

{Anno 1549.}

bread, it remainyng bread still? And if you thinke to finde it, I pray you shewe me here, whether that bodye that hee gaue with materiall bread, were his true bodye or not? If not, then it was phantasticall, if it were his true bodye (as you doe graunt) then must there needes be two very true bodyes in one place together. Now that it was his verye true bodye and blood, it is certayne by the playne wordes of the text saying thus. which is betrayed of geuen, and which is shedde for you, and for many. But I will let all this passe ouer, and I do requyre of you this one question whether that the sacramentes of the old law, and of new law be all one?

The Sacraments of the old law and new law, how they differ.

Madew. If you doe consider the thinges themselves they be all one, but if you respecte the onely signes, figures and sacramentes outwardly then they be diuers.

Glin. I doe perceiue your aunswere very well, then further to our purpose, was Christ then after the same maner in the bread that came from heauen. In the paschall lamb, and in Isaac, as he is in this Sacrament? which if you do graunt me then these propofitions were true, for Christ to say this Manna is my bodye, this Lambe is my bodye, this Isaac is my bodye. Whoeuer if the Sacramentes of the olde law, and of the law of grace be all one, in very deede, & effect (as you seeme to graunt) the what difference is betwene the shew bread in Moyses law, and the bread, that we doe bryake that Saynt Paule speaketh of? They then had that bread, which signified Christ and so doth ours (as you say) that was bread, so is ours, and so by your reason there is no difference betwene them: yea they Manna because it came from heauen, was better then this earthly bread, that cometh from beneath, which is contrarye to the truth; for Saynt Paule sayth, that the law was geuen by Moyses, but the verity was geue by Iesus Christ. wherfore that which Christ gaue, was not onely a signe but also the veritye, that is to saye, the liuing breade, that came from heauen, the true Lambe that taketh awaye the finnes of the world, and Isaac himselfe which is Christ, or els you must graunt me that we christians doe receiue lesse then the Jewes did. For they receiued the breade called Manna from heauen, and we onely a poore morsel of bread from the earth. Theyeys was called Angelles foode, and ours is (as you holde) little better then common breade. We seemeth that you doe distrust the doctrine of the sayth of Christendome, for these fye hundred yeares, euen as though Christ had forsaken his Catholique Church after one thousand yeares, but that is not so, for he promised his holy spirite to assist his spowse the Church, and to lead her continually into all truerh from time to time, as neede should require. As I remember you sayd, that adozation did followe vpon transubstantiation, but the fathers for one thousand yeares past doe graunt adozation of the sacrament therefore transubstantiation also. The minor I proue by the most cleare testimonies of S. Austen, S. Ambrose, S. Denise, S. Basile, and S. Chrysostome.

Adoration of the Sacrament mainteyned by Glyn.

Madew. I denye (mayster Doctour) that I sayde any suche thing, and therewith I say that the Fathers do vnderstand by adozation a certeine reuerent maner, that we should receiue the Lordes supper with, which may be called a certie veneration, but no adozation. Glin. No may? S. Austen (de ciuitate Dei) witneseth that the Ethnikes, and Paynims doe esteeme the Christians to worship and adore the gods of wheat and barley called Ceres, and the God of wyne called Bacchus. And agayne S. Austen saith thus. Lo no man eateth of that bread except he first adoze and worship it. Madew. By your patience S. Austen in that place speaketh of the honoring of Christs bodye no w sitting in heauen. Glin. Yea mayster Doctour, thinke you so? And why not also of his blessed bodye in the sacrament? Seing that he saith it is there, this is my body, which is geuen for you, sayth he. Hoze playnely he needed not to speake for the reall presence of his blessed bodye, being both able & willing to verify his word. For if a cunning Lapidary should say to you or me this is a true right diamond, a perfecte carbuncle, saphyre, emerde or any such precious stone, we would beleue him, though we were ignorant of thesye natures. wherfore we ought much moze to beleue our Sauoure Christ God, and man, in that he sayth this is my body. And why then ought we not to honoz it in the sacrament. Or how many bodies hath Christ, seeing you do graunt his bodye in heauen to be honozed, but not his bodye here in the sacrament. Madew. Forsooth he hath but one very bodye, & no moc, but the same is sacramentally in the sacrament, and substantially in heauen, here by sayth, and there in deed. Glin. Well yet once agayne to you thus. The very true bodye of Christ is to be honozed, but the same very true bodye is in the Sacrament, ergo the bodye of Christ in the sacrament is to be honozed.

Math. 26. Marc.

Real presence defended by the Papiſtes.

Argument.

