

DISPUTATIONS AND EXAMINATIONS.

I. DISPUTATION AT OXFORD BETWEEN
DR SMITH, WITH HIS COLLEAGUES
AND OTHER DOCTORS, AND
BISHOP RIDLEY.

II. THE ORDER AND MANNER OF THE
EXAMINATION OF DOCTOR RIDLEY
HAD THE 30TH DAY OF
SEPTEMBER,
1555,
BEFORE THE QUEEN'S COMMISSIONERS.

I.

DISPUTATION AT OXFORD

BETWEEN

DR SMITH,

WITH HIS OTHER COLLEAGUES AND DOCTORS,

AND

BISHOP RIDLEY.

REPRINTED FROM FOX'S ACTS AND MONUMENTS.

DISPUTATION AT OXFORD

BETWEEN

DR SMITH,

WITH HIS OTHER COLLEAGUES AND DOCTORS,

AND

BISHOP RIDLEY.

PREFACE OF FOX.

THE next day following, which was the 17th¹ of April, Smith set to dispute against Ridley. [1555] was brought forth Dr Ridley to dispute; against whom was set Dr Smith² to be principal opponent. Touching which Dr Smith, forsomuch as mention here happeneth of his name, first the reader is to be advertised what is to be attributed to his judgment in religion, who so oftentimes before had turned and returned to and fro, grounded (as it seemeth) upon no firm conscience of doctrine, as both by his articles by him

[¹ This is said in some editions to have been April 12th, in others April 18th, and in the MSS. in the library of C.C.C. at Cambridge to have taken place on April 2, but Tuesday, April 17th, appears to have been the correct date. Strype in his life of Cranmer, (Book III. chap. 10.) gives the order of the proceedings day by day, grounding it as he alleges on a letter written by Dr Weston himself to the Bishop of London (Bonner): from this account it seems, that by a legal instrument the University of Cambridge authorised their Commissioners to go to Oxford to the Disputation; this was done by the Senate, April 10th, and at the same time a letter was written by the authority of the Senate to the University of Oxford; both these documents, viz. the legal instrument and the letter are given by Strype; (Append. nos. 77, 78,) the process commenced on Saturday. Cranmer, Ridley and Latimer disputed on Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday. On Wednesday, April 18th, the disputations ended, and on Friday, April 20th, all the three disputants were condemned. Ed.]

[² A full account of Dr Smith, together with the reason of his leaving England will be found in Strype's life of Cranmer, Book II. chap. 7 and 22. Ed.]

recanted may appear, and also by his own letter sent a little before in king Edward's days to the archbishop of Canterbury from Scotland. Which letter I thought here to exhibit as a certain preface before his own arguments, or rather as a testimony against himself, whereby the reader may understand how devoutly he magnified them and their doctrine a little before, against whom he now disputeth so busily. Read I beseech thee his epistle, and judge.

The true Copy of a certain Epistle of Dr Richard Smith to Dr Crammer, Archbishop of Canterbury, declaring his Affection to the setting forth of God's sincere Word.

Most honourable, I commend me unto your lordship, doing the same to understand, that I wrote letters to your grace in January last and the 10th day of February, declaring the causes of my sudden and unadvised departing from your grace over the sea; and desiring your good lordship, of your charity toward them that repent of their ill acts, to forgive me yourself all the wrong I did towards your grace, and to obtain in writing the king's majesty's pardon for me in all points concerning his laws: upon the receipt whereof I would return again home, and, within half a year (at the uttermost) afterward, write "De Sacerdotum Connubiis," etc. a Latin book that should be a just satisfaction for any thing that I have written against the same. Reliquaque omnia dogmata vestra tum demum libentur amplexurum, ubi Deus mentem meam [ita persuadeat] ut ea citra conscientiae læsionem agnoscam doceamque. I wrote not this that I want any good living here, but because mine absence out of the realm is dishonour to the king's highness and realm, and because I must need's (if I tarry here a quarter of a year longer) write an answer to your grace's book of the sacrament, and also a book of common places against all the doctrine set forth by the king's majesty, which I cannot do with a good conscience. Wherefore I beseech your grace help me home, as soon as you may conveniently, for God's sake; and ye shall never, I trust in God, repent that fact.

Ex urbe divi Andreae. 14. Feb. [1550.]

Rich. Smitheus.

Dr Smith
purposing
to write
for the
marriage
of priests.

And thus much touching the forenamed Dr Richard Smith, being set here (as is said) to dispute against bishop Ridley, who was brought now, the next day after the archbishop, to answer in the divinity school. Against whom also, besides Dr Smith, disputed Dr Weston, Dr Tresham, Dr Oglethorpe, Dr Glyn, Dr Seton, and Dr Cole, Master Ward, Master Harpsfield, Dr Watson, Master Pie, Master Harding, Master Curtop, Master Fecknam: to all them he answered very learnedly. He made a preface to these questions, but they would not let him go forth in it, but caused him to make an end of the same, and said it was blasphemy. And some said, he drove off the time in ambiguous things, nothing to the purpose; and so they would not suffer him to say his mind. Dr Smith could get nothing at his hand; insomuch that others did take his arguments and prosecuted them. He shewed himself to be learned, and a great clerk. They could bring nothing, but he knew it as well as they.

Disputers
against
Ridley.

The Disputation beginneth.

Weston the Prolocutor:—"Good christian people and brethren, we have begun this day our school, by God's good speed, I trust; and are entering into a controversy, whereof no question ought to be moved, concerning the verity of the body of our Lord Jesu Christ in the eucharist. Christ is true, who said the words. The words are true which he spake, yea, truth itself that cannot fail. Let us therefore pray unto God to send down unto us his holy Spirit, which is the true interpreter of his word; which may purge away errors, and give light, that verity may appear. Let us also ask leave and liberty of the church, to permit the truth received to be called this day in question, without any prejudice to the same. Your parts thereof shall be to implore the assistance of Almighty God, to pray for the prosperity of the queen's majesty, and to give us quiet and attentive ears. Now go to your question."

Dr Smith:—"This day, right learned Master Doctor, three questions are propounded, whereof no controversy among Christians ought to be moved, to wit;

The ques-
tions.

“First, Whether the natural body of Christ our Saviour conceived of the Virgin Mary, and offered for man’s redemption upon the cross, is verily and really in the sacrament by virtue of God’s word spoken by the priests, &c.

“Secondly, Whether in the sacrament, after the words of consecration, be any other substance, &c.

“Thirdly, Whether in the mass be a sacrifice propitiatory, &c.

“Touching the which questions, although you have publicly and apertly professed your judgment and opinion on Saturday last; yet being not satisfied with that your answer, I will essay again to demand your sentence in the first question—whether the true body of Christ, after the words pronounced, be really in the eucharist, or else only the figure. In which matter I stand here now to hear your answer.”

*The Preface or Protestation of Dr Ridley before his Disputation.*¹

“I received of you the other day, right worshipful master prolocutor, and ye my reverend masters, commissioners from the queen’s majesty and her honourable council, three propositions; whereunto ye commanded me to prepare against this day, what I thought good to answer concerning the same.

“Now, whilst I weighed with myself how great a charge of the Lord’s flock was of late committed unto me, for the which I am certain I must once render an account to my Lord God (and that how soon, he knoweth), and that moreover, by the commandment of the Apostle Peter, I ought to be ready alway to give a reason of the hope that is in me with meekness and reverence, unto every one that shall demand the same: beside this, considering my duty to the Church of Christ, and to your worships, being commissioners by public authority; I determined with myself to obey your commandment, and so openly to declare unto you my mind touching the aforesaid propositions. And albeit, plainly to confess

[¹ This Preface or Protestation exists in Ridley’s own Latin, and will be found in Appendix I. Ed.]

What moved Ridley to alter his.

unto you the truth in these things which ye now demand of me, I have thought otherwise in times past than now I do, yet (God I call to record unto my soul, I lie not) I have not altered my judgment, as now it is, either by constraint of any man or laws, either for the dread of any dangers of this world, either for any hope of commodity; but only for the love of the truth revealed unto me by the grace of God (as I am undoubtedly persuaded) in his holy word, and in the reading of the ancient fathers.

“These things I do rather recite at this present, because it may happen to some of you hereafter, as in times past it hath done to me: I mean, if ye think otherwise of the matters propounded in these propositions than now I do, God may open them unto you in time to come.

“But howsoever it shall be, I will in few words do that which I think ye all look I should do; that is, as plainly as I can, I will declare my judgment herein. Howbeit of this I would ye were not ignorant, that I will not indeed wittingly and willingly speak in any point against God’s word, or dissent in any one jot from the same, or from the rules of faith, and christian religion: which rules that same most sacred word of God prescribeth to the church of Christ, whereunto I now and for ever submit myself and all my doings. And because the matter I have now taken in hand is weighty, and ye all well know how unready I am to handle it accordingly, as well for lack of time, as also lack of books; therefore here I protest, that I will publicly this day require of you, that it may be lawful for me, concerning all mine answers, explications, and confirmations, to add or diminish whatsoever shall seem hereafter more convenient and meet for the purpose, through more sound judgment, better deliberation, and more exact trial of every particular thing. Having now, by the way of preface and protestation, spoken these few words, I will come to the answering of the propositions propounded unto me, and so to the most brief explication and confirmation of mine answers.”

Weston:—“Reverend master doctor, concerning the lack of books there is no cause why you should complain. What books soever you will name, ye shall have them; and as concerning the judgment of your answers to be had of your-

judgment from the church of Rome.

Ridley submitteth himself to the church of Christ.

This promise was not kept.

self with further deliberation, it shall, I say, be lawful for you, until Sunday next, to add unto them what you shall think good yourself. My mind is, that we should use short arguments, lest we should make an infinite process of the thing."

Ridley :—"There is another thing besides, which I would gladly obtain at your hands. I perceive that you have writers and notaries here present. By all likelihood our disputations shall be published¹: I beseech you for God's sake, let me have liberty to speak my mind freely, and without interruption; not because I have determined to protract the time with a solemn preface, but lest it may appear that some be not satisfied. God wot I am no orator, nor have I learned rhetoric to set colours on the matter."

Weston :—"Among this whole company it shall be permitted you to take two for your part."

Ridley :—"I will choose two, if there are any here with whom I were acquainted."

Weston :—"Here are two which master Cranmer had yesterday. Take them, if it please you."

Ridley :—"I am content with them; I trust they are honest men."

The First Proposition.

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 are really present under the forms of bread and wine.

The Answer of Dr Ridley.

Ridley :—"In matters appertaining to God we may not speak according to the sense of man, nor of the world: therefore this proposition or conclusion is framed after another manner of phrase or kind of speech than the Scripture useth.

["Shall be published." Dr Wordsworth says: "However this might be intended by the Romish party, yet the design was never executed, for reasons which it requires no Œdipus to conjecture. They were challenged by the Protestants to make them public. 'And yet for all this, I warrant you, they be not hasty in putting forth the disputations in print. As much as they brag, I dare say they will never put them forth.'" Ep.]

These two notaries were master Jewel, sometime bishop of Salisbury, and master Gilbert Mounson.

The proposition put forth in dark terms.

Again, it is very obscure and dark, by means of sundry words of doubtful signification. And being taken in the sense which the schoolmen teach, and at this time the church of Rome doth defend; it is false and erroneous, and plain contrary to the doctrine which is according to godliness."

The Explication.

Ridley :—"How far the diversity and newness of the phrase, in all this first proposition, is from the phrase of the holy Scripture, and that in every part almost, it is so plain and evident to any that is but meanly exercised in holy writ, that I need not now (especially in this company of learned men), to spend any time therein, except the same shall be required of me hereafter.

"First, there is a doubtful sense in these words 'by virtue of God's word:' for it is doubtful what word of God this is; whether it be that which is read in the evangelists, or in Paul, or any other. And if it be that which is in the evangelists, or in St Paul, what that is. If it be in none of them, then how it may be known to be God's word, and of such virtue that it should be able to work so great a matter.

"Again, there is a doubt in these words 'of the priest,' whether no man may be called a priest, but he which hath authority to make propitiatory sacrifice for the quick and the dead; and how it may be proved that this authority was committed of God to any man, but to Christ alone.

"It is likewise doubted, after what order the sacrificing priest shall be, whether after the order of Aaron, or else after the order of Melchizedek. For as far as I know, the holy Scripture doth allow no more."

Weston :—"Let this be sufficient."

Ridley :—"If we lack time at this present, there is time enough hereafter."

Weston :—"These are but evasions or starting holes: you consume the time in vain."

Ridley :—"I cannot start far from you: I am captive and bound."

Weston :—"Fall to it, my masters."

Smith :—"That which you have spoken, may suffice at this present."

First doubt.

Second doubt.

Third doubt.

Ridley :—" Let me alone, I pray you ; for I have not much to say behind."

Weston :—" Go forward."

Fourth
doubt.

Ridley :—" Moreover, there is ambiguity in this word 'really,' whether it be to be taken as the logicians term it, 'transcendenter;' that is, most generally: and so it may signify any manner of thing which belongeth to the body of Christ, by any means: after which sort we also grant Christ's body to be really in the sacrament of the Lord's supper (as in disputation, if occasion be given, shall be declared), or whether it be taken to signify the very same thing, having body, life, and soul, which was assumed and taken of the word of God into the unity of person. In which sense, since the body of Christ is really in heaven, because of the true manner of his body, it may not be said to be here in the earth.

Fifth
doubt.

"There is yet a further doubtfulness in these words, 'under the forms of bread and wine,' whether the forms be there taken to signify the only accidental and outward shews of bread and wine; or therewithal the substantial natures thereof, which are to be seen by their qualities, and perceived by exterior senses. Now the error and falseness of the proposition, after the sense of the Roman church and schoolmen, may hereby appear, in that they affirm the bread to be transubstantiated and changed into the flesh assumed of the word of God, and that (as they say) by virtue of the word, which they have devised by a certain number of words, and cannot be found in any of the evangelists, or in Paul; and so they gather that Christ's body is really contained in the sacrament of the altar. Which position is grounded upon the foundation of the transubstantiation; which foundation is monstrous, against reason, and destroyeth the analogy or proportion of the sacraments; and therefore this proposition also; which is builded upon this rotten foundation, is false, erroneous, and to be counted as a detestable heresy of the sacramentaries."

The propo-
sition
erroneous
after the
sense of
the Romish
church.

Transub-
stantiation
not founded
in Scripture.

Weston :—" We lose time."

Ridley :—" You shall have time enough."

Weston :—" Fall to reasoning. You shall have some other day for this matter."

Ridley :—" I have no more to say concerning my explication. If you will give me leave, and let me alone, I will but speak a word or two for my confirmation."

Weston :—" Go to; say on."

The Confirmation of the aforesaid Answer.

Fes-¹ Ridley :—" There ought no doctrine to be established in the church of God, which dissenteth from the word of God, from the rule of faith, and draweth with it many absurdities that cannot be avoided. Argument.

ti- "But this doctrine of the first proposition is such:

no. "Ergo, It ought not to be established and maintained in the church of God.

"The major or first part of my argument is plain, and the minor or second part is proved thus:

"This doctrine maintaineth a real, corporal, and carnal presence of Christ's flesh, assumed and taken of the word, to be in the sacrament of the Lord's supper, and that not by virtue and grace only, but also by the whole essence and substance of the body and flesh of Christ.

"But such a presence disagreeeth from God's word, from the rule of faith, and cannot but draw with it many absurdities: The real presence disagreeeth from Scripture.

"Ergo, The second part is true.

