OF BEING IN MANY PLACES.

THE SIXTH ARTICLE.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBY.

Or, that Christ's body is or may be in a thousand places or more at one time.

[OF THE BEING OF CHRIST'S BODY IN MANY PLACES AT ONE TIME.  
Article VI. H. A. 1564.]

M. HARDING. THE FIRST DIVISION.

(144) Among the miracles of this blessed sacrament one is, that one and the same body may be in many places at once, to wit, under all consecrated hosts. As for God, it is agreeable to his Godhead to be everywhere simpliciter et proprie; but as for a creature, to be but in one place only. But as for the body of Christ, (145) it is after a manner between both. For, whereas it is a creature, it ought not to be made equal with the Creator in this behalf, that it be everywhere: but, whereas it is united to the Godhead, herein it ought to excel other bodies, so as it may in one (146) time be in more places under this holy sacrament. For the uniting of Christ's natural body unto the almighty Godhead, duly considered, bringeth a true christian man in respect of the same to forsake reason and to lean to faith, to put apart all doubts and discourses of human understanding, and to rest in reverent simplicity of belief.

Thereby through the Holy Ghost persuaded, he knoweth that, although the body of Christ be natural and human indeed, yet, through the union and conjunction, many things be possible to the same now, that to all other bodies be impossible; as to walk upon waters, to vanish away out of sight, to be transfigured and made bright as the sun, to ascend up through the clouds; and, after it became immortal, death being conquered, to rise up again out of the grave, and to enter through doors fast shut. Through the same faith he believeth and acknowledgeth that, (147) according unto his word, by his power it is made present in the blessed sacrament of the altar, under the form of bread and wine, wheresoever the same is duly consecrated, according unto his institution in his holy supper; and that not after a gross or carnal manner, but spiritually and supernaturally, and yet substantially; not by local, but by substantial presence; not by manner of quantity, or filling of a place, or by changing of place, or by leaving his sitting on the right hand of the Father, but in such a manner as God only knoweth, and yet doth us to understand by faith the truth of his very presence, far passing all man's capacity to comprehend the manner how.

Whereas some against this point of belief do allege the article of Christ's ascension, and of his being in heaven at the right hand of God the Father, bringing certain texts of the scriptures pertaining to the same, and testimonies of ancient doctors signifying Christ's absence from the earth; it may be rightly understood, that he is verily both in heaven at the right hand of his Father, in his visible and corporeal form, very God and man, after which manner he is there, and not here; and also in the sacrament invisibly.

[1 His, H. A. 1564.]  
[2 Deo veniet esse ubique simpliciter, proprie; creature veniet esse in uno loco tantum; corpus Christi autem medio modo se habet de corpore Christi: cum enim sit creatura, non debet sqvarri Creatori in hoc, quod ubicue est; in hoc vero, quod est unitum divinitati, debet excellere alia corpora, ut simul in locis pluribus possit esse sub sacramento altaris.—Floret. Lugd. 1499. Lib. iv. fol. 96. 2.]  
[3 H. A. 1564, omits the.]  
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THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

Having somewhat largely answered the five first articles, wherein seemed to lie the greatest weight, I trust I may now the more slightly pass over the rest. Herein M. Harding see meth in words thoroughly to yield unto us without exception. For, whereas the question is moved of the being of Christ’s body in a thousand places, or more, his answer is, that Christ’s body is local only in one place, and so cannot be in a thousand places, but only in one place at one time. Howbeit, thus saying, he swerveth much from the old fathers, whose words, as it shall appear, sound far otherwise.

