

annf were him, because thou haft so called it. I beleue it not to be a figure, because thou sayst not, that it was a figure: ether reasons to auouch I know not. Of the worde it selfe. I contend not, but the thing it selfe I defend, for we must speake regularly. Thus Christ, thus the Apostles, thus all the ancient fathers haue spoke, our fathers hadde but onely figures and shadowes, but the Church of God hath the truth it selfe with the figures. Tertullian sayth one figure conteyneth not another, but Melchizedech was a figure, ergo this is the body. The Sacramentes of the Jewes were to care signes and tokens, but ours be both the signes and the thing signified also. Luther himselfe confessed that the body was present with the bread, and could not denye it: Oecolampadius took it for a figure onely. Chriostome demanding wherefore Christ gaue his body before his passion, rather then at any other time, answered, that he might reue the truth to the figure, saying, take, eate, this is my body, not a figure of my body. And the same Chriostome sayth agayne, if it were but bare bread, or but a figure, wherefore should his Disciples haue bene offended in eating a figure? Agayne in his 83. Homely vpon Mathew. They are not any humane worikes, which he did worike at his last supper, he it is that woriketh, he maketh perfect, we are his ministers, but it is he that sanctifieth, and chaungech the elementes of bread and wine into his bodye and blood. Agayne doe it thou see bread and wine? doe they passe into the priuy like other meates, God forbid. Theophilus Alexandrinus vpon these wordes of Marke the Evangelist this is my body, sayth. This whiche I geue, and which you receiue, is not onely bread, or a figure of Christs body, but the truth it selfe, for if it should appeare as it is, in forme of flesh & blood, we should loth it, and therefore the Lord condescendyng to our weakenesse, receynerh the formes of bread and wine, and yet conuerterh the same into the truth of his body and blood. Theophilactus sayeth the bread and the wine is the very body & blood of Christ, and not a figure onely. If you stand in suspence of the author, or appoyne him not, yet know you that he is counted and taken amongst all the learned for a most saythfull interpreter of Chriostome, the bread sayth he is transelementate, and transmuted into an other substance then it was before. Augustine sayth there was great heed taken in the primitive Church, least any part of the Sacrament should fall downe to the ground. Cyrillus sayth, leasse wee shoulde abhorre fleshe and blood in the Sacrament of the Altar, God humbleth himselfe to our weakenesse, pouering and infusing the force of life into it, and making it the very truth of his owne blessed body and blood. Damascene calleth it a diuine body, or a body deified. Origene, Ireneus, Eusebius Hieronimus, with all the rest of the ancient Catholike Fathers are of the same opinion with me, all which to produce it were too long.

The Declaration of Doctor Glin vpon his second conclusion.

The sacrifice and offering type of Christs body in the Sacrament of the Altar (right honourable and worshipfull) I will defende euen to the effusion of blood as a thing consonant to scripture, whereof I haue speaken to y^e Hebrewes. But perchance some will object, Christ offered by himselfe, ergo you ought not to offer him. I answer, yea, because he offered himselfe therfore. I offer him, for except he had offered himselfe, I could not haue offered hym. But you will say, Christs death is sufficient, and therefore you ought not to offer him agayne. I answer, So may we say, we neede neither to fast nor pray, for Christ hath done both sufficiently for vs. Agayne you will object, if you offer him type agayne, you crucify him anew. I answer, not so, for many haue offered him, that haue not crucified him, as Abraham, Isaac, Moyses, the Leuites, Anna, Samuel, &c. offer Christ, but not to the death, but in commemoration of his death, there beinge not onely commemoration therof, but also the very presence of Christs body and blood. Ireneus sayth, Christ counsailed his Disciples to offer the first fruites of all theyr goodes to God, not that he intended any other, but for that they shoulde not shewe themselves fruitlesse, or ingratefull, and therefore Christ took the greatest of bread, gaue thanks, and sayde this is my body, and hereofe the creature of the cuppe, and confessed sayng, this is my blood of the new Testament. Thus Christ hath taught a new kinde of Oblation, whiche the Church receiuing from the Apostles, offereth to God thow out all the whole world, who onely giuech vnto vs all kynd of fodde, and the first fruites of his gracious giftes in the new Testament, whereof Malachi thus sayth, I haue no pleasure in your sayth the Lorde of Hostes, I will not receiue any sacrifices at your handes, because my

name is glorified amongst the Nations from the East to the west sayth the Lorde, and in every place is incense and pure sacrifice offered to my name. But heere may be objected, Christe is the onely sacrifice for sinne, and with out hym there is no moe. I answer, notwithstanding we haue this commaundement, doe this in remembrance of me, besides that I denye not that it is a commemoration, but I denye that it is an onely commemoration. I denye his absence, and I affirme his presence.

