

Anno 1549. Ambrose

there did meane of a naturall property, and not of fleshye substance. And contrarywise in the body of Aard, where both the substance, and also the property was changed.

Glin. Holy S. Ambrose sayth, the body there made by the mighty power of Gods worde, is a bodye of the Wyrgyne Mary.

Rochest. What is to say, that by the word of God the thing hath a being, that it had not before, and we doe consecrate the body that we may receive the grace and power of y body of Christ in heauen by this sacramentall body.

Glin. By your patience (my Lorde) if it bee a bodye of the Wyrgyne as Saynt Ambrose sayth, which we do consecrate as ministers by Gods holy word, then must it needs be more then a sacramentall, or spiritual bodye: yea a very body of Christ in dech, yea the same that is still in heauen without all moving from place to place, vnspcakably, and farre passing our naturall reason, which is in this misery so captiuate, that it cannot conceiue how it is there, without a ludy sayth to Gods word. But let this passe: You do graunt that this breade doth quicken or geue life, which if it doe, then it is not a naturall bread, but a super-substantiall bread.

Rochester. So doth the effectuall, and lively word of god, which for that it nourisheth the soule, it doth geue life, for the diuine essence inuadeth it selfe vnspcakably into y faithfull receiuer of the sacrament.

Glin. How then say you to holy Damascene a Brecke author, who as one Tritenius sayth flourished one thousand yeares past, he sayth thus. The bodye that is of the holye Wirgine Mary is ioyned to the Diuinitye after the consecration in veritye, and in deede, not so as the body once assumed into heauen, and sitteth on the fathers ryght hand, doth remoue from thence, and cometh downe at the consecration time, but that the same breade and wyne are substantiallyly transumpted into the very bodye and blood of our Lord Iesus Christ. If (sayth he) thou dost not knowe the maner how it is brought to passe, let it be enough to thee to beleue, that it is done by the operation of the holy Ghost, and we do knowe no more but that the lyving word of God is working, and almighty, but the very maner how, is inscrutable to vs, and no great maruell sayth he, for we cannot well expresse howe the materiall bread, wine, or water are transumpted naturally into the same body and blood of the receiuer, and be become another body, then they were before. So sayth this great ancient Clarke, also this shewbread with wine and water, are changed by the coming of the holy Ghost into christes body and blood, and they be not two bodies there, but very one (of Christ) and the same.

Rochester. First I deuye (Mayer Doctor) that Damascene was one thousand yeares past, secondarily that hee is not to be holden as an ancient father, for that he maintaineth in his workes euill and damnable doctrine, as the worshipping of images, and such like. Thirdly I say that in deede God by his holy spirit is the worker of that, which is done in the sacrament. Also I graunt that there is a mutation of the common bread and wine spiritually into the Lordes breade and wine, by the sanctifying of them in the Lordes word. But I denye that there is any mutation of the substances, for there is no other change there indeed, then there is in vs, which when we do receive the sacrament worthely, there are we changed into Christes body, bones and blood, not in nature, but spiritually, and by grace, much like as I saias saw the burning cole, euen so we see not there the very simple bread, as it was before the consecration, for an union cannot be but of two very things, wherefore if we be ioyned to Christ receiving the sacrament, then there is no adnihilation of bread, which is, wher it is reduced to nothing as it is in your fained transubstantiation.

Glin. So I perceiue you would haue me to graunt, that the Sacrament is but a figure, which Theophilactus doeth deny.

Rochester. You say trueth, he denyeth it deed to be a figure, but he meaneth that it is not onely a figure.

Glin. Whereas Saynt Paule sayth that we being manye are one breade, he speaketh not, nor meaneth one materiall bread, as you do here, ergo he speaketh of a heauenly bread. And holy Chylostone vpon Mathew sayth, that the paschall Lambe was a figure, but the miserye is the very: For the Disciples would not haue bene offended to haue dronken a figure of Christes blood being well accustomed to figures. For Christ did not institute a figure for a figure but the cleare verity in stead of the figure, as Saynt Iohn sayth, grace and verity was geuen by Christ. Doest thou see bread? (sayth Chylostone) doth it anyoys or passe as other meates do which we receive? God forbid, ergo, &c. Madew. That ancient Clarke Origene vpon the 15. of S.

Damascene.

Damascene expounded.

