

Anno 1550.

nature I knowe came not from heauen. Rochester. The bread is his humane nature, but I humane nature of his came not from heauen, ergo neither the bread. Glin. It is true that the bread came not fro heauen as bread simply, but as celestiall & heavenly bread. But I will answer to that, whereas you hold that I body of Christ came not from heauen: I by the body and flesh of Christ do vnderstand whole Christ, neither separating his soule, nor yet his Deity, although bys humanity is not turned into his diuinity by confusion of substance, but is one by vnitie of both. Or els thus I may reason, the Word of glory is crucified, and the senue of Mary created the world. &c.

Christ is called a rocke a vyne, but in figure.

Rochester. So it is. But he is called a rocke and a vyne, and so after your iudgement he is both a materiall rocke, & also a materiall vyne. Glin. The circumstances there shew playnely that there is a trope or figure: for it foloweth I am the vyne, you are the branches: but here is no trope. For after these wordes, this is my body, he addeth, which is geuen for you.

The iudgement of the Papiites very grosse.

Rochester. Your iudgements herein is very grosse, and farre discrepant from the truth. Glin. If my iudgement in this be grosse (most reuerend father) the are all the auncient fathers as grosse in iudgement as I in this point and the catholicke church also.

Christ toke brake, and gaue bread.

Perne. Shew vs one place, or one Doctoz who sayth that it remaineth not bread after the consecration. Glin. I wonder that you are not ashamed to aske that of me, for haue you not had almost infinite places and doctozs alledged vnto you in my former declarations p'ouing as much as you request at my handes?

A Sacrament consisteth in a double matter.

Perne. He toke bread, he brake bread, ergo it is bread. Glin. I haue answered often hereto, and I graunt it is bread, but not onely, or materiall. Perne. Ireneus affirmeth that a sacrament consisteth of a double matter, of a earthly matter, and of a heavenly, ergo the bread remaineth.

Glin. Ireneus in that place by the earthly matter, meaneth the humanity of Christ, and by the heauenly matter, the deity of Christ. Rochester. The humanity, and the diuinity of Christ make not a sacrament, which consisteth of a visible, and an invisible nature, & I deny that Ireneus can be so vnderstanded: Therefore we desire the learned auditoz to search Ireneus at home as opportunity will serue for this matter. Glin. I wish them so to do also wth all my hart.

Here Maister Grindall beginneth to dispute.

Grindall replyeth.

Grindall. Whereas you say (wozshippful Doct.) that we speak not now as some times we thought, and iudged in this matter, peraduenture you also iudge not so now of all thinges as you haue done tofoze. But what we haue once bene, it forerth not, God respecteth no mans person. And whereas you say that you dare not contrary to Christ call it a signe, or a figure, August. notwithstanding darcth to call it a figure, and Tertullian likewise with many mo. Glin. True it is, but they called it not a signe or a figure onely, but proue you (if you can) that after the consecration remaineth any other substance then the real body of Christ?

What the forme of bread & wine doe nourish.

Grindall. If the formes do nourish (as you contend) they nourish the naturall and humane body, for they be both as one, and are nourished a like. Glin. Your reason is meete physicall, and therefore to be received in matters of sayth, but I graunt they nourish, but miraculously.

It remaineth bread and wine into the consecration.

Grindall. If you graunt that the formes do nourish, the you graunt that bread remaineth. Glin. I sayd euen now that that is true, but the nature of it is changed and that miraculously. Grindall. If it be the real and substantiall body of Christ because Christ sayde (this is my body) ergo because the Lord sayd I will not drinke of the fruite of this vyne, and Paule calleth it bread after the consecration it is therefore bread, & wine.

Glin. Truly say you must bring better arguments, or els you will proue nothing for your purpose. For to your reasons thus I answer: Christ sayth Christ did drinke of the blood, but whether this sentence I will not drinke of the fruite of the vyne be spoke of the blood it is not certayne. And truly Brasmus denyeth that it is not to be found in all I whole scripture, that it is called bread after the consecration. Or els thus I may answer you. Euen as it is called bread for the forme, and kind, and accidentes which remaine, so for I forme, & similitude which it hath it may be called I fruite of the vyne after the consecration. And whereas Christ calleth it wine, he speaketh of the nature whereof the sacrament necessarily is made. And I denye not but it may be called

How it is called bread and in what respect.

