

OF

COMMUNION UNDER BOTH KINDS.

THE SECOND ARTICLE.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

OR that there was then any communion ministered unto the people under one kind.

[OF COMMUNION UNDER ONE KIND. ARTICLE II. H. A. 1564.]

M. HARDING. THE FIRST DIVISION.

This being a sacrament of unity, every true christian man ought in receiving of it to consider how unity may be achieved and kept, rather than to shew a straitness of conscience about the outward forms of bread and wine to be used in the administration of it; and that so much the more, how much the end of every thing is to be esteemed more than that which serveth to the end. Otherwise herein the breach of unity is so little recompensed by the exact keeping of the outward ceremony, that, according to the saying of St Augustine, "whosoever taketh the mystery of unity, and keepeth not the bond of peace, he taketh not a mystery for himself, but a testimony against himself¹." Therefore they have great cause to weigh with themselves, what they receive in this sacrament, who, moved by slender reasons made for both kinds, do rashly and dangerously condemn the church for giving of it under one kind to all that do not in their own persons consecrate and offer the same in remembrance of the sacrifice once offered on the cross. And that they may think the church to stand upon good grounds herein, may it please them to understand, that the fruit of this sacrament, which they enjoy that worthily receive it, dependeth not of the outward forms of bread and wine, but redoundeth of the virtue of the flesh and blood of Christ. And whereas under either kind (46) whole Christ is verily present (for now that he is risen again from the dead, his flesh and blood can be sundered no more, because he dieth no more), this healthful sacrament is of true christian people with [Rom. vi. H. A. 1564.] no less fruit received under one kind than under both. [And as this spiritual fruit is not any thing diminished to him that receiveth one kind, so it is not any whit increased to him that receiveth both².] The sacramentaries, that believe not the truth of Christ's body and blood in this holy sacrament, I remit to sundry godly treatises made in defence of the right faith in that point. I think it not necessary here to treat thereof, or of any other matter which M. Jewel hath not as yet manifestly touched in his sermon.

The forty-sixth untruth, proceeding only of the gross error of transubstantiation.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

The former article of private mass, by M. Harding's own confession, proceedeth not from God, but from the negligence of the people: but the abuse of the communion under one kind, from whence soever it first proceeded, standeth now only upon the wilfulness of the priests, who, seeing and knowing the institution and commandment of Christ, yet notwithstanding have devised ways, against their own knowledge, violently to repel the same. And that the whole case may the better appear, the question that standeth between us is moved thus: "Whether

[¹ Qui accipit mysterium unitatis, et non tenet vinculum pacis, non mysterium accipit pro se, sed testimonium contra se.—August. in Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugd. 1624. Decret. Gratian. Decr. Tert.

Pars, Dist. ii. can. 36. col. 1929. Op. Par. 1679-1700. Serm. cclxxii. Tom. V. col. 1104.]

[² The sentence between brackets is found only in H. A. 1564.]

the holy communion at any time, within the space of six hundred years after Christ, were ever ministered openly in the church unto the people under one kind." For proof whereof M. Harding hath here brought in women, children, sick folks, infants, and madmen, that these have sometimes received the one kind, some in their private houses, some in their death-beds, some otherwise, as he did before for proof of his private mass. If in all this long treaty he have brought any one example, or proof sufficient, of the ministration in one kind openly used in any church, it is good reason he be believed. But if he, after all these vaunts, having published such a book as all the world (as it is supposed) is not able to answer, have hitherto brought no such, neither example nor proof; then may we justly think there is nothing to be brought at all, but that by his eloquence and fair speech he seeketh to abuse the simplicity and ignorance of his reader.

Difference between priest and lay.

The council of Basil³, above one hundred and thirty years past, made no conscience to grant the use of both kinds unto the kingdom of Bohemia; and this council now presently holden at Trident⁴, upon certain conditions, hath granted the same to other kingdoms and countries; and, were it not they should seem to confess the church of Rome hath erred, they would not doubt to grant the same freely to the whole world. None of them all can tell, neither when, nor where, nor how this error first began. Some think it sprang only of a certain superstition and simplicity of the people⁵. But whence soever it first began, as Tertullian writeth of the frowardness that he saw in certain of his time, it must now needs be maintained and made good against the truth. His words be these: *Consuetudo initium ab aliqua ignorantia vel simplicitate sortita in usum per successionem corroboratur, et ita adversus veritatem vendicatur. Sed Dominus noster Christus veritatem se, non consuetudinem, cognominavit... Viderint ergo, quibus novum est, quod sibi vetus est. Hæreses non tam novitas, quam veritas revincit. Quodcumque adversus veritatem sapit, hoc erit hæresis⁶, etiam vetus consuetudo⁷*: "Custom, either of simplicity, or of ignorance, getting once an entry, is inured and hardened by succession, and then is defended against the truth. But Christ our Lord called himself the truth, and not custom. Let them take heed therefore, unto whom the thing seemeth new, that in itself is old. It is not so much the novelty of the matter, as the truth, that reproveth an heresy. Whatsoever savoureth against the truth, it is an heresy, be the custom thereof never so old."

Concil. Basil.

Concil. Trident.

S. Gardiner in the Devil's Sophistry.

Tertull. de Virg. Vel.

To come near the matter: "Unity," saith M. Harding, "is the substance of this sacrament: and whoso receiveth not the same in unity, receiveth a testimony against himself." As this is true, and avouched by St Augustine, and of our part not denied, so is it also true that St Ambrose writeth: *Indignus est Domino, qui aliter mysterium celebrat, quam ab eo traditum est. Non enim potest devotus esse, qui aliter præsumit, quam datum est ab auctore⁸*: "He is unworthy of the Lord, that doth otherwise celebrate the mystery than it was delivered of the Lord. For he cannot be devout, that taketh it otherwise than it was given of the author." But this excuse, under the pretence and colour of unity, seemeth to import some default. For what, think these folk that unity cannot stand without the breach of Christ's institution? or that the apostles and holy fathers, that ministered the communion under both kinds, were not in unity? or that there was never unity in the church for the space of a thousand four hundred and more years after Christ, until the council of Constance, where this matter was first concluded? Herein standeth that mystical unity, that one bread is broken unto all, and one cup is delivered unto all equally, without difference; and that, as Chrysostom saith, in the reverend sacrifice there is no difference between the priest and the people, but all is equal⁹. But our adversaries have herein forced a

Ambros. 1 Cor. xi.

Chrysost. in 2 Cor. Hom. 18.

[³ Concil. Basil. Sess. xxx. in Concil. Stud. Labb. et Cossart. Lut. Par. 1671-2. Tom. XII. cols. 600, 1.]

[⁴ Concil. Trident. in eod. Sess. xxii. Decr. sup. Pet. Conc. Cal. Tom. XIV. col. 861.]

[⁵ A Detection of the Devils Sophistrie, Lond. 1546. fol. 139. 2, &c.]

[⁶ *Hæreses*, 1611.]

[⁷ Tertull. Op. Lut. 1641. De Virg. Vel. 1. p. 192.]

[⁸ *Indignum dicit esse Domino, &c.*—Ambros. Op. Par. 1686-90. Comm. in 1. Epist. ad Cor. v. 27. Tom. II. Append. col. 149.]

[⁹ Chrysost. Op. Par. 1718-38. In Epist. II. ad Cor. Hom. xviii. Tom. X. p. 568. See before, page 202, note 13.]

Whole
Christ in
either
part.

Johan. Sleidan. Lib. ix.
Gerson. in Tract. con.
Hær. Com.
Laic. sub
Utr. Spec.
Gab. Biel.

difference between the priest and the people without cause, and say, there must needs be such a difference.

And when the French king, who until this day receiveth still in both kinds, had moved his clergy wherefore he might so do more than others, they made him answer, "For that kings are anointed as well as priests¹." Gerso² saith that, if laymen should communicate under both kinds as well as priests, *dignitas sacerdotis non esset supra dignitatem laicorum*³: "the dignity of the priest should not be above the dignity of laymen." And Gabriel Biel extollet the priest above our lady, and All-hallows, because he may communicate under both kinds, and they cannot⁴. And so have they altered the sacrament of equality and unity, and made it a sacrament of difference and dissension.

"The fruit of the sacrament," saith M. Harding, "hangeth not of the forms of bread and wine." This is a strange form of speech unto the ignorant, that knoweth not what these forms mean. Beware, good reader; for under this word there lieth a snare. St Paul five times in one place calleth it bread; but this man saith it is the "form," the "appearance," and "shew of bread," but he would have thee believe that indeed it is no bread.

We know well the fruit of the sacrament standeth not, neither in the forms, nor in the bread or wine, which are outwardly received with the bodily mouth, but in the flesh and blood of Christ, which only are received spiritually into the soul.

He addeth further: "Whole Christ is under either kind; therefore he that receiveth in one kind only hath no wrong." If any ancient doctor had said the same, it might the rather have been believed. But M. Harding, of false principles of his own, thinketh he may boldly gather the like conclusions. These toys are sufficient to please vain fantasy; but they are not sufficient to content a godly conscience. But doth M. Harding so surely know that whole Christ is in either kind; and did Christ himself not know it? Or, if Christ did know it, was not he able to break his own ordinance, and to provide for this inconvenience, as well as others? We know, and it is our belief, that Christ's whole humanity, both flesh and blood, is in heaven. But that the same humanity of Christ is in the sacrament in such gross sort as is supposed by our adversaries, notwithstanding many bold vaunts thereof made, yet was it hitherto never proved. And although this matter be moved by M. Harding out of season, as being no part of this question, yet I think it not amiss briefly to signify by the way what the old catholic fathers have thought of it.

Consentius demandeth this question of St Augustine: "Whether the body of Christ, being now in heaven, have in it blood or no⁵?" Here to leave St Augustine's answer, it is easy for any man to consider, if Consentius had been persuaded, as M. Harding would seem to be, that Christ's body hath blood in⁶ the sacrament, he would never have moved this question of the body of Christ that is in heaven. To leave these new fantasies, whereof it doth not appear that ever the old catholic doctors made any report, we must understand that the bread is the sacrament of Christ's body, and the wine is the sacrament of his blood. So saith Beda: *Panis ad corpus Christi mystice, vinum refertur ad sanguinem*⁷: "The bread in mystical manner hath relation to the body of Christ: the wine hath relation unto his blood." So likewise saith St Paul: "The bread that we break, is it not the communication of the body of Christ? And the cup of the blessing which we bless, is it not the communication of the blood of Christ?" St Paul saith not each part is in other; but each hath a peculiar signification by itself.

11th. Epist.
Epist. 146.

Beda in Luc.
cap. xxii.
Lib. vi.

[¹ ... deinde Gallie regibus administrari totam: et cum inter disputandum theologis hoc ipsum rex objicit, illos respondere, unctos esse reges æque ac sacerdotes, &c.—Sleidan. de Stat. Relig. Comm. Argent. 1566. Lib. ix. fol. 155.]

[² Gerson, 1565.]

[³ ... tanta esset dignitas laicorum circa sump-tionem corporis Christi, sicut et sacerdotum.—Gerson. Op. Antw. 1706. Contr. Hær. de Com. Laic. sub Utr. Spec. Tom. I. Pars III. col. 467.]

[⁴ Biel discusses at length the communicating under one kind.—Gab. Biel. Sac. Canon. Miss. Ex-pos. Lugd. 1517. Lect. lxxxiv. See particularly fol. 182. 2; which perhaps is the passage referred to.]

[⁵ August. Op. Par. 1679-1700. Ad Consent. Epist. ccv. 2. Tom. II. col. 767.]

[⁶ Blood in it in, 1565.]

[⁷ Ven. Bed. Op. Col. Agrip. 1612. In Luc. Evang. cap. xxii. Lib. vi. Tom. V. col. 424; where for *panis* and *vinum*, we find *hic* and *illud*.]

But if it were so as M. Harding and certain others of late days have grossly imagined, yet notwithstanding the people, taking but one kind only, receiveth injury; as M. Harding may see by Alexander of Hales, and Durandus, and other of his own doctors. Alexander's words be these: *Licet illa sumptio, quæ est in accipiendo sub una specie, sufficiat, tamen illa quæ est sub duabus est majoris meriti*⁸: "Although that order of receiving the sacrament which is under one kind be sufficient, yet the other which is under both kinds is of greater merit." And immediately after: *Sumptio sub utraque specie, quem modum sumendi tradidit Dominus, est majoris efficacæ, et [majoris] complementi*⁹: "The receiving under both kinds, which order the Lord delivered, is of greater strength, and of greater fulness." And the same Alexander again saith: *Totus Christus non continetur sub utraque specie sacramentaliter; sed caro tantum sub specie panis, [et] sanguis...sub specie vini*¹⁰: "Whole Christ is not contained under each kind by way of sacrament, but the flesh only under the form of bread, and the blood under the form of wine." The like might be reported out of Durandus and others. Here M. Harding's own doctors confess that the people, receiving under one kind, receiveth not the full sacrament, nor the blood of Christ by way of sacrament; and that their doing therein is of less strength and merit than the doing of the priest. Wherefore M. Harding, in saying, "The people receiving only under one kind taketh no injury," doth the people double injury.

Whole Christ in either part.

Alex. iv. Quæst. liii. Memb. i.

Alex. iv. Quæst. xl. Memb. iii. Art. 2.

But to pass over these scholastical subtle points, it behoveth us to know that Christ the Son of God appointed the sacrament of his body to be given in bread, and the sacrament of his blood to be given in wine. These be the holy mysteries of Christ's body and blood. We may not here account what may be in either of them by the drift of vain fantasy; but rather we ought to consider what Christ in the first institution hereof did, and what he commanded to be done. Neither do we here condemn the church, as it pleaseth M. Harding unjustly to charge us; but we wish and pray to God that his whole church may once be reformed after the example and institution of Christ; without whom the church is no church, neither hath any right or claim without his promise, nor any promise without his word.

Now, whereas M. Harding saith, "The reasons that we make for the maintenance of Christ's institutions¹¹ are so slender;" if he had first weighed his own, perhaps he would the more favourably have reported ours. I mean not the reasons that others of that side have taken of men's beards, of fear of the palsy and shaking, or other diseases, or inconveniences that may happen; but even of the same that he hath here planted in the first rank and entry of his cause. The first is this:

1. "It is a sacrament of unity; therefore, if it be abused, we may seek no redress."
2. The second is this: "The fruit of the sacrament dependeth not of the forms of bread and wine; therefore we may break Christ's institution."
3. The third is this: "Whole Christ," as M. Harding saith, "is in either part of the sacrament; therefore there is no wrong done in barring the people from one kind." Certainly these reasons seem very slender, and specially to countermand the plain word of God. The sentence that St Basil useth in this case is very terrible: "Whoso forbiddeth the thing that God commandeth, and whoso commandeth the thing that God forbiddeth, is to be holden accursed of all them that love the Lord¹²."

Basil. Moral. Summ. cap. 14.

M. HARDING. THE SECOND DIVISION.

Now, concerning the outward forms of bread and wine, (47) their use is employed in signification only, and be not of necessity, so as grace may not be obtained by worthy receiving of the sacrament, unless both kinds be ministered. Therefore in

The forty-seventh untruth. For the bread and wine signify

[⁸ Alex. Alens. Theol. Summ. Col. Agrip. 1622. Pars IV. Quæst. xi. Membr. ii. Art. iv. 3. p. 406; * where we find *illa tamen*.]

[⁹ Id. *ibid.*]

[¹⁰ Id. Pars IV. Quæst. x. Membr. vii. Art. iii. 2. Resol. p. 360.]

[¹¹ Institution, 1565.]

[¹² ... qui prohibet nos facere quod a Domino præceptum est; vel rursum imperat quod Dominus fieri prohibuit; execrabilis debet esse, qui ejusmodi est, omnibus qui diligunt Deum.—Basil. Op. 1520. De Inst. Mon. Reg. cap. xiv. fol. 165.]

Whole
Christ in
either
part.

the body and
blood of
Christ: the
whiteness,
the round-
ness, and
other out-
ward forms
signify no-
thing.

The forty-
eighth un-
truth. For
the church
never thus
ministered
the sacra-
ment unto
the people
in any open
congregation
within the
space of six
hundred
years.

Chrysost. in.
2 ad Cor.
Hom. 18.

Retract.
Lib. ii.

Clemens.
Epist. 2.

consecrating of the sacrament, according to Christ's institution, both kinds be necessary; forasmuch as it is not prepared for the receiving only, but also for renewing and stirring up of the remembrance of our Lord's death. So inasmuch as the sacrament serveth the sacrifice, by which the death and oblation of Christ is represented, both the kinds be requisite; that, by divers and sundry forms, the blood of Christ, shed for our sins, and separated from his body, may evidently be signified. But inasmuch as the faithful people do receive the sacrament, thereby to attain spiritual grace and salvation of their souls; diversity of the forms or kinds, that be used for the signification only, hath no further use nor¹ profit. But by one kind, because in it whole Christ is exhibited, abundance of all grace is once given; so as by the other kind thereto over added (which giveth the same, and not another Christ) no further augmentation of spiritual grace may be attained. In consideration of this, the catholic church, taught by the Holy Ghost all truth, whiles in the daily sacrifice the memory of our Lord's death and passion is celebrated, for that it is necessary therein, to express most plainly the shedding and separating of the blood from the body that was crucified, hath always to that purpose diligently used both kinds of bread and wine; but in distributing of the blessed sacrament to christian people hath used liberty² (which Christ never imbarred by any commandment to the contrary), so as it hath (48) ever been most for the behoof and commodity of the receivers; and hath ministered sometimes both kinds, sometimes one kind only, as it hath been thought most expedient, in regard of time, place, and persons.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

Here is much talk, and no proof. I grant, the priest, if he minister the communion orderly, and as he should, doth renew the memory of Christ's passion, according to his own commandment: "Do this in my remembrance." Yet all this concludeth not directly, that therefore Christ's ordinance may be broken. Neither is it yet so clearly proved, that the priest in his mass representeth the separation of Christ's blood from his body. For, beside that there is no ancient doctor here alleged for proof hereof, I might well demand by what words, by what gesture, or to whom doth he represent this separation? His words be strange, his gesture secret: the people neither heareth nor seeth ought, nor knoweth what he meaneth. And being granted, that the separation of Christ's body and blood is represented in the holy mysteries, yet how knoweth M. Harding that the priest ought more to represent the same than the people? Doubtless Christ's blood was shed indifferently for all the faithful, as well for the people as for the priest; between whom and the people, as I have before shewed out of St Chrysostom, in this case there is no difference⁴. For whereas M. Harding taketh the name of sacrifice for some shew of proof in this matter, it behoveth him to know that not only the portion received by the priest, but also the portion that is distributed unto the people, is of the old fathers called a sacrifice. St Augustine hath these words: "In Carthage the manner was that hymns should be said at the altar out of the book of Psalms, either when the oblation was made, or when the thing that was offered was divided unto the people⁵."

By these plain words we may see that both the priest and people received one sacrifice. And Clemens (as M. Harding calleth him, the apostles' fellow) saith thus: *Tanta in altario holocausta offerantur, quanta populo sufficere debeant*⁶: "Let there be so many sacrifices offered at the altar, as may suffice for the people."

And, whereas it is further said that the priest, by receiving both parts in several, expresseth, as it were, unto the eye, how Christ's body and blood were done asunder; the scriptures and ancient fathers have taught us otherwise, that not any gesture of the priest, but the very ministration of the holy communion,

[¹ Ne, 1565, 1609, and H. A. 1564.]

[² Her liberty, H. A. 1564.]

[³ 1565 omits *for*.]

[⁴ Chrysost. Op. Par. 1718-38. In Epist. ii. ad Cor. Hom. xviii. Tom. X. p. 568. See before, page 202, note 13.]

[⁵ ... Hilarius ... morem, qui tunc esse apud Car-

thaginem coeperat, ut hymni ad altare dicerentur de psalmorum libro, sive ante oblationem, sive cum distribueretur populo quod fuisset oblatum, ... lacerabat. —August. Op. Par. 1679-1700. Retract. Lib. ii. cap. xi. Tom. I. col. 45.]

[⁶ Clement. Papæ I. Epist. ii. ad Jacob. in Epist. Decret. Sum. Pont. Rom. 1591. Tom. I. p. 17.]

and the whole action of the people, expresseth unto us the manner and order of Christ's death. St Paul saith: "As often as ye shall eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye shall declare the Lord's death until he come." And this St Paul writeth, not only to the priests, but also to the whole congregation of the Corinthians. And in like sort writeth St Augustine touching the same: *Cum frangitur hostia, et sanguis de calice in ora fidelium funditur, quid aliud quam dominici corporis in cruce immolatio, ejusque sanguinis de latere effusio designatur?*¹ "When the oblation is broken, and the blood from the cup is poured into the mouths of the faithful, what thing else is there signified, but the offering of the Lord's body upon the cross, and the flowing of his blood from his side?" Thus it is clear that the separation of Christ's body and blood is represented as well by the people as by the priest. Wherefore to devise a difference without cause, and of the same to conclude an error, it is double folly.

1 Cor. xi.
De Con. Dist.
2. Cum frangitur.

"The diversity of forms and kinds," saith M. Harding, "serveth for signification only, and hath no further use nor⁸ profit." Notwithstanding this saying were otherwise true, yet the issue thereof seemeth dangerous. It is our part to be obedient, and not to discuss or rectify God's commandments, and to say, any thing that Christ the Son of God hath appointed us to do is utterly void of use and profit. As for the liberty of the church that is here claimed, if we should demand where and when it was granted, perhaps the charter would not be found. The liberty of the church is not to be against God, nor to control any his ordinance. Neither hath M. Harding yet proved that the church within six hundred years after Christ, in open congregation and assembly of people (which is the state of this question), ever used any such kind of liberty.

In these words M. Harding hath privily couched sundry arguments, which of what value or force they be, I pray thee, gentle reader, to understand.

1. The first is this: The priest consecrateth the sacrament; therefore the people is not bound to receive in both kinds.
2. The second is this: The priest offereth the sacrifice, and representeth the separation of Christ's body and blood; *ergo*, it is sufficient for the people to receive in one kind.
3. The third is this: The church hath her liberty; *ergo*, she is not bound to Christ's institution.

Alas, how slenderly hang these things together! Yet these are the arguments that (as it is supposed) are never able to be answered.

M. HARDING. THE THIRD DIVISION.

[*Matt. xxvi. H. A. 1564.*]

[*Christ's words bind not the laity to receive both kinds. H. A. 1564.*
Ante passionem nobis solis præcepit hoc facere, inquit apostoli apud Clementem. Lib. viii. Const. Apostolicarum. cap. ult.

As touching the words of Christ, Bibite ex hoc omnes, "Drink ye all of this;" they pertain to the apostles only, and to their successors. For to them (49) only he gave commandment to do that, which he did in his supper, as Clement saith, to them only saying, Do this in my remembrance, he gave commission to consecrate, offer, and to receive the sacrament in remembrance of his death and passion, by the same words ordaining them priests of the new testament. Wherefore this belongeth not to the lay-people, neither can it justly be¹⁰ gathered by this place, that they are bound of necessity, and^a under pain of deadly sin, to receive the sacrament under both kinds.

The forty-ninth untruth. For these words pertained as well to the people as to the priests, as shall appear.

^a Here M. Harding altereth the case.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

When I read the words of M. Harding's, I am stricken with horror to consider the terrible judgment of God. It is much to be feared that he that is led away of this sort offendeth not of ignorance—for so were the fault the more pardonable—but against the manifest known truth, and against the Spirit of God. For whereas Christ saith, "Drink ye all of this;" if he will follow the letter, the words

[⁷ August. Lib. Sent. Prosp. in Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugd. 1624. Decret. Gratian. Decr. Tert. Pars, De Consecr. Dist. ii. can. 37. col. 1930.]

[⁸ Ne, 1565, 1609.]

[⁹ Const. Apost. in Concil. Stud. Labb. et Cosart. Lut. Par. 1671-2. Lib. viii. cap. xvi. Tom. I. col. 509.]

[¹⁰ Be justly, H. A. 1564.]

1 Cor. xi.

be plain that all should drink. If he will leave the letter, and take the meaning, St Paul hath opened it. For, writing unto the whole congregation at Corinth, he saith thus: "As often as ye shall eat this bread, and drink of this cup, ye shall declare the Lord's death until he come."—If he doubt St Paul, yet the very practice and continual order of the primitive church fully declareth what Christ meant: and they say, *Consuetudo est optima interpretis legis*¹: "Custom is the best interpreter of the law." If he will take neither the words of Christ, nor Christ's meaning, then I know not how to deal with him.

Once again he bringeth forth Clement, the apostles' fellow. And what Clement? Verily, even the same that ministered and delivered the holy communion to the faithful that then were in Rome under both kinds, as appeareth by the long usage of that church, even as Christ delivered it to his disciples; and M. Harding is not able to shew that the same Clement ever ministered otherwise. He seeth and knoweth that the word *Omnes* is against him; the meaning against him; the practice of the church against him; his own Clement against him: yet he beareth his countenance so as if all were with him. To be short, if Christ, when he said, "Drink ye all," meant not that all should drink; why did St Paul and all the apostles, and the whole primitive church, expound it and practise it as though he had meant so? And if he meant so, why doth M. Harding deceive the world, and say he meant not so?

But Clement saith, "Christ spake these words, 'Do this in my remembrance,' only unto the apostles." "Therefore," saith M. Harding, "these words, 'Drink ye all,' pertain to the apostles only, and to their successors." Understand, good reader, that Clement, in the place here alleged, speaketh not one word, either of one kind or of both; but only saith thus: "That Christ appointed his apostles to the office of the holy ministration," which he calleth "the spiritual oblation²." Therefore thou mayest see that M. Harding, shewing thee one thing for another, and of the same concluding what him liketh, cannot seem to deal plainly.

The argument that hereof is gathered standeth thus: Clement saith that Christ gave only unto his apostles the office of the ministry, and authority to offer the spiritual sacrifice; *ergo*, these words, "Drink ye all of this," pertain nothing to the people. Here is a very faint conclusion. For by force of this reason he may take from the people both parts of the sacrament, as well as one, and so leave them no sacrament at all.

M. HARDING. THE FOURTH DIVISION.

The fiftieth untruth. For⁴ they changed not, but restored the old custom.

And this understood they which above one³ hundred years past, (50) changing the old custom of the church of receiving the communion under one kind, by their private authority would needs usurp the cup also. For, seeing themselves not to have sufficient proof and warrant for their doing, of these words, "Drink ye all of this," the better to bolster up their new-fangled attempt, they thought it better to allege the words of Christ in St John: "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, John vi. and drink his blood, ye shall not have life in you;" which words, for all that, our new masters of forty years⁵ past will to be understood of the spiritual, and not of the sacramental eating. [Which place although it be taken for the sacramental eating]⁶, as it may be, and is taken for both, of the doctors viewed apart; yet in all that chapter there is no mention of the cup nor of wine at all. Wherefore they, that cry so much on the institution and commandment of Christ, cannot find in all the scriptures neither commandment where he gave charge the sacrament so to be given, neither so much as any example where Christ gave it under both kinds to any other than to the apostles. Whereas, contrariwise, it may be shewed of our part that the sacrament was given under one kind only to the two disciples that Luke xxiv. went to Emmaus; for that the bread which Christ there took, blessed, brake, and

[¹ Corp. Jur. Civil. Amst. 1663. Digest. Lib. i. Tit. III. 37. Tom. I. p. 79. This law is afterwards more fully given.]

[² Ὁς [Χριστός] γενόμενος ἄνθρωπος δι' ἡμᾶς καὶ τὴν πνευματικὴν θυσίαν προσφέρων τῷ Θεῷ αὐτοῦ καὶ Πατρὶ πρὸ τοῦ πάθους ἡμῶν διετάξατο μόνους τοῦτο ποιεῖν κ. τ. λ.—Const. Apost. in Con-

cil. Stud. Labb. et Cossart. Lut. Par. 1671-2. Lib. VIII. cap. xlv. Tom. I. col. 509.]

[³ An, H. A. 1564.]

[⁴ 1565 omits *for*.]

[⁵ These forty, H. A. 1564.]

[⁶ The words between brackets are found only in H. A. 1564.]

gave to them, was not simple and common bread, but the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ: for so ^aChrysostom⁷, ^bAugustine⁸, ^cBede⁹, and ^dTheophylact¹⁰, with one accord do witness. It appeareth also, that the communion under one kind was used at Hierusalem among Christ's disciples, by that St Luke writeth in the Acts of the Apostles of the breaking of the bread. If M. Jewel here think to avoid these places by their accustomed figure, Synecdoche, among his own sect happily it may be accepted; but among men of right and learned judgment that shift will seem over weak and vain. Now to conclude, touching the sixth chapter of St John, as thereof they can bring no one word mentioning the cup or wine, for proof of their both kinds; so it sheweth, and not in very obscure wise, that the form of bread alone is sufficient, whereas Christ saith, Qui manducat panem hunc, vivet in æternum: "He that eateth this bread shall live for ever."

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

In these words M. Harding chargeth not only us, but also the apostles of Christ, and all the fathers of the primitive church, with great oversight; who in their times ministered the holy sacrament unto the vulgar people, as it is now supposed by these men, without any example of Christ, and without commission.

Touching the institution of Christ, I have already said so much as unto a quiet mind may seem sufficient. Yet for further declaration I would demand of M. Harding, what thing he requireth to Christ's institution: if words, Christ's words be plain; if example, Christ himself ministered in both kinds; if authority, Christ commanded his disciples, and in them all other ministers of his church, to do the like; if certainty of his meaning, the apostles endued with the Holy Ghost so practised the same, and understood he meant so; if continuance of time, he bade the same to be continued until he come again. If neither the words, nor example, nor commandment of Christ, nor the understanding and practice of the apostles can warrant us Christ's institution, alas, what warrant then have they, that, being utterly void of all these things, only stay themselves, as it is confessed by the best of that side, by the simple devotion of the people¹¹? When Christ had delivered both kinds unto his disciples, he said unto them: "This do ye," the same that ye see I have done. But where did Christ ever say, Minister unto yourselves one way, and another way unto the people; or, Receive ye in both kinds, and let all the rest receive in one?

Although these things be plain and evident of themselves¹², yet, that the folly of these men may the better appear, it shall be good to hear the report of one of their own doctors touching these matters. One Gerardus Loricinus, in a book that he wrote, *De Missa Publica Proroganda*, hath these words: *Sunt pseudocatholici, qui reformationem ecclesiæ quoquo modo remorari non verentur. Hi ne laicis altera species restituatur, nullis parcunt blasphemiis. Dicunt enim, Christum solis apostolis dixisse, Bibite ex eo omnes. Atqui verba canonis habent, Accipite et manducate ex hoc omnes. Hic dicant, oro, num et hoc ad solos dictum sit apostolos... Ergo, laicis et a specie panis est abstinendum: Quod dicere est hæresis, et blasphemia pestilens, et execrabilis: Consequitur ergo, utrumque verbum dictum esse ad omnem ecclesiam*¹³: "They be false catholics," saith this man, "that are not ashamed by all means to hinder the reformation of the church. They, to the intent the other kind of the sacrament may not be restored unto the lay-people, spare no kind of blasphemies. For they say, that Christ said only unto his apostles, 'Drink ye all of this.' But the words of the canon (of the mass) be these: 'Take and eat ye all of this.' Here, I beseech them, let them tell me whether they will have these words also only to pertain unto the apostles. Then must the lay-people abstain from the other kind of the bread also. Which thing

S. Gardiner
in the Devil's
Sophistry.

Ger. Loric.
in 7. Parte
Canonis.

