me for a piece of flesh." Strictures on Southey's Book of the Church, p. 32.

[c] The bishop of London pronounced the sentence in the cases of Frith and Hewet. See Cranmer's relation of this, cited by Dr. Lingard, Hist. vol. 6. p. 366. and Ellis's Orig. Lett. vol. 2. p. 40.

[d] Collier, Eccl. Hist. vol. 2. p. 152.

did not sincerely believe it before: but Burnet and Strype conceive that he held the Lutheran tenet of consubstantiation at this period: and I am inclined to assent to them from the tenor of two letters already quoted, that to Hawkyns, and the other to Vadianus." Hist. ut supr. vol. 6. p. 368. The former of these letters, written by Cranmer, recites the opinion of Frith, who had been condemned by the bishop of London: " [e]His said opynion ys of such nature, that he thoughte it not necessary to be believed, as an article of our faythe, that ther ys the very corporall presence of Christe within the oste and sacramente of the alter; and holdeth of this poynte moste after the opynion of Oecolampadius. And surely I myself sent for hym iii or iiii tymes to persuade hym to leave that his imaginacion." The letter to Vadian is [f]supposed to express the prudent desire of eluding, and, if possible, of then suppressing controversy upon the subject, knowing the King's attachment to the doctrine of the real presence; because, " [g]dici non potest, quantum hæc tam cruenta controversia—maximè apud nos benè currenti verbo evangelii obstiterit." But Dr. Lingard is not correct in supposing that, at this

[e] Lingard and Ellis, as in the preceding note.

[f] Lingard, Hist. vol. 6. p. 367.

[g] Strype, Life of Cranmer, App. No. XXV. and Lingard, ut supra.

period, Cranmer held the Lutheran tenet. The Archbishop was asked by Martin, the civilian, at his trial, what he maintained as to this point, and his answer is preserved.

" [h] Martin. What doctrine taught you, when you condemned Lambert, the sacramentary, in the King's presence in Whitehall ?"

" Cranmer. *I maintained then the papists' doctrine.*" Dr. Lingard has here found it convenient to lean to the notions of Fox, and Burnet, and Strype; who, as Dr. Wordsworth has justly observed, " [i] upon no better authority than the calumnies of his adversaries, and the slight presumptions arising from his early familiarity with Germans, and his translating the Latin Catechism of Justus Jonas, have supposed that Cranmer once maintained the Lutheran doctrine of the sacrament; from whose hands the same error has been received by very many modern writers." Hence the affirmation of Dr. Milner, that " [k] it is *universally* acknowledged that Cranmer was a thorough-paced Lutheran, or Zuinglian, when he travelled through Germany, and married Osiander's sister, [niece,] for his second wife, in 1529." And Gardiner and Smith [l] accused the Archbishop of being first a Papist,

[h] Fox, Acts and Mon.

[i] Eccles. Biography, 1st edit. vol. 3. p. 550.

[k] Strictures on Southey's Book of the Church, p. 32.

[l] See before, p. xii.

then a Lutheran, and at last a Zuinglian, in what he maintained upon the doctrine of the sacrament. And thus too Dr. Martin assailed the primate with this taunt, "[m] You, Master Cranmer, have taught in this high sacrament of the altar *three contrary doctrines*, and yet you pretended in every one *verbum Domini*."—"Nay," replied the Archbishop, "I taught but two contrary doctrines in the same:" that is, the two doctrines of the Church of Rome, and of the Reformed Church of England. Yet Sanders, who cared not what he wrote, as Strype observes, "[n] so he might but throw his dirt upon the Reformation and the Reformers," has repeated without any proof the threefold charge against the Archbishop. Cranmer indeed appears to have [o] faltered at the doctrine of transubstantiation, after examining a learned preacher who denied it, in 1539; and again, upon a similar occasion, in 1541; though he professed the Romish tenet, till the conference with Ridley led him wholly to disclaim it, and gave rise to the treatise which in the following pages is again presented to the publick. An original letter, from the Archbishop to Sir Thomas Wriothesley, is in the State Paper Office, (without the date of the year, but, by the date of the letter

[m] Fox, Acts and Mon.

[n] Strype, Life of Cranmer, B. 1. ch. 18.

[o] Ibid.

which it describes, evidently written immediately after the receipt of it in Sept. 1540,) in which the aversion of Cranmer to the Church of Rome is undisguised.

" [p] Maister Wrythiosley,

" After my right harty recoīmendations, theis be to signifie vnto you that I have receyved out of the realme of Pole lettres from Dantiscus, busshope of Varmīien. who was many yeres the kynge of Pole his ambassadour vnto the emperour the same tyme that I was the kyng our master his ambassadour; in whome I founde at that tyme grete humanitie and feithfulnes; and, as I coude perceyve, an hart he had to serve the kyngs majestie our master, as if he had been his own subjecte; and as lovyngely he intreated me, as if he had been my own brother, *notwithsandynge that we were of two contrary jugements; for he was a meer papiste.* Nevertheles, he wold heare me diligently, and patiently, *to say al my mynde concernynge the busshope of Rome,* and seemed many times to condescend vnto my jugement, and to alowe the same. Howbeit, after he came home into his own contray, and had ij busshoprycks gyven vnto hym, *Jordanus conversus est retrorsum:* for he returned agayne holly

[p] Directed, To my loving ffrend Sr Thomas Wrythisley, Secretary vnto the Kyng's Majestie.

ad papismum. And now they say, that he is the gretest persecutor of Godd's worde that is in all the lande of Pole; and you may perceyve by his lettre, (which herewith you schal receyve,) how much he is offended with me, for that accordynge to Godd's worde I wrote myselfe in the subscription of my lettre, *ecclesie Cantuarien, ministerum.* Now syns I receyved this lettre, I haue been moch inquieted therwith, considerynge what haynous rumors by myschevous tongues be spred into so farr contrays of the kyng's majestie, which wolde make any true and lovynge subject's harte to blede in his body to heare or reade of his Prince. And bycause you sholde the better perceyve the same, I haue sent you Dantiscus' own letter, interlined in places most notable concernyng that matter; desierynge you to declare the same to the kyng's highnes at conuenient oportunitie, and to knowe his pleasure whether I shall make any answere vnto the said Dantiscus, and what answer I schal make: for the matter is of such importance, that I dare not presume to make a slender aunswer vpon myn own heade. Nevertheles, I thynke it not good to open this matter vnto the kyng's grace vntyl he be wel recouered of his disease, which I pray God shortely to put away, lest peradventure it myght trouble and move his grace, and rather be occasion of longer contynuance of the said disease. And if that had not

been, I wolde haue come to the Courte this day my selfe, but I thought it veray evyl that any person or matter sholde at this present disquyete his grace. Wherefore I referr vnto your wisedome to breake this matter vnto his grace at such tyme as you schal thynke most expedient. ffrom Lamhith this saynt Mathies day.

" Your assured,

" T. CANTUARIEN."

The original letter of Dantiscus, sent with the preceding, is in the same repository, but is in a perishing state. It is dated " ex arce nostra Heilsberg. prima Septembris 1540." It is written with strong animadversion upon obvious occurrences in England in that year, and with the following prophetical application as it were to Cranmer: " Tu tamen ne te πυρασου μορος occupet, quum ea sint apud vos tempora, quæ nulla prius in orbis Christiani regione fuerunt unquam, caveas." The passage is underlined by Cranmer, and over the Greek words are written by him *salamandre fatum.* Part of another sentence, underlined also by the Archbishop, which is much decayed, is too curious to be omitted: " Tot scilicet bonorum Ecclesiæ di[reptiones, qu.]—quodque magis hìc omnes in admiracionem ac detestacionem inducit, *tot conjugia, totque contra omnes cum humanas tum etiam divinas leges repudia,* quæ tamen, quamvis

passim hic in vulgus sparsa pro veris habentur, apud me adhuc sunt ambigua." Here is an evident allusion to the [q] frequency of divorces, which at that time prevailed. And presently there is an apparent reference to the marriage of the King; "de insigni ad te conjugio scripserim."

So much for this curious correspondence, so near the time too when the King, instead of promoting the Reformation, had been retracing his steps; and when Gardiner had been active in framing, and successful in establishing, the merciless Act of the Six Articles. This Act Cranmer had opposed. Dr. Lingard thus relates the opposition: "On the second day the king himself came down to the house, and joined in the debate: to resist the royal theologian required a degree of courage unusual in the prelates of that day: and Cranmer and his colleagues, who had hitherto led the opposition, now, with the exception of the bishop of Salisbury, owned themselves vanquished and convinced by the superiority of his reasoning and learning. On the authority of Fox we are told that the Archbishop persisted in his opposition to the last; (Fox, ii. 372. Burnet, i. 258.) but this statement not only seems irreconcilable with the Journals, but is contradicted by the express assertion of one of the lords who were present.

[q] Strype, Life of Cranmer, B. 1. ch. 20.

'Notwithstanding my lord of Canterbury, my lord of Ely, my lord of Salisbury, my lords of Worcester, Rochester, and St. Davyes, defended the contrary a long time, yet finally his highnes confounded them all with goodlie learning. York, Durham, Winchester, London, Chichester, Norwiche, and Carlisle, have shewed themselves honest and well learned men. We of the temporalty have been all of one opinion; and my lord chancellor (Audley) and my lord privy seal (Cromwell) as good as we can devise. My lord of Canterbury and all his bishops have given their opinions, and have come in to us, save Salisbury, who yet continueth a lewd fool.' Cleop. E. v. p. 128." Hist. up supr. vol. 6. p. 381. The preceding extract is part of the letter copied from the manuscript by the accurate Strype, and printed in the Appendix to his Life of Cranmer, No. XXVI. though Dr. Lingard has not noticed it; where it is observable that the letter is "*without any name subscribed*," which also Dr. Lingard has suppressed; so that instead of being *written by one of the lords present at the debate*, it may have been the exaggerated communication of any friend to the papal cause, in the way of news, as indeed it seems to be; for it begins, "And also *newes here*, I assure you never prince shewed himself so wise a man, &c. as the King hath done in this parlyment;" (which in Dr. Lingard's extract is omitted;) and pro-

bably was gathered from *the report* of some lord who had been present. In relating a publick circumstance, whether orally or by letter, which succeeds according to our wish, nothing is more common than to identify ourselves with the promoters of it. "[r] Great triumphing," says Strype, "was now on the papists' side as appears by this letter." He calls the news in this letter, however, "[s] a flying report." The letter also, I have observed, is anonymous; and still it conceals the strenuous, the noble opposition made to it by Cranmer; still it affirms, what is not true, that the bishop of Salisbury alone persisted in refusing his assent, and that the Archbishop of Canterbury with the bishops who have been already named of his opinion "came in" to the opposing party, when the [t] bishop of Worcester, as well as the bishop of Salisbury, rather than conform, resigned his bishoprick; and still it coldly talks of the debate, in general terms, of having continued only *a long time*, when as Fox has stated the fact, and as Lord Herbert, and Burnet, and Strype, and even Collier,

[r] Strype, Life of Cranmer, B. 1. ch. 19.

[s] Ibid.

[t] Lord Herbert, p. 449. Burnet, i. p. 266. Strype, Life of Cranmer, B. 1. ch. 19. and Dr. Lingard himself; "Latimer, and Shaxton, the bishops of Worcester and Salisbury, who by the intemperance of their language had given offence, resigned their sees. The French ambassador says, that both refused their assent." Hist. vol. 6. p. 381.

have repeated it, "[u] Cranmer *for three days together in the open assembly opposed these Articles boldly;*" and when even the second edition of Sanders has admitted the "*longam difficilemque altercationem*" in parliament upon the subject, after the first edition (like the anonymous writer of the present letter) had conceded only "*diu multumque disputatum.*" But the Romanists have ever aimed, in reciting the circumstances of the Six Articles, to fix upon the memory of Cranmer the stain of a judgment slavishly prostituted to the will of the king. "[x] There was no abject compliance," says Phillips, "to which he did not let himself down, to flatter the passions of Henry VIII. and to secure his own credit, &c. In consequence of this abandoned turn of mind, *he subscribed to the six famous Articles,* which contain so many points in which the Reformers disagree with the ancient doctrine, though he disbelieved them all." Here the archbishop is introduced assenting in a manner, which has been invented by the slanderer: for [y] *subscription to these Articles*

[u] Lord Herbert, p. 448.

[x] Life of Cardinal Pole, vol. ii. p. 211.

[y] And yet Mr. Butler thus expostulates with Dr. Southey: "Although Cranmer *subscribed,* and caused his clergy to *subscribe,* the Six Articles, the third and fourth of which enjoined celibacy to the clergy, and the observance of the vow of chastity, was he not married, and did not he continue to cohabit

was never enjoined at all. And when after the second day's debate, (a second day is admitted by Dr. Lingard,) and the third day to which the question was adjourned had arrived; Cranmer [z] protested against the bill, though the king desired him to retire, since he could not consent to it. Dr. Lingard adds, that "two separate committees were appointed, with the same instructions to each, to prepare a bill in conformity with the royal suggestion. One consisted, and it must appear *a most singular selection,* of three converts to the cause, the prelates of Canterbury, Ely,

with his wife? was not this dissimulation?" Book of the Rom. Cath. Church, p. 216. Let Strype answer Mr. Butler: "The papist writers say, Cranmer opposed the Six Articles, because himself was a married man, and so it would touch him close: but it is plain that there were other of these Six Articles, which he utterly disliked; and especially he abhorred the rigorous penalty of the Act. But hereupon he privately sent away his wife into Germany among her friends." Life of Cranmer, b. i. ch. 19. Hear also the belief and assertion of Lord Herbert: "It appears not what arguments Cranmer used: only I find the king sent to him for a copy of them, and misliked not his freedom, as knowing all he spake was out of a sincere intention, though some thought he had a private interest as being a married man; though, fearing this law, he sent away his wife for the present into Germany, &c." Hist. p. 448. As to *subscriptions* to the Act in question, they are the gratuitous appendages to it of Mr. Phillips and Mr. Butler. The Clergy were enjoined by the Act to read it in their churches once a quarter, but they were never required to *subscribe* to it.

[z] "The king desired the archbishop to go out of the House, since he could not give his consent to the Bill; but he humbly

and St. David's; and the other, of their warmest opponents, the bishops of York, Durham, and Winchester." Hist. vol. 6. p. 382. Has Dr. Lingard, then, never observed that, in committees of the lords and commons upon extraordinary questions, both enemies and friends of the point at issue are found? And can Dr. Lingard call Cranmer a convert to a cause, *which he waited for opportunity only again to oppose?* Of these very six Articles the archbishop himself afterwards brought in a bill to mitigate the penalties. For what *the three converts*, as Dr. Lingard calls them, had proposed as a committee, was rejected. His most impartial biographer shall relate the subsequent proceeding. "[a] *This was a bold attempt*, and drew on him the whole force of opposition. The bishops of Rochester and Hereford, who had promised to assist him, gave way, as the debate grew warm; and begged him to follow their example. It was in vain, they told him, to persist: he could not benefit his cause; but he might ruin himself. The archbishop, with that spirit which he always exerted where religion was concerned[b], declared himself careless of any consequences. His perseverance had

excused himself; for he thought he was bound in conscience to stay and vote against it." Burnet, vol. i. p. 258.

[a] Gilpin, p. 81.

[b] See Collier, vol. ii. p. 201.

an effect which he durst not have hoped for. The laity were entirely exempted from the penalties of the act; and the clergy were in no danger, till after the third conviction. The primate obtained also that no offences should be cognizable, after they had lain dormant a year. It is not improbable, that he was indebted for this victory to the [c] book, which he had sent to the king; the rigour of whose opinions it might, in some degree, have qualified."

To the charges which have been brought against the archbishop for his conduct in the condemnations of Joan Bocher or Bourchier, and George Van Parris, as hereticks, we proceed with sorrow; as recalling circumstances in our history, and in the history of Cranmer, truly painful. For the burning of the former, usually called Joan of Kent, Cranmer is said to have contended with the young king, who argued against it: "the objection was solved by the example of Moses, who had condemned blasphemers to be stoned; and the king with tears put his signature to the warrant." Lingard, Hist. vol. 7. p. 101. It has been usual to leave Cranmer in the present deplorable scene without any strong effort of defence. Strype, who in his Life of the Archbishop retires as it were

[c] Burnet, vol. i. p. 265. "Cranmer went about that which the king had commanded, and made a book of the reasons that led him to oppose the Six Articles," &c.

from the attempt, resolved afterwards, in his Ecclesiastical Memorials, not thus to "desert the primate in his utmost need." Sir John Hayward, in his Life and Reign of Edward VI. had said, "[d] that Cranmer was violent with the king by persuasions and entreaties to seal the warrant for Joan Bocher; and by his importunity prevailed with the king, who told the archbishop, he would lay the charge of it upon him before God:"—and then he adds his conjecture upon this, "that it might be Cranmer's importunity of blood, by which that woman was burnt, that he himself afterwards felt the smart of fire."—To these remarks Strype replies: "[e] This passage, whether it be true or no, I cannot tell. The king mentions nothing of it in his Journal, only that she was burnt for her obstinacy in her heresy. And the character is utterly disagreeing from Cranmer's spirit. For none was more tender of blood than he; none more pitiful and compassionate. Nor was he a man for rigorous methods and violent courses. Indeed Fox mentions, that the Council put Cranmer upon moving the king to sign this warrant: which was a sign he had no great forwardness to it himself. And in obedience to them he did labour with the king about it, and obtained it. And though

[d] Eccl. Memorials, vol. ii. p. 473.

[e] Ibid.

he did this, it neither argued *violence*, nor *importunity for blood.* For as he was not present at her condemnation, as appears by the Council-Book, so he may be concluded to have had no desire of her death, though the warrant by his means was signed for her execution. His thoughts, I am apt to think, were, that this fear of death, which she saw so near, might serve to reclaim her from her error, when his and other learned men's reasonings with her, being both ignorant and obstinate, were ineffectual." Dr. Lingard notices the next victim, Van Parris, a [f] Dutchman, and a surgeon in London, without any aggravation; unlike the historian, whom he sometimes follows, who, in order to heap redoubled shame upon his memory, has introduced the archbishop as resorting to the king with the same importunity for the punishment of Van Parris, as he had for Joan Bocher, and as if they had both suffered together; when between their respective condemnations there was

[f] There were in several parts of England many Anabaptists, as this Dutchman is said to have been, who had left their homes in Holland, and in Germany, on account of their tenets. Of these tenets Burnet has given, in the case of Van Parris, some account, Hist. Ref. vol. ii. p. 111. A very full account is to be found in the proceedings against Giles Vanbellar, another Dutchman, who abjured them, in the MS. Register of Edward (Lee) Archbishop of York, under the year 1534. Reg. Prerog. Off. York,

an interval of two years: "[g] Whereas the young king," Phillips says, "shewed a reluctance to sign *the warrant for the execution of these wretches*, one of whom was more a bedlamite than a heretick, Cranmer solved his scruples, and prevailed on him to put his hand to it." Of such interference by Cranmer, at the time when Van Parris really suffered, there is no notice in the Journal of Edward; as of such interference also there is none in the case of Bocher. But Dr. Milner appeals to Burnet, as testifying the alleged cruelty of Cranmer alike to Bocher and Van Parris. And indeed Burnet has misled this learned Romanist, and others, by the inaccuracy of his statement subjoined to instruments copied from the register of Cranmer in the Lambeth library. Burnet must have entrusted the labour of copying to some[h] unskilful hand. He himself would never have printed (as in the Records, No. 35. illustrating his second volume of the History of the Reformation, it is printed) "*Sermo factus* regi, &c." when the real words in the Register are "*Certificatorium factum* regi, &c." It is in fact, the necessary certificate of the sentence passed upon Bocher, and again recited in the case of

[g] Life of Cardinal Pole, vol. ii. p. 209.

[h] Even the reference to the entries in the Register, and a date, here mentioned by Burnet, are not correct. The true date is April 7. 1551. The folia in the Register are 74, 75, and 78, 79.

Van Parris, in obedience to the Act which had been passed at the beginning of this reign, that "the courts of Bishops and all their processes should be carried on in the King's name, as in the other courts of law." And therefore in these cases the words are, "Vestræ Regiæ sublimitati, &c. dictam Hæreticam *relinquimus*, &c." and "Vestræ Regiæ sublimitati, et potentiæ brachii vestri secularis, dictum Hæreticum *relinquimus*, et tradimus, animadversione vestra Regia puniendum, &c." Now, because Burnet, speaking of the case of Van Parris, says that the process and sentence, "*together with a petition imploring the execution thereof, and the assistance of the secular power*," are the same as in the case of Bocher: therefore the legal form, leaving the convict to the disposal of the king, in which there is no *imploration* except that of blessing upon the reign of Edward, has been converted into the stain of importunity for blood in the character of the principal judge. The word *petition* must have been adopted by Burnet, or by him who gave him the copy of the instruments, in the forensick meaning of the address to one having jurisdiction or authority; for the instruments exhibit *no entreaty whatever, no desire of assistance*, but simply state the process and the sentence, (as was requisite,) and *leave* the punishment to the power and the direction of the king. Without this explanation, the enemy of Cranmer

might still "have advantage against him;" with it, the charge deduced from Burnet, as by Dr. Milner, is refuted.

The intelligence brought to the Archbishop, upon the accession of Mary to the throne, that the Roman catholick service had been performed in his church at Canterbury, has drawn from the pen of Dr. Lingard the following statement of the consequences. The intelligence added, "that by strangers this innovation was supposed to have been made by Cranmer's order, or with his consent; and that a report was circulated of his having offered to celebrate mass before the queen. Cranmer hastened to refute these charges by a publick denial; and in a declaration which, while its boldness does honour to his courage, betrays by its asperity the bitterness of his feelings, asserted that the mass was the device and invention of the father of lies, who was even then persecuting Christ, his holy word, and his church; that it was not he, the Archbishop, but a false, flattering, lying, and deceitful monk, who had restored the ancient worship at Canterbury; that he had never offered to say mass before the queen, &c. Of this intemperate declaration several copies were dispersed, and publickly read to the people in the streets." Hist. ut supr. vol. 7. pp. 185, 186. But the whole truth is not told. The declaration was certainly drawn with a view to publick use; and

was submitted by Cranmer to Scory, who had been bishop of Chichester, for the advantage of his private and friendly consideration. Of this incomplete paper Scory indiscreetly gave copies; one of which was read in Cheapside; and many were subsequently dispersed; but without the knowledge or consent, on the contrary to the great mortification, of the Archbishop. For being summoned before the Council, and asked if he was the author of the declaration, he answered, that certainly he was; but that he was very sorry to find the paper had gone from him in such a manner, as he had resolved to enlarge it in many respects, and to affix it, with his hand and seal to it, to the doors of the churches in London. This reply before the Privy Council was made on the 8th of Sept. 1553, when, Burnet and others say, the Archbishop was, contrary to all expectation, dismissed. It was on that day, however, that the Council resolved to commit the Archbishop to the Tower upon the charge of treason, "[1] aggravated by spreadinge aboute seditious bills movinge tumultes to the disquietnes of the presente state." Not a single bill is Cranmer known to have dispersed. To the injudicious zeal of his friend the alleged mischief is to be attributed. At the close of the Latin version of the declaration,

[1] Extracts from the Privy Council Book, Archæolog. vol. xviii. cited by Dr. Lingard.

published in 1554, it is there said, " [m] Lecta publicè Londini in vico mercatorum *ab amico, qui clàm autographum surripuerat,* 5. *Sept. Anno Dom.* 1553." Valerandus Pollanus republished it, in 1554; though Burnet and Strype have overpassed the circumstance. The English copies were probably called in and destroyed. Of the reprint in 1557 by the English exiles a copy yet exists among Fox's collections in the ° Harleian manuscripts, (No. 417.) to whom it was sent by Grindal, afterwards archbishop of Canterbury; and in that part of the written narrative, which names it, there is a marginal direction by Grindal, " it is goode that the letter it selfe be lette in: the copie of it in prynte is annexed;" which is a single duodecimo leaf. In it the religion of the former reign is nobly owned; and a vindication both of the Reformation, and of Cranmer himself, proposed. And what wonder, if in it there be also an " asperity which betrays the bitterness of his feelings?" The false, flattering, lying, and dissembling *monk,* who caused the mass to be set up at Canterbury without his advice or counsel, was Thornden, prebendary of Canterbury and suffragan bishop of Dover, who had lived in his family, and with whom he used to converse most familiarly; and was one of several *dissembling monks* whom Cranmer had unfortunately selected, or permitted to

[m] Burnet, ii. Records, p. 250.

be selected, from the dissolved priory of Christ Church, Canterbury, into his cathedral, and who were joined with Thornden in a wicked confederacy against him. If, upon witnessing this new act of baseness by the leading monk, Cranmer had shewn no asperity, I should have marvelled at the tameness which allowed the usurpation of his authority to pass unreprehended. The recollection, probably, of the ill choice which had been made of [p] other worth-

[p] Besides Thornden, who had been a monk of Christ Church, I am compelled to name Mills, and Parkhurst, and Gardiner, who also had been of the same monastick body, and were transferred to prebends in the new foundation. Whether Willoughby and Sentleger, who were also of the first prebendaries, had been monks, I know not. These six were all concerned in the conspiracy against Cranmer. Indeed Strype has said that, "*for the most part*, the prebendaries of Canterbury were at that time addicted to the pope and the old superstitions." Life of Cranmer. B. i. chapters 26, and 27; where the above conspirators and their proceedings are named, and their base ingratitude as well as their false accusations exposed; together with the confessions of their guilt; their supplications to the archbishop for pardon, and to the king for release from confinement; and the conduct of the Archbishop towards them, "being a man that delighted not in revenge." The meanness of guilt is also very observable in their confessions and submissions. Strype's Cranm. Appendix, No. 33. It is apparently to this transaction of the late monks of Canterbury that an eloquent allusion is made, in a publication not many years after the event: "Did ever those papists, whose lives were spared by good byshop Cranmer's meanes, who were brought up, who were defended, who were advanced, who were sheelded from

less characters from the monks of Christ Church, might also renew the bitterness of his feelings. [q] Many of the members of the new foundation he had himself preferred, and to many of them was a kind friend. The expression is too strong to be mistaken; and however Dr. Lingard may deny the practice of other [r] immoralities, ascribed to the monks of Christ Church by several writers; of the sins of falsehood and ingratitude towards the benefactor whom they surrounded he will allow some to be guilty.

But, amongst the many partialities of Dr. Lingard, none can be more revolting than his pretence, by way of contrast to the character of Cranmer, of an unpersecuting temper in Gardiner and of a mild demeanour in Bonner; men, who have been hitherto regarded with national disgust, and of whom the mention in the pages of Dr. Lingard disclaims as it were the notice of them as persecutors, either in combination, or apart. "With whom the persecution under Mary originated, is a matter of uncertainty. By the reformed

harme and perill by him, once requite hym with one drop of kyndnesse? And yet they spake hym faire in hys prosperitie!" A Warning against Papists, &c. sign. L. 3. b. The behaviour of Cranmer, upon the present occasion, "who was gentle even to excess," is also recited by Burnet, iii. p. 110.

[q] Strype, Life of Cranm. B. 1. ch. 26.

[r] Hist. ut supr. vol. 6. p. 346.

writers the infamy of the measure is usually allotted to Gardiner, more, as far as I can judge, from conjecture and prejudice, than from real information. The charge is not supported by any authentic document: it is weakened by the general tenor of the chancellor's conduct." Hist. ut supr. vol. 7. p. 259. And whom has Dr. Lingard introduced to bear him out in the pretence of Gardiner's innocence? The Jesuit Persons, or Parsons, who was one of Cranmer's slanderers; an Englishman who dishonourably left his own country, and became a Romanist; and from the pope obtained leave to establish a seminary at Rome, in which English students might be educated to act as missionaries in their native country for the propagation of the Romish faith. But Dr. Lingard requires "*real information*," as to the innocence or guilt of Gardiner; which is a demand that cannot be too highly praised, and a demand that may be answered. Sir John Harington, whose literary character is well known, and who has repeatedly supplied other information with which Dr. Lingard has enriched his pages, has left an account in manuscript of the treatment which his father experienced, while a prisoner in the Tower, from Gardiner, who pretended to be his friend; and of the opinion, expressed by him, as to *the general character* both of the prelate,

and of the times. "[3] Gardiner and his fellowes did condemne to the fyre a number of poore harmlesse soules that profest to beleue as they were taught but three yeares before:—which great extremitye was part the cause of stirring vp of Wiat's rysing, for which many Protestants were greatly troubled: among others my father was committed to the Tower; and there, among other thinges he wrote, he translated *Tullie de Amicitia*, but finding Gardiner as he thought his heavie freind and harkning to no reason, he wrote a ryme to him, (in which kynde if I were not a partiall praiser, I would say he was equall to the best of those tymes,) one stanza whereof I will here sett downe, that charges the Bishop with ingratitude:

> "Your chaunce was once as myne is now,
> To keep this hould against your will;
> And then you sware you knew well how,
> Though now you swarve I know how ill.
> But thus the world his course doth passe:
> The Priest forgets that Clark he was:
> And you that then eryde Justice still,
> And now have justice at your will,
> Wrest justice wrong against all skill.

"This and much more to the like effect he wrote, but still lay in the Tower for his labor;

[3] Manuscript in the Library of York Cathedral, No. XVI. L. 5.

which wrong, infecting his Muse with some rancor, he prosecuted *him* with his penne after his death that persecuted him by his power in his life, verefieng the old saieng, *Scribit in marmore læsus:* for this epitaph I found in a book of my father's of his owne writing:

" Here lye the bones of busy Gardiner dead,
That in fiue yeares spoild more good lawes and lore,
Than two great kings, with all the witts they bred,
Could stablish sure in forty yeares before:
The Queen beguild, the Lords like lymehounds led,
The usurping rule of Rome he did restore,
Burne, head, and hang, imprison, vex, and spoile
The worthie sort of this declyning soile.

" Thus generallie did all the Protestants complaine of the great crueltie in Queen Maries tyme." pp. 231, 2, 3.

Sir John Harington also left an account, which has been published in his Catalogue of bishops, both of Gardiner and of Bonner; in which the former is certainly exhibited as an object of less dread and detestation than the latter. " [t] But," Sir John observes, " for his sharp persecuting or rather revenging himself on Cranmer and Ridley, his too great cruelty cannot be excused. And the plots he laid to entrap the lady Elizabeth;

[t] Brief View, or Catalogue, ut supr. under the Bishops of Winchester.

his terrible hard usage of all her followers; I cannot yet scarce think of with charity, nor write of with patience." Yet Sir John adds, that he had heard "some as partially praise his clemency," and others assert "that Bonner was more faulty than he; and that Gardiner would rate him for it, and call him ass for using poor men *so bloodily*." Others have attempted to clear him of being the author of the cruelties in the reign of Mary, by laying the blame of them upon Cardinal Pole. Of the subtilty of his character none appear to have doubted; and to his learning all have yielded their testimony. Fox proclaims not his pride, and envy, and cruelty, without mentioning also his sharp wit and his excellent memory. But the severest reflection upon him, among many which remain, is, that avarice and cruelty were the chief [u] ornaments of his character.

"There appears to be reason to think," Mr. Butler observes, "that Mary's bishops, in general, did not promote the persecution. *Little blame seems imputable to* [x] *Cardinal Pole,* or bishop Tun-

[u] "Avaricia et crudelitas, *ejus erant præcipua ornamenta.*" Account of Gardiner, prefixed to D. Nicolai Ridleii, Episc. Lond. de Cœna Dominica Assertio, &c. Genev. 1556. Epist. p. 6.

[x] Very powerfully it has been remarked, that "it ought not to create surprise that Pole should have found advocates, when such characters as Bonner and Gardiner have had their apologists. Of the former it has been said by a Catholick historian

stal; *more is chargeable on Gardiner; the greatest part of the odium fell on Bonner.* Dr. Lingard

[him, who has prefixed the name of Dodd to his Church History,] that he acted according to the statutes; which is a manifest untruth: for he began to persecute the Protestants with the utmost rigour before the revival of the repealed laws; and even after their re-enactment he exceeded the powers, which were vested in him, by taking the execution into his own hands, and inflicting cruel and illegal punishments. The same charge justly lies against the crafty Gardiner, of whom it is said upon the authority of the Jesuit, Robert Parsons, that 'no one great man in that government was further off from blood and bloodiness, or from cruelty and revenge; and that he was known to be a most tender-hearted and mild man in that behalf; insomuch that it was sometimes, and by some great personages, objected to him for no small fault, to be ever full of compassion in the office and charge that he bare; yea, to him especially it was imputed, that none of the greatest and most known Protestants in queen Mary's reign were ever called to account, or put to trouble for religion." Parsons's Answer to Sir Francis Hastings, as quoted by Lingard, vol. vii. p. 259. "Upon this testimony of an apostate and traitor, who endeavoured all that in him lay to make his native country a province of Spain, we are required to believe, contrary to the evidence of Gardiner's contemporaries, that this intriguing and versatile churchman was a man of compassion, and adverse to persecution. Yet it is a known fact, and the historian who has quoted Parsons as a voucher for Gardiner's character, could not but know it, that with this ecclesiastick, and with him alone, originated the six bloody Articles, &c. and that the butchery of the two prelates, Ridley and Latimer, to say nothing of Cranmer, was the joint deed of Gardiner and Pole, &c." The Life of Latimer, prefixed to his Sermons, by John Watkins, LL.D. 1824, p. clxi.

suggests some observations, *which render it very probable,* that neither Gardiner nor Bonner were *quite so guilty* as they have been represented." Book of the Rom. Cath. Church, p. 207. Of Gardiner I have spoken. The tyranny of Bonner, and his exultation over the victims of it, are the themes of several publications from 1541 till long after his death; exclusively of what Fox has at large related of him. Even Phillips, the biographer of Pole, conceding that " [y] a number of unhappy persons" (that is, protestants in the reign of Mary,) " [z] suffered in the diocese of London, of which Bonner was bishop, *who is represented as the chief incendiary of that flame;*" even Phillips has offered no contradiction to this especial charge. But it is need-

[y] Life of Cardinal Pole, vol. ii. p. 216.

[z] I will here advert to Dr. Lingard's account of the Protestant martyrs in the reign of Mary: " After every allowance it will be found, that in the space of four years *almost two hundred persons perished in the flames for religious opinion.*" Hist. ut supr. vol. vii. p. 285. An authentick account has been preserved, which Strype has printed, (Eccl. Mem. vol. iii. Orig. Papers, p. 291,) of the number of those who were burned, in the time of Mary, for religion; and of the places where they suffered. The gentle relation of only " *almost two hundred,*" which the pen of Dr. Lingard concedes, miserable to relate, is augmented in the " *four years,*" of which he speaks, to " *two hundred and eighty-eight, besides those that dyed of famine in sondry prisons:*" but with this number of those who perished at the stake, and with any mention of those who perished by famine, the pages of Dr. Lingard are not stained.

less to cite further evidence. When Bonner is named, " who knows not of his story?" Who has not read, that from him Elizabeth, at her accession to the throne, " [a] turned aside, as from a man polluted with blood, who was a just object of horror to every heart susceptible of humanity?" His successor, bishop Grindal, has left another exhibition of the " *real information,*" which Dr. Lingard demands, in the last tribute which was paid to this miserable prelate. Bonner had been excommunicated: By the law therefore, Grindal says, " [b] Christian sepulture might have been denyed him. But we thought nott goode to deale so rigorouslye, and therfore permitted him to be buried in St. George's church-yarde; and the same to be done nott in the daye solemnely, butt in the nighte privilye: which I, and some other with whome I conferred, thought requisite in that person for two causes. One was, I hearde that diverse his popishe cousins and frendes in London assembled themselves, entendynge to honor his funeralle so moche as they coude: *of which honor such a persecutor was nott worthy,* and speciallye in these dayes. Another was, for that I feared that the people of the cittie, *(to whom Bonner in his life was odious,)* if they had seene flockynge of Papistes

[a] Hume, Hist. of Eng. and Burnet, vol. ii. 374.

[b] Ellis's Original Letters, ii. p. 258.

aboute his coffin, they would have been moved with indignation."

But in relating the persecution under Mary, Dr. Lingard observes, that " fortunately for the professors of the ancient faith, Edward died before the code of ecclesiastical laws, supplied by Cranmer, had obtained the sanction of the legislature: by the accession of Mary the power of the sword passed from the hands of one religious party to those of the other; and within a short time Cranmer and his associates perished in the flames which they had prepared to kindle for their opponents." Hist. vol. 7. p. 258. We might, at the first reading of this melancholy passage, imagine that the persons who prepared and digested the body of laws, entitled *Reformatio Legum Ecclesiasticarum*, (which is the code in question,) had all perished in like manner with the primate; and that to these merciless prelates, divines, and lawyers, in all thirty-two, was meted out the punishment which *they only had enacted.* In this company there were indeed four or five, who were associates in martyrdom with Cranmer. And as to the persecuting code, it is called by Strype " a very noble enterprise;" and by Burnet, " that noble design, so near being *perfected* in king Edward's days." It was not perfected; that is, perhaps some hesitation still existed among the framers of the code as to the penalties recited in it, which in the mind of

the king, or of Cranmer, is very likely to have prevailed; but certainly it failed of being completed or ratified, in consequence of the death of the king. As to an establishment of it, which indeed had been intended in the former reign, it cannot be said that "the feet" of these associates of Cranmer "were swift to shed blood;" for the design, when it was revived in 1549 by act of parliament, directed indeed the examination of the old and a compilation of new ecclesiastical laws, but not absolutely the establishment of the altered code exactly at the end of the time prescribed for the important labour; which was the term of *three years*. And were Cranmer and his associates as active in exercising "the power of the sword" in the reign of Edward, as by others it was exercised in the reign of Mary? But they [d] *intended* it, as Dr. Lingard evidently insinuates; and it may be sufficient in his estimation, perhaps, to condemn a Protestant for the supposed intention, and acquit the Romanist for the real act; or it may be his hope to persuade the reader, that persecution was equally busy on both sides; that even the associates of Cranmer led the way to the atrocities of Mary's agents; and that, in the present

[d] Mr. Butler charitably says, that Cranmer and his associates *wished* Mary and her associates to be exposed to their projected persecutions. See the Book of the Rom. Cath. Church, p. 205.

case, the accomplished scholars and divines of the reign of Edward, of whose names the nation is proud, are to be dragged before the publick, exclaiming as it were,

——————— " [e] we but teach
" Bloody instructions, which, being taught, return
" To plague the inventor."

But these learned men were not the *inventors* of such measures, nor the persecutors of hundreds of persons, or of tens. By their means severe laws of the former reign were repealed. From the school, in which they had been taught the lesson of persecution, they gathered indeed so much of the papal laws as pronounced the tyranny of putting men to death for their opinions; and to the civil magistrate assigned the power, which had long been exercised by the pope, of punishing those who maintained heretical opinions. It was by the decisions and practice of the Church of Rome for above six centuries, by the revived laws against hereticks, that the agents of Mary directed their proceedings in regard to such persons. And hence originated " the [f] foulest blot, on the character of the queen, her long and cruel persecution of the reformers;" the sacrifice of nearly three

[e] Shakspeare, Macbeth.
[f] Dr. Lingard's own confession, Hist. vol. 7. p. 330.

hundred persons at the stake, the death of others in prison and by famine, for not yielding their religious opinions; and most of them for denying transubstantiation.

This brings us at once to the last days and hour of Cranmer, who "perished in the flames which" the Church of Rome in earlier times "had kindled," and which in the reign of Mary raged with redoubled fury. With no concession to the [g] weakness of human nature, with no acknowledgment of the fallen prelate's self-conviction, Dr. Lingard thus introduces him. "He had not the fortitude to look death in the face. To save his life, he feigned himself a convert to the established creed; openly condemned his past delinquency; and, stifling the remorse of his conscience, in seven successive instruments abjured the faith which he had taught, and approved of that which he had opposed." Hist. vol. 7. p. 274. Not a syllable follows of the subtilty, with which the fortitude of the Archbishop had been assailed and subdued; nor of the manner by which the instruments of abjuration were procured, and in which they appeared. Dr. Lingard would not willingly, I am persuaded, augment the degradation of Cranmer: but to the six instruments of the Archbishop's

[g] "We may admire inflexible constancy; but it becomes very few of us to insult over such weakness." Dr. Sturges, Answ. to Dr. Milner, 2nd edit. p. 182.

abjuration, published by Bonner, he has for the first time in the page of history mistakenly added a *seventh*. It is necessary here to copy at length what the indefatigable and accurate Strype has recorded.

"[h] Other historians speak of the Archbishop's recantation, which he made upon the incessant solicitations and temptations of the popish zealots at Oxford. Which unworthy compliance he was at last prevailed with to submit to, partly by the flattery and terror suggested to him, and partly by the hardship of his own straight imprisonment. Our writers mention only one recantation; and *that* Fox hath set down; wherein they follow him. But this is but an imperfect relation of this good man's frailty. I shall therefore endeavour to set down this piece of his history more distinctly. There were several recanting writings to which he had subscribed one after another: for after the unhappy prelate by over persuasion wrote one paper with his subscription set to it, which he thought to pen so favourably and dexterously for himself, that he might evade both the danger from the state, and the danger of his conscience too; *that* would not serve, but *another* was required as explanatory of that. And when he had complied with that, yet either because writ too briefly or too ambi-

[h] Eccl. Mem. vol. iii. p. 232.

guously, neither would that serve, but drew on a *third*, fuller and more expressive than the former. Nor could he escape so: but still a *fourth* and *fifth* paper of recantation were demanded of him to be more large and particular. Nay, and lastly a *sixth*, which was very prolix, containing an acknowledgment of all the forsaken and detested errors and superstitions of Rome, an abhorrence of his own books, and a vilifying of himself as a persecutor, a blasphemer, and a mischief-maker; nay, and as the wickedest wretch that lived. And this was not all; but after they had thus humbled and mortified the miserable man with recantations, subscriptions, submissions, and abjurations, *putting words into his mouth which his heart abhorred;* by all this drudgery they would not permit him to redeem his unhappy life; but *prepared him a renunciatory oration to pronounce publickly in St. Mary's Church, (Oxford,) immediately before he was led forth to burning*. But here he gave his enemies, insatiable in their reproaches of him, a notable disappointment. They verily thought that when they had brought him thus far, he would still have said as they would have him. But herein their politicks failed them; and by this last stretch of the cord all was undone, which they with so much art and labour had effected before. For the reverend man began indeed his speech according to their appointment and pleasure; but

in the process of it, at that very cue when he was to own the Pope and his superstitions, and to revoke his own book and doctrine of the Sacrament, (which was to be brought in by this preface, that *one thing above all the rest troubled his conscience beyond all that ever he did in his life,*) he, on the contrary, to their great astonishment and vexation, made that preface serve to *his revocation and abhorrence of his former extorted subscriptions, and to his free owning and standing to his book wrote against Transubstantiation,* and the avowing the evangelical doctrines he had before taught."

To the preceding passage Dr. Wordsworth has subjoined his own acute observation, that "[i] notwithstanding all the researches of the historians, it cannot, I think, be denied, that this part of Cranmer's story is involved in great obscurity and uncertainty. That he made a submission and recantation, cannot be doubted: but I own, I know not how to reconcile *six several submissions,* and the nature of them, their dates, &c. with other circumstances of the narrative. We are not told the precise period at which he was removed to the lodgings of the dean of Christ Church, and plied with the several [k] topicks, and arts of seduction, enumerated

[i] Eccl. Biography, vol. iii. p. 591.

[k] Especially with the promise of his life being spared, and with suggestions that yet he might live many years, and yet

by Fox. But let it be observed, that the 14th of February was the day of his degradation, at which time, surely, the Archbishop's behaviour gave no warnings of his lamentable fall: and yet the *fourth* submission, as published by Bonner, (and it should seem that they are ranged *chronologically*,) is dated on the 16th of the same month, only two days after. There are other very suspicious circumstances accompanying Bonner's publication. But the above remark, I think, is alone sufficient to shew, that this part of the narrative requires further elucidation."