A spiritual mutation of the bread and wine, but no mutation of the substance.

Theophilact. expounded.

The paschall Lambe a figure.

Mathew sayth thus, as touching that which is materiall in the Sacrament, it descendeth, and issueth out as other nutrimentes doe. But as concerning that which is celestiall, it doth not so.

Glin. Chylostone homile. 87. vpo Mathew sayth, that we cannot be deceined of Christes wordes, but our naturall senses may be deceined in this point very soone and easily: his sayd wordes cannot be false, but our senses be many times beguiled of theyr iudgementes. Becausc therefore that Christ sayd this is my body, let vs not at any hand doubt (sayth he) but let vs beleue it, and well perceiue it with the eyes of our vnderstanding. And within a litle after in that place, he sayth thus. It was not enough that he was become man, and afterwarde to be scourged for vs but also he did reduce, and bring vs to be as one body with him, not thowto sayth onely, but in very deed also he maketh vs his body. And after that, he sayth that these workes are not of mannes power: But the same things that hee wrought in his last supper, he nowe worketh also by his precept to his right minister, and we doe occupy the place of the same ministers, but hee it is that doth sanctify, and transumpt the creatures, he performeth still the same.

Rochester. M. Doctour you must vnderstand that in that place S. Chylostone sheweth vs that Christ deliuered to vs no sensible thing at his last supper.

Glin. Honourable sye by your patience, I graunt that hee gaue to his Disciples no sensible thing in substance, but a thing insensible, his owne precious body, and blood vnder the onely kindes of creatures. And truly (as it seemeth) Theophilactus best knowe the meaning of Chylostone, because all anchoris accept him as a saythfull interpreter of him. And he hath these same playne wordes, translated, and transformed. Also Theophilactus Alexandrinus super Marcum, Cyrillus, and Saynt Augustine sayth that before the consecration it is breade, but afterwarde it is Christes very body. In like maner S. Augustine vpon 33. psalme, sayth, that in his last supper Christ did beare himselfe in his owne handes. Nowe eury man may beare the figure of his body in his owne handes, but S. Austen saith it there for a miracle. Ireneus in his first booke is of the same minde. And Saynt Augustine sayth I doe remember my wordes, &c. The law and figures were by Moyses, but the verity and body came by Christ.

Rochester. well, say what you list, it is but a figuratine speech, like to this if you will receive, and vnderstand he is Elias for a property, but in deede he was not Elias, but Iohn the Baptist. And so in this place Christ called it his body, when it was very bread. But better then the common breade, because it was sanctified by the woorde of Christ.

¶ Here Master Langdale replied to Doctor Madew.

Langdale.

Right worshipfull Master Doctor by your patience I haue noted two things that you affirmed in yourc position euen nowe before this honourable audience, the which as me seemeth, are not consonant to the tructh of Gods worde. The first is as touching Christes sayinge I will not from hence forth drinke any moze of the fruite of the Wyne, vntill I drinke it newe with you. &c. whyche place of the Scripture you byd (as I thinke) vnderstand, and interpret as though nothing els remained after the consecration, but very wyne still. wherof I doe not a litle maruell. Seruyng that, that most famous Clarke Erasmus whose authozitye and sentence you refuse at this present onely, yet neuerthelesse he is very worthy in this matter of farre better estimation amongst learned men. wherefore I trust I shall not offend to alleadge him before this learned and honourable auditozpe, he playnely affirmeth that for all his great labour in searching the Scriptures, he coulde neuer finde either in the Euangelistes or yet in the Apostolicall doctrine, that it might be, or was called wyne, after the consecration. And therefore I cannot but maruell, if the thing be so open and playne, as in your declaration you seeme to make it, that such a profoud Clarke as he was, coulde not finde it out. For that sayde place he intreated of in his paraphrases, in his annotations, and in others of his lucubrations, and yet he playnely denyeth that same very thing to be found of him, which you here openly affirmed, that it is wine, or may be so called after the consecration duely performed by a right minister. I beseeche you not to be offended, though I credite not your laying in this so weighty a matter of Christian religion, as I do his. Madew. No forsooth, I will not be offended one iota with you

The materiall partes of the Sacrament issue out as other meates doe.

Two things noted in M. Madewes position.

The saying of Erasmus of the Lorde Supper.