[⁷ Chrysost. Op. Par. 1718-38. Opus Imperf. in Matt. Hom. xvii. ex cap. vii. Tom. VI. p. lxxxviii.]

[⁸ August. Op. Par. 1679-1700. De Consens. Evang. Lib. III. cap. xxv. 72. Tom. III. Pars II. cols. 141, 2.]

[⁹ Ven. Bed. Op. Col. Agrip. 1612. In Luc. Evang. cap. xxiii. Lib. vi. Tom. V. col. 446.]

[¹⁰ ... μεταλαμβάνουσι τοῦ εὐλογημένου ἄρτου.

—Theophyl. Op. Venet. 1754-63. In Luc. Comm. cap. xxiv. Tom. I. p. 495.]

[¹¹ A Detection of the Devils Sophistrie, Lond. 1546. fol. 139. 2, &c.]

[¹² Themselves, 1565.]

[¹³ Ger. Loric. De Miss. Pub. Prorogand. 1536. Lib. II. cap. ii. Sept. Pars Canon. p. 177.]

to say is an heresy, and a pestilent and a detestable blasphemy. Wherefore it followeth, that each of these words was spoken unto the whole church." Thus far Lorichius, an earnest defender of transubstantiation, of the pope's supremacy, and of private mass; lest M. Harding should say he were one of Luther's scholars, and so except against him, as being a party. And Julius, sometime bishop of Rome, hearing of certain that used to dip the bread in the wine, and so to deliver it to the people, had no way to reform them, but only by Christ's institution. For thus he saith: *Quod pro complemento communionis intinctam tradunt eucharistiam populis, nec hoc prolatum ex evangelio testimonium receperunt*: "Whereas for accomplishment of the communion they dip the sacrament and deliver it unto the people, they have not received this witness of the gospel." He addeth further: *Seorsum enim panis, et seorsum calicis commendatio memoratur*¹: "For the delivery of the bread and the delivery of the cup are mentioned asunder." And thus he speaketh of the ministration of the sacrament, that is due not only to the priests, but also to the people.

The learned men of Bohemia saw they could have no hold of Christ's institution; and therefore, to maintain their "new-fangled attempt," as it pleaseth M. Harding to term it, they were fain to take the words of Christ out of the sixth chapter of John: "Unless ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye shall have no life in you." But "these words in the sixth chapter of St John," saith M. Harding, "our new masters will have expounded of the spiritual, not of the sacramental eating." Of the Bohemians I cannot see why they should be called "new-fangled." Their request was none other but that they might continue the order of the primitive church, which Thomas of Aquine saith had continued in divers churches from the apostles until his time, for the space of a thousand and three hundred years, without controlment². And it may ill become a christian man, and a scholar of the apostolic see, to call the doing of Christ and of his disciples "new-fangled." Touching their reasons made in this behalf, I need not to speak. God's name be blessed, they have prevailed with the best-learned of the world. Whatsoever their premises seem to M. Harding, their conclusion was this, that no mortal creature should presume to disallow the ordinance of the immortal God.

"But our new masters," saith M. Harding, "must needs have these words of St John expounded of the spiritual eating." If it be either the violence of nature, or the manner of his catholic doctrine, that driveth M. Harding thus to taunt, he must be borne withal; notwithstanding it agreeth not with his promise. As touching the understanding of the words of Christ in the sixth of St John, they are not all new masters that have so taken them. For, to leave St Augustine, Origen, and others of that age, Nicolas Lyra, a man of latter³ years, saith, the said words of Christ must needs be taken spiritually, and none otherwise. Thus he saith: *Ista intelligi debent de manducatione et potatione spirituali; quia sequitur, Qui manducat meam carnem, et bibit meum sanguinem, in me manet, et ego in eo. Quod B. Augustinus exponens ait: Hoc est manducare illam escam, et bibere illum potum, in Christo manere, et Christum manentem in se habere: quod nihil aliud est, quam esse in caritate Christi*⁴: "These words must be taken of the spiritual eating and drinking. For it followeth: 'He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood dwelleth in me, and I in him.' Which thing St Augustine expounding saith thus: This is the eating of that food, and the drinking of that drink, for a man to dwell in Christ, and

De Con. Dist.
2. Cum
omne.

Part. iii. Qu.
80. Art. 12.

Nicol. Lyra
in Psal. cxl.

[¹ Jul. Papa in Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugd. 1624. Decret. Gratian. Decr. Tert. Pars, De Consecr. Dist. ii. can. 7. col. 1915, where in the text *recipit*.]

[² The author most probably refers to those expressions of Aquinas which imply that the communion in one kind was customary in some, not in all churches; e.g. *Contra est multarum ecclesiarum usus, in quibus populo communicanti datur corpus Christi communicanti sumendum, non autem san-*

guis.—Thom. Aquinat. Op. Venet. 1595. Summ. Theol. Pars III. Quæst. lxxx. Art. 12. Tom. XII. fol. 267. See also below, page 261.]

[³ Later, 1565.]

[⁴ Bibl. cum Gloss. Ord. et Expos. N. de Lyra, Basil. 1502. Psal. cx. Replic. Pars III. fol. 254; where we find, *de qua manducatione et potatione intelligi debet videlicet de spirituali; quia, &c.*]

to have Christ in him dwelling; which thing is nothing else but to be in the love of Christ." Here we see that Nicolas Lyra, a man that lived two hundred years ago, and therefore no very "new master," expoundeth these words of the spiritual eating.

Yet M. Harding saith, "the same place may be taken also of the sacramental eating." But Lyra thinketh no, and therefore addeth further: [*Hoc verbum*] *nihil directe pertinet ad sacramentalem vel corporalem manducationem... Nam hoc verbum fuit dictum diu antequam sacramentum eucharistie esset institutum. Ex illa igitur litera de sacramentali communione non potest fieri argumentum efficax*⁵. "These words pertain not directly unto the sacramental or corporal eating. For it was spoken long before the sacrament was ordained. Therefore out of this letter there cannot be made any good argument for the sacramental communion."

Nicol. Lyra
in Psal. cxi.

Likewise one Michael Væhe, one of late years, a man of M. Harding's own side, touching the same matter writeth thus: *Infirmum est argumentum: quæ enim de spirituali manducatione dicta sunt, ille ad sacramentalem torquet*⁶. "This," saith he, "is but a weak reason; for the words that be spoken of spiritual eating he applieth to the sacramental eating." Here may M. Harding see, besides St Augustine, Origen, and other old catholic fathers, whose words I have not alleged, what men he hath called "new masters." Nicolas Lyra was an Englishman, and lived two hundred years before Luther. Michael Væhe was of late years, and wrote namely against Luther. Verily, if Christ and his apostles were now conversant in the world, unless they would forsake their own doctrine, they should be called "new masters" too, as well as others.

Mich. Væhe,
Tract 5. contra Lutherum.

And notwithstanding these words in the sixth chapter of St John be spoken and taken of the spiritual eating, as it is already proved, yet are they oftentimes by the old fathers applied unto the sacrament; but undirectly, as it is above noted by Lyra. To allege the places specially, being so many, and not unknown unto the learned, it would be tedious. Christ's being at Emmaus, and the disciples' breaking of bread at Hierusalem, because it hath pleased M. Harding to bring them twice, shall be afterward answered in their places.

The reasons that M. Harding hath here gathered be these: In the sixth chapter of St John there is no mention made of the cup or wine; *ergo*, the people may receive under one kind. This reason is very weak; for he may as well conclude of the same words; *ergo*, the priest may receive under one kind; which he himself saith is against Christ's institution. He might far better have concluded the contrary. The lay-people, being faithful and godly, by faith and in their hearts do indeed and verily drink the blood of Christ: therefore they may drink the sacrament of the same. And as Eckius, a doctor of that side, saith: "The people drinketh in the person of the priest⁷." Therefore they may drink in their own person as well and without danger.

Eckius in
Locis Communibus.

Another reason is this: It doth not appear that Christ ever ministered in both kinds but only to his disciples; *ergo*, the people may receive in one kind. I marvel what luck M. Harding hath to such conclusions. For what necessary sequel can there be, either from the apostles to the people, or from both kinds to one kind, or from an affirmative to a negative? The sum of the reason standeth thus: The apostles are commanded to receive both kinds; *ergo*, the people is not commanded to receive both kinds. The weakness whereof is evident, and sheweth itself. It will much rather and better follow thus: The people is commanded to receive as the apostles received, for there is expressed no difference. The apostles received in both kinds; *ergo*, the people is commanded to receive in both kinds. And thus, notwithstanding it be here stoutly avouched that we have neither example nor institution, yet I trust it doth well appear that we have both the example of Christ that ministered the sacrament in both kinds, and also Christ's institution, that bade his disciples to do the same.

[⁵ Id. ibid.; where *hoc verbum* follows *manducationem*, and *fuert* is found for *esset*.]

[⁶ The editor has not been able to meet with the works of this writer.]

[⁷ ... in cujus [sacerdotis] persona totus populus quadam spiritali sumptione sanguinem Christi bibere gaudent debet credere.—Joh. Eck. Enchir. Loc. Com. Col. 1532. cap. x. fol. E 5.2.]

M. HARDING. THE FIFTH DIVISION.

Thus our adversaries have nothing to bring out of the scriptures against the use of the catholic church, in ministering the communion under one kind. And yet they cease not crying out upon the breach of Christ's express commandment. And M. Jewel, for his part, in his first answer to D. Cole, saith, that the council of Constance pronounced openly against Christ himself. But forasmuch as they are so hot in this point, I will send them to Martin Luther himself, their patriarch, that either by his sobriety in this matter they may be somewhat colded, or by his and his scholars' inconstancy herein be brought to be ashamed of themselves. Though the places be well known, as oftentimes cited of the catholic writers of our time against the gospellers, yet here I think good to rehearse them, that the unlearned may see how themselves make not so great a matter of this article as some seem to bear the people in hand it is¹. Luther writeth to them of Bohemia these very words: Quoniam pulchrum quidem esset, utraque specie eucharistiæ uti, et Christus hac in re nihil tanquam necessarium præcepit; præstaret pacem et unitatem, quam Christus ubique præcepit, sectari, quam de speciebus sacramenti contendere²: "Whereas it were a fair thing (saith he) to use both kinds of the sacrament, yet, for that Christ herein hath commanded nothing as necessary, it were better to keep peace and unity, which Christ hath every where charged us withal, than to strive for the outward kinds of the sacrament." Again his words be these, in a declaration that he wrote of the sacrament: Non dixi, neque consului, neque est intentio mea, ut unus aut aliquot episcopi propria auctoritate alicui incipiant utramque speciem porrigere, nisi ita constitueretur et mandaretur in concilio generali²: "Neither have I said, nor counselled, nor my mind is, that any one or more bishops begin by their own authority to give both kinds (of the sacrament) to any person, unless it were so ordained and commanded in a³ general council.

[Luther and his offspring doth not necessitate communion under both kinds. H. A. 1564.]

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

It grieveth M. Harding that we should say the council of Constance decreed against Christ himself; and therefore he sendeth us to Luther himself, that, seeing his inconstancy, we may be ashamed of ourselves⁴. And thus with one poor syllable he thought it good merrily to refresh himself: and yet touching inconstancy, wherein he so triumpheth against D. Luther, he seemeth utterly to have forgotten himself. For it is known to the world, that D. Luther in all his life never changed but once, and that from manifest error to the open confessed truth. But M. Harding, upon how good occasions I will not say, hath changed his doctrine and whole faith twice within the space of two years. And so much would I not now have touched, saving only to put him in remembrance of himself.

That the determination of the council of Constance was against Christ, besides Gerardus Lorichius, a doctor of M. Harding's own school, who affirmeth it in vehement words, what can there be so plain, as that St Paul writeth unto the Corinthians, "That I received of the Lord, the same have I delivered unto you?" After, he mentioneth each kind apart, and sheweth that, as Christ took the bread, so he also took the cup; and that the apostles received both at Christ's hands, not only for themselves, but also to the use and behoof of the people. Therefore, whereas M. Harding crieth so often against us, that the delivery of the cup unto the people is no part of Christ's institution, if he had considered these things well, or had conferred herein with the old catholic fathers, he would have better advised himself. For instead of many, for shortness sake, to allege but one, St Cyprian's words in this matter be very plain: *Quidam vel ignoranter*

De Miss.
Publica Pro-
roganda.
1 Cor. xi.

Cypr. Lib. ii.
Epist. 3.

[¹ In much of what Harding alleges under this article, he does little more than copy Hosius. See Hos. Op. Col. 1584. De Express. Dei Verb. Tom. I. pp. 625, &c. De Utr. Spec. Com. pp. 644, &c.]

[² Luther afterward speaks of his earlier opinion in these terms: Hactenus ego stultus sensi, pulchrum fore, si pro laicis utraque species sacramenti porri-

genda statueretur concilio generali.—Luth. Op. Witeb. 1552-80. De Captiv. Babyl. Tom. II. fol. 63. 2.

These passages are extracted almost literally from Hosius, De Utr. Spec. Com. p. 649.]

[³ H. A. 1564 omits a.]

[⁴ Ourselves, 1565.]

*vel simpliciter, in calice dominico sanctificando et plebi ministrando, non hoc faciunt, quod Jesus Christus Dominus et Deus noster, hujus sacrificii auctor et doctor, fecit et docuit*⁵: “Some there be that, in sanctifying the cup, and delivering it unto the people, do not that thing that Jesus Christ our Lord and God, the author and teacher of this sacrifice, both did and taught.” And addeth further: “If any man be in this error, seeing the light of the truth, let him return again unto the root and unto the original of the Lord’s tradition⁶.” And after in the same epistle: “We keep not the thing that is commanded us, unless we do the same that the Lord did⁷.” In these few words St Cyprian saith, “The Lord both did it, and taught it to be done.” He calleth it “the Lord’s tradition:” he calleth it “the Lord’s commandment.” And here cannot M. Harding steal away in the mist, and say, St Cyprian meant all this of the cup that the priest consecrateth for himself. For his very words be plain to the contrary: *In calice dominico sanctificando, et plebi ministrando*: that is, “In sanctifying the Lord’s cup, and ministering it unto the people.” And if St Cyprian might well write thus against the heretics called *Aquarii*, which in the holy ministration would use no wine, but instead thereof did consecrate water, and ministered it unto the people; much more may we say the same against our adversaries, which consecrate and minister unto the people no cup at all. Wherefore at the end of the same epistle he concludeth with these words: “Not to do that thing that the Lord did, what is it else than to cast off his word, and to despise his discipline, and to commit not worldly but spiritual robbery and adultery, while as a man from the truth of the gospel stealeth away both the sayings and doings of the Lord, and corrupteth and defileth God’s commandments? So is it⁸ written in the prophet Jeremy: ‘What is chaff in comparison of corn? Therefore will I upon these prophets, saith the Lord, that steal my words each one of them from his neighbour, and deceive my people in their lies and in their errors⁹.’”

Ad originem traditionis dominice. Quod mandatum est.

Jer. xxiii.

The words that Luther wrote to them of Bohemia, and the others here reported, were written by him before God had appointed him to publish the gospel; and therefore are no more to be alleged against him for that he wrote afterward, as note of inconstancy, than M. Harding’s sermons, preached openly in the time of king Edward, are to be alleged against that he writeth now.

M. HARDING. THE SIXTH DIVISION.

Thus he wrote before he had¹⁰ conceived perfect¹¹ hatred against the church. But after that he had been better acquainted with the devil, and of him, appearing unto him sensibly, had been instructed with arguments against the sacrifice of the mass, (51) that the memory of our redemption by Christ wrought on the cross might utterly be abolished, he wrote hereof far otherwise: Si quo casu concilium . . . statueret . . . minime omnium nos velle [mus] utraque specie potiri: imo tunc primum in despectum . . . concilii . . . vellemus aut una . . . aut neutra, et nequaquam utraque potiri, et eos plane anathema habere, quicumque talis concilii auctoritate . . . potirentur utraque¹²: “If in any case the council would so ordain, we would in no wise have both the kinds; but even then, in despite of the council, we would have one kind, or neither of them, and in no wise both, and hold them for accursed whosoever by authority of such a council would have both.” These words declare what spirit Luther was of. They shew him like himself. Whosoever

The fifty-first untruth, joined with a slander. Never man spake more reverently of the oblation of Christ upon the cross.

[⁵ Cypr. Op. Oxon. 1682. Ad Cæcil. Epist. lxxiii. p. 148, where two words are transposed, *sacrificii hujus*.]

[⁶ ... si quis in isto errore adhuc teneatur, veritatis luce perspecta ad radicem atque originem traditionis dominicæ revertatur.—Id. ibid.]

[⁷ ... invenimus non observari a nobis quod mandatum est, nisi eadem quæ Dominus fecit, nos quoque faciamus.—Id. ibid. p. 152.] [⁸ It is, 1565.]

[⁹ ... non hoc idem facere quod fecerit Dominus, quid aliud est, quam sermones ejus abjicere, et disciplinam dominicam contemnere, nec terrena sed spiritualia furta et adulteria committere; dum quis de evangelica veritate furatur Domini nostri verba et

facta, et corrumpit atque adulterat præcepta divina? Sicut apud Hieremiam scriptum est: Quid est, inquit, paleis ad triticum? propter hoc ecce ego ad prophetas, dicit Dominus, qui furantur verba mea unusquisque a proximo suo, et seducunt populum meum in mendaciis suis et in erroribus suis.—Id. ibid. p. 157.]

[¹⁰ Before that he had, H. A. 1564.]

[¹¹ Perfite, 1565, and H. A. 1564.]

[¹² Luth. Op. Form. Miss. pro Eccles. Witemb. Tom. II. fol. 386; where for *una* we find *alterutra*, *ac plane eos, auctoritate talis concilii, and utraque potirentur*.]

readeth his books with indifferent judgment shall find that, sithence the apostles' time, never wrote man so arrogantly, ne so despitefully against the church, nor so contrarily to himself. Which marks be so evident, that whosoever will not see them, but suffereth himself to be carried away into error, hatred of the church, and contempt of all godliness, either by him or by his scholars, except he repent and return, he is guilty of his own damnation, utterly overthrown, and sinneth inexcusably, [Tit. iii. H. A. 1564.] as one condemned by his own judgment. But for excuse hereof, in his book *of the Captivity of Babylon*, he confesseth that he wrote thus, not for that he thought so, nor for that he judged the use of one kind unlawful, but because he was stirred by hatred and anger so to do. His words do sound so much plainly: *Provocatus, imo per vim raptus*¹: "I wrote this (saith he) otherwise than I thought in my heart, provoked, and by violence pulled to it, whether I would or no." Here I doubt not but wise men will regard more that Luther wrote when his mind was quiet and calm, than when it was enraged with blustering storms of naughty affections².

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

There is nothing so easy as to speak ill. There was nothing further off from Luther's mind, than, upon any determination of any council, to minister the sacrament under one kind, and so to break Christ's institution into halves. But he thought it not meet that God's truth immortal should hang of the authority of a mortal man, and stand for true no further than it should please a man to allow of it. Notwithstanding, such interest and authority the pope hath claimed to himself, forcing the world to believe, as he himself writeth, that "he hath all right and law in the closet of his breast³." And one Sylvester Prierias, governor of pope Leo's palace, was not ashamed nor afraid to write these words: *A doctrina Romanæ ecclesiæ et Romani pontificis sacra scriptura robur et auctoritatem trahit*⁴: "The holy scripture taketh strength and authority of the church and bishop of Rome." This was the thing that D. Luther disliked, and thought intolerable. And therefore he said he would have God's word received only because it is God's word, and spoken by him, not because it is authorised by a council; and if the council would allow the ministration in one kind, then, he said, he would use both, because Christ in his institution appointed both. But if the bishops in the council would agree upon both kinds, as a matter standing wholly in their pleasures, as though they had full power to control or to ratify the will of God, then, he said, he would have no regard unto the authority of such a council, that setteth itself above God, but rather would use one kind only, or none at all. For this cause M. Harding reproveth Doctor Luther so bitterly, and calleth him arrogant, because he would not have God's will subject to the will of man.

Yet it appeareth that St Paul in the like case did the like. For, notwithstanding he had circumcised Timothy, yet, when he saw certain come in that would needs force the same upon Titus also, and so make it necessary, he withstood them stoutly, and would not yield. Thus he writeth: "Neither was Titus, that then was with me, compelled to be circumcised, for the coming in of certain false brethren, which came upon us to try out our liberty that we have in Christ Jesus⁵, to the intent to bring us into bondage. Unto whom we gave no place by yielding, no, not for any time, that the truth of the gospel might remain among you."

Eusebius in his story saith, there was an old law in Rome, that no emperor should consecrate a god, unless the same god had been first allowed by the council. Tiberius being emperor, when he heard of the wonderful works that

Extr. de
Const. Licet
Roman.
Sylvest.
Prier. Magist.
Palatii.

Acta xvi.

Gal. ii.

Euseb. Lib.
ii. cap. ii.

[¹ The whole passage will shew Luther's real meaning: *Nam quo tempore sermonem de eucharistia edebam, in usu communi hærebam... At nunc, provocatus et exercitatus, imo per vim raptus in hanc harenam, dabo libere, quæ sentio.*—Id. *De Captiv. Babyl.* Tom. II. fol. 64. 2.]

[² This passage is almost literally from Hosius, *Op. Col.* 1584. *De Utr. Spec. Com.* Tom. I. p. 649.]

[³ Bonifac. VIII. in *Corp. Jur. Canon.* Lugd.

1624. *Sext. Decretal. Lib.* i. Tit. ii. cap. 1. col. 11. See before, page 68.]

[⁴ *Quicumque non innititur doctrinæ Romanæ ecclesiæ ac Romani pontificis, tanquam regulæ fidei infallibili, a qua etiam sacra scriptura robur trahit et auctoritatem, hæreticus est.*—Sylvest. Prier. In *Luth. Concl. Dial.* in *Luth. Op.* Witeb. 1552-80. Tom. I. fol. 159. 2.]

[⁵ *Jesu*, 1563.]

were wrought by Christ in Jewry, thought therefore he was a God, and promoted a bill unto the council, that Christ might be proclaimed and taken for a God. But the council was otherwise bent, and would allow him for no God⁶. Tertullian laugheth at their folly. His words be these: *Apud vos de humano arbitrio divinitas pensatur. Nisi homini Deus placuerit, non erit Deus. Homo jam Deo propitius esse debet*⁷: "Amongst you the divinity and state of God is weighed by man's judgment. Unless God please man, God (amongst you) shall be no God. Now therefore man must be good and favourable unto his God." The like folly seemeth to be in them that think God's truth is no truth, unless the consent of a council allow it to be truth. To this same purpose Luther wrote a book unto the knights of the order of Russia, after they had obtained from the pope a dispensation to marry, notwithstanding their vow. He chargeth them, "that in any wise they marry not by warrant of that dispensation; otherwise (he saith) they offend God, and be worse than adulterers, as having more regard unto man than unto God; and having God's own dispensation, as if it were not sufficient, would seek further for the dispensation of a man."

Tertull. in
Apologet.

Ad Nobiles
Ordinis Teu-
tonici.

Luther wrote not this in the despite of any godly council, no more than the prophet Esay, when he said: *Inite concilium, et dissipabitur*: "Go, gather your council; and it shall be broken." But he could not suffer to see God's glory so defaced, that a company of men should presume to allow or disallow his truth, as if it were not true in itself, but must fall or stand only at their pleasure.

Isai. viii.

The rest that followeth is nothing else but unseemly slander. But God be blessed, that hath delivered that godly man from lying tongues!

But Luther, saith M. Harding, was contrary unto himself. Even so Marcion the heretic charged St Paul that he spake against the ceremonies, and yet himself shaved his head at Cenchreæ, and observed the ceremonies; that he would not circumcise Titus, and yet had circumcised Timotheus; that he would sometime defend the law, and sometime reprove the law; and so was evermore contrary to himself. And he that had M. Harding's spirit perhaps would no more doubt to find fault with St Paul for inconstancy than with Luther. If Luther were ever contrary to himself, yet might no man worse charge him in that behalf than M. Harding. But Luther evermore followed God's calling, and never returned back unto his vomit, neither fought against his own conscience, nor against the manifest known truth. And therefore, although he were contrary unto himself, as passing from error unto truth, yet was he not contrary unto God.

Acts xxi.

M. HARDING. THE SEVENTH DIVISION.

Now to put this matter, that Luther judged it a thing indifferent whether one receive the sacrament under one kind or both, more out of doubt, Philip Melancthon, his scholar, and nearest of his counsel, writeth: *Sicut edere suillam, aut abstinere a suilla, sic alterutra signi parte uti medium esse*⁸: "That, as it is a thing indifferent to eat swine's flesh, or to forbear swine's flesh, so it is also to use which part of the sign a man listeth." By the word "sign," he meaneth the sacrament, liking better that strange word, than the accustomed word of the church, lest he might perhaps be thought, of the brethren of his sect, in somewhat to join with the catholics.

Bucer also is of the same opinion, who, in the conference that was had between the catholics and protestants, for agreement in controversies of religion at Ratisbone, confirmed and allowed this article by his full consent, with these words: *Ad controversiam, quæ est de una aut utraque specie, tollendam, cum primis conducturum, ut sancta ecclesia liberam faceret potestatem sacramentum hoc in una vel in utraque specie sumendi; ea tamen lege, ut nulli per hoc detur occasio, quem usum tantopere retinuit ecclesia, temere condemnandi, aut invicem judicandi*⁹: "That the controversy for the one or both kinds may be taken

[⁶ Euseb. in Hist. Eccles. Script. Amst. 1695-1700. Lib. II, cap. II, pp. 31, 2.]

[⁷ Tertull. Op. Lut. 1641. Apologet. 5. p. 6; where we find *arbitratu, deus non erit, and debet*.]

[⁸ Hosius confesses that in later editions of the

Common-places Melancthon left out these words.]

[⁹ Hosius, from whom Harding transcribed the passage, did not mean to attribute these words to Bucer. They are, with some difference of expression, those of the article itself proposed at the con-

A Sign.

away, it shall be very well done that holy church made it free to receive this sacrament in one or both kinds; yet under such condition as hereby no occasion be given to any body rashly to condemn the use which the church hath so long time kept, nor to judge another¹." Soothly he which would have it free and at liberty to receive the sacrament under one or both kinds, and holdeth opinion that the old custom of the one kind only is not to be condemned, seemeth plainly enough to confess that nothing hath been instituted or commanded of Christ touching this matter, as necessary to salvation.

Thus we may see plainly that they, which have divided themselves from the mystical body of Christ, that is, his church, who were of greatest learning and judgment, make it a matter indifferent (as it is indeed of itself left to the liberty of the church) whether the sacrament be ministered under one kind or both. And thus² much hath been confessed against M. Jewel and his sect, not only by the learned adversaries of the church in our time, but also by a learned man of Bohemia, above six-score years past. His name is John Przbyram, of whose writings some are set forth in print. This learned man, whereas he endeavoured to prove the use of both kinds of the words of Christ written by St John, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye shall not have life in you," at length uttereth these words according to the eloquence of his time: Veruntamen hic Deum timens, et mores, impios aliorum præcavens, fateor, quod quaslibet personas de ecclesia communioni fidelium sub utraque specie repugnantes damnare aut hæreticare non intendo³: "But here, having the fear of God before mine eyes, and being well ware I follow not the wicked conditions of others, I grant that, what persons soever of the church repine against the communion of the faithful people under both kinds, I intend not to condemn them, nor to hold them for heretics." But if it be the commandment of God that the sacrament be received of all under both kinds, why should he be forbidden by the fear of God to condemn those that withstand that order of communion, seeing that whosoever goeth against God's commandment is worthy to be condemned? Therefore by his testimony the use of one or both kinds is indifferent⁴.

Thus we are able to allege Luther, Melancthon, Bucer, and that learned Bohemian, for the indifferency of the communion to be ministered⁵ either under one kind or both: whereby I mean not that the use of the sacrament is so left to every man's liberty as he that listeth may require both kinds, and another may content himself with one kind. Not so. Every man is bound to follow the order of the church; but the church is not bound of necessity, by God's commandment, to minister it under both kinds to the laity.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

To prove that the half communion is a thing indifferent, he bringeth forth the authority of Melancthon, Bucer, and a certain learned man of Bohemia; some of them falsely alleged, and some without any allegation at all. Neither doth he bring them to the intent to take them for his authors, and to follow them; for they, neither in their books, nor in the order of their churches, ever consented to the breach of Christ's institution. But herein he bewrayeth his want of old doctors; for, having the authority of them, he would never have alleged any of these.

In Melancthon he misliketh much the manner of his speech, in that he calleth the sacrament a sign: "which word," as he saith, "is strange, and not the accustomed word of the church." Saving that he seeketh occasions and quarrels without cause, as his wont is, otherwise he knoweth that a sacrament hath been called a sign in all times and ages of the church.

ference. See Lib. Propos. ad Comp. Relig. xxi. in Joh. Eck. Apol. adv. Col. Buc. Antv. 1542. foll. 38, 9. The following is the opinion of Bucer: Porro constituto consensu doctrinæ, si populus invitaretur ad hunc usum, et usus restitueretur, esset jam concordia. quia enim persecutio cessasset, et doctrina sincera proponeretur, etiamsi non subito mutarent suam consuetudinem singuli, in usu tamen discordia publica non esset, &c.—Acta Coll. Ratisp. Hab. per

M. Bucer. Argent. 1541. Artic. Protest. De Us. Integr. Sacr. fol. 37.]

[¹ One another, 1565, and H. A. 1564.]

[² This, H. A. 1564.]

[³ Duo de Sept. Sac. Tractat. duor. Bohem. ad calc. Coch. Hist. Hussit. Mogunt. 1549. p. 511.]

[⁴ The preceding paragraphs with the authorities are taken from Hosius, Op. Col. 1584. De Utr. Spec. Com. Tom. I. p. 650.] [⁵ Minister, H. A. 1564.]

Petrus Lombardus thus defineth a sacrament: *Sacramentum est signum rei sacræ*⁶: "A sacrament is the sign of a holy thing." And as it is thought, the very substance and nature of a thing cannot be better known than by the definition. St Augustine saith: [*Signa*] *cum ad res divinas adhibentur, sacramenta vocantur*⁷: "Signs, when they be applied to godly things, be called sacraments." And again, writing of the difference that is between the sacraments of the old law and of the new, he saith thus: *In signis diversis eadem fides*⁸: "The signs being divers, the faith is one." And writing against one Adimantus, he saith: *Non dubitavit Dominus dicere, Hoc est corpus meum, cum daret signum corporis sui*⁹: "The Lord doubted not to say, This is my body, when he gave the sign of his body." Likewise saith Chrysostom: *Si mortuus Jesus non est, cujus symbolum ac signum hoc sacrificium est*¹⁰? "If Jesus died not, whose token and whose sign is this sacrifice?" And lest any man should be deceived in the meaning of this word "sign," St Augustine himself hath expounded it thus: *Signum est res, præter speciem, quam ingerit sensibus, aliud quiddam faciens ex se in cognitionem venire*¹¹: "A sign is a thing, that, besides the sight itself which it offereth unto the senses, causeth of itself some other certain thing to come into knowledge." Hereby it may appear that this word "sign" is not so strange as M. Harding would have it seem, nor so unaccustomed unto the church. Although it mislike him that we should do as the old fathers did, yet he might give us leave to use such words and phrases as the old fathers used.