Indeed there are very [1] suspicious circumstances attending the publication of the six abjurations. Dr. Lingard says, " there is an entry in the Council-Book of March 13, ordering the printers, Rydall and Copland, to give up the printed copies of Cranmer's recantation to be burned. (Burnet, vol. iii. p. 179.) Perhaps it was incorrectly printed: perhaps they waited

enjoy dignity or ease, or both. This was no new artifice of the Romanists of that period, when a Protestant was to be recovered to their church. To the martyr, Dr. Rowland Taylor, it was accordingly urged, though in vain, as to producing any recantation, just as it had been successfully urged to Cranmer: " You are a man of goodly personage, in your best strength, and by nature like to live many years; and, without doubt, you should in time come to be in as good reputation as ever you were, or rather better," &c. Fox, Acts and Mon.

[1] Camerarius, in his Life of Melancthon, seems to suspect the subscriptions. Vita P. Mel. 1655, p. 340.

for that which, he said, God would inspire him to make." Hist. vol. 7. p. 276. The date of the order, in this extract, is the eighth day preceding the martyrdom of Cranmer. But the order which I will copy, appears to have been dated three days later. I shall premise, what Burnet has fairly told, and Dr. Lingard unfairly concealed, "[m] *that the Privy Council were concerned, when they heard that Cranmer's paper of recantation was published.*" This is the entry in the Council Book: "[n] A recognisance entred into by one Ryddall and Coplande prynters, that they will deliver forthwith to Mr. Cawood the queen's Majesties printer all such bookes as they of late printed concerning Cranmer's recantation to be by the said Cawoode burnt. dat. xvi March, 1555." The sneer and the conjectures of Dr. Lingard, in regard to this order, we have seen. Let us now observe what the learned Whiston, in defending the Archbishop, has said; that "[o] if the Privy Council had been satisfied that this recantation was genuine, their procedure seems not a little absurd and incredible. It is much more likely that the Council ordered it to be burnt *as a known forgery*, and as

[m] Burnet, vol. iii. p. 179.

[n] From the Orig. MS. by Bishop Kennet. Lansdowne MSS. Brit. Mus. No. 980, p. 189.

[o] An Enquiry into the Evidence of Archbishop Cranmer's Recantation, &c. 1736, p. 16.

capable of raising a groundless compassion and indignation in the people, when they should believe Cranmer was become a thorough Roman Catholick, and yet was to be burnt as an obstinate Protestant heretick." However, after a few days, the recantations, certainly with some palpable fabrications in them, were entrusted to the press of Cawood, and appeared with the sanction both of royal and episcopal authority. Bonner, bishop of London, is said in the title-page to have *examined* it; and it was printed *cum privilegio*, that is, with Mary's express permission.

Now to the words in this authorized publication, *pretending* to be those of the Archbishop, is prefixed this direction, "[p] *Here to declare the Quenes just title to the crowne;*" at once betraying

[p] From the publication of Bonner, entitled, "All the Submyssyons and Recantations of Thomas Cranmer, late Archebyshop of Canterburye, *truely* set forth both in Latyn and Englysh, agreable to the originalles, wrytten and subscribed with his owne hande. Visum et examinatum per reverendum patrem et dominum, Edmundum, Episcopum London. Anno MDLVI. Excusum Lond. in ædibus J. Cawodi, Typogr. Regiæ Majest. cum privilegio." Sign. B. i. b. This publication in its original form is very rarely to be met with; as though not called in by authority to be burnt, it is supposed to have been by the Romanists, in after times, for obvious reasons, suppressed as much as possible. From an original copy I have made my extracts. Strype has printed the whole, interspersed with his remarks. Eccl. Mem. vol. iii. p. 233, et seq.

a part of what had been [q] *prepared* for the martyr by others, not what he uttered himself. The words are as follow. "[r] And now I come to the great thing that so much troubleth my conscience, more than any other thing that ever I did; and that is, setting abroad untrue books and writings contrary to the truth *of God's Word, which*

[q] Dr. Lingard observes, that on the morning of his execution Cranmer transcribed and signed a paper; and giving to Garcina, the Spanish friar, who was directed to attend him, "one copy of it, retained the other for his own use. But when the friar was gone, he *appears* to have made a second copy, in which, entirely omitting the fourth article, the assertion of the queen's right, he substituted, in lieu of the confession contained in the fifth, a disavowal of the six retractations which he had already made." Hist. vol. 7. p. 278. Dr. Lingard then must suppose, what is irreconcilable with all the circumstances, that though Cranmer gave the friar a copy of his paper in which the assertion of the queen's right was made, and which, as he observes, the Archbishop entirely omitted, Bonner would be so moderate as not to have printed it! This egregious superintendant of the publication of Cranmer's recantations, having the effrontery to publish to the world the very contrary to what Cranmer professed as if it had been approved and pronounced by him, here forgot to fabricate the *fourth article*, or assertion of the queen's right; and, relying on the deluded primate's complete submission, *prepared* for him only *the hint on which he was to speak:* "Here to declare the quenes just title to the crowne." Dr. Milner, strange to tell, refers to these recantations in Strype, as if taken from *the Lambeth Records!* Strict. on Southey, p. 61. Not a syllable on the subject is in *the Lambeth Records;* nor indeed has Strype named them.

[r] From the Submyssyons, &c. sign. B. i. b. B. ii. a.

now I renounce and condemn, and refuse them utterly as erroneous and none of mine. But you must know also what books they were, that you may beware of them; or else my conscience is not discharged. For they be the books which I wrote against the Sacrament of the Altar, since the death of King Henry the Eighth. But whatsoever I wrote then, now is time and place to say truth. Wherefore renouncing all those books, and whatsoever is in them contained, I say and believe, that our Saviour Christ Jesus is really and substantially contained in the blessed Sacrament of the Altar, under the forms of bread and wine."

Now the real words of Cranmer (those which are printed in the preceding extract, in Italick letters, not being his,) have been [s] preserved by Fox, in his Acts and Monuments; and agree minutely with the speech, taken at the time by

[s] Fox thus abridges the narration: "the Archbishop revokes his former recantations, and repents the same; stands to his book; deceives the expectation of the Papists; and throws them into great rage." Burnet, in his History of the Reformation, says, that the Archbishop, after their last extortion of subscriptions from him, "still conceiving some jealousy that they might burn him, wrote secretly a paper, containing a sincere confession of his faith, such as flowed from his conscience, and not from his fears; and being brought out, he carried that along with him." The historian then gives the substance of this paper, precisely corresponding with what is found in Fox, and what is related by the Papist who attended the last moments of the martyr.

a papist, who was an eye and ear witness to the last moments of the martyr.

From the honest, plain, and uncontradicted testimony, therefore of the papist, an adversary of the Archbishop, the genuine speech here follows; such testimony convincing us, that when death approached, Cranmer had "the fortitude to look it in the face;" convincing us also of the baseness practised by those who, to the act of martyring him, scrupled not to join the fabrication we have just seen.

These, then, are the true words: "[t] And now I come to the great thing that troubleth my conscience more than any other thing that ever I said or did in my life; and that is, the setting abroad things contrary to the truth; which here I now renounce and refuse, as things written with my hand, contrary to the truth which I thought in my heart, and writ for fear of death, and to save my life, if it might be; and that is, all such bills, which I have written or signed with mine own hand since my degradation; wherein I have written many things untrue. And forasmuch as my hand offended in writing contrary to my heart, therefore my hand shall first be punished; for if I may come to the fire,

[t] This account of Cranmer's end, related by a Papist to his friend in a letter from Oxford, which is of considerable length and very circumstantial, is given by Strype in his Life of Cranmer, b. iii. ch. 21.

it shall be first burned. And as for the Pope, I refuse him, as Christ's enemy and antichrist, with all his false doctrine. And here, being admonished of his recantation and dissembling, he said, Alas, my lord, I have been a man that all my life loved plainness, and never dissembled till now against the truth; which I am most sorry for. He added hereunto, that, for the Sacrament, he believed as he had taught in his [u] book against the bishop of Winchester. And here he was [x] suffered to speak no more. Coming to the stake with a cheerful countenance and willing mind, he put off his garments with haste. Fire being now put to him, he stretched out his right hand, and thrust it into the flame; and held it there a good space before the fire came to any other part of his body, where his

[u] See the account of this book in the present Introduction, p. xi. et seq.

[x] In his disputation with the Papists on Transubstantiation and the Mass, he had in like manner not been suffered to speak all he wished. "Such haste was made, that no answer could be suffered to be taken fully to any argument, before another brought a new argument, &c." And Ridley, who was concerned with him in the same disputation, has recorded that he "never saw or heard any thing done or handled more vainly, or tumultuously," than this disputation was by their papistical opponents, who compelled them, after every kind of outrage and insult, to leave off the reading their arguments and their proofs. Fox, in his Acts and Monuments, has preserved at large these memorials of literary as well as religious cruelty.

hand was seen of every man sensibly burning; crying with a loud voice, "[y] *This hand hath offended.*"

Such was the end of Archbishop Cranmer, over whose weakness, as well as strength, the Romanists triumphed; but of whom it may be also said, in the history of his abjuration, that "[z] out of weakness he was made strong, and waxed valiant;" regardless of the base denial of their promised pardon, and punishing as far as he could his own unworthy submission to the treacherous conditions of it.

Whoever attentively considers the character of Cranmer, will agree with [a] one of his biographers, that the light in which he appears to most advantage, is in that of a reformer, conducting the great work of a religious establishment. That work for near three centuries has "[b] stood like a tower." And is it now to be assailed, with the hope of shaking it, by the revived enginery of early and of midway opponents? Is it possible that the misrepresentations of former days, the distortions of ancient facts, supported by insinuating diction and ingenious arrangement, should lead us to believe that the labours of Cranmer were ill-directed, and that his great

[y] "His eyes were lifted up to heaven," says Fox, "and oftentimes he repeated his *unworthy right hand*, so long as his voice would suffer him."

[z] Heb. xi. 34. [a] Gilpin. [b] Milton, P. L.

work is not worth defence? Forbid it, truth; forbid it, honour; forbid it, liberty. And to the [c] doubts or queries whether happiness, and wisdom, and improvement in morals, and the revival of letters, have been promoted by this great work, the Reformation, the sublime words of one of its noblest children might be a sufficient answer, if a passage of very animated eloquence upon the subject, from a production honoured by the University of Oxford, did not also present itself as worthy to be generally known and admired; with which I shall finish what I have collected, and what I urge, in behalf of Archbishop Cranmer, and of the Reformation in England.

And first, in the words of Milton: "[d] When I recall to mind at last, after so many dark ages, wherein the huge overshadowing train of error had almost swept all the stars out of the firmament of the church; how *the bright and blissful Reformation*, by Divine Power, struck through the black and settled night of ignorance and antichristian tyranny, methinks a sovereign

[c] They are expressed by Mr. Butler in his Book of the Roman Cath. Church, p. 167, et seq. Need I refer Mr. Butler also for an answer to the fine observations of Blackstone upon the Reformation, at the close of his excellent Commentaries on the laws of England? The learned members of Mr. Butler's communion will hardly be obliged by his queries.

[d] Of Reformation in England, B. 1.

and reviving joy must needs rush into the bosom of him that reads, or hears; and the sweet odour of the returning Gospel imbathe his soul with the fragrancy of heaven. Then was the sacred Bible sought out of the dusty corners where profane falsehood and neglect had thrown it; the schools opened; divine and human learning raked out of the embers of forgotten tongues; the princes and cities trooping apace to the new-erected banner of salvation; the martyrs, with the unresistible might of weakness, shaking the powers of darkness, and scorning the fiery rage of the old red dragon."

Lastly, let us mark the observation made in our own times. "[e] The Reformation, that great spring-time of English literature; the nativity, as it were, and very cradle of our national genius. For the children of the Reformation are, indeed, the great supporters and pedestals of our national fame. To the Reformation we are indebted for Hooker, and Hall, and Chillingworth, and even for the flower of our countrymen, Milton. Nor can it be doubted, but that those agitations and convulsions of the publick mind, which ever accompany any great change in publick opinion, especially on matters of such eternal importance,

[e] A Comparative Estimate of the English Literature of the seventeenth and eighteenth Centuries, by Richard Burdon of Oriel College; a prize Essay, recited in the Theatre at Oxford, in the year 1814. p. 29. et seq.

are highly favourable to the excitation of dormant genius, the evolution of latent powers. They say to the sluggard, arise; and to the secret one, come forth. They speak with a voice which not even the obstinacy of inveterate indolence can resist, which penetrated even to the dark cells of superstition. At the Reformation the mind first again recovered its liberty, and resulted back to its native independence of thinking. This was that universal and truly Catholick emancipation, that Egyptian deliverance, that enlargement and liberation of the soul, that manumission of the spirit, whereby it was rescued from the subtleties of the schoolmen, the vanities of a fearful ignorance; and having escaped as a bird out of the snare of the fowler, it took its flight from earth, to bring down fire from heaven. But what was more than all this, the writers of that day had their imaginations warmed, and their conceptions elevated, by that constant conversation with the Scriptures, which the Reformation excited; the Scriptures, those abundant repertories of all that is vast in thought, stupendous in imagery, and magnificent in language. To these fountains of sublime truth they made their daily pilgrimage, and their nightly visitations. Here it is that we must look for the reason, why there are passages in Hooker, which might have done honour to Shakspeare; passages, such as we now search for in vain either in poetry, or in prose."

A

DEFENCE

OF THE

TRUE AND CATHOLICK DOCTRINE OF THE SACRAMENT

OF THE BODY AND BLOOD

OF

OUR SAVIOUR CHRIST.

WITH

A CONFUTATION OF SUNDRY ERRORS CONCERNING THE SAME, GROUNDED AND ESTABLISHED UPON GOD'S HOLY WORD, AND APPROVED BY THE CONSENT OF THE MOST ANCIENT DOCTORS OF THE CHURCH.

MADE BY THE MOST REVEREND FATHER IN GOD,

THOMAS,

ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY,

PRIMATE OF ALL ENGLAND, AND METROPOLITAN.

1550

THIS BOOK IS DIVIDED INTO FIVE PARTS.

PAGE

The first is of the True and Catholick Doctrine and Use of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ - - - - - - - 9

The second is against the Error of Transubstantiation - - - - - - - - - - 43

The third teacheth the Manner how Christ is present in his Holy Supper - - - - - 101

The fourth is of the Eating and Drinking of the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ - - 198

The fifth Book is of the Oblation and Sacrifice of our Saviour Christ - - - - - - 229

A TABLE

OF THE

CHIEF AND PRINCIPAL MATTERS

CONTAINED IN THIS BOOK.

THE CONTENTS OF THE FIRST BOOK.

	PAGE
The abuse of the Lord's Supper - - -	9
The eating of the body of Christ - - -	10
The eating of the sacrament of his body - -	12
Christ calleth the material bread his body - -	15
Evil men do eat the sacrament but not the body of Christ	16
Things sufficient for a Christian man's faith, concerning this sacrament - - - - - -	17
The sacrament which was ordained to make love and concord, is turned into the occasion of variance and discord	17
The spiritual hunger and thirstiness of the soul -	19
The spiritual food of the soul - - -	22
Christ far excelleth all corporeal food - - -	25
The sacraments were ordained to confirm our faith -	25
Wherefore this sacrament was ordained in bread and wine	28
The unity of Christ's mystical body - - -	29
This sacrament moveth all men to love and friendship -	30
The doctrine of Transubstantiation doth clean subvert our faith in Christ - - - - - -	31
The spiritual eating is with the heart, not with the teeth	32
The principal errors of the Papists - - -	36
The first is of Transubstantiation - - -	36
The second is of the Presence of Christ in this sacrament	38

PAGE

The third is, that evil men eat and drink the very body and blood of Christ - - - - 41

[And a fourth error is, that Christ is offered every day for remission of sins] - - - - - 41

THE CONTENTS OF THE SECOND BOOK.

The confutation of the error of Transubstantiation - 43

The Papistical doctrine is contrary to God's word - 44

The Papistical doctrine is against reason - - 50

The Papistical doctrine is also against our senses - 52

The Papistical doctrine is contrary to the faith of the old authors of Christ's church - - - - 54

Transubstantiation came from Rome - - - 69

The first reason of the Papists to prove their Transubstantiation - - - - - - 71

The second argument for Transubstantiation - - 75

Authors wrested by the Papists for their Transubstantiation 78

Negatives by comparison - - - - 82

Absurdities that follow of Transubstantiation - - 97

THE CONTENTS OF THE THIRD BOOK.

The presence of Christ in the sacrament - - 101

Christ corporally is ascended into heaven - - 102

The difference between the true and the Papistical doctrine concerning the presence of Christ's body - 103

The proof whereof by our profession in our common creed 107

Another proof by the holy Scripture - - - 108

Also another proof by ancient authors - - - 109

One body cannot be in divers places at one time - 116

An answer to the Papists, alleging for them these words, "This is my body" - - - - 124

The argument of the Papists - - - - 124

The interpretation of these words, "This is my body" - 124

Christ called bread his body, and wine his blood - 126

Bread is my body, wine is my blood, be figurative speeches 131

PAGE.

To eat Christ's flesh and drink his blood, be figurative speeches - - - - - - 132
This is my body, this is my blood, be figurative speeches 138
The bread representeth Christ's body, and the wine his blood - - - - - - 138
Signs and figures have the names of the things which they signify - - - - - - 141
Five principal things to be noted in Theodoretus - 155
Figurative speeches be not strange - - - 158
Christ himself used figurative speeches - - 158
The Paschal Lamb - - - - - 160
The Lord's Supper - - - - - 161
What figurative speeches were used at Christ's last supper 163
Answers to the authorities and arguments of the Papists 164
One brief answer to all - - - - 164
The answers to all the doctors - - - 166

THE CONTENTS OF THE FOURTH BOOK.

Whether evil men do eat and drink Christ - - 198
The godly only eat Christ - - - - 198
What is the eating of Christ's flesh, and drinking of his blood - - - - - - 200
Christ is not eaten with teeth, but with faith - - 201
The good only eat Christ - - - - 202
The answer to the Papists that do affirm that the evil do eat Christ's body, &c. - - - - 215
The answer to the Papists' authors, which, at the first shew, seem to make for them - - - - 216
Figures be called by the names of the things which they signify - - - - - - 219
The adoration of the sacrament - - - 221
The simple people be deceived - - - 221
They be the Papists that have deceived the people - 227
An exhortation to the true honouring of Christ in the sacrament - - - - - - 228

THE CONTENTS OF THE FIFTH BOOK.

PAGE

The sacrifice of the mass - - - - 229
The difference between the sacrifice of Christ, and of the priests of the old law - - - - 230
Two kinds of sacrifices - - - - 232
The sacrifice of Christ - - - - 232
A more plain declaration of the sacrifice of Christ - 234
The sacrifices of the old law - - - - 235
The mass is not a sacrifice propitiatory - - 237
A confutation of the Papists' cavillation - - 238
The true sacrifice of all Christian people - - 239
The Popish mass is detestable idolatry, utterly to be banished from all Christian congregations - - 241
Every man ought to receive the sacrament himself, and not one for another - - - - 242
The difference between the priest and the layman - 243
The answer to the Papists, concerning the sacrifice propitiatory - - - - - - 244
An answer to the authors - - - - 246
The lay persons make a sacrifice as well as the priest - 248
The Papistical mass is neither a sacrifice propitiatory, nor of thanksgiving - - - - - 249
There were no Papistical masses in the primitive church - 249
The causes and means how Papistical masses entered into the church - - - - - 252
The abuses of the Papistical masses - - - 252
Which church is to be followed - - - 253
A short instruction to the holy communion - - 254

HERE ENDETH THE TABLE.

PREFACE TO THE READER.

Our Saviour Christ Jesus, according to the will of his Eternal Father, when the time thereto was fully accomplished, taking our nature upon him, came into this world, from the high throne of his Father, to declare unto miserable sinners good news; to heal them that were sick; to make the blind to see; the deaf to hear; and the dumb to speak; to set prisoners at liberty; to shew that the time of grace and mercy was come; to give light to them that were in darkness and in the shadow of death; and to preach and give pardon and full remission of sin to all his elected. And to perform the same, he made a sacrifice and oblation of his own body upon the cross, which was a full redemption, satisfaction, and propitiation, for the sins of the whole world. And to commend this his sacrifice unto all his faithful people, and to confirm their faith and hope of eternal salvation in the same, he hath ordained a perpetual memory of his said sacri

fice, daily to be used in the church to his perpetual laud and praise, and to our singular comfort and consolation; that is to say, the celebration of his holy supper, wherein he doth not cease to give himself, with all his benefits, to all those that duly receive the same supper, according to his blessed ordinance. But the Romish Antichrist, to deface this great benefit of Christ, hath taught that his sacrifice upon the cross is not sufficient hereunto, without another sacrifice devised by him, and made by the priest, or else without indulgences, beads, pardons, pilgrimages, and such other pelfry, to supply Christ's imperfection. And that Christian people cannot apply to themselves the benefits of Christ's passion, but that the same is in the distribution of the bishop of Rome, or else that by Christ we have no full remission, but be delivered only from sin, and yet remaineth temporal pain in purgatory due for the same, to be remitted after this life by the Romish Antichrist and his ministers, who take upon them to do for us that thing, which Christ either would not or could not do. O heinous blasphemy and most detestable injury against Christ; O wicked abomination in the temple of God; O pride intolerable of Antichrist, and most manifest token of the son of perdition, extolling himself above God, and with Lucifer exalting his seat and power above the throne of God! For he that taketh upon him to supply that

thing, which he pretendeth to be imperfect in Christ, must needs make himself above Christ, and so very Antichrist. For what is this else, but to be against Christ, and to bring him into contempt as one that either for lack of charity would not, or for lack of power he could not, with all his blood-shedding and death, clearly deliver his faithful, and give them full remission of their sins, but that the full perfection thereof must be had at the hands of Antichrist of Rome and his ministers? What man of knowledge and zeal to God's honour can with dry eyes see this injury to Christ, and look upon the state of religion brought in by the Papists, perceiving the true sense of God's word subverted by false glosses of man's devising, the true Christian religion turned into certain hypocritical and superstitious sects, the people praying with their mouths and hearing with their ears they wist not what, and so ignorant in God's word, that they could not discern hypocrisy and superstition from true and sincere religion? This was of late years the face of religion within this realm of England, and yet remaineth in divers realms. But (thanks be to Almighty God and to the king's majesty, with his father, a prince of most famous memory,) the superstitious sects of monks and friars, that were in this realm, be clean taken away; the Scripture is restored unto the proper and true understanding; the people may

daily read and hear God's heavenly word, and pray in their own language which they understand, so that their hearts and mouths may go together, and be none of those people of whom Christ complained, saying, "These people honour me with their lips, but their hearts be far from me[a]." Thanks be to God, many corrupt weeds be plucked up, which were wont to rot the flock of Christ, and to let the growing of the Lord's harvest.

But what availeth it to take away beads, pardons, pilgrimages, and such other like Popery, so long as the chief roots remain unpulled up? whereof, so long as they remain, will spring again all former impediments of the Lord's harvest, and corruption of his flock. The rest is but branches and leaves, the cutting away whereof is but like topping and lopping of a tree, or cutting down of weeds, leaving the body standing, and the roots in the ground; but the very body of the tree, or rather the roots of the weeds, is the Popish doctrine of Transubstantiation, of the real presence of Christ's flesh and blood in the sacrament of the altar, (as they call it,) and of the sacrifice and oblation of Christ made by the priest for the salvation of the quick and the dead. Which roots, if they be suffered to grow in the Lord's vineyard, they will over-

[a] Matt. xv.

spread all the ground again with the old errors and superstitions. These injuries to Christ be so intolerable, that no Christian heart can willingly bear them. Wherefore seeing that many have set to their hands, and whetted their tools, to pluck up the weeds, and to cut down the tree of error, I, not knowing otherwise how to excuse myself at the last day, have in this book set to my hand and axe with the rest to cut down this tree, and to pluck up the weeds and plants by the roots, which our heavenly Father never planted, but were grafted and sown in his vineyard by his adversary the devil, and Antichrist, his minister. The Lord grant, that this my travail and labour in his vineyard be not in vain, but that it may prosper and bring forth good fruits to his honour and glory. For when I see his vineyard overgrown with thorns, brambles, and weeds, I know that everlasting woe appertaineth unto me, if I hold my peace, and put not to my hands and tongue to labour in purging his vineyard. God I take to witness, (who seeth the hearts of all men thoroughly unto the bottom,) that I take this labour for none other consideration, but for the glory of his name, and the discharge of my duty, and the zeal that I bear toward the flock of Christ. I know in what office God hath placed me, and to what purpose; that is to say, to set forth his word truly unto his people, to the uttermost of my power, without

respect of person, or regard of thing in the world, but of Him alone. I know what account I shall make to Him hereof at the last day, when every man shall answer for his vocation, and receive for the same, good or ill, according as he hath done. I know how Antichrist hath obscured the glory of God, and the true knowledge of his word, overcasting the same with mists and clouds of error and ignorance, through false glosses and interpretations. It pitieth me to see the simple and hungry flock of Christ led into corrupt pastures, to be carried blindfold, they know not whither, and to be fed with poison in the stead of wholesome meats.

And moved by the duty, office, and place, whereunto it hath pleased God to call me, I give warning in his name unto all that profess Christ, that they flee far from Babylon, if they will save their souls, and to beware of that great harlot, that is to say, the pestiferous see of Rome, that she make you not drunk with her pleasant wine. Trust not her sweet promises, nor banquet with her; for instead of wine she will give you sour dregs, and for meat she will feed you with rank poison. But come to our Redeemer and Saviour Christ, who refresheth all that truly come unto him, be their anguish and heaviness never so great. Give credit unto him, in whose mouth was never found guile, nor untruth. By him you shall be clearly delivered from all your

diseases, of him you shall have full remission, *à pœna et à culpa*. He it is that feedeth continually, all that belong unto him, with his own flesh that hanged upon the cross; and giveth them drink of the blood flowing out of his own side, and maketh to spring within them water that floweth unto everlasting life. Listen not to the false incantations, sweet whisperings, and crafty jugglings of the subtle Papists, wherewith they have this many years deluded and bewitched the world, but hearken to Christ, give ear unto his words; which shall lead you the right way unto everlasting life, there with him to live ever as heirs of his kingdom. Amen.

THE FIRST BOOK

IS OF

THE TRUE AND CATHOLICK DOCTRINE AND USE

OF THE

SACRAMENT

OF THE

BODY AND BLOOD OF OUR SAVIOUR CHRIST.

CHAP. I.

The abuse of the Lord's Supper.

THE Supper of the Lord, otherwise called the Holy Communion, or Sacrament of the Body and Blood of our Saviour Christ, hath been of many men, and by sundry ways, very much abused; but especially within these four or five hundred years. Of some it hath been used as a sacrifice propitiatory for sin, and otherwise superstitiously, far from the intent that Christ did first ordain the same at the beginning; doing therein great wrong and injury to his death and passion. And of other some it hath been very lightly esteemed, or rather condemned and de-

spised, as a thing of small or none effect. And thus between both the parties hath been much variance and contention in divers places of Christendom. Therefore to the intent that this holy Sacrament, or Lord's Supper, may hereafter neither of the one party be contemned or lightly esteemed, nor of the other party be abused to any other purpose than Christ himself did first appoint and ordain the same; and that, so, the contention on both parties may be quieted and ended; the most sure and plain way is, to cleave unto holy Scripture. Wherein whatsoever is found, must be taken for a most sure ground and an infallible truth; and whatsoever cannot be grounded upon the same (touching our faith) is man's device, changeable and uncertain. And therefore here are set forth the very words that Christ himself and his apostle St. Paul spake, both of the eating and drinking of Christ's body and blood, and also of the eating and drinking of the sacrament of the same.

CHAP. II.

The eating of the body of Christ.

First, as concerning the eating of the body and drinking of the blood of our Saviour Christ, he speaketh himself, in the sixth chapter of St. John, in this wise:

"Verily, verily I say unto you, except you eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, you have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day. For

my flesh is very meat, and my blood is very drink. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father, even so he that eateth me, shall live by me. This is the bread which came down from heaven. Not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead. He that eateth this bread, shall live for ever[b]."

Of these words of Christ[c], it is plain and manifest, that the eating of Christ's flesh, and drinking of his blood, is not like to the eating and drinking of other meats and drinks. For although without meat and drink man cannot live, yet it followeth not, that he that eateth, and drinketh, shall live for ever.

But as touching this meat and drink of the body and blood of Christ, it is true, both he that eateth and drinketh them, hath everlasting life; and also he that eateth and drinketh them not, hath not everlasting life. For to eat that meat and drink that drink, is to dwell in Christ, and to have Christ dwelling in him[d].

And therefore no man can say or think[e], that he eateth the body of Christ or drinketh his blood, except he dwelleth in Christ, and hath Christ dwelling in him. Thus have ye heard of

[b] John vi.
[c] Augustin. in Joan. Tractat. 26.
[d] Eodem tract.
[e] Aug. de Civitate, lib. 21. cap. 25.

the eating and drinking of the very flesh and blood of our Saviour Christ.

CHAP. III.

The eating of the sacrament of his body.

Now as touching the sacraments of the same, our Saviour Christ did institute them in bread and wine, at his last supper, which he had with his apostles the night before his death, at which time, (as St. Matthew saith,)

" When they were eating, Jesus took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it, gave it to his disciples, and said, Take, eat, this is my body. And he took the cup, and when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this, for this is my blood of the New Testament, that is shed for many, for the remission of sins. But I say unto you, I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day, when I shall drink it new with you in my Father's kingdom [f]."

This thing is rehearsed also of St. Mark, in these words:

" As they did eat, Jesus took bread, and when he had blessed, he brake it, and gave it to them, and said, Take, eat, this is my body: and taking the cup, when he had given thanks, he gave it to them, and they all drank of it. And he said to them, This is my blood of the New Testament, which is shed for many. Verily I say unto you, I will drink no more of the

[f] Matt. xxvi.

fruit of the vine, until that day that I drink it new in the kingdom of God[g]."

The Evangelist St. Luke uttereth this matter on this wise.

"When the hour was come, he sat down, and the twelve apostles with him. And he said unto them, I have greatly desired to eat this pascha with you before I suffer. For I say unto you, Henceforth I will not eat of it any more, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God. And he took the cup, and gave thanks, and said, Take this, and divide it among you. For I say unto you, I will not drink of the fruit of the vine, until the kingdom of God come. And he took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and gave it unto them, saying, This is my body, which is given for you. This do in remembrance of me. Likewise also when he had supped, he took the cup, saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for you[h]."

Hitherto you have heard all that the Evangelists declare, that Christ spake or did at his last supper, concerning the institution of the communion and sacrament of his body and blood. Now you shall hear what St. Paul saith concerning the same, in the tenth chapter of the First to the Corinthians, where he writeth thus:

[g] Mark xiv. [h] Luke xxii.

" Is not the cup of blessing, which we bless, a communion of the blood of Christ? Is not the bread, which we break, a communion of the body of Christ? We being many, are one bread and one body. For we all are partakers of one bread and of one cup [i]."

And in the eleventh he speaketh on this manner.

" That which I delivered unto you, I received of the Lord. For the Lord Jesus, the same night in the which he was betrayed, took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat, this is my body, which is broken for you. Do this in remembrance of me. Likewise also he took the cup, when supper was done, saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood. Do this, as often as you drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as you shall eat this bread and drink this cup, shew forth the Lord's death till he come. Wherefore whosoever shall eat of this bread or drink of this cup unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But let a man examine himself, and so eat of the bread, and drink of the cup. For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh his own damnation, because he maketh no difference of the Lord's body. For this cause many are weak and sick among you, and many do sleep [k]."

[i] 1 Cor. x. [k] Ibid. xi.

By these words of Christ rehearsed by the Evangelists, and by the doctrine also of St. Paul, (which he confesseth that he received of Christ,) two things specially are to be noted.

CHAP. IV.

Christ called the material bread his body.

First, that our Saviour Christ called the material bread which he brake, his body, and the wine (which was the fruit of the vine) his blood. And yet he spake not this to the intent that men should think that material bread is his very body, or that his very body is material bread: neither that wine made of grapes is his very blood, or that his very blood is wine made of grapes, but to signify unto us (as St. Paul saith) that the cup is a communion of Christ's blood that was shed for us, and the bread is a communion of his flesh that was crucified for us. So that although, in the truth of his human nature, Christ be in heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father, yet whosoever eateth of that bread in the supper of the Lord, according to Christ's institution and ordinance, is assured by Christ's own promise and testament, that he is a member of his body, and receiveth the benefits of his passion, which he suffered for us upon the cross. And likewise he that drinketh of that holy cup in that supper of the Lord, according to Christ's institution, is certified by Christ's legacy and testament, that he is made partaker of the blood of Christ, which was shed for us. And this meant St. Paul, when he saith,

"Is not the cup of blessing which we bless, a communion of the blood of Christ? Is not the bread which we break, a communion of the body of Christ?" So that no man can contemn or lightly esteem this holy communion, except he contemn also Christ's body and blood, and pass not whether he have any fellowship with him or no. And of those men St. Paul saith, "That they eat and drink their own damnation, because they esteem not the body of Christ."

CHAP. V.

Evil men do eat the sacrament but not the body of Christ.

The second thing which may be learned of the foresaid words of Christ and St. Paul is this, that although none eateth the body of Christ, and drinketh his blood, but they have eternal life, (as appeareth by the words before recited of St. John,) yet both the good and the bad do eat and drink the bread and wine, which be the sacraments of the same: but, beside the sacraments, the good eateth everlasting life; the evil, everlasting death. Therefore St. Paul saith, "Whosoever shall eat of the bread or drink of the cup of the Lord unworthily, he shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord." Here St. Paul saith not, that he that eateth the bread and drinketh the cup of the Lord unworthily, eateth and drinketh the body and blood of the Lord, but is guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But what he eateth and drinketh St. Paul declareth, saying, "He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh his

own damnation." Thus is declared the sum of all that Scripture speaketh of the eating and drinking, both of the body and blood of Christ, and also of the sacrament of the same.

CHAP. VI.

These things suffice for a Christian man's faith, concerning this sacrament.

And as these things be most certainly true, because they be spoken of by Christ himself, the author of all truth, and by his holy apostle St. Paul, as he received them of Christ, so all doctrines contrary to the same be most certainly false and untrue, and of all Christian men to be eschewed, because they be contrary to God's word. And all doctrine concerning this matter, that is more than this, which is not grounded upon God's word, is of no necessity, neither ought the people's heads to be busied, or their consciences troubled with the same. So that things spoken and done by Christ, and written by the holy Evangelists and St. Paul, ought to suffice the faith of Christian people, as touching the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, and holy communion or sacrament of his body and blood; which, being well considered and weighed, shall be a just occasion to pacify and agree both parties, as well them that hitherto have contemned or lightly esteemed it, as also them which have hitherto, for lack of knowledge or otherwise, ungodly abused it.

CHAP. VII.

The sacrament which

Christ ordained the sacrament to move and stir all men to friendship, love, and concord, and to put away all hatred, variance, and dis-

was ordained to make love and concord, is turned into the occasion of variance and discord.

cord, and to testify a brotherly and unfeigned love between all them that be the members of Christ; but the devil, the enemy of Christ and of all his members, hath so craftily juggled herein, that of nothing riseth so much contention as of this holy sacrament. God grant that all contention set aside, both the parties may come to this holy communion with such a lively faith in Christ, and such an unfeigned love to all Christ's members, that as they carnally eat with their mouth this sacramental bread and drink the wine, so spiritually they may eat and drink the very flesh and blood of Christ, which is in heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of his Father. And that finally by his means they may enjoy with him the glory and kingdom of heaven. Amen.

CHAP. VIII.

Whereas in the first part of this treaty of the sacrament of the body and blood of our Saviour Christ, was briefly declared the institution and meaning of the same, according to the very words of the Gospel and of St. Paul, yet it shall not be in vain somewhat more at large to declare the same, according to the mind, as well of holy Scripture, as of old ancient authors; and that so sincerely and plainly, without doubts, ambiguities, or vain questions, that the very simple and unlearned people may easily understand the same, and be edified thereby; which by God's grace is mine only intent and desire,

that the flock of Christ dispersed in this realm (among whom I am appointed a special pastor) may no longer lack the commodity, and fruit, which springeth of this heavenly knowledge. For the more clearly it is understood, the more sweetness, fruit, comfort, and edification it bringeth to the godly receivers thereof. And to the clear understanding of this sacrament, divers things must be considered.

CHAP. IX.

The spiritual hunger and thirstiness of the soul.

First, that as all men of themselves be sinners, and through sin be in God's wrath, banished far away from him, condemned to hell and everlasting damnation, and none is clearly innocent, but Christ alone: so every soul, inspired by God, is desirous to be delivered from sin and hell, and to obtain at God's hands mercy, favour, righteousness, and everlasting salvation. And this earnest and great desire is called in Scripture, the hunger and thirst of the soul; with which kind of hunger David was taken, when he said: "As an hart longeth for springs of water, so doth my soul long for thee, O God[l]."—"My soul hath thirsted after God, who is the well of life. My soul thirsteth for thee, my flesh wisheth for thee[m]." And this hunger the silly, poor, sinful soul is drawn into, by means of the law, which sheweth unto her the horribleness of sin, the terror of God's indignation, and the horror of

[l] Psalm xlii. [m] Ibid. lxiii.

death and everlasting damnation. And when she seeth nothing but damnation for her offences, by justice and accusation of the law, and this damnation is ever before her eyes; then, in this great distress, the soul being pressed with heaviness and sorrow seeketh for some comfort, and desireth some remedy for her miserable and sorrowful estate. And this feeling of her damnable condition, and greedy desire of refreshing, is the spiritual hunger of the soul. And whosoever hath this godly hunger, is blessed of God, and shall have meat and drink enough, as Christ himself said: "Blessed be they that hunger and thirst for righteousness, for they shall be filled full[n]." And on the other side, they that see not their own sinful and damnable estate, but think themselves holy enough, and in good case and condition enough, as they have no spiritual hunger, so shall they not be fed of God with any spiritual food. For as Almighty God feedeth them that be hungry, so doth he send away empty all that be not hungry. But this hunger and thirst is not easily perceived of the carnal man: for when he heareth the Holy Ghost speak of meat and drink, his mind is by and by in the kitchen and buttery, and he thinketh upon his dishes and pots, his mouth and his belly. But the Scripture in sundry places useth

[n] Matt. v.

special words, whereby to draw our gross minds from the fancying of our teeth and belly, and from this carnal and fleshly imagination. For the apostles and disciples of Christ, when they were yet carnal, knew not what was meant by this kind of hunger and meat, and therefore when they desired him to eat, to withdraw their minds from carnal meat, he said unto them: "I have other meat to eat, which you know not[o]." And why knew they it not? Forsooth because their minds were gross as yet, and had not received the fulness of the Spirit. And therefore our Saviour Christ, minding to draw them from this grossness, told them of another kind of meat than they fancied, (as it were,) rebuking them, for that they perceived not that there was any other kind of eating and drinking, besides that eating and drinking which is with the mouth and the throat. Likewise when he said to the woman of Samaria: "Whosoever shall drink of that water that I shall give him, shall never be thirsty again[p]." They that heard him speak those words, might well perceive that he went about to make them well acquainted with another kind of drinking, than is the drinking with the mouth and throat. For there is no such kind of drink, that with one's drinking, can quench the thirst of a man's body for ever.

[o] John iv. [p] Ibid.

Wherefore, in saying, he shall never be thirsty again, he did draw their minds from drinking with the mouth unto another kind of drinking whereof they knew not, and unto another kind of thirsting wherewith as yet they were not acquainted. And when our Saviour Christ said, "He that cometh to me shall not hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never be thirsty[q];" he gave them a plain watch-word, that there was another kind of meat and drink than that wherewith he fed them at the other side of the water, and another kind of hungering and thirsting than was the hungering and thirsting of the body. By these words therefore he drove the people to understand another kind of eating and drinking, of hungering and thirsting, than that which belongeth only for the preservation of temporal life. Now then as the thing that comforteth the body, is called meat and drink; of a like sort the Scripture calleth the same thing that comforteth the soul, meat and drink.

CHAP. X.

The spiritual food of the soul.

Wherefore as here before in the first note is declared the hunger and drought of the soul, so is it now secondly to be noted, what is the meat, drink, and food of the soul. The meat, drink, food and refreshing of the soul, is our Saviour Christ, as he said himself. "Come unto me all you that travail and be laden, and I will

[q] John vi.

refresh you[r]."—"And if any man be dry," saith he, "let him come to me and drink. He that believeth in me, floods of water of life shall flow out of his belly[s]."—"And I am the bread of life," saith Christ; "he that cometh to me, shall not be hungry; and he that believeth in me, shall never be dry[t]." For as meat and drink do comfort the hungry body, so doth the death of Christ's body, and the shedding of his blood, comfort the soul, when she is after her sort hungry. What thing is it that comforteth and nourisheth the body? Forsooth, meat and drink. By what names then shall we call the body and blood of our Saviour Christ (which do comfort and nourish the hungry soul) but by the names of meat and drink? And this similitude caused our Saviour to say, "My flesh is very meat, and my blood is very drink[u]." For there is no kind of meat that is comfortable to the soul, but only the death of Christ's blessed body; nor no kind of drink that can quench her thirst, but only the blood-shedding of our Saviour Christ, which was shed for her offences. For as there is a carnal generation, and a carnal feeding and nourishment, so is there also a spiritual generation, and a spiritual feeding. And as every man, by carnal generation of father and

[r] Matt. xi. [s] John vii. [t] John vi. [u] Ibid.

mother, is carnally begotten and born unto this mortal life, so is every good Christian spiritually born by Christ unto eternal life. And as every man is carnally fed and nourished in his body by meat and drink, even so is every good Christian man spiritually fed and nourished in his soul by the flesh and blood of our Saviour Christ. And as the body liveth by meat and drink, and thereby increaseth and groweth from a young babe unto a perfect man, (which thing experience teacheth us,) so the soul liveth by Christ himself, by pure faith eating his flesh and drinking his blood. And this Christ himself teacheth us in the sixth of John, saying, "Verily, verily I say unto you, except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his blood, you have no life in you. Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day: for my flesh is very meat, and my blood is very drink. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood dwelleth in me, and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father, even so he that eateth me, shall live by me[x]." And this St. Paul confessed of himself, saying, "That I have life, I have it by faith in the Son of God. And now it is not I that live, but Christ liveth in me[y]."

[x] John vi. [y] Gal. ii.

CHAP. XI.

Christ far excelleth all corporal food.

The third thing to be noted is this, that although our Saviour Christ resembleth his flesh and blood to meat and drink, yet he far passeth and excelleth all corporal meats and drinks. For although corporal meats and drinks do nourish and continue our life here in this world, yet they begin not our life. For the beginning of our life we have of our fathers and mothers; and the meat, after we be begotten, doth feed and nourish us, and so preserveth us for a time. But our Saviour Christ is both the first beginner of our spiritual life, (who first begetteth us unto God his Father,) and also afterward he is our lively food and nourishment.

Moreover, meat and drink doth feed and nourish only our bodies; but Christ is the true and perfect nourishment both of body and soul. And besides that, bodily food preserveth the life but for a time, but Christ is such a spiritual and perfect food, that he preserveth both body and soul for ever. As he said unto Martha, "I am resurrection and life. He that believeth in me, although he die, yet shall he live. And he that liveth and believeth in me, shall not die for ever."

CHAP. XII.

The sacraments were ordained to confirm our faith.