"The first part of this argument is manifest, and the second may yet further be confirmed thus:"—

Weston :—" Thus you consume time, which might be better bestowed on other matters. Master opponent, I pray you to your arguments." Weston again interrupteth Ridley.

Smith :—" I will here reason with you upon transubstan-

[It may be well to observe, that ratiocination, according to the rules of logic, is conducted by means of figures and moods, as they are termed; these are couched in certain mnemonic words, which have been put into five mnemonic hexameters, as follows:

Fig. 1. Barbara, Celarent, Darii, Ferioque prioris.

Fig. 2. Cesare, Camestres, Festino, Baroco, secundæ.

Fig. 3. { Tertia, Darapti, Disamis, Datisi, Velapton.

et 4. { Bokardo, Feriso habet, quarta insuper addit, Bramantip, Camenes, Damaris, Felapo, Fresison.

See also Abp. Whately's Logic. Ed.]

tiation, which you say is contrary to the rule and analogy of faith; the contrary whereof I proved by the Scriptures and the doctors. But before I enter argumentation with you, I demand first, whether in the sixth chapter of John there be any mention made of the sacrament, or of the real presence of Christ in the sacrament?"

Ridley:—"It is against reason, that I should be impeached to prosecute that which I have to speak in this assembly; being not so long, but that it may be comprehended in few words."

Weston:—"Let him read on."

Ridley:—"First of all, this presence is contrary to many places of the holy Scripture.

"Secondly, it varieth from the articles of the faith.

"Thirdly, it destroyeth and taketh away the institution of the Lord's supper.

"Fourthly, it maketh precious things common to profane and ungodly persons; for it casteth that which is holy unto dogs, and pearls unto swine.

"Fifthly, it forceth men to maintain many monstrous miracles without necessity and authority of God's word.

"Sixthly, it giveth occasion to the heretics, who erred concerning the two natures in Christ, to defend their heresies thereby.

"Seventhly, it falsifieth the sayings of the godly fathers; it falsifieth also the catholic faith of the church, which the Apostles taught, the martyrs confirmed, and the faithful (as one of the fathers saith) do retain and keep until this day. Wherefore the second part of mine argument is true."

The Probation of the second or minor¹ part of this Argument by the parts thereof.

"This carnal presence is contrary to the word of God, as appeareth thus:—"I tell you the truth. It is profitable to you that I go away; for if I go not away, the Comforter shall not come unto you." "Whom the heavens must receive until the time of restoring of all things which God hath

[¹ Some editions have "antecedent or former part"; but on a reference to the syllogism in p. 197,—Festino,—it is plainly the second or minor against which Ridley is here arguing. Ed.]

Seven inconveniences come of the real presence.

Vigilius.

The seven inconveniences declared by parts. John xvi. Acts iii.

spoken.' 'The children of the bridegroom cannot mourn so long as the bridegroom is with them: but now is the time of mourning.' 'But I will see you again, and your hearts shall rejoice.' 'I will come again and take you to myself.' 'If they shall say unto you, Behold, here is Christ, or there is Christ, believe them not: for wheresoever the dead carcass is, thither the eagles will resort.'

"It varieth from the articles of the faith: 'He ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father, from whence (and not from any other place, saith St Augustine), he shall come to judge both the quick and the dead.'

"It destroyeth and taketh away the institution of the Lord's supper, which was commanded only to be used and continued until the Lord himself should come. If, therefore, he be now really present in the body of his flesh, then must the supper cease: for a remembrance is not of a thing present, but of a thing past and absent. And there is a difference between remembrance and presence, and, as one of the fathers saith, 'A figure is in vain where the thing figured is present.'

"It maketh precious things common to profane and ungodly persons, and constraineth men to confess many absurdities. For it affirmeth, that whoremongers and murderers, yea, and (as some of them hold opinion) the wicked and faithless, mice, rats, and dogs also, may receive the very real and corporal body of the Lord, wherein the fulness of the Spirit of light and grace dwelleth: contrary to the manifest words of Christ in six places and sentences of John vi.

"It confirmeth also and maintaineth that beastly kind of cruelty of the 'Anthropophagi,' that is, the devourers of man's flesh: for it is a more cruel thing to devour a quick man, than to slay him."

Pie:—"He requireth time to speak blasphemies. Leave your blasphemies."

Ridley:—"I had little thought to have had such reproachful words at your hands."

Weston:—"All is quiet. Go to your arguments, master doctor."

[² See Ridley's account of this tumultuous behaviour, among the documents before the letters. Ed.]

1. The real presence against the Scripture. Matt. ix. John xvi. John xiv.

Matt. xxiv.

2. Against the articles of the faith.

3. It destroyeth the institution of the Lord's supper.

4. It profaneth, &c.

The "Anthropophagi" are a kind of brutish people that feed on man's flesh.

Ridley :—" I have not many more things to say."

Weston :—" You utter blasphemies with a most impudent face: leave off, I say, and get you to the argument."

Ridley :—" It forceth men to maintain many monstrous miracles, without any necessity and authority of God's word. For at the coming of this presence of the body and flesh of Christ, they thrust away the substance of bread, and affirm that the accidents remain without any subject; and, in the stead thereof, they place Christ's body without his qualities and the true manner of a body. And if the sacrament be reserved so long until it mould, and worms breed, some say that the substance of bread miraculously returneth again, and some deny it. Other some affirm, the real body of Christ goeth down into the stomach of the receivers, and doth there abide so long only as they shall continue to be good. But another sort hold, that the body of Christ is carried into heaven, so soon as the forms of bread be bruised with the teeth. O works of miracles! Truly, and most truly, I see that fulfilled in these men, whereof St Paul prophesied, 'Because they have not received the love of the truth, that they might be saved, God shall send them strong delusions, that they should believe lies, and be all damned which have not believed the truth.' This gross presence hath brought forth that fond phantasy of concomitance, whereby is broken at this day and abrogated the commandment of the Lord for the distributing of the Lord's cup to the laity.

2 Thess. ii.

By this device of concomitance, the papists imagine as much to be received under one kind as both.

6. It giveth occasion to heretics.

7. It falsifieth the sayings of the old doctors.

"It giveth occasion to heretics to maintain and defend their errors; as to Marcion, which said that Christ had but a phantastical body; and to Eutyches, which wickedly confounded the two natures in Christ.

"Finally, it falsifieth the sayings of the godly fathers and the catholic faith of the church, which Vigilius, a martyr and grave writer, saith, was taught of the apostles, confirmed with the blood of martyrs, and was continually maintained by the faithful until his time. By the sayings of the fathers, I mean of Justin, Irenæus, Tertullian, Origen, Eusebius Emissenus', Athanasius, Cyril, Epiphanius, Jerome, Chrysos-

[Eusebius, Bp. of Emesa or Emissa, in Syria, and here called Emissenus, to distinguish him from Eusebius the historian: it is however probable, that the writer here referred to is Eusebius Philo-

tom, Augustine, Vigilius, Fulgentius, Bertram, and other most ancient fathers. All those places, as I am sure I have read making for my purpose, so am I well assured that I could shew the same, if I might have the use of mine own books; which I will take on me to do, even upon the peril of my life, and loss of all that I may lose in this world.

"But now, my brethren, think not, because I disallow that presence which the first proposition maintaineth (as a presence which I take to be forged, phantastical, and, beside the authority of God's word, perniciously brought into the church by the Romanists), that I therefore go about to take away the true presence of Christ's body in his supper rightly and duly ministered, which is grounded upon the word of God, and made more plain by the commentaries of the faithful fathers. They that think so of me, the Lord knoweth how far they are deceived. And to make the same evident unto you, I will in few words declare, what true presence of Christ's body in the sacrament of the Lord's supper I hold and affirm, with the word of God and the ancient fathers.

The faith and confession of Ridley in affirming the true presence in the sacrament.

"I say and confess with the evangelist Luke, and with the Apostle Paul, that the bread on the which thanks are given, is the body of Christ in the remembrance of him and his death, to be set forth perpetually of the faithful until his coming.

St Paul.

"I say and confess, the bread which we break to be the communion and partaking of Christ's body, with the ancient and the faithful fathers.

"I say and believe, that there is not only a signification of Christ's body set forth by the sacrament, but also that therewith is given to the godly and faithful the grace of Christ's body, that is, the food of life and immortality. And this I hold with Cyprian.

Cyprian.

"I say also with St Augustine, that we eat life and we drink life; with Emissene, that we feel the Lord to be present in grace; with Athanasius, that we receive celestial food, which cometh from above; the property of natural communion, with Hilary; the nature of flesh, and benediction which

Augustine.

Emissene.

Athanasius.

Hilary.

sophus, of whom Hoffman says, "Ex generosis Edessæ in Mesopotamia parentibus natus est. Extant homiliæ ejus lat. 8, Par. A.D. 1554. Op. 1575. Vixit tempore Constantii Imp. sub quo mortuus est, et Antiochia sepultus est, ideoque saltem ante A.D. 361 vivere desiit." Ed.]

- Cyril. giveth life, in bread and wine, with Cyril; and with the same Cyril, the virtue of the very flesh of Christ, life and grace of his body, the property of the only begotten, that is to say, life; as he himself in plain words expoundeth it.
- Basil. "I confess also with Basil, that we receive the mystical advent and coming of Christ, grace and the virtue of his very nature; the sacrament of his very flesh, with Ambrose; the body by grace, with Epiphanius; spiritual flesh, but not that which was crucified, with Jerome; grace flowing into a sacrifice, and the grace of the Spirit, with Chrysostom; grace and invisible verity, grace and society of the members of Christ's body, with Augustine.
- Ambrose.
- Epiphanius.
- Jerome.
- Chrysostom, &c.
- Bertram. "Finally, with Bertram (who was the last of all these) 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 not only feedeth the soul, but also cleanseth it. Out of these I suppose it may clearly 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."

The Second Proposition.

After the consecration there remaineth no substance of bread and wine, neither any other substance, than the substance of God and man.

The Answer of Dr Ridley.

Ridley:—"The second conclusion is manifestly false, directly against the word of God, the nature of the sacrament, and the most evident testimonies of the godly fathers; and it is the rotten foundation of the other two conclusions propounded by you, both of the first and of the third. I will not therefore now tarry upon any further explication of this answer, being contented with that which is already added afore to the answer of the first proposition."

[¹ The greater part, if not the whole, of the authors here mentioned, are cited by Ridley in former works—and as they are here only referred to generally, it has not been thought necessary to cite passages from them. Ed.]

The First Argument for the confirmation of this Answer.

"It is very plain by the word of God, that Christ did give bread unto his disciples, and called it his body.

"But the substance of bread is another manner of substance than is the substance of Christ's body, God and man:

"Therefore, the conclusion is false.

"The second part of mine argument is plain, and the first is proved thus:

The Second Argument.

Da- "That which Christ did take, on the which he gave thanks, and the which he brake, he gave to his disciples, and called it his body.

ti- "But he took bread, gave thanks on bread, and brake bread:

si. "Ergo, The first part is true. And it is confirmed with the authorities of the fathers, Irenæus, Tertulian, Origen, Cyprian, Epiphanius, Jerome, Augustine, Theodoret, Cyril, Rabanus, and Bede: whose places I will take upon me to shew most manifest in this behalf, if I may be suffered to have my books, as my request is.

"Bread is the body of Christ:

"Ergo, It is bread."

A tertio adjacente ad secundum adjacens cum verbi substantivi pura copula.

The rule of logic is this: "A propositione de tertio adjacente ad eam quæ est de secundo cum verbo recto significante existentiam, valet consequentia affirmavit," &c.

The Third Argument.

Ba- "As the bread of the Lord's table is Christ's natural body, so is it his mystical body.

ro- "But it is not Christ's mystical body by transubstantiation:

eo. "Ergo, It is not his natural body by transubstantiation.

"The second part of my argument is plain, and the first is proved thus: As Christ, who is the verity, spake of the bread, 'This is my body which shall be betrayed for you,' speaking there of his natural body: even so Paul, moved with the same Spirit of truth, said, 'We, though we be many, 1 Cor. x.

The major proved.

yet are we all one bread and one body, which be partakers of one bread.”

The Fourth Argument.

The argu-
ment hold-
eth.

“We may no more believe bread to be transubstantiate into the body of Christ, than the wine into his blood.

“But the wine is not transubstantiate into his blood:

“A destructio-
ne ante-
cedentis, ad
destructio-
nem conse-
quentis.”

“Ergo, Neither is that bread, therefore, transubstantiate into his body.

Matt. xxvi.
Mark xiv.

“The first part of this argument is manifest; and the second part is proved out of the authority of God’s word, in Matthew and Mark, ‘I will not drink of the fruit of the vine,’ &c. Now the fruit of the vine was wine, which Christ drank and gave to his disciples to drink. With this sentence agreeth plainly the place of Chrysostom on the twentieth chapter of Matthew¹: as Cyprian² doth also, affirming that there is no blood, if wine be not in the cup.”

Chryso-
stom.
Cyprian.

The Fifth Argument.

Ba- “The words of Christ spoken upon the cup and upon the bread have like effect and working.

ro- “But the words spoken upon the cup have not virtue to transubstantiate:

This argu-
ment hold-
eth after the
same rule as
did the other
before.

co. “Ergo, It followeth, that the words spoken upon the bread have no such virtue.

“The second part of the argument is proved; because they should then transubstantiate the cup, or that which is in the cup, into the new testament. But neither of these things can be done, and very absurd it is to confess the same.”

The Sixth Argument.

Da- “The circumstances of the Scripture, the analogy and proportion of the sacraments, and the testimony

[¹ The passage probably referred to in Chrysostom is in the 82 Homily on Matth. 26th chap., ἀμπελος δὲ οἴνου οὐχ ὑδωρ γεννᾷ. S. Chrysost. Op. Ed. Ben. Par. 1727, tom. vii. p. 784. Ed.]

[² Nam cum dicat Christus, Ego sum vitis vera, sanguis Christi non aqua est utique, sed vinum, nec potest videri sanguis ejus, quo redempti et vivificati sumus, esse in calice, quando vinum desit calici quo Christi sanguis ostenditur. S. Cypriani Epist. LXIII. Op. Ed. Ben. Par. 1726, p. 104. Ed.]

of the faithful fathers, ought to rule us in taking the meaning of the holy Scripture touching the sacrament.

ti- “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:

si. “Ergo, 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 the 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.

The circum-
stances and
words of
Scripture.

“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 analogy
of the sacra-
ments.

“The first consisteth in nourishing; as ye shall read in Rabanus, Cyprian, Augustine, Irenæus, and, most plainly, in Isidore out of Bertram.

Analogy in
three ways.

“The second is 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, Chrysostom, Augustine, Ambrose, Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Hilary, and, most plainly of all, in Bertram. Moreover, the sayings and places of all the fathers, whose names I have before recited against the assertion of the first proposition, do quite overthrow transubstantiation: but of all other most evidently and plainly, Irenæus, Origen, Cyprian, Chrysostom (to Cæsarius

The sayings
for the figu-
rative
speech.

the monk), Augustine (against Adamantus), Gelasius, Cyril, Epiphanius, Chrysostom again on Matthew xx., Rabanus, Damascene¹, and Bertram.