"But," saith he¹², "Melancthon and Bucer accounted it a¹³ thing indifferent." Indeed these godly-learned men, when they saw that, through the malice of their adversaries, they could not obtain that Christ's institution might universally be received, yet they desired at the least it might be left free, without restraint, for every church to do therein as they should think good, and that without murmur or offence of others. And thus far forth their desire was it might be judged free; not that they thought Christ had not ordained the sacrament to be ministered unto the people in both kinds, or that in itself it is indifferent, but that the faithful of God might indifferently and freely use it without controlment, and that it should not be judged heresy to do as Christ hath commanded.

So the godly fathers at the beginning, when they could not persuade the princes of the world, with their people, to receive the gospel, yet they thought they were gainers, and gave God thanks, when they might have place and liberty for themselves freely and with quiet conscience to meet together, and to preach the gospel.

This liberty M. Harding cannot like withal. He would have it free for the whole church to determine of it; but not for every church particular. This is a shift to deceive the ignorant. For he knoweth well that all other churches throughout the world, from the first planting of the gospel until this day, do still minister the holy communion in both kinds, as Christ commanded; and that Christ's institution was never openly and by consent broken, but only in the church of Rome; which church also is not universal, but mere particular; and that the same breach, in the same church of Rome, sprang not of any consent of bishops, or other learned men, but, as it is proved before, only of the simple devotion of the people. And doth M. Harding think the people may safely break Christ's institution without any general council, and may not safely return again to the same without a general council? Verily there needeth no council, where as nothing is done by council.

A Sign.

Lib. iv. Dist. i.

August. de Doctrina Christiana, Lib. iii. cap. vi.

In Johan. Tract. 45. August. contra Adimantum, cap. xii.

Chrysost. in Mat. Hom. 83.

August. de Doctrina Christiana, Lib. ii. De Con. Dist. 2. Signum est.

⁶ Pet. Lombard. Lib. Sentent. Col. Agrip. 1576. Lib. iv. Dist. i. B. fol. 330. 2; where the words are transposed.]

⁷ These words do not occur in the place indicated. See however August. Op. Par. 1679-1700. Ad Marcellin. Epist. cxxxvii. 7. Tom. II. col. 412; where for *adhibentur* we find *pertinent*.]

⁸ Id. In Johan. Evang. cap. x. Tractat. xlv. 9. Tom. III. Pars II. col. 598.]

⁹ Id. Cont. Adimant. Lib. cap. xii. 3. Tom. VIII. col. 124; where the words are transposed: *Non enim*

Dominus dubitavit, and signum daret.]

¹⁰ *Εἰ γὰρ μὴ ἀπέθανεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς, τίνας σύμβολα τὰ τελούμενα;*—Chrysost. Op. Par. 1718-38. In Matt. Hom. lxxxii. Tom. VII. p. 783.]

¹¹ August. in Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugd. 1624. Decret. Gratian. Decr. Tert. Pars, De Consecr. Dist. ii. can. 33. col. 1926; where we find *aliud aliquid ex se faciens*. Op. De Doctr. Christ. Lib. II. cap. i. 1. Tom. III. Pars I. col. 19.]

¹² He saith, 1565.]

¹³ It as a, 1565.]

Nestorius.

Cypr. Lib. ii.
Epist. iii.

Touching the indifferency of this matter, whereupon M. Harding hath built this whole treaty, and in what sort the breach of Christ's institution may seem a thing indifferent, I know no better answer than that is already made by St Cyprian, who in the like case maketh answer thus: *Si quis de antecessoribus meis . . . non hoc observavit et tenuit, quod nos Dominus . . . exemplo et magisterio suo docuit, potest simplicitati ejus de indulgentia Domini venia concedi: nobis vero non poterit ignosci, qui nunc a Domino admoniti et instructi sumus, &c.*¹ "If any of my predecessors have not followed and kept that thing which the Lord, by his example and commandment, hath taught us, he for his simplicity may be pardoned; but if we wilfully offend, there is no pardon for us, that are already warned and instructed of the Lord. We give God thanks, that, whiles he instructeth us what we shall do for the time to come, he forgiveth us that is past, because we have erred of simplicity." Thus far forth the breach of God's ordinance may be borne withal, by the judgment of St Cyprian. But he addeth further: *Post inspirationem vero, et revelationem factam, qui in eo quod erraverat perseverat, prudens et sciens, sine venia ignorantie peccat, presumptione . . . atque obstinatione . . . superatus*²: "After that God hath once opened and revealed (his truth) whoso continueth still in his error, willingly and wittingly offendeth, without hope of pardon, as being overcome with presumption and wilfulness."

Cypr. ad Ju-
balianum, de
Hæreticis
Baptizandis.

M. HARDING. THE EIGHTH DIVISION.

And whereas it was ministered in both kinds at Corinth, as it appeareth by St Paul, and in sundry other places, as we find most evidently in the writings of divers ancient fathers, yet the church hath been moved by divers and weighty causes to take order that the people should receive their communion under one kind, not only in the council of Basil, but also in that of Constance, and long before them, above a thousand years, in (52) the first council of Ephesus, as many do probably gather, and namely Urbanus Regius, a doctor of Luther's school, confesseth in his book *De Locis Communibus*⁴. One cause, and not the least, was, that thereby the heresy of Nestorius might the rather be extinguished, who, amongst other errors, held opinion (53) that under the form of bread in the sacrament is contained the body of Christ without his blood; and under the form of the wine, his blood only without his body. Many other causes moved those fathers to take that order, for the avoiding of many inconveniences, dangers, and offences, which might happen in the use of the cup, as unreverence of so high a sacrament, whereof christian people at the beginning had a marvellous care and regard; the loathsomeness of many that cannot brook the taste of wine; the difficulty of getting, and impossibility of keeping wine from corruption, in countries situated near to the north pole, in that clime where is known to be great extremity of cold; beside a number of the like. So that it had been besides⁵ reason to have bound all to the necessity of both kinds.

[Causes moving the church to communicate under one kind. H. A. 1564.]

The fifty-second untruth. For there was no such canon touched, or once moved in that council.

The fifty-third untruth. For Nestorius never dreamed of any such folly.

Weighty considerations wherefore Christ's institution should be broken.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

He granteth that St Paul at Corinth, and sundry other holy fathers in their several churches, ministered the sacrament in both kinds. He might as well have said, all the apostles, and all the holy fathers, saving for hindering of his cause. "But the church afterward upon good causes (as it is here alleged) took order to the contrary, and namely to confute the heretic Nestorius."

Here must thou mark, good christian reader, the question is, whether M. Harding's half communion were ever ministered openly to the people in the church within the space of six hundred years after Christ. For proof hereof he allegeth that this order was allowed in the councils of Constance and Basil;

[¹ Cypr. Op. Oxon. 1682. Ad Cæcil. Epist. lxxiii. pp. 156, 7; where for *meis* we find *nostris*.]

[² Id. Ad Jubal. Epist. lxxiii. p. 204; where *cum ratione superetur*.]

[³ 1565 omits *for*.]

[⁴ Nestorius Constantinopolitanus episcopus lai-

cos sub utraque specie communicavit, Ephesina synodus restitit.—Urban. Reg. Op. Norib. 1562. Loc. Com. xii. fol. 318. 2. See also Hos. Op. Col. 1584. De Utr. Spec. Com. Tom. I. p. 645.]

[⁵ Beside, H. A. 1564.]

the former whereof was begun and holden in the year of our Lord a thousand four hundred and fourteen⁶, and the same neither general, nor ever generally received. And what force can he find herein to prove his purpose? "It is also probably gathered," saith M. Harding, "that the same order was taken a thousand years before, in the first council of Ephesus." Here he is driven utterly to leave his learning, and, as he commonly doth, only to hold by bare guess. But if this new device were brought in to confute the heretic Nestorius, why then took it place first in the councils of Constance and Basil, a thousand years after that Nestorius was dead, and his heresy quite forgotten? If it were so ordered in the council of Ephesus, why is there no act or mention thereof extant in that council, nor any learned man within a thousand years after, to record the same?

Nestorius.
Anno 1414.

"But Urbanus Regius, a doctor of Luther's school, confesseth it." First, Urbanus Regius departed this life not above twenty years ago; and therefore is a very young witness to testify a thing done so long before. Besides this, the book of Common-places that is abroad in his name is nothing else but a heap of things gathered together by long reading, as the manner of students is, out of divers and sundry books, and that as well of the one side as of the other, only for help of memory and increase of knowledge. Neither was that book ever corrected or published by him, but only delivered to the printer as it was, by his widow, after his death, as appeareth by Pomeranus, that dedicated that book to the prince of Mensburg⁷. And therefore these collections do witness his diligence, but not his judgment. As touching that note concerning the council of Ephesus, it may be thought he had it out of Alardus, or Michael Væhe, or some other like writer of this age.

"Nestorius, amongst other errors," saith M. Harding, "held opinion, that, under the form of bread in the sacrament is contained the body of Christ without his blood, and, under the form of wine, the blood only without his body." Why should this man thus delight himself to uphold one falsehood⁸ with another? First he saith, "The council of Ephesus decreed against both kinds." This is untrue, and was never yet proved. Next, some cause must be devised that should lead the fathers to that decree: which, as it is here surmised, was this error of Nestorius. A cause that never was is good enough to prove the effect that never was. Thus is M. Harding driven not only to forge new doctors, and new decrees of councils, but also to imagine new heresies such as were never heard of before; even in like sort, and to like purpose, as by some it is supposed that Aristotle sometime imagined strange and monstrous opinions to be taught by Democritus, Parmenides, Melissus, and other old philosophers; not because they had ever taught or written so indeed, but to the end to find occasion of talk, and the better to set abroad his own learning. If it be true that is surmised by Nestorius, then M. Harding's whole defence standeth but upon an heresy: if it be untrue, as indeed it is, then it standeth upon an open falsehood⁸: and so, whether it be true or false, it hath a very weak foundation.

As for Nestorius, it is known he was a wicked and a blasphemous heretic, and was worthily condemned by sundry holy fathers and councils. Philastrius, Epiphanius, and St Augustine, have written namely of his errors: the council of Ephesus, the council of Chalcedon, Cœlestinus, Gelasius, Leo, bishops of Rome, Cyrillus bishop of Alexandria, have ripped up and condemned all the branches of his heresies. Yet none of them all ever charged Nestorius with this new heresy of M. Harding's making. If there had been in it any shew of truth, M. Harding, as he is eloquent, would have laid out all the circumstances, when this strange error first began, where, and how long it continued, who wrote against it, and by whom and in what council it was condemned. Verily this great silence declareth some want. It must needs be a very strange heresy, that never had neither beginning nor ending, nor defender nor reprover, nor mouth to utter it, nor ear to hear it, nor pen to write it, nor time to last in, nor place to

[⁶ Fourteenth, 1565.]

[⁷ Urban. Reg. Op. Epist. Loc. Theol. a J.]

[F. Pomer. fol. 298. 2.]

[⁸ Falsehead, 1565.]

rest in. And if all this had been true of Nestorius, yet had it been no reason that, for any one man's private error, Christ's institution should be broken.

But that the vain folly and manifest falsehood¹ of these men may appear, understand, good reader, that where as Nestorius dwelt, and his heresy took place, in those countries they have evermore kept Christ's institution in both kinds; but in these countries, where as neither the name of Nestorius was ever heard of, but only unto a few, nor his heresy ever received, there have they made great provisos against Nestorius, yea, a thousand years after Nestorius was dead.

The rest of the causes which he calleth so weighty, are scarcely worth any answer. "Some men do loathe wine; some people can hardly get, some can hardly keep wine; *ergo*, there must be made a law general, that the whole world shall communicate in one kind." If the conclusion had been, that such as have these impediments or wants might so communicate, it had been more tolerable. For, as it is well noted by Pomponius, "Laws must touch things that happen commonly and for the most part, not things that happen to few, or seldom²." Otherwise the like reason may be made for the priests: some priests, by mean of disease, can taste no wine; some in certain countries can hardly get, some can hardly keep wine; therefore it were well provided that all priests should minister under one kind. Certainly, where as wine may be provided for the priest, there may also wine be provided for the people: for it were strange to hear that a cart or a whole ship should come laden³ only with one bottle of wine into a country.

Some say that the priests in Russia, for lack of wine, used to consecrate in metheglen: some other say that Innocentius the Eighth, for the like want, dispensed with the priests of Norway to consecrate without wine⁴. It were no reason to bind the whole church to the necessity or imbecility of a few. For otherwise the same want and impossibility, that M. Harding hath here found for the one part of the sacrament, may be found also for the other. For Arrianus *de rebus Indicis*, and Strabo in his Geography, have written, that there be whole nations and countries that have no bread⁵. Therefore it should seem necessary by this conclusion, that, in consideration of them, the whole church should abstain from the other portion of the sacrament also, and so have no sacrament at all.

M. HARDING. THE NINTH DIVISION.

Now in very deed, if we would grant our⁶ adversaries, which in no wise we do⁷ grant, that it hath been commanded of Christ the lay-people should communicate under both kinds, by these words, "Drink ye all of this;" yet, this notwithstanding, the exact straitness of God's ordinance may without sin in cases be omitted, in such things which be not necessarily to be observed of themselves, or of the prescript of the law of nature; so that great and weighty causes (the rule of charity exactly observed) require the same. For evident proof of this, we have examples both of the old, and also of the new testament. Did not God command that none should eat of the shew-bread but the priest⁸ only? David ate thereof; and yet Christ cleareth him of all blame. The law of circumcision, so straitly commanded, was for the space of forty years by the people of Israel quite omitted, whiles they passed from Egypt to the land of promise; and God found no fault with them for it. God gave the law of keeping holy the sabbath-day without exception. The Machabees notwithstanding sticked not to arm themselves against Antiochus, and to spend

[¹ Falsehead, 1565.]

[² Jura constitui oportet, ut dixit Theophrastus, in his quæ ἐπὶ τὸ πλεῖστον, id est, ut plurimum, accidunt, non quæ ἐκ παραλόγου, id est, ex inopinato. —Pompon. in Corp. Jur. Civil. Amst. 1663. Digest. Lib. i. Tit. iii. 3. Tom. I. p. 78.]

[³ Loaden, 1565.]

[⁴ Innocentius octavus (Volaterrano teste) concessit Norwegiis, ut liceret illis sine vino sacrificare cali-

cem.—H. Corn. Agrip. De Incert. et Vanit. Scient. Col. 1584. De Cær. cap. lx. fol. N. 4. See before, page 137, note 6.]

[⁵ The Ichthyophagi are doubtless meant.—Arrian. Lib. Hist. Ind. cap. xxix. Strabon. Geograph. Lib. xv.]

[⁶ To our, 1565, and H. A. 1564.]

[⁷ Do not, 1565, 1609, and H. A. 1564.]

[⁸ Priests, 1565, and H. A. 1564.]

De Legib. et
Senatuscons.
et Longa
Consuetud.
'Επὶ τὸ
πλεῖστον
ἐκ παρα-
λόγου.

Corn. Agrip.
de Vanit.
Scient. Vola-
terrano.

Arrianus,
Lib. viii.
Strabon.

Lev. xxiv.

1 Sam. xxi.

Mark ii.

Gen. xvi.
and xxxiv.

Exod. xx.

1 Macc. ii.

that day in the field in their defence, having no scruple of conscience for breach of that law. Many the like examples we find in the old testament. But let us come to the new testament, and to the sacraments of the time of grace. In due consideration of which, we may find that Christ hath scarcely commanded any outward thing, the moderation, qualifying, and ordering whereof he hath not left to his church, as, according to the condition of the time, it hath been seen most expedient for the common preferment and edifying of the same: so that notwithstanding there be no swerving from the scope and principal intent, and no creature defrauded of that good which by the outward things is to be attained.

Touching the sacrament of baptism, though nothing be said of the teaching of them that should be baptized, neither of the dipping of them into the water, which Christ's charge in this behalf given seemeth plainly to require: "Go you," *Matt. xxviii.* saith he to his apostles, "and teach all nations, baptizing them," &c.; and yet the church hath not feared to baptize infants, that be without capacity of teaching; and for the due administration of this sacrament too many have⁹ thought pouring or sprinkling of water upon them sufficient: though this be not spoken of, I say, it is much to be considered to this purpose, that the apostles sticked not for a time to alter and change the very essential form of words with which Christ would this sacrament to be ministered. For, whereas he commanded them to baptize in *[Acts viii. H. A. 1564.]* the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, they baptized in the name of Jesus Christ (54) only, intending thereby to make that to be of more fame and celebrity.

The fifty-fourth untruth. A foul depravation of the scriptures.

So, to return to the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, whereof we treat, no man can deny but many things were at the institution of it done by the example of Christ, and by him commanded, which now be not observed; and yet in that respect no fault is found. Christ washed the apostles' feet, and gave them an express commandment to do the same, with these most plain words: "If I, that am

John xiii. your Master and Lord, have washed your feet, you also ought to wash one another's feet: for I have given you an example, that, as I have done, you do so likewise;" which commandment of Christ, according to the outward letter, verily bindeth no less than these words: "Drink ye all of this;" yet this commandment is not kept,

In Serm. de Cena Domini. but clean grown out of use: though it appear by St Bernard, who calleth it Magnum Sacramentum¹⁰, "a great sacrament," and long before, by report of St Cyprian, that Christ did not only wash his apostles' feet, but

In Serm. de Unctione Chrismatis. commanded also by solemn request, and ordained that the apostles afterward should do the same¹¹. Whether this ordinance of Christ hath been abolished, for that it should not be thought a rebaptization, as it may be gathered of St

Ad Januarium. cap. xviii. Augustine¹², or for any other cause, it forceth not greatly. But this is much to be marvelled at, that this, so earnestly commanded, is so quietly

and with such silence suffered undone, and in the ministration of the sacrament the use of the cup so factiously and with so much crying out required. Neither in many other rites and ceremonies we do not as Christ did. Christ celebrated this sacrament after that he had supped: we do it in the morning and fasting. Christ sat at the table with his twelve apostles: neither sit we at a table, neither think we it necessary to observe such number. Christ brake the bread: we think it not necessary to break the host that is to be delivered to the faithful participants. Here is to be noted, that St Cyprian, rebuking them which thought sprinkling or pouring of water not to be sufficient for baptism, declareth that the sacraments be not to be esteemed according to¹³ their extreme and rigorous observation, or administration of all the extern elements, but rather according to the integrity and soundness of faith of the giver and of the receiver; and that divine things, used in a compendious sort, confer and give nevertheless to the right believers their whole virtue¹⁴, Lib. iv. Epist. 7. Many other commandments of God concerning outward things might here be rehearsed; which notwithstanding by little and little in the church have been omitted; as the forbearing of

[⁹ To many, hath, 1565, and H. A. 1564.]

[¹⁰ Bernard. Op. Par. 1690. In Cen. Dom. Serm. 4. Vol. I. Tom. III. col. 891. See below, page 225, note 6.]

[¹¹ Cypr. Op. Oxon. 1689, De Unct. Chrism. (Ar-

nold.) p. 46.]

[¹² August. Op. Par. 1679-1700. Ad Inq. Januar. seu Epist. lv. 33. Tom. II. col. 141.]

[¹³ Unto, H. A. 1564.]

[¹⁴ Cypr. Op. Ad Magn. Epist. lxi. pp. 185, 6.]

In the name of Christ only. *strangled things and blood; which was commanded by God in the old testament, and, according to the pleasure and advice of the Holy Ghost, decreed by the apostles in the new testament. Yet, forasmuch as concerneth outward things, both this and many other the like have in process of time grown out of observation, and have without any scruple of conscience been abrogated.*

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

The best stay, that these men can lay hold upon, is to deny Christ's institution. And therefore M. Harding saith here, "In nowise we do not grant it;" which is an argument of good courage, but of small proof. But he addeth further, if it were Christ's institution, yet notwithstanding, by the authority of the church, and upon good consideration, it might be broken. His reasons be these: in the old testament, David did eat the shew-bread, notwithstanding it were forbidden; the people in the wilderness ceased from circumcision, notwithstanding it were commanded; the Machabees fought and defended themselves upon the sabbath-day, notwithstanding God had appointed that day to rest. In the new testament, we baptize infants that can receive no teaching; and sometime we think it sufficient to sprinkle them, or to pour them over; and the apostles, contrary to Christ's institution, baptized in the name of Jesus only. If M. Harding could have brought any such example or authority as was required, such poor helps should not have needed. For these allegations are partly true, partly false, partly not agreeable to that we have in hand, neither in place, nor in time, nor in the end, nor in the manner of doing, nor in other circumstances, and therefore make little to this purpose.

1 Sam. xxi.

Josh. v.

1 Macc. ii.

1 Sam. xxi.

David took of the shew-bread: but he was forced thereto by extremity of famine; neither did he ever decree that it should be lawful for all others to do the like.

Josh. v.

The people ceased from circumcision in the wilderness: but they had God's special dispensation so to do, as it is noted by Lyra, for that they were in continual travel from place to place; and people being newly circumcised could abide no labour¹: yet made they made no law that circumcision should quite be abolished.

1 Macc. ii.

Matt. xii.

Dion.

The Machabees might lawfully defend themselves upon the sabbath-day. For, as Christ expoundeth the law: "Man is not made for the sabbath; but the sabbath is made for man." And therefore the Jews did ill, that being besieged upon the sabbath-day, as Dion saith, stood still, and yielded themselves unto their enemies². Yet did not the Machabees proclaim that it should be lawful upon the sabbath to go to the field.

Touching baptism, first we teach the fathers, and afterward we baptize them and their children; and this is no breach of Christ's commandment. For after we be once become God's people, God hath promised, "that he will be our God, and the God of our children;" and by the prophet Ezechiel he saith, "Your children be my children." They that sprinkled them that they baptized used both the word and also the element or kind of water that was commanded: neither doth it appear that Christ gave any commandment of dipping the party into the water. But these men take quite away from the people both the element and kind of wine, and also the words of consecration.

Ezek. xvi.

M. Harding
falsifieth the
words of St
Luke.

Last of all, in that he saith, "The apostles, contrary to the institution, baptized in the name of Christ *only*," beside³ the mere sophistication of the matter, he also falsifieth the words, putting that behind that St Luke set before.

And that thou mayest the better perceive the fraud, I must do thee, christian reader, to understand that, in the time of the apostles, some that were baptized received the Holy Ghost in sensible signs, and were able immediately, some to

[¹ Populus enim Israel movebat castra quacumque hora nubes movebatur præbens eis ducatum: et quia incertus erat eis motus nubis; ideo dispensative factum est quod illi qui fuerunt nati in deserto remanserunt incircumcisi usque ad tempus istud: quia periculosum esset de novo circumcisos itinerare seu

portari in itinere.—Bibl. cum Gloss. Ord. et Expos. N. de Lyra, Basil. 1502. Jos. cap. v. Pars II. fol. 8. 2.]

[² Dion. Cass. Hist. Rom. Libb. xxxvii. xlix.]

[³ Besides, 1565.]

speak sundry tongues, some to work other miracles. Some others received⁴ no such miracle, but baptism only; as they of Samaria, that were baptized by Philip. Therefore, saith St Luke, "Peter and John prayed for them, that they also might receive the Holy Ghost in visible signs, as well as others. For the Holy Ghost, until that time, was come upon none of them, but only they were baptized in the name of the Lord Jesus;" by this word "only" excluding nothing else but the outward miraculous gifts of the Holy Ghost.

Washing
of feet.

Acts viii.

Only.

But M. Harding transporteth⁵ and shifteth St Luke's words at his pleasure, and placeth this word "only" in the end, and thereby excludeth the essential form of baptism, as if they had been baptized in the name of Christ only, and so not in the name of the Father and of the Holy Ghost. This error must needs hold by the canvassing of the scriptures.

To baptize in the "name of Christ," is to baptize according to the order, institution, and commandment of Christ. Neither do these words, "in the name of Christ," import that baptism was ministered in the name of Christ only, and in none other name beside; no more than these words, "Paul the servant of Jesus Christ," do import that Paul was the servant of Christ only, and so not the servant of God the Father, nor of the Holy Ghost; or these words that Paul spake unto the keeper, "Believe in the Lord Jesus," do discharge him from believing in the other two Persons of the holy Trinity. Doubtless he must be very bold with the scriptures of God, that will presume hereby to prove, either that the apostles altered the essential form of baptism, or that they proclaimed them heretics, that in baptizing would follow Christ's institution.

Acts xvi.

The objection of washing of feet is common, and hath been often answered. "St Bernard calleth it a sacrament⁶." I grant. But St Bernard is a doctor but of late years; and therefore his authority herein must weigh the lighter. Neither doth he so call it according to the nature and common definition of a sacrament. For neither was there any certain element namely chosen, nor any special words appointed to make it a sacrament, nor any promise of grace thereto annexed. Only he calleth it a sacrament by a general kind of taking. And in that meaning St Hilary saith, "The sacrament of prayer:" "the sacrament of fasting:" "the sacrament of fulness:" "the sacrament of thirst:" "the sacrament of weeping⁷." And St Bernard in another place in like sort saith, "The sacrament of a painted cross⁸." And in this place he saith that the washing of feet betokeneth the washing and purging of venial sins, which signification he calleth a sacrament.

In Serm. de
Cœn. Dom.

Hilar. in
Matt. can. 5,
11, 12, 13.
Hilar. de
Trin. Lib. x.
Bernard de
bonis defen-
dendis.

But Christ saith: "I have given you an example, that, as ye have seen me do, ye also do the like." "Therefore," saith M. Harding, "this commandment bindeth as well as the other, Drink ye all of this." How may a man trust M. Harding in the dark, that will thus deceive him in the light? For he knoweth that the washing of feet was neither institution of Christ, nor any part of the sacrament, nor specially appointed to be done by the apostles, nor the breach thereof ever deemed sacrilege, as Gelasius writeth of this disorder of the half communion⁹. Whether the apostles for any time after Christ's resurrection observed it or no, it appeareth not. Neither is there anything, to my remembrance, written of it. As we may perceive by St Paul, it was an office more belonging unto women than unto men. And it seemeth by St Augustine, that this ceremony in the church had relation unto some other cause, and not unto the institution of Christ, neither to the example or practice of the apostles. For thus he writeth unto his friend Januarius touching the same: "If thou demand,

De Con. Dist.
Comperimus.

1 Tim. v.

August. ad
Januar. Epist.
118.

[⁴ Receive, 1611.]

[⁵ Transposeth, 1565, 1609.]

[⁶ ... habemus ejus sacramentum pedum ablutionem.—Bernard. Op. Par. 1690. In Cœn. Dom. Serm. 4. Vol. I. Tom. III. col. 891.]

[⁷ De orationis autem sacramento, &c.—Hilar. Op. Par. 1693. Comm. in Matt. cap. v. 1. col. 630. ... virtus interjecta verborum sacramentum et esuritionis et satietatis absolvit.—Id. ibid. cap. xii. 2. col. 668.

Quamquam ad fidei sacramentum, &c.—Id. ibid.

cap. xiii. 6. col. 676.

Qui sacramentum fletus, sitis atque esuritionis ignorat, &c.—Id. De Trin. Lib. x. 24. col. 1052.]

[⁸ Hujus rei sacramentum est, quod in dedicatione ecclesiarum depictas in pariete cruces oleo sancto pontifex linit.—Bernard. Op. Gaufrid. Abbat. Declam. ex Bern. xlvii. 58. Vol. II. Tom. v. col. 306.]

[⁹ Gelas. in Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugd. 1624. Decret. Gratian. Decr. Tert. Pars, De Consecr. Dist. ii. can. 12. col. 1918.]

Washing
of feet.

upon what consideration this ceremony of washing feet began first, notwithstanding I have well thought of it, yet can I find nothing that seemeth more likely than this; for that the bodies of them that had appointed to be baptized (at Easter), being ill cherished by reason of the Lenten fast, would have had some loathsomeness in the touching, unless they had been washed at some time before; and that therefore they chose this day chiefly to that purpose, upon which day the Lord's supper is yearly ¹celebrated²." Here St Augustine saith, it was the fulsomeness of the bodies, and loathsomeness of the senses, that first began this ceremony, and not the institution or commandment of Christ. But, as touching the ministration of the communion in both kinds, it is most certain that the apostles used it, and that Christ commanded it to be used still until his coming.

Matt. xx.

Matt. xviii.

Matt. x.
Matt. viii.

With what indifferent judgment then can M. Harding thus compare these things together; a sacrament with no sacrament; an institution with no institution; a thing that in the primitive church was everywhere used with that thing whereof no proof can be made that upon Christ's commandment it was ever used? Neither did Christ therefore so abase himself to wash his disciples' feet, to the intent they according to the letter should do the same; but in himself to shew them a perfect³ example of humility. For they were yet in a deep dream that Christ should come like a king with all worldly majesty, and that they should be princes, and sit with him to rule the world. Therefore, to break them out of this sleep, he took upon him this vile and servile office, that they might see that his coming was to serve them, and therefore might learn humility by his example, one of them to serve another. In like manner Christ set a child before his disciples, and willed them all to be as children. He bade them to shake off the dust from their shoes, and to carry neither rod nor scrip about them, and to salute no man upon the way; not that they should practise these things according to the rigour of the words, but to the intent that by the same they might be induced to a deeper understanding. Such was the sacrament and meaning of the washing of feet.

The reasons that follow are of like value. For Christ said not, Do this after supper, or sitting, or at a table, or being so many together. Neither did the apostles ever so understand his words. But, when he had ministered the sacrament unto his apostles in both kinds, he bade them do the same that he had done; and so they understood his words, and ministered the sacrament unto the people in both kinds accordingly.

The words of St Cyprian here alleged are spoken of sprinkling, or pouring on water over them that were baptized; which is but a ceremony, and therefore ought to be at liberty, and is not of the substance of baptism. Neither doth it follow: We may break a ceremony; *ergo*, we may break the substance of Christ's institution. This reason rather maketh against M. Harding and his fellows. For if "ceremonies should be used freely and without rigour," as St Cyprian saith, why then be they so precise in their oil, their balm, their lights, and other things of like value, that, be the abuse thereof never so great, yet they will remit nothing? And, if they be so precise and so earnest in ceremonies and devices of their own, how much more ought we to be earnest in matters touching the essential form of the institution of Christ?

M. HARDING. THE TENTH DIVISION.

I trust no man will gather of that I have said here, that it is none offence to do against God's commandment. My meaning is far otherwise. Neither say I that this saying of Christ in Matthew, "Drink ye all of this," or that in John, "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye shall not have life in you," or other commandments of Christ, be not to be kept; but this is that I say, and that

[¹ Celebrate, 1565.]

[² Si autem quaeris, cur etiam lavandi mos ortus sit: nihil mihi de hac re cogitanti probabilius occurrit, nisi quia baptizandorum corpora, per observationem quadragesimæ sordidata, cum offensione sensus ad fontem tractarentur, nisi aliqua die lavarentur:

istum autem diem potius ad hoc electum, quo cœna dominica anniversarie celebratur.—August. Op. Par. 1679-1700. Ad Inquis. Januar. seu Epist. liv. 10. Tom. II. col. 127.]