Christ is the only true sacrifice for sinne and without him there are no moe.

Here endeth the declaration of Doctor Glin.

Master Perne.

Where as you say (most reuerend master Doctor) in your proposition, I beleue, and therfore I speake, and we beleue, and therefore doe speake, our consciences, suggesting the same vnto vs, and agayne that miltereyes are not to be searched, and the like, it seemeth you go about to restrayne the teaching of holye Scriptures, whereas Christe sayth scrutamini scripturas, searche the Scriptures. For ouer you haue cited the fathers confusedly, & without order, you left transubstantiation and endenour your selfe to proue the real presence in the Sacrament, whereas we denye nothing lesse then his corporall presence, or the absence of his substance in the bread.

The Papistes retrayne the vse of Scriptures.

Glin. You muche wonderfully you knowe not agaynst what, for neyther I, nor yet August. doe denie the searching of the scriptures, but I sayd out of Augustine misteries are not to be searched: it is an other thing to search misteries, then it is to searche the Scriptures, whereas you requyre of me a regulare order of citing the Doctours, I had not (as all men know) the liberty of tyme so to do: but if you desire me so earnestly to performe that, if time may be graunted me, I will easely fulfill your request.

Perne. I pray you let me aske you, what is a sacrament?

Glin. A sacrament is a visible signe, of an invisible grace. Perne. Augustine agaynst Maximinus the Arian Bishop maketh this definition of a sacrament. A sacrament is a thing signifying one thing and shewing an other thing.

Glin. I refuse not his reason.

Perne. What is the thing figured by the sacrament?

Glin. The thing figured is twofolde, to wite the thyng contained, and the thyng signified, the thing significand, and not contained. For there be thre thynges conteyned, the true body of Christ, the mystical body and the fruit of benefite of the sacrament.

Perne. The formes and signes of bread nourishe not, ergo somewhat els besides the bare signe of bread doth remain, which nourissheth y^e substance of bread. For in euery sacrament there is a similitude, betwixte the signe and the thing signified, but betwixt the body of Christ, and the same or kinde of bread, there is no similitude, ergo the nature of a sacrament is taken away.

Glin. I deny your minor master Doctor.

Perne. The formes nourishe not, but the bodye nourissheth ergo there is no similitude betwixt them, and so is the nature of a sacrament cleane destroyed.

Glin. It is sufficient to similitudes that the bread whiche was doth nourishe, and yet certayne Doctours do affirme that the formes do nourish miraculously.

Rochester. Whosoever taketh away all the similitude of substances, consequently he taketh away the sacrament, for a similitude is thre folde, namely of nutrition, of unity and conuersion. But by a contrary similitude, he is not changed into our substance, but we into his: for in nutrition this is the similitude, that our blood nourissheth our bodies, so the blood of Christ doth nourish vs, but after a wonderfull manner, to wit by turning vs into himselfe.

Glin. I haue answered your reason (most reuerend father) in that I sayd that the formes do nourish miraculously, as certaine learned do affirme.

Perne. By what authority can you say that bread doth not remaine.

Glin. By the authority of Christ who sayth this is my body.

Perne. By the same reason may we say that bread still remaineth, for S. Paule calleth it bread sundry times in his epistles.

Glin. I denye not that it is breade, but that it is materiall bread, for Paule alwayes addeth this article (which) becoming (as all men hold) some chiefe thing.

Perne. We are chaunged into a new creature.

Glin. Not substantially, but actually.

Rochester. This is that bread which came downe from heauen, ergo it is not Christs body: for his body came not from heauen.

Christs body came not from heauen.

Glin. we may say that Christ, God & man, came downe from heauen for the unity of his person, or els for the mutual community of the same his nature in one: for his human nature

The Sacramentes of the Jewes were signes of Christ to come, ours of Christ already come.

Christ hath offered himselfe, ergo o man ought to offer him.