“Here, right worshipful master prolocutor and ye the rest of the commissioners, it may please you to understand, that I do not lean to these things only, which I have written in my former answers and confirmations, but that I have also, for the proof of that I have spoken, whatsoever Bertram, a man learned, of sound and upright judgment, and ever counted a catholic for these seven hundred years until this our age, hath written. His treatise whosoever shall read and weigh, considering the time of the writer, his learning, godliness of life, the allegations of the ancient fathers, and his manifold and most grounded arguments, I cannot (doubtless) but much marvel, if he have any fear of God at all, how he can, with good conscience, speak against him in this matter of the sacrament. This Bertram was the first that pulled me by the ear, and that first brought me from the common error of the Romish church, and caused me to search more diligently and exactly both the Scriptures and the writings of the old ecclesiastical fathers in this matter. And this I protest before the face of God, who knoweth I lie not in the things I now speak.”

The Third Proposition.

In the mass is the lively sacrifice of the church, propitiable and available for the sins as well of quick as of the dead.

The Answer of Dr Ridley.

Ridley:—“I answer to this third proposition as I did to the first: and moreover I say, 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.”

[¹ Damascenus, Johannes, Pater Ecclesie et Historicus, de quo vide Voss. de Hist. Gr. Floruit sub Leone Isaurico. Patriam Damascum habuit, vixitque, ut Petrus Martyr contra Gardinerum probat, circa a. d. 740. Hoffman. Lexicon. Ed.]

The Explication.

“Concerning the Romish mass which is used at this day, or the lively sacrifice thereof, propitiatory and available for the sins of the quick and the dead, the holy Scripture hath not so much as one syllable.”

“There is ambiguity also in the name of mass: what it signifieth, and whether at this day there be any such indeed, as the ancient fathers used; seeing that now there be neither catechists nor ‘pœnitentes’ to be sent away.”

“Again, touching these words, ‘the lively sacrifice of the church,’ there is a doubt whether they are to be understood figuratively and sacramentally, for the sacrament of the lively sacrifice (after which sort we deny it not to be in the Lord’s supper), or properly and without any figure: after the which manner there was but one only sacrifice, and that once offered, namely, upon the altar of the cross.”

“Moreover, in these words ‘as well as,’ it may be doubted whether they be spoken in mockage; as men are wont to say in sport, of a foolish and ignorant person, that he is apt as well in conditions as in knowledge—being apt indeed in neither of them both.”

“There is also a doubt in the word ‘propitiable,’ whether it signify here, that which taketh away sin, or that which may be made available² for the taking away of sin; that is to say, whether it is to be taken in the active or in the passive signification.”

“Now the falseness of the proposition, after the meaning of the schoolmen and the Romish church, and impiety in that sense which the words seem to import, is this: that they, leaning to the foundation of their fond transubstantiation, would make the quick and lively body of Christ, flesh, united and knit to the Divinity, to lie hid under the accidents and outward shews of bread and wine; which is very false, as I

[² “Made available.” The original in Latin is *an quod potest reddi propitium*; and “therefore,” says Dr Wordsworth, “the translation does not reach the sense of the original. The meaning of the clause is; ‘Whether it signify here, that which propitiates, or that which may be propitiated, that is to say, whether it is to be taken in the active, or in the passive signification.’” Ed.]

Commen-
dation of
Bertram.

Ridley first
brought to
the know-
ledge of the
sacrament
by Bertram.

Doubts in
the third
proposition.

In the primi-
tive church
the newly
instructed
in the faith
and the un-
worthy
were put
away from
the commu-
nion.

The false-
ness of the
third propo-
sition re-
proved.

have said afore: and they, building upon this foundation, do hold that the same body is offered unto God by the priest in his daily massings, to put away the sins of the quick and the dead; whereas by the Apostle to the Hebrews it is evident, that there is but one oblation, and one true and lively sacrifice of the church offered upon the altar of the cross, which was, is, and shall be for ever the propitiation for the sins of the whole world: and where there is remission of the same, there is (saith the Apostle) no more offering for sin."

But one sacrifice in the Scripture.

Arguments confirming his Answer.

- Heb. v. *Ce-* "No sacrifice ought to be done, but where the priest is meet to offer the same.
- la-* "All other priests be unmeet to offer sacrifice propitiatory for sin, save only Christ:
- rent.* "Ergo, No other priests ought to sacrifice for sin, but Christ alone.

"The second part of my argument is thus proved.

- Fe-* "No honour in God's church ought to be taken whereunto a man is not called, as Aaron.
- ri-* "It is a great honour in God's church to sacrifice for sin:
- son.* "Ergo, No man ought to sacrifice for sin, but only they which are called.

"But only Christ is called to that honour:

"Ergo, No other priest but Christ ought to sacrifice for sin. 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 Melchizedek. But now the order of Aaron is come to an end, by reason that it was unprofitable and weak; and of the order of Melchizedek there is but one priest alone, even Christ the Lord, who hath a priesthood that cannot pass to any other."

Heb. vii.

Another Argument.

Ba- "That thing is in vain, and to no effect, where no necessity is wherefore it is done.

- ro-* "To offer up any more sacrifice propitiatory for the quick and the dead there is no necessity, for Christ our Saviour did that fully and perfectly once for all:
- co.* "Ergo, To do the same in the mass it is in vain."

Another Argument.

- Fe-* "After that eternal redemption is found and obtained, there needeth no more daily offering for the same. Heb. ix.
- ri-* "But Christ coming an high bishop, &c., found and obtained for us eternal redemption:
- o,* "Ergo, There needeth now no more daily oblation for the sins of the quick and the dead."

Ab una causa veritatis ad præpositionem habentem illam causam valet consequentia.

Another Argument.

- Ca-* "All remission of sins cometh only by shedding of blood.
- mes-* "In the mass there is no shedding of blood:
- tres.* "Ergo, 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: Heb. ix.

"Ergo, 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.

Da- “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.

ri- “But in the new testament there is one only sacrifice now already long since offered, which is able to make the comers thereto perfect for ever:

i. “Ergo, In the new testament they ought to cease from offering any more propitiatory sacrifice.”

(Sentences of the Scripture, alleged by Ridley, tending to the same end and purpose; out of which also may be gathered other manifest Arguments for more confirmation thereof.)

Heb. x. “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,’ etc. ‘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.”

Col. i. “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.”

1 John ii. “‘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 subtle shifts: the one is, by the distinction of the bloody and unbloody sacrifice, as though our unbloody

The popish distinction between bloody and unbloody sacrifice.

sacrifice of the church were any other than the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving, than a commemoration, a shewing 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 such a strange kind of sense as the fathers themselves indeed never meant. For what the meaning of the fathers was, it is evident by that which St Augustine writeth in his epistle to Boniface, and in his book against Faustus the Manichee, besides many other places; likewise by Eusebius the Emisene, Cyprian, Chrysostom, Fulgentius, Bertram, and others, who 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 cannot 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 blessed side of our 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 shewing 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.

“These are the things, right worshipful master prolocutor, and ye the rest of the commissioners, which I could presently prepare to the answering of your three aforesaid propositions, being destitute of all help in this shortness of time, sudden warning, and want of books: wherefore I appeal to my first protestation, most humbly desiring the help of the same (as much as may be) to be granted unto me. And because ye have lately given most unjust and cruel sentence against me, I do here appeal (so far forth as I may) to a more indifferent and just censure and judgment of some other superior, competent, and lawful judge, and that according to the approved state of the church of England. Howbeit I confess, that I am ignorant what that is, at this present, through the trouble and alteration of the state of the realm.

The papists maintain their sacrifice propitiatory, by the old doctors falsely wrested.

The whole substance of our sacrifice, wherein it consisteth.

Ridley appealeth from the unjust sentence of his adversaries to some other superior, competent judge.

Ridley for lack of equal indifference appealeth to almighty God.

But if this appeal may not be granted to me upon earth, then do I fly (even as to my only refuge and alone haven of health) to the sentence of the eternal Judge, that is, of the almighty God; to whose most merciful justice towards us, and most just mercifulness, I do wholly commit myself and all my cause, nothing at all despairing of the defence of mine Advocate and alone Saviour Jesus Christ; to whom, with the everlasting Father, and the Holy Spirit, the Sanctifier of us all, be now and for ever all honour and glory. Amen."

Albeit this learned bishop was not suffered to read all that is above prefixed before the disputations, yet because he had it then ready, and offered it up to the prolocutor after the disputations and sentence pronounced, I thought here the place not unmeet to annex the same together with the rest. Now let us hear the arguments and answers between Dr Smith and him'.

Dr Smith beginneth to oppose.

Smith :—" You have occasioned me to go otherwise to work with you, than I had thought to have done. Me seemed you did, in your supposition, abuse the testimonies of Scripture concerning the ascension of Christ, to take away his presence in the sacrament; as though this were a strong argument to enforce your matter withal:

" Christ did ascend into heaven: ergo, he is not in the sacrament.

" Now therefore I will go about to disprove this reason of yours.

" Christ's ascension is no let to his real presence in the sacrament: ergo, you are deceived, whereas you do ground yourself upon those places."

Ridley :—" You import as though I had made a strong argument by Christ's going up into heaven. But howsoever mine argument is made, you collect it not rightly. For it doth not only stay upon his ascension, but also upon his ascension and his abiding there also."

[¹ This passage is Fox's: for the place and manner in which the reading of Ridley's protest was stopped, see p. 189. Ed.]

Answer. The verity of Ridley's answer touching the real being of Christ in earth to be restrained by his as-

Smith :—" Christ's going up to heaven, and his abiding there, hinder not his real presence in the sacrament: ergo, you are deceived."

Ridley :—" Of Christ's real presence there may be a double understanding. If you take the real presence of Christ according to the real and corporal substance which he took of the Virgin, that presence being in heaven cannot be on the earth also. But if you mean a real presence, 'secundum rem aliquam quæ ad corpus Christi pertinet,' i.e. according to something that appertaineth to Christ's body, certes the ascension and abiding in heaven are no let at all to that presence. Wherefore Christ's body, after that sort, is here present to us in the Lord's supper; by grace I say, as Epiphanius speaketh it."

Weston :—" I will cut off from henceforth all equivocation and doubt: for whensoever we speak of Christ's body, we mean that which he took of the Virgin."

Ridley :—" Christ's ascension and abiding in heaven cannot stand with his presence."

Smith :—" Christ appeared corporally and really on the earth, for all his ascension and continual abode in heaven unto the day of doom: ergo, his ascension and abiding in heaven is no let to his real presence in the sacrament."

Ridley :—" Master doctor, this argument is nothing worth. I do not so straitly tie Christ up in heaven, that he may not come into the earth at his pleasure: for when he will, he may come down from heaven, and be on the earth, as it liketh himself. Howbeit I do affirm, that it is not possible for him to be both in heaven and earth at one time."

Smith :—" Mark diligently, I pray you, my masters that be here, what he answereth: First he saith, that the sitting of Christ at the right hand of his Father is a let to the real presence of his body in the sacrament; and then afterward he flieth from it again."

Ridley :—" I would not have you think that I do imagine or dream upon any such manner of sitting, as these men here sit in the school."

Smith :—" Ergo, It is lawful for Christ, then, to be here present on the earth, when he will himself."

Ridley :—" Yea, when he will, it is lawful indeed."

ending and abiding in heaven, standeth upon a necessity which we call "necessitas consequentia;" by this demonstration; *Darii*. Every natural body must necessarily be contained in his peculiar and certain place. Christ's body is a natural body. Ergo, Christ's body not to be in one certain place at once contained, it is impossible, according to the rule, "Omnes propositiones de impossibili et de necesse æquipollent dicto dissimiliter se habenti, et modo similiter."

Smith :—"Ergo, He, ascending into heaven, doth not restrain his real presence in the sacrament."

Christ's abode in heaven is not let for him to appear on earth when he will: but whether he will, that must be proved. Again, it is one thing to appear on earth, another still in the sacrament, and to be present the same time with his body in heaven, when he is bodily present in earth.

Ridley :—"I do not gainsay, but that it is lawful for him to appear on the earth when he will: but prove you that he will."

Smith :—"Then your answer dependeth upon the will of Christ, I perceive: therefore I will join again with you in this short argument:

"Christ, albeit he doth alway abide in heaven after his ascension, was seen really and corporally on earth:

"Ergo, Notwithstanding his ascension and continual sitting at the right hand of his Father, he may be really and corporally in the sacrament."

Ridley :—"If the notaries should so record your argument as you have framed it, you, peradventure, would be ashamed thereof hereafter."

Smith :—"Christ, after his ascension, was seen really and corporally upon the earth:

"Ergo, Notwithstanding his ascension and abiding with his Father, he may be corporally in the sacrament."

Ridley :—"I grant the antecedent, but I deny the consequence."

Smith :—"Do you grant the antecedent?"

Ridley :—"Yea, I grant the antecedent. I am content to let you have so much: because I know that there be certain ancient fathers of that opinion. I am well content to let you use that proposition as true, and I will frame the argument for you.

"He was seen on earth after his ascension: ergo," &c.

Smith :—"Nay, nay, I will frame it myself.

"Christ, after his ascension, was seen really and corporally on earth, albeit he do abide in heaven continually:

"Ergo, Notwithstanding his ascension and continual abiding at the right hand of the Father, he may be really and corporally on the earth."

Ridley :—"Let us first agree about the continual sitting at the right hand of the Father."

Smith :—"Doth he so sit at the right hand of his Father, that he doth never forsake the same?"

Ridley :—"Nay, I do not bind Christ in heaven so straitly. I see you go about to beguile me with your equivocations.

Christ cannot be both corporally here, and

Such equivocations are to be distinguished. If you mean by his sitting in heaven, to reign with his Father, he may be both in heaven and also in earth. But if ye understand his sitting to be after a corporal manner of sitting, so is he always permanent in heaven. For Christ to be corporally here on earth, when corporally he is resident in heaven, is clean contrary to the holy Scriptures, as Augustinus saith¹: 'The body of Christ is in heaven; but his truth is dispersed in every place.' Now, if continually he abide in heaven after the manner of his corporal presence, then his perpetual abiding there stoppeth or letteth that the same corporal presence of him cannot be in the sacrament."

corporally also in heaven at one time.

Augustinus in Johan. tract. xxx.

Smith :—"In Acts iii. we read, that Christ shall sit perpetually at the right hand of God unto the consummation of the world."

Weston :—"I perceive you are come here to this issue, whether the body of Christ may be together both in earth and in heaven. I will tell you that Christ, in very deed, is both in earth and in heaven together, and at one time, both one and the same natural Christ, after the verity and substance of his very body: ergo," &c.

Ridley :—"I deny the antecedent."

Weston :—"I prove it by two witnesses: First by Chrysostom²: 'Do we not offer every day? we do so indeed; but doing it for the remembrance of his death. And this offering

¹ "Corpus Christi est in cœlo, sed veritas ejus ubique diffusa est." [S. Aug. in Johan. Evan. tract. xxx. Op. Ed. Ben. Par. 1685, tom. iii. col. 517. The words of St Augustine are: "Corpus enim Domini, in quo resurrexit, uno loco esse potest; veritas," etc. Ed.]