[³ Perfite, 1565.]

every catholic man saith, that the universal church doth better understand which are the commandments of Christ, and how they ought to be kept, than Berengarius, Wickleffe, Hus, Luther, Zuinglius, Calvin, Cranmer, Peter Martyr, or any their scholars and followers, which now be sundry sects. As for example, God hath thus commanded: "Thou shalt not swear;" and, "Thou shalt not kill;" and, "If thine eye cause thee to offend, pull him out and cast him away from thee." Whereas certain sects of heretics, as namely they which be called Waldenses and Picardi⁴, by their construction hereof have maintained opinion that no oath ought to be given or made in no case or respect; likewise that in no case or respect a man may do another to death; and also that, after the outward letter of the gospel, sometime a man is bound to pull out his eye and cast it from him; which thing hath been done by some of the Picardes, as it is reported, as though else God's commandment were not kept; this hath so been understood by the catholic church, confessing nevertheless these to be God's commandments, as in time, in place, and in certain cases, a man might and ought, without breach of commandment, both swear and kill, and likewise keep his eye in his head, and therein offended⁵ God nothing at all. So the catholic church understandeth, "Drink ye all of this," to be Christ's commandment, and of necessity to be observed; but of priests only—I mean of necessity, and that when in the sacrifice of the church is celebrated the memory of Christ's death—which in that degree be the successors of the apostles, to whom that commandment was specially given when they were consecrated priests of the new testament; who so did drink indeed, as St Mark witnesseth: Et biberunt ex eo omnes: "And they drank all of it." To these only, and to none other, the (55) catholic church hath ever referred the necessity of that commandment. Else if the necessity of it should pertain to all, and because Christ said, "Drink ye all of this," if all of every state and condition ought to drink of this cup of necessity⁷, how is it come to pass that our adversaries themselves (who pretend so strait a conscience herein) keep from it infants and young children, until they come to good years of discretion; specially whereas the custom of the primitive church was that they also should be partakers of this sacrament⁸, as it may plainly be seen in St Dionyse, Cyprian, Augustine, Innocentius, Zosimus, and other ancient fathers? What better reason have they to keep the infants from the cup, than the anabaptists have to keep them from their baptism? If they allege their impotency of remembering the⁹ Lord's death, the anabaptists will likewise allege their impotency of receiving and understanding doctrine, that Christ's institution in this behalf seemeth to require.

The fifty-fifth untruth. For⁶ the catholic or universal church never understood it so; but only the church of Rome, which is both late and mere particular.

Thus the adversaries of the church themselves do agnise¹⁰ that the use of the cup in the sacrament pertaineth not to all of necessity. So have they neither godly charity to join with the church, neither sufficient reason to impugn the church.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

The best defence to colour disobedience is to improve¹¹ God's commandment. Therefore saith M. Harding, "The half communion is no breach of Christ's institution. For Christ never commanded that the whole communion should be ministered unto the people in both kinds. And that (saith he) the church knoweth better than Luther, or Cranmer, or such others." Whatsoever ordinary light the church hath, she hath it not of herself, but of God's holy word, that is a lantern unto her feet. And it is no christian modesty to make such boasts of the gifts of God. God's holy "Spirit bloweth where it thinketh good." Daniel alone saw the innocency of Susanna: the judges and elders saw it not. Paphnutius alone was heard against all the rest of the Nicene council¹². St Hierome alone is received against all the whole council of Chalcedon¹³. And forasmuch as M. Harding delighteth himself with odious comparisons without cause, why may¹⁴ not a man

Psal. cxix.

John iii. Hist. Sus. Sozom. Lib. i. cap. xxii. xxxvi. Quæst. ii. Tria legit.

[⁴ See Mosheim, Cent. XIII. Part II. chaps. ii. v.]

[⁵ Offend, 1565, 1609, and H. A. 1564.]

[⁶ 1565 omits *for*.]

[⁷ Of necessity ought to drink of the cup, H. A. 1564.]

[⁸ See before, page 6.]

[⁹ Our, H. A. 1564.]

[¹⁰ Agnise: acknowledge.]

[¹¹ Improve: reprove, disprove.]

[¹² Sozom. in Hist. Eccles. Script. Amst. 1695-1700. Lib. i. cap. xxiii. pp. 356, 7.]

[¹³ Hieron. in Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugd. 1624. Decret. Gratian. Decr. Sec. Pars, Caus. xxxvi. Quæst. ii. can. 8. cols. 1882, 3. See also can. 4. col. 1881.]

[¹⁴ Might, 1565.]

likewise say, The primitive church in the time of the apostles and other catholic doctors and old councils, that ministered the whole sacrament unto the people in both kinds, understood Christ's institution as well as did afterward the council of Constance, in which council, holden fourteen hundred years after Christ and more, it was determined that the laity should content themselves only with the half communion in one kind? But therefore hath God given his holy scriptures, that the church should be directed, and never err. And St Augustine saith: *Dominus semper veraciter judicat: ecclesiastici autem judices, sicut homines, plerumque falluntur*¹." The Lord always judgeth truly; but the ecclesiastical judges, for that they be men, are oftentimes deceived.

The examples of killing, swearing, pulling out of eyes, eating of blood and strangled things, that are here brought in, stand more for a countenance, than for proof of the matter. Touching the first, God saith unto the private man: "Thou shalt not kill;" but unto the magistrate he saith: "Thine eye shall not spare: thou shalt not suffer the wicked sorcerer to live." This case was never doubtful; or if it were, let M. Harding shew in what council it was determined. Touching oaths, it is forbidden that any shall swear unadvisedly or without just cause, and so to abuse the name of God; but otherwise to swear before a judge, in the way of judgment, justice, and truth, God himself hath commanded.

The pulling out of the eye is an allegory, wherein by a figure or manner of speech one thing² is conceived of another, and Christ's meaning is, that whoso will follow him must pull out and cast from him his affections, his goods, and his friends, for the gospel's sake, yea, though he love them as his eyes. And if the Picard took it otherwise, it was an error of simplicity, much like the error of Origen³, and certain others, who, as it is written of them, grossly, and according to the letter, gelded themselves for the kingdom of heaven; or the error of the bishop of Rome, who, upon small occasion of these words, *Ecce duo gladii hic*, "Behold here be two swords," claimeth unto himself both the spiritual and also the temporal sword, and so the whole jurisdiction of all the world⁴.

The forbearing of blood and strangled meats began among the faithful in the time of the apostles, not as of God's commandment, or to continue for ever, but only of charity, to bear with the weakness of the Jews, until they might grow to a perfect⁵ knowledge in Christ; during which weakness this charitable order among the rest of the faithful Christians continued still, as may appear by Tertullian, by Arnobius, by Eusebius, by Cæcumenius, and others⁶: but after that the Jews were thoroughly persuaded that all creatures of God were clean, this forbearing, which began only for their sakes, had an end.

But how can M. Harding apply these things to his purpose? Or how can he hereby warrant the manifest breach of Christ's institution? The church in every of these orders was directed and guided by God's word. Touching killing, God saith unto the magistrate: "Thou shalt not suffer the wicked to live." Touching swearing, God saith: "Thou shalt swear in truth, in judgment, and in justice." Touching pulling out of our eyes, St Paul saith: "No man ever hated his own flesh, but doth nourish and cherish it." And touching blood and strangled meats, Christ saith: "The thing that entereth into the mouth defileth not the man." And St Paul saith: "Every creature of God is good." Therefore the church in these cases devised no new thing of herself, nor brake any of God's ordinances, but only followed the word of God.

Now of the other part, let M. Harding shew what word of God the church of Rome had to follow in the ordering of the half communion. Where did Christ or his apostles ever say, Let not the people receive the whole sacrament as it was ordained at the first, but let it be sufficient for them to receive one portion? If there be no such commandment to be shewed, then be not these cases like.

August. contra Cresc.
Gram. Lib. ii.
cap. xxi.

Exod. xx.
Lev. xx.
Deut. xviii.

Jer. iv.
Matt. v.

Euseb. Lib.
vi. cap. vii.

De Major. et
Obed. Unam
Sanctam.

[Acts xv.
1565.]

Jer. iv.
Eph. v.

[¹ August. Op. Par. 1679-1700. Cont. Cresc. Donatist. Lib. ii. cap. xxi. 26. Tom. IX. cols. 422, 3; where we read *ille* for *Dominus*, *judicet*, and *fallantur*.]

[² Things, 1609, 1611.]

[³ Euseb. in Hist. Eccles. Script. Amst. 1695-1700. Lib. vi. cap. viii. pp. 169, 70.]

[⁴ Bonifac. VIII. in Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugd. 1624. Extrav. Comm. De Major. et Obed. Lib. i. cap. 1. col. 208.]

[⁵ Perfite, 1565.]

[⁶ Tertull. Op. Lut. 1641. De Monogam. 5, p. 676; De Pudicit. 12. p. 728. For further authorities, see Bingham, Orig. Eccles. Book xvii. chap. v. 20.]

And if the cases be not like, why doth M. Harding deceive the world, and compare them thus together as though they were like? What, troweth he there is no difference between obeying God's commandment, and breaking God's commandment? Or thinketh he, because it was lawful for Abraham, having God's commandment, to have slain his son Isaac, that therefore it was lawful for him to slay Ismael also, having no commandment? It is a dangerous doctrine to say, the church is omnipotent, and may allow or disallow God's commandments without difference, at her pleasure. For, as it is discreetly noted by the emperors Valentinian and Martian, "Whosoever, after the truth is once found, seeketh further, he seeketh for a lie, and not for the truth⁷."

Gen. xi:ii.

In Edict.
Imp. Valent.
et Mart. in
Chalced. Con:
Act. iii.

"But to minister unto the vulgar lay-people in both kinds," saith M. Harding, "was not Christ's institution." Thus he saith, and saith it often, and only saith it. Other authority than his own he bringeth none. The reason that moveth him, I ween, is this; for that there was no lay-people at that banquet with Christ, but the apostles only. But this reason would spoil the lay-people not of one part only, but of all together. Surely one Lorichius, a doctor of M. Harding's own side, saith thus: *Ipsius sacramenti institutio vult, ut omnes una manducemus et bibamus*⁸: "The very institution of the sacrament willeth that we all eat and drink together." M. Harding's doctor saith: "It is Christ's institution." M. Harding himself saith: "It is not Christ's institution." Whether of them two a man may believe, I leave it to others. Howbeit in the mean time, while these doctors can better agree, it cannot be denied but Christ ministered unto his disciples the whole sacrament in both kinds, and gave them in charge, in plain express words, to do the same. But of the half communion in one kind Christ neither gave them charge, nor spake any one word at all. If M. Harding will reply, that Christ's words in this case be doubtful, and may be diversly taken, yet is that objection already answered. For the law saith: *Si de interpretatione legis quaeratur, in primis inspicendum est quo jure civitas retro in hujusmodi casibus usa fuerit. Optima enim est legum interpretatio consuetudo*⁹: "If question happen to be moved touching the meaning of a law, first of all we must see what order hath been used in the like cases in times past. For the custom and practice of the people is the best expounder of the law." Now it appeareth plainly that the custom and practice of the purest church in the time of the apostles, and others old catholic fathers, was, to minister unto the people in both kinds; whereof we may conclude that the same was Christ's institution and very meaning. But if M. Harding will apply the authority of custom unto his purpose, for that the common practice of the church of Rome for a few late years hath been to the contrary, that therefore this was Christ's meaning, this objection is also soon answered. For both law and common reason saith: *In ambiguo sermone non utrumque dicimus, sed id duntaxat quod volumus*¹⁰: "In a doubtful speech we speak not both the things (that may be gathered), but that thing only that we mean." Now, if Christ meant both the order that was practised by the apostles and old fathers, and also the contrary order, that of late hath been practised in the church of Rome; then had Christ, at one time, and in the uttering of one sentence, not only two, but also divers and contrary meanings, and so, by M. Harding's judgment, Christ must needs construe his own words in this wise: "Drink ye all of this;" I mean, let priests only drink of this. "Drink ye all;" I mean, some may not drink. "Drink ye all;" I mean contrary, drink ye not all. And when I say, "Do ye the same that I have done," my meaning is otherwise, do not the same that I have done. O M. Harding! it is an old saying: *Maledicta glossa quæ corrumpit textum*: "Cursed be that glossing construction that destroyeth the text."

De Miss. Pub.
Prorogand.De Legibus
et Senatus-
consult. et
Longa Con-
sue. Si de.De Rebus
Dubis.
In ambiguo.

Ye say, "The priests are bound of necessity to receive both kinds, but the lay-people is not bound." And so ye conclude that Christ ordained two sundry

[⁷ Quisquis enim post veritatem repertam aliquid ulterius discutit, mendacium quaerit.—Edict. Valent. et Marc. Imp. in Concil. Chalced. Act. 111. in Crabb. Concil. Col. Agrip. 1551. Tom. I. p. 863.]

[⁸ Sed major profecto ejus rei causa est, ipsius sacramenti institutio, quæ vult &c.—Ger. Lorich. De

Miss. Pub. Prorogand. 1536. Lib. 11. cap. iii. p. 214.]

[⁹ Callistr. in Corp. Jur. Civil. Amst. 1663. Digest. Lib. 1. Tit. iii. 37. Tom. I. p. 79; where we find *ejusmodi* and *interpretes*.]

[¹⁰ Paul. in eod. Digest. Lib. xxxiv. Tit. v. 3. Tom. I. p. 487.]

Hieron.
1 Cor. xi.
Chrysost.
2 Cor. xviii.

communions, the one not like the other; the one for the priests, the other for the people. And therefore by your advice we must correct St Hierome, that saith, "The Lord's supper must be common to all¹;" and likewise Chrysostom, that saith, "In the holy mysteries there is no difference between the priest and the people²." For it is now otherwise agreed that the Lord's supper may not be common unto all, and that in the mysteries there must be a difference between the priest and the people.

The objection that is made of keeping children from the communion is but childish, and nothing to the matter. For in so doing we divide not the mysteries, nor break any part of Christ's institution; no more than when, by order of excommunication, we remove the wicked from the whole use of the sacrament. For notwithstanding it appear by St Augustine, St Cyprian, and others, that infants in the primitive church in sundry places were admitted to the holy communion³, yet afterward, upon good advice, they were justly removed from it; because that, being in that age, they were not thought able to examine and prove themselves according to the doctrine of St Paul, and so to eat of that bread, and to drink of that cup. In like sort in the law of Moses, notwithstanding all men-children were commanded to be circumcised, yet none were admitted to eat the passover but only such as could demand what it meant.

"The church," saith M. Harding, "is the interpreter of God's mind. The church knoweth that this was not Christ's institution." Verily, if the church know it now at last, she hath been long in learning this lesson. For the old catholic church, as it is well known, took it far otherwise, and that following the plain words of God, whereby God's ordinary way is to reveal his mind; and because Christ ministered unto his disciples in both kinds, and commanded them to do the same, therefore that church understood him, even as his words sounded, and ministered unto the people the whole communion in both kinds.

Now, whereas M. Harding saith, "The church of Rome of late years hath more secret intelligence of God's mind than the elder church had at any time before;" methinketh he imagineth Christ thus to say to his apostles: "Do the same to others that ye have seen me do to you. For a time it shall be lawful: after it shall not be lawful. Now it is my institution: the time shall come when it shall be no longer my institution. After fourteen hundred years there shall be a certain council of five hundred bishops and eight hundred monks and friars: there shall be terrible contention whether the pope be above the council, or the council above the pope. One pope shall be deposed: another shall be erected against him; and so two popes at one time. The one shall excommunicate and curse, and seek all means to depose the other. Kings and princes shall be in parts. The whole world shall be troubled. Then shall these matters be concluded. That I command, they shall break: that I bind, they shall loose." Unless M. Harding give such exposition to Christ's words, he cannot be greatly relieved by them. Thus have we reason sufficient to open the error of M. Harding's church, and godly charity to join with the old catholic church of the apostles and holy fathers, which, we doubt not, was the church of God.

M. HARDING. THE ELEVENTH DIVISION.

And although herein we could be content infants not to be spoken of, yet it may easily be proved that the communion under both kinds hath not ever been general. And as we do not condemn it, but confess it might be restored again by the authority of the church lawfully assembled in a general council, upon mature deliberation before had, and a wholesome remedy against the inconveniences thereof provided; even so are we able to shew good authority for the defence of the one kind now used in the church.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

M. Harding would have us put God's word to daying, and none otherwise to be obedient to Christ's commandment, than if a few bishops gathered at

[¹ Hieron. Op. Par. 1693-1706. Comm. in Epist. 1. ad Cor. cap. xi. Tom. V. col. 997.]

Cor. Hom. xviii. Tom. X. p. 568.]

[² Chrysost. Op. Par. 1718-38. In Epist. 11. ad

[³ See before, p. 6.]

Trident shall allow it. But we may answer such a council as king Agesilaus sometime answered the Macedonians, through whose country he desired to have passage against his enemies. For when they had sent him word that the matter was great, and that therefore they would well consider of it: "Let them consider," said he, "while they list; but in the mean time I will pass through." If the council, upon advice, will restore again the whole communion, why then doth pope Leo call it "the heresy of the Greeks and of the Bohemians?" Or why doth Gerson entitle his book, *Contra hæresim communicandi laicos sub utraque specie*? "Against the heresy of communicating the lay-people under both kinds?" I trow, councils be not called to restore the world to heresies. The great inconveniences, that M. Harding would have a general council to make provisos for, are noted by Gerson, the greatest promoter of the council of Constance, and are these:

Emmaus.

In Bulla Leonis x. Gerson.

The liquor might⁵ be shed:

It cannot be carried about without danger:

In winter it would soon sour, and turn to vinegar:

In summer it would putrefy, and breed worms:

It would be loathsome for men to drink:

In some countries it is hard to be gotten:

The lay-people should touch the cup:

Some of them have beards, some have palsies:

The dignity of the priest and layman should be all one⁶.

These and other like inconveniences are such as Christ and his apostles never knew; yet the council that is now holden at Trident, upon mature and solemn deliberation, hath pronounced and published: "If any man will say that these be not just causes why the people should stand content with the half communion, accursed be he⁷."

And notwithstanding the bishops in that council have already yielded that certain countries and kingdoms may use the whole communion, according to Christ's institution⁸, yet have they added so fond conditions unto the same, that all men may see they sit there only for a countenance to mock the world.

M. HARDING. THE TWELFTH DIVISION.

And because M. Jewel beareth the world in hand nothing can be brought for it of our side, some places I will allege here that seem to me very evidently to prove that the use of both kinds hath not always been thought necessary to all persons, and that the communion under one kind hath been practised and holden for good within the six hundred years after Christ, that he would so fain bind us unto.

*Here may be alleged, first, the example of our Lord himself, out of the twenty-fourth chapter of St Luke, which is spoken of before, where it is declared that he gave the sacrament unto⁹ the two disciples at Emmaus under *the form of bread only; which place ought to have the more weight of authority, in a catholic man's judgment, because it is brought by the council of *Constance, and also by the council of Basil, for proof of the communion under one kind. That it was the sacrament, the ancient doctors do affirm it plainly; and the words, conferred with the words of our Lord's supper, do agree. And that it is not needful of our own head to add thereto the administration of the cup, as our adversaries do by their figure Synecdoche, it appeareth by that those two disciples declared to the twelve apo-*

[Proofs for communion under one kind. H. A. 1564.]

*S. Luke nameth neither 'form' nor 'only.'
*In the year of our Lord 1414.

[⁴ ...hæresin etiam Græcorum et Bohemicam expressæ continentes, &c.—Bull. Leon. Papæ X. adv. Luth. in Concil. Stud. Labb. et Cossart. Lut. Par. 1671-2. Tom. XIV. col. 391.]

[⁵ Mought, 1565.]

[⁶ Primum periculum in effusione. Secundum in deportatione de loco ad locum. Tertium in vasorum sordidatione ... Quartum in barbis longis laicorum. Quintum in conservatione pro infirmis; quoniam posset in vase acetum generari ... addito quod in æstate bibliones aut muscæ generarentur...quandoque etiam putresceret, aut fieret velut abominabile ad bibendum: ...Sextum damnum esset in sumptuositate vini,

saltem apud multas partes in quibus vix invenitur vinum, &c.—Gerson. Op. Antw. 1706. Contr. Hæ. de Com. Laic. sub Utr. Spec. Tom. I. Pars III. cols. 467, 8.]

[⁷ Si quis dixerit, sanctam ecclesiam catholicam non justis causis et rationibus adductam fuisse, ut laicos, atque etiam clericos non conficientes, sub panis tantummodo specie communicaret, aut in eo errasse, anathema sit.—Concil. Trident. in Concil. Stud. Labb. et Cossart. Sess. xxi. can. 2. Tom. XIV. col. 847.]

[⁸ See before, page 205, note 4.]

[⁹ To, H. A. 1564.]

Emmaus. stles, assembled together in Hierusalem, how they knew our Lord in fractione panis, "in breaking of the bread" to them, which cannot be taken for the wine. And as soon as they knew him in breaking of the bread, he vanished away from their sight, ere that he took the cup into his hands, and blessed it, and gave it unto them, (56) as it appeareth evidently enough to St Augustine, to Bede, and to all other that be not wilfully opinative.

The fifty-sixth untruth. For neither S. Augustine, nor Bede, nor any other ancient father, hath any such word, but rather the contrary.

Again, what need is it to use violence in this scripture, and join unto it a patch of our own device, by so simple a warrant of a figure, sith that, according to the mind of the learned fathers, Christ gave here to the two disciples, not a piece of the sacrament, but the whole sacrament? as it is proved by the effect of the same; and the effect presupposeth the cause. For St Augustine confesseth by that sacrament of bread (so he calleth it), Unitate corporis . . . participata, removeri . . . impedimentum inimici, ut Christus possit² agnosc³; "That thereby they were made partakers of the unity of Christ's body, that is to say, made one body with Christ, and that all impediment or let of the enemy, the devil, was taken away, so as Christ might be acknowledged." What more should they have gotten, if they had received the cup also?

[De Consensu Evangelistarum. Lib. iii. cap. xxv. H.A. 1564.]

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

If I would speak only by authority, and prove nothing, as M. Harding's wont is, I might answer all this matter in three words:

First, that the bread that Christ brake at Emmaus was common table-bread, and not the sacrament.

Secondly, that, albeit some writers seem to call it the sacrament, yet none of them saith it was ministered in one kind; as M. Harding by his slender guesses would seem to gather.

Thirdly, although he were able to prove that Christ so ministered at that time, and in that place, yet were all this nothing to prove his purpose. For we join issue of the people; he answereth of the priests. I speak of the church; he speaketh of an inn. And to conclude, by this example it appeareth that Christ himself received in one kind; which one thing overthroweth all that M. Harding hath built.

And because he maketh himself so sure and certain that Christ at Emmaus ministered the sacrament, it may please him to remember, that even the same doctors that he hath here alleged, and divers others of late years, upon good consideration have said it was not the sacrament. St Augustine saith the breaking of bread there was hospitality, and entertaining of strangers. His words be these: *Quia hospitalitatem sectati sunt, eum, quem in . . . expositione scripturarum non agnoverunt, in panis fractione cognoscunt*⁴: "Because they were given to hospitality, they knew him in the breaking of bread, whom they knew not in the expounding of the scriptures." Which thing St Gregory uttereth in plainer manner: *Mensam [igitur] ponunt, [panes] cibos[que] offerunt, et Deum, quem in scripturarum expositione non cognoverant, in panis fractione cognoscunt*⁵: "They lay the table, and set forth bread and meat, and God, whom they knew not in the expounding of the scriptures, they know in the breaking of bread." It were hard to say, the setting forth of bread and meat upon a table in an hostery was the ministration of the sacrament. And, to leave Bede and others, that follow the same exposition, Dionysius, one of late years, and therefore led away with many errors, according to the weakness of that time, saith thus: *Accepit panem et benedixit: non tamen in suum corpus convertit, sicut in cœna; sed ut moris est benedicere cibum*⁶: "He took bread and blessed it; but he turned it not into his body, as he did at his supper; but only as the manner is, to say grace, or to bless the meat."

Aug. in Caten. in xxiv. Luc.

Greg. in Evangel. Hom. 23.

Dionys. in xxiv. Lucæ.

[¹ 1565 omits *for*.]

[² Posset, 1565, and H. A. 1564.]

[³ August. Op. Par. 1679-1700. De Consens. Evang. Lib. iii. cap. xxv. 72. Tom. III. Pars ii. col. 142.]

[⁴ August. in Caten. Aur. in Thom. Aquinat. Op. Venet. 1595. Sup. Luc. xxiv. Tom. XV. fol. 209. 2; where *cognoverunt*. Op. Quæst. Evang. Lib.

ii. Quæst. li. Tom. III. Pars ii. col. 276; where the reading is *cognoverant*.]

[⁵ Gregor. Magni Papæ I. Op. Par. 1705. In Evang. Lib. ii. Hom. xxiii. Tom. I. col. 1538; where we find *scripturæ sacræ*.]

[⁶ Dionys. Carthus. in Nov. Test. Col. 1532. In Evang. Luc. Enarr. cap. xxiv. Art. 50. Tom. I. fol. 271. 2.]

So likewise saith Antonius Julianus: *Accepit panem . . . benedixit . . . fregit, et porrigebat illis, sicut consueverat . . . ante passionem*⁷: "He took bread, blessed it, brake it, and gave it unto them, as his manner was before his passion." Lyra saith they knew him, for that "he brake the bread so even as if he had cut it with a knife"⁸. By these writers it appeareth it was common bread that Christ gave to his disciples, and not the sacrament.

Emmaus.

Anton. Julianus in Postilla majori. Nicol. Lyra.

And whereas M. Harding allegeth St Augustine to the contrary, if he had considered the words of one William Wideford, a doctor of his own side, which he useth against Wickliffe, I reckon, either he would have better advised himself, or else would have refused his own doctor. Wideford's words be these: *Hic dico, quod non habetur ex textu, vel ex glossa Lucæ xxiv, vel per antiquos doctores, quod ille panis, quem [Christus] fregit post resurrectionem . . . fuit consecratus, vel . . . sacramentalis . . . Ideo inepte . . . et consequenter dico, quod falso allegat auctoritatem Augustini*⁹: "This I say, it cannot be gathered neither by the text of St Luke, nor by the gloss, nor by the ancient doctors, that the bread that Christ brake after his resurrection was the consecrate or sacramental bread. And therefore I say that foolishly, and by consequence that falsely, he allegeth St Augustine to this purpose."

Wil. Wideford contra Wiclevum.

"The two councils of Constance and Basil thus understood the words of St Luke; and that," saith M. Harding, "in a catholic man's judgment ought to weigh much." The former of these two councils was holden but of late days, above fourteen hundred years after Christ, and the weight of them is already determined by others. For all the Dominick friars, and all others that held with Thomas of Aquine, which thought themselves to be the best learned that were then alive, utterly refused the council of Basil, and said it was never lawfully called together¹⁰.

Ludovic. Vives in xx. de Civit. Dei, cap. xxvi.

And Albertus Pighius saith that both these councils, as well that of Basil as the other of Constance, "decreed against the order of nature, against the manifest scriptures, against the authority of all antiquity, and against the catholic faith of the church"¹¹.

Pigh. in Hierarch.

Those be the two councils that M. Harding would have to weigh so deeply in a catholic man's conscience. Neither can it justly be replied, that any of these were Lutherans. For the Dominick friars were a hundred years before Luther ever preached; and Albertus Pighius wrote namely and of purpose against Luther. Verily these councils seem over light to weigh down all the old councils of grave and catholic fathers that were before them. Touching the authority of councils, because they seem oftentimes to vary, Gelasius thought it best to take up the matter thus: *In gestis conciliorum, quotiescunque discors sententia invenitur, illius concilii sententia magis teneatur, cujus antiquior et potior extat auctoritas*¹²: "Whensoever contrariety in sentence is found in the acts of councils, let the sentence of that council be taken that hath the elder and better authority." If this determination of Gelasius be good, there is no cause why these two so late councils should weigh down any catholic man's conscience, specially against so many contrary councils as have been before. Doubtless it is a marvellous case, that either of these two councils should at last see that thing in the words of St Luke that the council of the apostles could not see.

Dist. 50. Dominico Saneto.

Yet, to help M. Harding forthward, let us grant St Augustine understood these words of the sacrament. Indeed, he calleth it in the same place *sacramentum panis*, "the sacrament of bread;" meaning thereby that the substance of bread in the same remaineth still; but he calleth it not, "the form or shadow of bread," as M. Harding doth. But let us grant it was the sacrament.

Now have an eye, good reader, to M. Harding's fingers, and mark how he juggleth with St Augustine's words. St Augustine saith, *Per sacramentum panis*

Aug. de Consens. Evang. Lib. iii. cap. xxv.

[⁷ Postill. Maj. Lugd. 1525. Fer. ii. post Pasch. Evang. fol. 173.]

[⁸ Sic enim frangebatur panem ac si scinderetur cum cultello . . . cognoverunt eum per modum fractionis panis.—Bibl. cum Gloss. Ord. et Expos. N. de Lyra, Basil. 1502. Luc. cap. xxiv. Pars V. fol. 182. 2.]

[⁹ Wicliffe. Wodford. adv. Johan. Wiclef. in Fascic. Rer. Expet. et Fug. Lond. 1690. Tom. I. p. 198.]

[¹⁰ August. De Civit. Dei, per Joan. Lud. Vivem, Basil. 1522. Comm. in Lib. xx. cap. xxvi. p. 702.]

[¹¹ Pigh. Hierarch. Eccles. Assert. Col. 1538. Lib. vi. cap. ii. fol. 213. 2. See before, page 35, note 7.]

[¹² Isidor. in Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugd. 1624. Decret. Gratian. Decr. Prima Pars, Dist. l. can. 28. col. 251; where we find *quotiescunque in gestis, magis teneatur sententia, et aut antiquior, aut potior*.]

...*unitate corporis...participata*¹: these plain words it liketh M. Harding to English thus: "Thereby they were made partakers of the unity of Christ's body, that is to say, made one body with Christ's²." Alas! this was no part of St Augustine's mind. Beware, good reader; this man seeketh ways to deceive thee. Lyra himself confesseth that these words of St Augustine have *mysticam interpretationem*, "a mystical understanding;" and may not be taken neither of the sacrament, nor of Christ's natural body, but of his body mystical, which is the church; and that whosoever is partaker or member of the church knoweth Christ; whosoever is without the church knoweth not Christ. But who can better report the same than St Augustine himself? His words be these, plain and clear, and in the same place; howbeit M. Harding thought good to dissemble them: *Nec quisquam se Christum agnovisse arbitretur, si ejus corporis particeps non est, id est, ecclesie; cujus unitatem in sacramento panis apostolus commendat, dicens, Unus panis, unum corpus multi sumus*³: "Let no man think he knoweth Christ, unless he be partaker of his body, that is to say, of the church; the unity of which church the apostle commendeth in the sacrament of bread, saying, 'We being many, are one bread, and one body.'" The church was that body whereof the two disciples were made partakers and members, and so came to the knowledge of Christ.

Now, notwithstanding we have granted that St Augustine expoundeth this place of the sacrament, yet doth not St Augustine say that Christ ministered the half sacrament to his disciples in one kind only. But saith M. Harding, "Luke speaketh only of the bread; *ergo*, there was no wine."

This argument may be good in M. Harding's divinity; but it is of small force in good logic.