Rocheſter. Welbeloued frendes and brethren in our ſantoſt Christ you muſt vnderſtand that this diſputatiō, with the other that ſhalbe after this are appointed to ſearch forth the playne truth of the holy ſcriptures in theſe matters of religion, which of a long ſeaſon haue bene hidden from vs by the ſalle gloſes of that greate Antichriſt and his Miniſters of Rome and now in our dayes muſt be reuocled to vs Engliſhe men, thozow the great mercy of God principally, and ſecondarily thozow the moſt gentle clemencie of our naturall ſoueraigne Lord the kings maieſty, whom the liuing Lord long preferre to raigne ouer vs in health wealch & godlines, & maintenaunce of Gods holy word, and to the extirpation of all blinde gloſes of men, that goe about to ſubuert the truth. For becauſe therfore that I am one that doth loue the truth, and haue professed the ſame amongſt you: therfore I ſay becauſe of conſtring my mind with yours, I will here gladly declare what I thinke in this poynſt now in controuerſy. For becauſe this worſhip full Doctour hath any need of my heale in diſſoluing of arguments propoſed agaynſt him, for as me ſemeth he hath aunſwered hitherto very well and clarkly according to the truth of Gods word. But now to the purpose. I do graunt vnto you (mayſter oponent) that the old auncient fathers do record and witneſſe, a certeine honour and adozation to be done vnto Christs bodye, but then they ſpeake not of it in the ſacrament, but of it in heauen at the right hand of the father as holy Chriſtoſtome ſayth, honoz thou it, and then eat it but that honoz may not be geue to the outward ſigne but to the bodye of Christ it ſelf in heauen. For that bodye is there onely in a ſigne vrtually, by grace, in the exhibition of it in ſpirite, effect, and ſayth, to the worthy receiuer of it. For we receiue vrtually onely Christs bodye in the ſacrament.

Byſhop Ridley replyeth.

Christ to be honozed in heauen not in the Sacrament.

Glin. How the (if it pleaſe your good Lordſhip) doth baptiſme differ from this Sacrament? For in that we receiue Christ alſo by grace and vrtually.

Christ worketh otherwiſe in Baptiſme, then the Sacramental bread.

Rocheſter. Christ is preſent after an other ſort in baptiſm, then in this ſacrament, for in that he purgeth and waſheth the infant from all kinde of ſinne, but here he doth feed ſpirituallye the receiuer in ſayth, with all the merites of hys bleſſed death and paſſion. And yet he is in heauen ſtill really and ſubſtancially. As for example. The kinges Maieſty our Lord and maſter is but in one place, wherfore ſaith that his royall perſon is abiding for the time, and yet hys mighty power, and authoritey is euery where in his realmes and dominions. So Christs real perſon is onely in heauen ſubſtancially placed, but his might is in all thinges created effectually. For Christs ſelf may be vnderſtanded for the power, or inward might of his ſelf.

Object.

Glin. If it pleaſe your fatherhood, S. Ambroſe and S. Auſten do ſay, that befoze the conſecratiō, it is but very bread, and after the conſecratiō it is called the verye bodye of Christ.

Madew. Indeed it is the very bodye of Christ ſacramentally after the conſecration, whereas befoze it is nothing but common bread, and yet after that it is the Lordes bread, & thus muſt S. Ambroſe and S. Auſten be vnderſtanded.

¶ Here the proctours comanded the Opponent to diuert to the ſecōd concluſion; but he requested them, that they would permit hym as long in this matter, as they would in the ſecōd, and ſo he ſtill proſecuted the fyrſt matter as followeth.

Glin.

The bread after the conſecration doth feed the ſoule, ergo the ſubſtance of common breade doth not remaine. The argument is good, for S. Ambroſe de ſacramentis ſaith thus. After the conſecration there is not the thing, that nature did forme, but that which the bleſſing doth conſecrate. And if the benediction of the Prophet Elias did turne the nature of water how much moze then doth the benediction of Christ here both God and man.

Aunſwerc. Well cauilled & lyke a Papiſte.

Madew. That booke of S. Ambroſe is ſuſpected to be none of his workes.

Rocheſter. So ſay all the fathers. Glin. I doe maruaile at that; for S. Auſten in his booke of retractations maketh playne that, that was his own very worke.

Cyprian.

Rocheſter. He ſpeaketh indeede of ſuch a booke ſo intituled to S. Ambroſe; but yet we do lacke the ſame booke indeed. Glin. Well, let it then paſſe to other mens iudgements; what then ſay you to holy S. Cyprian 1200. yeares paſt? who ſaith that the bread which our Lord gaue to his diſciples, was not changed in forme, or qualitie; but in verity nature, and by the almighty word was made fleſhe. Madew. I do aunſwerc thus, that thesye word fleſhe may be taken two wayes either for the ſubſtance it ſelfe, or els for a natural propertie of a fleſhy thing. So that Cyprian there