[² τί οὖν; ἡμεῖς καθ' ἐκάστην ἡμέραν οὐ προσφέρομεν; προσφέρομεν μὲν, ἀλλ' ἀνάμνησιν ποιούμενοι τοῦ θανάτου αὐτοῦ. καὶ μία ἐστὶν αὐτή, καὶ οὐ πολλαί· ἐπειδὴ ἅπαξ προσηνέχθη, ὡσπερ ἐκείνη ἢ εἰς τὰ ἅγια τῶν ἁγίων. τοῦτο ἐκείνης τύπος ἐστὶ, καὶ αὐτὴ ἐκείνης. τὸν γὰρ αὐτὸν αἰεὶ προσφέρομεν, οὐ κἄν μὲν ἕτερον πρόβατον, αὐριον δὲ ἕτερον, ἀλλ' αἰεὶ τὸ αὐτό· ὥστε μία ἐστὶν ἡ θυσία, ἐπεὶ τῷ λόγῳ τούτῳ, ἐπειδὴν πολλαχοῦ προσφέρεται, καὶ πολλοὶ Χριστοί. ἀλλ' οὐδαμῶς· ἀλλ' εἰς πανταχοῦ ὁ Χριστός, καὶ ἐν ταῦθα πλήρης ὢν καὶ ἐκεῖ πλήρης, ἐν σώμα. S. Chrys. Hom. xvii. in Heb. cap. 10. Op. Ed. Ben. Par. tom. xii. pars 1. pp. 168, 169. Weston's translation gives the sense of the passage, but is a very loose one. Ed.]

is one, and not many. And how is it one, and not many, which was once offered in the holy place? This sacrifice is a pattern of that: the selfsame we always offer; not now as offering one lamb to-day, and another to-morrow, but always one and the same lamb. Wherefore here is but one sacrifice; for else by this means, seeing there be many sacrifices in many places, be there many Christs. Not so, but one Christ in all places, both perfect here and perfect there, one only body. Now thus I argue:

“We offer one thing at all times.

Argument. “There is one Christ in all places, both here complete, and there complete.

“Ergo, By Chrysostom, there is one body both in heaven and earth.”

Answer. *Ridley*:—“I remember the place well. These things make nothing against me.”

Weston:—“One Christ is in all places; here full and there full.”

Ridley:—“One Christ is in all places; but not one body in all places.”

Weston:—“One body, saith Chrysostom.”

Answer to Chrysostom.

Ridley:—“But not after the manner of bodily substance is he in all places, nor by circumscription of place. For ‘hic’ and ‘illic,’ ‘here’ and ‘there,’ in Chrysostom do assign no place; as Augustine saith¹, ‘The Lord is above, but the truth of the Lord is in all places.’”

Weston:—“You cannot so escape. He saith not, the verity of Christ is one; but one Christ is in all places, both here and there.”

Ridley:—“One sacrifice is in all places, because of the unity of him whom the sacrifice doth signify: not that the sacrifices be all one and the same.”

Weston:—“Ergo, By your saying it is not Christ, but the sacrifice of Christ. But Chrysostom saith, ‘One body and one Christ is there;’ and not one sacrifice.”

Sacrifice, why it is called one.

Ridley:—“I say, that both Christ and the sacrifice of Christ are there: Christ by his spirit, grace, and verity; the

[¹ “Sursum est Dominus, sed ubique est veritas Domini.” S. Aug. in Johan. Evan. tract. xxx. Op. Ed. Ben. Par. 1635, tom. iii. col. 517. The words of St Augustine are: “sed etiam hic est veritas,” etc. Ed.]

sacrifice by signification. Thus I grant with Chrysostom, that there is one host or sacrifice, and not many. And this our host is called one, by reason of the unity of that one, which one only all our hosts do represent. That only host was never other but that which was once offered on the altar of the cross, of which host all our hosts are but sacramental examples.

Out of Ridley's own writing.

“And whereas you allege out of Chrysostom, that Christ is offered in many places at once (both here full Christ, and there full Christ), I grant it to be true; that is, that Christ is offered in many places at once, in a mystery and sacramentally, and that he is full Christ in all those places; but not after the corporal substance of our flesh which he took, but after the benediction which giveth life; and he is given to the godly receivers in bread and wine, as Cyril speaketh. Concerning the oblation of Christ, whereof Chrysostom here speaketh, he himself doth clearly shew what he meaneth thereby, in saying by the way of correction, ‘We always do the selfsame, howbeit by the recordation or remembrance of his sacrifice.’”

How one Christ is offered in many places at once.

Weston:—“The second witness is Bernard, in a sermon that he made of the supper of the Lord, who saith²: ‘How cometh this to us, most gentle Jesus, that we, silly worms, creeping on the face of the earth, that we, I say, which are but dust and ashes, may deserve to have thee present in our hands and before our eyes, who, both together, full and whole, dost sit at the right hand of the Father; and who also, in the moment of one hour, from the rising of the sun to the going down of the same, art present, one and the selfsame; in many and divers places?’”

Bernard.

Ridley:—“These words of Bernard make for you nothing at all. But I know that Bernard was in such a time, that in this matter he may worthily be suspected. He hath many good and fruitful sayings; as also in the same aforesaid place by

The time of Bernard.

[² “Unde hoc nobis, piissime Jesu, ut nos vermiculi, reptantes super faciem terræ, nos, inquam, qui pulvis et cinis sumus, te præsentem habere mereamur præ manibus, præ oculis, qui totus et integer sedes ad dextram Patris, qui etiam unius horæ momento, ab ortu solis usque ad occasum, ab aquilone usque ad austrum, præsto es unus in multis, idem in diversis locis?” S. Bernard. Op. Ed. Par. 1609, p. 1678. Ed.]

you alleged: but yet he followed in an age, when the doctrine of the holy supper was sore perverted. Notwithstanding yet I will so expound him, rather than reject him, that he shall make nothing for you at all. He saith, that we have Christ in a mystery, in a sacrament, under a veil or cover; but hereafter shall have him without veil or cover. In the mean time here now he saith, that the verity of Christ is everywhere: the verity of Christ is both here and there, and in all places."

Weston:—"What do you call verity? He saith not the verity of Christ, but the verity of the body of Christ."

Ridley:—"The verity of the body of Christ is the true faith of the body of Christ: after that verity he is with them which truly believe upon him."

Weston:—"Christ is one and the same in divers places. I urge these words 'in diversis locis,' 'in divers places;' and yet I am not satisfied."

Smith:—"Christ was seen really and corporally on the earth after his ascension, and continually sitting at the right hand of the Father: ergo, the ascension and perpetual sitting in heaven hinder nothing, but that he may be really and corporally in the sacrament."

Ridley:—"If by perpetual sitting you mean the residence of his body in heaven, your reason containeth manifest contradiction."

Smith:—"These two have no contradiction in them at all, both to sit continually at his Father's right hand, and also to be seen here really in earth after his ascension. First, you will give me, that Christ sitteth in heaven at the right hand of his Father: for so it is written, 'Heaven must needs receive him, unto the time of the restoring of all,' &c. Secondly, he was also seen of Paul here corporally on earth. Wherefore these two do import, as ye see, no contradiction."

Ridley:—"What letteth but that Christ, if it please him, and when it pleaseth him, may be in heaven and in earth, and appear to whom he will? and yet, notwithstanding, you have not yet proved that he will so do. And though Christ continually shall be resident in heaven unto the judgment, yet there may be some intermission, that notwithstanding. But this controversy, as I said, is amongst all the ancient doctors and writers. And that Christ hath been here seen,

Bernard rather expounded than rejected.

The verity of the body of Christ.

Acts iii.

To be here and not here importeth contradiction in respect of sundry times.

that they grant all: but whether then he being in earth or in heaven, that is doubtful."

Smith:—"I will prove that he would appear in earth. He so would, and also did appear here in earth after his ascension: ergo," &c.

Ridley:—"He appeared, I grant; but how he appeared, whether then being in heaven or in earth, that is uncertain. So he appeared to Stephen, being then corporally sitting in heaven. For, speaking after the true manner of man's body, when he is in heaven, he is not the same time in earth; and when he is in earth, he is not the same time corporally in heaven."

Smith:—"Christ hath been both in heaven and in earth all at one time: ergo, you are deceived in denying that."

Ridley:—"I do not utterly deny Christ here to have been seen in earth. Of uncertain things I speak uncertainly."

Smith:—"He was seen of Paul, as being born before his time, after his ascending up to heaven." ^{1 Cor. xv.}

"But his vision was a corporal vision:

"Ergo, He was seen corporally upon the earth after his ascending into heaven." ^{This argument holdeth rather "materia" than "ratione formæ."}

Ridley:—"He was seen really and corporally indeed: but whether being in heaven or earth, is a doubt: and of doubtful things we must judge doubtfully. Howbeit you must prove, that he was in heaven at the same time when he was corporally on earth."

Smith:—"I would know of you, whether this vision may enforce the resurrection of Christ."

Ridley:—"I account this a sound and firm argument to prove the resurrection. But whether they saw him in heaven or in earth, I am in doubt: and to say the truth, it maketh no great matter. Both ways the argument is of like strength: for whether he were seen in heaven, or whether he were seen on earth, either of both maketh sufficiently for the matter. Certain it is, he rose again: for he could not have been seen, unless he had risen again."

Smith:—"Paul saw him as he was here conversant on earth, and not out of heaven, as you affirm."

Ridley:—"You run to the beginning again: that you take for granted, which you should have proved."

Whether Paul saw Christ in heaven or in earth; all is one to prove his resurrection. Petitio principii.

Smith :—" You make delays for the nonce."

Ridley :—" Say not so, I pray you. Those that hear us be learned: they can tell both what you oppose, and what I answer, well enough, I warrant you."

Argument. *Tresham* :—" He was seen after such sort, as that he might be heard: ergo, he was corporally on the earth; or else how could he be heard?"

Answer. *Ridley* :—" He that found the means for Stephen to behold him in heaven, even he could bring to pass well enough, that Paul might hear him out of heaven."

Argument. *Da- Smith* :—" As others saw him, so Paul saw him."

ti- " Other did see him visibly and corporally on earth:

si. " Ergo, Paul saw him visibly and corporally on earth."

Answer. *Ridley* :—" I grant he was seen visibly and corporally: but yet have you not proved that he was seen in earth."

Smith :—" He was seen of him as of others."

" But he was seen of others being on earth, and appeared visibly to them on earth:

" Ergo, He was seen of Paul on earth."

Ridley :—" Your controversy is about 'existens in terra,' that is, being on earth. If 'existere,' 'to be,' be referred as unto the place, I deny that Christ after that sort was on earth. But if it be referred as to the verity of the body, then I grant it. Moreover I say, that Christ was seen of men in earth after his ascension, it is certain: for he was seen of Stephen; he was seen also of Paul. But whether he descended unto the earth, or whether he, being in heaven, did reveal or manifest himself to Paul, when Paul was rapt into the third heaven, I know that some contend about it: and the Scripture, as far as I have read or heard, doth not determine it. Wherefore we cannot but judge uncertainly of those things which be uncertain."

Lib. iii. cap. 3. *Smith* :—" We have Hegesippus and Linus against you¹, which testify, that Christ appeared corporally on the earth

[¹ Hegesippus, who was born in the beginning of the second century, was the author of the first ecclesiastical history, a work which now unhappily has perished, save a few fragments preserved chiefly by Eusebius. St Jerome speaks of it in high terms. The writings attributed to Linus, who is mentioned by St Paul, are spurious, see Cave, Hist. Lit. vol. i. pp. 27. 73. Ed.]

to Peter after his ascension. Peter, overcome with the requests and mournings of the people, which desired him to get him out of the city because of Nero his lying in wait for him, began without company to convey himself away from thence: and when he was come to the gate, he seeth Christ come to meet him, and worshipping him he said, 'Master, whither walk you?' Christ answered, 'I am come again to be crucified.' Linus, writing of the passion of Peter, hath the selfsame story. St Ambrose hath the same likewise, and also Abdias, scholar to the apostles, which saw Christ before his ascending into heaven. With what face, therefore, dare you affirm it to be a thing uncertain, which these men do manifestly witness to have been done?"

Ridley :—" I said before, that the doctors in that matter did vary."

Smith :—" Do you think this story is not certain, being approved by so ancient and probable authority?"

Ridley :—" I do so think, because I take and esteem not their words for the words of Scripture. And though I did grant you that story to be certain, yet it maketh not against me."

Smith :—" Such things as be certain, and approved of them, you do reject as things uncertain."

Ridley :—" The story of Linus is not of so great authority; although I am not ignorant that Eusebius so writeth also, in the Story of the Church. And yet I account not these men's reports so sure as the canonical Scriptures. Albeit, if at any time he had to any man appeared here on the earth after his ascension, that doth not disprove my saying. For I go not about to tie Christ up in fetters (as some do untruly report of us); but that he may be seen upon the earth according to his divine pleasure, whensoever it liketh him. But we affirm, that it is contrary to the nature of his manhood, and the true manner of his body, that he should be together and at one instant both in heaven and earth, according to his corporal substance. And the perpetual sitting at the right hand of the Father may, I grant, be taken for the stability of Christ's kingdom, and his continual or everlasting equality with his Father in the glory of heaven."

Linus.
Ambrosius.
Abdias.

The credit
of Linus's
story.

This addition
is taken
out of the
copy of Rid-
ley's own
writing.

Chrysostom.

Smith:—"Now, whereas you boast that your faith is the very faith of the ancient church, I will shew here that it is not so, but that it doth directly strive against the faith of the old fathers: I will bring in Chrysostom for this point'. 'Eliseus received the mantle, as a right great inheritance: for it was indeed a right excellent inheritance, and more precious than any gold beside. And the same was a double Elias: he was both Elias above, and Elias beneath. I know well you think that just man to be happy, and you would gladly be, every one of you, as he is. What will you then say, if I shall declare unto you a certain other thing, which all we that are endued with these holy mysteries do receive much more than that? Elias indeed left his mantle to his scholar: but the son of God ascending did leave here his flesh unto us. Elias left it, putting off the same: but Christ both left it to us, and ascended also to heaven, having it with him.'"

Here, at this answer, great cart-fulls of taunting, spiteful, and reproachful words were cast upon this good bishop.

Ridley:—"I grant that Christ did both; that is, both took up his flesh with him ascending up, and also did leave the same behind him with us, but after a diverse manner and respect. For he took his flesh with him, after the true and corporal substance of his body and flesh: again, he left the same in mystery to the faithful in the supper, to be received after a spiritual communication, and by grace. Neither is the same received in the supper only, but also at other times, by hearing the gospel, and by faith. For the 'bread,' which we break, is the communication of the body of Christ: and generally, 'Unless ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye shall have no life in you.'"

[¹Ἐδέξατο καθάπερ μεγίστην κληρονομίαν τὴν μνηωτὴν ὁ Ἐλισαῖος· καὶ γὰρ ἦν ἀληθῶς μεγίστη κληρονομία παντὸς χρυσοῦ τιμιωτέρα. καὶ ἦν διπλοῦς Ἡλίας ἐκεῖνος. καὶ ἦν ἄνω Ἡλίας, καὶ κάτω Ἡλίας. οἶδα, ὅτι μακαρίζετε τὸν δίκαιον ἐκεῖνον, καὶ ἐβούλεσθε αὐτὸς ἕκαστος ἐκεῖνος εἶναι· τί οὖν ἂν ὑμῖν ὑποδείξω ὅτι ἕτερόν τι πολλῶ μείζον ἐκεῖνον πάντες ἐλάβομεν οἱ μεμυσταγωγημένοι; ὁ μὲν γὰρ Ἡλίας μνηωτὴν ἀφήκε τῷ μαθητῇ, ὁ δὲ υἱὸς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀναβαίνων τὴν σάρκα ἡμῖν κατέλιπε τὴν ἑαυτοῦ, ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν Ἡλίας ἀποδυσάμενος, ὁ δὲ Χριστὸς καὶ ἡμῖν κατέλιπε, καὶ ἔχων αὐτὴν ἀνῆλθε. S. Chrysostomi, Hom. ii. in Antioch. Op. Ed. Ben. Par. 1718, tom. ii. p. 34. Ed.]