Fourthly, it is to be noted, that the true knowledge of these things is the true knowledge of Christ; and to teach these things, is to teach Christ; and the believing and feeling of these things, is the believing and feeling of Christ in

our hearts. And the more clearly we see, understand, and believe these things, the more clearly we see and understand Christ, and have more fully our faith and comfort in him. And although our carnal generation and our carnal nourishment be known to all men by daily experience, and by our common senses; yet this our spiritual generation and our spiritual nutrition be so obscure and hid unto us, that we cannot attain to the true and perfect knowledge and feeling of them, but only by faith, which must be grounded upon God's most holy word and sacraments. And for this consideration our Saviour Christ hath not only set forth these things most plainly in his holy word, that we may hear them with our ears; but he hath also ordained one visible sacrament of spiritual regeneration in water, and another visible sacrament of spiritual nourishment in bread and wine, to the intent, that as much as is possible for man, we may see Christ with our eyes, smell him at our nose, taste him with our mouths, grope him with our hands, and perceive him with all our senses. For as the word of God, preached, putteth Christ into our ears; so likewise these elements of water, bread, and wine, joined to God's word, do, after a sacramental manner, put Christ into our eyes, mouths, hands, and all our senses. And for this cause Christ ordained baptism in water, that as surely as we see, feel, and touch

water with our bodies, and be washed with water; so assuredly ought we to believe, when we be baptized, that Christ is verily present with us, and that by him we be newly born again spiritually, and washed from our sins, and grafted in the stock of Christ's own body, and be apparelled, clothed, and harnessed with him, in such wise, that as the devil hath no power against Christ, so hath he none against us, so long as we remain grafted in that stock, and be clothed with that apparel, and harnessed with that armour. So that the washing in water of baptism, is, as it were, a shewing of Christ before our eyes, and a sensible touching, feeling, and groping of him, to the confirmation of the inward faith, which we have in him. And in like manner Christ ordained the sacrament of his body and blood in bread and wine, to preach unto us, that as our bodies be fed, nourished, and preserved with meat and drink, so (as touching our spiritual life towards God) we be fed, nourished, and preserved by the body and blood of our Saviour Christ; and also that he is such a preservation unto us, that neither the devils of hell, nor eternal death, nor sin, can be able to prevail against us, so long as, by true and constant faith, we be fed and nourished with that meat and drink. And for this cause Christ ordained this sacrament in bread and wine, (which we eat and drink, and be chief nutriments of our

body,) to the intent that as surely as we see the bread and wine with our eyes, smell them with our noses, touch them with our hands, and taste them with our mouths; so assuredly ought we to believe, that Christ is our spiritual life and sustenance of our souls, like as the said bread and wine is the food and sustenance of our bodies. And no less ought we to doubt, that our souls be fed and live by Christ, than that our bodies be fed and live by meat and drink. Thus our Saviour Christ knowing us to be in this world, as it were, but babes and weaklings in faith, hath ordained sensible signs and tokens, whereby to allure and draw us to more strength and more constant faith in him. So that the eating and drinking of this sacramental bread and wine, is, as it were, a shewing of Christ before our eyes, a smelling of him with our noses, a feeling and groping of him with our hands, and an eating, chawing, digesting, and feeding upon him to our spiritual strength and perfection.

CHAP. XIII.

Wherefore this sacrament was ordained in bread and wine.

Fifthly, it is to be noted, that although there be many kinds of meats and drinks, which feed the body, yet our Saviour Christ (as many ancient authors write) ordained this sacrament of our spiritual feeding in bread and wine, rather than in other meats and drinks, because that bread and wine do most truly represent unto us the spiritual union and knot of all faithful people, as well unto Christ, as also amongst themselves.

For like as bread is made of a great number of grains of corn, ground, baken, and so joined together, that thereof is made one loaf; and an infinite number of grapes be pressed together in one vessel, and thereof is made wine; likewise is the whole multitude of true Christian people spiritually joined, first to Christ, and then among themselves together, in one faith, one baptism, one holy spirit, one knot and bond of love.

CHAP. XIV.

The unity of Christ's mystical body.

Sixthly, it is to be noted, that as the bread and wine, which we do eat, be turned into our flesh and blood, and be made our very flesh and very blood, and be so joined and mixed with our flesh and blood, that they be made one whole body together, even so be all faithful Christians spiritually turned into the body of Christ, and be so joined unto Christ, and also together among themselves, that they do make but one mystical body of Christ, as St. Paul saith: "We be one bread and one body, as many as be partakers of one bread and one cup [y]." And as one loaf is given among many men, so that every one is partaker of the same loaf, and likewise one cup of wine is distributed unto many persons, whereof every one is partaker; even so our Saviour Christ (whose flesh and blood is represented by the mystical bread and wine in the Lord's Supper) doth give himself unto all his true members,

[y] 1 Cor. x.

spiritually to feed them, nourish them, and to give them continual life by him [z]. And as the branches of a tree, or member of a body, if they be dead or cut off, they neither live, nor receive any nourishment or sustenance of the body or tree; so likewise ungodly and wicked people, (which be cut off from Christ's mystical body, or be dead members of the same,) do not spiritually feed upon Christ's body and blood, nor have any life, strength, or sustenance thereby.

CHAP. XV.

This sacrament moveth all men to love and friendship.

Seventhly, it is to be noted, that whereas nothing in this life is more acceptable before God, or more pleasant unto man, than Christian people to live together quietly in love and peace, unity and concord: this sacrament doth most aptly and effectually move us thereunto. For when we be made all partakers of this one table, what ought we to think, but that we be all members of one spiritual body, (whereof Christ is the head,) that we be joined together in one Christ, as a great number of grains of corn be joined together in one loaf. Surely they have very hard and stony hearts, which with these things be not moved. And more cruel and unreasonable be they than brute beasts, that cannot be persuaded to be good to their Christian brethren and neighbours (for whom Christ suffered death) when in this sacrament they be put

[z] Dionysius.

in remembrance, that the Son of God bestowed his life for his enemies. For we see by daily experience, that eating and drinking together maketh friends, and continueth friendship. Much more then ought the table of Christ to move us so to do. Wild beasts and birds be made gentle by giving them meat and drink; why then should not Christian men wax meek and gentle with this heavenly meat of Christ? Hereunto we be stirred and moved as well by the bread and wine in this holy supper, as by the words of holy Scripture recited in the same. Wherefore whose heart soever this holy sacrament, communion, and supper of Christ, will not kindle with love unto his neighbours, and cause him to put out of his heart all envy, hatred, and malice, and to grow in the same all amity, friendship, and concord, he deceiveth himself if he think that he hath the spirit of Christ dwelling within him. But all these foresaid godly admonitions, exhortations, and comforts, do the Papists (as much as lieth in them) take away from all Christian people, by their Transubstantiation.

The doctrine of Transubstantiation doth clean subvert our faith in Christ.

For if we receive no bread nor wine in the holy communion, then all those lessons and comforts be gone, which we should learn and receive by eating of the bread and drinking of the wine. And that fantastical imagination giveth an occasion utterly to subvert our whole faith in Christ. For if this sacrament be or-

dained in bread and wine (which be food for the body) to signify and declare unto us our spiritual food by Christ, then if our corporal feeding upon the bread and wine be but fantastical, (so that there is no bread nor wine there indeed to feed upon, although there appear there to be,) then it doth us to understand, that our spiritual feeding in Christ is also fantastical, and that indeed we feed not of him. Which sophistry is so devilish and wicked, and so much injurious to Christ, that it could not come from any other person but only from the devil himself, and from his special minister, Antichrist.

CHAP. XVI.

The spiritual eating is with the heart, not with the teeth.

The eighth thing that is to be noted is, that this spiritual meat of Christ's body and blood, is not received in the mouth, and digested in the stomach, (as corporal meats and drinks commonly be,) but it is received with a pure heart, and a sincere faith. And the true eating and drinking of the said body and blood of Christ, is with a constant and a lively faith to believe that Christ gave his body, and shed his blood upon the cross for us, and that he doth so join and incorporate himself to us, that he is our head, and we his members, and flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bones, having him dwelling in us, and we in him. And herein standeth the whole effect and strength of this sacrament. And this faith God worketh inwardly in our hearts by his holy Spirit, and confirmeth the same outwardly to

our ears by hearing of his word, and to our other senses, by eating and drinking of the sacramental bread and wine in his holy supper. What thing then can be more comfortable to us, than to eat this meat and drink this drink? Whereby Christ certifieth us, that we be spiritually and truly fed and nourished by him, and that we dwell in him, and he in us. Can this be shewed unto us more plainly, than when he saith himself, "He that eateth me, shall live by me[a]?" Wherefore whosoever doth not contemn the everlasting life, how can he but highly esteem this sacrament? How can he but embrace it, as a sure pledge of his salvation? And when he seeth godly people devoutly receive the same, how can he but be desirous oftentimes to receive it with them? Surely no man, that well understandeth and diligently weigheth these things, can be without a great desire to come to this holy supper. All men desire to have God's favour; and when they know the contrary, that they be in his indignation, and cast out of his favour, what thing can comfort them? How be their minds vexed! What trouble is in their consciences! All God's creatures seem to be against them, and do make them afraid, as things being ministers of God's wrath and indignation towards them. And rest and comfort can they

[a] John vi.

find none, neither within them nor without them. And in this case they do hate as well God as the devil; God as an unmerciful and extreme judge, and the devil as a most malicious and cruel tormentor. But in this sorrowful heaviness, holy Scripture teacheth them, that our heavenly Father can by no means be pleased with them again, but by the sacrifice and death of his only-begotten Son, whereby God hath made a perpetual amity and peace with us, doth pardon the sins of them that believe in him, maketh them his children, and giveth them to his first-begotten Son Christ, to be incorporate into him, to be saved by him, and to be made heirs of heaven with him. And in the receiving of the holy supper of our Lord, we be put in remembrance of this his death, and of the whole mystery of our redemption. In the which supper is made mention of his testament, and of the foresaid communion of us with Christ, and of the remission of our sins by his sacrifice upon the cross. Wherefore in this sacrament (if it be rightly received with a true faith) we be assured that our sins be forgiven, and the league of peace and the testament of God is confirmed between him and us, so that whosoever by a true faith doth eat Christ's flesh, and drink his blood, hath everlasting life by him. Which thing when we feel in our hearts, at the receiving of the Lord's Supper, what thing can be

more joyful, more pleasant, or more comfortable unto us? All this to be true, is most certain by the words of Christ himself, when he did first institute his holy supper, the night before his death, as it appeareth, as well by the words of the Evangelists, as of St. Paul. "Do this," saith Christ, "as often as you drink it in remembrance of me." And St. Paul saith, "As often as you eat this bread, and drink this cup, you shall shew the Lord's death until he come." And again, Christ said, "This cup is a new testament, in my own blood, which shall be shed for the remission of sins." This doctrine, here recited, may suffice for all that be humble and godly, and seek nothing that is superfluous, but that is necessary and profitable. And therefore unto such persons may be made here an end of this book. But unto them that be contentious Papists, and idolaters, nothing is enough. And yet because they shall not glory in their subtle inventions and deceivable doctrine, (as though no man were able to answer them,) I shall desire the readers, of patience, to suffer me a little while to spend some time in vain to confute their most vain vanities. And yet the time shall not be altogether spent in vain, for thereby shall more clearly appear the light from the darkness, the truth from false sophistical subtleties, and the certain word of God from men's dreams and fantastical inventions.

CHAP. XVII.

The principal errors of the Papists. The first is of Transubstantiation.

But these things cannot manifestly appear to the reader, except the principal points be first set out, wherein the Papists vary from the truth of God's word, which be chiefly four.

First, the Papists say, that in the Supper of the Lord, after the words of consecration (as they call it) there is none other substance remaining, but the substance of Christ's flesh and blood, so that there remaineth neither bread to be eaten, nor wine to be drunken. And although there be the colour of bread and wine, the savour, the smell, the bigness, the fashion, and all other (as they call them) accidents or qualities and quantities of bread and wine, yet (say they) there is no very bread nor wine, but they be turned into the flesh and blood of Christ. And this conversion they call Transubstantiation, that is to say, turning of one substance into another substance. And although all the accidents, both of the bread and wine, remain still, yet (say they) the same accidents be in no manner of thing; but hang alone in the air, without any thing to stay them upon. For in the body and blood of Christ (say they) these accidents cannot be, nor yet in the air for the body and blood of Christ, and the air, be neither of that bigness, fashion, smell, nor colour, that the bread and wine be. Nor in the bread and wine (say they) these accidents cannot be; for the substance of

bread and wine (as they affirm) be clean gone. And so there remaineth whiteness, but nothing is white: there remaineth colours, but nothing is coloured therewith: there remaineth roundness, but nothing is round: and there is bigness, and yet nothing is big: there is sweetness, without any sweet thing: softness, without any soft thing: breaking, without any thing broken: division, without any thing divided: and so other qualities and quantities, without any thing to receive them. And this doctrine they teach as a necessary article of our faith. But it is not the doctrine of Christ, but the subtle invention of Antichrist, first decreed by Innocent the Third [b], and after more at large set forth by school authors, whose study was ever to defend and set abroad to the world all such matters, as the bishops of Rome had once decreed. And the devil, by his minister Antichrist, had so dazzled the eyes of a great multitude of Christian people in these latter days, that they sought not for their faith at the clear light of God's word, but at the Romish Antichrist, believing whatsoever he prescribed unto them, yea though it were against all reason, all senses, and God's most holy word also. For else he could not have been very Antichrist indeed, except he had been so repugnant

[b] De summa Trini. et fide Catholica.

unto Christ, whose doctrine is clean contrary to this doctrine of Antichrist. For Christ teacheth, that we receive very bread and wine in the most blessed Supper of the Lord, as sacraments to admonish us, that as bodily we be fed with bread and wine bodily, so we be fed with the body and blood of our Saviour Christ spiritually. As in our baptism we receive very water, to signify unto us, that as water is an element to wash the body outwardly, so be our souls washed by the Holy Ghost inwardly.

The second is of the presence of Christ in this sacrament.

The second principal thing, wherein the Papists vary from the truth of God's word, is this. They say, that the very natural flesh and blood of Christ, which suffered for us upon the cross, and sitteth at the right hand of the Father in heaven, is also really, substantially, corporeally and naturally, in or under the accidents of the sacramental bread and wine, which they call the forms of bread and wine. And yet here they vary not a little among themselves. For some say, that the very natural body of Christ is there, but not naturally nor sensibly. And others say, that it is there naturally and sensibly, and of the same bigness and fashion that it is in heaven, and as the same was born of the blessed virgin Mary, and that it is there broken and torn in pieces with our teeth. And this appeareth partly by the school authors, and partly by the

confession of Berengarius[c], which Nicholas the Second constrained him to make, which was this. That of the sacraments of the Lord's table, the said Berengarius should promise to hold that faith, which the said Pope Nicholas and his counsel held; which was, that not only the sacraments of bread and wine, but also the very flesh and blood of our Lord Jesu Christ, are sensibly handled of the priest in the altar, broken, and torn with the teeth of the faithful people. But the true Catholick faith, grounded upon God's most infallible word, teacheth us, that our Saviour Christ (as concerning his man's nature and bodily presence) is gone up into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of his Father, and there shall he tarry until the world's end, at what time he shall come again, to judge both the quick and the dead, as he saith himself in many Scriptures. "I forsake the world," saith he, "and go to my Father[d]." And in another place he saith, "You shall have ever poor men among you, but me you shall not ever have[e]." And again he saith, "Many hereafter shall come and say, look, here is Christ, or, look, there he is, but believe them not[f]." And St. Peter saith in the Acts, "That heaven must receive Christ,

[c] De consecrati. Distin. 2. Ego Berengarius.
[d] John vi. [e] Matt. xxvi. [f] Ibid. xxiv.

until the time that all things shall be restored[g]." And St. Paul, writing to the Colossians, agreeth hereto, saying, "Seek for things that be above, where Christ is sitting at the right hand of the Father[h]." And St. Paul, speaking of the very sacrament, saith, "As often as you shall eat this bread, and drink this cup, shew forth the Lord's death until he come[i]." Till he come, saith St. Paul, signifying, that he is not there corporeally present. For what speech were this, or who useth of him that is already present, to say, until he come? For until he come, signifieth that he is not yet present. This is the Catholick faith, which we learn from our youth in our common Creed, and which Christ taught, the apostles followed, and the martyrs confirmed with their blood. And although Christ in his human nature substantially, really, corporeally, naturally and sensibly, be present with his Father in heaven, yet sacramentally and spiritually he is here present in water, bread, and wine, as in signs and sacraments, but he is indeed spiritually in the faithful Christian people, which according to Christ's ordinance be baptized, or receive the holy communion, or unfeignedly believe in him. Thus have you heard the second principal article, wherein the Papists vary from

[g] Acts iii. [h] Colos. iii. [i] 1 Cor. xi.

the truth of God's word, and from the Catholick faith. Now the third thing, wherein they vary, is this.

The third is, that evil men eat and drink the very body and blood of Christ.

The Papists say, that evil and ungodly men receive in this sacrament the very body and blood of Christ, and eat and drink the self-same thing that the good and godly men do. But the truth of God's word is contrary, that all those that be godly members of Christ, as they corporally eat the bread and drink the wine, so spiritually they eat and drink Christ's very flesh and blood; and as for the wicked members of the devil, they eat the sacramental bread, and drink the sacramental wine, but they do not spiritually eat Christ's flesh, nor drink his blood, but they eat and drink their own damnation.

The fourth thing, wherein the Popish priests dissent from the manifest word of God, is this. They say, that they offer Christ every day for remission of sin, and distribute by their masses the merits of Christ's passion. But the prophets, apostles, and evangelists do say, that Christ himself in his own person made a sacrifice for our sins upon the cross, by whose wounds all our diseases were healed, and our sins pardoned; and so did never no priest, man, nor creature but he, nor he did the same never more than once. And the benefit hereof is in no

man's power to give unto any other, but every man must receive it at Christ's hands himself, by his own faith and belief, as the prophet saith [k].

[k] Habakkuk ii.

HERE ENDETH THE FIRST BOOK.

THE SECOND BOOK

IS

AGAINST THE ERROR

OF

TRANSUBSTANTIATION.

CHAP. I.

The confutation of the error of Transubstantiation.

THUS have you heard declared four things, wherein chiefly the Papistical doctrine varieth from the true word of God, and from the old Catholick Christian faith, in this matter of the Lord's Supper.

Now, lest any man should think that I feign any thing of mine own head, without any other ground or authority, you shall hear, by God's grace, as well the errors of the Papists confuted, as the Catholick truth defended, both by God's most certain word, and also by the most old approved authors and martyrs of Christ's church.

CHAP. II.

The Papistical doctrine is contrary to God's word.

And first, that bread and wine remain after the words of consecration, and be eaten and drunken in the Lord's Supper, is most manifest by the plain words of Christ himself, when he ministered the same supper unto his disciples. For as the Evangelists write, "Christ took bread, and brake it, and gave it to his disciples, and said, Take, eat, this is my body[l]."

Here the Papists triumph of these words, when Christ said, "This is my body[m]," which they call the words of consecration. For (say they) as soon as these words be fully ended, there is no bread left, nor none other substance, but only Christ's body. When Christ said "this," the bread (say they) remained. And when he said "is," yet the bread remained. Also when he added "my," the bread remained still. And when he said "bo-," yet the bread was there still. But when he had finished the whole sentence, "This is my body," then (say they) the bread was gone, and there remained no substance but Christ's body, as though the bread could not remain, when it is made a sacrament. But this negative, that there is no bread, they make of their own brains, by their unwritten verities.

Oh, good Lord, how would they have bragged if Christ had said, this is no bread! But Christ

[l] Matt. xxvi. Mark xiv. [m] Luke xxii.

spake not that negative, this is no bread, but said affirmingly, "This is my body," not denying the bread, but affirming that his body was eaten (meaning spiritually) as the bread was eaten corporally. And that this was the meaning of Christ, appeareth plainly by St. Paul, in the tenth chapter to the Corinthians, the first Epistle, where he (speaking of the same matter) saith, "Is not the bread, which we break, the communion of the body of Christ[o]?" Who understood the mind of Christ better than St. Paul, to whom Christ shewed his most secret counsels? And St. Paul is not afraid, for our better understanding of Christ's words, somewhat to alter the same, lest we might stand stiffly in the letters and syllables, and err in mistaking of Christ's words. For whereas our Saviour Christ brake the bread and said, This is my body, St. Paul saith, that the bread which we break is the communion of Christ's body. Christ said, his body: and St. Paul said, the communion of his body: meaning, nevertheless, both one thing, that they, which eat the bread worthily, do eat spiritually Christ's very body. And so Christ calleth the bread his body, (as the old authors report,) because it representeth his body, and signifieth unto them which eat that bread according to Christ's ordinance, that they do spi-

[o] 1 Cor. x.

ritually eat his body, and be spiritually fed and nourished by him, and yet the bread remaineth still there, as a sacrament to signify the same. But of these words of consecration shall be spoken hereafter more at large. Therefore to return to the purpose, that the bread remaineth, and is eaten in this sacrament, appeareth by the words which go before the consecration. For that Christ "took bread, and brake it, and gave it to his disciples, and said, Take, eat[p]:" all this was done and spoken before the words of consecration. Wherefore they must needs be understood of the very bread, that Christ took bread, brake bread, gave bread to his disciples, commanding them to take bread, and eat bread. But the same is more plain and evident of the wine, that it remaineth, and is drunken at the Lord's Supper, as well by the words that go before, as by the words that follow after the consecration. For before the words of consecration, Christ took the cup of wine, and gave it unto his disciples, and said, "Drink you all of this[q]." And after the words of consecration followeth, "they drank all of it[r]." Now I ask all the Papists, what thing it was that Christ commanded his disciples to drink, when he said, Drink ye all of this? The blood of Christ was not yet there, by their own confession, for it was spoken be-

[p] Matt. xxvi. [q] Ibid. [r] Mark xiv.

fore the consecration: therefore it could be nothing else but wine that he commanded them to drink. Then I ask the Papists once again, whether the disciples drank wine or not? If they say, yea, then let them recant their error, that there was no wine remaining after the consecration. If they say, nay, then they condemn the apostles of disobedience to Christ's commandment, which drank not wine as he commanded them. Or rather they reprove Christ as a juggler, which commanded his apostles to drink wine, and when they came to the drinking thereof, he himself had conveyed it away. Moreover, before Christ delivered the cup of wine to his disciples, he said unto them, "Divide this among you[s]." Here would I ask the Papists another question, what thing it was that Christ commanded his disciples to divide among them? I am sure they will not say, it was the cup, except they be disposed to make men laugh at them. Nor I think they will not say, it was the blood of Christ, as well because the words were spoken before the consecration, as because the blood of Christ is not divided, but spiritually given whole in the sacrament. Then could it be understood of nothing else but of wine, which they should divide among them, and drink all together. And when the communion was ended, Christ said

[s] Luke xxii.

unto his apostles, "Verily I say unto you, that I will drink no more henceforth of this fruit of the vine, until that day, that I shall drink it new with you, in my Father's kingdom[t]." By these words it is clear, that it was very wine that the apostles drank at that godly supper. For the blood of Christ is not the fruit of the vine, nor the accidents of wine; nor none other thing is the fruit of the vine, but very wine only. How could Christ have expressed more plainly, that bread and wine remain, than by taking the bread in his hands, and breaking it himself, and giving it unto his disciples, commanding them to eat it? And by taking the cup of wine in his hands, and delivering it unto them, commanding them to divide it among them, and to drink it, and calling it the fruit of the vine? These words of Christ be so plain, that if an angel of heaven would tell us the contrary, he ought not to be believed. And then much less may we believe the subtle lying Papists. If Christ would have had us to believe (as a necessary article of our faith) that there remaineth neither bread nor wine, would he have spoken after this sort, using all such terms and circumstances as should make us believe, that still there remaineth bread and wine? What manner of teacher make they of Christ, that say he meant one thing, when his

[t] Matt. xxvi. Mark xiv.

words be clean contrary? What Christian heart can patiently suffer this contumely of Christ? But what crafty teachers be these Papists, who devise fantasies of their own heads, directly contrary to Christ's teaching, and then set the same abroad to Christian people, to be most assuredly believed as God's own most holy word! St. Paul did not so, but followed herein the manner of Christ's speaking, in calling of bread, bread, and wine, wine, and never altering Christ's words herein. "The bread which we break," saith he, "is it not the communion of Christ's body[u]?" Now I ask again of the Papists, whether he spake this of the bread consecrated or not consecrated? They cannot say that he spake it of the bread unconsecrated, for that is not the communion of Christ's body by their own doctrine. And if St. Paul spake it of bread consecrated, then they must needs confess, that after consecration such bread remaineth, as is broken bread, which can be none other than very true material bread. And straightways after St. Paul saith, in the same place, "that we be partakers of one bread and one cup[x]." And in the next chapter, speaking more fully of the same matter, four times he nameth the bread and the cup, never making mention of any transubstantiation, or remaining of accidents without any sub-

[u] 1 Cor. x. [x] Ibid.

stance; which things he would have made some mention of, if it had been a necessary article of our faith to believe that there remaineth no bread nor wine. Thus it is evident and plain, by the words of the Scripture, that after consecration remaineth bread and wine, and that the Papistical doctrine of Transubstantiation is directly contrary to God's word.

CHAP. III.

The Papistical doctrine is against reason.

Let us now consider also, how the same is against natural reason and natural operation, which although they prevail not against God's word, yet when they be joined with God's word, they be of great moment to confirm any truth. Natural reason abhorreth *vacuum*, that is to say, that there should be any empty place, wherein no substance should be. But if there remain no bread nor wine, the place where they were before, and where their accidents be, is filled with no substance, but remaineth *vacuum*, clean contrary to the order of nature. We see also that the wine, though it be consecrated, yet will it turn to vinegar, and the bread will mould, which then be nothing else but sour wine and moulded bread, which could not wax sour nor mouldy, if there were no bread nor wine there at all. And if the sacraments were now burnt, (as in the old church they burned all that remained uneaten,) let the Papists tell what is burnt. They must needs say, that it is either bread, or the body of Christ. But bread (say they) is none

there. Then must they needs burn the body of Christ, and be called Christ-burners, (as heretofore they have burned many of his members,) except they will say, that accidents burn alone without any substance, contrary to all the course of nature. The sacramental bread and wine also will nourish, which nourishment naturally cometh of the substance of the meats and drinks, and not of the accidents. The wine also will poison, (as divers bishops of Rome have had experiences, both in poisoning of others, and being poisoned themselves,) which poisoning they cannot ascribe to the most wholesome blood of our Saviour Christ, but only to the poisoned wine. And most of all it is against the nature of accidents, to be in nothing. For the definition of accidents is to be in some substance, so that if they be, they must needs be in something. And if they be in nothing, then they be not. And a thousand things more of like foolishness do the Papists affirm by their Transubstantiation, contrary to all nature and reason; as that two bodies be in one place, and one body in many places at one time, and that substances be gendered of accidents only, and accidents converted into substances, and a body to be in a place and occupy no room, and generation to be without corruption, and corruption without generation, with many such like things, against all order and principles of nature and reason.

CHAP. IV.

The Papistical doctrine is also against all our outward senses.

The Papistical doctrine is also against all our outward senses, called our five wits. For our eyes say, they see there bread and wine, our noses smell bread and wine, our mouths taste, and our hands feel bread and wine. And although the article of our faith be above all our outward senses, so that we believe things which we can neither see, feel, hear, smell, nor taste, yet they be not contrary to our senses, at the least so contrary, that in such things which we from time to time do see, smell, feel, hear, and taste, we shall not trust our senses, but believe clean contrary. Christ never made no such article of our faith. Our faith teacheth us to believe things that we see not; but it doth not bid us, that we shall not believe that we see daily with our eyes, and hear with our ears, and grope with our hands. For although our senses cannot reach so far as our faith doth, yet so far as the compass of our senses doth usually reach, our faith is not contrary to the same, but rather our senses do confirm our faith. Or else what availeth it to St. Thomas, for the confirmation of Christ's resurrection, that he did put his hand into Christ's side, and felt his wounds, if he might not trust his senses, nor give no credit thereto? And what a wide door is here opened to Valentinus, Marcion, and other hereticks, which said that Christ was not crucified, but that Simon Cyrenæus was crucified for him, al-

though to the sight of the people it seemed that Christ was crucified? Or to such hereticks as said, that Christ was no man, although to men's sights he appeared in the form of man, and seemed to be hungry, dry, weary; to weep, sleep, eat, drink, yea and to die like as other men do? For if we once admit this doctrine, then no credit is to be given to our senses, we open a large field, and give a great occasion unto an innumerable rabblement of most heinous heresies. And if there be no trust to be given to our senses in this matter of the sacrament, why then do the Papists so stoutly affirm, that the accidents remain after the consecration, which cannot be judged but by the senses? For the Scripture speaketh no word of the accidents of bread and wine, but of the bread and wine themselves. And it is against the nature and definition of accidents to be alone without any substance. Wherefore if we may not trust our senses in this matter of the sacrament, then if the substance of the bread and wine be gone, why may we not then say, that the accidents be gone also? And if we must needs believe our senses, as concerning the accidents of bread and wine, why may we not do the like of the substance, and that rather than of the accidents? Forasmuch as after the consecration, the Scripture saith in no place, that there is no substance of bread nor of wine, but calleth them still by

such names, as signify the substances, and not the accidents. And finally, if our senses be daily deceived in this matter, then is the sensible sacrament nothing else, but an illusion of our senses. And so we make much for their purpose, that said that Christ was a crafty juggler, that made things to appear to men's sights, that indeed were no such things, but forms only, figures and appearances of them. But to conclude in few words this process of our senses, let all the Papists lay their heads together, and they shall never be able to shew one article of our faith, so directly contrary to our senses, that all our senses by daily experience shall affirm a thing to be, and yet our faith shall teach us the contrary thereunto.

CHAP. V.

Now forasmuch as it is declared, how this Papistical opinion of Transubstantiation is against the word of God, against nature, against reason, and against all our senses, we shall shew furthermore, that it is against the faith and doctrine of the old authors of Christ's church, beginning at those authors, which were nearest unto Christ's time, and therefore might best know the truth herein. First, Justinus, a great learned man, and an holy martyr, the oldest author that this day is known to write any treatise upon the sacraments, and wrote not much above one hundred years after Christ's ascension.

The Papistical doctrine is contrary to the faith of the old authors of Christ's church.

Justinus.

He writeth in his second Apology, "That the bread, water, and wine in this sacrament, are not to be taken as other common meats and drinks be, but they be meats ordained purposely to give thanks to God, and therefore be called *Eucharistia*, and be called also the body and blood of Christ. And that it is lawful for none to eat or drink of them, but that profess Christ, and live according to the same. And yet the same meat and drink," saith he, "is changed into our flesh and blood, and nourisheth our bodies." By which saying it is evident, that Justinus thought, that the bread and wine remained still, for else it could not have been turned into our flesh and blood, to nourish our bodies. Next to him was Irenæus[y], above one hundred and fifty years after Christ, who (as it is to be supposed) could not be deceived in the necessary points of our faith, for he was a disciple of Polycarpus, which was disciple to St. John the Evangelist. This Irenæus followeth the sense of Justinus wholly in this matter, and almost also his words, saying, "That the bread wherein we give thanks unto God, although it be of the earth, yet when the name of God is called upon it, it is not then common bread, but the bread of thanksgiving, having two things in it, one earthly and the other heavenly. What meant

[y] Irenæus contra Valentin. li. 4. cap. 34.

he by the heavenly thing, but the sanctification which cometh by the invocation of the name of God? And what by the earthly thing, but the very bread, which (as he said before) is of the earth, and which also (he saith) doth nourish our bodies, as other bread doth which we do use?

Shortly after Irenæus was Origen, about two hundred years after Christ's ascension; who also affirmeth, that the material bread remaineth, saying, "That the nature of the bread availeth nothing, but goeth down into the belly, and is voided downward; but the word of God, spoken upon the bread, is it that availeth[z]." After Origen came Cyprian the holy martyr, about the year of our Lord 250, who writeth against them that ministered this sacrament with water only, and without wine. "Forasmuch," saith he, "as Christ said, I am a true vine, therefore the blood of Christ is not water, but wine; nor it cannot be thought that his blood (whereby we be redeemed and have life) is in the cup, when wine is not in the cup, whereby the blood of Christ is shewed[a]."

What words could Cyprian have spoken more plainly, to shew that the wine doth remain, than to say thus: "If there be no wine, there is no

[z] Origenes in Math. cap. 15.

[a] Cyprian. ad Cæcilium, li. 2. Epistola 3.

blood of Christ." And yet he speaketh shortly after, as plainly, in the same Epistle: "Christ," saith he, "taking the cup, blessed it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, 'Drink you all of this, for this is the blood of the New Testament, which shall be shed for many, for the remission of sins. I say unto you, that from henceforth I will not drink of this creature of the vine, until I shall drink with you new wine in the kingdom of my Father.' By these words of Christ," says St. Cyprian, "we perceive, that the cup which the Lord offered, was not only water, but also wine; and that it was wine, that Christ called his blood; whereby it is clear, that Christ's blood is not offered, if there be no wine in the chalice." And after it followeth: "How shall we drink with Christ new wine of the creature of the vine, if in the sacrifice of God the Father and of Christ we do not offer wine?" In these words of St. Cyprian appeareth most manifestly, that in this sacrament is not only offered very wine, that is made of grapes that come of the vine, but also that we drink the same. And yet the same giveth us to understand, that if we drink that wine worthily, we drink also spiritually the very blood of Christ, which was shed for our sins.

Eusebius Emissenus.

Eusebius Emissenus, a man of singular fame in learning, about three hundred years after Christ's ascension, did in few words set out this matter so plainly, (both how the bread and wine

be converted into the body and blood of Christ, and yet remain still in their nature, and also how, besides the outward receiving of bread and wine, Christ is inwardly by faith received in our hearts,) all this, I say, he doth so plainly set out, that more plainness cannot be reasonably desired in this matter. For he saith, that the conversion of the visible creatures of bread and wine, into the body and blood of Christ, is like unto our conversion in baptism, where outwardly nothing is changed, but remaineth the same that was before, but all the alteration is inwardly and spiritually. "If thou wilt know," saith he [b], "how it ought not to seem to thee a new thing, and impossible, that earthly and corruptible things be turned into the substance of Christ, look upon thyself, which art made new in baptism, when thou wast far from life, and banished as a stranger from mercy, and from the way of salvation, and inwardly wast dead, yet suddenly thou beganst another life in Christ, and wast made new by wholesome mysteries, and wast turned into the body of the church, not by seeing, but by believing; and of the child of damnation, by a secret pureness, thou wast made the chosen son of God. Thou visibly didst remain in the same measure, that thou hadst before, but invisibly thou wast made greater, with-

[b] De Consecr. Distinct. 2.

out any increase of thy body. Thou wast the self-same person, and yet by increase of faith thou wast made another man. Outwardly nothing was added, but all the change was inwardly. And so was man made the son of Christ, and Christ formed in the mind of man. Therefore as thou (putting away thy former vileness) didst receive a new dignity, not feeling any change in thy body; and as the curing of thy disease, the putting away of thine infection, the wiping away of thy filthiness, be not seen with thine eyes, but believed in thy mind: so likewise, when thou dost go up to the reverend altar, to feed upon spiritual meat, in thy faith look upon the body and blood of him that is thy God, honour him, touch him with thy mind, take him in the hand of thy heart, and chiefly drink him with the draught of thy inward man." Hitherto have I rehearsed the sayings of Eusebius, which be so plain, that no man can wish more plainly to be declared, that this mutation of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, is a spiritual mutation, and that outwardly nothing is changed. But as outwardly we eat the bread and drink the wine with our mouths, so inwardly by faith we spiritually eat the very flesh, and drink the very blood, of Christ.

Hilarius also, in few words, saith the same. Hilarius.
"There is a figure," saith he; "for bread and

wine be outwardly seen. And there is also a truth of that figure; for the body and blood of Christ be of a truth inwardly believed." And this Hilarius was within less than three hundred and fifty years after Christ.

And Epiphanius, shortly after the same time, saith[c], that the bread is meat, but the virtue that is in it, is it that giveth life. But if there were no bread at all, how could it be meat?

About the same time, or shortly after, about the year of our Lord 400, St. John Chrysostome writeth thus, against them that used only water in the sacrament. "Christ," saith he, "minding to pluck up that heresy by the roots, used wine, as well before his resurrection, when he gave the mysteries, as after at his table without mysteries. For he saith, of the fruit of the vine; which surely bringeth forth no water, but wine[d]." These words of Chrysostome declare plainly, that Christ in his holy table both drank wine, and gave wine to drink, which had not been true, if no wine had remained after the consecration, as the Papists feign. And yet more plainly St. Chrysostome[e] declareth this matter in another place, saying, "The bread before it be sanctified, is called bread, but when it is

[c] Epiphanius contra hæreses, lib. 3. 10. 2. Et in Anacephaleosi.

[d] Chrysost. in Mat. ca. 26. hom. 83.

[e] Ad Cæsarium monachum.

sanctified by the means of the priest, it is delivered from the name of bread, and is exalted to the name of the Lord's body, although the nature of bread doth still remain." The nature of bread (saith he) doth still remain, to the utter and manifest confutation of the Papists, which say, that the accidents of bread do remain, but not the nature and substance. At the same time was St. Ambrose, who declareth the alteration of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, not to be such, that the nature and substance of bread and wine be gone, but that through grace there is a spiritual mutation by the mighty power of God, so that he that worthily eateth of that bread doth spiritually eat Christ, and dwelleth in Christ, and Christ in him. " For," saith St. Ambrose[f], speaking of this change of bread into the body of Christ, " if the word of God be of that force that it can make things of nought, and those things to be which never were before, much more it can make things that were before still to be, and also to be changed into other things." And he bringeth, for example hereof, the change of us in baptism, wherein a man is so changed, (as is before declared in the words of Eusebius,) that he is made a new creature, and yet his substance

Ambrosius.

[f] De iis qui mysteriis initiantur, cap. ultim. et de sacramentis, li. 4. ca. 4.

remaineth the same that was before. And St. Augustinus. Augustine [g], about the same time, wrote thus: "That which you see in the altar, is the bread and the cup, which also your eyes do shew you. But faith sheweth further, that bread is the body of Christ, and the cup his blood." Here he declareth four things to be in the sacrament: two that we see, which be bread and wine; and other two, which we see not, but by faith only, which be the body and blood of Christ. And the same thing he declareth also as plainly in another place [h], saying, "The sacrifice of the church consisteth of two things; of the visible kind of the element, and of the invisible flesh and blood of our Lord Jesu Christ, both of the sacrament, and of the thing signified by the sacrament: even as the person of Christ consisteth of God and man, forasmuch as he is very God and very man. For every thing containeth in it the very nature of those things, whereof it consisteth. Now the sacrifice of the church consisteth of two things; of the sacrament, and of the thing thereby signified, that is to say, the body of Christ. Therefore there is both the sacrament, and the thing of the sacrament, which is Christ's body." What can be devised to be spoken more plainly against the error of the Pa-

[g] Augustinus in sermone ad infantes.

[h] In lib. sententiarum Prosperi.

pists, which say that no bread nor wine remaineth in the sacrament? For as the person of Christ consisteth of two natures, that is to say, of his manhood, and of his Godhead, (and therefore both those natures remain in Christ,) even so (saith St. Augustine) the sacrament consisteth of two natures; of the elements of bread and wine, and of the body and blood of Christ; and therefore both these natures must needs remain in the sacrament.

For the more plain understanding hereof, it is to be noted, that there were certain hereticks, as Simon, Menander, Marcion, Valentinus, Basilides, Cerdon, Manes, Eutyches Manichæus, Apollinaris, and divers other of like sorts, which said, that Christ was very God, but not a very man, although in eating, drinking, sleeping, and all other operations of man, to men's judgments he appeared like unto a man. Others there were, as Artemon, Theodorus, Sabellius, Paulus Samosathenus, Marcellus, Photinus, Nestorius, and many others of the same sects, which said, that he was a very natural man, but not very God, although in giving the blind their sight, the dumb their speech, the deaf their hearing, in healing suddenly with his word all diseases, in raising to life them that were dead, and in all other works of God, he shewed himself as he had been God. Yet other there were which, seeing the Scripture so plain in those two mat-

ters, confessed that he was both God and man, but not both at one time. For before his incarnation (said they) he was God only, and not man; and after his incarnation he ceased from his Godhead, and became a man only, and not God, until his resurrection or ascension, and then (said they) he left his manhood, and was only God again, as he was before his incarnation. So that when he was man, he was not God, and when he was God, he was not man. But against these vain heresies, the Catholick faith, by the express word of God, holdeth and believeth, that Christ after his incarnation left not his divine nature, but remained still God, as he was before, being together at one time (as he is still) both perfect God and perfect man. And for a plain declaration hereof, the old ancient authors give two examples; one is of man, which is made of two parts, of a soul and of a body, and each of these two parts remain in man at one time; so that when the soul, by the almighty power of God, is put into the body, neither the body nor soul perisheth thereby, but thereof is made a perfect man, having a perfect soul and a perfect body remaining in him both at one time. The other example, which the old authors do bring in for this purpose, is of the holy supper of our Lord, which consisteth (say they) of two parts; of the sacrament, or visible element of bread and wine, and of the body and blood of

Christ. And as in them that duly receive the sacrament the very natures of bread and wine cease not to be there, but remain there still, and be eaten corporally, as the body and blood of Christ be eaten spiritually: so likewise doth the divine nature of Christ remain still with his humanity. Let now the Papists avaunt themselves of their Transubstantiation, that there remaineth no bread nor wine in the ministration of the sacrament, if they will defend the wicked heresies before rehearsed, that Christ is not God and man both together. But to prove that this was the mind of the old authors, beside the saying of St. Augustine here recited, I shall also rehearse divers other.

St. John Chrysostome[1] writeth against the pestilent error of Apollinaris, which affirmed that the godhead and manhood in Christ were so mixed and confounded together, that they both made but one nature. Against whom St. John Chrysostome writeth thus: "When thou speakest of God, thou must consider a thing that in nature is single, without composition, without conversion, that is invisible, immortal, incircumscriptible, incomprehensible, with such like. And when thou speakest of man, thou meanest a nature that is weak, subject to hunger, thirst, weeping, fear, sweating, and such

[1] Chrysost. ad Cæsarium Monachum.

like passions, which cannot be in the divine nature. And when thou speakest of Christ, thou joinest two natures together in one person, who is both passible and impassible: passible, as concerning his flesh, and impassible in his deity." And after, he concludeth, saying, "Wherefore Christ is both God and man. God by his impassible nature, and man because he suffered. He himself being one person, one son, one lord, hath the dominion and power of two natures joined together, which be not of one substance, but each of them hath his properties distinct from the other. And therefore remaineth there two natures, distinct, and not confounded. For as before the consecration of the bread, we call it bread, but when God's grace hath sanctified it by the priest, it is delivered from the name of bread, and is exalted to the name of the body of the Lord, although the nature of the bread remain still in it, and it is not called two bodies, but one body of God's son; so likewise here, the divine nature resteth in the body of Christ, and these two make one son, and one person." These words of St. John Chrysostome declare, and that not in obscure terms, but in plain words, that after the consecration the nature of bread remaineth still, although it have an higher name, and be called the body of Christ; to signify unto the godly eaters of that bread, that they spiritually eat the supernatural bread of the body

of Christ, who spiritually is there present, and dwelleth in them, and they in him, although corporeally he sitteth in heaven, at the right hand of his Father.

Hereunto accordeth also Gelasius[k], writing against Eutyches and Nestorius, of whom the one said, that Christ was a perfect man, but not God, and the other affirmed clean contrary, that he was very God, but not man. But against these two heinous heresies Gelasius proveth, by most manifest Scriptures, that Christ is both God and man, and that after his incarnation remained in him [as well] the nature of his Godhead, [as the nature of his manhood;] so that he hath in him two natures with their natural properties, and yet he is but one Christ. And for the more evident declaration hereof, he bringeth two examples; the one is of man, who being but one, yet he is made of two parts, and hath in him two natures, remaining both together in him, that is to say, the body and the soul with their natural properties. The other example is of the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ; "which," saith he, "is a godly thing, and yet the substance or nature of bread and wine do not cease to be there still." Note well these words against all the Papists of our time, that Gelasius (which was bishop of Rome more than a thousand years past) writeth of this sa-

[k] Gelasius contra Eutychen et Nestorium.

crament, that the bread and wine cease not to be there still, as Christ ceased not to be God after his incarnation, but remained still perfect God as he was before.