"As for your synecdoche, whereby of the part ye understand the whole," saith M. Harding, "it is but a patch of your device, and will not serve." Yet St Augustine, St Gregory, Bede, Julianus, Dionysius, Lyra, Wideford, and others that understand these words of St Luke of hospitality, must needs crave the warrant of a figure, and, under the name of bread, must needs conceive meat and wine also; otherwise there had been a very simple and a dry feast. Now, if M. Harding can allow them the figure of synecdoche, why may not he as well allow us the same? It is a manner of speech commonly used in all the scriptures.

"But Christ straightway vanished from their sight upon the breaking of the bread, and therefore had no leisure to deliver the other portion: neither is there any mention made of the cup." O what miserable straits these men be driven into! To make up their tale, they are glad to say that Christ lacked leisure. "But there is nothing written of the cup." I grant. Neither is there anything there written that Christ did consecrate the bread. And this place is privileged above all others. We must conceive no more of it than is spoken. Then was there a sacrament without consecration. Neither is there anything there written, that either Christ himself or the disciples did eat the bread. Thus hath M. Harding, with much ado, found out at last, not a communion of one kind, that he sought for, but a communion of no kind at all. And so have we a sacrament without sacrament, and a communion without communion.

What shall I say further? If I grant M. Harding his whole demand, yet hath he won nothing against me, but very much against himself. For the question is moved of lay-people: M. Harding bringeth examples of Christ and two disciples, who were of the number of the seventy and two that were sent abroad to preach the gospel; and therefore it may well be thought they were ministers, and not of the lay sort. Lyra and others think the one of them was St Luke himself⁴. Epiphanius thinketh it was Nathaniel⁵. Therefore M. Harding may well gather hereof, that priests may receive in one kind; which thing he will in no wise grant:

Lyra in Luc.
cap. xxiv.
Epiph. contra
Saturnil.

[¹ August. Op. Par. 1679-1700. De Consens. Evang. Lib. III. cap. xxv. 72. Tom. III. Pars II. col. 142; where *ad for per*.]

[² Christ, 1565, 1609.]

[³ Id. *ibid.* col. 141; where *ne for nec*, and *commendat apostolus*.]

[⁴ Alius dicitur fuisse Lucas evangelista: propter

quod et nomen suum tacuit.—Bibl. cum Gloss. Ord. et Expos. N. de Lyra, Basil. 1502. Luc. cap. xxiv. Pars V. fol. 182.]

[⁵ ... ὁ Λουκᾶς διαβεβαιούται αὐτὸν τὸν Σωτῆρα μετὰ τὸ ἀναστῆναι ... ὥφθαι κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν τοῖς περὶ τὸν Ναθαναὴλ καὶ τὸν Κλεόπαν.—Epiph. Op. Par. 1622. Adv. Hær. Lib. I. Tom. I. p. 67.]

but he can conclude nothing against the people. Such luck hath he to allege matter against himself.

M. HARDING. THE THIRTEENTH DIVISION.

Here might be alleged the place of the Acts in the second chapter, where mention is made of the communion of breaking of the bread, the cup not spoken of; which the heretics called Waldenses did confess that it must be understood of the sacrament, In confessione ad Uladislau⁶; and likewise the place of the twentieth chapter, and specially that of the twenty-seventh chapter of the Acts, (57) where Chrysostom and other fathers understand the bread that St Paul, in peril of shipwreck, took, gave thanks over, brake, and ate, to be the holy sacrament⁸.

The fifty-seventh untruth. For Chrysostom understandeth it of common meat.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

He thought it not good to recite the words, as knowing they would not greatly serve his purpose. "That the two former places were meant of the sacrament, it appeareth," saith he, "not only by the Waldenses, but also by the exposition of the old fathers." Yet could none of them, in either of these places, ever find out the half communion in one kind. "But here is no mention of the cup; ergo (saith M. Harding), the communion was ministered in bread alone." A learned man, before he conclude so unadvisedly, should foresee what would follow. M. Harding granteth, as shall hereafter appear, that if a priest do communicate in one kind alone, he committeth sacrilege; for so it is determined by Gelasius. Now let us lay these two verities of M. Harding's both together. The first is, if a priest minister in one kind, he committeth sacrilege: the second is, the apostles were priests, and ministered only in one kind; for here is no manner mention of the cup. These both be M. Harding's premises. Hereof it must necessarily follow, and cannot be avoided, that the apostles of Christ committed sacrilege. But what will not these men grant, to win their purpose?

M. Harding's conclusion, that the apostles of Christ committed sacrilege.

The weight of M. Harding's argument is taken, as they name it in schools, *ab auctoritate negative*; and, unless it be in consideration of some other circumstance, it is so simple, that a very child may soon answer it. For as he saith here, "There is no mention made but of breaking of bread; ergo, there was no cup;" so might he also say, There is no mention made but of breaking of bread; ergo, there was not Christ's body. Or thus: Jacob went down into Egypt with threescore and ten souls; ergo, in his company he had no bodies. Certainly, as the soul in that place importeth the whole man, even so in the other place the breaking of bread importeth the whole ministration.

Gen. xlv.

As for the breaking of bread in the twenty-seventh of the Acts, which place (as it is avouched) Chrysostom understandeth of the sacrament, verily M. Harding was therein much overseen. For the text is clear: if St Paul gave the sacrament, being at that time in the ship, he gave it only unto infidels, that knew not Christ. And Chrysostom's exposition, even in the same place, is plain to the contrary. For thus he enlargeth St Paul's words, that he spake to the mariners: *Obsecro vos, ut sumatis cibum: hoc enim ad salutem vestram fuerit: hoc est, ne forsan fame pereatis, cibum sumite*⁹: "I pray you take some sustenance; it is behoveful for you that ye so do. That is to say, take some meat, lest perhaps ye die for hunger." Now let M. Harding either say these words are spoken of the sacrament, or confess that he hath made untrue report of his doctor.

M. Harding misreporteth¹⁰ St Chrysostom.

M. HARDING. THE FOURTEENTH DIVISION.

It is not to be marvelled at, albeit St Paul delivered to the Corinthians the institution of our Lord's supper under both kinds, that yet, upon occasion given, and

[⁶ Profess. Fid. Fratr. Wald. ad Ulad. in Fascic. Rer. Expet. et Fug. Lond. 1690. Tom. I. p. 170.]

[⁷ 1565 omits *for*.]

[⁸ Et Paulus navigans non solum benedixit panem, sed de manu sua porrexit Lucæ et ceteris discipulis suis. Quod autem de manu porrigitur, nec animalibus dandum est, nec infidelibus porrigendum;

quia non solum sanctificatum, sed etiam sanctificatio est, &c.—Chrysost. Op. Par. 1718–38. Opus Imperf. in Matt. Hom. xvii. ex cap. vii. p. lxxxviii; which passage favours Harding's notion: but see Chrysostom again as referred to in the next note.]

[⁹ Id. In Act. Apost. Hom. liii. Tom. IX. p. 401.]

[¹⁰ Misreporteth, 1565, 1609.]

The fifty-eighth untruth. For St Paul never ministered the communion so.

The fifty-ninth untruth. For immediately before he saith: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communication of Christ's blood?"

when condition of time so required, (58) he ministered the communion under one kind; sith that (without doubt) he took that holy mystery under one kind for the whole sacrament, as we perceive by his words, where he saith, *Unus panis, et unum corpus, multi sumus, omnes qui de uno pane participamus*: "One bread, and one body, we (being many) are, all that do participate of one bread." (59) Where he speaketh nothing of the cup. And likewise by his words, where he speaketh disjunctively, as the Greek and the true Latin text hath: *Quicumque manducaverit panem, vel biberit calicem Domini indigne, reus erit corporis et sanguinis Domini*: "Whosoever eateth the bread or drinketh of the cup of our Lord unworthily, he shall be guilty of the body and blood of the² Lord." Whereon dependeth an argument of the contrary, that whosoever eateth³ this bread worthily, or drinketh this cup worthily, he eateth and drinketh righteousness and life.

1 Cor. xi.
H. A. 1564.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

"It is no marvel," saith M. Harding, "though St Paul ministered sometimes in one kind." But it is much to be marvelled that any christian man durst ever thus boldly to publish open error under the name of St Paul. What would not these men take in hand to prove, that dare thus to allege St Paul himself against himself, and that without any testimony, or word of St Paul? "Yes, marry," saith M. Harding, "St Paul saith, 'We being many are one bread, and one body;' and speaketh nothing of the cup." Here, by the way, M. Harding chargeth St Paul with manifest sacrilege. For it is already confessed by all them of that side, that it is sacrilege if a priest, such as St Paul was, do minister and receive the sacrament under one kind.

M. Harding chargeth St Paul with sacrilege.

"But," he saith, "there is nothing spoken of the cup." What may we think hereof? Whether is this man himself blind, or thinketh he all others to be blind? Is there nothing there spoken of the cup? O good christian reader, mark the dealing of this man, and beware of him. Unless thou consider well the places that he allegeth, he may soon deceive thee. Thus lie St Paul's words: "The cup of the blessing, which we bless, is it not the communication of the blood of Christ? The bread that we break, is it not the communication of the body of Christ? For we, being many, are one bread and one body, all that be partakers of one bread." Here St Paul distinctly nameth both parts together, and the cup before the bread. "Yet," saith M. Harding, "there is nothing spoken here of the cup." If he hath⁴ dealt faithfully herein, thou mayest trust him further for the rest. Verily St Hierome noteth it thus: *Ideo de calice primum dixit, ut posset postea de pane latius disputare*⁵: "Therefore St Paul spake first of the cup, that he might afterward entreat more at large of the bread."

1 Cor. x.

M. Harding misreporteth St Paul's words.

Hieron. in 1 Cor. x.

"Further," saith M. Harding, "St Paul useth a disjunctive, as appeareth both by the Greek, and also by the true Latin text." Such diligence and circumspection in searching the scriptures for defence of a truth is much to be commended. For there may be oftentimes⁶ great weight in one letter, as appeareth by sundry disputations between the Christians and the Arians. But this man seeketh so narrowly only to find some covert for his error. St Hierome, Anselmus, Haimo⁷, and many others, both in the text and in the exposition of the same place, use the copulative. Notwithstanding, to grant M. Harding his disjunctive, yet, if he be so skilful in the digest, as in other places of his book he would seem to be, he might soon remember that the very discretion of the law hath determined, that sometimes disjunctives stand instead of copulatives, sometimes copulatives instead of disjunctives: *Sæpe ita comparatum est, ut [et] conjuncta pro disjunctis accipiantur, et disjuncta pro conjunctis*⁸.

De Verb. et Rerum Significatione.

[¹ 1565 omits *for*.]

[² Our, H. A. 1564.]

[³ Either eateth, H. A. 1564.]

[⁴ Have, 1565, 1609.]

[⁵ Hieron. Op. Par. 1693-1706. Comm. in Epist. 1. ad Cor. cap. x. Tom. V. col. 995; where *ideo primum calicem nominavit, ut posset de pane, &c.*]

[⁶ Oft-times, 1565.]

[⁷ Id. Comm. in Epist. 1. ad Cor. cap. xi. Tom. V. col. 998.]

Anselm. Op. Col. Agrip. 1612. In 1. ad Cor. cap. xi. Tom. II. p. 148.]

Haym. in Paul. Epist. Interp. 1528. Ad Cor. 1. cap. xi. fol. x. ii.]

[⁸ Paul. in Corp. Jur. Civil. Amst. 1663. Digest. Lib. 1. Tit. xvi. 53. Tom. I. p. 778.]

But if M. Harding have so good eye to one little disjunctive, and mean uprightly, why doth he so blindly pass by so many copulatives in the self-same place altogether? For St Paul saith: "As often as ye shall eat of this bread, and drink of this cup;" and again: "Let a man examine himself, and so eat of that bread, and drink of that cup;" and again: "He that eateth and drinketh unworthily eateth and drinketh his own damnation:" here be four copulatives together. And by these it were good reason that M. Harding should expound his disjunctive; specially for that St Paul, recording the institution, useth a copulative; and the order of the primitive church, and the exposition of St Hierome and others, is agreeable to the same. In such cases Tertullian hath given a good rule: *Oportet secundum plura intelligi pauciora. Sed proprium hoc est omnium hæreticorum. Nam quia pauca sunt, quæ in sylva invenire⁹ possunt, pauca adversus plura defendunt, et posteriora adversus priora suscipiunt¹⁰*: "It is meet that we expound the fewer places according to the more. But this is the very cast of all heretics. For because there be few things to be found in the wood, or in the multitude, therefore they defend a few things against many, and things lately devised, against the first." Thus doth M. Harding, as we plainly see; "and this," saith Tertullian, "is the very cast of all heretics." 1 Cor. xi.
Likewise also the cup.
Tertull. adv. Præxearn.

M. HARDING. THE FIFTEENTH DIVISION.

For this purpose we have a notable place in the Hebrew gospel of St Matthew, which St Hierome saith he saw in the library of Cæsarea, and translated it. This place is cited by St Hierome in his book, *De Ecclesiasticis Scriptoribus*, in Jacobo fratre Domini: the words touching the communion, that St Hierome rehearseth, agree thoroughly with those of St Luke xxiv. chap. Mattheus sic refert: Dominus autem, &c.: "Matthew reporteth thus: When our Lord had given his shroud unto the bishop's servant, he went to James, and appeared to¹¹ him; for James had made an oath that he would not eat bread from that hour he drank of the cup of the¹² Lord, until he saw him raised from the dead." It followeth a little after: Afferte, ait Dominus, mensam et panem. Statimque addit: Tulit panem, et benedixit, et¹³ fregit, ac¹⁴ dedit Jacobo Justo, et dixit ei, Frater, ... comedite panem tuum, quia resurrexit Filius hominis a dormientibus¹⁵: "Bring the table, and set on bread, quoth our Lord; and by and by it is added, He took bread, and blessed it, and brake it, and gave it to James the just, and said unto him, My brother, eat thy bread; for the Son of man is risen again from the dead." No man can doubt but this was the sacrament. And wine was there none given, for anything that may be gathered. For it is not likely that St James had wine in his house then; forasmuch as Egesippus, who was not long after him, witnesseth of him, that he never drank wine but at our Lord's supper¹⁶.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

What shall need long answer to him that allegeth nothing? Here is no word spoken of the sacrament, no more than when Christ did eat of the broiled fish and of the honeycomb. And other proof thereof there is none brought, but words and boldness. For shew and countenance of somewhat there is brought forth the gospel of St Matthew, and that written in Hebrew, as though St Matthew had written two gospels, in two sundry tongues; and not only two, but also divers. I know it is thought of some that St Matthew wrote his gospel in Hebrew; and, by report of Theophylactus, St John the evangelist translated the same into Greek¹⁷. But that there should be any contrariety or diversity of story, or matter, as M. Harding seemeth to mean, I have not heard. Luke xxiv.

[⁹ Inveniri, 1565, 1609.]

[¹⁰ Tertull. Op. Lut. 1641. Adv. Prax. 20. p. 651; where we have *cum oporteat*, and *inveniri*.]

[¹¹ Unto, H. A. 1564.] [¹² Our, H. A. 1564.]

[¹³ Ac, H. A. 1564.] [¹⁴ Et, H. A. 1564.]

[¹⁵ Evangelium quoque quod appellatur secundum Hebræos, et a me nuper in Græcum Latinumque sermonem translatus est, quo et Origenes sæpe utitur, post resurrectionem Salvatoris refert: 'Dominus autem cum dedisset sindonem servo sacerdotis, ivit ad Jacobum, et apparuit ei. Juraverat enim Jacobus,

se non comesturum panem ab illa hora qua biberat calicem Domini, donec videret eum resurgentem a dormientibus.' Rursusque post paululum: 'Afferte, ait, &c. ... additur ... ac fregit, et, &c.'—Hieron. Op. Catal. Script. Eccles. 2. Tom. IV. Pars II. col. 102.]

[¹⁶ See the next page, note 4.]

[¹⁷ 'Ο τοίνυν Ματθαῖος πρῶτος πάντων ἔγραψε τὸ εὐαγγέλιον Ἑβραϊδὶ φωνῇ ... μετέφρασε καὶ τοῦτο Ἰωάννης ἀπὸ τῆς Ἑβραϊδοῦ γλώττης εἰς τὴν Ἑλληνίδα, ὡς λέγουσι.—Theophyl. Op. Venet. 1754-63. In Matt. Comm. Præfat. Tom. I. p. 2.]

Hieron. de
Eccles.
Script.

But St Hierome, in the place here alleged, as he not once nameth the sacrament, so he speaketh not one word of St Matthew. Which thing addeth some more distrust to M. Harding's dealing. St Hierome only nameth the gospel of the Hebrews, which, he saith, he himself translated both into Greek and Latin, and is often alleged by Origen¹. But Eusebius accounteth it for no gospel, but only among the bastard scriptures².

Euseb. Lib.
iii. cap. xxiv.

Howbeit, whatsoever the credit of the book be, thus it is written: "Christ took bread, and blessed it, and brake it." "Here," saith M. Harding, "no man can doubt but it was the sacrament." I see well he would fain have it so. Yet is there here, neither by the Hebrews' gospel, nor by St Hierome, any word³ spoken of the sacrament. Neither had St James vowed that he would not minister or receive the communion, but that he would eat no common bread before he had seen Christ risen again from the dead. As for the blessing of the bread, it was not a thing peculiar to the sacrament, but a general manner that Christ observ'd, whensoever he used God's creatures, as it may appear throughout the story of the gospels. That Christ should then minister the sacrament, it is but M. Harding's guess. No old writer ever saw so much before, no, not St Hierome, that wrote the story. Yet M. Harding, as though he had learned it in the third heaven, saith, "It is so plain, that no man may doubt of it."

But be it the sacrament; *ergo*, saith M. Harding, "there was but one kind." And how may that be proved? Now must one guess help another. "For it is likely," saith M. Harding, "that there was no wine in the house." And why so? "Because St James drank no wine." If guesses go for arguments, this matter is done: howbeit, it seemeth a very silly guess, to say: "St James drank no wine;" *ergo*, he had no wine in his house.

Egesippus.
Abd. Lib. vi.

Verily the same Egesippus, that saith St James never drank wine, saith also that "he never was anointed, never ware woollen cloth, never eat flesh in all his life⁴." Hereof, by M. Harding's logic, we may conclude that he had neither ointment, nor woollen cloth, nor flesh in his house. Yet is there here another greater inconvenience. St Hierome saith that St James continued bishop in Hierusalem the space of thirty years, until the seventh year of Nero⁵: if it be true that is here avouched, that in all his life he never drank wine but only at Christ's last supper, then must it follow that, being bishop in Hierusalem the space of thirty years, he never said mass; which thing M. Harding may not well grant: or else that he consecrated in one kind; which thing by Gelasius is adjudged sacrilege. Which way soever M. Harding turn himself, into one of these inconveniences he must needs fall.

Hieron. de
Eccles.
Script.

Again, if here be mention indeed of the sacrament, and no wine to be had in St James's house, then did Christ himself receive in one kind, to whose example, as these men say, bishops and priests are bound to stand. Therefore let them no longer defraud the people, but, by Christ's example, let both bishops and priests content themselves with the half communion, as well as others.

M. HARDING. THE SIXTEENTH DIVISION.

But because perhaps our adversaries will cast some mist over these allegations to darken the truth with their cloudy glosses, which be clear enough to quiet and sober wits, that give ear to the Holy Ghost, speaking to us by the mouth of the church; I will bring forth such witnesses and proofs for this purpose out of ancient fathers, as by no reason or sophistical shift they shall be able to avoid. Many of the places that I alleged in the article before this for private communion, may serve to this⁶ purpose very well; and therefore I will not let to recite some of them here also.

[¹ See the preceding page, note 15.]

[² Ἡ δὲ ἐν τούτοις τινὲς καὶ τὸ καθ' Ἑβραίων εὐαγγέλιον κατέλεξαν ... ταῦτα μὲν πάντα τῶν ἀντιλεγομένων αὐ εἶη.—Euseb. in Hist. Eccles. Script. Amst. 1695-1700. Lib. III. cap. xxv. p. 78.]

[³ Any one word, 1565, 1609.]

[⁴ Vinum et siceram non bibit, sed neque animal manducavit ... Oleo non est perunctus ... Neque enim

lanceo utebatur indumento, sed tantum sindone.—Abd. Apost. Hist. Par. 1571. Lib. vi. fol. 73.]

[⁵ Triginta itaque annos Ierosolymorum rexit ecclesiam, id est, usque ad septimum Neronis annum, &c.—Hieron. Op. Par. 1693-1706. Catal. Script. Eccles. 2. Tom. IV. Pars II. col. 102.]

[⁶ His, H. A. 1564.]

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

God wot, it were great wrong to cast a mist over darkness. But M. Harding having alleged such matter for his half communion, as he himself seeth may be easily answered, and William Wicford, a doctor of his own learning, saith, "is foolishly and falsely brought in to serve this turn⁷;" yet he would not pass it over without some bravery. But now will he bring in such authorities, so clear, so forcible, and so invincible, as cannot possibly be avoided. Howbeit, God be thanked, these authorities be neither so weighty, nor so strange. I knew them all, and had weighed them well before I spake anything in that behalf. Here he doubleth a great many things before by him alleged for his private mass, indeed, serving as well to the one purpose as to the other.

Wil. Wicford, contra Wiclevum.

M. HARDING. THE SEVENTEENTH DIVISION.

Melciades, that constant martyr of Christ, and bishop of Rome, ordained that sundry hosts, prepared by the consecrating of a bishop, should be sent abroad among the churches and parishes, that christian folk, who remained in the catholic faith, might not through heretics be defrauded of the holy sacrament⁸. Which can none otherwise be taken than for the form of bread only; because the wine cannot so conveniently be⁹ carried abroad from place to place, in small quantity, for such use, much less any long time be kept without corruption.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

This argument hangeth only upon lack of carriage. For if it were possible to devise a way that the sacrament might be carried about in both kinds, then were this guess soon answered. For otherwise Melciades speaketh not one word of the communion in one kind. Now that the carriage of both kinds is not impossible¹⁰, the examples of antiquity do well declare. St Hierome writeth thus of Exuperius, the bishop of Tolouse in France: *Nihil illo ditius, qui corpus Domini [in] canistro vimineo, sanguinem portabat in vitro*¹¹: "There was no man richer than he, that carried the Lord's body in a wicker basket, and his blood in a glass." Likewise Justinus Martyr, declaring the order of the church in his time, saith thus: *Illis, quæ cum gratiarum actione consecrata sunt, unusquisque participat: eadem ad eos qui absunt, diaconis dantur perferenda*¹²: "Of the things that be consecrate (that is, the bread, water, and wine) every man taketh part: the same things are delivered to the deacons to be carried unto them that be away." Here have we found not only a possibility, but also a common usage and practice, of carrying the sacrament in both kinds. This is the first invincible argument that all the world cannot answer.

Hieronym. 'ad Rusticum.

Justinus Martyr in Apologia ii.

M. HARDING. THE EIGHTEENTH DIVISION.

The council of Nice decreed, that in churches where neither bishop nor priest were present, the deacons themselves bring forth and eat the holy communion¹³. Which likewise cannot be referred to the form of wine, for cause of souring and corruption if it be long kept.

This canon is neither found in the Greek, nor extant in the first edition, nor alleged by Gratian.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

This latter clause (*Ipsi proferant et edant*), "Let them bring it forth themselves and eat," neither is in the Greek, nor in the decrees, nor in the former edition of the councils. Certain words somewhat like are found in Ruffinus in this sort: *Præsentibus presbyteris, diaconi ne dividant eucharistiam, sed illis agentibus solum ministrent. Si vero presbyter nullus sit in præsentia, tunc demum etiam ipsis liceat*

Ruffinus. Libro i. cap. vi.

[⁷ Et ideo inepte adducit hoc ad propositum.—Wilh. Wodford. adv. Johan. Wiclef. in Fascic. Rer. Expet. et Fug. Lond. 1690. Tom. I. p. 198.]

[⁸ Decret. Melciad. in Crabb. Concil. Col. Agrip. 1551. Tom. I. p. 217. See before, page 160.]

[⁹ Conveniently be so, H. A. 1564.]

[¹⁰ Impossible, 1565, 1609.]

[¹¹ Hieron. Op. Ad Rust. Monach. Epist. xcv. Tom. IV. Pars II. cols. 777, 8; where we find *portat*.]

[¹² Just. Mart. Op. Par. 1742. Apol. i. p. 83.]

[¹³ Quod si non fuerit in præsentia vel episcopus vel presbyter, tunc ipsi proferant, et edant.—Concil. Nicen. in Crabb. Concil. Edit. ii. can. 14. Tom. I. p. 255. These words do not appear Edit. i., nor in Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugd. 1624. Decret. Gratian. Decr. Prima Pars, Dist. xciii. can. 14. col. 444; where the canon of Nice is quoted.]

*dividere*¹: "In the presence of the priests let not the deacons divide or minister the sacrament, but only serve the priests in their office. But if there be no priest present, then let it be lawful for the deacons to minister." Here is very small help for M. Harding's purpose; unless perhaps he will say that *proferre* or *dividere* is "to minister in one kind." But if he think this a very fond translation, as it is indeed, then this authority might have been spared.

M. Harding upon occasion of these words would have men believe, that the deacon, in the absence of the priest, went to the pix, and took out the sacrament and received it. But Ruffinus speaketh not one word neither of taking forth of the sacrament, nor of the receiving of the deacon, but of dividing or ministering to the people. And his meaning seemeth to be this, that, in the absence of the priest, the deacon might consecrate, and so serve the people. Which thing, notwithstanding it seem in some part contrary to another canon of the same council², namely in the presence of a priest, yet that it was so used in the primitive church, it appeareth by most manifest and certain proofs. St Ambrose imagineth St Laurence, being a deacon, thus to say unto Sixtus the bishop, when he saw him led to his martyrdom: *Experire . . . utrum idoneum ministrum elegeris, cui commiseris dominici sanguinis consecrationem*³: "O father, try whether thou have chosen a fit minister unto whom thou hast committed the consecration of the Lord's blood." By these words we see that deacons then used to consecrate. Therefore Eutropius was not well advised, when he without cause corrupted and altered St Ambrose's words, and for *Dominici sanguinis consecrationem*, read, *Dominici sanguinis dispensationem*. For it followeth immediately in St Ambrose: *Et consummandorum consortium sacramentorum*³: that is, "The fellowship of perfecting⁴ the sacraments."

And the emperor Justinian in his Authentics, *De ecclesiasticis diversis capitulis*: "Let the bishop appoint unto the women that be under his government such priest or deacon as they shall choose to make answer⁵ unto them, or to minister unto them the holy oblation⁶."

The same also may evidently be gathered by the second canon of the council Ancyran: the words be: *Diaconi similiter, qui immolaverunt, honorem quidem habeant: cessare vero [debent] ab omni sacro ministerio, sive a pane sive a calice offerendo, vel prædicando*⁷: "Let the deacons that have offered (unto idols) keep their estate still. But they must give over all holy ministry, both of offering the bread and wine, and also of preaching."

This part of the deacon's office was afterward in sundry decrees abrogated. First, Bergomensis in the life of Honorius saith: "It was decreed by Zosimus bishop of Rome, that the deacon should not minister in the presence of the bishop or priest⁸." And long before that time order was taken in the council holden at Arle in France, that deacons should not minister the sacrament at all. The words be: *De diaconis, quos cognovimus multis locis offerre, placuit [id] minime fieri debere*⁹: "Touching deacons, of whom we hear say that they make the oblation in many places, we have thought it good that they do so no more."

M. Harding will not deny but these be proofs sufficient, that the deacons in those days used to minister the holy communion. Therefore the meaning of the council of Nice is not that the deacon should go to the pix, and take the sacrament reserved, as M. Harding seemeth to gather upon a false text, being neither in the Greek, nor in the former setting forth of the councils, nor alleged by

[¹ Et ne diaconi . . . illis [presbyteris] presentibus eucharistiam dividant, sed, &c. . . licere, &c.—Hist. Eccles. Par. Lib. x. cap. vi. fol. 108.]

[² . . . qui [diaconi] potestatem non habent offerendi, &c.—Concil. Nicen. in Crabb. Concil. Col. Agrip. 1551. Edit. i. can. 18. Tom. I. p. 256.]

[³ Ambros. Op. Par. 1686-90. De Offic. Ministr. Lib. i. cap. xli. 214. Tom. II. col. 55; where we read *commiseris*, and *cui consummandorum*. See Not. in loc. for the various reading of Eutropius.]

[⁴ Perfiting, 1565.] [⁵ Answers, 1565.]

[⁶ Ταῖς δὲ γυναῖξιν, ὅν ἂν αὐταὶ ἐπιλέξωνται εἴτε πρεσβύτερον εἴτε διάκονον, εἰς τὸ ποιεῖν αὐ-

ταῖς τὰς ἀποκρίσεις, ἢ τὴν ἀγίαν αὐταῖς κοινωνίαν φέρειν, ὃ ὁσιώτατος ἐπίσκοπος, ὕψ' ὃν εἰσίν.—Corp. Jur. Civil. Amst. 1663. Auth. Coll. ix. Tit. vi. Novell. cxxiii. 36. Tom. II. p. 175. See also Just. Princ. Novell. Const. Basil. 1561. Const. cxxiii. p. 365.]

[⁷ Concil. Ancyran. in Crabb. Concil. Ed. i. cap. 2. Tom. I. p. 199.]

[⁸ Censuit item diaconum presente episcopo vel presbytero eucharistiæ sacramentum ministrare non debere.—J. P. Bergom. suppl. Chronic. Par. 1538. Lib. ix. Honor. fol. 218. 2.]

[⁹ Concil. Arel. i. in Crabb. Concil. cap. 15. Tom. I. p. 287; where *diaconibus*.]

Canon 18.

Ambr. Offic.
Lib. i. cap. xli.

Eutropius.

Folio 356.
Authen. De
Eccl. Diver.
Capitulis.

Concil.
Ancyran.
can. 2.

Bergomen. in
Honorio.

Concil.
Arelat. i.
cap. 15.

Gratian; but that the deacon, in the absence of the priest, might consecrate the holy mysteries, and deliver the same unto the people, as may well be gathered by the words of Ruffine. But let us grant M. Harding, that the sacrament was reserved; yet hath he gotten very small advantage for his half communion. For if he would say thus: The sacrament was reserved;

Ergo, it was reserved in one kind,

the sequel of his argument would be too weak. No logic could make it good.

I grant the holy mysteries were sometimes kept in the primitive church upon sundry occasions; but they were kept in both kinds, as manifestly appeareth by Nicephorus¹⁰, and by the first epistle of complaint sent by Chrysostom unto Innocentius¹¹. This being true, as it cannot be denied, that the sacrament was reserved in both kinds, what then hath M. Harding gotten by this invincible argument for his half communion in one kind?

Nicephor.
Lib. xiii. cap.
xix.
Chrys. Epist.
i. ad Inno-
centium.

M. HARDING. THE NINETEENTH DIVISION.

Where oftentimes we find it recorded of the fathers, that christian people in time of persecution received of the priests at church in fine linen cloths the sacrament in sundry portions, to bear with them, and to receive it secretly in the morning before other meat, as their devotion served them; for the same cause, and in respect¹² of other circumstances, it must of necessity be taken only for the kind or form of bread.