Smith:—"Chrysostom saith²: 'O miracle, O good will of God! He that sitteth above, at the sacrifice time is contained in the hands of men.' Or else, as others have translated it, thus: 'O miracle, O the gentleness of God! he that sitteth above with the Father, is handled with the hands of all men at the very same moment of time, and doth himself deliver himself to them that are desirous to take him and embrace him.'"

Ridley:—"He that sitteth there, is *here* present in mystery, and by grace; and is holden of the godly, such as communicate him, not only sacramentally with the hand of the body, but much more wholesomely with the hand of the heart, and by inward drinking is received: but by the sacramental signification he is holden of all men."

Seton:—"Where is then the miracle, if he be only present through his grace and mystery only?"

Ridley:—"Yes, there is a miracle, good sir: Christ is not idle in his sacraments. Is not the miracle great, trow you, when bread, which is wont to sustain the body, becometh food to the soul? He that understandeth not that miracle, he understandeth not the force of that mystery. God grant we may every one of us understand his truth, and obey the same."

The miracle in the sacrament, wherein.

Smith:—"Chrysostom calleth it a miracle, that Christ sitteth at the right hand of God in heaven, and at the same time is held in the hands of men.—Not that he is handled with the hands of men—only in a mystery, and is with them through grace. Therefore while you deny that, you are altogether deceived, and stray far from the truth."

Harpsfield:—"The former place of Chrysostom is not to be let slip. Let me, before I begin, ask this one question of you. Is it not a great matter that Elias left his cloak or mantle, and the gift of his prophecy to his scholar?"

Ridley:—"Yes, surely; it is a great matter."

Harpsfield:—"Did not Elias then leave great grace?"

[²Ὁ τοῦ θαύματος Ὁ τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ φιλανθρωπίας· ὁ μετὰ τοῦ πατρὸς ἄνω καθημένος κατὰ τὴν ὄραν ἐκεῖνην ταῖς ἀπάντων κατέχεται χερσὶ, καὶ δίδωσι αὐτὸν τοῖς βουλομένοις περιπτύξασθαι καὶ περιλαβεῖν. S. Chrys. de Sacerdotio, lib. iii. cap. 4. Op. Ed. Ben. Par. 1718, tom. i. p. 382. Ed.]

Ridley :—“ He did so.”

Harpfield :—“ But Christ left a far greater grace than Elias ; for he could not both leave his cloak and take it with him ; Christ doth both in his flesh.”

How Christ took up his body, and left it with us. The phrase of Chrysostom considered.

Ridley :—“ I am well content to grant, that Christ left much greater things to us than Elias to Eliseus, albeit he be said to have left his double spirit with him ; for that the strength and grace of the body of Christ, which Christ ascending up here left with us, is the only salvation and life of all men which shall be saved : which life Christ hath here left unto us, to be received by faith through the hearing of the word, and the right administration of the sacraments. This virtue and grace Chrysostom, after the phrase and manner of John the evangelist, calleth Christ’s flesh.”

Comparison between Elias’s mantle and Christ’s flesh : Elias took his mantle, and left neither mantle nor sacrament of his mantle behind him. Christ took his flesh, and left a sacrament of his flesh, which was more than Elias did : and yet the said Elias afterward cast down his mantle.

Harpfield :—“ But Christ performed a greater matter. He carried up, and left behind. You understand not the comparison. The comparison is in this, That Elias left his mantle, and carried it not with him : Christ left his flesh behind him, and carried it with him also.”

Ridley :—“ True it is, and I myself did affirm no less before. Now, where you seem to speak many things, indeed you bring no new things at all. Let there be a comparison between grace and grace ; then Christ gave the far greater grace, when he did insert or graft us into his flesh.”

Harpfield :—“ If you will give me leave, I will ask you this question : If Chrysostom would have meant so, that Christ left his body in the eucharist, what plainer words think you, or more evident could he have used than these ?”

Ridley :—“ These things be not of so great force as they bear a great shew outwardly. He might also have used grosser words, if he had listed to have uttered his mind so grossly : for he was an eloquent man. Now he speaketh after the manner of other doctors, which of mystical matters speak mystically, and of sacraments sacramentally.”

Harpfield :—“ The comparison lieth in this : That which was impossible to Elias, is possible with Christ.”

Ridley :—“ I grant it was possible to Christ, which was to the other impossible. Elias left his cloak : Christ both left his flesh and took it with him.”

Harpfield :—“ Elias left behind him, and could not take with him : Christ both left behind him, and also took with him : except you will say the comparison here made to be nothing.”

Ridley :—“ He took up his flesh with him to heaven, and left here the communion of his flesh in earth.” *Harpfield answered.*

Weston :—“ You understand in the first place his flesh for very true flesh ; and in the second place for grace, and communion of his flesh ; and why do you not understand it in the second place also, for his true flesh ? I will make it evident how blockish and gross your answer is.” “ Quam sit stupida et crassa responsio tua.”

Ridley :—“ These be taunts and reproaches not beseeing, as I think, the modesty of this school.”

Weston :—“ Elias left his cloak to his disciple ; but the Son of God, going up to heaven, left his flesh. But Elias certainly left his cloak behind, and Christ likewise his flesh ; and yet, ascending, he carried the same with him too. By which words we make this reason :

“ Christ left his flesh to his disciples, and yet, for all that, he took the same up with him :

“ Ergo, He is present here with us.”

Here Dr Weston, crying to the people, said unto them, “ Master doctor answereth it after this fashion : ‘ He carried his flesh into heaven, and he left here the communion of his flesh behind.’ Assuredly the answer is too unlearned.” *Weston speaketh in English.*

Ridley :—“ I am glad you speak in English. Surely, I wish that all the whole world might understand your reasons and my answers. He left us his flesh. This you understand of his flesh, and I understand the same of grace. He carried his flesh into heaven, and left behind the communion of his flesh unto us.” “ Reliquit nobis carnem suam.”

Weston :—“ Ye judges, what think ye of this answer ?”

Judges :—“ It is ridiculous, and a very fond answer.”

Ridley :—“ Well, I take your words patiently, for Christ’s cause.”

Weston here citeth a place : “ We are sprinkled with the blood of Christ.” “ Spargimur sanguine Christi.”

Ridley :—“ Master doctor, it is the same blood, but yet spiritually received. And indeed all the prophets were sprinkled with Christ’s blood.” How we are sprinkled with Christ’s blood.

with the same blood, but yet spiritually, I say, and by grace. And whatsoever they be that are not sprinkled with this blood, they cannot be partakers of the everlasting salvation."

This he repeated in English to the people also.

Weston :—"Here I bring Bernard unto you again¹: 'Even from the west unto the east, from the north unto the south, there is one and the selfsame Christ in many and divers places.'"

Answer to Bernard.

Ridley :—"The answer is soon made, that one Christ is here and in divers places: for God, according to his majesty, and according to his providence, as St Augustine saith, is everywhere with the godly, according to his indivisible and unspeakable grace. Or else, if ye should understand Bernard according to the corporal presence, how monstrous, or huge and giant-like a body would you then make Christ's body to be, which should reach even from north to south, from west to east."

Weston :—"Nay, nay, you make a monstrous answer, and unlearned."

Ridley falsely charged to set forth the catechism. Here they returned again to Latin.

Ward :—"Before I come in with those reasons which I had purposed to bring against you, I am minded to come again to Master doctor's argument, by which you, being brought into the briars, seemed to doubt of Christ's presence on the earth. To the proof of which matter I will bring nothing else, than that which was agreed upon in the catechism² of the synod of London, set out not long ago by you,"

Ridley :—"Sir, I give you to wit, before you go any further, that I did set out no catechism."

Weston, in King Edward's days, subscribed.

Weston :—"Yes, you made me subscribe to it, when you were a bishop in your ruff."

Ridley :—"I compelled no man to subscribe."

Ward :—"Yes, by the rood, you are the very author of that heresy."

[¹ See p. 216, note. Ed.]

[² The catechism here referred to is the Catechism of King Edward VI. published by Royal Authority both in Latin and English in A. D. 1553, and which was revised and approved by convocation. Fox, in his side note, "of this catechism read before," refers to the conference with Secretary Bourne, where he (Fox) speaks of the Catechism, but erroneously. Ed.]

Ridley :—"I put forth no catechism."

Cole :—"Did you never consent to the setting out of those things which you allowed?"

Ridley :—"I grant that I saw the book; but I deny that I wrote it. I perused it after it was made, and I noted many things for it: so I consented to the book. I was not the author of it."

Of this catechism read before.

Judges :—"The catechism is so set forth, as though the whole convocation-house had agreed to it. Cranmer said yesterday, that you made it."

The judges give an untrue verdict: for Dr Cranmer, meaning by the council, spake no word of Ridley.

Ridley :—"I think surely, that he would not say so."

Ward :—"The catechism hath this clause: 'Si visibiliter et in terra.' 'If visibly and on the earth.'"

Ridley :—"I answer, that those articles were set out, I both writing and consenting to them. Mine own hand will testify the same, and Master Cranmer put his hand to them likewise, and gave them to others afterward. Now, as for the place which you allege out of it, that may easily be expounded, and without any inconvenience."

Ward :—"Christ is the power and the virtue of his Father: ergo, he was not of so little strength, that he could not bring to pass whatsoever he would himself."

A possibilis ad esse, non valet consequentia.

Ridley :—"I grant."

Ward :—"Christ was the wisdom of the Father: ergo, that he spake, he spake wisely, and so as every man might understand; neither was it his mind to speak one thing instead of another."

Ridley :—"All this I grant."

Ward :—"Christ was likewise the very truth: ergo, he made and performed indeed that which he intended to make. And likely it is, that he doth neither deceive, nor could be deceived, nor yet would go about to deceive others."

Argument of the wisdom and truth of Christ.

Weston :—"Hilary on Psal. cxviii. hath these words³: 'All God's words or sayings are true, and neither idly placed nor unprofitably, but fiery, and wonderful fiery, without all

S. Hil. in Psal. cxviii.

³ "Vera omnia sunt, et neque otiose neque inutiliter constituta Dei verba, sed extra omnem ambiguitatem superflue inanitatis, ignita, et ignita vehementer, ne quid illic esse, quod non perfectum ac proprium sit, existimetur." [S. Hilar. in Psal. cxviii. (hodie Psal. cxix.) Op. Ed. Ben. Par. 1693, col. 350. Ed.]

doubtfulness of superfluous vanity; that there may be nothing thought to be there, which is not absolute and proper.”

Ward:—“He is the truth of the Father: ergo, he can neither deceive, nor yet be deceived; especially, I mean, when he spake at his latter end, and made his testament.”

Ridley:—“Christ is the very truth of the Father; and I perceive well to what scope you drive your reason. This is but a far-fetched compass of words. If that these words of Christ, ‘This is my body,’ which you mean, be rightly understood, they are most true.”

Ward:—“He took, he brake, he gave, &c. What took he?”

Ridley:—“Bread: his body.”

Ward:—“What brake he?”

Ridley:—“Bread.”

Ward:—“What gave he?”

Ridley:—“Bread.”

Ward:—“Gave he bread made of wheat, and material bread?”

Ridley:—“I know not whether he gave bread of wheat; but he gave true and material bread.”

Ward:—“I will prove the contrary by Scriptures.

“He delivered to them that which he bade them take.

“But he bade not them take material bread, but his own body:

“Ergo, He gave not material bread, but his own body.”

Ridley:—“I deny the minor. For he bade them take his body sacramentally in material bread: and after that sort it was both bread which he bade them take, because the substance was bread, and that it was also his body, because it was the sacrament of his body, for the sanctifying and the coming of the Holy Ghost, which is always assistant to those mysteries which were instituted of Christ, and lawfully administered!”

[¹ Εἰπὼν δὲ, Τοῦτό μου ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα, δεικνύει ὅτι αὐτὸ τὸ σῶμα τοῦ Κυρίου ἐστὶν ὁ ἄρτος ὁ ἀγιαζόμενος ἐν τῷ θυσιαστηρίῳ, καὶ οὐχὶ ἀντίτυπον· οὐ γὰρ εἶπε, Τοῦτό ἐστὶν ἀντίτυπον, ἀλλὰ Τοῦτό μου ἐστὶ τὸ σῶμα· ἀρρήτῳ γὰρ ἐνεργεῖα μεταποιεῖται, καὶ φαίνεται ἡμῖν ἄρτος· ἐπεὶ γὰρ ἀσθενεῖς ἐσμεν, καὶ οὐκ ἂν ἐδεξάμεθα κρέας ἐσθίειν ὠμὸν καὶ ἀνθρώπου σάρκα, διὰ τοῦτο ἄρτος μὲν ἡμῖν φαίνεται, σὰρξ δὲ τῷ ὄντι ἐστὶ. Theoph. in Matth. cap. xxvi. Ed. Morelli, Paris, p. 162. En.]

Answer to Ward's argument.

This argument is not formal in the second figure. Answer.

Harpfield:—“What is he that so saith, ‘By the coming unto of the Holy Spirit?’”

Ridley:—“I have Theophylact for mine author for this manner of speaking. And here I bring him, that ye may understand that phrase not to be mine, upon Matthew xxvi. Furthermore the said Theophylact, writing upon these words, ‘This is my body,’ sheweth, that the body of the Lord is bread, which is sanctified on the altar.”

Oglethorpe:—“That place of Theophylact maketh openly against you: for he saith in that place, that Christ said not, ‘This is the figure of my body, but my body.’ ‘For,’ saith he, ‘by an unspeakable operation it is transformed, although it seem to us to be bread.’”

Ridley:—“It is not a figure; that is to say, ‘Non tantum est figura;’ i.e. It is not only a figure of his body.”

Weston:—“Where have you that word ‘tantum,’ ‘only?’”

Ridley:—“It is not in that place, but he hath it in another; and Agustine doth so speak many times, and other doctors more.”

Here Weston repeating the words of Theophylact in English, said, “He saith, it is no figure, and you say, it is a figure.” And the same Theophylact saith moreover, that the converting or turning of the bread is made into the Lord's flesh.

That which Christ gave, we do give.

But that which he gave was not a figure of his body, but his body.

Ergo, We give no figure, but his body².

Ridley:—“I grant,” quoth he, “the bread to be converted and turned into the flesh of Christ; but not by transubstanti-

[² Fox has the following note on this passage: “As concerning the authority of Theophylactus, what he thought and might have spoken of that author, Dr Ridley did not then speak, nor could conveniently (as he himself afterwards declared, reporting and writing with his own hand the disputations in the prison,) because of the uproars and clamours, which were so great, and he of so many called upon, that he could not answer as he would, and what he thought touching the authority of Theophylactus, but answered simply to that which is brought out of that author on this sort.” Ed.]

The words of Theophylact (who said not this is a figure of my body) answered.

This argument is without perfect mood and form, having the minor negative in the second figure. Conversion after what sort in the sacrament.

ation, but by sacramental converting or turning. 'It is transformed,' saith Theophylact in the same place, 'by a mystical benediction, and by the accession or coming of the Holy Ghost unto the flesh of Christ.' He saith not, by expulsion or driving away the substance of bread, and by substituting or putting in its place the corporal substance of Christ's flesh¹. And whereas he saith, 'It is not a figure of the body,' we should understand that saying, as he himself doth elsewhere add 'only,' that is, it is no naked or bare figure *only*. For Christ is present in his mysteries; neither at any time, as Cyprian saith, doth the Divine Majesty absent himself from the divine mysteries."

