

Erasmus his opinion of the Sacrament. Anno 1549. Inough to beleue Christ to be present in the Sacrament any manner of way.

Tertullian his interpretation upon Malachie.

A true proposition bread is Christs body.

Christ not substantially in the Sacrament. Christs body in the Sacrament sacramentally and on the Crosse after a mortall & bloody sorte. Christ crucified substantially, but yet is in the Sacrament figuratiuely.

A question whether the bread be changed in accident or substance.

you, but for to confesse your minde in this poynt. It is most constant and sure, that Erasmus was of that mind and opinion, that it was enough for a christian to beleue Christs body and blood to be in the sacrament in what manner or condition former it were.

Langdale. By your licencie good mayster Doctor, these be Erasmus wordes. The Church of Christ hath determined very lately transubstantiation in the sacrament. It was of a long season enough to beleue Christs body to be cyther vnder the bread consecrated, or els to be present after any other maner. But yet (sayth he) after that the sayd Church had pddered and weyed the thing more pitheily to greater iudgement, then she made a more certeyne determination of the same. In the which place 1. Cor. 7. Erasmus sayth that the proceeding of the body, whost equally from the Father, & the sonne, was also determined of the same Church. But let this passe. And as touching the second poynt, whiche I noted in your so eloquent declacation, which was that you did wryte, and wyng the saying of Tertullian from the verity of his minde, for you sayde that he doth interpret the Propheete Malachye speaking of our dayly sacrifice in the new law, to meane nothing els, by that sacrifice in that place, but prater and thankesguyng. But the sayd ancient Lette Tertullian hath not those wordes that you doe alleaue of him, that is to saye, (nothing els.) And yet though that Oecolampadius do so interpret that place, yet (as me seemeth) the iudgement of the hole Chrysten church is to be preferred in suche a matter of religion. But I will passe ouer this poynte, and returne to the matter it selfe. And first I doe requyre of your maysterhippe, whether that this sentence (this is my body) be spoken of Christ figuratiuely or not?

Madew. After the minde of the common glose of Cyprian & Origene it is so taken in very deed.

Langdale. What cannot be by your patience, for it is taken there substantially, ergo not figuratiuely.

Madew. I deny your argument. Langdale. I proue my argument good thus. This worde substance doth playnely repugne, and is contrary to this worde figure, ergo substantially, and figuratiuely do alleo- pugne. Whereouer I aske of you whether that this be a true proposition or not, bread is Christs body?

Madew. Yea forsooth, it is a true proposition. Langdale. Then thus to you, Christs body was geuen for vs, but you saye that bread is Christs body ergo bread was geuen for vs.

Rochester. Not so say, for your former proposition is of doubtie understanding.

Langdale. Well, yet you M. Doctor doe graunt that Christ is substantially in the sacrament.

Madew. No I deny that I sayd to euer.

Langdale. Yea? do you so? well I passe not therewith greatly, for I will proue it by an other meanes. Christ did suffer his most glorious passion for vs really, and substantially ergo he is also in the sacrament substantially. The argument is good, for because that it is the same here, that was there crucified for vs, how be it here inuisibly, in deede spiritually and sacramentally, but there visibly, and after a mortall, and most bloody maner.

Rochester. Mayster Langdale, your argument doth well conlude, in case that his body were here in the sacrament, after such a sorte as it was when he was betrayed. But that is not so, for he was betrayed, and crucified in his naturall body substantially, and really in very deede; but in the Sacrament he is not so, but spiritually, and figuratiuely onely.

Langdale. By your good Lordships fauor that is not so, for he is there, not figuratiuely but verily, and indeed by the power of his mighty word, yea euen his very owne naturall body vnder the sacrament, duely performed by the lawfull minister.

Madew. Oh say not so, for you speake blasphemy.

Langdale. No, no, M. Doctor, God forbid, that either I or any mans els should be noyed of blasphemy, saying nothing, but the very playne truth, as in my conscience, & learning I do no lesse.

Rochester. O M. Langdale, I wis it becommeth you, not heare to haue such wordes.

Langdale. If it like your good Lordship I gaue not fyrist occasion of them, but onely did refuse that, whiche I was vniuersally burthened withall as reason doth require, and it greued me to heare it. He sayth (if it please your Lordshippe) that there is a mutation or change of the bread after it is consecrated, which if it be so (as I graunt no lesse) then I would inqurye of him, whether it be changed in the substance, or in the accidentes, or els in both, or in nothing. No man can iustly say that there is a change into nothing. And all ancient fathers do agree, that the same

accidentes are there still after, that were before, nor no doctro sayth, that there is any mutation of both the substance, and accidentes also, ergo the substance of bread is chaunged into some other thing, that is there really present vnder the formes of bread and wine, which by Christs wordes, must needs be his owne blessed body.