Theodoretus[1] also affirmeth the same, both in his first and in his second dialogue. In the first he saith thus: "He that called his natural body wheat and bread, and also called himself a vine, the self-same called bread and wine his body and blood, and yet changed not their natures." And in his second dialogue he saith more plainly. "For," saith he, "as the bread and wine after the consecration lose not their proper nature, but keep their former substance, form, and figure, which they had before, even so the body of Christ, after his ascension, was changed into the godly substance." Now let the Papists choose which of these two they will grant, (for one of them they must needs grant,) either that the nature and substance of bread and wine remain still in the sacrament after the consecration, (and then must they recant their doctrine of Transubstantiation,) or else that they be of the error of Nestorius and others, which did say, that the nature of the Godhead remained not in Christ after his incarnation. For all these old authors agree, that it is in the one, as it is in the other.

[1] Theodoretus in Dialogis.

CHAP. VI.

Transubstantiation came from Rome.

Now forasmuch as it is proved sufficiently, (as well by the holy Scripture, as by natural operation, by natural reason, by all our senses, and by the most old and best learned authors, and holy martyrs of Christ's church,) that the substance of bread and wine do remain, and be received of faithful people in the blessed sacrament, or supper of the Lord; it is a thing worthy to be considered and well weighed, what moved the school authors of late years to defend the contrary opinion, not only so far from all experience of our senses, and so far from all reason, but also clean contrary to the old church of Christ, and to God's most holy word.

Surely nothing moved them thereto so much, as did the vain faith which they had in the church and see of Rome. For Johannes Scotus[m], otherwise called Duns, (the subtlest of all the school authors,) in treating of this matter of Transubstantiation, sheweth plainly the cause thereof. "For," saith he, "the words of the Scripture might be expounded more easily and more plainly without Transubstantiation; but the church did choose this sense, (which is more hard,) being moved thereto, as it seemeth, chiefly because that of the sacraments men ought to hold, as the holy church of Rome holdeth. But it holdeth, that bread is transubstantiate, or

[m] Scotus, sup. 4. sen. distinct. 11.

turned into the body, and wine into the blood, as it is shewed *De summa Trinitate, et fide Catholica, firmiter credimus.*"

Gabriel. And Gabriel [Biel] also, (who of all others wrote most largely upon the canon of the Mass,) saith thus: "It is to be noted, that although it be taught in the Scripture, that the body of Christ is truly contained and received of Christian people under the kinds of bread and wine, yet how the body of Christ is there, whether by conversion of any thing into it, or without conversion the body is there with the bread, both the substance and accidents of bread remaining there still, it is not found expressed in the Bible. Yet forasmuch as of the sacraments men must hold as the holy church of Rome holdeth, as it is written, *De hæreticis, ad abolendam;* and that church holdeth, and hath determined, that the bread is transubstantiated into the body of Christ, and the wine into his blood; therefore is this opinion received of all them that be catholick, that the substance of bread remaineth not, but really and truly is turned, transubstantiated, and changed into the substance of the body of Christ."

CHAP. VII. Thus you have heard the cause, wherefore this opinion of Transubstantiation at this present is holden and defended among Christian people, that is to say, because the church of Rome hath so determined, although the contrary, by the

Papists' own confession, appear to be more easy, more true, and more according to the Scripture. But because our English Papists (who speak more grossly herein than the Pope himself, affirming that the natural body of Christ is naturally in the bread and wine,) cannot, nor dare not, ground their faith, concerning Transubstantiation, upon the church of Rome; which although in name it may be called most holy, yet indeed it is the most stinking dunghill of all wickedness that is under heaven, and the very synagogue of the devil, which whosoever followeth, cannot but stumble, and fall into a pit full of errors; because, I say, the English Papists dare not now establish their faith upon that foundation of Rome, therefore they seek fig-leaves, that is to say, vain reasons, gathered of their own brains, and authorities wrested from the intent and mind of the authors, wherewith to cover and hide their shameful errors. Wherefore I thought it good somewhat to travel herein, to take away those fig-leaves, that their shameful errors may plainly to every man appear.

CHAP. VIII.

The first reason of the Papists to prove their Transubstantiation.

The greatest reason and of most importance, and of such strength, as they think, or at the least as they pretend, that all the world cannot answer thereto, is this: Our Saviour Christ taking the bread, brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, This is my body: Now (say they) as soon as Christ had spoken these words, the

bread was straightway altered and changed, and the substance thereof was converted into the substance of his precious body. But what
The answer. Christian ears can patiently hear this doctrine, that Christ is every day made anew, and made of another substance than he was made of in his mother's womb? For whereas, at his incarnation, he was made of the nature and substance of his blessed mother; now, by these Papists' opinion, he is made every day of the nature and substance of bread and wine, which (as they say) be turned into the substance of his body and blood. O, what a marvellous metamorphosis and abominable heresy is this; to say that Christ is daily made anew, and of a new matter: whereof it followeth necessarily, that they make us every day a new Christ, and not the same that was born of the Virgin Mary, nor that was crucified upon the cross, as it shall be plainly proved by these arguments following.

First, thus: if Christ's body that was crucified was not made of bread, but the body that was eaten in the supper was made of bread, (as the Papists say,) then Christ's body that was eaten was not the same that was crucified.

And again: if Christ's body that was crucified, was not made of bread, and Christ's body that was crucified was the same that was eaten at his last supper, then Christ's body that was eaten was not made of bread.

And moreover, if Christ's body that was eaten at the last supper was the same that was crucified, and Christ's body that was eaten at the supper was made of bread, (as the Papists feign,) then Christ's body that was crucified was made of bread.

And in like manner it followeth, if the body of Christ in the sacrament, be made of the substance of bread and wine, and the same body was conceived in the Virgin's womb, then the body of Christ in the Virgin's womb was made of bread and wine. Or else turn the argument thus: the body of Christ in the Virgin's womb was not made of bread and wine, but this body of Christ in the sacrament is made of bread and wine; then this body of Christ is not the same that was conceived in the Virgin's womb.

Another argument. Christ that was born in the Virgin's womb, as concerning his body, was made of none other substance but of the substance of his blessed mother; but Christ in the sacrament is made of another substance; then he is another Christ. And so the Antichrist of Rome, the chief author of all idolatry, would bring faithful Christian people from the true worshipping of Christ, that was made and born of the blessed Virgin Mary, through the operation of the Holy Ghost, and suffered for us upon the cross, to worship another Christ made of bread and wine, through the consecration of a

Popish priest. And thus the Popish priests make themselves the makers of God. For (say they) the priest by the words of consecration maketh that thing which is eaten and drunken in the Lord's Supper; and that (say they) is Christ himself both God and man, and so they take upon them to make both God and man. But let all true worshippers worship one God, one Christ, once corporeally made, of one only corporeal substance, that is to say, of the blessed Virgin Mary, that once died, and rose once again, once ascended into heaven, and there sitteth and shall sit at the right hand of his Father evermore, although spiritually he be every day amongst us, and whosoever come together in his name, he is in the midst among them. And he is the spiritual pasture and food of our souls, as meat and drink is of our bodies, which he signifieth unto us by the institution of his most holy supper in bread and wine, declaring that as the bread and wine corporally comfort and feed our bodies, so doth he with his flesh and blood spiritually comfort and feed our souls. And now may be easily answered the Papists' argument, whereof they do so much boast. For brag they never so much of the conversion of bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, yet that conversion is spiritual, and putteth not away the corporal presence of the material bread and wine. But forasmuch as the same is a most holy sa-

crament of our spiritual nourishment, (which we have by the body and blood of our Saviour Christ,) there must needs remain the sensible element, that is to say, bread and wine, without the which there can be no sacrament: as in our spiritual regeneration there can be no sacrament of baptism, if there be no water. For as baptism is no perfect sacrament of spiritual regeneration, without there be as well the element of water, as the Holy Ghost, spiritually regenerating the person that is baptized, (which is signified by the said water,) even so the supper of our Lord can be no perfect sacrament of spiritual food, except there be as well bread and wine, as the body and blood of our Saviour Christ, spiritually feeding us, which by the said bread and wine is signified. And howsoever the body and blood of our Saviour Christ be there present, they may as well be present there with the substance of bread and wine, as with the accidents of the same, as the school authors do confess themselves; and it shall be well proved if the adversaries will deny it.

Thus you see the strongest argument of the Papists answered unto; and the chief foundation, whereupon they build their error of Transubstantiation, utterly subverted and overthrown.

CHAP. IX.

The second argument for

Another reason have they of like strength. If the bread should remain (say they) then should follow many absurdities, and chiefly, that Christ

Transubstantiation. hath taken the nature of bread, as he took the nature of man, and so joined it to his substance. And then as we have God verily incarnate for our redemption, so should we have him impanate.

The answer. Thou mayst consider, good reader, that the rest of their reasons be very weak and feeble, when these be the chief and strongest. Truth it is indeed, that Christ should have been impanate, if he had joined the bread unto his substance in unity of person, that is to say, if he had joined the bread unto him in such sort, that he had made the bread one person with himself. But forasmuch as he is joined to the bread but sacramentally, there followeth no impanation thereof, no more than the Holy Ghost is inaquate, that is to say, made water, being sacramentally joined to the water in baptism. Nor he was not made a dove, when he took upon him the form of a dove, to signify that he, whom St. John did baptize, was very Christ. But rather of the error of the Papists themselves, (as one error draweth another after it,) should follow the great absurdity, which they speak upon, that is to say, that Christ should be impanate and invinate. For if Christ do use the bread in such wise, that he doth not annihilate and make nothing of it, (as the Papists say,) but maketh of it his own body, then is the bread joined to his body in a greater unity, than is his humanity to

his Godhead. For his Godhead is adjoined unto his humanity in unity of person, and not of nature: but our Saviour Christ (by their saying) adjoineth bread unto his body in unity both of nature and person. So that the bread and the body of Christ be but one thing, both in nature and person. And so is there a more entire union between Christ and bread, than between his Godhead and manhood, or between his soul and his body. And thus these arguments of the Papists return (like rivetted nails) upon their own heads.

CHAP. X.

Yet a third reason they have, which they gather out of the sixth of John, where Christ saith, "I am lively bread, which came from heaven. If any man eat of this bread, he shall live for ever. And the bread which I will give is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world." Then they reason after this fashion. If the bread which Christ gave, be his flesh, then it cannot also be material bread; and so it must needs follow, that the material bread is gone, and that none other substance remaineth, but the flesh of Christ only.

The third reason.

To this is soon made answer, that Christ, in that place of John, spake not of the material and sacramental bread, nor of the sacramental eating, (for that was spoken two or three years before the sacrament was first ordained,) but he spake of spiritual bread (many times repeating,

The answer.

" I am the bread of life, which came from heaven,") and of spiritual eating by faith, after which sort he was at the same present time eaten of as many as believed on him, although the sacrament was not at that time made and instituted. And therefore he said, " Your fathers did eat manna in the desert, and died; but he that eateth this bread shall live for ever." Therefore this place of St. John can in no wise be understood of the sacramental bread, which neither came from heaven, neither giveth life to all that eat it. Nor of such bread Christ could have then presently said, This is my flesh, except they will say that Christ did then consecrate, so many years before the institution of his Holy Supper.

CHAP. XI.

Authors wrested by the Papists for their Transubstantiation.

Now that I have made a full, direct, and plain answer to the vain reasons and cavillations of the Papists; order requireth to make likewise answer unto their sophistical allegations and wresting of authors unto their fantastical purposes. There be chiefly three places, which at the first shew seem much to make for their intent, but when they shall be thoroughly weighed, they make nothing for them at all.

The first is a place of Cyprian[n], in his sermon of the Lord's Supper, where he saith, as is alleged in the detection of the devil's sophistry,

[n] Cyprianus de Cœna Domini.

" This bread, which our Lord gave to his disciples, changed in nature, but not in outward form, is, by the omnipotency of God's word, made flesh." Here the Papists stick tooth and nail to these words, " changed in nature." Ergo (say they) the nature of the bread is changed. Here is one chief point of the devil's sophistry used, who in allegation of Scripture useth ever, either to add thereto, or to take away from it, or to alter the sense thereof. And so have they, in this author, left out those words which would open plainly all the whole matter. For next the words, which be here before of them recited, do follow these words: " As in the person of Christ the humanity was seen, and the divinity was hid, even so did the divinity ineffably put itself into the visible sacrament." Which words of Cyprian do manifestly shew, that the sacrament doth still remain with the divinity; and that, sacramentally, the divinity is poured into the bread and wine, the same bread and wine still remaining: like as the same divinity, by unity of person, was in the humanity of Christ, the same humanity still remaining with the divinity. And yet the bread is changed, not in shape, nor substance, but in nature, (as Cyprian truly saith,) not meaning that the natural substance of bread is clean gone, but that, by God's word, there is added thereto another higher property, nature, and condition, far passing the nature and condi-

The answer.

tion of common bread, that is to say, that the bread doth shew unto us, (as the same Cyprian saith,) that we be partakers of the Spirit of God, and most purely joined unto Christ, and spiritually fed with his flesh and blood; so that now the said mystical bread is both a corporal food for the body, and a spiritual food for the soul. And likewise is the nature of the water changed in baptism; forasmuch as beside his common nature, (which is to wash and make clean the body,) it declareth unto us, that our souls be also washed and made clean by the Holy Ghost. And thus is answered the chief authority of the doctors, which the Papists take for the principal defence of their error. But for further declaration of St. Cyprian's mind herein, read the place of him before recited, fol. 78.

CHAP. XII.

Chrysostomus.

Another authority they have of St. John Chrysostome, which they boast also to be invincible. Chrysostome (say they) writeth us, in a certain homely *De Eucharistia:* "Dost thou see bread? Dost thou see wine? Do they void beneath, as other meats do? God forbid; think not so. For as wax, if it be put into the fire, it is made like the fire, no substance remaineth, nothing is left: so here also think thou that the mysteries be consumed by the substance of the body." At these words of Chrysostome the Papists do triumph, as though they had won the field. Lo, (say they,) doth not Chrysostomus, the great

clerk, say most plainly, that we see neither bread nor wine? but that, as wax in the fire, they be consumed to nothing, so that no substance remaineth? But if they had rehearsed no more but the very next sentence that followeth in Chrysostome, (which craftily and maliciously they leave out,) the meaning of St. John Chrysostome would easily have appeared, and yet will make them blush, if they be not utterly past shame. For after the foresaid words of Chrysostome, immediately follow these words: "Wherefore," saith he, "when ye come to these mysteries, do not think that you receive by a man the body of God, but that with tongues you receive fire by the angels seraphim." And straight after it followeth thus: "Think that the blood of salvation floweth out of the pure and godly side of Christ, and so coming to it receive it with pure lips. Wherefore, brethren, I pray you and beseech you, let us not be from the church, nor let us not be occupied there with vain communication, but let us stand fearful and trembling, casting down our eyes, lifting up our minds, mourning privily without speech, and rejoicing in our hearts." These words of Chrysostome do follow immediately after the other words, which the Papists before rehearsed. Therefore if the Papists will gather of the words by them recited, that there is neither bread nor wine in the sacrament, I

The answer.

may as well gather of the words that follow, that there is neither priest nor Christ's body. For as in the former sentence Chrysostome saith, that we may not think that we see bread and wine: so in the second sentence he saith, that we may not think that we receive the body of Christ of the priest's hands. Wherefore if upon the second sentence, (as the Papists themselves will say,) it cannot be truly gathered, that in the holy communion there is not the body of Christ ministered by the priest: then must they confess also, that it cannot be well and truly gathered upon the first sentence, that there is no bread nor wine. But there be all these things together in the holy communion: Christ himself spiritually eaten and drunken, and nourishing the right believers; the bread and wine as a sacrament declaring the same; and the priest as a minister thereof. Wherefore St. John Chrysostome meant not absolutely to deny that there is bread and wine, or to deny utterly the priest and the body of Christ to be there; but he useth a speech which is no pure negative, but a negative by comparison: which fashion of speech is commonly used, not only in the Scripture, and among all good authors, but also in all manner of languages. For when two things be compared together, in the extolling of the more excellent, or abasing of the more vile, is many times used a negative by comparison, which nevertheless is

Negatives by comparison.

no pure negative, but only in the respect of the more excellent, or the more base. As by example: when the people, rejecting the prophet Samuel, desired to have a king, Almighty God said to Samuel, "They have not rejected thee, but me[o]." Not meaning by this negative absolutely that they had not rejected Samuel, (in whose place they desired to have a king,) but by that one negative by comparison he understood two affirmatives, that is to say, that they had rejected Samuel, and not him alone, but also that they had chiefly rejected God. And when the prophet David said in the person of Christ, "I am a worm, and not a man[p];" by this negative he denied not utterly that Christ was a man, but (the more vehemently to express the great humiliation of Christ) he said, that he was not abased only to the nature of man, but was brought so low, that he might rather be called a worm than a man. This manner of speech was familiar and usual to St. Paul, as when he said, "It is not I that do it, but it is the sin that dwelleth in me[q]." And in another place he saith, "Christ sent me not to baptize, but to preach the Gospel[r]." And again he saith, "My speech and preaching was not in words of man's persuasion, but in manifest declaration of the spirit and power[s]." And he saith also, "Neither he that grafteth,

[o] 1 Sam. viii. [p] Psal. xxii. [q] Rom. vii. [r] 1 Cor. i. [s] Ibid.

nor he that watereth, is any thing; but God that giveth the increase[t]." And he saith moreover, "It is not I that live, but Christ liveth within me[u]."—And "God forbid that I should rejoice in any thing, but in the cross of our Lord Jesu Christ[x]." And further, "We do not wrestle against flesh and blood, but against the spirits of darkness[y]." In all these sentences, and many other like, although they be negatives, nevertheless St. Paul meant not clearly to deny that he did that evil whereof he spake, or utterly to say that he was not sent to baptize, (who indeed did baptize at certain times, and was sent to do all things that pertained to salvation,) or that in his office of setting forth God's word he used no witty persuasions, (which indeed he used most discreetly,) or that the grafter and waterer be nothing, (which be God's creatures made to his similitude, and without whose work there should be no increase,) or to say that he was not alive, (who both lived and ran through all countries, to set forth God's glory,) or clearly to affirm that he gloried and rejoiced in no other thing than in Christ's cross, (who rejoiced with all men that were in joy, and sorrowed with all that were in sorrow,) or to deny utterly that we wrestle against flesh and blood, which cease not daily to wrestle and war against our enemies, the world, the flesh, and the devil.

[t] 1 Cor. iii. [u] Gal. ii. [x] Gal. vi. [y] Ephes. vi.

In all these sentences, St. Paul (as I said) meant not clearly to deny these things, which undoubtedly were all true, but he meant, that in comparison of other greater things, these smaller were not much to be esteemed; but that the greater things were the chief things to be considered: as that sin, committed by his infirmity, was rather to be imputed to original sin, or corruption of nature, which lay lurking within him, than to his own will and consent. And that although he was sent to baptize, yet he was chiefly sent to preach God's word. And that although he used wise and discreet persuasions therein, yet the success thereof came principally of the power of God, and of the working of the Holy Spirit. And that although the grafter and waterer of the garden be some things, and do not a little in their offices, yet it is God chiefly that giveth the increase. And that although he lived in this world, yet his chief life, concerning God, was by Christ, whom he had living within him. And that although he gloried in many other things, yea, in his own infirmities, yet his greatest joy was in the redemption by the cross of Christ. And that although our spirit daily fighteth against our flesh, yet our chief and principal fight is against our ghostly enemies, the subtle and puissant wicked spirits and devils.

The same manner of speech used also St.

Peter, in his first Epistle, saying, "That the apparel of women should not be outwardly, with braided hair, and setting on of gold, nor in putting on of gorgeous apparel, but that the inward man of the heart should be without corruption[z]." In which manner of speech he intended not utterly to forbid all braiding of hair, all gold and costly apparel, to all women; for every one must be apparelled according to their condition, state, and degree; but he meant hereby clearly to condemn all pride and excess in apparel, and to move all women that they should study to deck their souls inwardly with all virtues, and not to be curious outwardly to deck and adorn their bodies with sumptuous apparel. And our Saviour Christ himself was full of such manner of speeches. "Gather not unto you," saith he, "treasure upon earth[a]:" willing us thereby rather to set our minds upon heavenly treasure, which ever endureth, than upon earthly treasure, which, by many sundry occasions, perisheth, and is taken away from us. And yet worldly treasure must needs be had, and possessed of some men, as the person, time, and occasion doth serve. Likewise he said, "When you be brought before kings and princes, think not what and how you shall answer[b]:" not willing us by this negative, that we should negli-

[z] 1 Pet. iii. [a] Matt. vi. [b] Matt. x.

gently and unadvisedly answer we care not what, but that we should depend on our Heavenly Father, trusting that by his Holy Spirit He will sufficiently instruct us of answer, rather than to trust to any answer to be devised by our wit and study. And in the same manner he spake, when he said, "It is not you that speak, but it is the Spirit of God that speaketh within you[c]." For the Spirit of God is he, that principally putteth godly words into our mouths, and yet nevertheless we do speak according to his moving. And to be short, in all these sentences following, that is to say, "Call no man your father upon earth[d]."—"Let no man call you lord or master[e]."—"Fear not them that kill the body[f]."—"I came not to send peace upon earth[g]."—"It is not in me to set you at my right hand or left hand[h]."—"You shall not worship the Father neither in this mount, nor in Jerusalem[i]."—"I take no witness at no man[k]."—"My doctrine is not mine[l]."—"I seek not my glory[m]." In all these negatives, our Saviour Christ spake not precisely and utterly to deny all the foresaid things, but in comparison of them to prefer other things: as to prefer our Father and Lord in heaven, above any worldly father, lord, or master in earth, and his fear above the fear of any creature, and his word and gospel above all worldly

[c] Matt. x. [d] Matt. xxiii. [e] Ibid. [f] Matt. x. [g] Ibid.
[h] Matt. xx. [i] John iv. [k] John v. [l] John vii. [m] John viii.

peace; also to prefer spiritual and inward honouring of God in pure heart and mind, above local, corporal, and outward honour, and that Christ preferred his Father's glory above his own.

Now forasmuch as I have declared at length the nature and kind of these negative speeches, (which be no pure negatives but by comparison,) it is easy hereby to make answer to St. John Chrysostome, who used this phrase of speech most of any author. For his meaning in his foresaid homily, was not that in the celebration of the Lord's Supper is neither bread nor wine, neither priest, nor the body of Christ, (which the Papists themselves must needs confess,) but his intent was, to draw our minds upwards to heaven, that we should not consider so much the bread, wine, priest, and body of Christ, as we should consider his divinity and Holy Spirit given unto us to our eternal salvation. And therefore in the same place he useth so many times these words, "Think, and think not;" willing us by those words, that we should not fix our thoughts and minds upon the bread, wine, priest, nor Christ's body; but to lift up our hearts higher unto his spirit and divinity, without the which his body availeth nothing, as he said himself: "It is the spirit that giveth life, the flesh availeth nothing[n]." And as the same

[n] John vi.

Chrysostome in many places moveth us not to consider the water in baptism, but rather to have respect to the Holy Ghost, received in baptism, and represented by the water: even so doth he in this homily of the holy communion move us to lift up our minds, from all visible and corporal things, to things invisible and spiritual. Insomuch, that although Christ was but once crucified, yet would Chrysostome have us to think that we see him daily whipped and scourged before our eyes, and his body hanging upon the cross, and the spear thrust into his side, and the most holy blood to flow out of his side into our mouths. After which manner St. Paul wrote to the Galatians [o], that Christ was painted and crucified before their eyes. Therefore, saith Chrysostome, in the same homily, a little before the place rehearsed, "What dost thou, O man? didst not thou promise to the priest, which said, Lift up your minds and hearts; and thou didst answer, We lift them up unto the Lord? Art not thou ashamed and afraid, being at that same hour found a liar? A wonderful thing: the table is set forth furnished with God's mysteries, the Lamb of God is offered for them, the priest is careful for them, spiritual fire cometh out of that heavenly table, the angels seraphim be there present, covering their faces with six wings. All the angelical powers, with the priest, be means

Chrysostomus.

[o] Galat. iii.

and intercessors for you, a spiritual fire cometh down from heaven, blood in the cup is drunk out of the most pure side unto thy purification. And art not thou ashamed, afraid, and abashed, not endeavouring thyself to purchase God's mercy? O man, doth not thine own conscience condemn thee? There be in the week one hundred and sixty-eight hours, and God asketh but one of them to be given wholly unto him, and thou consumest that in worldly business, in trifling and talking; with what boldness then shalt thou come to these holy mysteries, O corrupt conscience?" Hitherto I have rehearsed St. John Chrysostome's words, which do shew how our minds should be occupied at this holy table of our Lord, that is to say, withdrawn from the consideration of sensible things, unto the contemplation of most heavenly and godly things. And thus is answered this place of Chrysostome, which the Papists took for an insoluble, and a place that no man was able to answer. But for a further declaration of Chrysostome's mind in this matter, read the place of him before rehearsed, fol. 60 and 65.

CHAP. XIII.

Yet there is another place of St. Ambrose[p], which the Papists think maketh much for their purpose; but, after due examination, it shall plainly appear how much they be deceived. They allege these words of St. Ambrose, in a

[p] Ambros. de iis qui mysteriis initiantur.

book entitled *De iis qui initiantur mysteriis:* "Let us prove that there is not that thing which nature formed, but which benediction did consecrate, and that benediction is of more strength than nature. For by the blessing, nature itself is also changed. 'Moses held a rod, he cast it from him, and it was made a serpent. Again he took the serpent by the tail, and it was turned again into the nature of a rod [p].' Wherefore thou seest, that by the grace of the prophet, the nature of the serpent and rod was twice changed. 'The floods of Egypt ran pure water, and suddenly blood began to burst out of the veins of the springs, so that men could not drink of the flood; but, at the prayer of the prophet, the blood of the flood went away, and the nature of water came again [q].'—'The people of the Hebrews were compassed about, on the one side with the Egyptians, and on the other side with the sea. Moses lifted up his rod, the water divided itself, and stood up like a wall, and between the waters was left a way for them to pass on foot. And Jordan, against nature, turned back to the head of his spring [r].' Doth it not appear now that the nature of the sea floods, or of the course of fresh water, was changed? 'The people was dry, Moses touched a stone, and water came out of the stone [s].' Did not

[p] Exod. vii. [q] Ibid. [r] Exod. xiv. [s] Exod. xvii.

grace here work above nature, to make the stone to bring forth water, which it had not of nature? 'Marath was a most bitter flood, so that the people being dry, could not drink thereof[t].' Moses put wood into the water, and the nature of the water lost his bitterness, which grace infused did so suddenly moderate. 'In the time of Elisha the prophet, an axe had fallen from one of the prophet's servants into the water; he that lost the iron, desired the prophet Elisha's help, who put the helve into the water, and the iron swam above[u].' Which thing we know was done above nature, for iron is heavier than the liquor of water. Thus we perceive that grace is of more force than nature, and yet hitherto we have rehearsed but the grace of the blessing of the prophets. Now if the blessing of a man be of such value, that it may change nature, what do we say of the consecration of God, wherein is the operation of the words of our Saviour Christ? For this sacrament which thou receivest, is done by the word of Christ. Then if the word of Elijah was of such power that it could bring fire down from heaven, shall not the word of Christ be of that power to change the kinds of the elements? Of the making of the whole world thou hast read, 'That God spake, and the things were done; he com-

[t] Exod. xv. [u] 2 Kings vi.

manded, and they were created[x].' The word then of Christ, that could of nothing make things that were not, can it not change those things that be into that thing which before they were not? For it is no less matter to give to things new natures, than to alter natures." Thus far have I rehearsed the words of St. Ambrose, if the said book be his, (which they that be of greatest learning and judgment do not think,) by which words the Papists would prove that in the supper of the Lord, after the words of consecration, as they be commonly called, there remaineth neither bread nor wine, because that St. Ambrose saith in this place, that the nature of the bread and wine is changed.

But to satisfy their minds, let us grant, for their pleasure, that the foresaid book was St. Ambrose's own work; yet the same book maketh nothing for their purpose, but quite against them. For he saith not that the substance of bread and wine is gone, but he saith that their nature is changed, that is to say, that in the holy communion we ought not to receive the bread and wine as other common meats and drinks, but as things clean changed into a higher estate, nature, and condition, to be taken as holy meats and drinks, whereby we receive spiritual feeding and supernatural nourishment from heaven, of the very

The answer.

[x] Psal. cxlviii.

true body and blood of our Saviour Christ, through the omnipotent power of God and the wonderful working of the Holy Ghost. Which so well agreeth with the substance of bread and wine still remaining, that if they were gone away, and not there, this our spiritual feeding could not be taught unto us by them.

And therefore in the most part of the examples which St. Ambrose allegeth for the wonderful alteration of natures, the substances did still remain, after the natures and properties were changed. As when the water of Jordan, contrary to his nature, stood still like a wall, or flowed against the stream towards the head and spring, yet the substance of the water remained the same that it was before. Likewise the stone, that above his nature and kind flowed water, was the self-same stone that it was before. And the flood of Marath, that changed his nature of bitterness, changed, for all that, no part of his substance. No more did that iron, which, contrary to his nature, swam upon the water, lose thereby any part of the substance thereof. Therefore as in these alterations of natures, the substances nevertheless remained the same that they were before the alterations: even so doth the substance of bread and wine remain in the Lord's Supper, and be naturally received and digested into the body, notwithstanding the sacramental mutation of the same into the body

and blood of Christ. Which sacramental mutation declareth the supernatural, spiritual, and inexplicable eating and drinking, feeding and digesting, of the same body and blood of Christ, in all them that godly, and according to their duty, do receive the said sacramental bread and wine. And that St. Ambrose thus meant, that the substance of bread and wine remain still after the consecration, it is most clear by three other examples of the same matter, following in the same chapter.

One is of them that be regenerated, in whom after their regeneration doth still remain their former natural substance. Another is of the incarnation of our Saviour Christ, in the which perished no substance, but remaineth as well the substance of his godhead, as the substance which he took of the blessed Virgin Mary. The third example is of the water in baptism, where the water still remaineth water, although the Holy Ghost come upon the water, or rather upon him that is baptized therein.

And although the same St. Ambrose, in another book, entitled *De Sacramentis*, doth say, "That the bread is bread before the words of consecration; but when the consecration is done, of bread is made the body of Christ[y]:" yet in the same book, and in the same chapter, he tell-

[y] In libro 4. De Sacramentis, cap. 4.

eth in what manner and form the same is done by the words of Christ: not by taking away the substance of the bread, but adding to the bread the grace of Christ's body, and so calling it the body of Christ. And hereof he bringeth four examples; the first, of the regeneration of a man; the second is of the standing of the water of the Red Sea; the third is of the bitter water of Marath; and the fourth is of the iron that swam above the water. In every of the which examples, the former substance remained still, notwithstanding alteration of the natures. And he concludeth the whole matter in these few words: "If there be so much strength in the words of the Lord Jesu, that things had their beginning which never were before, how much more be they able to work, that those things that were before should remain, and also be changed into other things!" Which words do shew manifestly, that notwithstanding this wonderful, sacramental, and spiritual changing of the bread into the body of Christ, yet the substance of the bread remaineth the same that it was before. Thus is a sufficient answer made unto three principal authorities, which the Papists use to allege, to establish their error of Transubstantiation: the first of Cyprian, the second of St. John Chrysostome, and the third of St. Ambrose. Other authorities and reasons some of them do bring for the same purpose; but foras-

much as they be of small moment and weight, and easy to be answered unto, I will pass them over at this time, and not trouble the reader with them, but leave them to be weighed by his discretion.

CHAP. XIV.

Absurdities that follow of Transubstantiation.

And now I will rehearse divers difficulties, absurdities, and inconveniences, which must needs follow upon this error of Transubstantiation; whereof not one doth follow of the true and right faith, which is according to God's word.

First, if the Papists be demanded, what thing it is that is broken, what is eaten, what is drunken, and what is chewed with the teeth, lips, and mouth in this sacrament, they have nothing to answer, but the accidents. For (as they say) bread and wine be not the visible elements in this sacrament, but only their accidents; and so they be forced to say, that accidents be broken, eaten, drunken, chewed, and swallowed, without any substance at all: which is not only against all reason, but also against the doctrine of all ancient authors.

Secondly, these transubstantiators do say, (contrary to all learning,) that the accidents of bread and wine do hang alone in the air without any substance, wherein they may be stayed. And what can be said more foolishly?

Thirdly, that the substance of Christ's body is there really, corporally, and naturally present, without any accidents of the same. And so the

Papists make accidents to be without substances, and substances to be without accidents.

Fourthly, they say, that the place where the bread and wine be, hath no substance there to fill that place, and so must they needs be granted *vacuum*, which nature utterly abhorreth.

Fifthly, they are not ashamed to say the substance is made of accidents, when the bread mouldeth, or is turned into worms, or when the wine soureth.

Sixthly, that substance is nourished without substance by accidents only, if it chance any cat, mouse, dog, or any other thing, to eat the sacramental bread, or drink the sacramental wine.

These inconveniences and absurdities do follow of the fond Papistical Transubstantiation, with a number of other errors as evil or worse than these, whereunto they be never able to answer, as many of them have confessed themselves. And it is a wonder to see, how in many of the foresaid things, they vary among themselves. Whereas the other doctrine of the Scripture, and of the old Catholick church, (but not of the lately corrupted Romish church,) is plain and easy, as well to be understood, as to answer to all the foresaid questions, without any absurdity or inconvenience following thereof: so that every answer shall agree with God's word, with the old church, and also with all reason and true philosophy.

For as touching the first point, what is broken, what is eaten, what drunken, and what chewed in this sacrament, it is easy to answer, the bread and wine, as St. Paul saith: the bread which we break.

And as concerning the second and third points, neither is the substance of bread and wine without their proper accidents, nor their accidents hang alone in the air without any substance, but according to all learning the substances of the bread and wine reserve their own accidents, and the accidents do rest in their own substances.

And also as concerning the fourth point, there is no place left void after consecration, (as the Papists dream,) but bread and wine fulfil their places, as they did before.

And as touching the fifth point, (whereof the worms or moulding is engendered, and whereof the vinegar cometh,) the answer is easy to make, according to all learning and experience, that they come, according to the course of nature, of the substance of the bread and wine too long kept, and not of the accidents alone, as the Papists do fondly fancy. And likewise the substances of the bread and wine do feed and nourish the body of them that eat the same, and not the only accidents.

In these answers is no absurdity nor inconvenience, nothing spoken either contrary to holy Scripture, or to natural reason, philosophy, or

experience, or against any old ancient author, or the primitive or Catholick church; but only against the malignant and Papistical church of Rome. Whereas on the other side, that cursed synagogue of Antichrist hath defined and determined in this matter so many things contrary to Christ's word, contrary to the old Catholick church, and the holy martyrs and doctors of the same, and contrary to all natural reason, learning, and philosophy. And the final end of all this Antichrist's doctrine is none other, but by subtlety and craft to bring Christian people, from the true honouring of Christ, unto the greatest idolatry that ever was in this world devised: as, by God's grace, shall be plainly set forth hereafter.

THUS ENDETH THE SECOND BOOK.

THE THIRD BOOK

TEACHETH THE MANNER HOW

CHRIST IS PRESENT IN HIS HOLY SUPPER.

The presence of Christ in the sacrament.

Now this matter of Transubstantiation being, as I trust, sufficiently resolved, (which is the first part before rehearsed, wherein the Papistical doctrine varieth from the Catholick truth,) order requireth next to treat of the second part, which is of the manner of the presence of the body and blood of our Saviour Christ in the sacrament thereof, wherein is no less contention than in the first part. For a plain explication whereof, it is not unknown to all true faithful Christian people, that our Saviour Christ, being perfect God, and in all things equal and co-eternal with his Father, for our sakes became also a perfect man, taking flesh and blood of his blessed mother and virgin Mary, and, saving sin, being in all things like unto us; adjoining unto his divinity a most perfect soul and a most perfect body; his soul being endued with life, sense, will,

reason, wisdom, memory, and all other things required to the perfect soul of man; and his body being made of very flesh and bones, not only having all members of a perfect man's body in due order and proportion, but also being subject to hunger, thirst, labour, sweat, weariness, cold, heat, and all other like infirmities and passions of man, and unto death also, and that the most vile and painful, upon the cross. And after his death he rose again, with the self-same visible and palpable body, and appeared therewith, and shewed the same unto his apostles, and especially to Thomas, making him to put his hands into his side and to feel his wounds.

Christ corporally is ascended into heaven.

And with the self-same body he forsook this world, and ascended into heaven, (the apostles seeing and beholding his body when it ascended,) and now sitteth at the right hand of his Father, and there shall remain until the last day, when he shall come to judge the quick and the dead [a]. This is the true Catholick faith, which the Scripture teacheth, and the universal church of Christ hath ever believed from the beginning until within these four or five hundred years last past, that the bishop of Rome, with the assistance of his Papists, hath set up a new faith and belief of their own devising, that the same body really, corporally, naturally, and sensibly,

[a] Acts iii.

is in this world still, and that in an hundred thousand places at one time, being enclosed in every pix and bread consecrated.

CHAP. II.

The difference between the true and the Papistical doctrine concerning the presence of Christ's body.

And although we do affirm, (according to God's word,) that Christ is in all persons that truly believe in him, in such sort, that with his flesh and blood he doth spiritually nourish them, and feed them, and giveth them everlasting life, and doth assure them thereof, as well by the promise of his word, as by the sacramental bread and wine in his holy supper, which he did institute for the same purpose, yet we do not a little vary from the heinous errors of the Papists: for they teach, that Christ is in the bread and wine: but we say, according to the truth, that he is in them that worthily eat and drink the bread and wine. They say, that when any man eateth the bread and drinketh the cup, Christ goeth into his mouth or stomach with the bread and wine, and no further: but we say, that Christ is in the whole man, both in the body and soul of him that worthily eateth the bread and drinketh the cup, and not in his mouth or stomach only. They say, that Christ is received in the mouth, and entereth in with the bread and wine: we say, that he is received in the heart, and entereth in by faith. They say, that Christ is really in the sacramental bread, being reserved an whole year, or so long as the form of bread remaineth; but after the receiving thereof, he flyeth up (say

they) from the receiver unto heaven, as soon as the bread is chewed in the mouth, or changed in the stomach: but we say, that Christ remaineth in the man that worthily receiveth it, so long as the man remaineth a member of Christ.

They say, that in the sacrament, the corporal members of Christ be not distant in place one from another, but that wheresoever the head is, there be the feet, and wheresoever the arms be, there be the legs; so that in every part of the bread and wine is altogether whole head, whole feet, whole flesh, whole blood, whole heart, whole lungs, whole breast, whole back, and altogether whole, confused, and mixt without distinction or diversity. O, what a foolish and an abominable invention is this, to make of the most pure and perfect body of Christ such a confused and monstrous body! And yet can the Papists imagine nothing so foolish, but all Christian people must receive the same as an oracle of God, and as a most certain article of their faith, without whispering to the contrary.

Furthermore the Papists say, that a dog or a cat eat the body of Christ, if they by chance do eat the sacramental bread: we say, that no earthly creature can eat the body of Christ, nor drink his blood, but only man. They say, that every man, good and evil, eateth the body of Christ: we say, that both do eat the sacramental bread and drink the wine, but none do eat the

very body of Christ, and drink his blood, but only they that be lively members of his body.

They say, that good men eat the body of Christ, and drink his blood, only at that time when they receive the sacrament: we say, that they eat, drink, and feed of Christ continually, so long as they be members of his body.

They say, that the body of Christ that is in the sacrament, hath his own proper form and quantity: we say, that Christ is there sacramentally and spiritually, without form or quantity.

They say, that the fathers and prophets of the Old Testament did not eat the body nor drink the blood of Christ: we say, that they did eat his body and drink his blood, although he was not yet born nor incarnated.

They say, that the body of Christ is every day many times made as often as there be masses said, and that then and there he is made of bread and wine: we say, that Christ's body was never but once made, and then not of the nature and substance of bread and wine, but of the substance of his blessed mother.

They say, that the mass is a sacrifice satisfactory for sin, by the devotion of the priest that offereth, and not by the thing that is offered: but we say, that their saying is a most heinous lie and detestable error against the glory of Christ. For the satisfaction for our sins is not the devo-

tion nor offering of the priest; but the only host and satisfaction for all the sins of the world is the death of Christ, and the oblation of his body upon the cross, that is to say, the oblation that Christ himself offered once upon the cross, and never but once, nor never none but he. And therefore that oblation, which the priests make daily in their Papistical masses, cannot be a satisfaction for other men's sins by the priest's devotion, but it is a mere elusion and subtle craft of the devil, whereby Antichrist hath many years blinded and deceived the world.

They say, that Christ is corporally in many places at one time, affirming that his body is corporally and really present in as many places as there be hosts consecrated: we say, that as the Son corporally is ever in heaven, and no where else; and yet by his operation and virtue, the Son is here on earth, by whose influence and virtue all things in the world be corporally regenerated, encreased, and grow to their perfect state; so likewise our Saviour Christ bodily and corporally is in heaven, sitting at the right hand of his Father, although spiritually he hath promised to be present with us upon earth unto the world's end. And whensoever two or three be gathered together in his name, he is there in the midst among them, by whose supernal grace all godly men be first by him spiritually regenerated, and after increase and grow to their spiri-

tual perfection in God, spiritually by faith eating his flesh and drinking his blood, although the same corporally be in heaven, far distant from our sight.

CHAP. III.

The proof hereof by our profession in our common Creed.

Now to return to the principal matter, lest it might be thought a new device of us, that Christ as concerning his body and his human nature is in heaven, and not in earth: therefore by God's grace, it shall be evidently proved, that this is no new devised matter, but that it was ever the old faith of the Catholick church, until the Papists invented a new faith, that Christ really, corporally, naturally, and sensibly is here still with us in earth, shut up in a box, or within the compass of bread and wine. This needeth no better nor stronger proof, than that which the old authors bring for the same, that is to say, the general profession of all Christian people in the common Creed, wherein, as concerning Christ's humanity, they be taught to believe after this sort: that he was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary; that he suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried; that he descended into hell, and rose again the third day; that he ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of his almighty Father, and from thence shall come to judge the quick and the dead. This hath been ever the Catholick faith of Christian people, that Christ, as concerning his body and his manhood,

is in heaven, and shall there continue until he come down at the last judgment. And forasmuch as the Creed maketh so express mention of the article of his ascension, and departing hence from us; if it had been another article of our faith, that his body tarrieth also here with us in earth, surely in this place of the Creed was so urgent an occasion given to make some mention thereof, that doubtless it would not have been passed over in our Creed with silence. For if Christ, as concerning his humanity, be both here and gone hence, and both those two be articles of our faith, when mention was made of the one in the Creed, it was necessary to make mention of the other, lest, by professing the one, we should be dissuaded from believing the other, being so contrary the one to the other.

CHAP. IV.

The proof hereof by the Scripture.

To this article of our Creed accordeth holy Scripture, and all the old ancient doctors of Christ's church. For Christ himself said, "I leave the world, and go to my Father[b]." And also he said, "You shall ever have poor folks with you, but you shall not ever have me with you[c]." And he gave warning of this error before hand, saying, "That the time would come when many deceivers should be in the world, and say, Here is Christ, and there is Christ; but believe them not, said Christ[d]." And St. Mark

[b] John xvi. [c] Matt. xxvi. [d] Matt. xxiv.

writeth in the last chapter of his Gospel, "That the Lord Jesus was taken up into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of his Father [e]." And St. Paul exhorteth all men "to seek for things that be above in heaven, where Christ," saith he, "sitteth at the right hand of God his Father [f]." Also he saith, "That we have such a bishop, that sitteth in heaven at the right hand of the throne of God's majesty [g]." And "that he having offered one sacrifice for sins, sitteth continually at the right hand of God, until his enemies be put under his feet, as a footstool [h]." And hereunto consent all the old doctors of the church.

CHAP. V.

The proof thereof by ancient authors.