wine, but yet eucharisticall. &c. Rochester. The Euangclistes, Math, Marke, and Luke call it the fruite of the vyne, and Christ sayth that the fruite of the vyne is nothing els but wine, ergo Christ gaue that wine, and dranke wine himselfe also, not blood. Glin. Christ sayd towe I will not drinke of the fruite of the vyne, once or the eating of the paschall Lambe (as Luke sayth) when was it wine indeed: And agayne after the consecration of his body and blood he sayd the like, and then it was not wine, which me think I can proue by the plain wordes of S. Luke if we compare him wth Math. For if it were wine as they both affirme, then the wordes of Christ cannot well stand, because first (as Luke sheweth) he sayde at his legall supper I will not drinke of the fruite of this vyne. &c. And agayne in Math. after the consecration of his body & blood he dranke: it followeth therefore that that which he dranke was not wine by nature, for then must Christ needs be a lyer, which were blasphemy to say. Rochester. August. doth thus reconcile those places, saying it is spoken by a figure which we call histeron proteron. Glin. I know that August. sayth so, but me think I which I haue sayd semeth to be the true meaning of the places. Rochester. August. seeketh no starting holes, nor yet any indirecte syltes to obscure the truth. Glin. Say your father thode what you will of Aug. I thinke not so. Grindall. This cup is the new testament in my blood, but here is a trope, ergo, in these wordes of Christ (this is my body) is a trope also. Glin. I deny your argument: for toheras Luk sayth this cup, Math. sayth this is my blood, & therefore as Aug. sayth places that be darcke, are to be expounded by other that be light. Rochester. All of your side, deny I Christ euer vied any trope in the instituting of sacramentes. Glin. For my part I hold no opinion but the truth, whether you your selfe also do pretend the like. Rochester. What vnderstand you by this word (hoc, this) & in what words standeth the force or strength of the sacrament? In this pronoune (hoc, this) or in this verbe (est, is) or els in this whole sentence this is my body? Glin. It is not made the true body, except all the words be spoke, as in baptisme, I baptise thee in the name of the father, of the sonne, and of the holy ghost. For neither doth baptisme consist in this word ego I, or in baptise, or in this word (te, thee) or in these words in nomine, in the name. &c. but in all the wordes spoken in order. Grindall. If to eat the body of Christ be a figuratiue speech, as August. sayth it is, ergo, then these wordes (this is my body) is a figuratiue speech also. Glin. It is a figuratiue speech, because we eat not the body of Christ after the same maner that we do other meates. &c. Grind. Ciprian vnderstandeth this of those I come vnto: they, & make no difference of I L orders body speaking of I diuidicatio of the sacramentes & not of the body of Christ. Glin. Truly he speaketh of the true body of Christ. Rochester. They receiue vnto ourselues, who neither iudge themselues, nor yet the sacraments taking them as other common bread. Grind. August. vpon the 33. psal. sayth Christ bere himselfe in his owne handes after a sort, not in deed or truly. &c. Glin. You omit many other thinges which August. sayth, & I confesse that he carried himselfe in his owne handes after a sort, but August. deliuereth this vnto vs, and as a great miracle. And you knowe it was no great miracle to cary a figure of his body in his handes. And whereas you say I. will caryed himselfe after a sort in his owne handes, it is very true, but yet diuersly, for he sat after one maner at his supper, & after another maner he carried himselfe in his handes. For Christ in the visible figure bore himselfe invisibly. Grind. Tertullian calleth it a figure, ergo, it is so. Glin. It is (as I haue sayd) a figure, but not a figure onely. But heare what Tertullian sayth, he toke bread, and made it his body, saying, this is my body. &c. Grind. Heare what Christ. vpon Math. hon. 11. sup. ca. 5. if beuelles sanctified to holy vses. &c. Glin. That worke is receiued not as Christostomes, but some mans els, as you knowe, or thus I answer, it is not I true body in proper and visible forme.

Here Maister Gest disputed.

The bread is not changed before the consecration, ergo not after it neither. Glin. I deny your argument G. Gest.

Gest. Christ gaue earthly bread, ergo there is no transubstantiation. Glin. I deny your antecedent.

Gest. That that Christ toke he blessed, that which he blessed he brake, what he brake he gaue, ergo he receiuing earthly bread, gaue the same bread.

Christ called it wine not blood.

Two places alloyed.

In these wordes this is my body is a trope.

A question wherein consisteth the strength of the Sacrament.

To erre the body of Christ a figuratiue speech.

Cyprian explained.

Christ sup. Math. hemilit. cap. 6.