Rochester. Sy; you are deceiued greatly, for there is no change of the substances neither of the accidentes; but in very deed there do come vnto the bread other accidentes, in so much that whereas the bread and wyne were not sanctified before, and holy, yet afterwarde they be sanctified, and so do receiue then an other sorte, or kind of vertue whiche they had not before.

Here is to be noted, that Peter Martyr in his aunswere at Oxford did graunt a change in the substances of bread and wine, which in Cambridge by the Bishop Doct. Ridley was denied.

Langdale. By your patience reuerend father, by such meanes a man may easely auoyde all the misteries of our christe sayth: As where it is sayde thus of God the father, this is my beloued sonne, &c. A man may also wyng that to be vnderstood thus: this is y^e image of my welbeloued sonne, or this is the vertue of my welbeloued sonne; yea much more iustly then your good Lordship doth y^e other, because S. Paul to the Hebrewes doth call the sonne the Image of the father, and in an other place he calleth him the power, or vertue of God, and Gods wisdom. Now though he be so called in scripture, God forbid that we shoulde call by onely Gods Image or Gods vertue, and not God himselfe.

Rochester. Oh gentle M. Langdale, you ought not to reason after such a sorte as you do now, because that a trope or figuratiue speache is nookie somewhere, but not euery where, nor in this matter.

Langdale. Yet by your licencie (honorabile father) it doth appere to me no trope at all in these wordes of christ, this is my body, which is geuen for you, and that for this reason: Christ did exhibite of geue againe the very same things at his last supper, by the which thinges he was ioyned to vs, but he was ioyned or knit vnto vs by his owne naturall flesh, & blood, ergo he did exhibite to vs at his last supper no lesse agayne. My former proposition I proue by the testimony of S. Chriost, whose wordes in Christs person are these: I would be your brother, I toke vpon me common flesh & blood for your sakes, and euen by the same things that I am ioyned to you, the very same I haue exhibite to you agayne, &c.

Here the Proctors commaunded Langdale to geue place to an other.

Rochester. we are not ioyned by natural flesh, but do receiue his flesh spiritually from aboue, &c.

Here M. Segewicke replied.

Right worshipful M. Doctor, I do also aske of you first of all, whether the grecke article (this) of the neuter gender be referred to the word (bread) or to the word (body) if it be referred to the worde (bread) then Christ woulde not haue sayd this, in the neuter gender, but rather this, in the masculine gender.

Rochester. Forsooth that article is referred to neyther of both, but may signify vnto vs any other kinde of thing. Segewicke. No forsooth, but it doth note vnto vs some excellent great thing determinately, & not so confusedly as you say, for such a great heap of articles, in the grecke doth note vnto vs a great and weighty thing to be in the sacrament determinately, if wee may credite the ancient fathers. Whereouer this word (bread) is not alwayes in the scriptures taken after one sorte: wherefore I desire you to shew me how it is taken in this place of S. Paul: we are many, one bread, &c.

Madew. Forsooth of the very wheaten bread, Segewicke. Then after your minde, we are all very wheaten bread.

Rochester. Forsooth we are bread, not for the nature of bread, but for the fellowship and vniuty that is noted by the coagulation of many graynes into one bread or loafe.

Segewicke. Well let that passe, then thus. It is the body, ergo no figure, for because there is a perpetuall contrarietye betweene the law of Moyses & the law of grace. Therein were figures & shadowes, and herein is the verity in deede.

Rochester. I do graunt it to be Christs true body, & flesh by a propriety of the nature assumed to the godhead, yea and we do really eat and drinke his flesh and blood after a certeyne reall property.

Segewicke. It is not the figurate paschall lambe, it is not the figuratiue aganna, nor yet y^e figuratiue shew bread, &c. ergo it is no figure.

No change neither of the substance, nor yet of the accidentes in the Sacrament.

How Scripture may be abused to any purpose as commonly the Papistes vse it.

A figuratiue speach somewhere hurtfull, somewhere not.

A fond reason wherefore this is my body should seeme no figuratiue speach.

Whether the article of the neuter gender (this) be referred to the bread or to the body.

Bread taken diuersly in the Scripture.

How we are bread, and how not.

How the bread is Christs body.