The places of Tertullian and St Cyprian be known. Tertullian, writing Lib. ii. ad Uxorem. to his wife, exhorteth her not to marry again, specially to an infidel, if he die before her; for that, if she do, she shall not be able at all times, for her husband, to do as a christian woman ought to do. "Will not thy husband know," saith he, "what thou eatest secretly before all other meat? And in case he do know it, he will believe it to be bread, not (60) him who it is called¹³." St Cyprian writeth in his sermon, De Lapsis, that, when a woman had gone about with unworthy hands to open her coffer where the holy thing of our Lord was laid up, she was made afraid with fire that rose up from thence, as she durst not touch it¹⁴. Which doubtless must be taken for that one kind of the sacrament.

The sixtieth
untruth.
Standing in
the false
translating of
Tertullian.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

The matter that hangeth in question between us is, whether the people, being assembled together in the church, at any time within the space limited received the communion under one kind. M. Harding answereth me, not of the order of the church, but of several men and private houses. Thus he flieth that thing that should be proved; and the thing that needeth no proof, as nothing pertinent unto the matter, he proveth only by¹⁵ conjecture. In the place of Tertullian he useth a manifest corruption; as I have already shewed.

M. Harding
falsifieth
Tertullian.

His conjectures be these: "Women received the sacrament in a linen cloth: Tertullian's wife received it at home before meats: St Cyprian saith, a woman kept it at home in a chest; *ergo*, the sacrament was ministered in one kind." These be cold guesses, and no proofs. To say, They had the bread; *ergo*, they had not the wine, is a very faint reason, and hangeth only of ignorance, for that M. Harding knoweth not in what order these things were kept. But that women and others kept the sacrament and carried it about them, and that in both kinds, it is evident, and cannot be denied.

Gregory Nazianzene thus writeth of his sister Gorgonia: *εἰ πού τι τῶν ἀντιτύπων τοῦ τιμίου σώματος καὶ αἵματος ἡ χεὶρ ἐθησαύρησεν, τοῦτο καταμινύσσει τοῖς δάκρυσι*¹⁶, &c. "If her hand had laid up any portion of the tokens of the precious body and of the blood, mingling it with her tears," &c. Here Nazianzene, contrary to M. Harding's judgment, saith, she had laid up both parts. And what should I stand

Nazian. in
Funere Gor-
goniæ.

[¹⁰ Niceph. Callist. Hist. Eccles. Lib. xiii. cap. xix. Tom. II. p. 391.]

[¹¹ 'Αλλ' ἐνθα τὰ ἅγια ἀπέκειντο εἰσελθόντες οἱ στρατιῶται... πάντα τε ἐώρων τὰ ἔνδον, καὶ τὸ ἀγιάτων αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ... εἰς τὰ τῶν προειρη-
μένων στρατιωτῶν λιμάνια ἐξεχείτο.—Chrysost. Op. Par. 1718-38. Ad Innocent. Epist. i. Tom. III. p. 519.]

[¹² Respects, H. A. 1564.]

[¹³ Tertull. Op. Lut. 1641. Ad Uxor. Lib. ii. 5. p. 190. See before, page 148.]

[¹⁴ Cypr. Op. Oxon. 1682. De Laps. pp. 132, 3.]

[¹⁵ To, 1565.]

[¹⁶ Gregor. Nazianz. Op. Par. 1778-1840. In Laud. Gorgon. Orat. viii. 18. Tom. I. p. 229; where we find ἡ τοῦ αἵματος, and ἐθησαύρισε.]

Amphilo-
chius.

long to heap examples? M. Harding's own Amphilo-chius, of whom he seemeth to make so great account, among other his fables, whereof he hath good store, saith that a certain Jew came and received among the faithful, and privily carried part of either kind home with him¹: how or wherein, it is not written. Yet will it not follow: M. Harding cannot tell wherein the Jew carried home the wine; therefore Amphilo-chius' tale is not true.

Now, if M. Harding had his own request, yet is he far off from his purpose. For if he would reason thus: One woman received the half sacrament in one kind at home; *ergo*, the people received in like sort openly in the church (which is the thing that should be proved), this argument would hardly hold.

Cyprian. de
Lapsis Serm.
5.

To be short, these three examples here alleged are nothing else but mere abuses of the sacrament. And therefore, as it appeareth by St Cyprian, God shewed himself by miracle to be offended with it, fraying the woman that so had kept it with a flame of fire². And it was decreed in the council holden at Cæsaraugusta in Spain, that, if any man received the sacrament, and eat not the same presently in the church, he should be accursed for ever³. Thus M. Harding's reasons hold only by guess, grounded upon abuse, and, being granted, yet are not able to prove his purpose.

Concil.
Cæsaraugust.
cap. 3.

M. HARDING. THE TWENTIETH DIVISION.

The examples of keeping the holy sacrament under the form of bread only, to be in a readiness for the sick and for others in time of danger, that they might have their necessary victual of life, or voyage provision, with them at their departure hence, be in manner infinite. Here one or two may serve instead of a number. For though M. Jewel maketh his vaunt that we have not one sentence or clause for proof of these articles, which he so defaceth with his negative; yet I will not accumulate this treatise with tedious allegation of authorities. St Ambrose, at the hour of death, received the communion under one kind, kept for that purpose, as it appeareth by this testimony of Paulinus, who wrote his life. And because it may be a good instruction to others to die well, I will here recite his words: "At the same time as he departed from us to our Lord, from about the eleventh hour of the day, until the hour that he gave up the ghost, stretching abroad his hands in manner of a cross, he prayed. We saw his lips move, but voice we heard none. Horatus, a priest of the church of Vercels, being gone up to bed, heard a voice three times of one calling him, and saying to him, Arise and haste thee; for he will depart hence by and by. Who, going down, gave to the saint our Lord's body, which taken and swallowed down, he gave up the ghost, having with him a good voyage provision, so as the soul, being the better refreshed by the virtue of that meat, may now rejoice with the company of angels, whose life he led in the earth, and with the fellowship of Elias⁴."

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

It is no vaunt to say the truth. Neither did I deny that ever any one man received the communion in one kind. For I knew all these examples, and the weight of them. Neither is it so hard a matter for a man to know them. But this is the only thing that I denied: "That you are not able to bring any one sufficient authority or example that ever the whole people received the communion in the open church under one kind." Hereupon resteth that strange negative, wherewithal ye are so grieved. This is it that ye should prove, and

[¹ Amphilo-ch. Op. Par. 1644. In Vit. S. Basil. pp. 177, 8.]

[² Cyr. Op. Oxon. 1632. De Laps. pp. 132, 3.]

[³ Concil. Cæsaraug. can. 3. in Concil. Stud. Labb. et Cossart. Lut. Par. 1671-2. Tom. II. cols. 1009, 10. See before, page 148, note 1.]

[⁴ Sed eodem tempore quo migravit ad Dominum, ab hora circiter undecima diei usque ad illam horam, in qua emisit spiritum, expansis manibus in modum crucis oravit: nos vero labia illius moveri videbamus, vocem autem non audiebamus. Honoratus etiam

sacerdos ecclesiæ Vercellis cum in superioribus domus se ad quiescendum composuisset, tertio vocem vocantis se audivit, dicentisque sibi: Surge, festina, quia modo est recessurus. Qui descendens, obtulit sancto Domini corpus: quo accepto ubi glutivit, emisit spiritum, bonum viaticum secum ferens; ut in virtute escæ anima refector, angelorum nunc consortio, quorum vita vixit in terris, et Eliæ societate lætetur. —Ambros. Op. Par. 1686-90. Vit. Sanct. Ambros. a Paul. 47. Tom. II. Append. col. xii.]

yet hitherto have not proved. Ye say, ye will not accumulate examples, as though ye had enow⁵ to spare. Yet have ye gotten together sick folk, women, infants, madmen, conjectures, guesses, miracles, and fables; and have spared nothing that might be found, although it made nothing to your purpose. Such is the store of your examples. Paulinus.

Touching Paulinus, that (as it is supposed) wrote this life of St Ambrose, I will say nothing as of myself⁶, but only refer you to Erasmus, whose judgment ye would seem sometime not to dislike. Thus he saith: *Idem est artifex qui tam multa contaminavit in scriptis Hieronymi et Augustini*⁷, &c. "It is the same craftsman that hath corrupted so many things in the writings of St Hierome and St Augustine, a man even made to such purpose⁸. He had the story of St Ambrose's life written by some other. Unto the same he set a jolly preface of his own: he wove in a great many talks between parties, and thereunto framed a conclusion, and patched on a sort of miracles. Compare the very phrase and manner of speech of the true Paulinus with this fellow's rags," &c.

Erasm. in
prefatione in
Ambrosium.

This is that Paulinus whom M. Harding hath chosen for his author.

Touching the matter, if it be granted, it neither relieveth M. Harding's purpose, nor hindereth ours. For, if St Ambrose straight upon receiving of the bread yielded up the spirit, and therefore did not receive the cup, which thing notwithstanding is not yet proved, yet will it not follow that this was the common order of the church. What example of dying well M. Harding hath here found, I cannot see: unless he mean that the sacrament, only because it is received, hath power to work salvation, and to cause a man to die well; which is a dangerous doctrine, and by M. Harding already refused. For as much as may appear by the story, neither did St Ambrose in that case call for the sacrament, nor utter any kind of word, nor understood what he received; but only lay speechless, and, as soon as he had swallowed the bread down, gave up the ghost. But this Paulinus in the same story noteth one special sentence of St Ambrose, much had in remembrance and commended by St Augustine in his old age, and here dissembled by M. Harding, whereof a man may take great comfort, and indeed learn a good lesson to die well. For he said lying in his death-bed: *Non sic vixi, ut pudeat inter vos vivere; nec mori timeo, quia bonum habemus Dominum*⁹: "Neither have I so lived, that I am ashamed longer to live amongst you; nor am I afraid to die, for that we have a gracious Lord."

Articulo xx.

M. HARDING. THE TWENTY-FIRST DIVISION.

Dionysius Alexandrinus, about the year of our Lord 200, as Eusebius Casariensis reciteth, manifestly declareth how that an old man, called Serapion, was houseled under one kind at his end. This Serapion, after that he had lain speechless three days, sent for the sacrament. The priest, for sickness not able to come himself, gave to the lad that came of that errand a little of the sacrament, commanding him to wet it, and so, being moisted, to pour it into the old man's mouth.

Thus¹⁰ much is expressed by the words there, as the Greek is to be construed. The lad, being returned home, moisted with some liquor that divine meat to serve the old man withal, lying now panting for desire to be dismissed¹¹ hence, and to haste him away to heaven, and poured it into his mouth. For that this old man's mouth and throat had long been dry by force of his sickness, the priest, who had experience in that case, providently gave warning to moist the sacrament with some liquor, and so together to pour it into his mouth. Which was so done by the lad, as Dionysius

*Ἐκκλ. Hist.
Lib. vi. c. xlv.
Ἀποβρέξαι
κελεύσας καὶ
τῷ πρεσ-
βυτῇ κατὰ
τοῦ στόμα-
τος ἐπι-
στᾶσαι.*

[⁵ Enough, 1563.]

[⁶ Meself, 1565.]

[⁷ Ambros. Op. Basil. 1555. D. Erasm. Cens. Tom. I. fol. B. 2; where he proceeds: Hieronymianis, et Augustinianis, natus ad hunc ludum. Habebat historiam Ambrosianæ vitæ, ei attexuit præfationem (ut vides) lepidam, intertexuit interlocutiones, addidit coronidem, et affinxit aliquot prodigia... Conferat qui volet Paulini stylam cum hujus assutis pannis, &c.]

[⁸ A purpose, 1565.]

[⁹ Non ita inter vos vixi, ut pudeat me vivere: nec timeo mori, quia Dominum bonum habemus.—Ambros. Op. Vit. Sanct. Ambros. a Paul. 45. Tom. II. Append. col. xii.]

[¹⁰ This, H. A. 1564.]

[¹¹ Dimissed, 1565, and H. A. 1564.]

*expresseth*¹. Now, if the form of wine had then also been brought by the lad to be ministered, there had been no need of such circumstance to procure the old man a moisture to swallow down that holy food. And that this was the manner of ministering the sacrament to old men at their departing, it appeareth by record of Theodoretus, who writeth in his ecclesiastical story, how one Bassus, an arch-priest, ministered unto an old man called Simeones, of great fame for his holiness. "Bassus," saith he, "as he visited his churches, chanced upon holy Simeones, that wonder of the world, lying sic, who through feebleness was not able to speak nor move. When Bassus saw he should die, he giveth him his rights before: but after what sort, it is to be marked. Spongia petita Simeoni os humectat atque eluit, ac tum ei divinum obtulit sacramentum: he calleth for a sponge (saith Theodoretus), and therewith moisteth and washeth Simeones' mouth, and then giveth him the holy sacrament²." If at that time the receiving of the sacred cup had been in use, such procuring of moisture for the better swallowing down of the sacrament under one³ kind had been needless.

Amphilochius, that worthy bishop of Iconium in Lycaonia, of whom mention is made in the article afore this, writeth in the life of St Basil, that, a little before he gave up his ghost, he received a portion of the holy sacrament, which long before he had caused⁴ to be kept, to the intent it might be put in his grave with him at his burial⁵; which no man can cavil to be any other than the form of bread only.

The burying
of the sacra-
ment.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

M. Harding, rather than he would seem to answer nothing, answereth one thing for another. The question is of the usage and order of the church: his answer is of Serapion's death-bed, as though there had been no churches yet erected in those days.

This Serapion, for open idolatry by him committed, was excommunicate from the church, and utterly cut off from the company of the faithful, and that in such extreme sort, for the greater terror of others, that during his life he should never be admitted again. Notwithstanding which extremity, upon good proofs and tokens of repentance, lest the party should be utterly swallowed up with despair, the church oftentimes with charitable discretion remitted some part of that rigour; as may appear by St Cyprian, St Augustine, and others, and by Dionysius that wrote this story.

St Augustine, speaking of the times of persecution: "Do not we consider," saith he, "in what multitudes the people in such danger⁶ resorteth to the church, some desiring they may be baptized, some that they may be reconciled from excommunication, some that they may be admitted to shew their repentance (for their open crimes); every man desiring comfort, every man desiring the participation of the sacrament? In which case, if there be no minister to be had, what misery then followeth them that depart this life either unbaptized or else bound (in their sins)⁷!" Likewise St Cyprian saith: "In this extreme case of death, the party excommunicate should not tarry to be reconciled by the bishop (in the presence of the church, as the order was then), but discharge himself before any deacon, and so depart unto the Lord in peace⁸." Therefore the priest,

August.
Epist. cxxx.

[¹ Euseb. in Hist. Eccles. Script. Amst. 1695-1700. Lib. vi. cap. xlv. pp. 200, 1.]

[² Σπογγίαν τοίνυν αἰτήσας, καὶ ταύτην τὸ στόμα διαβρέξας, καὶ ἀποκλύσας, προσήνεγκεν αὐτῷ τῶν θείων μυστηρίων τὰ σύμβολα.—Theodor. Op. Lut. Par. 1642-84. Relig. Hist. xxvi. Tom. III. p. 880.]

[³ The one, H. A. 1564.]

[⁴ Willed, H. A. 1564.]

[⁵ Amphiloch. Op. Par. 1644. In Vit. S. Basil. p. 224. See before, page 188.]

[⁶ Dangers, 1565, 1609.]

[⁷ An non cogitamus, cum ad istorum periculorum pervenitur extrema, nec est potestas ulla fugiendi, quantus in ecclesia fieri soleat ab utroque sexu atque ab omni ætate concursus, aliis baptismum flagitanti-

bus, aliis reconciliationem, aliis etiam pœnitentiæ ipsius actionem, omnibus consolationem et sacramentorum confectionem et erogationem? Ubi si ministri desint, quantum exitium sequitur eos, qui de isto seculo vel non regenerati exeunt vel ligati!—August. Op. Par. 1679-1700. Ad Honorat. Epist. ccxxviii. 8. Tom. II. col. 833.]

[⁸ ... si incommodo aliquo et infirmitatis periculo occupati fuerint, non expectata presentia nostra, apud presbyterum ... vel si presbyter repertus non fuerit, et urgere exitus cœperit, apud diaconum quoque, exomologesin facere delicti sui possint; ut manu eis in pœnitentia imposita veniant ad Dominum in pace.—Cypr. Op. Oxon. 1682. Ad Presb. et Diac. Epist. xviii. pp. 40, 1.]

understanding the state the old man Serapion, being excommunicate, stood in, and being not able for sickness to go himself, lest he should depart comfortless in desperation, in token that he was reconciled unto the church, sent unto him the sacrament by the lad, and sent it not in one kind only, but in both. For such was the order of the church then, as it appeareth well by the story of Exuperius⁹, and by Justinus¹⁰, and others. And the boy that carried the sacrament, for more ease of the old man in that case, was warned by the priest to moist the bread in the sacramental wine that he brought with him, like as Bassus also did unto Simeones; whom M. Harding highly commendeth for his holiness, notwithstanding he were the founder of the Messalians¹¹, and therefore, as he afterward saith, the first parent of the sacramentary heresy. And what hath M. Harding herein found for his half communion? He will say, the boy was commanded to dip the bread; and Bassus was fain to wash Simeones' mouth; *ergo*, he¹² received in one kind. Verily Serapion's boy were soon able to answer this argument. For what sequel is this in reason: The sick man's mouth was dry; *ergo*, he could not receive the cup? Who would make such reasons but M. Harding? Of this ground he might better reason thus: The sick man's mouth was dry; *ergo*, he could not receive the bread. In my judgment, the scouring of the sick man's mouth hath small force to take from him the sacrament of Christ's blood, and so to prove the half communion.

Hieronym.
ad Rusticum.
Justinus,
Apologia ii.

Theodoret.
Lib. iv. cap.
xi.

As for the fable of M. Harding's Amphilochius, it were great wrong to answer it otherwise than as a fable. For thus it is: The bread had been kept by the space of seven years, or more; St Basil in his death-bed called for it, and received it, to the intent, as M. Harding saith, it might be buried with him. The former part hereof, to say, either that the sacrament was kept the space of seven years, or that at the end of so long time it was fit to be received of a sick man in his death-bed, is mere folly. But to say, as M. Harding here saith, that the body of Christ, being now immortal and glorious, and at the right hand of God, may be laid in the grave and buried, is manifest and wicked blasphemy. Abdias saith that St Matthy the apostle, when he was stoned to death, desired that two of the first stones might be buried with him, for a witness against them that so used him¹³: who, although he be full of like fables, yet hath he some reason in his fables; but M. Harding's Amphilochius hath none at all.

Now for view of M. Harding's proofs, good reader, consider this: I demand of the laity: he answereth of St Ambrose and St Basil, which were bishops. I demand of the whole people: he answereth of several men. I demand of the usage of the church: he answereth of persons excommunicate, that were without the church. I demand of sufficient and certain proofs: he answereth me by guesses and fables. And these be his invincible arguments, that no man can answer.

M. HARDING. THE TWENTY-SECOND DIVISION.

It hath been a (61) custom in the Latin church from the apostles' time to our days, that on Good Friday, as well priests as other christian people, receive the sacrament under the form of bread only, consecrated the day before, called the day of our Lord's supper, commonly Maunday Thursday, and that not without signification of a singular mystery; and this hath ever been judged a good and sufficient communion.

The sixty-first untruth, without any colour or shew of truth.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

This may well be called a Good Friday's argument, it cometh in so naked without witness. Indeed M. Tonsal saith, it hath been used of old in the Latin church¹⁴; but he durst not say from the time of the apostles, as M. Harding

Tonsal. De Euchar.

[⁹ Hieron. Op. Par. 1693-1706. Ad Rust. Monach. Epist. xc. Tom. IV. Pars II. col. 778.]

[¹⁰ Just. Mart. Op. Par. 1742. Apol. i. p. 83.]

[¹¹ Theodoret. in Hist. Eccles. Script. Lib. IV. cap. xi. p. 163.]

[¹² They, 1565, 1609.]

[¹³ Matthias autem petiit illos duos lapides consecrari sibi, in testimonium illis.—Gest. S. Matthiæ, ad calc. Abd. Apost. Hist. Par. 1571. fol. 131. 2.]

[¹⁴ ...sciendum est, Græcorum ecclesiam, in quadragesima eucharistiam non consecrare, nisi in sabbatis et dominicis diebus. Ceteris vero diebus utuntur

here saith. Yet, for augmentation of matter of his side, I will say further; the first council Arausicane¹, holden sometime in France, and Innocentius the first², have added hereto the holy Saturday, which now is called Easter Eve, and say it is a tradition of the church that in those two days the sacrament in any wise be not ministered. The like whereof is written by Socrates of Good Friday, and the Wednesday before³.

The singular mystery hereof M. Harding holdeth secret as a mystery. Innocentius saith: "It is because the apostles ran their way that day, and hid themselves²." Thomas of Aquine⁴ and Gerson⁵ say: "Because, if any had consecrate that day while Christ lay dead, the body had been without blood, and the blood without the body." Others say: "If the sacrament that mean while had been kept, it would have been dead in the pix."

Hugo Cardinalis saith: *Quinta feria duæ hostiæ consecrantur, et altera in crastinum reservatur, quod eleganter fit*⁶, &c.; "Upon Shire⁷ Thursday two hosts be consecrate, and the one of them is reserved until the next day; which thing is very trimly done. For Christ's passion is the truth; and the sacrament is a figure of the same. Therefore when the truth is come, the figure giveth place." These be the greatest mysteries that I could ever learn touching this matter.

"But this," saith M. Harding, "was ever counted a good communion." I grant. But ye have not yet proved that this was your half communion. For if ye say, they consecrated the day before; *ergo*, they received in one kind only the day after, this would be no formal argument. For the Greek church all the Lent long used to consecrate the sacrament only upon Saturdays and Sundays, as it is noted in the council of Constantinople⁸; and upon other days they used the communion of things consecrate before; and yet had they never until this day the communion under one kind. Yet, notwithstanding, unto this manner of the Greek church ^{M. Tonal} resembleth the observation of Good Friday in the Latin church⁹. So far is M. Harding off from proving his purpose by Good Friday.

M. HARDING. THE TWENTY-THIRD DIVISION.

And that in the Greek church also, even in the time of Chrysostom, the communion under the form of bread only was used and allowed, it appeareth by this notable story of Sozomenus, a Greek writer; which because it is long, I will here rehearse it only in English, remitting the learned to the Greek. "When John, otherwise named Chrysostom, governed the church of Constantinople very well, a certain man of the Macedonian heresy had a wife of the same opinion. When this man had heard John in his sermon declare how one ought to think of God, he praised his doctrine, and exhorted his wife to conform herself to the same judgment also. But when as she was led by the talk of noble women, rather than by her husband's good advertisements, after that he saw counsel took no place, 'Except,' quoth he, 'thou wilt bear me company in things touching

*Histor. Eccles.
Lib. viii. cap. v.
in Græco.*

liturgia ante consecratorum ... qualis mos ab antiquo in die parasceves in Latinorum etiam ecclesiis servari solitus est.—Tonal. De Verit. Corp. et Sang. Dom. in Euchar. Lut. 1554. Lib. i. fol. 47. 2.]

[¹ ... in biduo isto, id est, parasceve et sabbato, sacramenta penitus non celebrari.—Concil. Araus. i. in Crabb. Concil. Col. Agrip. 1551. Tom. I. p. 624.]

[² ... constat, apostolos biduo isto ... propter metum Judæorum se oculuisse ... non dubium est ... eos jejunasce biduo memorato, ut traditio ecclesiæ habeat, isto biduo sacramenta penitus non celebrari.—Innoc. Papæ I. Epist. i. 4. in eod. Tom. I. p. 453.]

[³ Αἰθὺς δὲ ἐν Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ τῇ τετράδι καὶ τῇ λεγομένῃ παρασκευῇ ... πάντα τὰ συνάξεως γίνονται, δόξα τῆς τῶν μυστηρίων τελετῆς.—Socrat. in Hist. Eccles. Script. Amst. 1695-1700. Lib. v. cap. xxii. p. 235.]

[⁴ Unde si tunc fuisset hoc sacramentum celebratum sub speciebus panis, fuisset corpus Christi

sine sanguine, et sub speciebus vini sanguis sine corpore, sicut erat in rei veritate.—Thom. Aquinat. Op. Venet. 1595. Summ. Theol. Tert. Pars. Quæst. lxxvi. Art. 2. Tom. XII. fol. 245. 2. See also Quæst. lxxxi. Art. 4. foll. 272, 3.]

[⁵ Nota quod si quis in triduo confecisset, panis fuisset conversus in corpus mortuum; non in vivum, cum anima esset actualiter separata a corpore.—Floret. Lugd. 1499. Lib. iv. fol. 97. 2.]

[⁶ Hugon. de S. Char. Op. Col. Agrip. 1621. In Evang. sec. Luc. cap. xxiii. Tom. VI. fol. 272. Hugo proceeds: Congruum est enim ut ea die qua veritas est exhibitæ, cesset omnino figura.]

[⁷ See Brand, Pop. Antiq. with Sir H. Ellis's note. Vol. I.]

[⁸ Concil. Quinisext. can. 52. in Concil. Labb. et Cossart. Lut. Par. 1671-2. Tom. VI. cols. 1166, 7. See before, page 129, note 6.]

[⁹ See above, page 245, note 14.]

Concil.
Araus. i.

Socr. L b. v.
cap. xxi.

Innoc. i.
cap. 4.

Thom. iil.
Par. de Euch.
q. 76. Art. 2.
Gerson contra Floret.
Lib. iv.
Thom. iiii.
Par. q. 81.
Art. 4.
Innoc. iiii.
Hugo Cardinal in Evang.
secundum
Lucam, cap.
xxiv.
Eleganter.

Sexta Synoda
Constantin.
can. 52.
τῇ θείᾳ
λειτουργίᾳ
τῶν προηγιασμένων.
Tonal. De
Euchar.

God, thou shalt have no more to do with me, nor live any longer¹⁰ with me.' The woman, hearing this, promising feignedly that she would agree unto it, conferreth the matter with a woman-servant that she had, whom she esteemed for trusty, and useth her help to deceive her husband. About the time of the mysteries, she, holding fast that which she had received, stooped down, making resemblance to pray. Her servant, standing by, giveth to her secretly that which she had brought with her in her hand. That, as she put her teeth to it to bite it, hardeneth into a stone. With that the woman, sore astonished, fearing lest some evil should happen unto her therefore, which came by the power of God, ran forthwith to the bishop, and, bewraying herself, sheweth him the stone, having yet in it the prints of her bit, representing a strange matter and a wondrous colour; and so with tears of her eyes besought forgiveness, promising her husband she would consent and agree to him. If this seem to any incredible (saith Sozomenus), that stone is witness, which to this day is kept among κειμήλια. the jewels of the church of Constantinople¹¹." By this story it is clear the sacrament was then ministered under one kind only. For, by receiving that one form, this woman would have persuaded her husband that she had communicated with him, and with that holy bishop. Else, if both kinds had then been ministered, she should have practised some other shift for the avoiding of the cup, which had not been so easy.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

I may not disgrace the credit of this story; albeit in Sozomenus and Nicephorus¹², of both whom the same is recorded, there be sundry things that may well be filed. But I see no cause yet wherefore M. Harding should blow the triumph. For in all this long rehearsal there is not one word spoken of the communion under one kind. The bread so changed into a stone, and kept for a memory among the jewels there, was a witness of the woman's dissimulation, and not of M. Harding's half communion. "Yet," saith he, "by this story it is clear the sacrament was then ministered under one kind only. For by receiving that one form, the woman would have persuaded her husband that she had communicated with him. Else, if both kinds had then been ministered, she would have practised some other shift for the avoiding of the cup, which had not been so easy." Now truly here is but a cold conclusion, hanging wholly (as it may appear) only upon the sleight of a woman's wit. For as this woman had devised to deceive her husband in the bread, why might she not as well devise to deceive him in the cup? Why might she not take the cup, and feign that she drank, and yet drink nothing? Doubtless such dissimulation is sooner wrought in the cup than in the bread; and she, that durst so to dissemble in the one part of God's sacraments, would little fear to dissemble in the other.

Here we see the certainty of M. Harding's guesses. He reapeth the thing that was never sown, and gathereth of his authors the thing that was never spoken.

But touching the truth of this whole matter, if a man list only to go by guess, as M. Harding doth, why may he not thus imagine with himself: If this woman would thus dissemble in a case so dangerous, what needed her to take the bread at her maid's hand, and specially at that time, in that place, and in the sight of

[¹⁰ Further, H. A. 1564.]

[¹¹ Ἰωάννης δὲ ἀριστα τῆς Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐκκλησίας ἐπιτροπεύων ἀνὴρ τις τῆς Μακεδονίου αἰρέσεως τοιαύτη γυναικὶ συνῴκει· περιτυχὼν δὲ αὐτῇ διδάσκοντι ὅπως χρῆ περὶ Θεοῦ δοξάζειν, ἐπανέτης ἦν τοῦ δόγματος, καὶ τὴν γυναῖκα ὁμοφρονεῖν αὐτῷ παρεκάλει· ἐπεὶ δὲ τῇ πρὸ τούτου συνηθείᾳ καὶ ταῖς ὁμιλίαις τῶν γνωρίμων γυναικῶν ἠττάτο, καὶ πολλάκις ρουθετῶν ὁ ἀνὴρ οὐδὲν ἤνυνεν, εἰ μὴ, φησὶ, κοινωνήσεις μοι τῶν θείων, οὐδὲ τοῦ βίου κοινωνὸς ἔσῃ μοι τοῦ λοιποῦ· ἐνταῦθα δὲ ἡ γυνὴ συνημένη τοῦτο ποιεῖν, κοινοῦται τινὶ τῶν θεραπακιδῶν ἣν ἠγάτο πιστὴν, καὶ παραλαμβάνει συνεργὸν ἐς ἀπάτην τοῦ ἀνδρός· περὶ δὲ τὸν καιρὸν τῶν μυστηρίων ἰσασι δὲ οἱ μεμνημένοι ὁ λέγω· ἡ μὲν, ὅπερ ἐδέξατο κατέχουσα, ὡς εὐχομένη ἀπέκυψε·

παρεστῶσα δὲ αὐτῇ ἡ θεραπαινὶς, λάθρα δέδωκεν ὁ μετὰ χεῖρας ἤλαε φέρονσα. τὸ δὲ πρὸς τοῖς ὁδοῦσι λίθος ἐπήγγυστο· περιδεῖς δὲ γενομένη ἡ γυνὴ μή τι πάθοι, θεῖον οὕτω πρᾶγμα ἐπ' αὐτῇ συμβάν, δρομαία ἐπὶ τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ἔλθουσα, αὐτὴν κατεμήνυσε· καὶ τὸν λίθον ἐπέδειξεν, εἰκόνα φέροντα τοῦ δήγματος, ἀγνώστα δὲ τὴν ὕλην, καὶ παράξενόν τι δεικνύντα χρῶμα· σὺν δάκρυσι τε συγγνώμην αἰτήσασα, ὁμοφρονούσα τῷ ἀνδρὶ συνην. ἀλλὰ τὰδε μὲν εἶπω μὴ πιθανὰ δοκεῖ, μάρτυς αὐτὸς ὁ λίθος, εἰσέτι νῦν ἐν τοῖς κειμήλοις τῆς ἐκκλησίας Κωνσταντινουπόλεως φυλαττόμενος.—Sozom. in Hist. Eccles. Script. Lib. VIII. cap. v. pp. 617, 8.]