First, Origen [i] upon Matthew reasoneth this matter, how Christ may be called a stranger that is departed into another country, seeing that he is with us alway unto the world's end, and is among all them that be gathered together in his name, and also in the midst of them that know him not. And thus he reasoneth: "If he be here among us still, how can he be gone hence as a stranger departed into another country? Whereunto he answereth, that Christ is both God and man, having in him two natures. And as a man he is not with us unto the world's end, nor is present with all his faithful that be

[e] Mark vii. [f] Coloss. iii. [g] Heb. viii. [h] Heb. x.
[i] Origen. in Mat. Tract. 33.

gathered together in his name; but his divine power and spirit is ever with us. Paul (saith he) was absent from the Corinthians in his body, when he was present with them in his spirit. So is Christ (saith he) gone hence, and absent in his humanity, which in his divine nature is every where. And in this saying (saith Origen) we divide not his humanity; for St. John writeth, that no spirit that divideth Jesus can be of God; but we reserve to both his natures their own properties." In these words Origen hath plainly declared his mind, that Christ's body is not both present here with us, and also gone hence and estranged from us. For that were to make two natures of one body, and to divide the body of Jesus; forasmuch as one nature cannot at one time be both with us and absent from us. And therefore, saith Origen, that the presence must be understood of his divinity, and the absence of his humanity.

And according hereunto, St. Augustine writeth thus, in an Epistle *Ad Dardanum*[k]. "Doubt not but Jesus Christ, as concerning the nature of his manhood, is now there, from whence he shall come; and remember well and believe the profession of a Christian man, that he rose from death, ascended into heaven, sitteth at the right hand of his Father, and from that place, and

[k] August. ad Dardanum, Epist. 57.

none other, shall he come to judge the quick and the dead. And he shall come (as the angels said) as he was seen go into heaven, that is to say, in the same form and substance, unto the which he gave immortality, but changed not nature. After this form, (saith he,) meaning his man's nature, we may not think that he is every where. For we must beware, that we do not so establish his divinity, that we take away the verity of his body." These be St. Augustine's plain words. And by and by, after, he addeth these words: "The Lord Jesus as God is every where, and as man is in heaven." And, finally, he concludeth this matter in these few words: "Doubt not but our Lord Jesus Christ is every where as God; and as a dweller he is in man that is the temple of God, and he is in a certain place in heaven, because of the measure of a very body." And again St. Augustine writeth upon the Gospel of St. John[l]: "The Lord Jesus," saith he, "is above, but yet the truth of his word is here. His body wherein he arose is in one place, but the truth of his word is spread every where." And in another place of the same book[m], St. Augustine, expounding these words of Christ, "You shall ever have poor men with you, but me you shall not ever have," saith, "That Christ spake these words of the presence

[l] In Joan. Tract. 30.

[m] Tract. 50.

of his body. For (saith he) as concerning his Divine Majesty, as concerning his providence, as concerning his infallible and invisible grace, these words be fulfilled which he spake, 'I am with you unto the world's end.' But as concerning the flesh which he took in his incarnation, as concerning that which was born of the Virgin, as concerning that which was apprehended by the Jews, and crucified upon a tree, and taken down from the cross, lapped in linen clothes, and buried, and rose again, and appeared after his resurrection; as concerning that flesh he said, 'You shall not ever have me with you.' Wherefore seeing, that as concerning his flesh, he was conversant with his disciples forty days, and they accompanying, seeing, and following him, he went up into heaven, both he is not here, (for he sitteth at the right hand of his Father,) and yet he is here, for he departed not hence, as concerning the presence of his Divine Majesty. As concerning the presence of his Majesty, we have Christ ever with us; but as concerning the presence of his flesh, he said truly to his disciples, 'Ye shall not ever have me with you.' For as concerning the presence of his flesh, the church had Christ but a few days; yet now it holdeth him fast by faith, though it see him not with eyes." All these be St. Augustine's words.

Also in another book [n], entitled to St. Augustine, is written thus: "We must believe and confess, that the Son of God, as concerning his divinity, is invisible, without a body, immortal, and incircumscriptible; but, as concerning his humanity, we ought to believe and confess, that he is visible, hath a body, and is contained in a certain place, and hath truly all the members of a man." Of these words of St. Augustine, it is most clear, that the profession of the Catholick faith is, that Christ, as concerning his bodily substance and nature of man, is in heaven, and not present here with us in earth. For the nature and property of a very body is to be in one place, and to occupy one place, and not to be every where, or in many places at one time. And though the body of Christ, after his resurrection and ascension, was made immortal, yet the nature thereof was not changed; for then, as St. Augustine saith, it were no very body. And further, St. Augustine sheweth both the manner and form, how Christ is here present with us in earth, and how he is absent, saying, that he is present by his divine nature and majesty, by his providence, and by his grace; but by his human nature and very body, he is absent from this world, and present in heaven.

[n] De Essentia Divinitatis.

Cyrillus[o] likewise, upon the Gospel of St. John, agreeth fully with St. Augustine, saying, "Although Christ took away from hence the presence of his body, yet in the majesty of his Godhead he is ever here, as he promised to his disciples at his departing, saying, 'I am with you ever unto the world's end.'" And in another place[p] of the same book, St. Cyril saith thus: "Christian people must believe, that although Christ be absent from us, as concerning his body, yet by his power he governeth us and all things, and is present with all them that love him. Therefore he said, 'Truly, truly I say unto you, wheresoever there be two or three gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.' For like as when he was conversant here in earth as a man, yet then he filled heaven, and did not leave the company of angels: even so being now in heaven with his flesh, yet he filleth the earth, and is in them that love him. And it is to be marked, that although Christ should go away only as concerning his flesh, (for he is ever present in the power of his divinity,) yet for a little time he said he would be with his disciples." These be the words of St. Cyril.

St. Ambrose also saith[q], "That we must not

[o] Cyrillus in Joan. lib. 6. cap. 14. [p] Libro 6. cap. 21.

[q] Ambrosius in Lucam. lib. 10. cap. 24.

seek Christ upon earth, nor in earth, but in heaven, where he sitteth at the right hand of his Father."

And likewise St. Gregory[r] writeth thus: "Christ," saith he, "is not here by the presence of his flesh, and yet he is absent no where by the presence of his majesty." What subtlety thinkest thou, good reader, can the Papists now imagine, to defend their pernicious error, that Christ in his human nature is bodily here in earth, in the consecrated bread and wine; seeing that all the old church of Christ believed the contrary, and all the old authors wrote the contrary? For they all affirmed and believed, that Christ, being one person, hath nevertheless in him two natures or substances, that is to say, the nature of his Godhead, and the nature of his manhood. They say furthermore, that Christ is both gone hence from us unto heaven, and is also here with us in earth, but not in his human nature, as the Papists would have us to believe; but the old authors say, that he is in heaven, as concerning his manhood, and nevertheless both here and there, and every where, as concerning his Godhead. For although his divinity be such that it is infinite, without measure, compass, or place; so that, as concerning that nature, he is circumscribed with no place, but is every where,

[r] Gregorius in Hom. Paschat.

and filleth all the world: yet as concerning his human nature, he hath measure, compass, and place; so that when he was here upon earth, he was not at the same time in heaven; and now that he is ascended into heaven, as concerning that nature, he hath now forsaken the earth, and is only in heaven.

CHAP. VI.

One body cannot be in divers places at one time.

For one nature, that is circumscribed, compassed, and measured, cannot be in divers places at one time. This is the faith of the old Catholick church, as appeareth as well by the authors before rehearsed, as by these that hereafter follow.

St. Augustine speaking, that a body must needs be in some place, saith, "That if it be not within the compass of a place, it is no where. And if it be no where, then it is not[s]."

And St. Cyril, considering the proper nature of a very body, said, "That if the nature of the Godhead were a body, it must needs be in a place, and have quantity, greatness, and circumscription[t]."

If then the nature of the Godhead must needs be circumscribed, if it were a body, much more must the nature of Christ's manhood be circumscribed and contained within the compass of a certain place.

Didymus also[u], in his book *De Spiritu Sancto,*

[s] Ad Dardanum. [t] Cyrillus de Trin. lib. 2.

[u] Didymus de Spiritu Sancto, lib. 1. cap. 1.

(which St. Jerome did translate,) proveth, that the Holy Ghost is very God; because he is in many places at one time, which no creature can be. "For," saith he, "all creatures, visible and invisible, be circumscribed and environed either within one place, (as corporeal and visible things be,) or within the propriety of their own substance, (as angels and invisible creatures be,) so that no angel," saith he, "can be at one time in two places. And forasmuch as the Holy Ghost is in many men at one time, therefore," saith he, "the Holy Ghost must needs be God." The same affirmeth St. Basil also [x], "That the angel, which was with Cornelius, was not at the same time with Philip; nor the angel, which spake to Zachary in the altar, was not the same time in his proper place in heaven. But the Holy Ghost was at one time in Habakkuk, and in Daniel in Babylon, and with Jeremy in prison, and with Ezekiel in Chober; whereby he proveth, that the Holy Ghost is God." Wherefore the Papists, which say that the body of Christ is in an infinite number of places at one time, do make his body to be God, and so confound the two natures of Christ, attributing to his human nature that thing which belongeth only to his divinity, which is a most heinous and detestable heresy. Against whom writeth Fulgentius [y] in this wise,

[x] Basilius de Spiritu Sancto, cap. 22.

[y] Fulgentius ad Trasimundum Regem, lib. 2.

speaking of the distinction and diversity of the two natures in Christ: "One and the self-same Christ," saith he, "of mankind was made a man, compassed in a place, who of his Father is God, without measure or place. One and the self-same person, as concerning his man's substance, was not in heaven, when he was in earth, and forsook the earth when he ascended into heaven: but as concerning his godly substance, which is above all measure, he neither left heaven, when he came from heaven, nor he left not the earth when he ascended into heaven, which may be known by the most certain word of Christ himself, who, to shew the placing of his humanity, said to his disciples, 'I ascend up to my Father and your Father, to my God and your God.' Also when he had said of Lazarus, that he was dead, he added, saying, 'I am glad for your sakes, that you may believe; for I was not there.' But to shew the unmeasurable compass of his divinity, he said to his disciples, 'Behold, I am with you always unto the world's end.' Now how did he go up into heaven, but because he is a very man, contained within a place? Or how is he present with faithful people, but because he is very God, being without measure?" Of these words of Fulgentius it is declared most certainly, that Christ is not here with us in earth, but by his Godhead, and that his humanity is in heaven only, and absent from us.

Yet the same is more plainly shewed, (if more plainly can be spoken,) by Vigilius[z], a bishop and an holy martyr. He writeth thus against the heretick Eutyches, which denied the humanity of Christ, holding opinion that he was only God, and not man. Whose error Vigilius confuting, proveth that Christ had in him two natures joined together in one person, the nature of his Godhead and the nature of his manhood. Thus he writeth: "Christ said to his disciples, 'If you loved me, you would be glad, for I go unto my Father.' And again he said, 'It is expedient for you that I go, for if I go not, the Comforter shall not come to you.' And yet surely the eternal word of God, the virtue of God, the wisdom of God, was ever with his Father, and in his Father, yea even at the same time when he was with us and in us. For when he did mercifully dwell in this world, he left not his habitation in heaven, for he is every where whole with his Father equal in divinity, whom no place can contain, for the Son filleth all things, and there is no place that lacketh the presence of his divinity. From whence then and whither did he say that he would go? Or how did he say that he went to his Father, from whom doubtless he never departed? But that to go to his Father, and from us, was to take from this world that nature which

[z] Vigilius contra Eutychen, lib. 1.

he received of us. Thou seest, therefore, that it was the property of that nature to be taken away and go from us, which in the end of the world shall be rendered again to us, as the angels witnessed, saying, 'This Jesus, which is taken from you, shall come again, like as you saw him going up into heaven.' For look upon the miracle, look upon the mystery, of both the natures. The Son of God, as concerning his humanity, went from us; as concerning his divinity, he said unto us, 'Behold I am with you all the days unto the world's end.'"

Thus far have I rehearsed the words of Vigilius, and by and bye he concludeth thus: "He is with us, and not with us. For those whom he left and went from them, as concerning his humanity, those he left not, nor forsook them not, as touching his divinity. For as touching the form of a servant, (which he took away from us into heaven,) he is absent from us; but by the form of God, (which goeth not from us,) he is present with us in earth: and nevertheless, both present and absent, he is all one Christ."

Hitherto you have heard Vigilius speak, that Christ as concerning his bodily presence, and the nature of his manhood is gone from us, taken from us, is gone up into heaven, is not with us, hath left us, hath forsaken us. But as concerning the other nature of his Deity, he is still with us; so that he is both with us, and not with us:

with us in the nature of his Deity, and not with us in the nature of his humanity. And yet more clearly doth the same Vigilius declare the same thing in another place [a], saying, "If the word and the flesh were both of one nature, seeing that the word is every where, why is not the flesh then every where? For when it was in earth, then verily it was not in heaven; and now when it is in heaven, it is not surely in earth. And it is so sure that it is not in earth, that as concerning it, we look for him to come from heaven, whom, as concerning his eternal word, we believe to be with us in earth. Therefore by your doctrine, (saith Vigilius unto Eutyches, who defended that the divinity and humanity in Christ was but one nature,) either the word is contained in a place with his flesh, or else the flesh is every where with the word. For one nature cannot receive in itself two divers and contrary things. But these two things be divers and far unlike, that is to say, to be contained in a place, and to be every where. Therefore inasmuch as the word is every where, and the flesh is not every where, it appeareth plainly, that one Christ himself hath in him two natures; and that by his divine nature he is every where, and by his human nature he is contained in a place; that he is created, and hath no beginning,

[a] Contra Eutychen, lib. 4.

that he is subject to death, and cannot die. Whereof one he hath by the nature of his word, whereby he is God, and the other he hath by the nature of his flesh, whereby the same God is man also. Therefore one Son of God, the self-same was made the son of man, and he hath a beginning by the nature of his flesh, and no beginning by the nature of his Godhead. He is created by the nature of his flesh, and not created by the nature of his Godhead. He is comprehended in a place by the nature of his flesh, and not comprehended in a place by the nature of his Godhead. He is inferior to angels in the nature of his flesh, and is equal to his Father in the nature of his Godhead. He died by the nature of his flesh, and died not by the nature of his Godhead. This is the faith and Catholick confession which the apostles taught, the martyrs did corroborate, and faithful people keep unto this day." All these be the sayings of Vigilius, who, according to all the other authors before rehearsed, and to the faith and Catholick confession of the apostles, martyrs, and all faithful people unto his time, saith, that as concerning Christ's humanity, when he was here on earth, he was not in heaven; and now when he is in heaven, he is not in earth. For one nature cannot be both contained in a place in heaven, and be also here in earth at one time. And forasmuch as Christ is here with us in earth, and

also is contained in a place in heaven, he proveth thereby, that Christ hath two natures in him, the nature of a man, whereby he is gone from us, and ascended into heaven; and the nature of his Godhead, whereby he is here with us in earth. So that it is not one nature that is here with us, and that is gone from us, that is ascended into heaven, and there contained, and that is permanent here with us in earth. Wherefore the Papists, which now of late years have made a new faith, that Christ's natural body is really and naturally present both with us here in earth, and sitteth at the right hand of his Father in heaven, do err in two very horrible heresies. The one, that they confound his two natures, his Godhead and his manhood, attributing unto his humanity that thing which appertaineth only to his divinity, that is to say, to be in heaven and earth and in many places at one time. The other is, that they divide and separate his human nature, or his body, making of one body of Christ two bodies and two natures; one which is in heaven, visible and palpable, having all members and proportions of a most perfect natural man; and another, which they say is in earth here with us, in every bread and wine that is consecrated, having no distinction, form, nor proportion of members: Which contrarieties and diversities (as this holy martyr Vigilius saith) cannot be together in one nature.

CHAP. VII.

An answer to the Papists, alleging for them these words, "This is my body."

But now seeing that it is so evident a matter, both by the express words of Scripture, and also by all the old authors of the same, that our Saviour Christ (as concerning his bodily presence) is ascended into heaven, and is not here in earth; and seeing that this hath been the true confession of the Catholick faith ever since Christ's ascension; it is now to be considered what moved the Papists to make a new and contrary faith, and what Scriptures they have for their purpose. What moved them I know not, but their own iniquity, or the nature and condition of the see of Rome, which is of all other most contrary to Christ, and therefore most worthy to be called the see of Antichrist. And as for Scripture,

The argument of the Papists.

they allege none but only one, and that not truly understood; but, to serve their purpose, wrested out of tune, whereby they make it to jar and sound contrary to all other Scriptures pertaining to that matter.

The interpretation of these words, "This is my body."

Christ took bread, (say they,) blessed and brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying, "This is my body." These words they ever still repeat and beat upon, that Christ said, "This is my body." And this saying they make their sheet-anchor, to prove thereby as well the real and natural presence of Christ's body in the sacrament, as their imagined Transubstantiation. For these words of Christ (say they) be most plain and most true. Then forasmuch as he said,

"This is my body," it must needs be true, that that thing which the priest holdeth in his hands is Christ's body. And if it be Christ's body, then can it not be bread, whereof they gather by their reasoning, that there is Christ's body really present, and no bread. Now forasmuch as all their proof hangeth only upon these words, "This is my body," the true sense and meaning of these words must be examined. But (say they) what need they any examination? What words can be more plain than to say, "This is my body?"

The answer.

Truth it is indeed, that the words be as plain as may be spoken; but that the sense is not so plain, it is manifest to every man that weigheth substantially the circumstances of the place. For when Christ gave bread to his disciples, and said, "This is my body," there is no man of any discretion, that understandeth the English tongue, but he may well know by the order of the speech, that Christ spake those words of the bread, calling it his body, as all the old authors also do affirm, although many of the Papists deny the same. Wherefore this sentence cannot mean as the words seem and purport, but there must needs be some figure or mystery in this speech, more than appeareth in the plain words. For by this manner of speech, plainly understood without any figure as the words lie, can be gathered none other sense but that bread

is Christ's body, and that Christ's body is bread, which all Christian ears do abhor to hear. Wherefore in these words must needs be sought out another sense and meaning than the words of themselves do bear.

CHAP. VIII.

Christ called bread his body, and wine his blood.

And although the true sense and understanding of these words be sufficiently declared before, when I spake of Transubstantiation; yet to make the matter so plain that no scruple or doubt shall remain, here is occasion given more fully to treat thereof. In which process shall be shewed, that these sentences of Christ, "This is my body," "This is my blood," be figurative speeches. And although it be manifest enough by the plain words of the Gospel, and proved before in the process of Transubstantiation, that Christ spake of bread when he said, "This is my body;" likewise that it was very wine which he called his blood; yet lest the Papists should say that we suck this out of our own fingers, the same shall be proved, by testimony of all the old authors, to be the true and old faith of the Catholick church. Whereas the school authors and Papists shall not be able to shew so much as one word of any ancient author to the contrary.

First, Irenæus, writing against the Valentinians, in his fourth book[b], saith, "That Christ

[b] Irenæus contra Valen. lib. 4. cap. 32.

confessed bread, which is a creature, to be his body, and the cup to be his blood." And in the same book[c], he writeth thus also: "The bread, wherein the thanks be given, is the body of the Lord." And yet again, in the same book[d], he saith, "That Christ taking bread of the same sort that our bread is of, confessed that it was his body. And that that thing which was tempered in the chalice, was his blood." And in the fifth book[e], he writeth further, "That of the chalice, which is his blood, a man is nourished, and doth grow by the bread, which is his body." These words of Irenæus be most plain, that Christ taking very material bread, a creature of God, and of such sort as other bread is, which we do use, called that his body, when he said, "This is my body." And the wine also, which doth feed and nourish us, he called his blood.

Tertullian likewise, in his book written against the Jews[f], saith, "That Christ called bread his body." And in his book against Marcion, he oftentimes repeateth the self-same words. And St. Cyprian, in the first book of his Epistles[g], saith the same thing, "That Christ called such bread, as is made of many corns joined together, his body: and such wine he named his blood, as is pressed out of many grapes, and made into

[c] Irenæus contra Valen. cap. 34. [d] Cap. 57. [e] Lib. 5.

[f] Tertullianus adversus Judæos.

[g] Cyprianus ad Magnum, lib. 1. epist. 6.

wine." And in his second book[h], he saith these words, "Water is not the blood of Christ, but wine." And again, in the same Epistle, he saith, "That it was wine which Christ called his blood; and that if wine be not in the chalice, then we drink not of the fruit of the vine." And in the same Epistle he saith, "That meal alone, or water alone, is not the body of Christ, except they be both joined together to make thereof bread." Epiphanius also saith[i], "That Christ, speaking of a loaf which is round in fashion, and cannot see, hear, nor feel, said of it, 'This is my body.'" And St. Jerome, writing *Ad Hedibiam*, saith these words[k], "Let us mark, that the bread which the Lord brake and gave to his disciples, was the body of our Saviour Christ, as he said unto them, 'Take and eat, this is my body.'" And St. Augustine also saith[l], "That although we may set forth Christ by mouth, by writing, and by the sacrament of his body and blood, yet we call neither our tongue, nor words, nor ink, letters, nor paper, the body and blood of Christ; but that we call the body and blood of Christ, which is taken of the fruit of the earth, and consecrated by mystical prayer." And also he saith[m], "Jesus called meat his body, and drink, his blood."

[h] Cyprianus ad Magnum, lib. 2. epist. 3.

[i] Epiphan. in Ancorato.

[k] Hieron. ad Hedibiam.

[l] August. de Trinit. lib. 3. cap. 4.

[m] De verbis Apostoli, serm. 2.

Moreover Cyril, upon St. John, saith[n], "That Christ gave to his disciples pieces of bread, saying, 'Take, eat, this is my body.'"

Likewise Theodoretus saith[o], "When Christ gave the holy mysteries, he called bread his body; and the cup mixt with wine and water, he called his blood."

By all these foresaid authors and places, with many more, it is plainly proved, that when our Saviour Christ gave bread unto his disciples, saying, "Take and eat, this is my body;" and likewise when he gave them the cup, saying, "Divide this among you, and drink you all of this, for this is my blood;" he called then the very material bread his body, and the very wine his blood.

That bread (I say) that is one of the creatures here in earth among us, and that groweth out of the earth, and is made of many grains of corn, beaten into flour, and mixt with water, and so baken and made into bread, of such sort as other our bread is, that hath neither sense nor reason, and finally that feedeth and nourisheth our bodies. Such bread Christ called his body, when he said, "This is my body." And such wine as is made of grapes pressed together, and thereof is made drink which nourisheth the body, such

[n] Cyrillus in Joanem. lib. 4. cap. 14.

[o] Theodoretus in Dialogo. 1.

wine he called his blood. This is the true doctrine, confirmed as well by holy Scripture, as by all ancient authors of Christ's church, both Greeks and Latins, that is to say, that when our Saviour Christ gave bread and wine to his disciples, and spake these words, "This is my body," "This is my blood," it was very bread and wine which he called his body and blood.

Now let the Papists shew some authority for their opinion, either of Scripture or of some ancient author. And let them not constrain all men to follow their fond devices, only because they say it is so, without any other ground or authority, but their own bare words. For in such wise credit is to be given to God's word only, and not to the word of any man. As many of them as I have read (the bishop of Winchester only excepted) do say, that Christ called not the bread his body, nor wine his blood, when he said, "This is my body, this is my blood." And yet in expounding these words, they vary among themselves: which is a token that they be uncertain of their own doctrine. For some of them say, that by this pronoun demonstrative, "this," Christ understood not the bread nor wine, but his body and blood. And other some say, that by the pronoun "this," he meant neither the bread nor wine, nor his body nor blood, but that he meant a particular thing uncertain, which they call *individuum vagum*, or

individuum in genere, I trow some mathematical quiddity, they cannot tell what. But let all these Papists together shew any one authority, either of Scripture, or of ancient author, either Greek or Latin, that saith as they say, that Christ called not bread and wine his body and blood, but *individuum vagum;* and for my part I shall give them place, and confess that they say true. And if they can shew nothing for them of antiquity, but only their own bare words, then it is reason that they give place to the truth confirmed by so many authorities, both of Scripture and of ancient writers, which is, that Christ called very material bread his body, and very wine made of grapes his blood.

CHAP. IX.

Bread is my body, wine is my blood, be figurative speeches.

Now this being fully proved, it must needs follow consequently, that this manner of speaking is a figurative speech: for in plain and proper speech it is not true to say that bread is Christ's body, or wine his blood. For Christ's body hath a soul, life, sense, and reason: but bread hath neither soul nor life, sense nor reason. Likewise, in plain speech, it is not true that we eat Christ's body, and drink his blood. For eating and drinking, in their proper and usual signification, is with the tongue, teeth, and lips, to swallow, divide, and chew in pieces: which thing to do to the flesh and blood of Christ, is horrible to be heard of any Christian.

CHAP. X.

To eat Christ's flesh, and drink his blood, be figurative speeches.

So that these speeches, to eat Christ's body, and drink his blood, to call bread his body, or wine his blood, be speeches not taken in the proper signification of every word, but by translation of these words, "eating and drinking," from the signification of a corporeal thing to signify a spiritual thing; and by calling a thing that signifieth by the name of the thing which is signified thereby: which is no rare nor strange thing, but an usual manner and phrase in common speech. And yet lest this fault should be imputed unto us, that we do feign things of our own heads without authority, (as the Papists be accustomed to do,) here shall be cited sufficient authority, as well of Scripture, as of old ancient authors, to approve the same.

First, when our Saviour Christ, in the sixth of John, said, "That he was the bread of life, the which whosoever did eat, should not die, but live for ever; and that the bread which he would give us, was his flesh; and, therefore, whosoever should eat his flesh, and drink his blood, should have everlasting life; and they that should not eat his flesh and drink his blood, should not have everlasting life[p]." When Christ had spoken these words, with many more of the eating of his flesh and drinking of his blood, both the Jews, and many also of his disciples, were

[p] John vi.

offended with his words, and said, "This is an hard saying: for how can he give us his flesh to be eaten?" Christ perceiving their murmuring hearts, (because they knew none other eating of his flesh, but by chewing and swallowing,) to declare that they should not eat his body after that sort, nor that he meant of any such carnal eating, he said thus unto them, "What if you see the Son of man ascend up where he was before? It is the spirit that giveth life, the flesh availeth nothing. The words, which I spake unto you, be spirit and life." These words our Saviour Christ spake, to lift up their minds from earth to heaven, and from carnal to spiritual eating, that they should not fancy that they should with their teeth eat him presently here in earth, for his flesh so eaten (saith he) should nothing profit them. And yet so they should not eat him, for he would take his body away from them, and ascend with it into heaven: and there by faith, and not with teeth, they should spiritually eat him, sitting at the right hand of his Father. "And therefore," saith he, "the words which I do speak, be spirit and life:" that is to say, are not to be understood that we shall eat Christ with our teeth grossly and carnally, but that we shall spiritually and ghostly with our faith eat him, being carnally absent from us in heaven, in such wise as Abraham and other holy fathers did eat him, many years be-

fore he was incarnated and born. As St. Paul saith, "That they did eat the same spiritual meat that we do, and drank the same spiritual drink, that is to say, Christ[q]." For they spiritually by their faith were fed and nourished with Christ's body and blood, and had eternal life by him, before he was born, as we have now, that come after his ascension. Thus have you heard, by the declaration of Christ himself, and of St. Paul, that the eating and drinking of Christ's flesh and blood is not taken in the common signification, with mouth and teeth to eat and chew a thing being present, but by a lively faith in heart and mind to chew and digest a thing being absent, either ascended hence into heaven, or else not yet born upon earth.

And Origen[r] declaring the said eating of Christ's flesh and drinking of his blood, not to be understood as the words do sound, but figuratively, writeth thus upon these words of Christ: "Except you eat my flesh and drink my blood, you shall not have life in you." "Consider," saith Origen, "that these things, written in God's books, are figures; and therefore examine and understand them as spiritual and not as carnal men. For if you understand them as carnal men, they hurt you and feed you not. For even in the Gospels is there found let-

[q] 1 Cor. x. [r] Origen. in Levit. Hom. 7.

ter that killeth; and not only in the Old Testament, but also in the New, is there found letter that slayeth him that doth not spiritually understand that which is spoken. For if thou follow the letter or words of this that Christ said, 'Except you eat my flesh and drink my blood,' this letter killeth." Who can more plainly express in any words, that the eating and drinking of Christ's flesh and blood are not to be taken in common signification, as the words pretend and sound, than Origen doth in this place? And St. John Chrysostome affirmeth the same [s], saying, "That if any man understand the words of Christ carnally, he shall surely profit nothing thereby. For what mean these words, 'The flesh availeth nothing?' He meant not of his flesh, (God forbid,) but he meant of them that fleshly and carnally understood those things that Christ spake. But what is carnal understanding? To understand the words simply as they be spoken, and nothing else. For we ought not so to understand the things which we see, but all mysteries must be considered with inward eyes, and that is, spiritually to understand them." In these words St. John Chrysostome sheweth plainly, that the words of Christ, concerning the eating of his flesh and drinking of his blood, are not to be understood simply, as

[s] Chrysost. in Joannem. Hom. 26.

they be spoken, but spiritually and figuratively. And yet most plainly of all other, St. Augustine doth declare this matter in his book *De Doctrina Christiana*[1], in which book he instructeth Christian people, how they should understand those places of Scripture, which seem hard and obscure. "Seldom," saith he, "is any difficulty in proper words, but either the circumstance of the place, or the conferring of divers translations, or else the original tongue wherein it was written, will make the sense plain. But in words that be altered from their proper signification, there is great diligence and heed to be taken. And specially we must beware, that we take not literally any thing that is spoken figuratively. Nor, contrariwise, we must not take for a figure any thing that is spoken properly. Therefore must be declared," saith St. Augustine, "the manner how to discern a proper speech from a figurative; wherein," saith he, "must be observed this rule, that if the thing which is spoken be to the furtherance of charity, then it is a proper speech, and no figure. So that if it be a commandment that forbiddeth any evil or wicked act, or commandeth any good or beneficial thing, then it is no figure. But if it command any ill or wicked thing, or forbid any thing that is good and beneficial, then it is a figurative

[1] Augustinus De Doctrina Christ. lib. 3.

speech. Now this saying of Christ, 'Except you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you shall have no life in you,' seemeth to command an heinous and a wicked thing; therefore it is a figure, commanding us to be partakers of Christ's passion, keeping in our minds, to our great comfort and profit, that his flesh was crucified and wounded for us." This is briefly the sentence of St. Augustine, in his book *De Doctrina Christiana.* And the like he writeth in his book *De Catechisandis Rudibus* [u], and in his book *Contra Adversarium Legis et Prophetarum* [x], and in divers other places, which for tediousness I pass over. For if I should rehearse all the authorities of St. Augustine and others which make mention of this matter, it would weary the reader too much. Wherefore to all them that by any reasonable means will be satisfied, these things before rehearsed are sufficient to prove that the eating of Christ's flesh and drinking of his blood, is not to be understood simply and plainly, (as the words do properly signify,) that we do eat and drink him with our mouths; but it is a figurative speech spiritually to be understood, that we must deeply print and fruitfully believe in our hearts, that his flesh was crucified, and his blood shed, for our redemption. And this our belief in him, is to

[u] De Catech. rudib. cap. 26.

[x] Contra advers. Legis et Prophet. cap. 9.

eat his flesh and to drink his blood, although they be not present here with us, but be ascended into heaven. As our forefathers, before Christ's time, did likewise eat his flesh and drink his blood, which was so far from them, that he was not yet then born.

CHAP. XI.

"This is my body, this is my blood," be figurative speeches.

The same authors do say also, that when Christ called the bread his body, and the wine his blood, it was no proper speech that he then used; but as all sacraments be figures of other things, and yet have the very names of the things which they do signify: so Christ, instituting the sacrament of his most precious body and blood, did use figurative speeches, calling the bread by the name of his body, because it signifieth his body; and the wine he called his blood, because it represented his blood.

The bread representeth Christ's body, and the wine his blood.

Tertullian[y], herein writing against Marcion, saith these words: "Christ did not reprove bread, whereby he did represent his very body." And in the same book he saith, "That Jesus taking bread, and distributing it amongst his disciples, made it his body, saying, 'This is my body;' that is to say, (saith Tertullian,) a figure of my body. And therefore, (saith Tertullian,) that Christ called bread his body, and wine his blood, because that, in the Old Testament, bread and wine were figures of his body and blood."

[y] Tertullianus contra Marcionem, lib. 1.

And St. Cyprian, the holy martyr[z], saith of this matter, "That Christ's blood is shewed in the wine, and the people in the water, that is mixt with the wine: so that the mixture of the water to the wine, signifieth the spiritual commixtion and joining of us unto Christ." By which similitude Cyprian meant not that the blood of Christ is wine, or the people water; but as the water doth signify and represent the people, so doth the wine signify and represent Christ's blood: and the uniting of the water and wine together, signifieth the uniting of Christian people unto Christ himself. And the same St. Cyprian, in another place[a], writing hereof, saith, "That Christ, in his last supper, gave to his apostles with his own hands bread and wine, which he called his flesh and blood; but in the cross he gave his very body to be wounded with the hands of the soldiers, that the apostles might declare to the world how and in what manner bread and wine may be the flesh of Christ. And the manner he straightways declareth thus: that things which do signify, and those things which be signified by them, may be both called by one name." Here it is certain by St. Cyprian's mind, wherefore and in what wise bread is called Christ's flesh, and wine his blood; that is to say, because that every thing that representeth and

[z] Cyprianus, lib. 2. epist. 3. [a] De unctione Chrismatis.

signifieth another thing, may be called by name of the thing which it signifieth.

And therefore St. John Chrysostome saith [b], "That Christ ordained the table of his holy supper for this purpose, that in that sacrament he should daily shew unto us bread and wine for a similitude of his body and blood."

St. Jerome likewise saith [c], upon the Gospel of Matthew, "That Christ took bread, which comforteth man's heart, that he might represent thereby his very body and blood."

Also St. Ambrose [d] (if the book be his that is entitled *De hiis qui misteriis initiantur,)* saith, "That before the consecration another kind is named; but after the consecration the body of Christ is signified. Christ said his blood; before the consecration, it is called another thing; but, after the consecration, is signified the blood of Christ. And in his book *De Sacramentis* [e], (if that be also his,) he writeth thus: "Thou dost receive the sacrament for a similitude of the flesh and blood of Christ; but thou dost obtain the grace and virtue of his true nature; and, receiving the bread in that food, thou art partaker of his godly substance." And in the same book [f], he saith, "As thou hast in baptism received the similitude of death, so likewise dost thou in this

[b] Chrysost. in Psal. xxii. [c] Hieronym. in Matt. xxvi.
[d] Ambros. de hiis qui mysteriis initiantur. cap. ult.
[e] De sacramentis, lib. 6. cap. 10. [f] Lib. 4. cap. 4.

sacrament drink the similitude of Christ's precious blood." And again he saith, in the said book[g], "The priest saith, make unto us this oblation to be acceptable, which is the figure of the body and blood of our Lord Jesu Christ." And upon the Epistle of St. Paul to the Corinthians[h], he saith, "That in eating and drinking the bread and wine, we do signify the flesh and blood, which were offered for us. And the Old Testament," saith he, "was instituted in blood, because that blood was a witness of God's benefit; in signification and figure whereof, we take the mystical cup of his blood, to the tuition of our body and soul." Of these places of St. Chrysostome, St. Jerome, and St. Ambrose, it is clear, that in the sacramental bread and wine, is not really and corporally the very natural substance of the flesh and blood of Christ, but that the bread and wine be similitudes, mysteries, and representations, significations, sacraments, figures and signs of his body and blood; and therefore be called and have the name of his very flesh and blood.

Signs and figures have the names of the things which they signify.

And yet St. Augustine sheweth this matter more clearly and fully than any of the rest, specially in an Epistle which he wrote *Ad Bonifacium*[i], where he saith, "That a day or two before

[g] De sacramentis, lib. 4. cap. 5.

[h] 1 Cor. xi.

[i] August. ad Bonifacium, Epist. 23.

Good Friday, we used in common speech to say thus: to-morrow, or this day two days, Christ suffered his passion, where in very deed he never suffered his passion but once, and that was many years passed. Likewise upon Easter-day we say, this day Christ rose from death, where in very deed it is many hundred years since he rose from death. Why then do not men reprove us as liars, when we speak in this sort? But because we call these days so, by a similitude of these days, wherein these things were done in deed. And so it is called that day, which is not that day in deed, but by the course of the year is a like day, and such things be said to be done that day for the solemn celebration of the sacrament, which things in deed were not done that day, but long before. Was Christ offered any more but once? And he offered himself, and yet in a sacrament or representation, not only every solemn feast of Easter, but every day he is offered to the people; so that he doth not lie that saith, he is every day offered. For if sacraments had not some similitude or likeness of those things, whereof they be sacraments, they could in no wise be sacraments. And for their similitude and likeness, commonly they have the name of the things, whereof they be sacraments. Therefore, as after a certain manner of speech, the sacrament of Christ's body, is Christ's body; the sacrament of Christ's blood, is Christ's blood:

so likewise the sacrament of faith, is faith. And to believe, is nothing else but to have faith: and therefore, when we answer for young children in their baptism, that they believe, which have not yet the mind to believe, we answer that they have faith, because they have the sacrament of faith. And we say also, that they turn unto God, because of the sacrament of the conversion unto God; for that answer pertaineth to the celebration of the sacrament. And likewise speaketh the apostle of baptism, saying, 'That by baptism we be buried with him into death:' he saith not, that we signify burial; but he saith plainly, that we be buried.' So that the sacrament of so great a thing is not called but by the name of the thing itself."

Hitherto I have rehearsed the answer of St. Augustine unto Boniface, a learned bishop, who asked of him, how the parents and friends could answer for a young babe in baptism, and say in his person, that he believeth and converteth unto God, when the child can neither do nor think any such thing. Whereunto the answer of St. Augustine is this: that forasmuch as baptism is the sacrament of the profession of our faith, and of our conversion unto God, it becometh us so to answer for young children coming thereunto, as to that sacrament appertaineth, although the children indeed have no knowledge of such things. And yet in our said answers we ought

not to be reprehended as vain men or liars; forasmuch as in common speech we use daily to call sacraments and figures by the names of the things that be signified by them, although they be not the same thing indeed. As every Good Friday, (as often as it returneth from year to year,) we call it the day of Christ's passion; and every Easter-day we call the day of his resurrection; and every day in the year we say that Christ is offered, and the sacrament of his body, we call it his body, and the sacrament of his blood, we call it his blood; and our baptism St. Paul calleth our burial with Christ. And yet in very deed Christ never suffered but once, never arose but once, never was offered but once; nor in very deed in baptism we be not buried, nor the sacrament of Christ's body is not his body, nor the sacrament of his blood is not his blood. But so they be called, because they be figures, sacraments, and representations of the things themselves which they signify, and whereof they bear the name. Thus doth St. Augustine most plainly open this matter in his Epistle to Bonifacius. Of this manner of speech, (wherein a sign is called by the name of the thing which it signifieth,) speaketh St. Augustine also right largely in his questions *Super Leviticum et contra Adamantium*[k], declaring how blood in Scripture

[k] Super Lev. quest. 57.

is called the soul. "A thing which signifieth," saith he, "is wont to be called by the name of the thing which it signifieth, as it is written in the Scripture. The seven ears be seven years; the Scripture saith not signifieth seven years; and seven kine be seven years, and many other like. And so said Paul, that 'the stone was Christ,' and not that it signified Christ; but even as it had been he in deed, which nevertheless was not Christ by substance, but by signification. Even so," saith St. Augustine, "because the blood signifieth and representeth the soul, therefore in a sacrament or signification it is called the soul." And *Contra Adamantium*[1], he writeth much like, saying, "In such wise is blood the soul, as the stone was Christ; and yet the apostle saith not, that the stone signified Christ, but saith it was Christ. And this sentence, 'blood is the soul,' may be understood to be spoken in a sign or figure. For Christ did not stick to say, 'This is my body,' when he gave the sign of his body." Here St. Augustine rehearsing divers sentences which were spoken figuratively, that is to say, when one thing was called by the name of another, and yet was not the other in substance, but in signification; as that blood is the soul, seven kine be seven years, seven ears be seven years, the stone was Christ;

[1] Contra Adamantium, cap. 12.

among such manner of speeches, he rehearsed those words which Christ spake at his last supper, "This is my body," which declareth plainly St. Augustine's mind that Christ spake those words figuratively, not meaning that the bread was his body by substance, but by signification. And therefore St. Augustine saith, *Contra Maximinum*[m], "That in sacraments we must not consider what they be, but what they signify. For they be signs of things, being one thing, and signifying another." Which he doth shew specially of this sacrament, saying, "The heavenly bread, which is Christ's flesh, by some manner of speech is called Christ's body, when in very deed it is the sacrament of his body. And that offering of the flesh, which is done by the priest's hands, is called Christ's passion, death, and crucifying, not in very deed, but in a mystical signification[n]."

And to this purpose it is both pleasant, comfortable, and profitable, to read Theodoretus, in his Dialogues[o], where he disputeth and sheweth at length, how the names of things be changed in Scripture, and yet the things remain still. And for example, he proveth, that the flesh of Christ is in the Scripture sometimes called a veil of covering, sometimes a cloth, sometimes a

[m] Contra Maximinum, lib. 3. cap. 22.

[n] In lib. sententiarum Prosperi de consecr. diss. 2 Hoc est.

[o] Theodoret. in dialogis.

vestment, and sometimes a stole: and the blood of the grape is called Christ's blood, and the names of bread and wine, and of his flesh and blood, Christ doth so change, that sometimes he calleth his body, corn or bread; and sometimes contrary, he calleth bread, his body. And likewise his blood sometime he calleth wine, and sometimes, contrary, he calleth wine his blood. For the more plain understanding whereof, it shall not be amiss to recite his own sayings in his foresaid Dialogues, touching this matter of the holy sacrament of Christ's flesh and blood. The speakers in these Dialogues be *Orthodoxus* the right believer, and *Eranistes* his companion, but not understanding the right faith.

In the first Dialogue.

Orthodoxus saith to his companion, "Dost thou not know that God calleth bread his flesh?

Eranistes. "I know that.

Orthodoxus. "And in another place he calleth his body corn?

Eran. "I know that also; for I have heard him say, 'The hour is come that the Son of man shall be glorified[p];' and except the grain-corn that falleth in the ground, die, it remaineth sole; but if it die, then it bringeth forth much fruit.

Orth. "When he gave the mysteries or sacraments, he called bread his body; and that which was mixt in the cup, he called blood.

[p] John xii.

Eran. " So he called them.

Orth. " But that also which was his natural body, may well be called his body; and his very blood also, may be called his blood.

Eran. " It is plain.

Orth. " But our Saviour without doubt changed the names, and gave to the body the name of the sign or token, and to the token he gave the name of the body. And so when he called himself a vine, he called blood that, which was the token of blood.

Eran. " Surely thou hast spoken the truth; but I would know the cause wherefore the names were changed.

Orth. " The cause is manifest to them that be expert in true religion. For he would that they which be partakers of the godly sacraments, should not set their minds upon the nature of the things which they see, but, by the changing of the names, should believe the things which be wrought in them by grace. For he that called that which is his natural body, corn and bread, and also called himself a vine, he did honour the visible tokens and signs with the names of his body and blood, not changing the nature, but adding grace to nature.

Eran. " Sacraments be spoken of sacramentally, and also by them be manifestly declared things which all men know not.

Orth. " Seeing then that it is certain that the

patriarch called the Lord's body 'a vestment and apparel [q],' and that now we be entered to speak of godly sacraments, tell me truly of what thing thinkest thou this holy meat to be a token and figure? Of Christ's divinity, or of his body and blood?

Eran. "It is clear that it is the figure of those things, whereof it beareth the name.

Orth. "Meanest thou of his body and blood?

Eran. "Even so I mean.

Orth. "Thou hast spoken as one that loveth the truth; for the Lord, when he took the token or sign, he said not, 'This is my divinity,' but 'This is my body,' and 'This is my blood.' And in another place, 'The bread which I will give, is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world [r].'