Weston:—"You put in 'only,' and that is one lie. And I tell you further: Peter Martyr was fain to deny the author, because the place was so plain against him. But mark his words, how he saith, 'It is no figure, but his flesh.'"

Ridley:—"To take his words, and not his meaning, is to do injury to the author."

Harding:—"No other doctor maketh more against you. For the word in Greek is μεταστοιχειούται; which is in Latin 'trans-elementatur,' that is, turned from one element into another. And shewing the cause why it is in form of bread, he saith, 'Because we are infirm, and abhor to eat the raw flesh, especially the flesh of man; therefore it appeareth bread, but it is flesh.'"

Ridley:—"That word hath not that strength which you seem to give it. You strain it overmuch, and yet it maketh not so much for your purpose. For the same author hath in another place, ἡμεῖς μεταστοιχειούμεθα, that is, 'We are trans-elemented, or transformed and changed, into the body of Christ:' and so by that word, in such meaning as you speak of, I could prove as well that we are transformed indeed into the very body of Christ."

[¹ Ὁ ἄρτος, ὁ ἐν τοῖς μυστηρίοις ὑφ' ἡμῶν ἐσθιόμενος, οὐχὶ ἀντίτυπον τῆς τοῦ Κυρίου σαρκός, ἀλλ' αὐτὴ ἡ τοῦ Κυρίου σὰρξ· οὐ γὰρ εἶπεν, ὅτι Ὁ ἄρτος ὃν ἐγὼ δώσω ἀντίτυπον ἐστὶ τῆς σαρκός μου, ἀλλ' Ἡ σὰρξ μου ἐστὶ μεταποιεῖται γὰρ ἀπορρήτοις λόγοις ὁ ἄρτος αὐτός, διὰ τῆς μυστικῆς εὐλογίας καὶ ἐπιφοιτήσεως τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος εἰς σάρκα τοῦ Κυρίου. Theophylact, in *Evan. Johan.* cap. vi. Ed. Morelli, Paris 1631, p. 651—2. Ed.]

Ward:—"Learned master doctor, thus you expound the place, 'Hoc est corpus meum,' i.e. 'This is my body,' that is, a figure of my body."

Ridley:—"Although I know there be that so expound it, yet that exposition is not full to express the whole."

Da- *Ward*:—"My sheep hear my voice, and follow me. *ti-* "But all the sheep of Christ hear his voice, 'This is my body,' without a figure:

si. "Ergo, The voice of Christ here hath no figure."

Ridley:—"The sheep of Christ follow the voice of Christ, unless they be seduced and deceived through ignorance."

Ward:—"But the fathers took this place for no figurative speech."

Ridley:—"Yet they do all number this place among figurative and tropical speeches."

Ward:—"Justin Martyr, in his second Apology², hath thus: οὐ γὰρ ὡς κοινὸν ἄρτον οὐδὲ κοινὸν πόμα ταῦτα λαμβάνομεν· ἀλλ' ὃν τρόπον διὰ λόγου θεοῦ σαρκοποιηθεὶς Ἰησοῦς, ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν, καὶ σάρκα καὶ αἷμα ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας ἡμῶν ἔσχεν, οὕτως καὶ τὴν δι' εὐχῆς λόγου τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν τροφήν, ἐξ ἧς αἷμα καὶ σάρκες κατὰ μεταβολὴν τρέφονται ἡμῶν, ἐκείνου τοῦ σαρκοποιηθέντος Ἰησοῦ καὶ σάρκα καὶ αἷμα ἐδιδάχθημεν εἶναι."

"Neque vero hæc pro pane potuve communi sumimus: imo quemadmodum verbo Dei Jesus Christus, Servator noster, incarnatus habuit pro salute nostra carnem et sanguinem; ita per orationem illius verbi consecratum hoc alimentum, quo sanguis et carnes nostræ per immutationem enutriuntur, ejusdem incarnati carnem et sanguinem esse sumus edocti."

"This place Cranmer hath corrupted. Thus it is Englished: 'For we do not take this for common bread and drink; but like as Jesus Christ our Saviour, incarnate by the word of God, had flesh and blood for our salvation; even so we be taught the food wherewith our flesh and blood is nourished by alteration, when it is consecrated by the prayer of his word, to be the flesh and blood of the same Jesus incarnate.'

"Dr Cranmer hath thus translated it: 'Bread, water, and wine, are not to be taken as other common meats and drinks

[² In modern editions, *Apolog.* i. § 66, p. 85. Venetiis, 1747. Ed.]

This Harding sat at the table among the notaries.

The word μεταστοιχειούσθαι. Theophylact expounded.

Argument in the third figure.

Justin Martyr.

Cranmer charged with mis-translating a place of Justin.

be, but they be ordained purposely to give thanks to God, and therefore be called Eucharistia, and be called the body and blood of Christ: and that it is lawful for none to eat and drink of them, but such as profess Christ, and live according to the same; and yet the same meat and drink is changed into our flesh and blood, and nourisheth our bodies.”

Ridley:—“O good master doctor, go sincerely to work: I know that place, and I know how it is used.”

Ward here repeated the place again out of Justin, ‘We are taught,’ &c. as above.

Ridley:—“O what unright dealing is this! I have the selfsame place of Justin here copied out. You know yourself, who are skilful in Greek, how the words here be removed out of the right place; and that without any just cause.”

Ward:—“I stand still upon mine argument. What say you?”

Ridley:—“If you will, that I should answer to Justin, then you must hear. I have but one tongue, I cannot answer at once to you all.”

Weston:—“Christ gave us his very and true flesh to be eaten:

“But he never gave it to be eaten but in his last supper, and in the sacrament of the altar:

“Ergo, There is the very true flesh of Christ.”

Ridley:—“If you speak of the very true flesh of Christ, after the substance of his flesh taken in the womb of the Virgin Mary, and not by grace and spiritually, I then do deny the first part of your reason. But if you understand it of the true flesh, after grace and spiritual communication, I then grant the first part, and deny the second. For he giveth unto us truly his flesh, to be eaten of all that believe in him: for he is the very and true meat of the soul, wherewith we are fed unto everlasting life, according to his saying, ‘My flesh is meat indeed,’ &c.”

Ward:—“I have desired with my hearty desire to eat

[¹ “Professus itaque se concupiscentia concupiscere edere pascha ut suum (indignum enim ut alienum concupisceret Deus) acceptum panem et distributum discipulis corpus illum suum fecit, Hoc est corpus meum, dicendo, etc.” *Tertul. contra Marcion. lib. iv. cap. 40. Op. Ed. Rigalt. Par. 1641, p. 571. Ed.*]

Sumptum
ex exem-
plari Do-
mini Ridley
descripto.

In this argu-
ment if the
minor be a
negative, the
form is
false: if it
be affirma-
tive, equi-
pollenter,
the major is
to be de-
nied.

“Desiderio
desideravi
hoc pascha
manducare
vobiscum.”

this paschal with you.’ What paschal, I pray you, desired he to eat? If you stand in doubt, you have Tertullian against Marcion: He, therefore, protesting a great desire to eat his paschal (his own paschal I say, for it was not meet that he should desire any other than his own), taking bread and distributing it to his disciples, made it his body, saying, ‘This is my body.’ What say you? Did he understand by this paschal the Judaical lamb, or by that which afterwards he gave in his supper?”

Ridley:—“I suppose that the first he understood of the Judaical passover, and afterward of the eucharist.”

Ward:—“Nay then Tertullian is against you, who saith:

Baro:—“He desired to eat his passover.

ro:—“But the Judaical passover was not his, but strange from Christ:

co:—“Ergo, He meant not of the Judaical passover.”

Ridley:—“The Judaical passover was not strange from Christ, but his own; insomuch as he is the Lord of all, and as well the Lord of the Judaical passover, as of his own supper.”

Ward:—“What answer you then to Tertullian, who saith, ‘He desired to eat his own passover,’ and not the Jewish passover, which stood upon words without flesh?”

Ridley:—“Tertullian may here dally in sense analogical. I know that Cyprian hath these words²: ‘He began then to institute the holy eucharist, but both were Christ’s.’”

Ward:—“Augustine on Psalm xcvi., writing upon these words, ‘Adorate scabellum pedum ejus;’ i. e. ‘Worship his footstool,’ &c.³ ‘I ask,’ saith he, ‘what is the footstool of

² “Tunc instituit quidem eucharistiam, sed utrumque erat Christi.”

[³ “Quero, inquit, quid sit scabellum pedum ejus? Et dicit mihi Scriptura, Terra scabellum pedum meorum. Fluctuans converto me ad Christum, quia ipsum quero hic, et invenio quomodo sine impietate adoretur scabellum pedum ejus. Suscepit enim de terra terram, quia caro de terra est, et de carne Mariæ carnem accepit, et quia in ipsa carne hic ambulavit, et ipsam carnem nobis manducandam ad salutem dedit: nemo autem illam carnem manducat nisi prius adoraverit. Invenit est quomodo tale scabellum pedum Domini adoretur, ut non solum non peccemus adorando, sed peccemus non adorando ipsum,” etc. S. August. in Psal. xcvi. Op. Ed. Ben. Par. 1685, tom. iv. col. 1604—5. Ed.]

Analogical
sense is that
which hath
a high and
mystical un-
derstand-
ing, that
lieth ab-
struse and
profound
under the
external
letter.”

his feet; and the Scripture telleth me, The earth is the footstool of my feet. And so, in searching thereof, I turn myself to Christ, because I seek him here in the earth, and find how, without impiety, the footstool of his feet may be worshipped. For he took earth of earth, in that he is flesh of the earth, and of the flesh of Mary he took flesh, and because that in the same flesh here he walked; and also he gave the same flesh to us, to be eaten unto salvation. But no man eateth that flesh except he have worshipped before. And so it is found, how such a footstool of the feet of the Lord is to be worshipped, so that not only we sin not in worshipping, but also do sin in not worshipping the same."

Da- "He gave to us his flesh to be eaten, the which he took of the earth, in which also here he walked, &c.

ti- "But he never gave his flesh to be eaten, but when he gave it at his supper, saying, 'This is my body:'

si- "Ergo, In the eucharist he gave us his flesh."

Ridley:—"You do allege the place of Augustine upon Psalm xcvi.iii., where he saith, that Christ gave his flesh to be eaten which he took of the earth, and in which here he walked; inferring hereupon that Christ never gave the same his flesh to be eaten, but only in the eucharist: I deny your minor; for he gave it both in the eucharist to be eaten, and also otherwise, as well in the word, as also upon the cross."

Smith:—"What if Augustine say, that Christ did not only give himself to us in a figure, but gave his own very flesh indeed and really?"

Ridley:—"I never said that Christ gave only a figure of his body; for indeed he gave himself in a real communication, that is, he gave his flesh after a communication of his flesh."

(Here Weston read the place of Augustine in English, and afterward said, "Ye say Christ gave not his body, but a figure of his body.")

Ridley:—"I say not so: I say, he gave his own body verily; but he gave it by a real, effectual, and spiritual communication."

After this, Dr Glyn began to reason, who (notwithstanding master Ridley had always taken him for his old friend)

If the minor of this argument (as is said before) be equipollent to affirmative, then it cometh next to the mood *Datist*. How Christ gave his flesh to be eaten, and when.

Dr Glyn, Bishop Ridley's old

made a very contumelious preface against him. This preface master Ridley, therefore, did the more take to heart, because it proceeded from him. Howbeit he thought, that Dr Glyn's mind was to serve the turn; for afterward he came to the house wherein master Ridley was kept, and, as far as master Ridley could call to remembrance, before Dr Young and Dr Oglethorpe he desired him to pardon his words. The which master Ridley did even from the very heart; and wished earnestly, that God would give not only to him, but unto all others, the true and evident knowledge of God's evangelical sincerity, that, all offences put apart, they being perfectly and fully reconciled, might agree and meet together in the house of the heavenly Father.

friend, desireth him of pardon. Ridley forgiveth Dr Glyn.

Glyn:—"I see that you elude or shift away all Scriptures and fathers: I will go to work with you after another sort:—Christ hath here his church known in earth, of which you were once a child, although now you speak contumeliously of the sacraments."

Ridley:—"This is a grievous contumely, that you call me a shifter away of the Scripture and of the doctors. As touching the sacraments, I never yet spake contumeliously of them. I grant that Christ hath here his church in earth; but that church did ever receive and acknowledge the eucharist to be a sacrament of the body of Christ, yet not the body of Christ really, but the body of Christ by grace."

Glyn:—"Then I ask this question: whether the catholic church hath ever or at any time been idolatrous?"

Ridley:—"The church is the pillar and stay of the truth, that never yet hath been idolatrous in respect of the whole; but, peradventure, in respect of some part thereof, which sometimes may be seduced by evil pastors, and through ignorance."

Glyn:—"That church ever hath worshipped the flesh of Christ in the eucharist.

"But the church hath never been idolatrous:

"Ergo, It hath alway judged the flesh of Christ to be in the eucharist."

Ridley:—"And I also worship Christ in the sacrament, but not because he is included in the sacrament: like as I

"This argument, having the minor a negative, neither is formable in the third

figure, nor doth it conclude rightly, but should conclude thus: ergo, to worship the flesh of Christ in the eucharist is no idolatry."—*Sumptum ab autografo Ridley manu descripto.*

worship Christ also in the Scriptures, not because he is really included in them. Notwithstanding I say, that the body of Christ is present in the sacrament; but yet sacramentally and spiritually (according to his grace) giving life, and in that respect really, that is, according to his benediction, giving life. Furthermore, I acknowledge gladly the true body of Christ to be in the Lord's supper, in such sort as the Church of Christ (which is the spouse of Christ, and is taught of the Holy Ghost, and guided by God's word) doth acknowledge the same. But the true church of Christ doth acknowledge a presence of Christ's body in the Lord's supper to be communicated to the godly by grace, and spiritually, as I have often shewed, and by a sacramental signification; but not by the corporal presence of the body of his flesh."

Glyn:—"Augustine against Faustus [saith,] 'Some there were which thought us, instead of bread and of the cup, to worship Ceres and Bacchus.'" Upon this place I gather, that there was an adoration of the sacrament among the fathers; and Erasmus, in an epistle to the brethren of Low Germany, saith, that the worshipping of the sacrament was before Augustine and Cyprian."

Ridley:—"We do handle the signs reverently: but we worship the sacrament as a sacrament, not as a thing signified by the sacrament."

Glyn:—"What is the symbol or sacrament?"

Ridley:—"Bread."

Glyn:—"Ergo, We worship bread."

Ridley:—"There is a deceit in this word 'adoramus.'"

We worship the symbols, when reverently we handle them. We worship Christ wheresoever we perceive his benefits; but we understand his benefits to be greatest in the sacrament."

Glyn:—"So I may fall down before the bench here, and worship Christ; and if any man ask me what I do, I may answer, I worship Christ."

Ridley:—"We adore and worship Christ in the eucharist. And if you mean the external sacrament; I say, that also is to be worshipped as a sacrament."

["Nonnulli propter panem et calicem Cererem et Bacchum nos colere existimabat," etc. August. contra Faust. lib. xx. cap. 13. Op. Ed. Ben. Par. 1685, tom. viii. col. 342. Ed.]

Glyn:—"So was the faith of the primitive church."

Ridley:—"Would to God we would all follow the faith of that church!"

Glyn:—"Think you that Christ hath now his church?"

Ridley:—"I do so."

Glyn:—"But all the church adoreth Christ verily and really in the sacrament."