[¹² Niceph. Callist. Hist. Eccles. Lut. Par. 1630. Lib. XIII. cap. vii. Tom. II. pp. 363, 4.]

the whole people? Or how could she so openly receive it, without suspicion? Or why might she not have brought it in a napkin secretly about herself? The burden was not great: her feigning and hypocrisy had been the easier. And thus much to answer one guess by another.

But that there was no such dismembering of the holy communion at that time, we may well understand both by St Basil, Nazianzene, Gregory Nyssene, and others of that age, and also by these plain words of Chrysostom: *Est ubi nihil differat sacerdos a subdito: ut quando fruendum est horrendis mysteriis*¹: "In some cases there is no difference between the priest and the people; as when they must enjoy the reverend mysteries." Besides that, the Greek church never had this half communion, neither before that time nor ever since. And therefore pope Leo the tenth calleth the use of the whole sacrament, according to Christ's institution, the Bohemians' and the Grecians' heresy².

M. HARDING. THE TWENTY-FOURTH DIVISION.

The place of St Basil's epistles ad Cæsariam cannot be avoided by no shift nor sophistry of the gossellers. These be his words: "All they which live the solitary life in wilderness, where is no priest, keeping the communion at home, communicate themselves. And in Alexandria and in Egypt each³ of the people for the most part hath the communion in his house⁴."

Here I might ask M. Jewel, how they could keep wine consecrated in small measures, as should serve for every man's house apart, in those countries of extreme heat, specially in wilderness, where they had neither priest, nor deacon, as in that place St Basil writeth; for lack of whom they kept it in store a long time, that they might not be destitute of it at need. Again, here I might ask him, whether it was the form of bread only, or of wine also, which christian men, and specially women, were wont devoutly to receive of the priests in their clean linen or napkins, to bear home with them, taking great heed that no fragments of it fell down to⁵ the ground, as both Origen⁶, and also St Augustine⁷ do witness. I think he will confess that linen cloth is not a very fit thing to keep liquor in.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

The gossellers, whom M. Harding so often upbraideth with that name, as if he himself had no part in God's gospel, have little need to avoid that thing whereby they see themselves nothing hindered. For the question is moved of the whole congregation: answer is made of several persons. We speak of the order of churches: M. Harding answereth of forests and wilderness. Verily, if he could find any thing to purpose in the church, he would not thus hunt the mountains; neither would he fly⁸ for aid into Egypt, if he could find any near at home.

The ground of this argument is the impossibility of keeping wine, which M. Harding hath hitherto uttered by the name of form. Now that it is come to souring, he calleth it wine. There is cunning in shifting of terms. But if there be no wine there remaining, as these men would persuade the world, what shall we call it then that thus standeth in danger of souring? Certainly Christ's blood will not sour; and forms of wine, without substance, cannot sour: either of these both can as well abide the hot country as the cold. But Gelasius saith, "There remaineth in the sacrament⁹ the nature and substance of bread and wine¹⁰."

Of preserving wines in hot countries I will not reason. Notwithstanding, I remember Macrobius saith that, as the country of Egypt is extreme hot, so the wines of the same be extreme cold¹¹, and therefore, as it may be supposed, the

Chrysost. in
2 Cor. Hom.
18.

Bread and
wine shifted
suddenly into
forms.

[Vide articulum
priorem, H. A.
1564.]

Macrobius.

[¹ Chrysost. Op. Par. 1718-38. In Epist. II. ad Cor. Hom. xviii. Tom. X. p. 568. See before, page 202, note 13.]

[² See before, p. 231.]

[³ Each one, H. A. 1564.]

[⁴ Basil. Op. Par. 1721-30. Ad Cæsar. Epist. xciii. Tom. III. pp. 186, 7. See before, page 152.]

[⁵ On, H. A. 1564.]

[⁶ Orig. Op. Par. 1733-59. In Exod. Hom. xiii.

3. Tom. II. p. 176. See before, page 148, note 7.]

[⁷ August. Op. Par. 1679-1700. Serm. cccxix.

5. Tom. V. Append. cols. 376, 7. See before, page 148, note 8.]

[⁸ Flee, 1565.]

[⁹ Sacraments, 1565, 1609.]

[¹⁰ Gelas. Episc. Rom. adv. Eutych. et Nestor. in Mag. Biblioth. Vet. Patr. Col. Agrip. 1618-22. Tom. V. Pars III. p. 671.]

[¹¹ A. Macrobius. Saturn. Lib. vii. cap. viii.]

more durable. And although the country of Naples be very hot, yet the wines thereof have been preserved the space of forty or fifty years, as it is mentioned by Plutarch, Athenæus, and others. Howbeit, this is not much material. But as the wine is in danger of souring, so is the bread in danger of moulding, as appeareth by sundry cautels of the mass therefore provided. Yet one question would well be here demanded. If the wine in the mountains of Egypt could not be kept in small quantities a few days, how then could the wine that Christ changed out of water in Cana of Galilee be kept at Orlean in France¹², as a relique, for the space of fifteen hundred and thirty years, ever sithence that time, until this day, and that still without souring? But let us yield that wine in the mountains could not be kept; yet might¹³ it well be had, and kept in churches, at the least during the time of the communion; and that to this purpose is sufficient.

Plut. in Lucull.
Athen.
Lib. 1.

Vinum Ar-
chitriclini.

The keeping of liquor in a linen cloth was M. Harding's conceit, more to solace himself withal, than much making to the matter. For otherwise, as the women received the bread in a cloth, so might they receive the wine in a vial, or some other like thing. And that they so did, it may well be gathered by the story of Gorgonia, Nazianzene's sister¹⁴, by Exuperius, of whom St Hierome writeth¹⁵; and by the fable of the Jew, in M. Harding's own Amphilochius¹⁶. And for that M. Harding maketh such sport with "keeping liquor in a cloth," it was decreed in the council holden at Altisiodorum, "That the priest should put his oil in a chrismatory, and in linen," by these words: *Ut...chrisma...chrismario et linteo imponent*¹⁷. I doubt not but M. Harding thinketh a linen cloth will hold wine as well as oil.

Naz. in Fugere Gorg.
Hieron. ad Rusticum.
Narbonen.
Concil. Altisiodor. can. 6.

M. HARDING. THE TWENTY-FIFTH DIVISION.

Though I might bring a great number of other places for the use of one kind, which, after the most common rule of the church, was the form of bread; yet here I will stay myself¹⁸, putting the reader in mind that the communion hath been ministered to some persons under the form of wine only, and hath been taken for the whole sacrament; specially to such, as for driness of their throat, at their death, could not swallow it down under the form of bread. Whereas it appeareth by St Cyprian, and also by St Augustine, that the sacrament was given to infants in their time¹⁹. We find in St Cyprian, that, when a deacon offered the cup of our Lord's blood to a little maid-child, which, through default of the nurse, had tasted of the sacrifices that had been offered to devils, the child turned away her face, by the instinct of the divine Majesty (saith he), closed fast her lips, and refused the cup. But yet, when the deacon had forced her to receive a little of the cup, the yeax²⁰ and vomit followed, so as that sanctified drink in the blood of our Lord gushed forth of the polluted bowels. If the sacrament had been given to this infant under the form of bread before, she would have refused that no less than she did the cup, that the deacon then would not have given her the cup. And that this may seem the less to be wondered at, Johannes Teutonicus, that wrote scholies upon Gratian, witnesseth that, even in his time, the custom was in some places to give the sacrament to infants, not by delivering to them the body of Christ, but by pouring the blood into their mouths²¹; which custom hath been, upon good consideration, abrogated in the church of Rome, and kept in the Greek church, as Lyra writeth upon St John²².

De Consecrat.
dist. 4, can. 4.
Si qui apud illos
Hæreticos.

[¹² See Becon's Works, Lond. 1560-4. *Monstrous Merchandise of the Romish Bishops*. Vol. III. fol. 188.]

[¹³ Mought, 1565.]

[¹⁴ Gregor. Nazianz. Op. Par. 1778-1840. In Laud. Gorgon. Orat. viii. 18. Tom. I. p. 229.]

[¹⁵ Hieron. Op. Par. 1693-1706. Epist. xc. ad Rust. Monach. Tom. IV. Pars II. cols. 777, 8.]

[¹⁶ Amphiloch. Op. Par. 1644. In Vit. S. Basil. pp. 177, 8.]

[¹⁷ Concil. Antisiodor. can. 6. in Crabb. Concil. Col. Agrip. 1551. Tom. II. pp. 184, 5.]

[¹⁸ Meself, 1565.]

[¹⁹ Cypr. Op. Oxon. 1682. De Laps. p. 132. August. Op. Epist. ad Bonif. xcviii. 4. Tom. II. col. 265. See before, page 6, note 6.]

[²⁰ Yeax: hiccough.]

[²¹ Hoc de adultis: quia parvulis non datur corpus Christi... nisi forte ubi consuetudo est, quod infunditur per ora eorum sanguis Christi, non corpus secundum quosdam.—Gloss. in August. in Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugd. 1624. Decret. Gratian. Decr. Tert. Pars, De Consecr. Dist. iv. can. 28. col. 1985.]

[²² Dicunt Græci quod hoc sacramentum est tantæ

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

M. Harding
is against
himself, and
speareth
contrary².

Whatsoever plenty of such examples M. Harding hath, if he had any better he might well have spared these. Here he saith: "Some old men, for their age and drithe¹, were suffered to communicate of the cup only, as being not able to swallow the bread." A little before he said that "St Ambrose, lying in his death-bed, received the bread only³;" and that "St Basil, in the like case, received the sacrament, being then stale and dry, of seven years' keeping, and that alone, without wine⁴." Seneca saith: *Proprium est luxuriæ, gaudere per-versis*: "It is the property of wantonness to delight in things out of order."

Cypr. Serm.
5. de Lapsis.

Infants, saith M. Harding, received in one kind, and thereto he allegeth the authority of St Cyprian; which although it made with him to this purpose, touching children, yet to other great purposes it maketh directly against him. For first, by that place of St Cyprian, the holy communion was thought so necessary to all the faithful, that children and infants were not excluded⁵; which plainly overthroweth the private mass. Besides that, the whole people received in both kinds, as it is manifest by St Cyprian's words; which thing is contrary to M. Harding's half communion.

M. Harding
allegeth
S. Cyprian
against him-
self.

All this he granteth touching the people—wherein only I joined issue—and maketh his whole plea upon an infant; and yet of infants, as he knoweth, I spake nothing. If all that he saith were proved true, yet hath he gotten but an infant of his side. But what if this infant received both kinds? Verily there is nothing in Cyprian to the contrary. And it appeareth by St Hierome, St Augustine⁶, and other old writers, that they that were baptized, as well children as others, immediately received the holy mysteries in both kinds. St Hierome, speaking of one Hilarius, saith thus: *Non [potest] baptismum tradere sine eucharistia*⁷: "He cannot minister baptism without the sacrament of thanksgiving." St Cyprian's words touching this matter be these: *Ubi...solemnibus adimpletis calicem diaconus offerre præsentibus cœpit, et accipientibus ceteris, locus ejus advenit, faciem suam parvula, instinctu divinæ Majestatis, avertere*⁸, &c. "After the solemnity (of the consecration) was done, and the deacon began to minister the cup unto them that were present, and among others that received her turn was come, the child, by the power of God's divine majesty, turned away her face, &c." Hereby we may well gather, that, like as the priest, the deacons, and the people received, even so the child received too, without any manner innovation or difference.

August. de
Ecc. Dog-
mat. Lib. i.
cap. lii.
Hieron. con-
tra Lucif.

He will say, There is mention made but only of the cup: therefore the child received not the other kind. This guess is over slender: yet is it an ordinary argument with M. Harding. But it seemeth he doth not well consider the inconvenience that thereof may follow. For so may he as well conclude that the priest himself, and the deacons, and the whole people, received only of the cup. For there is no mention at all made of the other portion.

"If the bread had been offered to the child, she would as well have refused that as she did the cup." This is another guess, without any necessary sequel. This effect followed when God would have it; of whose doings we can give no reason.

Lyra and Teutonicus lived at the least thirteen hundred years after Christ; wherefore their authority in this case must needs seem the less. Yet, for ought that I can see, Lyra is untruly alleged, as writing to another purpose. Teutonicus in his gloss in the same place manifestly corrupteth St Augustine's text. For whereas St Augustine speaketh namely of children, and calleth them *parvulos*, "little ones," he saith in his gloss, *Hoc intellige de adultis*⁹: "Understand this of

necessitatis, quod pueris debet dari sicut baptismus: quod est falsum: quia in sumente hoc sacramentum requiritur actualis devotio et reverentia: quæ non sunt in pueris.—Bibl. cum Gloss. Ord. et Expos. N. de Lyra, Basil. 1502. Johan. cap. vi. Pars V. fol. 206. 2.]

[¹ Drithe: driness.]

[² Contraries, 1565, 1609.]

[³ See before, page 242.]

[⁴ See before, page 244.]

[⁵ See the preceding page.]

[⁶ August. Op. Par. 1679-1700. Lib. de Eccles. Dog. cap. xxii. Tom. VIII. Append. col. 78. It is this passage (falsely attributed to Augustine) upon which, as recited in Gratian, the gloss before mentioned (see the preceding page, note 20.) is made.]

[⁷ Hieron. Op. Par. 1693-1706. Adv. Lucifer. Tom. IV. Pars II. col. 302; where *neque* for *non*.]

[⁸ Cypr. Op. Oxon. 1682. De Laps. p. 132.]

[⁹ See the preceding page, note 20.]

men of ripe years." Then, to confirm his error, he allegeth a custom, but he knoweth not where; and proveth it also, but he knoweth not by whom. For thus he avoucheth it: *Secundum quosdam*; that is, "As some men say." Which was never good witness in any court. Wherefore M. Harding might have spared these doctors, without any prejudice of his cause.

M. HARDING. THE TWENTY-SIXTH DIVISION.

Can. 76. *The fourth council of Carthago decreed, if a man in sickness (who was enjoined public penance) do demand his housel, and ere he die fall in a phrensy, or become speechless, that the sacrament be poured into his mouth*¹⁰. To take this for

Can. 11. *the form of wine, we are moved by the decree of the eleventh council Toletane; where it is said, that "the weak nature of man is wont at the point of death to be so far oppressed with drouth, that it may be refreshed by no means, unless it be sustained*¹¹ *with comfort of drink." Then it followeth: "Which thing we see to be so at the*¹² *departing of many, who, being very desirous to receive their voyage provision of the holy communion, when the sacrament was given them, have cast it up again; not that they did this through infidelity, but for that they were not able to swallow down the sacrament delivered to them, but only a draught of our Lord's cup*¹³*." Howsoever this be taken, it is plain by this council, as by many other ancient councils and doctors, that the manner of the catholic church hath been to minister the sacrament to the sick under one kind.*

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

These authorities answer themselves¹⁴. Being every way granted, yet is M. Harding never the nearer¹⁵. The whole matter we stand upon is the open order and usage in the church. For proof hereof, here are brought in lunatics and madmen. It were a strange sight to see a church full of such people. The substance of his argument resteth only upon this guess, That the bread cannot be poured into the sick man's mouth: and yet he may learn by the third council of Carthage¹⁶, and by the abridgement of the council of Hippo¹⁷, that the sacrament was then put into dead men's mouths. Neither can I see what necessity is in this reason: The man is frantic, or lieth speechless, which was the suggestion of that council; *ergo*, he cannot receive the sacramental bread. If there be danger in the receiving, there is none more than in the cup.

The canon of the council of Toledo here alleged is not an exposition of this council of Carthage, as M. Harding thinketh; but a declaration of a canon made in the first council of Toledo, as it is plain by these words: *In collatione nostri cœtus relectus est canon Toletani concilii primi, in quo præceptum est, ut si quis acceptam a sacerdote eucharistiam non sumpserit, velut sacrilegus propellatur*¹⁸. "In the conference of our council there was read a canon of the council of Toledo, wherein it was ordered, that if any man received not the sacrament delivered to him by the priest, the same should be excommunicate, as a wicked doer." This decree seemed very strait, specially for that a godly man, by mean of sickness, or other weakness of nature, might happen to refuse, or not to receive down the sacrament, but to cast it up against his will. Therefore the council, by way of declaration, determineth thus: That, if any man happen so to do by force of sickness, he shall not stand in danger of the law.

Concil.
Carthag. iii.
cap. 6.

Concil. Tolet.
xi. cap. 11.

[¹⁰ Is qui pœnitentiam in infirmitate petit, si casu, dum ad eum sacerdos, invitatus, venit, oppressus infirmitate obmutuerit, vel in phrenesim versus fuerit ... Et si continuo creditur moriturus, ... infundatur ori ejus eucharistia.—Concil. Carth. iv. can. 76. in Crabb. Concil. Col. Agrip. 1551. Tom. I. p. 440.]

[¹¹ Unneth sustained, 1565, 1609, and H. A. 1564.]

[¹² 1565, 1609, and H. A. 1564 omit *the*.]

[¹³ Solet enim humanæ naturæ infirmitas, in ipso mortis exitu prægravata, tanto siccitatis pondere deprimi, ut nullis ciborum illationibus refici, sed vix tantundem illati delectetur poculi gratia sustentari. Quod etiam in multorum exitu vidimus, qui, optatum suis votis sacræ communionis expetentes viaticum,

collatam sibi a sacerdote eucharistiam rejecerunt. Non quod infidelitate hæc agerent, sed quod propter [al. præter] dominici calicis haustum, traditam sibi non possent eucharistiam deglutire.—Concil. Tolet. xi. cap. 11. in eod. Tom. II. p. 269.]

[¹⁴ Themselves, 1565.]

[¹⁵ Neare, 1565, 1609.]

[¹⁶ Concil. Carthag. iii. cap. 6. in eod. Tom. I. p. 427.]

[¹⁷ Concil. Hippon. Abbrev. 5. in eod. Tom. I. p. 433.]

[¹⁸ Concil. Tolet. xi. cap. 11. in eod. Tom. II. p. 269.]

Hereupon M. Harding concludeth thus: "It is plain by this council, and by many other councils and doctors," &c. Other council or doctor here is none named. This council neither maketh any law touching this matter, nor declareth any order or manner of public ministration, but only excuseth the invincible necessity and weakness of nature.

Si quis accep-
tam eucha-
ristiam non
sumpsit.
Collatam a
sacerdote
eucharistiam
rejecit.

But touching the manner and order of the church, the same council in the self-same¹ place saith, that the whole sacrament was offered even to the sick: that the sick did sometime of infirmity cast it up again²; which is a good argument that they did receive it; and that infants did sometime the like: whereof we may gather that infants then received the sacrament, and that in such sort as others did.

All these things considered accordingly, M. Harding might well conclude thus against himself: It was granted of special favour unto lunatics and madmen, and other sick persons, that, in consideration of their weakness, they might communicate under one kind without danger of the law. Therefore the rest, that were not so excepted, communicated under both kinds, and that by the very force of the law.

M. HARDING. THE TWENTY-SEVENTH DIVISION.

Now, whereas some say that the sacrament, to be given under the form of bread, was first dipped in the blood of our Lord, and would have so used now also for the sick, and that it is so to be taken for the whole and entire sacrament, as though the sacrament under the form of bread were not of itself sufficient; let them understand that this was an old error, condemned above twelve hundred years past by Julius the first, that great defender of Athanasius; who hereof, in an epistle to the bishops through Egypt, wrote thus: *Illud vero quod pro complemento communio-
nionis intinctam tradunt eucharistiam populis, nec hoc prolatum ex
evangelio testimonium receperunt, ubi apostolis corpus suum Dominus commen-
davit et sanguinem. Seorsum enim panis, [et] seorsum calicis commendatio me-
moratur*³. "Whereas some deliver to the people the sacrament dipped, for the full and whole communion, they have not received this testimony pronounced out of the gospel, where our Lord gave his body and his blood. For the giving of the bread is recorded apart by itself, and the giving of the cup apart likewise by itself." And whereas some afterward, in the time of Vitellianus, would have brought in again this abrogated custom, it was in like manner condemned and abolished, In tertio Concilio Braccaren-
si, Can. 1.⁴

De Con. dist. 2.
can. Cum omne
crimen.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

There have been many great abuses about the holy mysteries, not only of late years in the church of Rome, whereof we justly complain, but also in the primitive church, even from the apostles' time. For some there were that ministered in water only; some that ministered milk instead of wine; some bruised grapes into the cup, and so ministered; some ministered bread and cheese together; some dipped the sacrament of Christ's body in the sacrament of his blood⁵. But neither this folly, whereof Julius speaketh, nor any other like old folly, was ever renewed by any of us. Indeed M. Harding, and all the rest of that side, have used to break the bread, and to dip the third part of it into the wine, and for the same have devised a solemn mystery. For some of them say, "It signifieth Christ's rising from the dead;" some, "the faithful that be yet alive;" some others, "the blessed that be in heaven⁶." And yet M. Harding knoweth

De Con. Dist.
2.
Cum Omne.
Aug. ad
Quod-vult-
deum.

[¹ Same self, 1565.] [² See before, page 251.]

[³ Jul. Papa in Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugd. 1624. Decret. Gratian. Decr. Tert. Pars, De Consecr. Dist. ii. can. 7. col. 1915; where the text has *recipit*, also *corpus suum, et sanguinem commendavit*.]

[⁴ Concil. Brac. III. cap. 1. in Crabb. Concil. Col. Agrip. 1551. Tom. II. p. 272.]

[⁵ Audivimus ... quosdam ... lac pro vino ... dedicare: alios quoque intinctam eucharistiam populis... porrigere: quosdam etiam expressum vinum...offerre:

&c.—Jul. Papa in Corp. Jur. Canon. Decret. Gratian. Decr. Tert. Pars, De Consecr. Dist. ii. can. 7. col. 1914.

Artotyritæ...offerunt ... panem et caseum. Aquarii...aquam offerunt in poculo sacramenti.—August. Op. Par. 1679-1700. Lib. de Hæres. capp. xxviii. lxiv. Tom. VIII. cols. 10, 20, 1.]

[⁶ See, for a variety of notions, Durand. Rat. Div. Offic. Lugd. 1565. Lib. iv. cap. li. 21, 2. foll. 196, 7. cap. liv. 9. fol. 201. 2.]

that Julius calleth it "a schismatical ambition, and a practice contrary to the apostles' doctrine."

We, both herein and in all other cases like, follow only Christ's institution: who, as the evangelists have written, and as Julius also recordeth, first gave the bread apart, and afterward the wine likewise apart; and said not only, "Eat this," but also by express words, "Drink this." Yet Ivo saith that, for danger of shedding, sometimes the bread is dipped into the cup, and so delivered to the people⁷.

Ivo de Div.
Offic.
Cassandr.

This Julius here alleged standeth fully of our side; and therefore I marvel that M. Harding would seek comfort at his hand. For where he saith, *Porrigunt eucharistiam populis*; "They deliver the sacrament unto the people;" he importeth a communion: where he reproveth the error of dipping, and rectifieth the same by Christ's institution, and commandeth both kinds to be given apart, he signifieth the whole communion expressly in both kinds; and so quite overthroweth whatsoever M. Harding hath hitherto builded⁸.

Julius commandeth both kinds, contrary to M. Harding's doctrine.

M. HARDING. THE TWENTY-EIGHTH DIVISION.

Now I refer me to the judgment of the reader, of what opinion soever he be, whether, for proof of the communion under one kind, we have any word, sentence, or clause at all, or no; and whether these words of M. Jewel in his sermon be true or no, where he saith thus: "It was used throughout the whole catholic church, six hundred years after Christ's ascension, under both kinds, without exception." That it was so used, yea, six hundred years, and long after, we deny not; but that it was so always, and in every place used, and without exception, that we deny; and upon what grounds we do it, let M. Jewel himself be judge. If some of our allegations may be with violence wrested from our purpose, verily a great number of them cannot; the authority of the ancient fathers who wrote them remaining inviolated. Wherefore it followeth that, after the judgment of these fathers, whereas Christ instituted this blessed sacrament, and commanded it to be celebrated, and received in remembrance of his death, (62) he gave no necessary commandment, either for the one, or for both kinds (beside and without the celebration of the sacrifice), but left that to the determination of the church. Now that the church, for the avoiding of unreverence, perils, offences, and other weighty and important causes, hath decreed it *in two general councils, to be received of the lay-people in¹¹ one kind only, we think it good, with all humbleness, to submit ourselves to the church herein; which church Christ commandeth to be heard and obeyed, saying, "He that heareth not the church, let him be to thee as a heathen and as a publican." In doing whereof we weigh advisedly with ourselves the horrible danger that remaineth for them who be authors of schism and breakers of unity.

The question is of the open ministration in the church.

The sixty-second untruth. For¹⁰ Christ's institution pertaineth as well to the people, as to the priest.

*These councils were holden fourteen hundred and fourteen years after Christ.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

Good christian reader, now that M. Harding hath said so much as he is able, it behoveth thee, as thou wilt judge indifferently between us both, so to consider and mark well the very state and issue of the matter, wherein the whole question lieth. The negative of our side, which so much troubleth him, is this: "That, for the space of six hundred years after Christ, it cannot be found in any old doctor, or council, that ever the holy communion was ministered to the people, in the church, or any open assembly, in one kind only, as it is now ministered in the church of Rome." The issue therefore of the whole matter between us standeth upon the order and usage of the church.

M. Harding, for proof hereof, hath brought certain particular examples of drouth, infirmities, sickness, age, inevitable necessities, and impossibilities, and weakness of nature. Verily, good reader, I looked for other proofs at M. Harding's hands. For all these, and other like things, I knew before. He hath alleged Christ's breaking of bread at Emmaus; the allegation whereof to

[⁷ ... quem [populum] intincto pane, non auctoritate, sed summa necessitate timoris sanguinis Christi effusionis, permittitur communicare.—Ivo. de Div. Offic. in Cassandr. Op. Par. 1616. Liturg.

cap. xxxi. p. 76.]

[⁸ Built, 1565.]

[⁹ See before, page 9.]

[¹⁰ 1565 omits *for*.]

[¹¹ Under, H. A. 1564.]

Wil. Wic-
ford.

this purpose, one of his own doctors saith, is mere folly¹. He hath alleged two women, three sick folk in their death-beds, persons excommunicate, infants, phrenetics, and madmen.

He allegeth napkins, chests, chambers, mountains, and wilderness; and, for further proof, hath brought conjectures, guesses, lies, and fables. He allegeth abuses that long sithence have been condemned. He allegeth scriptures, doctors, and councils, plainly and directly against himself.

He is learned, and hath read much: he is eloquent, and can utter much: yea, he is able to make nothing to appear somewhat, and a little to seem much.

He hath had good conference with as many as he thought meet, either within this realm, or without. He hath seen whatsoever hath been written by Cochläus, Eckius, Pighius, Hofmeister, Michael Væhe, Hosius, Staphylus, and such other of that sort. He hath had five whole years and more to order and digest his book. It toucheth him very near that any man should be so bold to say, "They have defrauded the people of half the sacrament, and yet can allege nothing for it." He sheweth himself much offended, and therefore spareth not his familiar terms, "heretics, schismatics, adversaries of the church, God's enemies, and such like." Yet, having so much learning, so much eloquence, so much conference, so much study, so much leisure, being so affected, and so offended, yet hath he not hitherto brought one word, either of ancient council, or of old doctor, to prove that thing that is denied; that is, "That the sacrament was ever ministered unto the people in one kind, openly in any congregation, or in the open order and usage of any church." Yet were there churches then erected; yet were there priests and people then; yet was the holy ministration then openly used in form and order, and learned men to record the same. All this notwithstanding, M. Harding hath hitherto found nothing in the open ministration, in the congregation and assembly of the people, whereby to prove his half communion. Wherefore there is no cause yet shewed to the contrary but M. Jewel may say now as he truly before said in his sermon, "The whole communion was used throughout the whole catholic church under both kinds six hundred years after Christ's ascension, in all congregations and churches, without exception."

Ad Casul.

"But Christ hath left these matters to the discretion and determination of the church." By what record may that appear? M. Harding's word is no charter. Or if it be true, where did the church ever so determine of it, within the compass of six hundred years? St Augustine in this case is very reasonable. His words be these: *Ubi auctoritas deficit, ibi consuetudo majorum pro lege tenenda est*²: "Where authority faileth, there the custom of our elders must hold for a law." But having God's word, and Christ's institution, we want no authority.

Lud. Vives
in xx. Lib. de
Civ. Del.
cap. xxvi.

"The authority of the church is great." I grant; but the causes that moved the church of Rome to break Christ's institution, "as the keeping of the wine, beards, and palsies, and such like," are not great; notwithstanding M. Harding enlarge them much, and call them "important and weighty causes." The two councils of Basil and Constance, where this matter was first concluded, as they were at the least fourteen hundred years after Christ, and therefore not to be alleged in this case against my assertion; so the authority of them both hangeth yet in question. For the Thomists say the council of Basil came unlawfully together, and that therefore all their determinations were in vain³. And Pighius saith the other council of Constance "concluded against nature, against the scriptures, against antiquity, and against the faith of the church"⁴. These be the two councils that M. Harding would have us yield unto.

"We are bound to hear the church," saith M. Harding. But much more are we bound to hear God. This saying of St Cyprian is worthy deeply to be noted: *Non jungitur ecclesiae, qui ab evangelio separatur*⁵: "He hath no fellowship with the

[¹ Wilh. Wodford. adv. Joan. Wiclef. in Fasc. Rer. Expet. et Fug. Lond. 1690. p. 198. See before, page 233.]

[² In his enim rebus de quibus nihil certi statuit scriptura divina, mos populi Dei vel instituta majorum pro lege tenenda sunt.—August. Op. Par. 1679-1700. Ad Casul. Epist. xxxvi. 2. Tom. II. col. 68.]

[³ Id. de Civit. Dei, per Joan. Lud. Vivem. Basil. 1522. Comm. in Lib. xx. cap. xxvi. p. 702. See before, page 233.]

[⁴ Pigh. Hierarch. Eccles. Assert. Col. 1538. Lib. vi. cap. ii. fol. 218. 2.]

[⁵ Nec ecclesiae jungitur, qui &c.—Cypr. Op. Oxon. 1682. De Laps. p. 129.]

church that is divided from the gospel." And likewise, writing against certain that abused the cup of Christ, ministering therein water instead of wine, he giveth this lesson to all bishops and others, touching the reformation of the church: *Religioni...nostræ congruit, et timori, et ipsi loco, et officio sacerdotii nostri,...custodire traditionis dominicæ veritatem; et quod prius apud quosdam videtur erratum, Domino monente, corrigere: ut cum in claritate sua et majestate cœlesti venire cœperit, inveniatur nos tenere quod monuit, observare quod docuit, facere quod fecit*⁶: "It behoveth the religion that we profess, and our reverence towards God, and the very place and office of our priesthood, to keep the truth of the Lord's tradition, and by the Lord's advertisement to correct that thing that by certain hath been amiss; that when he shall come in his glory and majesty, he may find us to hold that he warned us, to keep that he taught us, to do that he did."

Gelasius.

Cypr. ad Cæcil. Lib. ii. Epist. 3.