Further, for the better understanding hereof, it shall behave thee, gentle reader, to understand that, touching the body of Christ, there have been sundry great errors raised and maintained in the church of old time, and that not only by heretics, but also by holy learned fathers. The Manichees held that Christ had only a fantastical body, without any material flesh, blood, or bone, in appearance and in sight somewhat, but in very deed and in substance nothing. Eutyches held that Christ’s body, after his incarnation, was made equal with his divinity; an error much like unto this that is now maintained by M. Harding. St Hilary held that Christ received no flesh of the blessed virgin, but brought the same from heaven; and that his body was impassible, and felt no more grief when it was stricken, than water, fire, or air, when it is divided with a knife. Theodoretus saith that the heretics called Helcias held that there be sundry Christ, two at the least; the once dwelling in heaven above, the other in the world here beneath. All these, and other such-like errors and heresies, grew only of admiration and reverence towards Christ’s divine nature; and the authors and maintainers of the same, leaving reason, according to M. Harding’s counsel, and cleaving wholly to their imagination, which they called faith, were far deceived.

But M. Harding layeth the foundation hereof upon a miracle; whereof, notwithstanding, touching this gross and fleshly presence, he hath no manner warrant, neither in the scriptures, nor in any of the holy fathers. As for that is alleged of Chrysostom and Basil, it is to a far other purpose, as shall appear, and may soon be answered. St Augustine wrote three special books namely of the miracles of the old and new testament; and Gregory Nazianzen wrote in like sort of the same: yet did neither of them both ever make mention of this miracle. And albeit this kind of reasoning, ab auctoritate negative, in such cases imply no great necessity; yet must it needs be thought either great negligence or great forgetfulness, writing purposely and namely of miracles, to leave out untouched the greatest miracle. Certainly, St Augustine hereof writeth thus: Quia hoc hominibus nota sunt, quia per homines fiunt, honorem, tanquam religiosa, habere possunt, stuporem, tanquam mira, non possunt: “These things (speaking of the sacrament of Christ’s body), because they are known unto men, and by men are wrought, may have honour, as things appointed to religion; but wonder, as things marvellous, they cannot have.” Thus St Augustine overthroweth M. Harding’s whole foundation, and saith that in his great miracle there is no wonder or miracle at all.

He saith further: “It is agreeable to the Godhead to be every where, simpliciter and propriè. For a creature it is agreeable to be in one place. But as for the body of Christ,” he saith, “it is after a manner between both.” This is


[7 Quæst. 4. 5 et 6. lib. 7. cap. 6-8. Tom. III. Append. cols. 1, &c. This work is considered spurious.]

[8 Id. De Trin. Lib. iii. cap. x. 20. Tom. VIII. col. 806; where possess habere.]
A mean between both.


the whole countenance of this matter. And this whole place M. Harding hath borrowed, even word by word, out of Gerson. But, whereas he addeth that the body of Christ, as it is united unto the Godhead, may be at one time in sundry places, he should have remembered that this is an old error, long sithence reprieved and condemned by St Augustine and other learned fathers. St Augustine saith thus: Capendum est ... ne ita divinatrum astra premiscimus, ut veritatem corporis auferamus. Non est autem consequens, ut, quod in Deo est, ita sit ubique, ut Deus: We must beware that we do not so maintain the divine nature of Christ being man, that we take away the truth of his body. Neither doth it follow that the thing that is in God is therefore every where, as God is.” St Augustine’s words be plain, that whose saith the body of Christ is every where (or in infinite places at one time, which is all one thing, the reason and miracle being like) utterly denieth the verity of Christ’s body.