Ridley:—"You know yourself, that the eastern church would not acknowledge transubstantiation; as appeareth in the council of Florence."

This council of Florence was but of late years, in the time of the council of Basil.

Cole:—"That is false: for in the same they did acknowledge transubstantiation; although they would not entreat of that matter, for that they had not in their commission so to do."

Ridley:—"Nay, they would determine nothing of that matter, when the article was propounded unto them."

Cole:—"It was not because they did not acknowledge the same, but because they had no commission so to do."

Curtrop:—"Reverend Sir, I will prove and declare, that the body of Christ is truly and really in the eucharist: and whereas the holy fathers, both of the west and east church, have written both many things and no less manifest of the same matter, yet will I bring forth only Chrysostom. The place is this:

"That which is in the cup, is the same that flowed from the side of Christ.

"But true and pure blood did flow from the side of Christ:

"Ergo, His true and pure blood is in the cup."

Ridley:—"It is his true blood which is in the chalice, I grant, and the same which sprang from the side of Christ. But how? It is blood indeed, but not after the same manner, after which manner it sprang from his side. For here is the blood, but by way of a sacrament.—Again I say, like as the bread of the sacrament and of thanksgiving is called the body of Christ given for us; so the cup of the Lord is called the blood which sprang from the side of Christ: but

The major should be thus: Whosoever did flow from the side of Christ is in the cup, &c. or else the argument being in the figure is affirmative, and false.

[² Τοῦτο τὸ ἐν ποτηρίῳ ὄν, ἐκεῖνο ἐστὶ τὸ ἀπὸ τῆς πλευρᾶς ρέυσαν· καὶ ἐκεῖνον μετέχομεν. S. Chrys. in cap. x. Cor. 1. Hom. xxiv. Op. Ed. Ben. Par. 1732, tom. x. pp. 212—13. Ed.]

that sacramental bread is called the body, because it is the sacrament of his body. Even so likewise the cup is called the blood also, which flowed out of Christ's side, because it is the sacrament of that blood which flowed out of his side, instituted of the Lord himself for our singular commodity, namely, for our spiritual nourishment; like as baptism is ordained in water to our spiritual regeneration."

Curtop :—"The sacrament of the blood is not the blood."

Ridley :—"The sacrament of the blood is the blood; and that is attributed to the sacrament, which is spoken of the thing of the sacrament."

(Here Weston repeateth *Curtop*'s argument in English.)

Weston :—"That which is in the chalice, is the same which flowed out of Christ's side.

"But there came out very blood :

"Ergo, There is very blood in the chalice."

Ridley :—"The blood of Christ is in the chalice indeed, but not in the real presence, but by grace, and in a sacrament."

Weston :—"That is very well. Then we have blood in the chalice."

Ridley :—"It is true; but by grace, and in a sacrament."

(Here the people hissed at him.)

Ridley :—"O my masters! I take this for no judgment: I will stand to God's judgment."

Watson :—"Good sir, I have determined to have respect of the time, and to abstain from all those things which may hinder the entrance of our disceptation: and therefore first I ask this question: When Christ said in John vi., 'He that eateth my flesh,' &c., doth he signify in those words the eating of his true and natural flesh, or else of the bread and symbol?"

Ridley :—"I understand that place of the very flesh of Christ to be eaten, but spiritually: and further I say, that the sacrament also pertaineth unto the spiritual manducation: for without the spirit to eat the sacrament is to eat it unprofitably; for whoso eateth not spiritually, he eateth his own condemnation."

This argument concludeth not directly, and, being in the second figure affirmative, it is not formal.

"Qui manducat carnem meam."

Spiritual eating of the flesh of Christ.

Watson :—"I ask then, whether the eucharist be a sacrament?"

Ridley :—"The eucharist, taken for a sign or symbol, is a sacrament."

Watson :—"Is it instituted of God?"

Ridley :—"It is instituted of God."

Watson :—"Where?"

Ridley :—"In the supper."

Watson :—"With what words is it made a sacrament?"

Ridley :—"By the words and deeds which Christ said and did, and commanded us to say and do the same."

Watson :—"It is a thing commonly received of all, that the sacraments of the new law give grace to them that worthily receive."

Ridley :—"True it is, that grace is given by the sacrament; but as by an instrument. The inward virtue and Christ give the grace through the sacrament."

Watson :—"What is a sacrament?"

Ridley :—"I remember there be many definitions of a sacrament in Agustine: but I will take that which seemeth most fit to this present purpose. A sacrament is a visible sign of invisible grace." Sacrament defined.

Watson :—"Ergo, Grace is given to the receivers."

Ridley :—"The society or conjunction with Christ through the Holy Ghost is grace; and by the sacrament we are made the members of the mystical body of Christ, for that by the sacrament the part of the body is grafted in the head."

Watson :—"But there is difference between the mystical body and natural body."

Ridley :—"There is, I grant you, a difference; but the head of them both is one."

Watson :—"The eucharist is a sacrament of the new testament."

"Ergo, It hath a promise of grace.

"But no promise of grace is made to bread and wine :

"Ergo, Bread and wine be not the sacraments of the new testament."

Ridley :—"I grant that grace pertaineth to the eucharist, according to this saying, 'The bread which we break, is it not the communication or partaking of the body of Christ?'"

The syllogism is thus to be formed. The sacrament of the New Testament hath a promise of grace annexed: bread and wine have

no promise of grace annexed: ergo, bread and wine is no sacrament of the New Testament. No promise made to bread and wine as they be common bread and common wine: but as they be sanctified and made sacraments of the Lord's body and blood, they are not now called bread and wine, but have a promise annexed to them, or rather (to say the truth) annexed to the receivers of them. John vi.

And like as he that eateth and he that drinketh unworthily the sacrament of the body and blood of the Lord, eateth and drinketh his own damnation; even so he that eateth and drinketh worthily, eateth life, and drinketh life. I grant also that there is no promise made to bread and wine. But inasmuch as they are sanctified, and made the sacraments of the body and blood of the Lord, they have a promise of grace annexed unto them; namely, of spiritual partaking of the body of Christ to be communicated and given, not to the bread and wine, but to them which worthily do receive the sacrament."

Watson :—"If the substance of bread and wine do remain, then the society betwixt Christ and us is promised to them that take bread and wine.

"But that society is not promised to bread and wine, but to the receivers of the flesh and blood: 'Qui manducat,' &c.

"Ergo, The substance of bread and wine remaineth not."

Ridley :—"The promise undoubtedly is made to the flesh and the blood; but the same is to be received in the sacrament through faith."

Watson :—"Every sacrament hath a promise of grace annexed unto it; but bread and wine have not a promise of grace annexed unto them:

"Ergo, The bread and wine are not sacraments."

Ridley :—"True it is, every sacrament hath grace annexed unto it instrumentally. But there is divers understanding of this word 'habet,' 'hath:' for the sacrament hath not grace included in it; but to those that receive it well, it is turned to grace. After that manner the water in baptism hath grace promised, and by that grace the Holy Spirit is given: not that grace is included in water, but that grace cometh by water."

Watson :—"This promise is made to the flesh and blood of Christ, and not to the bread and wine:

"Ergo, The sacrament is not bread and wine, but the body and blood of Christ."

Ridley :—"There is no promise made to him that taketh common bread and common wine; but to him that receiveth the sanctified bread, and bread of the communion, there is a large promise of grace made: neither is the promise given

Sacraments have a promise of grace annexed, not absolutely, but instrumentally.

to the symbols, but to the thing of the sacrament. But the thing of the sacrament is the flesh and blood."

Watson :—"Every sacrament of the new testament giveth grace, promised of God to those that worthily receive it."

Ridley :—"This sacrament hath a promise of grace, made to those that receive it worthily, because grace is given by it, as by an instrument; not that Christ hath transfused grace into the bread and wine."

Sacraments only instruments of grace.

Watson :—"But this promise which is made, is not but to those that worthily receive the flesh and blood; not the bread and wine."

Ridley :—"That proposition of yours hath a divers understanding. There is no promise made to them that receive common bread, as it were; but to those that worthily receive the sanctified bread there is a promise of grace made, like as Origen doth testify."

Watson :—"Where is that promise made?"

Ridley :—"The bread which we break, is it not a communication of the body of Christ? And we being many are one bread, one body of Christ."

1 Cor. x.

Watson :—"What doth he mean by bread in that place?"

Ridley :—"The bread of the Lord's table, the communion of the body of Christ."

Watson :—"Hearken what Chrysostom saith upon that place: 'The bread which we break, is it not the communication of Christ's body? Wherefore did he not say participation? Because he would signify some greater matter, and that he would declare a great convenience and conjunction betwixt the same. For we do not communicate by participation only and receiving, but also by uniting; for likewise as that body is co-united to Christ, so also we, by the same bread, are conjoined and united to him.'"

[¹ Ὁ ἄρτος ὃν κλῶμεν, οὐχὶ κοινωνία τοῦ σώματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐστὶ; διὰ τί μὴ εἶπε μετοχή; ὅτι πλέον τι δηλωσαὶ ἢ βουλήθη, καὶ πολλὴν ἐνδείξασθαι τὴν συνάφειαν· οὐ γὰρ τῷ μετέχειν μόνον καὶ μεταλαμβάνειν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τῷ ἐνούσθαι κοινωνοῦμεν. καθάπερ γὰρ τὸ σῶμα ἐκεῖνο ἡνωταὶ τῷ Χριστῷ, οὕτω δὲ ἡμεῖς αὐτῷ διὰ τοῦ ἄρτου τούτου ἐνούμεθα. S. Chrysost. Hom. xxiv. in 1 Corinth. cap. x. Op. Ed. Ben. Par. 1718. tom. x. p. 213. Ed.]

Answer to
Chrysos-
tom.

Ridley :—“ Let Chrysostom have his manner of speaking and his sentence. If it be true, I reject it not. But let it not be prejudicial to me, to name it true bread.”

Chrysos-
tom: one
bread, one
mystical
body.

Watson :—“ ‘All,’ saith Chrysostom, ‘which sit together at one board, do communicate together of one true body. What do I call,’ saith he, ‘this communicating? We are all the selfsame body. What doth bread signify? The body of Christ. What be they that receive it? The body of Christ: for many are but one body.’ Chrysostom doth interpret this place against you: ‘All we be one bread and one mystical body, which do participate together one bread of Christ.’”

Ridley :—“ All we be one mystical body, which do communicate of one Christ in bread, after the efficacy of regeneration or quickening.”

Watson :—“ Of what manner of bread speaketh he?”

Ridley :—“ Of the bread of the Lord’s table.”

Watson :—“ Is not that bread one?”

Ridley :—“ It is one, the church being one; because one bread is set forth upon the table: and so of one bread all together do participate, which communicate at the table of the Lord.”

Watson :—“ See how absurdly you speak. Do you say, all which be from the beginning to the end of the world?”

Ridley :—“ All, I say, which at one table together have communicated in the mysteries might well so do. Albeit the heavenly and celestial bread is likewise one also, whereof the sacramental bread is a mystery: the which, being one, all we together do participate.”

A cavil.

Watson :—“ A perverse answer. Which ‘all’? Mean you all christian men?”

Ridley :—“ I do distribute this word ‘all;’ for all were wont together to communicate of the one bread divided into parts: all, I say, which were in one congregation, and which all did communicate together at one table.”

[¹ Τί γὰρ λέγω κοινωνίαν, φησίν; αὐτό ἐσμεν ἐκεῖνο τὸ σῶμα. τί γὰρ ἐστὶν ὁ ἄρτος; σῶμα Χριστοῦ. τί δὲ γίνονται οἱ μεταλαμβάνοντες; σῶμα Χριστοῦ, οὐχὶ σώματα πολλὰ ἀλλὰ σῶμα ἓν. S. Chrysost. Hom. xxiv. in 1 Corinth. cap. x. Op. Ed. Ben. Par. 1718. tom. x. p. 213. Ed.]

Watson :—“ What? Do you exclude then from the body of Christ all them which did not communicate, being present?”

Flecknam :—“ But Cyprian saith², ‘Bread which no multitude doth consume:’ which cannot be understood but only of the body of Christ.”

Ridley :—“ Also Cyprian in this place did speak of the true body of Christ, and not of material bread.”

Flecknam :—“ Nay, rather he did there entreat of the sacrament in that tractation ‘De Cœna Domini,’ writing upon the supper of the Lord.”

Ridley :—“ Truth it is, and I grant he entreateth there of the sacrament: but also he doth admix something therewithal of the spiritual manducation.”

Smith :—“ When the Lord saith, ‘This is my body,’ he useth no tropical speech:

“Ergo, You are deceived.”

Ridley :—“ I deny your antecedent.”

Smith :—“ I bring here Augustine expounding these words, ‘He was carried in his own hands’: How may this be understood to be done in man? For no man is carried in his own hands, but in the hands of other. How this may be understood of David after the letter, we do not find; of Christ we find it. For Christ was borne in his own hands, when he saith, ‘This is my body:’ for he carried that same body in his own hands, &c. Augustine here did not see how this place, after the letter, could be understood of David; because no man can carry himself in his own hands. ‘Therefore,’ saith he, ‘this place is to be understood of Christ after the letter.’ For Christ carried himself in his own hands in his supper, when he gave the sacrament to his disciples, saying, ‘This is my body.’”

Ridley :—“ I deny your argument, and I explicate the same. Augustine could not find, after his own understanding,

Augustine
answered.

[² “Nulla panem hunc multitudo consumit.” Cyprian. de Cœna Dom. Op. Ed. Ben. Par. 1726. col. cxv. Ed.]

[³ “Hoc vero, fratres, quomodo possit fieri in homine, quis intelligat? Manibus enim suis nemo portatur, sed alienis. Quomodo intelligatur de David secundum literam, non invenimus; de Christo autem invenimus. Ferebatur enim Christus in manibus suis cum diceret, Hoc est corpus meum. Ferebat enim illud corpus in manibus suis,” etc. S. Aug. in Psal. xxxiii. En. 1. Op. Ed. Ben. Par. 1685. tom. iv. col. 214. Ed.]

how this could be understood of David after the letter. Augustine goeth here from others in this exposition, but I go not from him. But let this exposition of Augustine be granted to you; although I know this place of Scripture be otherwise read of other men, after the verity of the Hebrew text, and it is also otherwise to be expounded. Yet, to grant to you this exposition of Augustine, I say yet notwithstanding, it maketh nothing against my assertion: for Christ did bear himself in his own hands, when he gave the sacrament of his body to be eaten of his disciples."

Smith:—"Ergo, It is true of Christ after the letter, that he was borne in his own hands."

Ridley:—"He was borne literally, and after that letter which was spoken of David: but not after the letter of these words, 'Hoc est corpus meum.'

The place of Augustine, how Christ was carried in his own hands "ad literam," i.e. literally.

"I grant that St Augustine saith, that it is not found literally of David, that he carried himself in his own hands, and that it is found of Christ. But this word 'ad literam,' 'literally,' you do not well refer to that which was borne, but rather it ought to be referred to him that did bear it. St Augustine's meaning is this; that it is not read anywhere in the Bible, that this carnal David, the Son of Jesse, did bear himself in his hands; but of that spiritual David, that overthrew Goliath the devil (that is, of Christ our Saviour, the son of the Virgin), it may well be found literally, that he bare himself in his own hands after a certain manner, namely, in carrying the sacrament of himself. And note, that St Augustine hath these words, 'quodam modo,' 'after a certain manner;' which manifestly declare, how the doctor's meaning is to be taken."