M. HARDING. THE TWENTY-NINTH DIVISION.

[Gelasius his canon, guilefully by M. Jewel alleged, truly examined, H. A. 1564.] Now for answer to M. Jewel's place alleged out of Gelasius, which is the chief that he and all other (the adversaries of the church) have to bring for their purpose in this point, thus⁷ much may be said. First, that he allegeth Gelasius untruly, making him to sound in English otherwise than he doth in Latin. M. Jewel's words be these: "Gelasius, an old father of the church, and a bishop of Rome, saith, that to minister the communion under one kind is open sacrilege." But where saith Gelasius so? This is no sincere handling of the matter. And because he knew the words of that father imported not so much, guilefully he reciteth them in Latin, and doth not English them; which he would not have omitted, if they had so plainly made for his purpose. The words of Gelasius be these: *Divisio unius ejusdemque mysterii sine grandi sacrilegio non potest pervenire*⁸: "The division of one and the same mystery cannot come without great sacrilege." Of these words he cannot conclude Gelasius to say, that to minister the communion under one kind is open sacrilege. Gelasius rebuketh and abhorreth the division of that high mystery, which under one form, and under both, is *unum idemque*, "one and the same:" not one under the form of bread, and another under the form of wine; not one in respect of the body, and another in respect of the blood; but *unum idemque*, "one and the self-same." The words afore recited be taken out of a fragment of a canon of Gelasius, which is thus, as we find in Gratian: *Comperimus autem, quod quidam, sumpta tantum...corporis sacri portione, a calice sacrati cruoris absteineant. Qui proculdubio (quoniam nescio qua superstitione docentur adstringi) aut integra sacramenta percipiant, aut ab integris arceantur; quia divisio unius ejusdemque mysterii sine grandi sacrilegio non potest pervenire*⁸; which may thus be Englished: "But we have found that some, having received only the portion wherein is the holy body, abstain from the cup of the sacred blood; who without doubt (forasmuch as I know not with what superstition they be taught to be tied) either let them receive the whole sacraments, or let them be kept from the whole; because the division of one and the same mystery cannot come without great sacrilege."

Here might be said to M. Jewel, Shew us the whole epistle of Gelasius from whence this fragment is taken, that we may weigh the circumstance, and the causes why he wrote it, conferring that goeth before, and that followeth; and we will frame you a reasonable answer. But it is not extant; and therefore your argument, in that respect, is of less force.

Gelasius untruly translated by M. Harding.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

Neither are we the adversaries of the church, nor Gelasius the chiefest that we bring for our purpose. We follow Christ, as he hath commanded us, whom it became Gelasius also to follow. But it is a world to see into how many faces and fashions M. Harding is fain to turn himself to avoid this authority of Gelasius. He leaveth the whole rout of his own company, and is glad to run alone. He expoundeth Gelasius by Leo, as though they wrote both of one thing. And yet

[⁶ Id. ad Cæcil. Epist. lxiii. p. 157; where *atque officio*.]

[⁷ This, 1565, and H. A. 1564.]

[⁸ Gelas. in Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugd. 1624. De-

cret. Gratian. Decr. Tert. Pars, De Consecr. Dist. ii. can. 12. col. 1918; where *sacri cruoris, obstringi, and provenire*.]

Gelasius.

In Pontif. ut
citatur in l.
Tom. Concil.
Vita Gelasii.

others of his own side say that Leo wrote of heretics, and Gelasius of catholics; Leo of the people, Gelasius of the priests. He complaineth that the rest of Gelasius is not to be found, as though it were suppressed by some of us; and yet it is thought the pope hath it whole in his library¹. He deviseth new causes of unity of the mystery, such as Gelasius never knew. He concludeth at the last, that this breach of Christ's institution, and ministration under one kind, that is now universally used in the church of Rome, was first brought in and practised by the Manichees, which were in old time wicked and horrible heretics.

He saith I have guilefully alleged Gelasius; and, to the intent it might the sooner appear, he hath noted it specially in the margin. But, if M. Harding himself had meant no guile, he would have shewed plainly wherein I have been guileful, or what I might have gotten by this guile, or what advantage I might have lost by plainer dealing. For guile without cause is mere folly, and no guile. But I recited the words in Latin, and had forgotten to English them. Now surely that is but a simple guile, and might well have been spared out of the margin.

But my words be these: "Gelasius saith that to minister the sacrament in one kind is open sacrilege." And what guile can he find herein? This word "sacrilege," and "the refusing of the cup," are both specially named by Gelasius. There remain only these words, "To minister the sacrament;" and there, saith M. Harding, lieth the guile. Howbeit, therein, as it shall well appear, I say nothing but that Gelasius saith, and M. Harding himself would have him say. For thus saith Gelasius, "The division of the mystery," whereby he meaneth the sacrament, "is sacrilege:"

But the priest that ministereth in one kind divideth the mystery;

Ergo, the priest that ministereth in one kind committeth sacrilege.

This argument is perfect², and formal, and founded upon Gelasius' words. I trow this is no guileful dealing.

The unity of the mystery that M. Harding hath here fantasied, that either part is in other, and therefore harpeth so often, as it were by reports, upon these words, *Unum et idem*, is but his own voluntary. He is not able to allege either Gelasius, or any other old father that ever expounded *unum* and *idem* in that sort. He calleth it "one mystery," as Hugo Cardinalis saith (although otherwise a very gross writer), *propter unitatem institutionis*³, "for the unity of the institution," and for that the bread and wine, being sundry portions, have both relation unto one Christ. And for that cause, by St Hierome's judgment, St Paul saith, *Una fides, unum baptisma*⁴; "One faith, one baptism:" and for that also, that being, as I said, two sundry portions, yet they make not two sundry sacraments, but one only sacrament. And therefore Durandus, a late writer, seemeth to say well: *In multis locis communicatur cum pane et vino, id est, cum toto sacramento*⁵: "In many places they communicate with bread and wine; that is," saith he, "with the whole sacrament." Of which words the reader, be he never so simple, may easily gather that the communion in one kind is but the half sacrament, and so the division of one mystery, and so, further, the self-same thing that Gelasius calleth sacrilege.

M. HARDING. THE THIRTIETH DIVISION.

But for avoiding that⁶, our adversaries would hereof conclude, it is to be understood, that this canon speaketh against the heretics named Manichæi, who, in the

[¹ Hic fecit 5. libros adversus Nestorium et Eutychem, qui hodie in bibliotheca et archivo ecclesiæ continentur. Fecit et hymnos, &c.—Decret. Gelas. Ex Libr. Pontif. in Crabb. Concil. Col. Agrip. 1551. Tom. I. p. 964.]

[² Perfite, 1565.]

[³ The passage intended is probably the following: *Unum quidem ex unitate institutionis, et principaliter signati.*—Hugon. de S. Char. Op. Col. Agrip. 1621. In Epist. 1. ad Cor. cap. xi. fol. 104. 2. Hugo is not however in this place speaking of the two kinds.]

[⁴ *Unus est Dominus, et unus est Deus: quia Patris et Filii dominatio una divinitas est. Propterea et fides una dicitur: quia similiter in Patrem, et in*

Filium, et in Spiritum sanctum credimus. Et baptisma unum: eodem enim modo et in Patrem, et in Filium, et in Spiritum sanctum baptizamur. Et ter mergimur, ut Trinitatis unum appareat sacramentum, &c.—Hieron. Op. Par. 1693-1706. Comm. in Epist. ad Ephes. Lib. II. cap. iv. Tom. IV. Pars. 1. cols. 361, 2.]

[⁵ This passage is afterwards (see below, page 261) assigned to another chapter. Both references are probably erroneous. See, however, Durand. Rat. Div. Offic. Lugd. 1565. Lib. IV. cap. liv. 12, 13. fol. 202. 2; where the receiving under one kind is said not to be *plenum*, or *completum sacramentum*.]

[⁶ Of that, H. A. 1564.]

Unum et
Idem.

Hugo Cardi-
nal. 1 Cor. xi.

Hieron. ad
Ephes. Lib. II.
cap. iv.

Durand. Lib.
iv. cap. xxiv.

time of Leo the first, about forty years before Gelasius, went about to spread their heresy in Rome, and in the parts⁷ of Italy. Their heretical opinion was, that Christ took not our flesh and blood, but that he had a fantastical body, and died not, nor⁸ rose again truly and indeed, but by way of phantasy. And therefore, at the communion, they abstained from the cup; and, the better to cloke their heresy, came to receive the sacrament in form⁹ of bread, with other catholic people. Against whom Leo saith thus: Abdicant enim se sacramento salutis nostræ¹⁰, &c.; “They drive themselves away from the sacrament of our salvation. And, as they deny that Christ our Lord was born in truth of our flesh, so they believe not that he died, and rose again truly. And for this cause they condemn the day of our salvation and gladness (that is, the Sunday) to be their sad fasting day. And whereas, to cloke their infidelity, they dare to be at our mysteries, they temper themselves so in the communion of the sacraments, as in the mean time they may the more safely keep them privy. With unworthy mouth they receive Christ’s body; but to drink the blood of our redemption, utterly they will none of it. Which thing we would advertise your holiness of, that both such men may be manifested by these tokens unto you, and also that they, whose devilish simulation and feigning is found, being brought to light, and bewrayed of the fellowship of saints, may be thrust out of the church by priestly authority.” Thus far be Leo his words.

Gelasius, that succeeded forty years after Leo, employed no less diligence than he did, utterly to vanquish and abolish that horrible heresy. Of whom Platina writeth, that he banished so many Manichees as were found at Rome, and there openly burned their books¹¹. And because this heresy should none elsewhere take root, and spring, he wrote an epistle to Majoricus and Joannes, two bishops, amongst other things warning them of the same. Out of which epistle this fragment only is taken: whereby he doth both briefly shew what the Manichees did for clogging of their infidelity, as Leo saith; and also, inasmuch as their opinion was that Christ’s body had not very blood, as being fantastical only, and therefore superstitiously abstained from the cup of that holy blood, giveth charge and commandment, that either forsaking their heresy they receive the whole sacraments, to wit, under both kinds, or that they be kept from them wholly. Here the words of Leo afore mentioned, and this canon of Gelasius conferred together, specially the story of that time known, it may soon appear to any man of judgment, against whom this fragment of Gelasius was written. Verily, not against the church for ministering the communion under one kind, but against the detestable Manichees, who, going about to divide the mystery of the body and blood of Christ, denying him to have taken very flesh and blood, so much as in them lay, loosed

¹ John *in*. Christ, whereof St John speaketh, and would have made frustrate the whole work of our redemption.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

To avoid the inconvenience growing of this authority, M. Harding is driven to avoid the company of Pighius, Hosius, Tapper, D. Cole, and all others his fellows of that side, and to say that Gelasius wrote this decree against the Manichees; notwithstanding all they say, he wrote it against certain superstitious priests. D. Cole referreth himself unto the construction of the gloss there written¹². The words thereof be these: “There were certain priests that consecrated the body and blood of Christ in due order, and received the body, but abstained from the

De Con.
Dist. 2.
Comperim.
In Glossa.

[⁷ Parties, H. A. 1564.]

[⁸ Ne, 1565, 1609, and H. A. 1564.]

[⁹ The form, 1565, and H. A. 1564.]

[¹⁰ Abdicant enim se sacramento salutis humanæ, et Christum Dominum nostrum, sicut in veritate carnis nostræ denegent natum, ita vere mortuum et resurrexisse non credunt. Et ob hoc diem salutis et lætitiæ nostræ sui jejunii mœrore condemnant. Cumque ad tegendum infidelitatem suam nostris audeant interesse mysteriis, ita in sacramentorum communione se temperant, ut interdum tutius lateant: ore indigno Christi corpus accipiunt; sanguinem autem redemp-

tionis nostræ haurire omnino declinant. Quod ideo vestram volumus scire sanctitatem, ut vobis hujusmodi homines et his manifestentur indicis, et quorum deprehensa fuerit sacrilega simulatio, notati et proditi a sanctorum societate sacerdotali auctoritate pellantur.—Leon. Magn. Op. Lut. 1623. Sermon. iv. De Quadrag. col. 108.]

[¹¹ Gelasius autem Manichæos in urbe deprehensos exilio damnat, eorumque libros apud basilicam divæ Mariæ publice comburit.—Plat. De Vit. Sum. Pont. Col. 1551. Gelas. I. p. 61.]

[¹² See before, pages 38, 56.]

blood. Against them Gelasius writeth¹. This guess of that glosser for many good causes seemeth unlikely: for, first, it cannot be shewed by any story, neither where nor when any such priests were that so abstained; and again, Gelasius seemeth to write of them that should be taught, not of them that should teach; of them that should be removed from the sacraments, not of the priests that should remove them; of the sacrilege and wickedness of the fact, not of the difference of any persons.

But the gloss saith notwithstanding: "The priest² consecrated both the body and the blood, and received the body, and abstained from the blood." Here would I fain learn of D. Cole, what then became of the cup. The priest drank it not: that is certain; for the gloss saith so. Again, the people drank it not; for so saith the gloss also, and, be it true or false, it must be defended.

Then must it needs follow that Christ's blood was consecrate to be cast away. D. Cole might have foreseen that this gloss would soon be taken against himself. Now let us see of this very self gloss what may be concluded of our side. The sacrament of Christ's blood was not thrown away: the priest received it not; *ergo*, it followeth, of very fine force, it was received by the people. Thus D. Cole, seeking to prove that the people received not in both kinds, himself unawares necessarily proveth that the people received in both kinds. Wherefore M. Harding's conjecture carrieth more substance of truth. For the very story and conference of time will soon give the advised reader to understand, that Gelasius wrote this decree against the Manichees.

Thus much therefore hath M. Harding gotten hereby, that now it appeareth that the first authors of his half communion were a sort of heretics. They held that Christ never received flesh of the blessed virgin, neither was born, nor suffered, nor died, nor rose³ again. Which errors are manifestly convinced by the sacraments. For they are sacraments of Christ's body and blood; therefore whoso receiveth the same confesseth thereby that Christ of the virgin received both body and blood. So saith St Chrysostom: *Si mortuus Christus non est, cujus symbolum et signum hoc sacramentum est*⁴? "If Christ died not indeed, tell me then, whose token or whose sign is this sacrament?" Tertullian also by a like argument taken of the sacrament reproveth Marcion, that held that Christ had no body, but only a shew and a phantasy of a body: [*Christus*] *acceptum panem, et distributum discipulis, corpus suum illum fecit, dicendo, Hoc est corpus meum, hoc est, figura corporis mei. Figura autem non esset, nisi veritatis esset corpus. Ceterum vacua res, quod est phantasma, figuram capere non potest*⁵: "Christ, having received the bread, and giving the same to his disciples, made it his body, saying, 'This is my body,' that is to say, a figure of my body. But it could not be a figure, unless there were a body of a truth. For a void thing, as is a phantasy, can receive no figure at all." Thus the sacraments do plainly testify that Christ received not a phantasy or shew of a body, but a very body indeed. Therefore the Manichees abstained from the holy cup, as it appeareth by Leo: notwithstanding St Augustine in one place, writing namely against the Manichees, seemeth to signify the contrary. These be his words: *Sacramentum panis et calicis ita laudatis, ut in eo nobis pares esse volueritis*⁶: "Ye so commend the sacrament of the bread and of the cup, that therein you would make yourselves equal with us." Neither were they indeed able to shew any simple cause, why they should more shun the one portion than the other. For the sacrament of the bread no less confounded their error than the sacrament of the cup. And as they thought that Christ's body was no body, but only a phantasy, so they likewise thought that Christ's blood was no natural blood, but only a phantasy. But if they would

Heretics, the first authors of the half communion.

Chrysost. in Matt. Hom. 83.

Contra Marcion. Lib. iv.

Contr. Faust. Manich. Lib. xx. cap. xliii.

[¹ Erant quidam sacerdotes, qui ordine debito consecrabant corpus et sanguinem Christi: corpus sumebant, sed a sanguine abstinebant, &c.—Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugd. 1624. Decret. Gratian. Decr. Tert. Pars, De Consecr. Dist. ii. Gloss. in can. 12. col. 1917.]

[² These priests, 1565.]

[³ Arose, 1565.]

[⁴ Chrysost. Op. Par. 1718-38. In Matt. Hom. lxxxii. Tom. VII. p. 783.]

[⁵ Tertull. Op. Lut. 1641. Adv. Marcion. Lib. iv. 40. p. 571; where we have *illum suum fecit, hoc est &c. dicendo, non fuisse* and *posset*.]

[⁶ August. Op. Par. 1679-1700. Contr. Faust. Lib. xx. cap. xliii. Tom. VIII. col. 342; where *panis et calicis sacramentum, quod ita laudatis, ut &c.*]

not believe Leo or Augustine, that Christ had one body, how much less would they believe M. Harding that Christ hath two bodies, the one in the bread, the other in the cup, and each wholly in the other! Gelasius.

M. HARDING. THE THIRTY-FIRST DIVISION.

And therefore M. Jewel doth us great wrong in wresting this canon against us; forasmuch as we do not divide this divine mystery, but believe stedfastly with heart, and confess openly with mouth, that, under each kind, the very flesh and blood of Christ, and whole Christ himself is present in the sacrament; (63) even as Gelasius believed. Upon this occasion, in the parties of Italy, where the Manichees uttered their poison, the communion under both kinds was restored, and commanded to be used again; whereas before (64) of some the sacrament was received under one kind, and of some under both kinds. Else, if the communion under both kinds had been taken for a necessary institution and commandment of Christ, and so generally and inviolably observed everywhere and always without exception; what needed Gelasius to make such an ordinance of receiving the whole sacraments, the cause whereof by this⁸ parenthesis (*quoniam nescio qua superstitione docentur adstringi*) plainly expresseth? Again, if it had been so inviolably observed of all until that time, then the Manichees could not have covered and clogged their infidelity, as Leo saith, by the⁹ receiving the communion with other catholic people under one kind. For whiles the catholics went from church, contented with the only form of bread, it was uncertain whether he that came to receive were a Manichee or a catholic. But after that, for descrying of them, it was decreed, that the people should not forbear the communion of the cup any more, the good catholic folk so received, and the Manichees by their refusal of the cup bewrayed themselves. Whereby it appeareth, that the communion under one kind, used before, by the commandments of Leo and Gelasius was forbidden, to the intent thereby the Manichees' heresy might the better be espied, rooted out, and clean abolished.

The sixty-third untruth. For? Gelasius never believed so. The sixty-fourth untruth. For? no catholic congregation ever received the sacrament in one kind.

Thus because we do not divide the mystery of the¹⁰ Lord's body and blood, but acknowledge, confess, and teach, that Christ took of the virgin Mary very flesh and very blood indeed, and was a whole and perfect¹¹ man, as also God, and delivered the same whole flesh to death for our redemption, and rose again in the same for our justification, and giveth the same to us to be partakers of it in the blessed sacrament to life everlasting; that decree of Gelasius cannot seem against us justly to be alleged; much less may he seem to say or mean, that to minister the communion under one kind is open sacrilege.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

Here M. Harding complaineth, we do him wrong to allege this canon against him; for that he believeth, even as Gelasius did, that whole Christ is in each part of the sacrament. It is very much to allege Gelasius' faith without his words, or to found any new faith, as this is, without some kind of proof. This is M. Harding's gross error, and not Gelasius', or any other of the catholic fathers' faith. If the holy fathers had so believed, they had words, and were able to utter it. If this had been the faith of the catholic church, it had not been kept so long in silence.

As for Gelasius, his own words are sufficient to declare his faith. Thus he writeth against Nestorius and Eutyches: *Sacramenta, quæ sumimus, corporis et sanguinis Christi, divinæ res sunt; propter quod et per eadem divinæ efficimur consortes naturæ. Et tamen esse non desinit substantia vel natura panis et vini*¹²: "The sacraments of Christ's body and blood, that we receive, are a godly thing; and therefore by the same we are made partakers of the divine nature. Yet there letteth not to be the substance or nature of bread and wine." This was Gelasius' faith touching these portions of the sacrament.

Now hath M. Harding devised another mystery of the wonderful conjunction

[⁷ 1565 omits *for*.]

[⁸ His, H. A. 1564.]

[⁹ Their, H. A. 1564.]

[¹⁰ Our, H. A. 1564.]

[¹¹ Perfit, 1565, and H. A. 1564.]

[¹² Gelas. Episc. Rom. adv. Eutych. et Nestor. in Mag. Biblioth. Vet. Patr. Col. Agrip. 1618-22. Tom. V. Pars III. p. 671; where we find *divina res est*.]

Gelas. ccntr. Eutych.

of God and man in Christ, whereof Gelasius spake not one word in this place, neither was it any thing to his purpose to speak of it. Besides this, he imagineth Gelasius to give a law, that no man should divide that mystery; whereas it never lay in the power of man to divide it. Neither had that been a division, but an utter dissolution of the mystery.

August.
contr. Epist.
Parmen. Lib.
iii. cap. ii.

Thus, so he may seem to say somewhat, he weigheth not greatly what he say, examining each thing, as St Augustine saith, *non in statera æqua divinarum scripturarum, sed in statera dolosa consuetudinum suarum*¹: "Not in the just balance of the holy scriptures, but in the deceitful and false beams of his own customs."

Irenæus,
Lib. i.

Of the cup he maketh the bread: of the bread he maketh the cup: of one he maketh both: of both he maketh one: of one mystery he maketh another: and thus they deal, even as Irenæus writeth of the heretic Valentinus: *Ordinem et textum scripturarum supergredientes, et quantum in ipsis est, solventes, membra veritatis transferunt, et transfigunt, et alterum ex altero facientes, seducunt multos, ex his quæ aptant ex dominicis eloquiis male composito phantasmati*²: "Overrunning the order and text of the scriptures, and, as much as in them lieth, dismembering the limbs of the truth, they alter and transpose matters, and, making one thing of another, they deceive many by that they gather out of the Lord's words, and join to their ill-favoured phantasy."

The mystery whereof Gelasius speaketh is the holy sacrament, which, albeit it stand of two parts, yet is it one sacrament, and not two. The Manichees divided the same, taking one part, and leaving the other. And this is it that Gelasius calleth sacrilege.

Here it is further surmised that Leo and Gelasius, by their decrees, restored the catholic people again to the use of both kinds. This is utterly untrue, and may be guessed by M. Harding, but cannot any way be proved.

The decrees of Leo and Gelasius be abroad, and may be known. But where are these decrees? In what books are they written? Or who ever made mention of them? Verily these godly fathers reprovèd the Manichees for their sacrilege, and not the catholics; and commanded such as had offended to correct their faults, and not such as were faultless.

"But how could the Manichees have been known," saith M. Harding, "unless the catholic people among whom they received, had communicated³ in one kind?" This question is out of course. I might better say: "Nay, how could the Manichees have been known, if they and the catholics had received in one kind both alike?" For this is the token that Leo would have them known by: *Sanguinem redemptionis nostræ haurire detrectant*⁴: "They refuse to drink the blood of our redemption." By these words it is clear that the cup was offered orderly unto them, as unto others; but they refused it.

Thou seest, good christian reader, that M. Harding, notwithstanding he be driven to leave his own fellows, to shift one mystery for another, to imagine new laws and new decrees, that were never heard of, to change himself into sundry forms, and to seek all manner holes to creep out at, yet at last hath found by the authority of Leo, whom he himself allegeth, that the catholic people received the whole communion under both kinds, according to Christ's institution; and that the patrons and founders of his half communion were old wicked heretics, named the Manichees; that the same is the division of one whole entire mystery; and therefore by the authority of Gelasius may well be called open sacrilege.

Now, to shew what might be said of our side were labour infinite. For our doctrine taketh no authority of private folk, of women, of forcelets⁵, of napkins, of sick bodies, of death-beds, of miracles, of fables, of children, and of madmen, which be the only grounds of all that M. Harding seemeth hitherto able to say; but of Christ's institution, of the scriptures, of the practice of the apostles,

[¹ August. Op. Par. 1679—1700. Contr. Epist. Parmen. Lib. iii. cap. ii. 9. Tom. IX. col. 61.]

[² Iren. Op. Par. 1710. Cont. Hæres. Lib. i. cap. viii. p. 36.]

[³ Communicate, 1565]

[⁴ See before, page 257, note 10.]

[⁵ Forcelets. Little or no information is supplied as to this word by lexicographers; but the meaning may be conjectured from Whitaker's Latin version of Jewel's work, made a few years after its publication, where, for "forcelets and napkins," we find "linteis atque lineis."]

of the usage of the primitive church, of old canons, of ancient councils, of catholic fathers, Greeks and Latins, old and new, even of Clemens, Abdias, and Amphilochius, which are M. Harding's peculiar doctors. St Chrysostom saith : "In the receiving of the holy mysteries there is no difference between priest and people⁶." Dionysius saith : "The unity of the cup is divided unto all⁷." Ignatius saith : "One cup is divided unto the whole church⁸." St Augustine saith : "We drink all together, because we live all together⁹." But to reckon up the authorities of antiquity, as I said, it would be infinite.

Chrysost. in
2 Cor. Hom.
18.
Ecl. Hier.
cap. iii.
Ignat. ad
Philad.
De Consecr.
Dist. 2.
Quia passus.

The scholastical doctors of very late years have seen and testified that M. Harding's doctrine is but new. Thomas of Aquine saith : *In quibusdam ecclesiis provide observatur, ut populo sanguis . . . non detur*¹⁰ : "In certain churches it is providently observed, that the blood be not given to the people." "In certain churches," he saith, not in all churches.

Thom. Par.
iii. Quæst. 80.
Art. 12.

Likewise Durandus : *In multis locis communicatur cum pane et vino, id est, cum toto sacramento*¹¹ : "In many places they communicate with bread and wine, that is to say, with the whole sacrament." "In many places," he saith, but not in all places. Likewise Alexander de Hales, a great school-doctor : *Ita fere ubique a laicis fit in ecclesia*¹² : "Thus the lay-people in the church for the most part do." "For the most part," he saith, but not in all parts. And Linwood in his Provincials : *Solis . . . celebrantibus sanguinem sub specie vini consecrati sumere, in hujusmodi minoribus ecclesiis est concessum*¹³ : "It is granted only unto the priests that celebrate in such small churches, to receive the blood under the form of wine." He excepteth only "the small country churches," not the greater churches in cities and towns. All these doctors lived within the space of three hundred years past. So long it was before M. Harding's doctrine could grow general.

Durand. Lib.
iv. cap. xlii.

Alex. Par. iv.
Quæst. 55.
Membr. 1.

Linwood de
Summ. Trin.
et Fide Ca-
thol.

Antoninus saith, that king William the Conqueror, that lived a thousand years after Christ, caused his whole army to communicate, and that, as the order was then, under both kinds¹⁴. Haimo, that was not long before him, saith : *Appellatur . . . calix communicatio propter participationem ; quia omnes communicant ex illo*¹⁵ : "The cup is called the communication, because of the participation ; for that every man receiveth of it." Thus is our doctrine confirmed, not only by the old doctors, but also by the new.

Antoninus.

Haimo in
1 Cor. xi.

Wherefore M. Harding, thus maintaining the open abuse of the holy mysteries, offendeth against Christ's institution, against the scriptures, against the perfection of the sacrament, against the confirmation of the new testament, against the tradition and practice of the apostles, against the ancient councils, against the canons, against the doctors, both old and new. The apostles of Christ, being full of the Holy Ghost, so took Christ's words as we take them now. And St Hierome saith : *Quicumque . . . aliter scripturam intelligit, quam sensus Spiritus sancti flagitat, quo conscripta est, licet de ecclesia non recesserit, tamen hæreticus appellari potest*¹⁶ : "Whosoever understandeth the scriptures otherwise than the sense of the Holy Ghost requireth, by which Holy Ghost the scriptures were written, although he be not yet departed from the church, yet he may well be called an heretic." If M. Harding will say, "That was true then, and this is true now ;" then may we answer him as St Hilary did the Arians : *Veritas ergo temporum erit*

Hieron. ad
Galat. Lib.
iii. cap. v.

Hilar. ad
Const. Au-
gust.

[⁶ Chrysost. Op. Par. 1718-38. In Epist. 11. ad Cor. Hom. xviii. Tom. X. p. 668. See before, page 202, note 13.]

[⁷ ... τὸν ἐνιαῖον τοῦ ποτηρίου πᾶσι καταμερίσας.—Dionys. Areop. Op. Antv. 1634. De Eccl. Hierarch. cap. iii. Tom. I. p. 299.]

[⁸ Ignat. ad Philad. cap. iv. in Patr. Apostol. Oxon. 1838. Tom. II. p. 378. See before, page 116, note 4. But Jewel quotes the interpolated epistle : ἐν ποτήριον τοῖς ὅλοις διενεμήθη.]

[⁹ ... simul bibimus, quia simul vivimus.—August. in Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugd. 1624. Decret. Gratian. Decr. Tert. Pars, De Consecr. Dist. ii. can. 36. col. 1929.]

[¹⁰ Thom. Aquinat. Op. Venet. 1595. Summ. Theol. Tert. Pars, Quæst. lxxx. Art. 12. Tom. XII.

fol. 267. 2 ; where *provide precedes in.*]

[¹¹ See before, page 256, note 5.]

[¹² ... sicut fere ubique fit a laicis in ecclesia.—Alex. Alens. Theol. Summ. Col. Agrip. 1622. Pars IV. Quæst. xi. Membr. ii. Art. iv. 3. p. 406.]

[¹³ Provincial. seu Const. Angl. Antw. 1525. Lib. 1. De Summ. Trin. foll. 7, 8.]

[¹⁴ Northmanni ... mane dominico corpori et sanguini communicaverunt.—Antonin. Chron. Lugd. 1586. Tit. xvi. Var. Hist. Undec. Sæc. cap. v. 1. Pars II. fol. 623.]

[¹⁵ Haym. in Epist. Interpr. 1528. Ad Cor. 1. cap. x. fol. yii. 2. See before, page 135.]

[¹⁶ Hieron. Op. Par. 1693-1706. Comm. in Epist. ad Galat. Lib. 111. cap. v. Tom. IV. Pars 1. col. 302.]

August. de
Unit. Eccles.
cap. xi.

*magis, quam evangeliorum*¹: "Then truth must be as pleaseth the time, not as pleaseth the gospel." And further, as St Augustine answered the Donatists: *Si aliud declamas, aliud recitas, nos post vocem Pastoris nostri, per ora prophetarum, et os proprium, [et] per ora evangelistarum, nobis apertissime declaratam, voces vestras non admittimus, non credimus, non accipimus*²: "If ye preach any otherwise, or tell us any other tale, after we have once heard the voice of our Shepherd, most plainly declared unto us by the mouths of his prophets, by his own mouth, and by the mouths of his evangelists, touching your voices, we take them not, we believe them not, we receive them not."

Cypr. ad Cæcil.
Lib. ii.
Epist. 3.

But, forasmuch as this is a mystery of unity, God grant unto us such humility of mind, that we may all submit ourselves unto his holy word, that we may join together in holy and perfect³ unity; and, as I alleged before out of St Cyprian, "by his advertisement redress that thing wherein certain have erred; that, when he shall come in his glory and in his heavenly majesty, he may find us to hold that he warned us, to keep that he taught us, to do that he did! Amen⁴."

[¹ ... facta est fides temporum potius quam evangeliorum.—Hilar. Op. Par. 1693. Ad Constant. August. Lib. II. 4. col. 1227.]

[² August. Op. Par. 1679-1700. Lib. De Unit. Eccles. cap. xii. 32. Tom. IX. col. 359; where *Si*

autem aliunde clamas vel recitas, and per os.]

[³ Perfit, 1565.]

[⁴ Cypr. Op. Oxon, 1682. Ad Cæcil. Epist. lxiii. p. 157. See before, page 255.]