Eran. "The things be true, for they be God's words."

All this writeth Theodoretus in his first Dialogue.

And in the second he writeth the same in effect, (and yet in some things more plainly,) against such hereticks as affirmed, that after Christ's resurrection and ascension his humanity was changed from the very nature of a man, and turned into his divinity. Against whom thus he writeth. Dialogue 2.

[q] Gen. xlix. [r] John vi.

Orth. "Corruption, health, sickness, and death, be accidents; for they go and come.

Eran. "It is meet they be so called.

Orth. "Men's bodies after their resurrection be delivered from corruption, death, and mortality, and yet they lose not their proper nature.

Eran. "Truth it is.

Orth. "The body of Christ therefore did rise quite clean from all corruption and death, and is impassible, immortal, glorified with the glory of God, and is honoured of the powers of heaven; and yet it is a body, and hath the same bigness that it had before.

Eran. "Thy sayings seem true, and according to reason; but after he was ascended up into heaven, I think thou wilt not say, that his body was not turned into the nature of the Godhead.

Orth. "I would not so say for the persuasion of man's reason; nor am I so arrogant and presumptuous to affirm any thing which Scripture passeth over in silence; but I have heard St. Paul cry, 'That God hath ordained a day, when he will judge all the world in justice by that man which he appointed before, performing his promise to all men, and raising him from death[s].' I have learned also of the holy angels, 'That he will come after that fashion, as his disciples saw him go to heaven[t].' But they saw a nature of a

[s] Acts xvii. [t] Acts i.

certain bigness, not a nature which had no bigness. I heard furthermore the Lord say, 'You shall see the Son of man come in the clouds of heaven[u].' And I know that every thing that men see, hath a certain bigness. For that nature that hath no bigness, cannot be seen. Moreover to set in the throne of glory, and to set the lambs upon his right hand, and the goats upon his left hand, signifieth a thing that hath quantity and bigness."

Hitherto I have rehearsed Theodoretus's words, and shortly after *Eranistes* saith:

Eran. "We must turn every stone, (as the proverb saith,) to seek out the truth, but specially when godly matters be propounded.

Orth. "Tell me then the sacramental signs, which be offered to God by his priests, whereof be they signs which be offered to God by his priest; whereof be they signs, sayest thou?

Eran. "Of the Lord's body and blood.

Orth. "Of a very body, or not of a very body?

Eran. "Of a very body.

Orth. "Very well, for an image must be made after a true pattern; for painters follow nature, and paint the images of such things as we see with our eyes.

Eran. "Truth it is.

Orth. "If therefore the godly sacraments re-

[u] Matt. xxiv.

present a true body, then is the Lord's body yet still a body, not converted into the nature of his Godhead, but replenished with God's glory.

Eran. "It cometh in good time that thou makest mention of God's sacraments; for by the same I shall prove, that Christ's body is turned into another nature. Answer, therefore, unto my questions.

Orth. "I shall answer.

Eran. "What callest thou that which is offered before the invocation of the priest?

Orth. "We must not speak plainly, for it is like that some be present, which have not professed Christ.

Eran. "Answer covertly.

Orth. "It is a nourishment made of seeds that be like.

Eran. "Then how call we the other sign?

Orth. "It is also a common name, that signifieth a kind of drink.

Eran. "But how dost thou call them after the sanctification?

Orth. "The body of Christ, and the blood of Christ.

Eran. "And dost thou believe that thou art made partaker of Christ's body and blood?

Orth. "I believe so.

Eran. "Therefore as the tokens of God's body and blood be other things before the priest's invocation, but after the invocation they be chang-

ed, and be other things: so also the body of Christ, after his assumption, is changed into his divine substance.

Orth. "Thou art taken with thine own net. For the sacramental signs go not from their own nature after the sanctification, but continue in their former substance, form, and figure, and may be seen and touched as well as before; yet in our minds we do consider what they be made, and do repute and esteem them, and have them in reverence, according to the same things that they be taken for. Therefore compare the images to the pattern, and thou shalt see them like. For a figure must be like to the thing itself. For Christ's body hath his former fashion, figure, and bigness; and, to speak at one word, the same substance of his body. But after his resurrection, it was made immortal, and of such power, that no corruption nor death could come unto it; and it was exalted to that dignity, that it was set at the right hand of the Father, and honoured of all creatures, as the body of him that is the Lord of nature.

Eran. "But the sacramental token changeth his former name; for it is no more called as it was before, but is called Christ's body. Therefore must his body, after his ascension, be called God, and not a body.

Orth. "Thou seemest to me ignorant; for it is not called his body only, but also the bread of

life, as the Lord called it. So the body of Christ we call a godly body, a body that giveth life, God's body, the Lord's body, our Master's body, meaning that it is not a common body, as other men's bodies be, but that it is the body of our Lord Jesu Christ, both God and man."

This have I rehearsed of the great clerk and holy bishop Theodoretus, whom some of the Papists perceiving to make so plainly against them have defamed, saying that he was infected with the error of Nestorius. Here the Papists shew their old accustomed nature and condition, which is, (even in a manifest manner,) rather to lie without shame, than to give place unto the truth, and confess their own error. And although his adversaries falsely bruited such a fame against him when he was yet alive, nevertheless he was purged thereof by the holy council of Calcedon, about eleven hundred years ago. And furthermore, in his book which he wrote against heresies, he specially condemneth Nestorius by name. And also all his three books of his Dialogues, before rehearsed, he wrote chiefly against Nestorius, and was never herein noted of error this thousand year, but hath ever been reputed and taken for an holy bishop, a great learned man, and a grave author, until now at this present time, when the Papists have nothing to answer unto him, they begin in excusing of themselves, to defame him.

Thus much have I spoken for Theodoretus, which I pray thee be not weary to read, good reader, but often and with delectation, deliberation, and good advertisement to read. For it containeth plainly and briefly the true instruction of a Christian man, concerning the matter which in this book we treat upon.

Five principal things to be noted in Theodoretus.

First, that our Saviour Christ in his last supper, when he gave bread and wine to his apostles, saying, "This is my body, this is my blood," it was bread which he called his body, and wine mixed in the cup, which he called his blood: so that he changed the names of the bread and wine, which were the mysteries, sacraments, signs, figures, and tokens of Christ's flesh and blood, and called them by the names of the things which they did represent and signify, that is to say, the bread he called by the name of his very flesh, and the wine by the name of his blood.

Second, that although the names of bread and wine were changed after sanctification, yet nevertheless the things themselves remained the self-same that they were before the sanctification, that is to say, the same bread and wine in nature, substance, form, and fashion.

The third, seeing that the substance of the bread and wine be not changed, why be then their names changed, and the bread called Christ's flesh, and the wine his blood? Theodoretus sheweth, that the cause thereof was this, that we should not have

so much respect to the bread and wine, which we see with our eyes and taste with our mouths, as we should have to Christ himself, in whom we believe with our hearts, and feel and taste him by our faith, and with whose flesh and blood, by his grace, we believe that we be spiritually fed and nourished. These things we ought to remember and revolve in our minds, and to lift up our hearts from the bread and wine unto Christ that sitteth above. And because we should so do, therefore after the consecration, they be no more called bread and wine, but the body and blood of Christ.

The fourth. It is in these sacraments of bread and wine, as it is in the very body of Christ. For as the body of Christ before his resurrection, and after, is all one in nature, substance, bigness, form, and fashion, and yet it is not called as another common body, but with addition, for the dignity of his exaltation, it is called a heavenly, a godly, an immortal, and the Lord's body: so likewise the bread and wine, before the consecration and after, is all one in nature, substance, bigness, form, and fashion, and yet it is not called as other common bread, but for the dignity whereunto it is taken, it is called with addition, heavenly bread, the bread of life, and the bread of thanksgiving.

The fifth, that no man ought to be so arrogant and presumptuous to affirm for a certain truth in

religion, any thing which is not spoken of in holy Scripture. And this is spoken to the great and utter condemnation of the Papists, which make and unmake new articles of our faith from time to time, at their pleasure, without any Scripture at all, yea quite and clean contrary to Scripture. And yet will they have all men bound to believe whatsoever they invent, upon peril of damnation and everlasting fire. And they would constrain with fire and faggot all men to consent, contrary to the manifest words of God, to these their errors in this matter of the holy sacrament of Christ's body and blood. First, that there remaineth no bread nor wine after the consecration, but that Christ's flesh and blood is made of them. Second, that Christ's body is really, corporally, substantially, sensibly, and naturally in the bread and wine. Thirdly, that wicked persons do eat and drink Christ's very body and blood. Fourthly, that priests offer Christ every day, and make of him a new sacrifice propitiatory for sin.

Thus, for shortness of time, do I make an end of Theodoretus, with other old ancient writers, which do most clearly affirm, that to eat Christ's body, and to drink his blood, be figurative speeches. And so be these sentences likewise, which Christ spake at his supper, "This is my body, this is my blood."

CHAP. XII.

Figurative speeches be not strange.

And marvel not, good reader, that Christ at that time spake in figures, when he did institute that sacrament, seeing that it is the nature of all sacraments to be figures. And although the Scripture be full of schemes, tropes, and figures, yet specially it useth them when it speaketh of sacraments.

"When the ark," (which represented God's majesty,) "was come into the army of the Israelites, the Philistines said that God was come into the army [x]." And God himself said, by his prophet Nathan, "That from the time that he had brought the children of Israel out of Egypt, he dwelled not in houses, but that he was carried about in tents and tabernacles [y]." And yet was not God himself so carried about, or went in tents or tabernacles, but because the ark, which was a figure of God, was so removed from place to place, he spake of himself that thing, which was to be understood of the ark.

Christ himself used figurative speeches.

And Christ himself oftentimes spake in similitudes, parables, and figures, as when he said, "The field is the world, the enemy is the devil, the seed is the word of God [z]."—"John is Elias, I am a vine, and you be the branches [a]."—"I am bread of life [b]."—"My father is an husbandman, and he hath his fan in his hand, and will make

[x] 1 Sam. iv. [y] 2 Sam. vii. [z] Matt. xiii.
[a] Matt. xi. and xvii. [b] John xvi.

clean his floor, and gather the wheat into his barn; but the chaff he will cast into everlasting fire[c]."—"I have a meat to eat, which you know not[d]."—"Work not meat that perisheth, but that endureth unto everlasting life[e]."—"I am a good shepherd[f]."—"The Son of man will set the sheep at his right hand, and the goats at his left hand[g]."—"I am a door[h]."—One of you is the devil[i]." "Whosoever doeth my Father's will, he is my brother, sister, and mother[k]." And when he said to his mother and to John, "This is thy son, this is thy mother[l]."

These, with an infinite number of like sentences, Christ spake in parables, metaphors, tropes, and figures. But chiefly when he spake of the sacraments, he used figurative speeches. As when of baptism he said, "That we must be baptized with the Holy Ghost[m]:" meaning of spiritual baptism. And like speech used St. John the Baptist, saying of Christ, "That he should baptize with the Holy Ghost and fire[n]." And Christ said, "That we must be born again, or else we cannot see the kingdom of God[o]." And said also, "Whosoever shall drink of that water which I shall give him, he shall never be dry again. But the water which I shall give

[c] John vi. [d] John xv. Matt. iii. [e] John iv.
[f] John vi. [g] John x. [h] Matt. xxv. [i] John x.
[k] John vi. [l] Matt. xii. [m] Acts i. [n] Matt. iii.
[o] John iii.

him, shall be made within him a well, which shall spring into everlasting life[q]." And St. Paul saith, "That in baptism we clothe us with Christ, and be buried with him[r]."

This baptism, washing, and new birth by the fire and the Holy Ghost, and this water that springeth in a man, and floweth into everlasting life, cannot be understood of any material water, material washing, and material birth, but by translation of things visible into things invisible, they must be understood spiritually and figuratively.

After the same sort the mystery of our redemption, and the passion of our Saviour Christ upon the cross, as well in the New as the Old Testament, is expressed and declared by many figures and figurative speeches. As the pure paschal Lamb without spot, signified Christ. The effusion of the Lamb's blood, signified the effusion of Christ's blood. And the salvation of the children of Israel from temporal death by the Lamb's blood, signified our salvation from eternal death by Christ's blood. And as Almighty God, passing through Egypt, killed all the Egyptians' heirs in every house, and left not one alive; and nevertheless he passed by the children of Israel's houses, where he saw the Lamb's blood upon the doors, and hurted none of them,

The paschal Lamb.

[q] John iv. [r] Rom. vi. Galat. iii.

but saved them all by the means of the Lamb's blood: so likewise at the last judgment of the whole world, none shall be passed over and saved, but that shall be found marked with the blood of the most pure and immaculate Lamb Jesus Christ. And forasmuch as the shedding of that Lamb's blood, was a token and figure of the shedding of Christ's blood then to come; and forasmuch also as all the sacraments and figures of the Old Testament ceased and had an end in Christ: lest by our great unkindness we should peradventure be forgetful of the great benefit of Christ, therefore at his last supper, (when he took his leave of his apostles to depart out of the world,) he did make a new will and testament, wherein he bequeathed unto us clean remission of all our sins, and the everlasting inheritance of heaven. And the same he confirmed the next day with his own blood and death. And lest we should forget the same, he ordained not a yearly memory, (as the paschal Lamb was eaten but once every year,) but a daily remembrance he ordained thereof in bread and wine, sanctified and dedicated to that purpose, saying, "This is my body; this cup is my blood, which is shed for the remission of sins. Do this in the remembrance of me." Admonishing us by these words, spoken at the making of his last will and testament, and at his departing out of the world, (because they should be the better remember-

The Lord's Supper.

ed,) that whensoever we do eat the bread in his holy supper, and drink of that cup, we should remember how much Christ hath done for us, and how he died for our sakes. Therefore, saith St. Paul, "As often as ye shall eat of this bread and drink the cup, you shall shew forth the Lord's death until he come." And forasmuch as this holy bread broken, and the wine divided, do represent unto us the death of Christ now passed, as the killing of the paschal Lamb did represent the same yet to come: therefore our Saviour Christ used the same manner of speech of the bread and wine, as God before used of the paschal Lamb. For as in the Old Testament God said, "This is the Lord's pass-by, or passover:" even so saith Christ in the New Testament, "This is my body, this is my blood." But in the old mystery and sacrament, the Lamb was not the Lord's very passover or passing-by, but it was a figure which represented his passing by. So likewise in the New Testament, the bread and wine be not Christ's very body and blood, but they be figures, which by Christ's institution be, unto the godly receivers thereof, sacraments, tokens, significations, and representations of his very flesh and blood: instructing their faith, that as the bread and wine feed them corporally, and continue this temporal life; so the very flesh and blood of Christ feedeth them spiritually, and giveth them everlasting life.

What figurative speeches were used at Christ's last supper.

And why should any man think it strange to admit a figure in these speeches, "This is my body, this is my blood?" seeing that the communication the same night (by the Papists' own confessions) was so full of figurative speeches? For the apostles spake figuratively when they asked Christ where he would eat his passover or pass-by. And Christ himself used the same figure when he said, "I have much desired to eat this passover with you." Also to eat Christ's body and to drink his blood, I am sure they will not say that it is taken properly, to eat and drink as we do eat other meats and drinks. And when Christ said, "This cup is a new testament in my blood;" here, in one sentence, be two figures, one in this word "cup," which is not taken for the cup itself, but for the thing contained in the cup: another is in this word "testament;" for neither the cup, nor the wine contained in the cup, is Christ's testament, but is a token, sign, and figure, whereby is represented unto us his testament, confirmed by his blood.

And if the Papists will say, (as they say indeed,) that by this cup is neither meant the cup nor the wine contained in the cup, but that thereby is meant Christ's blood contained in the cup: yet must they needs grant that there is a figure. For Christ's blood is not in proper speech the new testament, but it is the thing that confirmed the new testament. And yet by this strange in-

terpretation the Papists make a very strange speech, more strange than any figurative speech is. For this they make the sentence: this blood is a new testament in my blood. Which saying is so fond, and so far from all reason, that the foolishness thereof is evident to every man.

CHAP. XIII.

Answer to the authorities and arguments of the Papists.

Now forasmuch as it is plainly declared and manifestly proved, that Christ called bread his body, and wine his blood, and that these sentences be figurative speeches; and that Christ, as concerning his humanity and bodily presence, is ascended into heaven with his whole flesh and blood, and is not here upon earth; and that the substance of bread and wine do remain still, and be received in the sacrament; and that although they remain, yet they have changed their names, so that the bread is called Christ's body, and the wine his blood; and that the cause why their names be changed, is this, that we should lift up our hearts and minds from the things which we see unto the things which we believe, and be above in heaven, whereof the bread and wine have the names, although they be not the very same things in deed. These things well considered and weighed, all the authorities and arguments, which the Papists feign to serve for their purpose, be clean wiped away.

CHAP. XIV.

One brief answer to all.

For whether the authors (which they allege) say that we do eat Christ's flesh, and drink his blood, or that the bread and wine is converted

into the substance of his flesh and blood, or that we be turned into his flesh, or that in the Lord's Supper we do receive his very flesh and blood; or that in the bread and wine is received that which did hang upon the cross, or that Christ hath left his flesh with us, or that Christ is in us, and we in him; or that he is whole here and whole in heaven; or that the same thing is in the chalice which flowed out of his side, or that the same thing is received with our mouth which is believed with our faith; or that the bread and wine, after the consecration, be the body and blood of Christ; or that we be nourished with the body and blood of Christ; or that Christ is both gone hence and is still here; or that Christ at his last supper bare himself in his own hands: —These and all other like sentences may not be understood of Christ's humanity literally and carnally, as the words in common speech do properly signify: for so doth no man eat Christ's flesh, nor drink his blood; nor so is not the bread and wine turned into his flesh and blood, nor we into him; nor so is the bread and wine after the consecration his flesh and blood; nor so is not his flesh and blood whole here in earth, eaten with our mouths; nor so did not Christ take himself in his own hands: But these and all other like sentences, which declare Christ to be here in earth, and to be eaten and drunken of Christian people, are to be understood either of his divine

nature, whereby he is every where, or else they must be understood figuratively or spiritually. For figuratively he is in the bread and wine, and spiritually he is in them that worthily eat and drink the bread and wine; but really, carnally, and corporally, he is only in heaven, from whence he shall come to judge the quick and dead.

This brief answer will suffice for all that the Papists can bring for their purpose, if it be aptly applied. And for the more evidence hereof, I shall apply the same to some such places as the Papists think do make most for them: that, by the answer to those places, the rest may be the more easily answered unto.

CHAP. XV.

The answer to Clemens, Epistola 2.

They allege St. Clement, whose words be these, as they report. "The sacraments of God's secrets are committed to three degrees, to a priest, a deacon, and a minister; which with fear and trembling ought to keep the leavings of the broken pieces of the Lord's body, that no corruption be found in the holy place, lest by negligence great injury be done to the portion of the Lord's body." And by and by followeth: "So many hosts must be offered in the altar, as will suffice for the people: and if any remain, they must not be kept until the morning, but be spent and consumed of the clerks with fear and trembling. And they that consume the residue of the Lord's body, may not by and by take other common meats, lest they should mix that

holy portion with the meat which is digested by the belly, and voided by the fundament. Therefore if the Lord's portion be eaten in the morning, the ministers that consume it must fast unto six of the clock; and if they do take it at three or four of the clock, the minister must fast until the evening." Thus much writeth Clement of this matter, if the epistle which they allege were Clement's, as indeed it is not. But they have feigned many things in other men's names, thereby to establish their feigned purposes. But whose soever the epistle was, if it be thoroughly considered, it maketh much more against the Papists, than for their purpose. For by the same epistle appeareth evidently three special things against the errors of the Papists.

The first is, that the bread in the sacrament is called the Lord's body, and the pieces of the broken bread be called the pieces and fragments of the Lord's body, which cannot be understood but figuratively. The second is, that the bread ought not to be reserved and hanged up, as the Papists every where do use. The third is, that the priests ought not to receive the sacrament alone, (as the Papists commonly do, making a sale thereof unto the people,) but they ought to communicate with the people. And here it is diligently to be noted, that we ought not unreverently and unadvisedly to approach unto the meat of the Lord's table, as we do to other com-

mon meats and drinks, but with great fear and dread; lest we should come to that holy table unworthily, wherein is not only represented, but also spiritually given unto us, very Christ himself. And therefore we ought to come to that board of the Lord with all reverence, faith, love and charity, fear and dread, according to the same.

Here I pass over Ignatius[s] and Irenæus[t], which make nothing for the Papists' opinions, but stand in the commendation of the holy communion, and in exhortation of all men to the often and godly receiving thereof. And yet neither they, nor no man else, can extol and commend the same sufficiently, according to the dignity thereof, if it be godly used, as it ought to be.

The answer to Dionysius de Eccles. Hier. cap. 3.

Dionysius also, whom they allege to praise and extol this sacrament, (as indeed it is most worthy, being a sacrament of most high dignity and perfection, representing unto us our most perfect spiritual conjunction unto Christ, and our continual nourishing, feeding, comfort, and spiritual life in him,) yet he never said that the flesh and blood of Christ was in the bread and wine really, corporally, sensibly, and naturally, (as the Papists would bear us in hand;) but he

[s] Ignatius in Epist. ad Ephesianos.

[t] Irenæus, lib. 5. contra Valentin.

calleth ever the bread and wine signs, pledges, and tokens, declaring unto the faithful receivers of the same, that they receive Christ spiritually, and that they spiritually eat his flesh and drink his blood. And although the bread and wine be the figures, signs, and tokens of Christ's flesh and blood, (as St. Dionysius calleth them both before the consecration as after,) yet the Greek annotations upon the same Dionysius do say, that the very things themselves be above in heaven. And as the same Dionysius maketh nothing for the Papists' opinions in this point of Christ's real and corporal presence; so in divers other things he maketh quite and clean against them, and that specially in three points; in Transubstantiation, in reservation of the sacrament, and in the receiving of the same by the priest alone.

The answer to Tertullianus de resurrectione carnis.

Furthermore they do allege Tertullian, that he constantly affirmeth, that in the sacrament of the altar we do eat the body and drink the blood of our Saviour Christ. To whom we grant that our flesh eateth and drinketh the bread and wine, which be called the body and blood of Christ, because (as Tertullian saith) they do represent his body and blood, although they be not really the same in very deed. And we grant also, that our souls by faith do eat his very body and drink his blood; but that is, spiritually, sucking out of the same everlasting life.

But we deny that unto this spiritual feeding is required any real and corporal presence. And therefore this Tertullian, speaketh nothing against the truth of our Catholick doctrine, but he speaketh many things most plainly for us, and against the Papists, and specially in three points. First in that he saith, that Christ called bread his body. The second, that Christ called it so, because it representeth his body. The third, in that he saith, that by these words of Christ, "This is my body," is meant, this is a figure of my body.

The answer to Origenes in Numer. Hom. 7.

Moreover they allege for them Origen, because they would seem to have many ancient authors favourers of their erroneous doctrine; which Origen is most clearly against them. "For although he do say (as they allege) that those things which before we signified by obscure figures, be now truly in deed, and in their very nature and kind, accomplished and fulfilled; and for the declaration thereof, he bringeth forth three examples; one of the stone that floweth water, another of the sea and cloud, and the third of manna, which in the Old Testament did signify Christ to come, who is now come indeed, and is manifested and exhibited unto us, as it were, face to face, and sensibly, in his word, in the sacrament of regeneration, and in the sacraments of bread and wine;"—yet Origen meant not, that Christ is corporally either in his word,

or in the water of baptism, or in the bread and wine, nor that we carnally and corporally be regenerated and born again, or eat Christ's flesh and blood. For our regeneration in Christ is spiritual, and our eating and drinking is a spiritual feeding, which kind of regeneration and feeding requireth no real and corporal presence of Christ, but only his presence in spirit, grace, and effectual operation. And that Origen thus meant, that Christ's flesh is a spiritual meat, and his blood a spiritual drink; and that the eating and drinking of his flesh and blood may not be understood literally, but spiritually; it is manifested by Origen's own words, in his seventh homily upon the book called Leviticus, where he sheweth, "That those words must be understood figuratively, and whosoever understandeth them otherwise, they be deceived, and take harm by their own gross understanding [u]."

The answer to Cyprianus, lib. 2. epist. 3.

And likewise meant Cyprian, in those places which the adversaries of the truth allege for him, concerning the true eating of Christ's very flesh and drinking of his blood.

For Cyprian spake of no gross and carnal eating with the mouth, but of an inward, spiritual, and pure eating with heart and mind, which is to believe in our hearts, that his flesh was rent and torn for us upon the cross, and his blood

[u] In Levit. Hom. 7.

shed for our redemption, and that the same flesh and blood now sitteth at the right hand of the Father, making continual intercession for us; and to imprint and digest this in our minds, putting our whole affiance and trust in him, as touching our salvation, and offering ourselves clearly unto him, to love and serve him all the days of our life: This is truly, sincerely, and spiritually to eat his flesh and to drink his blood.

And this sacrifice of Christ upon the cross, was that oblation which, Cyprian saith, was figured and signified, before it was done, by the wine which Noah drank, and by the bread and wine which Melchisedec gave to Abraham, and by many other figures which Cyprian there rehearseth.

And now when Christ is come, and hath accomplished that sacrifice, the same is figured, signified, and represented unto us by that bread and wine, which faithful people receive daily in the holy communion: wherein like as with their mouths carnally they eat the bread and drink the wine; so by their faith spiritually they eat Christ's very flesh, and drink his very blood. And hereby it appeareth that St. Cyprian clearly affirmeth the most true doctrine, and is wholly upon our side. And against the Papists he teacheth most plainly, that the communion ought to be received of all men under both the

kinds, and that Christ called bread his body and wine his blood, and that there is no transubstantiation, but that bread remaineth there as a figure to represent Christ's body, and wine to represent his blood; and that those which be not the lively members of Christ, do eat the bread and drink the wine, and be nourished by them, but the very flesh and blood of Christ they neither eat nor drink.

Thus have you heard declared the mind of Cyprian.

The answer to Hilarius 8 de Trinitate.

But Hilarius (think they) is plainest for them in this matter, whose words they translate thus: "If the word was made verily flesh, and we verily receive the word being flesh in our Lord's meat, how shall not Christ be thought to dwell naturally in us? who, being born man, hath taken unto him the nature of our flesh, that cannot be severed, and hath put together the nature of his flesh to the nature of his eternity, under the sacrament of the communion of his flesh unto us. For so we be all one, because the Father is in Christ, and Christ in us. Wherefore whosoever will deny the Father to be naturally in Christ, he must deny first either himself to be naturally in Christ, or Christ to be naturally in him. For the being of the Father in Christ, and the being of Christ in us, maketh us to be one in them. And therefore if Christ have taken verily the flesh of our body, and the man that

was verily born of the Virgin Mary is Christ, and also we receive under the true mystery the flesh of his body, by means whereof we shall be one, (for the Father is in Christ, and Christ in us,) how shall that be called the unity of will, when the natural property, brought to pass by the sacrament, is the sacrament of unity?"

Thus do the Papists (the adversaries of God's word and of his truth) allege the authority of Hilarius, either perversely and purposely, as it seemeth, untruly citing him, and wresting his words to their purpose, or else not truly understanding him. For although he saith that Christ is naturally in us, yet he saith also that we be naturally in him. And nevertheless in so saying, he meant not of the natural and corporal presence of the substance of Christ's body and of ours; for as our bodies be not after that sort within his body, so it is not his body after that sort within our bodies; but he meant that Christ in his incarnation received of us a mortal nature, and united the same unto his divinity, and so be we naturally in him. And the sacraments of baptism and of his holy supper, (if we rightly use the same,) do most assuredly certify us, that we be partakers of his godly nature, having given unto us by him immortality and life everlasting, and so is Christ naturally in us. And so be we one with Christ, and Christ with us, not only in will and mind, but also in very natural properties.

And so concludeth Hilarius against Arius, that Christ is one with his Father, not in purpose and will only, but also in very nature. And as the union between Christ and us in baptism is spiritual, and requireth no real and corporal presence; so likewise our union with Christ in his holy supper is spiritual, and therefore requireth no real and corporal presence. And therefore Hilarius, speaking there of both the sacraments, maketh no difference between our union with Christ in baptism, and our union with him in his holy supper; and saith further, that as Christ is in us, so be we in him; which the Papists cannot understand corporally and really, except they will say, that all our bodies be corporally within Christ's body. Thus is Hilarius answered unto both plainly and shortly.

The answer to Cyrillus.

And this answer to Hilarius will serve also unto Cyril, whom they allege to speak after the same sort that Hilarius doth, that Christ is naturally in us. The words which they recite be these: "We deny not," saith Cyril against the heretick, "but we be spiritually joined to Christ by faith and sincere charity; but that we should have no manner of conjunction in our flesh with Christ, that we utterly deny, and think it utterly discrepant from God's holy Scriptures. For who doubteth, that Christ is so the vine tree, and we so the branches, as we get thence our life. Hear what St. Paul saith, 'We be all one body with

Christ; for though we be many, we be one in him.' All we participate in one food. Thinketh this heretick that we know not the strength and virtue of the mystical benediction? which, when it is made in us, doth it not make Christ, by communication of his flesh, to dwell corporally in us? Why be the members of faithful men's bodies called the members of Christ? 'Know you not, (saith St. Paul,) that your members be the members of Christ? And shall I make the members of Christ parts of the whore's body? God forbid.' And our Saviour also saith, 'He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.'"

Although in these words Cyril doth say, that Christ doth dwell corporally in us, when we receive the mystical benediction; yet he neither saith that Christ dwelleth corporally in the bread, nor that he dwelleth in us corporally only at such times as we receive the sacrament, nor that he dwelleth in us, and not we in him; but he saith as well, that we dwell in him, as that he dwelleth in us. Which dwelling is neither corporal nor local, but an heavenly, spiritual, and supernatural dwelling, whereby, so long as we dwell in him, and he in us, we have by him everlasting life. And therefore Cyril saith, in the same place, that Christ is the vine, and we the branches, because that by him we have life. For as the branches receive life and nourishment

of the body of the vine, so receive we by him the natural property of his body, which is life and immortality; and by that means we, being his members, do live, and are spiritually nourished. And this meant Cyril by this word corporally, when he saith, that Christ dwelleth corporally in us. And the same meant also St. Hilarius by this word naturally, when he said that Christ dwelleth naturally in us. And as St. Paul, when he said that in Christ dwelleth the full divinity corporally, by this word corporally, he meant not that the divinity is a body, and so by that body dwelleth bodily in Christ. But by this word corporally, he meant that the divinity is not in Christ accidentally, lightly, and slenderly, but substantially and perfectly, with all his might and power: so that Christ was not only a mortal man, to suffer for us; but also he was immortal God, able to redeem us. So St. Cyril, when he said that Christ is in us corporally, he meant that we have him in us, not lightly and to small effect and purpose, but that we have him in us substantially, pithily, and effectually, in such wise that we have by him redemption and everlasting life. And this I suck not out of mine own fingers, but have it of Cyril's own express words, where he saith, "A little benediction draweth the whole man to God, and filleth him with his grace; and after this manner Christ

dwelleth in us, and we in Christ [x]." But as for corporal eating and drinking with our mouths, and digesting with our bodies, Cyril never meant that Christ doth so dwell in us, as he plainly declareth.

"Our sacrament," saith he [y], "doth not affirm the eating of a man, drawing wickedly Christian people to have gross imaginations and carnal fantasies of such things as be fine and pure, and received only with a sincere faith. But as two waxes that be molten and put together, they close so in one, that every part of the one is joined to every part of the other: even so, (saith Cyril [z],) he that receiveth the flesh and blood of the Lord, must needs be so joined with Christ, that Christ must be in him, and he in Christ." By these words of Cyril appeareth his mind plainly, that we may not grossly and rudely think of the eating of Christ with our mouths, but with our faith, by which eating, although he be absent hence bodily, and be in the eternal life and glory with his Father, yet we be made partakers of his nature, to be immortal and have eternal life and glory with him. And thus is declared the mind as well of Cyril as of Hilarius. And here may be well enough passed over Basilius, Gregorius Nyssenus, and Gregorius Nazianzenus, partly because they speak little of

Basilius, Nyssenus, and Nazianzenus.

[x] In Johan. lib. 4. cap. 17. [y] Anathematismo. 11.

[z] In Johan. lib. 4. cap. 17.

this matter, and because they may be easily answered unto, by that which is before declared and often repeated, which is, that a figure hath the name of the thing whereof it is the figure, and therefore of the figure may be spoken the same thing that may be spoken of the thing itself. And as concerning the eating of Christ's flesh and drinking of his blood, they spake of the spiritual eating and drinking thereof by faith, and not of corporal eating and drinking with the mouth and teeth.

Likewise Eusebius Emissenus is shortly answered unto; for he speaketh not of any real and corporal conversion of bread and wine into Christ's body and blood, nor of any corporal and real eating and drinking of the same, but he speaketh of a sacramental conversion of bread and wine, and of a spiritual eating and drinking of the body and blood. After which sort, Christ is as well present in baptism (as the same Eusebius plainly there declareth) as he is in the Lord's table: which is not carnally and corporally, but by faith, and spiritually. But of this author is spoken before more at large in the matter of Transubstantiation.

The answer to Emissenus.

And now I will come to the saying of St. Ambrose, which is always in their mouths. Before the consecration, saith he, (as they allege,) it is bread; but after the words of consecration it is

The answer to Ambrosius de sacramentis, lib. 4. cap. 4.

the body of Christ. For answer hereunto, it must be first known what consecration is.

Consecration.

Consecration is the separation of any thing from a profane and worldly use unto a spiritual and godly use.

And therefore when usual and common water is taken from other uses, and put to the use of baptism in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, then it may rightly be called consecrated water, that is to say, water put to an holy use. Even so when common bread and wine be taken and severed from other bread and wine, to the use of the holy communion, that portion of bread and wine, although it be of the same substance that the other is from the which it is severed, yet it is now called consecrated or holy bread and holy wine. Not that the bread and wine have or can have any holiness in them, but that they be used to an holy work, and represent holy and godly things.

And therefore St. Dionyse[a] calleth the bread holy bread, and the cup an holy cup, as soon as they be set upon the altar to the use of the holy communion.

But specially they may be called holy and consecrated, when they be separated to that holy use by Christ's own words, which he spake for that purpose, saying of the bread, "This is my

[a] De Eccl. Hierar. cap. 3.

body[b];" and of the wine, "This is my blood[c]." So that commonly the authors, before those words be spoken, do take the bread and wine but as other common bread and wine; but after those words be pronounced over them, then they take them for consecrated and holy bread and wine. Not that the bread and wine can be partakers of any holiness or godliness, or can be the body and blood of Christ; but that they represent the very body and blood of Christ, and the holy food and nourishment which we have by him. And so they be called by the names of the body and blood of Christ, as the sign, token, and figure is called by the name of the very thing which it sheweth and signifieth. And therefore as St. Ambrose, in the words before cited by the adversaries, saith, that before the consecration it is bread, and after the consecration it is Christ's body: so in other places he doth more plainly set forth his meaning, saying these words: "Before the benediction of the heavenly words, it is called another kind of thing; but, after the consecration, is signified the body of Christ. Likewise before the consecration, it is called another thing; but, after the consecration, it is named the blood of Christ[d]." And again he saith: "When I treated of the

[b] Matt. xxvi. Matt. xiv. [c] Luke xxii.

[d] De his qui mysteriis initiantur cap. ult.

sacraments, I told you, that that thing which is offered before the words of Christ, is called bread; but when the words of Christ be pronounced, then it is not called bread, but it is called by the name of Christ's body[e]."

By which words of St. Ambrose, it appeareth plainly, that the bread is called by the name of Christ's body after the consecration; and although it be still bread, yet after consecration it is dignified by the name of the thing which it representeth, as at length is declared before in the process of Transubstantiation, and specially in the words of Theodoretus.

And as the bread is a corporal meat, and corporally eaten, so, saith St. Ambrose[f], is the body of Christ a spiritual meat, and spiritually eaten, and that requireth no corporal presence.

The answer to Chrysostomus.

Now let us examine St. John Chrysostome, who, in sound of words, maketh most for the adversaries of the truth: but they that be familiar and acquainted with Chrysostome's manner of speaking, how in all his writings he is full of allusions, schemes, tropes, and figures, shall soon perceive, that he helpeth nothing their purposes, as it shall well appear by the discussing of those places, which the Papists do allege of him; which be specially two: One is *In Sermone de Eucharistia in Encæniis;* and the other is, *De Proditione*

[e] De sacramentis, lib. 5. cap. 4. [f] Ibid. lib. 6. cap. 1.

Judæ. And as touching the first, no man can speak more plainly against them than St. John Chrysostome speaketh in that sermon. Wherefore it is to be wondered why they should allege him for their party, unless they be so blind in their opinion that they can see nothing, nor discern what maketh for them, nor what against them. For there he hath these words: "When you come to these mysteries, (speaking of the Lord's board and holy communion,) do not think that you receive by a man the body of God," meaning of Christ[g]. These be St. John Chrysostome's own words in that place.

Then if we receive not the body of Christ at the hands of a man, Ergo, the body of Christ is not really, corporally, and naturally in the sacrament, and so given to us by the priest. And then it followeth that all the Papists be liars, because they feign and teach the contrary.

But this place of Chrysostome is touched before more at length in answering to the Papists' Transubstantiation.

Wherefore now shall be answered the other place[h], which they allege of Chrysostome in these words: "Here he is present in the sacrament and doth consecrate, which garnished the table at the maundy or last supper. For it is

[g] In sermone de Eucharistia in Encæniis.

[h] De proditione Judæ.

not man, which maketh of the bread and wine, being set forth to be consecrated, the body and blood of Christ; but it is Christ himself (which for us is crucified) that maketh himself to be there present. The words are uttered and pronounced by the mouth of the priest, but the consecration is by the virtue, might, and grace of God himself: and as this saying of God, 'Increase, be multiplied, and fill the earth[i],' once spoken by God, took always effect towards generation: even so the saying of Christ, 'This is my body[k],' being but once spoken, doth throughout all churches to this present, and shall to his last coming, give force and strength to this sacrifice."

Thus far they rehearse of Chrysostome's words. Which words, although they sound much for their purpose, yet if they be thoroughly considered, and conferred with other places of the same author, it shall well appear, that he meant nothing less than that Christ's body should be corporally and naturally present in the bread and wine; but that in such sort he is in heaven only, and in our minds by faith we ascend up into heaven, to eat him there, although sacramentally as in a sign and figure, he be in the bread and wine, and so is he also in the water of baptism; and in them that rightly receive the

[i] Gen. i. [k] Matt. xxvi. Matt. xiv. Luke xxii.

bread and wine, he is in a much more perfection than corporally, which should avail them nothing; but in them he is spiritually with his divine power, giving them eternal life.

And as in the first creation of the world all living creatures had their first life by God's only word; for God only spake his word, and all things were created by and by accordingly; and after their creation he spake these words, "Increase and multiply[l];" and, by the virtue of those words, all things have gendered and increased ever since that time: even so after that Christ said, "Eat, this is my body, and drink, this is my blood, do this hereafter in remembrance of me[m];" by virtue of these words, and not by virtue of any man, the bread and wine be so consecrated, that whosoever with a lively faith doth eat that bread and drink that wine, doth spiritually eat, drink, and feed upon Christ, sitting in heaven with his Father. And this is the whole meaning of St. Chrysostome.

And therefore doth he so often say, that we receive Christ in baptism; and when he hath spoken of the receiving of him in the holy Communion, by and by he speaketh of the receiving of him in baptism, without declaring any diversity of his presence in the one, from his presence in the other.

[l] Gen. i. [m] Matt. xxvi. Mark xiv. Luke xxii.

He saith also in many places [n], "That we ascend into heaven, and do eat Christ sitting there above."

And where St. Chrysostome and other authors do speak of the wonderful operation of God in his sacraments, passing all man's wit, senses, and reason, he meaneth not of the working of God in the water, bread, and wine, but of the marvellous working of God in the hearts of them that receive the sacraments, secretly, inwardly, and spiritually transforming them; renewing, feeding, comforting, and nourishing them with his flesh and blood, through his most Holy Spirit, the same flesh and blood still remaining in heaven.

Thus is this place of Chrysostome sufficiently answered unto; and if any man require any more, then let him look what is recited of the same author before, in the matter of Transubstantiation.

The answer to Theophylactus in Mark xiv.

Yet furthermore they bring for them Theophilus Alexandrinus, who (as they allege) saith thus: "Christ giving thanks did break, (which also we do,) adding thereto prayer: And he gave unto them, saying, 'Take, this is my body;' this that I do now give, and that which ye now do take. For the bread is not a figure only of Christ's body, but it is changed into the

[n] Ad populum Antiochenum, hom. 61. et in Joan. hom. 45.

very body of Christ; for Christ saith, 'The bread which I will give you, is my flesh[o].' Nevertheless the flesh of Christ is not seen for our weakness, but bread and wine are familiar unto us. And surely if we should visibly see flesh and blood, we could not abide it. And therefore our Lord, bearing with our weakness, doth retain and keep the form and appearance of bread and wine; but he doth turn the very bread and wine into the very flesh and blood of Christ."

These be the words which the Papists do cite out of Theophilus upon the Gospel of St. Mark. But by this one place it appeareth evidently, either how negligent the Papists be in searching out and examining the sayings of the authors, which they allege for their purpose; or else how false and deceitful they be, which willingly and wittingly have made in this one place, and, as it were with one breath, two loud and shameful lies.

The first is, that because they would give the more authority to the words by them alleged, they (like false apothecaries that sell *quid pro quo*) falsify the author's name, fathering such sayings upon Theophilus Alexandrinus, an old and ancient author, which were indeed none of his words, but were the words of Theophylactus,

[o] John vi.

who was many years after Theophilus Alexandrinus. But such hath ever been the Papistical subtleties, to set forth their own inventions, dreams, and lies, under the name of antiquity and ancient authors.

The second lie or falsehood is, that they falsify the author's words and meaning, subverting the truth of his doctrine. For where Theophylactus (according to the Catholick doctrine of ancient authors) saith, that Almighty God, condescending to our infirmity, reserveth the kind of bread and wine, and yet turneth them into the virtue of Christ's flesh and blood, they say that he reserveth the forms and appearances of bread and wine, and turneth them into the verity of his flesh and blood, so turning and altering kinds into forms and appearances, and virtue into verity, that of the virtue of the flesh and blood they make the verity of his flesh and blood. And thus have they falsified as well the name as the words of Theophylactus, turning verity into plain and flat falsity.

But to set forth plainly the meaning of Theophylactus in this matter: As hot and burning iron is iron still, and yet hath the force of fire; and as the flesh of Christ, still remaining flesh, giveth life, as the flesh of him that is God: so the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their proper kinds; and yet to them that worthily eat and drink them, they be turned not into the cor-

poral presence, but into the virtue of Christ's flesh and blood.

And although Theophylactus spake of the eating of the very body of Christ, and the drinking of his very blood, (and not only of the figures of them,) and of the conversion of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, yet he meaneth not of a gross, carnal, corporal, and sensible conversion of the bread and wine, nor of a like eating and drinking of his flesh and blood; for so not only our stomachs would yearn and our hearts abhor to eat his flesh and to drink his blood; but also such eating and drinking could nothing profit and avail us: but he spake of the celestial and spiritual eating of Christ, and of a sacramental conversion of the bread, calling the bread not only a figure, but also the body of Christ, giving us by those words to understand, that in the sacrament we not only eat corporally the bread, which is a sacrament and figure of Christ's body; but spiritually we eat also his very body, and drink his very blood. And this doctrine of Theophylactus is both true, godly, and comfortable.

The answer to Hieronymus super Epist. ad Titum.

Besides this our adversaries do allege St. Jerome, upon the Epistle *Ad Titum*, that there is as great difference between the loaves called *panes propositionis*, and the body of Christ, as there is between a shadow of a body, and the body itself, and as there is between an image

and the thing itself, and between an example of things to come and the things that be prefigured by them."