Smith:—"When then was he borne in his own hands, and after what letter?"

Ridley:—"He was borne in the supper sacramentally, when he said, 'This is my body.'"

Smith:—"Every man may bear in his own hands a figure of his body. But Augustine denieth that David could carry himself in his hands:

"Ergo, He speaketh of no figure of his body."

Ridley:—"If Augustine could have found in all the Scripture, that David had carried the sacrament of his body, then he would never have used that exposition of Christ."

A figure he may bear, but not a sacrament.

Smith:—"But he did bare himself in his own hands:

"Ergo, He did not bear a figure only."

Ridley:—"He did bear himself, but in a sacrament: and Augustine afterward addeth, 'quodam modo,' that is, 'sacramentally.'"

Smith:—"You understand not what Augustine meant when he said, 'quodam modo;' for he meant, that he did bear his very true body in that supper, not in figure and form of a body, but in form and figure of bread:

Quodam modo.

"Ergo, You are holden fast, neither are you able to escape out of this labyrinth."

Dr Weston repeated this place again in English: which done, then Dr Tresham began thus to speak, moved (as it seemed to master Ridley) with great zeal; and desired that he might be in the stead of John Baptist, in converting the hearts of the fathers, and in reducing the said Bishop Ridley again to the mother church. Now at the first, not knowing the person, he thought he had been some good old man, which had the zeal of God, although not according to knowledge, and began to answer him with mansuetude and reverence: but afterward he smelled a fox under a sheep's clothing.

Tresham:—"God Almighty grant that it may be fulfilled in me, that was spoken by the prophet Malachi of John Baptist, 'Which may turn the hearts of the fathers to the children, and the hearts of the children to their fathers, that you at length may be converted.' The wise man saith, 'Son, honour thy father, and reverence thy mother:' but you dishonour your Father in heaven, and pollute your mother the holy church here on earth, while ye set nought by her."

Tresham prayeth for converting Ridley.

Ridley:—"These bye words do pollute your school."

Tresham:—"If there were an Arian which had that subtle wit that you have, he might soon shift off the authority of the Scriptures and fathers."

Weston:—"Either dispute, or else hold your peace, I pray you."

Tresham:—"I bring a place here out of the council of Lateran, the which council representing the universal church,

The decree of the Lateran council

alleged for
transub-
stantiation.

wherein were congregated three hundred bishops and seventy metropolitans, besides a great multitude of others, decreed that bread and wine, by the power of God's word, was transubstantiate into the body and blood of the Lord. Therefore whosoever saith contrary, cannot be a child of the church, but a heretic."

Ibid.

Ridley :—" Good sir, I have heard what you have cited out of the council of Lateran, and remember that there was a great multitude of bishops and metropolitans, as you said : but yet you have not numbered how many abbots, priors, and friars were in that council, who were to the number of eight hundred."

Carping.

One of the Scribes :—" What ! will you deny then the authority of that council, for the multitude of those priors ?"

Ridley :—" No, sir, not so much for that cause, as for that, especially, because the doctrine of that council agreed not with the word of God, as it may well appear by the acts of that council, which was holden under Innocent the Third, a man (if we believe the histories) most pernicious to the church and commonwealth of Christ."

Council of
Lateran.

Tresham :—" What ! do you not receive the council of Lateran ?" Whereupon he, with certain others, cried, " Scribite, scribe," Write, write.

Ridley :—" No, sir, I receive not that council ; ' scribite, et rescribite,' write, and write again."

Tresham :—" Evil men do eat the natural body of Christ : ergo, the true and natural body of Christ is on the altar."

Ridley :—" Evil men do eat the very true and natural body of Christ sacramentally, and no further ; as St Augustine saith. But good men do eat the very true body, both sacramentally, and spiritually by grace."

Tresham :—" I prove the contrary by St Augustine : ' Sicut enim Judas, cui buccellulam Dominus tradidit, non malum accipiendo, sed male accipiendo, peccavit,' &c.¹ ' Like as Judas, to whom the Lord gave the morsel, did offend, not in taking a thing that was evil, but in receiving it after an evil manner,' &c. And a little after², ' Because some

[¹ Aug. lib. v. cont. Donatistas. cap. 8. Op. Ed. Ben. Par. 1685. tom. ix. col. 146. Ed.]

[² Aut quia non ad salutem accipit, nihil acceperit. Ibid. Ed.]

do not eat unto salvation, it followeth not therefore, that it is not his body."

Ridley :—" It is the body to them, that is, the sacrament of the body : and Judas took the sacrament of the Lord to his condemnation. Augustine hath distinguished these things well in another place, where he saith³, ' The bread of the Lord, [and] the bread the Lord. Evil men eat the bread of the Lord, but not the bread the Lord : but good men eat both the bread of the Lord, and bread the Lord.'"

Weston :—" Paul saith, ' the body,' and you say, the sacrament of the body." This Weston spake in English.

Ridley :—" Paul meaneth so indeed."

Watson :—" You understand it evil concerning the sign : for the fathers say, that evil men do eat him which descended from heaven."

Ridley :—" They eat him indeed, but sacramentally. The fathers use many times the sacrament for the matter of the sacrament, and all that same place maketh against you : and so here he cited the place." The old doctors, &c.

Weston :—" I bring Theophylact, which saith, that Judas did taste the body of the Lord⁴. ' The Lord did shew the cruelty of Judas, who, when he was rebuked, did not understand, and tasted the Lord's flesh,' &c." Theophylact alleged.

Ridley :—" This phrase to divines is well known, and used of the doctors : He tasted the flesh of the Lord, ' insensibiliter,' ' insensibly ;' that is, the sacrament of the Lord's flesh." Answer.

Weston :—" Chrysostom saith, that the same punishment remaineth to them which receive the body of the Lord unworthily, as to them which crucified him." Chrysostom alleged.

Ridley :—" That is, because they defile the Lord's body : for evil men do eat the body of Christ sacramentally, but" Chrysostom expounded.

[³ " Panem Domini, et panem Dominum. Mali manducant panem Domini, non panem Dominum : boni autem manducant et panem Domini, et panem Dominum." S. Aug. on Johan. Evan. Tract. lix. Op. Ed. Ben. Par. 1685. tom. iii. pars 2. col. 663. Ed.]

[⁴ Διὰ τοῦτο προσέθηκε τὸ ἐσθιόντων, ἵνα παραστήσῃ τὴν ἀπανθρωπίαν τοῦ Ἰουδα, ὅτι ἐν τραπέζῃ καὶ τῶν αὐτῶν βρωμάτων κοινωνῶν, ὅτε, εἰ καὶ θηρίον ἦν, πρῶτος ἂν ἐγεγονεῖ, τότε οὐδὲ ἐλεγχόμενος συνῆκεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦ σώματος αὐτοῦ γενόμενος οὐ μεταμελεῖται. Theoph. in Math. Evan. cap. xxvi. Ed. Morelli, Paris. 1631. p. 161. Ed.]

good men eat both the sacrament and the matter of the sacrament."

The council of Nice alleged.

Watson:—"You reject the council of Lateran, because (you say) it agreeth not with God's word. What say you then to the council of Nice? The words of the council be these: 'Let us not look a-low by the ground upon the bread and the drink set before us, but, lifting up our mind, let us faithfully believe, there upon that holy table to lie the Lamb of God taking away the sins of the world, being sacrificed of the priests'."

Ridley:—"That council was collected out of ancient fathers, and is to me a great authority; for it saith, 'that bread is set upon the altar, and having our minds lifted up, we must consider him which is in heaven.' The words of the council make for me."

The place expounded. If the Lamb of God lie really upon the table, then why doth the council bid us lift up our minds; which rather should bid us let down our minds to the altar?

Watson:—" 'Exaltata mente,' 'with a mind exalted:' that is, not as brute beasts at the rack or manger, having an eye only upon the thing that is set before them: 'The Lamb of God lieth on the table,' saith the council."

Ridley:—"The Lamb of God is in heaven, according to the verity of the body: and here he is with us in a mystery, according to his power; not corporally."

Watson:—"But the Lamb of God lieth on the table."

Ridley:—"It is a figurative speech; for in our mind we understand him which is in heaven."

Watson:—"But he lieth there, the Greek word is κείται."

Ridley:—"He lieth there; that is, he is there present, not corporally, but he lieth there by his operation."

Watson:—"He lieth; but his operation lieth not."

Ridley:—"You think very grossly of the sitting or lying of the celestial Lamb on the table of the Lord: for we may not imagine any such sitting or lying upon the table, as the reason of man would judge; but all things are here to be

[¹ Ἐπὶ τῆς θείας τραπέζης, πάλιν κἀνταῦθα μὴ τῷ προκειμένῳ ἄρτῳ καὶ τῷ ποτηρίῳ ταπεινῶς προσέχωμεν, ἀλλ' ὑψώσαντες ἡμῶν τὴν διάνοιαν πίστει νοήσωμεν κείσθαι ἐπὶ τῆς ἱερᾶς ἐκείνης τὸν ἄμῳν τοῦ θεοῦ, τὸν αἴροντα τὴν ἁμαρτίαν τοῦ κόσμου, ἀθύτως ὑπὸ τῶν ἱερέων θύομενον. Gelasius. Hist. Conc. Nicæn. cap. xxx. apud Labbæum. Ed. 1671. tom. ii. col. 233. Ed.]

understood spiritually. For that heavenly Lamb is (as I confess) on the table; but by a spiritual presence, by grace, and not after any corporal substance of his flesh taken of the Virgin Mary. And indeed the same canon doth very plainly teach, that the bread which is set on the table is material bread; and therefore it (the canon, I mean) commandeth that we should not creep on the ground in our cogitation, to those things which are set before us; as who should say, what other things are they (as much as pertaineth to their true substance) than bread and wine? 'But rather,' saith the canon, 'lifting up our minds into heaven, let us consider with faith the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sins of the world, sitting or lying upon the table.' 'For a lifted up faith,' saith he, 'seeth him which sitteth on the right hand of God the Father, after the true manner of a body set by grace on the Lord's table, and taking away the sins of the world. For I think you mean not so; as though the Lamb did lie there prostrate with his members spread upon the table.'"

Smith:—"I bring another place out of the council of Nice²: 'None of the apostles said, this is a figure of the body of Christ: none of the reverend elders said the unbloody sacrifice of the altar to be a figure.'

"Ergo, You are deceived."

Ridley:—"This canon is not in the council of Nice; for I have read over this council many times."

Then came in another, whom master Ridley knew not, and said: "The universal church both of the Greeks and Latins, of the east and of the west, have agreed in the council of Florence uniformly in the doctrine of the sacrament; that in the sacrament of the altar there is the true and real body."

Ridley:—"I deny the Greek and the east church to have agreed either in the council at Florence, or at any time else, with the Romish church in the doctrine of transubstantiation

² "Nullus apostolorum dixit, hæc est figura corporis Christi: nullus venerabilium presbyterorum dixit incruentum altaris sacrificium figuram," etc.

Another place alleged.

The council of Florence alleged.

Out of Dr Ridley's copy.

of bread into the body of Christ. For there was nothing in the council of Florence¹, wherein the Greeks would agree with the Romanists; albeit hitherto, I confess, it was left free for every church to use, as they were wont, leavened or unleavened bread.”

Here cried out Dr Cole, and said, they agreed together concerning transubstantiation of bread into the body of Christ. Master Ridley said, that could not be.

One of the scribes.

Here started up another unknown to master Ridley, but thought to be one of the scribes, who affirmed with him, that indeed there was nothing decreed concerning transubstantiation; but the council left that, as a matter not meet nor worthy to disturb the peace and concord of the church: to whom master Ridley answered again, saying, that he said the truth.

Pie:—“What say you to that council, where it is said, that the priest doth offer an unbloody sacrifice of the body of Christ?”

Ridley:—“I say, it is well said, if it be rightly understood.”

Pie:—“But he offereth an unbloody sacrifice.”

Ridley:—“It is called unbloody, and is offered after a certain manner, and in a mystery, and as a representation of that bloody sacrifice; and he doth not lie, who saith Christ to be offered.”

Weston playeth Go-liath with David.

Weston:—“I, with one argument, will throw down to the ground your opinion, out of Chrysostom², and I will teach, not only a figure, and a sign of grace only, but the very same

[¹ This assertion is perfectly true, although cardinal Bessarion had managed to produce a temporary union; for his conduct in which business he was severely blamed, the Greek church being uninformed of his proceedings, and having never authorised him to attempt a union. See *Historia concertationis Græc. Latinorumque de Transubstant. auct. J. R. Kieslingio; Lipsiæ, 1754, pp. 188—194. Fleury, Hist. Eccles. livre 108, § 135, and Labbé, tom. xiii. Ed.*]

[² Τοῦτο τὸ σῶμα καὶ ἐπὶ φάτνης κείμενον ἠδέσθησαν μάγοι * * * * * οὐ δὲ οὐκ ἐν φάτνη ὄρας, ἀλλ' ἐν θυσιαστηρίῳ, οὐ γυναικα κατέχουσιν, ἀλλ' ἱερέα παρεστῶτα. S. Chrys. Hom. xxiv. in 1 Cor. cap. x. Op. Ed. Ben. Par. 1710, tom. x. p. 218. Ed.]

body, which was here conversant on the earth, to be in the eucharist.

“We worship the selfsame body in the eucharist which the wise men did worship in the manger.

“But that was his natural and real body, not spiritual:

“Ergo, The real body of Christ is in the eucharist.

“Again, the same Chrysostom saith, ‘We have not here the Lord in the manger, but on the altar: here a woman holdeth him not in her hands, but a priest.’”

This argument, after the disposition and terms, as it standeth, is not formal.

Ridley:—“We worship, I confess, the same true Lord and Saviour of the world, which the wise men worshipped in the manger; howbeit we do it in a mystery, and in the sacrament of the Lord’s supper, and that in spiritual liberty, as saith St Augustine³, not in carnal servitude; that is, we do not worship servilely the signs for the things: for that should be, as he also saith, a part of a servile infirmity. But we behold with the eyes of faith him present after grace, and spiritually set upon the table; and we worship him which sitteth above, and is worshipped of the angels. For Christ is always assistant to his mysteries, as the said Augustine saith. And the Divine Majesty, as saith Cyprian, doth never absent itself from the divine mysteries; but this assistance and presence of Christ, as in baptism it is wholly spiritual, and by grace, and not by any corporal substance of the flesh, even so it is here in the Lord’s supper, being rightly and according to the word of God duly ministered.”

Weston:—“That which the woman did hold in her womb, the same thing holdeth the priest.”

Ridley:—“I grant the priest holdeth the same thing, but after another manner. She did hold the natural body; the priest holdeth the mystery of the body.”

(Weston repeated again his argument out of Chrysostom in English.)

Ridley:—“I say that the author meant it spiritually.”

(Weston here, dissolving the disputations, had these

Weston bloweth up the triumph.

[³ S. Aug. de Doctrina Christiana. lib. iii. cap. vi. Op. Ed. Ben. Par. 1685. tom. iii. pars 1. col. 47. Ed.]

words¹: "Here you see the stubborn, the glorious, the crafty, the unconstant mind of this man. Here you see this day, that the strength of the truth is without foil. Therefore I beseech you all most earnestly to blow the note (and he began, and they followed,) 'Verity hath the victory,' 'Verity hath the victory.'"

¹ "Vidētis præfractum hominis animum, gloriosum, vafrum, inconstantem: vidētis hodie veritatis vires inconcussas. Itaque clamate, Vicit veritas."