These words of St. Jerome, truly understood, serve nothing for the intent of the Papists. For he meant that the shew-bread of the law was but a dark shadow of Christ to come; but the sacrament of Christ's body is a clear testimony that Christ is already come, and that he hath performed that which was promised, and doth presently comfort and feed us spiritually with his precious body and blood, notwithstanding that corporally he is ascended into heaven.

Augustinus, Sedulius, Leo, Fulgentius, Cassiodorus, Gregorius.

And the same is to be answered unto all that the adversaries bring of St. Augustine, Sedulius, Leo, Fulgentius, Cassiodorus, Gregorius, and others, concerning the eating of Christ in the sacrament.

Which thing cannot be understood plainly as the words sound, but figuratively and spiritually, as before is sufficiently proved, and hereafter shall be more fully declared in the fourth part of this book.

But here John Damascene [p] may in no wise be passed over, whom for his authority the adversaries of Christ's true natural body do reckon as a stout champion sufficient to defend all the whole matter alone. But neither is the autho-

[p] Damascenus de fide orth. lib. 4. cap. 14.

rity of Damascene so great, that they may oppress us thereby, nor his words so plain for them, as they boast and untruly pretend. For he is but a young new author in the respect of those which we have brought in for our party. And in divers points he varieth from the most ancient authors, (if he mean as they expound him,) as when he saith, that the bread and wine be not figures, which all the old authors call figures, and that the bread and wine consume not, nor be voided downward, which Origen and St. Augustine affirm, or that they be not called the examples of Christ's body after the consecration, which shall manifestly appear false by the Liturgy ascribed unto St. Basil.

And moreover the said Damascene was one of the bishop of Rome's chief proctors against the emperors, and as it were his right hand, to set abroad all idolatry by his own hand-writing. And therefore if he lost his hand (as they say he did) he lost it by God's most righteous judgment, whatsoever they feign and fable of the miraculous restitution of the same. And yet whatsoever the said Damascene writeth in other matters, surely in this place which the adversaries do allege, he writeth spiritually and godly, although the Papists either of ignorance mistake him, or else willingly wrest him and writhe him to their purpose, clean contrary to his meaning.

The sum of Damascene's doctrine in this mat-

ter is this: that as Christ, being both God and man, hath in him two natures; so hath he two nativities, one eternal and the other temporal. And so likewise we, being as it were double men, or having every one of us two men in us, the new man and the old man, the spiritual man and the carnal man, have a double nativity: one of our first carnal father, Adam, by whom as by ancient inheritance cometh unto us malediction and everlasting damnation; and the other of our heavenly Adam, that is to say, of Christ, by whom we be made heirs of celestial benediction and everlasting glory and immortality.

And because this Adam is spiritual, therefore our generation by him must be spiritual, and our feeding must be likewise spiritual. And our spiritual generation by him is plainly set forth in baptism, and our spiritual meat and food is set forth in the holy communion and supper of the Lord. And because our sights be so feeble that we cannot see the spiritual water wherewith we be washed in baptism, nor the spiritual meat wherewith we be fed at the Lord's table; therefore to help our infirmities, and to make us the better to see the same with a pure faith, our Saviour Christ hath set forth the same as it were before our eyes by sensible signs and tokens, which we be daily used and accustomed unto.

And because the common custom of men is to wash in water, therefore our spiritual regenera-

tion in Christ, or spiritual washing in his blood, is declared unto us in baptism by water. Likewise our spiritual nourishment and feeding in Christ, is set before our eyes by bread and wine, because they be meats and drinks which chiefly and usually we be fed withal; that as they feed the body, so doth Christ with his flesh and blood spiritually feed the soul.

And therefore the bread and wine be called examples of Christ's flesh and blood, and also they be called his very flesh and blood, to signify unto us that as they feed us carnally, so do they admonish us that Christ with his flesh and blood doth feed us spiritually and most truly unto everlasting life. And as Almighty God by his most mighty word and his Holy Spirit and infinite power brought forth all creatures in the beginning, and ever since hath preserved them; even so by the same word and power he worketh in us from time to time this marvellous spiritual generation and wonderful spiritual nourishment and feeding, which is wrought only by God, and is comprehended and received of us by faith.

And as bread and drink by natural nourishment be changed into a man's body, and yet the body is not changed, but the same that it was before; so although the bread and wine be sacramentally changed into Christ's body, yet his body is the same and in the same place that it

was before, that is to say, in heaven, without any alteration of the same.

And the bread and wine be not so changed into the flesh and blood of Christ, that they be made one nature, but they remain still distinct in nature, so that the bread in itself is not his flesh, and the wine his blood, but unto them that worthily eat and drink the bread and wine, to them the bread and wine be his flesh and blood, that is to say, by things natural and which they be accustomed unto, they be exalted unto things above nature. For the sacramental bread and wine be not bare and naked figures, but so pithy and efficacious, that whosoever worthily eateth them, eateth spiritually Christ's flesh and blood, and hath by them everlasting life.

Wherefore whosoever cometh to the Lord's table, must come with all humility, fear, reverence, and purity of life, as to receive not only bread and wine, but also our Saviour Christ both God and man, with all his benefits, to the relief and sustentation both of their bodies and souls.

This is briefly the sum and true meaning of Damascene, concerning this matter.

Wherefore they that gather of him either the natural presence of Christ's body in the sacraments of bread and wine, or the adoration of the outward and visible sacrament, or that after the consecration there remaineth no bread nor wine nor other substance, but only the substance of

the body and blood of Christ; either they understand not Damascene, or else of wilful frowardness they will not understand him; which rather seemeth to be true, by such collections as they have unjustly gathered and noted out of him.

For although he say, that Christ is the spiritual meat, yet as in baptism the Holy Ghost is not in the water, but in him that is unfeignedly baptized; so Damascene meant not that Christ is in the bread, but in him that worthily eateth the bread.

And though he say, that the bread is Christ's body, and the wine his blood, yet he meant not that the bread considered in itself, or the wine in itself being not received, is his flesh and blood; but to such as by unfeigned faith worthily receive the bread and wine, to such the bread and wine are called by Damascene the body and blood of Christ, because that such persons through the working of the Holy Ghost be so knit and united spiritually to Christ's flesh and blood, and to his divinity also, that they be fed with them unto everlasting life.

Furthermore Damascene saith not that the sacrament should be worshipped and adored, as the Papists term it, which is plain idolatry, but that we must worship Christ, God and man. And yet we may not worship him in bread and wine, but sitting in heaven with his Father, and being spiritually within ourselves.

Nor he saith not, that there remaineth no bread nor wine, nor none other substance, but only the substance of the body and blood of Christ; but he saith plainly, that as a burning coal is not wood only, but fire and wood joined together; so the bread of the communion is not bread only, but bread joined to the divinity. But those that say, that there is none other substance but the substance of the body and blood of Christ, do not only deny that there is bread and wine, but by force they must deny also that there is either Christ's divinity or his soul. For if the flesh and blood, the soul and divinity of Christ be four substances, and in the sacrament be but two of them, that is to say, his flesh and blood, then where be his soul and divinity? And thus these men divide Jesus, separating his divinity from his humanity: of whom St. John saith, "Whosoever divideth Jesus, is not of God, but he is Antichrist [q]."

And moreover these men do so separate Christ's body from his members in the sacrament, that they leave him no man's body at all. For as Damascene saith, "That the distinction of members pertain so much to the nature of a man's body, that where there is no such distinction, there is no perfect man's body [r]." But by these Papists' doctrine, there is no such distinc-

[q] 1 John iv. [r] In libro de duabus in Christo voluntatibus.

tion of members in the sacrament; for either there is no head, feet, hands, arms, legs, mouth, eyes, and nose at all; or else all is head, all feet, all hands, all arms, all legs, all mouth, all eyes, and all nose. And so they make of Christ's body no man's body at all.

Thus being confuted the Papists' errors as well concerning Transubstantiation, as the real, corporal, and natural presence of Christ in the sacrament, which were two principal points purposed in the beginning of this work; now it is time something to speak of the third error of the Papists, which is concerning the eating of Christ's very body and drinking of his blood.

THUS ENDETH THE THIRD BOOK.

THE FOURTH BOOK

IS OF THE

EATING AND DRINKING OF THE BODY AND BLOOD

OF

OUR SAVIOUR CHRIST.

CHAP. I.

THE gross error of the Papists, is of the carnal eating and drinking of Christ's flesh and blood with our mouths.

Whether ill men do eat and drink Christ.

For they say, that whosoever eat and drink the sacraments of bread and wine, do eat and drink also with their mouths Christ's very flesh and blood, be they never so ungodly and wicked persons. But Christ himself taught clean contrary in the sixth of John, that we eat not him carnally with our mouths, but spiritually with our faith, saying, "Verily, verily I say unto you, he that believeth in me, hath everlasting life. I am the bread of life. Your fathers did eat manna in the wilderness, and died. This is the bread that came from heaven, that whosoever shall eat thereof, shall not die. I am the lively bread that came from heaven; if any man eat of this bread,

The godly only eat Christ.

he shall live for ever. And the bread which I will give, is my flesh, which I will give for the life of the world."

This is the most true doctrine of our Saviour Christ, that whosoever eateth him, shall have everlasting life. And by and by it followeth in the same place of John more clearly: "Verily, verily I say unto you, except you eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, you shall not have life in you. He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath life everlasting, and I will raise him again at the last day: for my flesh is very meat, and my blood is very drink. He that eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him. As the living Father hath sent me, and I live by the Father; even so he that eateth me, shall live by me. This is the bread which came down from heaven, not as your fathers did eat manna, and are dead; he that eateth of this bread, shall live for ever[a]."

This taught our Saviour Christ as well his disciples as the Jews at Capernaum, that the eating of his flesh and drinking of his blood was not like to the eating of manna. For both good and bad did eat manna, but none do eat his flesh and drink his blood, but they have everlasting life. For as his Father dwelleth in him, and he

[a] John vi.

in his Father, and so hath life by his Father: so he that eateth Christ's flesh and drinketh his blood, dwelleth in Christ, and Christ in him, and by Christ he hath eternal life.

What need we any other witness, when Christ himself doth testify the matter so plainly, that whosoever eateth his flesh and drinketh his blood, hath everlasting life? And that to eat his flesh and to drink his blood, is to believe in him? And whosoever believeth in him, hath everlasting life? Whereof it followeth necessarily, that ungodly persons, being limbs of the devil, do not eat Christ's flesh nor drink his blood: except the Papists would say, that such have everlasting life.

But as the devil is the food of the wicked, which he nourisheth in all iniquity, and bringeth up unto everlasting damnation: so is Christ the very food of all them that be the lively members of his body, and them he nourisheth, feedeth, bringeth up, and cherisheth unto everlasting life.

CHAP. II.

What is the eating of Christ's flesh, and drinking of his blood.

And every good and faithful Christian man feeleth in himself how he feedeth of Christ, eating his flesh, and drinking his blood. For he putteth the whole hope and trust of his redemption and salvation in that only sacrifice, which Christ made upon the cross, having his body there broken, and his blood there shed for the remission of his sins. And this great benefit of

Christ the faithful man earnestly considereth in his mind, cheweth and digesteth it with the stomach of his heart, spiritually receiving Christ wholly into him, and giving again himself wholly unto Christ.

And this is the eating of Christ's flesh and drinking of his blood, the feeling whereof is to every man the feeling how he eateth and drinketh Christ, which none evil man nor member of the devil can do.

CHAP. III.

Christ is not eaten with teeth, but with faith.

For as Christ is a spiritual meat, so is he spiritually eaten and digested with the spiritual part of us, and giveth us spiritual and eternal life, and is not eaten, swallowed, and digested with our teeth, tongues, throats, and bellies. "Therefore," saith St. Cyprian[b], "he that drinketh of the holy cup, remembering this benefit of God, is more thirsty than he was before. And lifting up his heart unto the living God, is taken with such a singular hunger and appetite, that he abhorreth all gally and bitter drinks of sin; and all savour of carnal pleasure is to him, as it were, sharp and sour vinegar. And the sinner being converted, receiving the holy mysteries of the Lord's Supper, giveth thanks unto God, and boweth down his head, knowing that his sins be forgiven, and that he is made clean and perfect; and his soul (which God hath sanctified) he ren-

[b] Cyprianus de cœna Domini.

dereth to God again as a faithful pledge, and then he glorieth with Paul, and rejoiceth, saying, 'Now it is not I that live, but it is Christ that liveth within me.' These things be practised and used among faithful people; and to pure minds the eating of his flesh is no horror but honour, and the spirit delighteth in the drinking of the holy and sanctifying blood. And doing this, we whet not our teeth to bite, but with pure faith we break, the holy bread." These be the words of Cyprian.

And according unto the same, St. Austin saith, "Prepare not thy jaws, but thy heart[c]." And in another place[d], (as it is cited of him,) he saith, "Why dost thou prepare thy belly and thy teeth? believe, and thou hast eaten." But of this matter is sufficiently spoken before, where it is proved, that to eat Christ's flesh and drink his blood be figurative speeches.

CHAP. IV.

The good only eat Christ.

And now to return to our purpose, that only the lively members of Christ do eat his flesh and drink his blood, I shall bring forth many other places of ancient authors before not mentioned. First, Origen[e] writeth plainly after this manner: "The word was made flesh and very meat, which whoso eateth, shall surely live for ever; which no evil man can eat. For if it could be that he

[c] August. de verbis Domini, serm. 33.

[d] In Joan. tract. 25.

[e] Origenes in Math. cap. 15.

that continueth evil, might eat the word made flesh, seeing that he is the word and bread of life, it should not have been written, 'Whosoever eateth this bread, shall live for ever.'" These words be so plain, that I need say nothing for the more clear declaration of them. Wherefore you shall hear how Cyprian agreeth with him. Cyprian, in his sermon ascribed unto him of the Lord's Supper[f], saith, "The author of this tradition said, that except we eat his flesh and drink his blood, we should have no life in us; instructing us with a spiritual lesson, and opening to us a way to understand so privy a thing, that we should know that the eating is our dwelling in him, and our drinking is as it were an incorporation in him, being subject unto him in obedience, joined unto him in our wills, and united in our affections. The eating therefore of this flesh, is a certain hunger and desire to dwell in him." Thus writeth Cyprian of the eating and drinking of Christ. And a little after he saith, "That none do eat of this lamb, but such as be true Israelites, that is to say, pure Christian men, without colour or dissimulation."

And Athanasius[g], speaking of the eating of Christ's flesh, and drinking of his blood, saith,

[f] Cyprianus in sermo. de cœna Domini.

[g] Athanasius de peccato in Spiritum Sanctum.

"That for this cause he made mention of his ascension into heaven, to pluck them from corporal fancy, that they might learn hereafter that his flesh was called the celestial meat that came from above, and a spiritual food which he would give. For those things that I speak to you (saith he) be spirit and life. Which is as much to say, as that thing which you see shall be slain, and given for the nourishment of the world, that it may be distributed to every body spiritually, and be to all men a conservation unto the resurrection of eternal life.

In these words Athanasius declareth the cause why Christ made mention of his ascension into heaven, when he spake of the eating and drinking of his flesh and blood. The cause after Athanasius's mind was this, that his hearers should not think of any carnal eating of his body with their mouths; for as concerning the presence of his body, he should be taken from them, and ascend into heaven; but that they should understand him to be a spiritual meat, and spiritually to be eaten, and by that refreshing to give eternal life, which he doth to none but to such as be his lively members.

And of this eating speaketh also Basilius [h], "That we eat Christ's flesh and drink his blood, being made, by his incarnation and sensible life,

[h] Basilius, epistola. 141.

partakers of his word and wisdom. For his flesh and blood be called all his mystical conversation here in his flesh and his doctrine, consisting of his whole life, pertaining both to his humanity and divinity, whereby the soul is nourished and brought to the contemplation of things eternal." Thus teacheth Basilius how we eat Christ's flesh and drink his blood, which pertaineth only to the true and faithful members of Christ.

St. Jerome also saith [i], "All that love pleasure more than God, eat not the flesh of Jesu, nor drink his blood, of the which himself saith, 'He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life.'"

And in another place [k], St. Jerome saith, "That hereticks do not eat and drink the body and blood of the Lord."

And moreover he saith [l], "That hereticks eat not the flesh of Jesu, whose flesh is the meat of faithful men."

Thus agreeth St. Jerome with the other before rehearsed, that hereticks and such as follow worldly pleasures, eat not Christ's flesh nor drink his blood, because that Christ said, "He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life."

[i] Hieronimus in Esaiam, cap. 66.

[k] In Hieremiam.

[l] In Oseam. cap. 8.

And St. Ambrose saith [m], "That Jesus is the bread which is the meat of saints; and that he that taketh this bread, dieth not a sinner's death; for this bread is the remission of sins."

And in another book to him entitled [n], he writeth thus: "This bread of life which came from heaven, doth minister everlasting life; and whosoever eateth this bread, shall not die for ever; and is the body of Christ."

And yet in another book [o] set forth in his name, he saith on this wise: "He that did eat manna died, but he that eateth this body shall have remission of his sins, and shall not die for ever."

And again he saith [p], "As often as thou drinkest, thou hast remission of thy sins."

These sentences of St. Ambrose be so plain in this matter, that there needeth no more but only the rehearsal of them.

But St. Augustine in many places [q] plainly discussing this matter, saith: "He that agreeth not with Christ, doth neither eat his body nor drink his blood, although to the condemnation of his presumption he receive every day the sacrament of so high a matter."

And moreover St. Augustine most plainly resolveth this matter in his book *De civitate*

[m] Ambrosius de benedictione patriarcharum, cap. 9.

[n] De his qui mysteriis initiantur.

[o] De sacramentis, lib. 4. cap. 5. [p] Lib. 5. cap. 3.

[q] Augustinus in sententiis ex Prospero decerptis, cap. 339.

Dei[r], disputing against two kinds of hereticks: "Whereof the one said, that as many as were christened and received the sacrament of Christ's body and blood, should be saved, howsoever they lived or believed; because that Christ said, 'This is the bread that came from heaven; that whosoever shall eat thereof, shall not die. I am the bread of life, which came from heaven; whosoever shall eat of this bread, shall live for ever.' Therefore (said these hereticks) all such men must needs be delivered from eternal death, and at length be brought to eternal life."

"The other said, that hereticks and schismaticks might eat the sacrament of Christ's body, but not his very body; because they be no members of his body. And therefore they promised not everlasting life to all that received Christ's baptism and the sacrament of his body, but all such as professed a true faith, although they lived never so ungodly. For such (said they) do eat the body of Christ, not only in a sacrament, but also in deed, because they be members of Christ's body."

But St. Augustine, answering to both these heresies, saith, "That neither hereticks, nor such as profess a true faith in their mouths and in their living shew the contrary, have either a true faith, (which worketh by charity and doth

[r] De civitate Dei, lib. 21. cap. 25.

none evil,) or are to be counted among the members of Christ. For they cannot be both members of Christ and members of the devil. Therefore (saith he) it may not be said, that any of them eat the body of Christ. For when Christ saith, 'He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me and I in him;' he sheweth what it is (not sacramentally, but in deed) to eat his body and drink his blood: which is, when a man dwelleth so in Christ, that Christ dwelleth in him. For Christ spake those words, as if he should say, 'He that dwelleth not in me, and in whom I dwell not, let him not say or think, that he eateth my body or drinketh my blood.'"

These be the plain words of St. Augustine, that such as live ungodly, although they may seem to eat Christ's body, (because they eat the sacrament of his body,) yet indeed they neither be members of his body, nor do eat his body.

Also upon the Gospel of St. John[*] he saith, "That he that doth not eat his flesh and drink his blood, hath not in him everlasting life. And he that eateth his flesh and drinketh his blood, hath everlasting life. But it is not so in those meats, which we take to sustain our bodies; for although without them we cannot live, yet it is not necessary that whosoever receiveth them

[*] In Johan. tract. 26.

shall live, for they may die by age, sickness, or other chances. But in this meat and drink of the body and blood of our Lord, it is otherwise; for both they that eat and drink them not, have not everlasting life: and, contrariwise, whosoever eat and drink them, have everlasting life."

Note and ponder well these words of St. Augustine, that the bread and wine and other meats and drinks, which nourish the body, a man may eat, and nevertheless die; but the very body and blood of Christ no man eateth but that hath everlasting life. So that wicked men cannot eat nor drink them, for then they must needs have by them everlasting life.

And in the same place St. Augustine saith further: "The sacrament of the unity of Christ's body and blood, is taken in the Lord's table of some men to life, and of some men to death; but the thing itself (whereof it is a sacrament) is taken of all men to life, and of no man to death." And moreover he saith, "This is to eat that meat, and drink that drink, to dwell in Christ, and to have Christ dwelling in him. And for that cause, he that dwelleth not in Christ, and in whom Christ dwelleth not, without doubt he eateth not spiritually his flesh nor drinketh his blood, although carnally and visibly with his teeth he bite the sacrament of his body and blood."

Thus writeth St. Augustine in the twenty-sixth

Homily of St. John. And in the next Homily following[t], he writeth thus: "This day our sermon is of the body of the Lord, which he said he would give to eat for eternal life. And he declared the manner of his gift and distribution, how he would give his flesh to eat, saying, 'He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood, dwelleth in me, and I in him.' This therefore is a token or knowledge, that a man hath eaten and drunken, that is to say, if he dwell in Christ, and have Christ dwelling in him; if he cleave so to Christ, that he is not severed from him. This therefore Christ taught and admonished by these mystical or figurative words, that we should be in his body under him our head, among his members, eating his flesh, not forsaking his unity."

And in his book *De Doctrina Christiana*[u], St. Augustine saith, (as before is at length declared,) "That to eat Christ's flesh and to drink his blood, is a figurative speech, signifying the participation of his passion, and the delectable remembrance to our benefit and profit, that his flesh was crucified and wounded for us."

And in another sermon also, *De verbis Apostoli*[x], he expoundeth what is the eating of Christ's body, and the drinking of his blood, saying, "The eating is to be refreshed, and the drinking

[t] In Johan. tract. 27.

[u] De Doctrina Christiana, lib. 3. cap. 14.

[x] De verbis Apostoli, serm. 20.

what is it but to live? Eat life, drink life. And that shall be, when that which is taken visibly in the sacrament, is in very deed eaten spiritually and drunken spiritually."

By all these sentences of St. Augustine, it is evident and manifest, that all men, good and evil, may with their mouths visibly and sensibly eat the sacrament of Christ's body and blood; but the very body and blood themselves be not eaten but spiritually, and that of the spiritual members of Christ, which dwell in Christ, and have Christ dwelling in them, by whom they be refreshed and have everlasting life.

And therefore, saith St. Augustine[y], that when the other apostles did eat bread that was the Lord, yet Judas did eat but the bread of the Lord, and not the bread that was the Lord. So that the other apostles, with the sacramental bread, did eat also Christ himself, whom Judas did not eat. And a great number of places more hath St. Augustine for this purpose, which for eschewing of tediousness I let pass for this time, and will speak something of St. Cyril.

Cyril, upon St. John's Gospel[z], saith, "That those which eat manna died, because they received thereby no strength to live ever, (for it gave no life, but only put away bodily hunger;) but they that receive the bread of life shall be

[y] In Johan. tract. 59. [z] Cyrillus in Johan. lib. 4. cap. 10.

made immortal, and shall eschew all the evils that pertain to death, living with Christ for ever." And in another place[a] he saith: "Forasmuch as the flesh of them to Christ doth naturally give life, therefore it maketh them to live that be partakers of it. For it putteth death away from them, and utterly driveth destruction out of them."

And he concludeth the matter shortly in another place[b] in few words, saying, "That when we eat the flesh of our Saviour, then have we life in us. For if things that were corrupt were restored by only touching of his clothes, how can it be that we shall not live that eat his flesh?" And further[c] he saith, "That as two waxes that be molten together, do run every part into other: so he that receiveth Christ's flesh and blood, must needs be joined so with him, that Christ must be in him, and he in Christ."

Here St. Cyril declareth the dignity of Christ's flesh, being inseparably annexed unto his divinity, saying, that it is of such force and power, that it giveth everlasting life. And whatsoever occasion of death it findeth, or let of eternal life, it putteth out and driveth clean away all the same from them that eat that meat and receive that medicine. Other medicines or plasters sometimes heal, and sometimes heal not; but

[a] Cyrillus in Johan. lib. 4. cap. 12. [b] Cap. 14. [c] Cap. 17.

this medicine is of that effect and strength, that it eateth away all rotten and dead flesh, and perfectly healeth all wounds and sores that it is laid unto.

This is the dignity and excellency of Christ's flesh and blood joined to his divinity; of the which dignity Christ's adversaries, the Papists, deprive and rob him when they affirm, that such men do eat his flesh and receive this plaster as remain still sick and sore, and be not holpen thereby.

CHAP. V.

And now for corroboration of Cyril's saying, I would thus reason with the Papists, and demand of them, when an unrepentant sinner receiveth the sacrament, whether he have Christ's body within him or no?

If they say no, then have I my purpose, that evil men, although they receive the sacrament of Christ's body, yet receive they not his very body. If they say yea, then I would ask them further, whether they have Christ's spirit within them or no?

If they say nay, then do they separate Christ's body from his spirit, and his humanity from his divinity, and be condemned by the Scripture as very Antichrists that divide Christ.

And if they say yea, that a wicked man hath Christ's spirit in him, then the Scripture also condemneth them, saying, "That as he which hath no spirit of Christ's, is none of his; so he

that hath Christ in him, liveth, because he is justified. And if his spirit that raised Jesus from death dwell in you, he, that raised Christ from death, shall give life to your mortal bodies for his spirit's sake, which dwelleth in you[d]."

Thus on every side the Scripture condemneth the adversaries of God's word.

And this wickedness of the Papists is to be wondered at, that they affirm Christ's flesh, blood, soul, holy spirit, and his deity to be a man that is subject to sin, and a limb of the devil. They be wonderful jugglers and conjurers, that with certain words can make God and the devil to dwell together in one man, and make him both the temple of God and the temple of the devil. It appeareth that they be so blind, that they cannot see the light from darkness, Belial from Christ, nor the table of the Lord from the table of devils.

Thus is confuted this third intolerable error and heresy of the Papists, that they which be the limbs of the devil do eat the very body of Christ, and drink his blood, manifestly and directly contrary to the words of Christ himself, who saith, "Whosoever eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath everlasting life."

CHAP. VI.

But lest they should seem to have nothing to say for themselves, they allege St. Paul, in the

[d] Romans viii.

eleventh to the Corinthians, where he saith, The answer to the Papists. "He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh his own damnation, not discerning the Lord's body[e]."

But St. Paul in that place speaketh of the eating of the bread, and drinking of the wine, and not of the corporal eating of Christ's flesh and blood, as it is manifest to every man that will read the text: for these be the words of St. Paul, "Let a man examine himself, and so eat of the bread, and drink of the cup; for he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh his own damnation, not discerning the Lord's body."

In these words St. Paul's mind is, that forasmuch as the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper do represent unto us the very body and blood of our Saviour Christ, by his own institution and ordinance; therefore, although he sit in heaven at his Father's right hand, yet should we come to this mystical bread and wine with faith, reverence, purity, and fear, as we would do if we should come to see and receive Christ himself sensibly present. For unto the faithful Christ is at his own holy table present, with his mighty spirit and grace, and is of them more fruitfully received, than if corporally they should receive him bodily present. And therefore they that

[e] 1 Cor. xi.

shall worthily come to this God's board, must, after due trial of themselves, consider first who ordained this table, also what meat and drink they shall have that come thereto, and how they ought to behave themselves thereat. He that prepared the table, is Christ himself. The meat and drink wherewith he feedeth them that come thereto as they ought to do, is his own body, flesh, and blood. They that come thereto must occupy their minds in considering how his body was broken for them, and his blood shed for their redemption. And so ought they to approach to this heavenly table with all humbleness of heart, and godliness of mind, as to the table wherein Christ himself is given. And they that come otherwise to this holy table, they come unworthily, and do not eat and drink Christ's flesh and blood, but eat and drink their own damnation; because they do not duly consider Christ's very flesh and blood, which be offered there spiritually to be eaten and drunken, but despising Christ's most holy supper do come thereto, as it were to other common meats and drinks, without regard of the Lord's body, which is the spiritual meat of that table.

CHAP. VII.

The answer to the Papists' authors.

But here may not be passed over the answer unto certain places of ancient authors, which at the first shew seem to make for the Papists' purpose, that evil men do eat and drink the very flesh and blood of Christ. But if those places

be truly and thoroughly weighed, it shall appear that not one of them maketh for their error, that evil men do eat Christ's very body.

The first place is of St. Augustine *Contra Cresconium Grammaticum*[f], where he saith, "That although Christ himself say, 'He that eateth not my flesh, and drinketh not my blood, shall not have life in him:' yet do not his apostles teach that the same is pernicious to them which use it not well; for he saith, 'Whosoever eateth the bread and drinketh the cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.'"

In which words St. Augustine seemeth to conclude, that as well the evil as the good do eat the body and blood of Christ, although the evil have no benefit but hurt thereby.

But consider the place of St. Augustine diligently, and then it shall evidently appear that he meant not of the eating of Christ's body, but of the sacrament thereof. For the intent of St. Augustine there, is to prove that good things avail not to such persons as do evil use them; and that many things which of themselves be good, and be good to some, yet to other some they be not good. As the light is good for whole eyes, and hurteth sore eyes; the meat which is good for some, is ill for other some: one medi-

[f] Augustinus contra Cresconium, lib. 1. cap. 25.

cine healeth some, and maketh other sick; one harness doth arm one, and cumbreth another; one coat is meet for one, and too straight for another. And after other examples, at the last St. Augustine sheweth the same to be true in the sacraments both of baptism and of the Lord's body, which he saith do profit only them that receive the same worthily.

And the words of St. Paul, which St. Augustine citeth, do speak of the sacramental bread and cup, and not of the body and blood. And yet St. Augustine calleth the bread and the cup, the flesh and blood; not that they be so indeed, but that they so signify; as he saith in another place, *Contra Maximinum*[g]. "In sacraments," saith he, "is to be considered not what they be, but what they shew; for they be signs of other things, being one thing, and signifying another."

Therefore, as in baptism, those that come feignedly, and those that come unfeignedly, both be washed with the sacramental water, but both be not washed with the Holy Ghost, and clothed with Christ: so, in the Lord's Supper, both eat and drink the sacramental bread and wine, but both eat not Christ himself, and be fed with his flesh and blood, but those only which worthily receive the sacrament.

[g] Contra Maximinum, lib. 3. cap. 22.

And this answer will serve to another place[h] of St. Augustine against the Donatists, where he saith, "That Judas received the body and blood of the Lord." For as St. Augustine in that place speaketh of the sacrament of baptism, so doth he speak of the sacrament of the body and blood, which nevertheless he calleth the body and blood, because they signify and represent unto us the very body, flesh, and blood.

CHAP. VIII.

Figures be called by the names of the things which they signify.

And (as before is at length declared) a figure hath the name of the thing that is signified thereby. As a man's image is called a man, a lion's image, a lion; a bird's image, a bird; and an image of a tree and herb, is called a tree or herb. So were we wont to say, our lady of Walsingham, our lady of Ipswich, our lady of grace, our lady of pity, St. Peter of Milan, St. John of Amyas, and such like, not meaning the things themselves, but calling their images by the name of the things by them represented. And likewise we were wont to say, great St. Christopher of York or Lincoln; our lady smileth, or rocketh her child; let us go in pilgrimage to St. Peter at Rome, and St. James in Compostella: and a thousand like speeches, which were not understood of the very things, but only of the images of them.

So doth St. John Chrysostome say, that we

[h] De bap. contra Donat. lib. 5. cap. 8.

see Christ with our eyes, touch him, feel him, and grope him with our hands, fix our teeth in his flesh, taste it, break it, eat it, and digest it, make red our tongues and dye them with his blood, and swallow it, and drink it.

And in a Catechism by me translated, and set forth, I used like manner of speech, saying, that with our bodily mouths we receive the body and blood of Christ. Which my saying divers ignorant persons (not used to read old ancient authors, nor acquainted with their phrase and manner of speech) did carp and reprehend, for lack of good understanding.

For this speech, and other before rehearsed of Chrysostome, and all other like, be not understood of the very flesh and blood of our Saviour Christ, (which in very deed we neither feel nor see,) but that which we do to the bread and wine, by a figurative speech is spoken to be done to the flesh and blood, because they be the very signs, figures, and tokens instituted of Christ, to represent unto us his very flesh and blood.

And yet as with our corporal eyes, corporal hands and mouths, we do corporally see, feel, taste, and eat the bread, and drink the wine, (being the signs and sacraments of Christ's body,) even so with our spiritual eyes, hands, and mouths, we do spiritually see, feel, taste, and eat his very flesh and drink his very blood.

As Eusebius Emissenus saith[1], "When thou comest to the reverend altar to be filled with spiritual meats, with thy faith look upon the body and blood of him that is thy God, honour him, touch him with thy mind, take him with the hand of thy heart, and drink him with the draught of thine inward man." And these spiritual things require no corporal presence of Christ himself, who sitteth continually in heaven, at the right hand of his Father.

And as this is most true, so it is full and sufficient to answer all things that the Papists can bring in this matter, that have any appearance for their party.

CHAP. IX.

The adoration of the sacrament.

Now it is requisite to speak something of the manner and form of worshipping of Christ, by them that receive this sacrament, lest that in the stead of Christ himself be worshipped the sacrament. For as his humanity, joined to his divinity, and exalted to the right hand of his Father, is to be worshipped of all creatures in heaven, earth, and under the earth: even so, if in the stead thereof we worship the signs and sacraments, we commit as great idolatry as ever was, or shall be, to the world's end.

The simple people be deceived.

And yet have the very Antichrists (the subtlest enemies that Christ hath) by their fine inventions, and crafty scholastical divinity, deluded

[1] Eusebius Emissenus in serm. de Eucharistia.

many simple souls, and brought them to this horrible idolatry, to worship things visible and made with their own hands, persuading them that creatures were their Creator, their God, and their Maker.

For else what made the people to run from their seats to the altar, and from altar to altar, and from sakering (as they called it) to sakering, peeping, tooting, and gazing at that thing, which the priest held up in his hands, if they thought not to honour that thing which they saw? What moved the priests to lift up the sacrament so high over their heads? or the people to cry to the priest, hold up, hold up, and one man to say to another, stoop down before, or to say, this day I have seen my Maker; and, I cannot be quiet except I see my Maker once a day? What was the cause of all these, and that as well the priests as the people so devoutly did knock and kneel at every sight of the sacrament, but that they worshipped that visible thing which they saw with their eyes, and took it for very God? For if they worshipped in spirit only Christ, sitting in heaven with his Father, what needeth they to remove out of their seats to toot and gaze, as the apostles did after Christ when he was gone up into heaven? If they worshipped nothing that they saw, why did they rise up to see? Doubtless many of the simple peo-

ple worshipped that thing which they saw with their eyes.

And although the subtle Papists do colour and cloak the matter never so finely, saying, that they worship not the sacraments which they see with their eyes, but that thing which they believe with their faith to be really and corporally in the sacraments, yet why do they then run from place to place to gaze at the things which they see, if they worship them not, giving thereby occasion to them that be ignorant to worship that which they see? Why do they not rather quietly sit still in their seats, and move the people to do the like, worshipping God in heart and in spirit, than to gad about from place to place, to see that thing which they confess themselves is not to be worshipped?

And yet to eschew one inconvenience (that is to say, the worshipping of the sacrament,) they fall into another as evil, and worship nothing there at all. For they worship that thing (as they say) which is really and corporally and yet invisibly present under the kinds of bread and wine, which (as before is expressed and proved) is utterly nothing. And so they give unto the ignorant occasion to worship bread and wine, and they themselves worship nothing there at all.

But the Papists (for their own commodity to keep the people still in idolatry) do often allege

a certain place[k] of St. Augustine upon the Psalms, where he saith, "That no man doth eat the flesh of Christ, except he first worship it, and that we do not offend in worshipping thereof, but we should offend if we should not worship it."

That is true which St. Augustine saith in this place. For who is he that professeth Christ, and is spiritually fed and nourished with his flesh and blood, but he will honour and worship him, sitting at the right hand of his Father, and render unto him, from the bottom of his heart, all laud, praise, and thanks, for his merciful redemption!

And as this is most true which St. Augustine saith, so is that most false which the Papists would persuade upon St. Augustine's words, that the sacramental bread and wine, or any visible thing, is to be worshipped in the sacrament. For St. Augustine's mind was so far from any such thought, that he forbiddeth utterly to worship Christ's own flesh and blood alone, but in consideration and as they be annexed and joined to his divinity. How much less then could he think or allow that we should worship the sacramental bread and wine, or any outward or visible sacrament, which be shadows, figures, and representations of Christ's very flesh and blood!

[k] August. in Psal. xcviii.

And St. Augustine was afraid, lest in worshipping of Christ's very body we should offend; and therefore he biddeth us, when we worship Christ, that we should not tarry and fix our minds upon his flesh, which of itself availeth nothing, but that we should lift up our minds from the flesh to the spirit, which giveth life: and yet the Papists be not afraid, by crafty means, to induce us to worship those things, which be signs and sacraments of Christ's body.

But what will not the shameless Papists allege for their purpose, when they be not ashamed to maintain the adoration of the sacrament by these words of St. Augustine, wherein he speaketh not one word of the adoration of the sacrament, but only of Christ himself?

And although he say, that Christ gave his flesh to be eaten of us, yet he meant not that his flesh is here corporally present, and corporally eaten, but only spiritually. As his words declare plainly, which follow in the same place, where St. Augustine, as it were, in the person of Christ, speaketh these words: "It is the spirit that giveth life, but the flesh profiteth nothing. The words which I have spoken unto you, be spirit and life. That which I have spoken, understand you spiritually. You shall not eat this body which you see, and drink that blood which they shall shed that shall crucify me. I have commended unto you a sacrament, understand it

spiritually, and it shall give you life. And although it must be visibly ministered, yet it must be invisibly understood."

These words of St. Augustine, with the other before recited, do express his mind plainly, that Christ is not otherwise to be eaten than spiritually, which spiritual eating requireth no corporal presence; and that he intended not to teach here any adoration either of the visible sacraments, or of any thing that is corporally in them. For indeed there is nothing really and corporally in the bread to be worshipped, although the Papists say, that Christ is in every consecrated bread.

But our Saviour Christ himself hath given us warning before hand, that such false Christians and false teachers should come, and hath bid us to beware of them, saying, "If any man tell you that Christ is here, or Christ is there, believe him not; for there shall arise false Christs and false prophets, and shall shew many signs and wonders, so that if it were possible, the very elect should be brought into error. Take heed, I have told you beforehand [1]."

Thus our Saviour Christ, like a most loving pastor and saviour of our souls, hath given us warning beforehand of the perils and dangers that were to come, and to be wise and ware that

[1] Matt. xxiv.

we should not give credit unto such teachers as would persuade us to worship a piece of bread, to kneel to it, to knock to it, to creep to it, to follow it in procession, to lift up our hands to it, to offer to it, to light candles to it, to shut it up in a chest or box, to do all other honour unto it, more than we do unto God; having alway this pretence or excuse for our idolatry, Behold here is Christ. But our Saviour Christ calleth them false prophets, and saith, "Take heed, I tell you before, believe them not; if they say to you, Behold Christ is abroad or in the wilderness, go not out; and if they say that he is kept in close places, believe them not [m]."

CHAP. X.

And if you will ask me the question, who be those false prophets and seducers of the people, the answer is soon made; the Romish Antichrists and their adherents, the authors of all error, ignorance, blindness, superstition, hypocrisy, and idolatry.

They be the Papists that have deceived the people.

For Innocentius the Third, one of the most wicked men that ever was in the see of Rome, did ordain and decree that the host should be diligently kept under lock and key.

Innocentius tertius.

And Honorius the Third not only confirmed the same, but commanded also that the priests should diligently teach the people from time to time, that when they lifted up the bread called

Honorius tertius.

[m] Matt. xxiv.

the host, the people should then reverently bow down, and that likewise they should do when the priest carrieth the host unto sick folks. These be the statutes and ordinances of Rome, under pretence of holiness, to lead the people unto all error and idolatry; not bringing them by bread unto Christ, but from Christ unto bread.

CHAP. XI.

An exhortation to the true honouring of Christ in the sacrament.

But all that love and believe Christ himself, let them not think that Christ is corporally in the bread, but let them lift up their hearts unto heaven, and worship him, sitting there at the right hand of his Father. Let them worship him in themselves, whose temples they be, in whom he dwelleth and liveth spiritually: but in no wise let them worship him as being corporally in the bread; for he is not in it, neither spiritually, as he is in man, nor corporally, as he is in heaven; but only sacramentally, as a thing may be said to be in the figure, whereby it is signified.

Thus is sufficiently reproved the third principal error of the Papists, concerning the Lord's Supper, which is, that wicked members of the devil do eat Christ's very body, and drink his blood.

THUS ENDETH THE FOURTH BOOK.

THE FIFTH BOOK

IS OF

THE OBLATION AND SACRIFICE

OF

OUR SAVIOUR CHRIST.

CHAP. I.

The sacrifice of the mass.

THE greatest blasphemy and injury that can be against Christ, and yet universally used through the Popish kingdom, is this, that the priests make their mass a sacrifice propitiatory, to remit the sins as well of themselves, as of other both quick and dead, to whom they list to apply the same. Thus, under pretence of holiness, the Papistical priests have taken upon them to be Christ's successors, and to make such an oblation and sacrifice, as never creature made but Christ alone, neither he made the same any more times than once, and that was by his death upon the cross.

CHAP. II.

For as St. Paul in his Epistle to the Hebrews witnesseth, "Although the high priests of the

The difference between the sacrifice of Christ, and of the priests of the old law.

old law offered many times, (at the least every year once,) yet Christ offereth not himself many times, for then he should many times have died. But now he offereth himself but once, to take away sin by that offering of himself. And as men must die once, so was Christ offered once, to take away the sins of many [a]."

And furthermore St. Paul saith, "That the sacrifices of the old law, although they were continually offered from year to year, yet could they not take away sin, nor make men perfect. For if they could once have quieted men's consciences by taking away sin, they should have ceased, and no more have been offered. But Christ, with once offering, hath made perfect for ever them that be sanctified; putting their sins clean out of God's remembrance. And where remission of sins is, there is no more offering for sin [b]."

And yet further he saith, concerning the Old Testament, "That it was disannulled and taken away, because of the feebleness and unprofitableness thereof; for it brought nothing to perfection. And the priests of that law were many, because they lived not long, and so the priesthood went from one to another; but Christ liveth ever, and hath an everlasting priesthood that passeth not from him to any man else. Where-

[a] Heb. ix. [b] Heb. x.

fore he is able perfectly to save them that come to God by him, forasmuch as he liveth ever to make intercession for us. For it was meet for us to have such an high priest that is holy, innocent, without spot, separated from sinners, and exalted up above heaven; who needeth not daily to offer up sacrifice, as Aaron's priests did, first for his own sins, and then for the people. For that he did once, when he offered up himself[c]."

Here, in his Epistle to the Hebrews, St. Paul hath plainly and fully described unto us the difference between the priesthood and sacrifices of the Old Testament, and the most high and worthy priesthood of Christ, his most perfect and necessary sacrifice, and the benefit that cometh to us thereby. For Christ offered not the blood of calves, sheep, and goats, as the priests of the old law used to do; but he offered his own blood upon the cross. And he went not into an holy place made by man's hand, (as Aaron did,) but he ascended up into heaven, where his Eternal Father dwelleth; and before Him he maketh continual supplication for the sins of the whole world, presenting his own body, which was torn for us, and his precious blood, which of his most gracious and liberal charity he shed for us upon the cross.

And that sacrifice was of such force, that it

[c] Heb. vii.

was no need to renew it every year, as the bishops did of the Old Testament; whose sacrifices were many times offered, and yet were of no great effect or profit, because they were sinners themselves that offered them, and offered not their own blood, but the blood of brute beasts; but Christ's sacrifice, once offered, was sufficient for evermore.

CHAP. III.

And that all men may the better understand this sacrifice of Christ, which he made for the great benefit of all men, it is necessary to know the distinction and diversity of sacrifices.

Two kinds of sacrifices.

One kind of sacrifice there is, which is called a propitiatory or merciful sacrifice, that is to say, such a sacrifice as pacifieth God's wrath and indignation, and obtaineth mercy and forgiveness for all our sins, and is the ransom for our redemption from everlasting damnation.

The sacrifice of Christ.

And although in the Old Testament there were certain sacrifices called by that name, yet in very deed there is but one such sacrifice whereby our sins be pardoned, and God's mercy and favour obtained, which is the death of the Son of God our Lord Jesu Christ; nor never was any other sacrifice propitiatory at any time, nor ever shall be.

This is the honour and glory of this our High Priest, wherein he admitteth neither partner nor successor. For by his one oblation he satisfied his Father for all men's sins, and reconciled

mankind unto his grace and favour. And whosoever deprive him of this honour, and go about to take it to themselves, they be very Antichrists and most arrogant blasphemers against God, and against his Son Jesus Christ whom He hath sent.

The sacrifice of the church.

Another kind of sacrifice there is, which doth not reconcile us to God, but is made of them that be reconciled by Christ, to testify our duties unto God, and to shew ourselves thankful unto him; and therefore they be called sacrifices of laud, praise, and thanksgiving.

The first kind of sacrifice Christ offered to God for us; the second kind we ourselves offer to God by Christ.

And by the first kind of sacrifice Christ offered also us unto his Father; and by the second we offer ourselves, and all that we have, unto him and his Father.

And this sacrifice generally is our whole obedience unto God, in keeping his laws and commandments. Of which manner of sacrifice speaketh the prophet David, saying, "A sacrifice to God, is a contrite heart[d]." And St. Peter saith of all Christian people, "That they be an holy priesthood, to offer spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesu Christ[e]." And St. Paul saith, "That alway we offer unto God a sacrifice of laud and praise by Jesus Christ[f]."

[d] Psal. l. [e] 1 Pet. ii. [f] Heb. xiii.

CHAP. IV.

A more plain declaration of the sacrifice of Christ.

But now to speak somewhat more largely of the priesthood and sacrifice of Christ, he was such an high bishop, that he, once offering himself, was sufficient, by one effusion of his blood, to abolish sin unto the world's end. He was so perfect a priest, that by one oblation he purged an infinite heap of sins, leaving an easy and a ready remedy for all sinners, that his one sacrifice should suffice for many years unto all men that would not shew themselves unworthy. And he took unto himself not only their sins that many years before were dead, and put their trust in him, but also the sins of those that until his coming again should truly believe in his Gospel. So that now we may look for none other priest, nor sacrifice, to take away our sins, but only him and his sacrifice. And as he, dying once, was offered for all, so, as much as pertained to him, he took all men's sins unto himself. So that now there remaineth no more sacrifices for sin, but extreme judgment at the last day, when he shall appear to us again, not as a man to be punished again, and to be made a sacrifice for our sins, as he was before; but he shall come in his glory, without sin, to the great joy and comfort of them, which be purified and made clean by his death, and continue in godly and innocent living; and to the great terror and dread of them that be wicked and ungodly [g]."

[g] Heb. ix.

Thus the Scripture teacheth, that if Christ had made any oblation for sin more than once, he should have died more than once; forasmuch as there is none oblation and sacrifice for sin, but only his death. And now there is no more oblation for sin, seeing that by him our sins be remitted, and our consciences quieted.

CHAP. V.

The sacrifices of the old law.

And although in the Old Testament there were certain sacrifices, called sacrifices for sin, yet they were no such sacrifices that could take away our sins in the sight of God; but they were ceremonies ordained to this intent, that they should be, as it were, shadows and figures, to signify beforehand the excellent sacrifice of Christ that was to come, which should be the very true and perfect sacrifice for the sins of the whole world.

And for this signification they had the name of a sacrifice propitiatory, and were called sacrifices for sins, not because they indeed took away our sins, but because they were images, shadows, and figures, whereby godly men were admonished of the true sacrifice of Christ then to come, which should truly abolish sin and everlasting death.

And that those sacrifices, which were made by the priests in the old law, could not be able to purchase our pardon, and deserve the remission of our sins, St. Paul doth clearly affirm in his said Epistle to the Hebrews, where he saith,

"It is impossible that our sins should be taken away by the blood of oxen and goats[h]."

Wherefore all godly men, although they did use those sacrifices ordained of God, yet they did not take them as things of that value and estimation, that thereby they should be able to obtain remission of their sins before God. But they took them partly for figures and tokens ordained of God, by the which he declared, that he would send that seed, which he promised to be the very true sacrifice for sin, and that he would receive them that trusted in that promise, and remit their sins for the sacrifice after to come. And partly they used them as certain ceremonies, whereby such persons as had offended against the law of Moses, and were cast out of the congregation, were received again among the people, and declared to be absolved. As for like purposes we use, in the church of Christ, sacraments by him instituted. And this outward casting out from the people of God, and receiving in again, was according to the law and knowledge of man; but the true reconciliation and forgiveness of sin before God, neither the fathers of the old law had, nor we yet have, but only by the sacrifice of Christ, made in the mount of Calvary. And the sacrifices of the old law were prognostications and figures of the

[h] Heb. ix.

same then to come, as our sacraments be figures and demonstrations of the same now passed.

CHAP. VI.

The mass is not a sacrifice propitiatory.

Now by these foresaid things may every man easily perceive, that the offering of the priest in the mass, or the appointing of his ministration at his pleasure, to them that be quick or dead, cannot merit and deserve, neither to himself, nor to them for whom he singeth or sayeth, the remission of their sins: but that such Popish doctrine is contrary to the doctrine of the Gospel, and injurious to the sacrifice of Christ.

For if only the death of Christ be the oblation, sacrifice, and price, wherefore our sins be pardoned, then the act or ministration of the priest cannot have the same office. Wherefore it is an abominable blasphemy to give the office or dignity to a priest, which pertaineth only to Christ; or to affirm that the church hath need of any such sacrifice; as who should say, that Christ's sacrifice were not sufficient for the remission of our sins; or else that his sacrifice should hang upon the sacrifice of a priest.

But all such priests as pretend to be Christ's successors, in making a sacrifice of him, they be his most heinous and horrible adversaries. For never no person made a sacrifice of Christ, but he himself only. And therefore St. Paul saith, "That Christ's priesthood cannot pass from him to another. For what needeth any more sacrifices, if Christ's sacrifice be perfect and suffi-

cient[i]?" And as St. Paul saith, "That if the sacrifices and ministration of Aaron, and other priests of that time, had lacked nothing, but had been perfect and sufficient, then should not the sacrifice of Christ have been required, (for it had been but in vain to add any thing to that, which of itself was perfect;) so likewise if Christ's sacrifice which he had made himself be sufficient, what need we every day to have more and more sacrifices[k]?" Wherefore all Popish priests that presume to make every day a sacrifice of Christ, either must they needs make Christ's sacrifice vain, imperfect, and unsufficient, or else is their sacrifice in vain, which is added to the sacrifice which is already of itself sufficient and perfect.

But it is a wonderous thing to see what shifts and cautels the Popish Antichrists devise, to colour and cloak their wicked errors. And as a chain is so joined together, that one link draweth another after it; so be vices and errors knit together, that every one draweth his fellow with him. And so doth it here in this matter.

CHAP. VII.

A confutation of the Papists' cavillation.

For the Papists, to excuse themselves, do say, that they make no new sacrifice, nor none other sacrifice than Christ made; for they be not so blind, but they see that then they should add another sacrifice to Christ's sacrifice, and so make his sacrifice imperfect; but they say, that

[i] Heb. vii. [k] Heb. viii.

they make the self-same sacrifice for sin that Christ himself made.

And here they run headlong into the foulest and most heinous error that ever was imagined. For if they make every day the same oblation and sacrifice for sin that Christ himself made, and the oblation that he made was his death, and the effusion of his most precious blood upon the cross, for our redemption and price of our sins: then followeth it of necessity, that they every day slay Christ and shed his blood; and so be they worse than the wicked Jews and Pharisees, which slew him, and shed his blood but once.

CHAP. VIII.

The true sacrifice of all Christian people.

Almighty God, the Father of light and truth, banish all such darkness and error out of his church, with the authors and teachers thereof; or else convert their hearts unto him, and give this light of faith to every man, that he may trust to have remission of his sins, and be delivered from eternal death and hell, by the merit only of the death and blood of Christ: and that by his own faith every man may apply the same unto himself, and not take it at the appointment of Popish priests, by the merit of their sacrifices and oblations.

If we be indeed, as we profess, Christian men, we may ascribe this honour and glory to no man, but to Christ alone. Wherefore let us give the whole laud and praise hereof unto him; let us

fly only to him for succour; let us hold him fast, and hang upon him, and give ourselves wholly to him. And forasmuch as he hath given himself to death for us, to be an oblation and sacrifice to his Father for our sins, let us give ourselves again unto him, making unto him an oblation, not of goats, sheep, kine, and other beasts that have no reason, as was accustomed before Christ's coming; but of a creature that hath reason, that is to say, of ourselves, not killing our own bodies, but mortifying the beastly and unreasonable affections that would gladly rule and reign in us.

So long as the law did reign, God suffered dumb beasts to be offered unto him; but now that we be spiritual, we must offer spiritual oblations, in the place of calves, sheep, goats, and doves. We must kill devilish pride, furious anger, insatiable covetousness, filthy lucre, stinking lechery, deadly hatred and malice, foxy wiliness, wolvish ravening and devouring, and all other unreasonable lusts and desires of the flesh. "And as many as belong to Christ, must crucify and kill these for Christ's sake, as Christ crucified himself for their sakes[r]."

These be the sacrifices of Christian men; these hosts and oblations be acceptable to Christ. And as Christ offered himself for us, so is it our

[r] Galat. v.

duties after this sort to offer ourselves to him again. And so shall we not have the name of Christian men in vain; but as we pretend to belong to Christ in word and profession, so shall we indeed be his in life and inward affection. So that within and without we shall be altogether his, clean from all hypocrisy or dissimulation. And if we refuse to offer ourselves after this wise unto him, by crucifying our own wills, and committing us wholly to the will of God, we be most unkind people, superstitious hypocrites, or rather unreasonable beasts, worthy to be excluded utterly from all the benefits of Christ's oblation.

CHAP. IX.

The Popish mass is detestable idolatry, utterly to be banished from all Christian congregations.

And if we put the oblation of the priest in the stead of the oblation of Christ, refusing to receive the sacrament of his body and blood ourselves, as he ordained; and trusting to have remission of our sins by the sacrifice of the priest in the mass, and thereby also to obtain release of the pains in purgatory, we do not only injury to Christ, but also commit most detestable idolatry. For these be but false doctrines, without shame devised, and feigned, by wicked Popish priests, idolaters, monks, and friars, which for lucre have altered and corrupted the most holy Supper of the Lord, and turned it into manifest idolatry. Wherefore all godly men ought with all their heart to resist and abhor all such blasphemy against the Son of God.

And forasmuch as in such masses is manifest wickedness and idolatry, wherein the priest alone maketh oblation satisfactory, and applieth the same for the quick and the dead at his will and pleasure; all such Popish masses are to be clearly taken away out of Christian churches, and the true use of the Lord's Supper is to be restored again, wherein godly people assembled together may receive the sacrament every man for himself, to testify that he is a member of Christ's body, fed with his flesh, and drinking his blood spiritually.

CHAP. X.

Every man ought to receive the sacrament himself, and not one for another.

Christ did not ordain his sacraments to this use, that one should receive them for another, and the priest for all the lay people; but he ordained them for this intent, that every man should receive them for himself, to ratify, confirm, and establish his own faith and everlasting salvation. Therefore as one man may not be baptized for another, (and if he be, it availeth nothing;) so ought not one to receive the holy communion for another. For if a man be dry or hungry, he is never a whit eased, if another man drink or eat for him: or if a man be all befiled, it helpeth him nothing, another man to be washed for him: so availeth it nothing to a man, if another man be baptized for him, or be refreshed for him with the meat and drink at the Lord's table. And therefore, said St. Peter, "Let every man be baptized in the name of Jesu

Christ[m]." And our Saviour Christ said to the multitude, "Take, and eat." And further he said, "Drink you all of this." Whosoever therefore will be spiritually regenerated in Christ, he must be baptized himself. And he that will live himself by Christ, must by himself eat Christ's flesh and drink his blood.

And briefly to conclude: he that thinketh to come to the kingdom of Christ himself, must also come to his sacraments himself, and keep his commandments himself, and do all things that pertain to a Christian man and to his vocation himself; lest if he refer these things to another man to do them for him, the other may with as good right claim the kingdom of heaven for him.

CHAP. XI.

The difference between the priest and the layman.

Therefore Christ made no such difference between the priest and the layman, that the priest should make oblation and sacrifice of Christ for the layman, and eat the Lord's Supper from him all alone, and distribute and apply it as him liketh. Christ made no such difference; but the difference that is between the priest and the layman in this matter, is only in the ministration; that the priest, as a common minister of the church, doth minister and distribute the Lord's Supper unto other, and other receive it at his hands. But the very supper itself was by Christ instituted and given to the whole church, not to be offered

[m] Acts ii.

and eaten of the priest for other men, but by him to be delivered to all that would duly ask it.

As in a prince's house the officers and ministers prepare the table, and yet other, as well as they, eat the meat and drink the drink: so do the priests and ministers prepare the Lord's Supper, read the Gospel, and rehearse Christ's words; but all the people say thereto, Amen. All remember Christ's death, all give thanks to God, all repent and offer themselves an oblation to Christ, all take him for their Lord and Saviour, and spiritually feed upon him; and in token thereof, they eat the bread and drink the wine in his mystical supper.

And this nothing diminisheth the estimation and dignity of priesthood and other ministers of the church, but advanceth and highly commendeth their ministration. For if they are much to be loved, honoured, and esteemed that be the king's chancellors, judges, officers, and ministers in temporal matters; how much then are they to be esteemed that be ministers of Christ's words and sacraments, and have to them committed the keys of heaven, to let in and shut out, by the ministration of his word and gospel!

CHAP. XII.

The answer to the Papists.

Now, forasmuch, as I trust that I have plainly enough set forth the propitiatory sacrifice of our Saviour Jesu Christ, to the capacity and comfort of all men that have any understanding of Christ;

and have declared the heinous abomination and idolatry of the Popish mass, wherein the priests have taken upon them the office of Christ, to make a propitiatory sacrifice for the sins of the people, it is now necessary to make answer to the subtle persuasions and sophistical cavillations of the Papists, whereby they have deceived many a simple man, both learned and unlearned.

The place of St. Paul unto the Hebrews[n], (which they do cite for their purpose,) maketh quite and clean against them. For where St. Paul saith, "That every high priest is ordained to offer gifts and sacrifices for sins," he spake not that of the priests of the New Testament, but of the Old: which (as he saith) offered calves and goats. And yet they were not such priests, that by their offerings and sacrifices they could take away the people's sins, but they were shadows and figures of Christ, our everlasting priest, which only by one oblation of himself taketh away the sins of the world." Wherefore the Popish priests that apply this text unto themselves, do directly contrary to the meaning of St. Paul, to the great injury and prejudice of Christ, by whom only, St. Paul saith, "That the sacrifice and oblation for the sin of the whole world was accomplished and fulfilled."

[n] Hebrews v.

And as little serveth for the Papists' purpose the text of the prophet Malachi, "That every where should be offered unto God a pure sacrifice and oblation[o]." For the prophet in that place spake no word of the mass, nor of any oblation propitiatory to be made by the priests; but he spake of the oblation of all faithful people (in what place soever they be) which offer unto God, with pure hearts and minds, sacrifices of laud and praise: prophesying of the vocation of the Gentiles, that God would extend his mercy unto them, and not be the God only of the Jews, but of all nations from east to west, that with pure faith call upon him, and glorify his name.

CHAP. XIII.

An answer to the authors.

But the adversaries of Christ gather together a great heap of authors, which (as they say) call the mass, or holy communion, a sacrifice. But all those authors be answered unto in this one sentence, that they called it not a sacrifice for sin, because that it taketh away our sin, (which was taken away only by the death of Christ,) but because it was ordained of Christ to put us in remembrance of the sacrifice made by him upon the cross. And for that cause it beareth the name of that sacrifice, as St. Augustine declareth plainly in his Epistle *Ad Bonifacium*[p], before rehearsed in this book; and in his book *De fide ad Petrum Diaconum*, before rehearsed

[o] Malachi i.

[p] Augustinus ad Bonifacium.

also. And in his book *De civitate Dei*[q], he saith, "That which men call a sacrifice, is a sign or representation of the true sacrifice."

And the master of the sentences (of whom all the school authors take their occasion to write) judged truly in this point, saying, "That which is offered and consecrated of the priest, is called a sacrifice and oblation, because it is a memory and representation of the true sacrifice and holy oblation, made in the altar of the cross[r]."

And St. John Chrysostome[s], after he hath said that Christ is our bishop which offered that sacrifice that made us clean, and that we offer the same now, lest any man might be deceived by his manner of speaking, he openeth his meaning more plainly, saying, "That which we do, is done for a remembrance of that which was done by Christ. For Christ saith, Do this in remembrance of me." Also Chrysostome declaring at length, that the priests of the old law offered ever new sacrifices, and changed them from time to time, and that Christian people do not so, but offer ever one sacrifice of Christ; yet by and by, lest some men might be offended with this speech, he maketh as it were a correction of his words, saying, "But rather we make a remembrance of Christ's sacrifice." As though

[q] De civitat. lib. 10. cap. 5.
[r] Lombardus, lib. 4. dist. 12.
[s] Chrysost. ad Heb. Hom. 17.

he should say: Although in a certain kind of speech we may say, that every day we make a sacrifice of Christ; yet in very deed, to speak properly, we make no sacrifice of him, but only a commemoration and remembrance of that sacrifice, which he alone made, and never none but he. Nor Christ never gave this honour to any creature, that he should make a sacrifice of him, nor did not ordain the sacrament of his holy supper, to the intent that either the people should sacrifice Christ again, or that the priests should make a sacrifice of him for the people: but his holy supper was ordained for this purpose, that every man eating and drinking thereof should remember that Christ died for him, and so should exercise his faith, and comfort himself by the remembrance of Christ's benefits; and so give unto Christ most hearty thanks, and give himself also clearly unto him.

Wherefore the ordinance of Christ ought to be followed; the priest to minister the sacrament to the people, and they to use it to their consolation. And in this eating, drinking, and using of the Lord's Supper, we make not of Christ a new sacrifice propitiatory for remission of sin.

CHAP. XIV.

The lay persons make a sacrifice as well as the priest.

But the humble confession of all penitent hearts, their acknowledging of Christ's benefits, their thanksgiving for the same, their faith and consolation in Christ, their humble submission and obedience to God's will and commandments,

is a sacrifice of laud and praise, accepted and allowed of God no less than the sacrifice of the priest. For Almighty God, without respect of person, accepteth the oblation and sacrifice of priest and lay person, of king and subject, of master and servant, of man and woman, of young and old, yea of English, French, Scot, Greek, Latin, Jew, and Gentile; of every man according to his faithful and obedient heart unto Him; and that through the sacrifice propitiatory of Jesu Christ.

CHAP. XV.

The Papistical mass is neither a sacrifice propitiatory, nor of thanksgiving.

And as for the saying or singing of mass by the priest, as it was in time passed used, it is neither a sacrifice propitiatory, nor yet a sacrifice of laud and praise, nor in any wise allowed before God, but abominable and detestable, and thereof may well be verified the saying of Christ, "That thing which seemeth an high thing before men, is abomination before God [t]."

They therefore which gather of the doctors, that the mass is a sacrifice for remission of sin, and that it is applied by the priest to them for whom he saith or singeth; they which so gather of the doctors, do to them most grievous injury and wrong, most falsely belying them.

CHAP. XVI.

There were no Papisti-

For these monstrous things were never seen nor known of the old and primitive church, nor there were not then in one church many masses

[t] Luke xvi.

cal masses in the primitive church.

every day, but upon certain days there was a common table of the Lord's Supper, where a number of people did together receive the body and blood of the Lord: but there were then no daily private masses, where every priest received alone, like as until this day there is none in the Greek churches but one common mass in a day. Nor the holy fathers of the old church would not have suffered such ungodly and wicked abuses of the Lord's Supper.

But these private masses sprang up of late years partly through the ignorance and superstition of unlearned monks and friars, which knew not what a sacrifice was, but made of the mass a sacrifice propitiatory, to remit both sin and the pain due for the same; but chiefly they sprang of lucre and gain, when priests found the means to sell masses to the people, which caused masses so much to increase, that every day was said an infinite number, and that no priest would receive the communion at another priest's hand, but every one would receive it alone; neither regarding the godly decree of the most famous and holy council of Nice[u], which appointeth in what order priests should be placed above deacons at the communion; nor yet the canons of the apostles[x], which command that when any commu-

[u] Concilium Nicenum, cap. 14.

[x] Canones Apostolorum, cap. 8.

nion is ministered, all the priests together should receive the same, or else be excommunicated. So much the old fathers misliked, that any priest should receive the sacrament alone.

Therefore when the old fathers called the mass, or supper of the Lord, a sacrifice, they meant that it was a sacrifice of lauds and thanksgiving, (and so as well the people as the priest do sacrifice,) or else that it was a remembrance of the very true sacrifice propitiatory of Christ: but they meant in no wise that it is a very true sacrifice for sin, and applicable by the priest to the quick and dead.

For the priest may well minister Christ's words and sacraments to all men both good and bad, but he can apply the benefit of Christ's passion to no man of age and discretion, but only to such as by their own faith do apply the same unto themselves. So that every man of age and discretion taketh to himself the benefits of Christ, or refuseth them himself, by his own faith, quick or dead; that is to say, by his true and lively faith, that worketh by charity, he receiveth them, or else by his ungodliness or feigned faith rejecteth them.

And this doctrine of the Scripture clearly condemneth the wicked inventions of the Papists in these latter days, which have devised a purgatory to torment souls after this life, and oblations of masses said by the priests to deliver them

from the said torments; and a great number of other commodities do they promise to the simple ignorant people by their masses.

CHAP. XVII.

The causes and means how Papistical masses entered into the church.

Now the nature of man being ever prone to idolatry from the beginning of the world, and the Papists being ready by all means and policy to defend and extol the mass for their estimation and profit; and the people being superstitiously enamoured and doted upon the mass, because they take it for a present remedy against all manner of evils; and part of the princes being blinded by Papistical doctrine, part loving quietness, and loth to offend their clergy and subjects, and all being captive and subject to the Antichrist of Rome; the state of the world remaining in this case, it is no wonder that abuses grew and increased in the church, that superstition with idolatry were taken for godliness and true religion, and that many things were brought in without the authority of Christ:

The abuses of the Papistical masses.

As purgatory, the oblation and sacrificing of Christ by the priest alone, the application and appointing of the same to such persons as the priest would sing or say mass for, and to such abuses as they could devise, to deliver some from purgatory, and some from hell, if they were not there finally by God determined to abide, as they termed the matter; to make rain or fair weather, to put away the plague and other sicknesses both from man and beast, to hallow and

preserve them that went to Jerusalem, to Rome, to St. James in Compostella, and to other places in pilgrimage; for a preservative against tempest and thunder, against perils and dangers of the sea; for a remedy against murrain of cattle, against pensiveness of the heart, and against all manner of affliction and tribulation.

And, finally, they extol their masses far above Christ's passion; promising many things thereby, which were never promised us by Christ's passion: As that if a man hear mass, he shall lack no bodily sustenance that day, nor nothing necessary for him, nor shall be letted in his journey; he shall not lose his sight that day, nor die no sudden death; he shall not wax old in the time that he heareth mass, nor no wicked spirits shall have power of him, be he never so wicked a man, so long as he looketh upon the sacrament. All these foolish and devilish superstitions the Papists of their own idle brain have devised of late years, which devices were never known in the old church.

CHAP. XVIII.

Which church is to be followed.

And yet they cry out against them that profess the Gospel, and say that they dissent from the church, and would have them to follow the example of their church. And so would they gladly do, if the Papists would follow the first church of the apostles, which was most pure and incorrupt; but the Papists have clearly varied from the usage and example of that church, and

have invented new devices of their own brains, and will in no wise content to follow the primitive church; and yet they would have other to follow their church, utterly varying and dissenting from the first most godly church.

But thanks be to the Eternal God, the manner of the holy communion, which is now set forth within this realm, is agreeable with the institution of Christ, with St. Paul and the old primitive and apostolick church, with the right faith of the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross for our redemption, and with the true doctrine of our salvation, justification, and remission of all our sins by that only sacrifice.

A short instruction to the holy communion.

Now resteth nothing but that all faithful subjects will gladly receive and embrace the same, being sorry for their former ignorance; and every man repenting himself of his offences against God, and amending the same, may yield himself wholly to God, to serve and obey Him all the days of his life, and often to come to the holy supper, which our Lord and Saviour Christ hath prepared; and as he there corporally eateth the very bread, and drinketh the very wine; so spiritually he may feed of the very flesh and blood of Jesu Christ his Saviour and Redeemer, remembering his death, thanking him for his benefits, and looking for none other sacrifice at no priest's hands for remission of his sins, but only trusting to his sacrifice, which being both the

high priest, and also the Lamb of God, prepared from the beginning to take away the sins of the world, offered up himself once for ever in a sacrifice of sweet smell unto his Father, and by the same paid the ransom for the sins of the whole world; who is before us entered into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of his Father, as patron, mediator, and intercessor for us; and there hath prepared places for all them that be lively members of his body, to reign with him for ever, in the glory of his Father; to Whom with Him, and the Holy Ghost, be glory, honour, and praise, for ever and ever. Amen.

APPENDIX.

No. I.

From bishop RIDLEY'S *Replies in the Disputation with the Papists, held at Cambridge, June* 20, 1549. *First printed in Fox's Acts and Monuments; reprinted in* 1688 *by Dr. Gilbert Ironside, as some assert; by the learned and reverend Henry Wharton, according to others.*

I GRANT that the old ancient fathers do record, and witness, a certain honour and adoration to be due unto Christ's body; but they speak not of it in the sacrament, but of it in heaven, at the right hand of the Father; as holy *Chrysostome* saith, *Honour thou it, and then eat it.* But that honour may not be given to the outward sign, but to the body of Christ itself in heaven. For that body is [a] there only in a sign virtually, by grace, in the exhibition of it in spirit, effect, and faith, to the worthy receiver of it. For we receive, virtually only, Christ's body in the sacrament.

Also I grant, that there is a mutation of the common bread and wine spiritually into the Lord's bread and wine, by the sanctifying of them in the Lord's word. But I deny that there is any mutation of the substances; for there is no change either of the substances, or of the accidents; but in very deed there do come unto the

[a] In the Sacrament.

bread other accidents, insomuch that whereas the bread and wine were not sanctified before, nor holy, yet afterwards they are sanctified, and so do receive then another sort or kind of virtue which they had not before.

Christ dwelleth in us by faith, and by faith we receive Christ both God and man, both in spirit and flesh; that is, this sacramental eating is the mean, and way, whereby we attain to the spiritual eating; and indeed for the strengthening of us to the eating of this spiritual food was this sacrament ordained. And these words, *This is my body,* are meant thus: by grace it is my true body, but not my fleshly body, as some of you suppose.—[b] The circumstances of the Scripture, the analogy and proportion of the sacraments, and the testimony of the faithful Fathers, ought to rule us in taking the meaning of the Holy Scripture touching the sacrament [of the Lord's Supper.] But the words of the Lord's Supper, the circumstances of the Scripture, the analogy of the sacraments, and the sayings of the Fathers, do most effectually and plainly prove a figurative speech in the words of the Lord's Supper. Therefore, a figurative sense and meaning is specially to be received in these words, *This is my body.*

The circumstances of the Scripture: *Do this in remembrance of me. As oft as ye shall eat of this bread, and drink of this cup, ye shall shew forth the Lord's death. Let a man prove himself, and so eat of this bread and drink of this cup. They came together to break bread; and they continued in breaking of bread. The bread which we break, &c. For we, being many, are all one bread and one body, &c.*

[b] From the bishop's Answers to the Propositions of the Papists, in the Disputation at Oxford, in April, 1554. First printed in Fox's Acts and Monuments; reprinted in 1688.

The analogy of the sacraments is necessary; for if the sacraments had not some similitude or likeness of the things whereof they be sacraments, they could in no wise be sacraments. And this similitude, in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, is taken three manner of ways. The first consisteth in nourishing; as you shall read in *Rabanus, Cyprian, Austin, Irenæus,* and most plainly in *Isidore* out of *Bertram.* The second, in the uniting and joining of many into one, as *Cyprian* teacheth. The third is a similitude of unlike things; where, like as the bread is turned into one body, so we by the right use of this sacrament are turned, through faith, into the body of Christ.

The sayings of the Fathers declare it to be a figurative speech; as it appeareth in *Origen, Tertullian, Chrysostome* in opere imperfecto, *Augustine, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Hilary,* and most plainly of all, in *Bertram.* Moreover the sayings and places of all the fathers, whose names I have [c] before recited against the assertion of the first proposition, do quite overthrow Transubstantiation. But of all, most evidently and plainly, *Irenæus, Origen, Cyprian, Chrysostome* to Cæsarius the monk, *Augustine* against Adamantius, *Gelasius, Cyril, Epiphanius, Chrysostome* again on the 20th of Matthew, *Rabanus, Damascene,* and *Bertram.*—Finally, with *Bertram,* I confess that Christ's body is in the sacrament in this respect; namely, as he writeth: because there is in it the spirit of Christ; that is, the power of the Word of God, which

[c] Namely, against the assertion, *that in the sacrament of the altar, by the virtue of God's Word spoken of the priest, the natural body of Christ, born of the Virgin Mary, and his natural blood, is really present under the forms of bread and wine.* Against this assertion, the fathers, whom Ridley adduces, besides those named in the preceding and subsequent sentences above, are, *Justin, Irenæus, Eusebius Emissenus, Athanasius, Jerome, Vigilius, and Fulgentius.*

not only feedeth the soul, but also cleanseth it.—I suppose it may [now] appear unto all men how far we are from that opinion, whereof some go about falsely to slander us to the world, saying, we teach that the godly and faithful should receive nothing else at the Lord's Table but a figure of the body of Christ.

[d] I answer also to this proposition, [THAT IN THE MASS IS THE LIVELY SACRIFICE OF THE CHURCH, PROPITIABLE AND AVAILABLE FOR THE SINS AS WELL OF THE QUICK AS OF THE DEAD,] that being taken in such sense as the words seem to import, it is not only erroneous, but withal so much to the derogation and defacing of the death and passion of Christ, that I judge it may and ought most worthily to be counted wicked and blasphemous against the most precious blood of our Saviour Christ.

ARGUMENTS CONFIRMING THIS ANSWER.

No sacrifice ought to be done, but where the priest is meet to offer the same.

All other priests are unmeet to offer sacrifice propitiatory for sin, save only Christ.

Therefore, no other priests ought to sacrifice for sin, but Christ alone.

The second part of my argument is thus proved.

No honour in God's Church ought to be taken, whereunto a man is not called as Aaron.

It is a great honour in God's Church to sacrifice for sin.

Therefore, no man ought to sacrifice for sin, but only they which are called.

But only Christ is called to that honour.

Therefore, no other priest but Christ ought to sacrifice for sin.

[d] From the bishop's Answers, &c. as before

That no man is called to this degree of honour but Christ alone, it is evident; for there are but two only orders of priesthood allowed in the Word of God; namely, the order of Aaron and the order of Melchisedech. But now the order of Aaron is come to an end, by reason that it was unprofitable and weak; and of the order of Melchisedech there is but one priest alone, even Christ the Lord, who hath a priesthood that cannot pass to any other.

ANOTHER ARGUMENT.

That thing is vain, and to no effect, where no necessity is wherefore it is done.

To offer up any more sacrifice propiatory for the quick and the dead there is no necessity; for Christ our Saviour did that fully and perfectly, once for all.

Therefore, to do the same in the mass, it is in vain.

ANOTHER ARGUMENT.

After that eternal redemption is found and obtained, there needeth no more daily offering for the same.

But Christ, coming an high bishop, &c. found and obtained for us eternal redemption.

Therefore, there needeth now no more daily oblation for the sins of the quick and the dead.

ANOTHER ARGUMENT.

All remission of sins cometh only by shedding of blood.

In the mass there is no shedding of blood.

Therefore, in the mass there is no remission of sins; and so it followeth also that there is no propitiatory sacrifice.

ANOTHER ARGUMENT.

In the mass the passion of Christ is not in verity, but in a mystery, representing the same; yea even there, where the Lord's Supper is duly ministered.

But where Christ suffereth not, there is he not offered in verity: for the Apostle saith, *Not that he might offer up himself oftentimes; for then must he have suffered oftentimes since the beginning of the world.* Now where Christ is not offered, there is no propitiatory sacrifice.

Therefore, in the mass there is no propitiatory sacrifice. *For Christ appeared once in the latter end of the world, to put sin to flight by the offering up of himself. And as it is appointed to all men that they shall once die, and then cometh the judgment; even so Christ was once offered to take away the sins of many. And unto them that look for him shall he appear again without sin unto salvation.*

ANOTHER ARGUMENT.

Where there is any sacrifice that can make the comers thereunto perfect, there ought men to cease from offering any more expiatory and propitiatory sacrifices.

But in the New Testament there is one only sacrifice now already long since offered, which is able to make the comers thereunto perfect for ever.

Therefore, in the New Testament they ought to cease from offering any more propitiatory sacrifice.

SENTENCES OF THE SCRIPTURE TENDING TO THE SAME END AND PURPOSE, OUT OF WHICH ALSO MAY BE GATHERED OTHER MANIFEST ARGUMENTS FOR MORE CONFIRMATION THEREOF.

By the which will, saith the Apostle, *we are sanctified by the offering up of the body of Jesus Christ, once for all.* And in the same place, *But this man, after that he had offered one sacrifice for sin, sitteth for ever at the right hand of God, &c. For with one offering hath he made perfect for ever them that are sanctified, and by himself hath he purged our sins.* I beseech you to mark

these words, *by himself;* the which, well weighed, will, without doubt, cease all controversy. The Apostle plainly denieth any other sacrifice to remain for him that treadeth under his feet the blood of the Testament by the which he was made holy. Christ will not be crucified again; he will not his death to be had in derision. *He hath reconciled us in the body of his flesh.* Mark, I beseech you, he saith not *in the mystery of his body,* but *in the body of his flesh. If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous, and he is the propitiation for our sins; not for ours only, but for the sins of the whole world.*

I know that all these places of the Scripture are avoided by two manner of subtil shifts. The one is by the distinction of the bloody and unbloody sacrifice; as though our unbloody sacrifice of the Church were any other than the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, than a commemoration, a showing forth, and a sacramental representation of that one only bloody sacrifice offered up once for all. The other is by depraving and wresting the sayings of the ancient Fathers unto a strange kind of sense, as the Fathers themselves, indeed, never meant. For what the meaning of the Fathers was, is evident by that which St. *Augustin* writeth in his Epistle to Boniface, and in the 83d chapter of his ninth book against *Faustus,* the Manichee; besides many other places: likewise by *Eusebius Emissene, Cyprian, Chrysostome, Fulgentius, Bertram,* and others; which do wholly concord and agree together in this unity in the Lord; that the redemption, once made in verity for the salvation of man, continueth in full effect for ever, and worketh without ceasing unto the end of the world; that the sacrifice, once offered, cannnot be consumed; that the Lord's death and passion is as effectual, the virtue of that blood

once shed, as fresh at this day for the washing away of sins, as it was even the same day that it flowed out of the side of our blessed Saviour; and finally, that the whole substance of our sacrifice, which is frequented of the Church in the Lord's Supper, consisteth in prayers, praise, and giving of thanks, and in remembering and showing forth of that sacrifice once offered upon the altar of the cross; that the same might continually be had in reverence by mystery, which once only, and no more, was offered for the price of our redemption.

No. II.

From bishop HOOPER's *Brief and Clear Confession of the Christian Faith, first printed in* 1550, *again in* 1581, *and in* 1584.

I believe that the holy sacrament of the Supper is a holy and outward ceremony, instituted by Jesus Christ in the Gospel, a day before his death, in the nature and substance of bread and wine, in remembrance and for a memorial of his death and passion, having and containing in it a promise of the remission of sins. By this sacrament we are indeed made partakers of the body and blood of Jesus Christ, and are therewith nourished and fed in the house of the Lord, which is his Church, and after that into the same we are entered through Baptism. The same ought to be given and ministered unto all under both the kinds, according to the ordinance and commandment of Christ; for the altering whereof none ought to be so hardy as to attempt any thing.

I believe that in the holy sacrament these signs and badges are not changed in any point, but the same do remain wholly in their nature; that is to say, the bread is not changed and transubstantiated (as the fond Papists and false doctors do teach, deceiving the poor,) into the body of Jesus Christ, neither the wine transubstantiated into his blood; but the bread remaineth still bread, and the wine remaineth still wine, every one in its proper and first nature. For the words that Christ spake to his disciples in giving them the bread, saying, *This is my body*, I understand and believe to be spoken by a figurative

manner of speech, called *metonymia*, which is a manner of speaking very common in the Scriptures; as the same was understood and also declared by the writing of the holy fathers and doctors of the Church, *Irenæus*, *Cyprian*, *Tertullian*, *Ambrose*, *Augustine*, *Chrysostome*, and other like, who lived before the Council of Lateran; when it was concluded that the bread was transubstantiated into the body of Christ, and the wine into his blood; and then was it given forth as an article of faith, to the great dishonour of God, and to the great slander of all the Church.

I believe that all this sacrament consisteth in the use thereof; so that without the right use the bread and wine in nothing differ from other common bread and wine that are commonly used; and therefore do not believe that the body of Christ can be contained, hid, or enclosed, in the bread, under the bread, or with the bread; neither the blood in the wine, under the wine, or with the wine. But I believe and confess the very body of Christ to be in heaven, on the right hand of the Father; and that always and as often as we use this bread and wine, according to the ordinance and institution of Christ, we do verily and indeed receive his body and blood.

I believe that this receiving is not done carnally or bodily, but spiritually, through a true and lively faith; this is to say, the body and blood of Christ are not given to the mouth and belly for the nourishing of the body, but unto our faith for the nourishing of the spirit, and inward man, unto eternal life. And for that cause we have no need that Christ should come from heaven to us, but that we should ascend unto him, lifting up our hearts through a lively faith on high unto the right hand of the Father, where Christ sitteth, from whence we wait for

our redemption; and we must not seek for Christ in these bodily elements.

I believe that Jesus Christ, by the sacrifice of his body which he offered upon the tree of the cross, hath defaced and destroyed sin, death, and the devil, with all his kingdom; and hath wholly performed the work of our salvation; and hath abolished and made an end of all other sacrifices. So that from thenceforth there is none other propitiatory sacrifice, either for the living or the dead, to be looked for, or sought for, than the same. For by this one only oblation hath he consecrated for ever all those that are sanctified.

I believe that the Holy Supper of the Lord is not a sacrifice, but only a remembrance and commemoration of this holy sacrifice of Jesus Christ. Therefore, it ought not to be worshipped as God, neither as Christ therein contained, who must be worshipped in faith only, without all corruptible elements.

Likewise, I believe and confess that the Popish mass is the invention and ordinance of man, a sacrifice of antichrist, and a forsaking of the sacrifice of Jesus Christ, that is to say, of his death and passion; and that it is a foul and infected sepulchre, which hideth and covereth the merit of the blood of Christ; and therefore ought the mass to be abolished, and the Holy Supper of the Lord to be restored and set in its perfection again.

No. III.

From bishop JEREMY TAYLOR'S *Dissuasive from Popery*, chap. 2. sect. 12.

If their [the Papists'] doctrines, as they are explicated by their practice and the commentaries of their greatest doctors, do make their disciples GUILTY OF IDOLATRY; there is not any thing greater to deter men from them, than that danger to their souls, which is imminent over them, upon that account.

Their worshipping of images we have already reproved upon the account of its novelty, and innovation, in Christian religion. But that it is against good life; a direct breach of the second commandment; an act of idolatry, as much as the heathens themselves were guilty of, in relation to the second commandment; is but too evident by the doctrines of their own leaders.

The same also is the case in THEIR WORSHIPPING THE CONSECRATED BREAD AND WINE. Of which how far they will be excused before God by their ignorant pretensions and suppositions, we know not; but they hope to save themselves harmless by saying, that THEY BELIEVE THE BREAD TO BE THEIR SAVIOUR, and that if they did not believe so, they would not do so. We believe that they say true; but we are afraid that this will no more excuse them, than it will excuse those who worship the sun, and moon, and the queen of heaven, whom they would

not worship, if they did not believe to have divinity in them. And it may be observed, that they are very fond of that persuasion, by which they are led into this worship. The error might be some excuse, if it were probable, or if there were much temptation to it; but when they choose this persuasion, and have nothing for it but a tropical expression of Scripture, which rather than not believe in the natural, useless, and impossible sense, they will defy all their own reason, and four of the five operations of their soul, seeing, smelling, tasting, and feeling; and contradict the plain doctrine of the ancient Church, before they can consent to believe this error, THAT BREAD IS CHANGED INTO GOD, AND THE PRIEST CAN MAKE HIS MAKER;—we have too much cause to fear, that the error is too gross to admit an excuse. And it is hard to suppose it invincible and involuntary, because it is so hard, and so untempting, and so unnatural, to admit the error. We do desire that God may find an excuse for it, and that they would not. But this we are most sure of, that they might, if they pleased, find many excuses, or rather just causes, for not giving divine honour to the consecrated elements; because there are so many contingencies in the whole conduct of this affair, and we are so uncertain of the priest's intention, and we can never be made certain, that there is not in the whole order of causes any invalidity in the consecration; and it is so impossible that any man should be sure that *here*, and *now*, and *this* bread is transubstantiated, and is really the natural body of Christ; that it were fit to omit the giving God's due to that which they do not know to be any thing but a piece of bread; and it cannot consist with holiness, and our duty to God, *certainly* to give

divine worship to that thing, which, though their doctrine were true, *they cannot know certainly* to have a divine being.

[e] We hope it may be sufficient to say, THAT WHAT THE CHURCH OF ROME TEACHES OF TRANSUBSTANTIATION, IS ABSOLUTELY IMPOSSIBLE, AND IMPLIES CONTRADICTIONS VERY MANY, TO THE BELIEF OF WHICH NO FAITH CAN OBLIGE US, AND NO REASON CAN ENDURE. For Christ's body being in heaven, glorious, spiritual, and impassible, cannot be broken. And since, by the Roman doctrine, nothing is broken but that which cannot be broken, that is, the colour, the taste, and other accidents of the elements; yet if they could be broken, since the accidents of bread and wine are not the substance of Christ's body and blood, it is certain that on the altar Christ's body naturally, and properly, cannot be broken. And since they say that every consecrated wafer is Christ's whole body, and yet this wafer is not that wafer; therefore either this, or that, is not Christ's body; or else Christ hath two bodies, for there are two wafers. But when Christ instituted the sacrament, and said, *This is my body which is broken;* because at that time Christ's body was not broken naturally and properly, the very words of institution do force us to understand the sacrament in a sense *not natural,* but *spiritual,* that is, *truly sacramental.* And all this is besides the plain demonstrations of sense, which tells us it is bread and it is wine naturally as much after as before consecration. And after all, the natural sense is such as our Blessed Saviour reproved in the men of Capernaum, and called them to a spiritual understanding; the natural sense being not

[e] From the Dissuasive, chap. i. sect. 5.

only unreasonable and impossible, but also to no purpose of the spirit, or any ways perfective of the soul; as hath been clearly demonstrated by many learned men against the fond hypothesis of the Church of Rome in this article.

THE END.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY R. GILBERT,
ST. JOHN'S-SQUARE.

Princeton Theological Seminary-Speer Library
1 1012 01082 2288

DATE DUE

APR 1 0 2007			
JUN 3 0 2008			

HIGHSMITH #45115