But what a fantasy this is, that “Christ’s body is neither the Creator nor a creature, but,” as it is here avouched, “after a manner between both?” Who ever would warrant this doctrine, but that holy eretic abbot Eutyches? Verily St Augustine saith: Omnis substantia, quae Deus non est, creatura est; et quae creatura non est, Deus est ... [et] quod Deus minus est, Deus non est: “Every substance that is not God is a creature; and that is not a creature is God; and whatsoever is less than God is not God.” Here St Augustine knoweth a Creator and a creature; but M. Harding’s mean between both he knoweth not. Leo, writing against Eutyches, of whom M. Harding seemeth to have received this learning, writeth thus: Emergent alii, qui carnem Domini et divinitatem dicunt unius esse naturæ. Quæ tantum sacræ linguae inveniæ ... Tolerabilia sunt Ariani, &c.; “Up there start others, that say the flesh of Christ and his divinity are both of one nature. What hell hath pour’d us out such wicked snicerogies? The very Arians are more to be borne withal than these men.” St Augustine saith: Quod ad hominem attinet, creatura est Christus: “Christ, as concerning his manhood, is (not a mean between both, but) a creature.” Again he saith: Duas ... substantias, id est, naturas esse fatumur; divinitatis scilicet et humanitatis; ... creatricis et creator, quæ tamen substantia, non coniuncta, sed unitas, atque in una eademque persona inseparabiles, et in sua semper propriete manentebant: “We confess there are in Christ two substances or natures; the one of the Godhead, the other of the manhood; the one of the Creator, the other of the creature: which substances notwithstanding are not confused, but united, and in one self-same person inseparable, and remaining evermore in their own properties.” The like writeth Leo, Cyrilus, Gelasius, and all the rest of the old learned fathers. Therefore M. Harding was much overseen, either to teach the people that Christ’s body is neither the Creator nor the creature, but a mean between both; or else to say that the same body, being united unto the Godhead, may therefore be in sundry places at one time. Herein rested the old heresy of Eutyches: for thus Flavianus writeth of him: Corpus Domini ... humanum quidem ... vocat; tamen negat esse nobis consubstantiale: “He calleth the body of our Lord a man’s body; but yet he saith it is not one in substance with our bodies.”

But M. Harding replieth: Christ’s body is now become immortal and glorious. This is most true, and without all question. Howbeit, it may please him to remember, that when Christ ministered the holy communion to his disciples, his body was then mortal, and subject to death and other injuries, and not glorious. Therefore, if Christ’s body in the sacrament be immortal and glorious, it must follow that for that present Christ had two manner bodies; the one mortal, the other immortal rules and He ad
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other immortal; the one glorious, the other not glorious. Thus M. Harding's rules and examples match not together.

He addeth further: "Christ's body walked upon the waters, vanished out of sight, ascended through the clouds, and entered through the doors, being fast shut," &c. These were the reasons that deceived the old Manichees. I marvel that M. Harding, being (as he saith) lately become a professor of the catholic faith, would found the whole substance of his doctrine upon heretics. Touching the special trust that the Manichees reposed in this argument, St Hierome writeth thus: Cum dicit Manichaevus, et similia Manichaeorum, Dominus non resurrexit in corporia veritate, et, ut scias non fuisses verum corpus, clausis ingressus est ostiiis, nos quid dicamus? Domine, libera animam meam a labiis iniquis, et a lingua dolosa?": "When the Manichee, or any other like the Manichees, saith, The Lord arose not again in the truth of his body; and for proof thereof saith thus, He entered in when the doors were shut; what then shall we say? Even thus: O Lord, deliver my soul from wicked lips and deceitful tongues." Here we see M. Harding is driven to seek upon old condemned heretics, and to borrow their weapons; wherefore it shall be good to follow St Hierome's counsel, and to say: "O Lord, deliver my soul from wicked lips and deceitful tongues."

Likewise St Ambrose saith the apostles of Christ, by the same manner of reasoning, were deceived. For upon that, "Christ entered, the gates being shut," he writeth thus: Denique conturbati discipuli estimabant se spiritum videre. Et ideo Dominus, ut speciem nobis resurrectionis ostenderet, Papalite, inquit, et videte quia spiritus carnes et ossa non habet, saeunt me videtis habere. The disciples being astonished, thought they saw a spirit or a fantasy. Therefore the Lord, to shew a token of his resurrection, said unto them, 'Feel, and see; for a spirit or fantasy hath not flesh and bone, as you see that I have.' Now, if these arguments were able to deceive the apostles of Christ, it is not impossible but they may likewise deceive M. Harding. Chrysostom saith: Clausa erat ostia, et ingressus est Jesus: ... non erat phantasma: non erat spiritu: vere corpus erat; Joh. Baptist. habebat carnes, et ossa. “The doors were shut; and Jesus entered: it was no fantasy: it was no spirit: it was verily a body: it had flesh and bones.” Thus, notwithstanding these marvellous effects, yet the ancient godly fathers said, Christ's body nevertheless is, and continueth still a creature, not a mean between both, as M. Harding here strangely hath imagined. Now let us consider M. Harding's arguments:

Christ's body walked upon the waters:
It entered through the doors being shut:
It ascended through the clouds:
Ergo, it may be at one time in sundry places.
Although this argument may soon be espied, having utterly no manner sequel in reason, yet the folly thereof may the better appear by the like:
St Peter walked upon the water:
Elias was taken up into the clouds:
St Bartholomew entered through the doors being shut;
Ergo, St Peter, Elias, and St Bartholomew may be at one time in sundry places.

And that I allege here of St Bartholomew, although it be but a vain fable, yet it may not easily be denied. For it is recorded by Abdias the bishop of Babylon, who, as Master Harding supposeth, saw Christ in the flesh, and was one of the apostles' fellows.

Over all this M. Harding throweth a sweet mist, to carry away the simple in the dark: Christ's body, saith he, is in the sacrament, not by local, but by substantial presence; carnally, but not in carnal manner; placed in the pix, in the hand, in the mouth, and yet in no place at all; a very natural body, even as

---

[9] This passage does not appear in the place referred to.
[14] Abd. in Barthol.
it was upon the cross, yet without all manner quantity and dimensions or proportions of a body, that is, neither thick, nor broad, nor short, nor long; there now where before it was not, and yet without any shifting or change of places. Unless this man were fast asleep, he could never fall into so deep a dream. In these fantasies he seemeth well to agree with the old heretics Eutyches and Manichee. For even such a body they imagined that Christ received of the blessed virgin; and yet were they heretics notwithstanding. For which of all the old learned fathers ever taught us this strange doctrine? Who ever durst to spoil Christ of his place, of his quantity, and of the natural proportions of his body? If the doctors of the church say thus, why are they not alleged? If they say not thus, why is this matter carried away with such countenance of antiquity? Or why doth M. Harding thus avouch this unsensible and unsavoury learning, only upon his own credit, without the authority of any doctor? The Manichees in old times, the better to maintain their error, and to avoid absurdities, were driven to say there were two Gods; the one good, the other ill. Even so M. Harding, to maintain his errors, and to avoid infinite absurdities, is driven to say: There are two Christs; the one local, the other not local; the one above, the other beneath; the one with proportion of body, the other without proportion. Howbeit, he seemeth to publish this principle unaware against himself. For if Christ's body in the sacrament be not local, as he saith, then is it no natural or real body. This rule St Augustine taketh to be infallible. His words be these: Tolle loca corporibus, et nusquam erunt; et quid nusquam erunt, nec erunt; “Take away the places from the bodies, and the bodies shall be no where; and, because they shall be no where, they shall have no being,” and so shall be no bodies at all. And he speaketh not thus only of other natural bodies, but specially and namely of the body of Christ.

Certainly, the more spiritual a thing is, the more it is void from the circumstance and necessity of place. Wherefore, when M. Harding saith the body of Christ is in heaven as in a place, and in the sacrament without place; he seemeth to say that Christ's body in the sacrament is more glorious, more spiritual, and divine, than is the very body of Christ indeed that is in heaven, in the glory of God the Father. Which conclusion, how well it may stand either with the rest of his own doctrine, or with the truth of our christian religion, I leave it in consideration to the reader.

But what needeth this newly devised difference of Christ's body local, and Christ's body not local? Or what forceth these men to say that the bare substance of Christ's body is in the sacrament, without length, breadth, or any other respect of quantity? Will M. Harding now at the last forsake the reverend simplicity of his belief, and lean to reason? Or will he in God's secret mysteries give credit to his eyes, and hearken to the course of nature? Verily God, as he is able by his omnipotent power to make Christ's body present without place and quantity; so is he likewise able to make the same body present in place, and with quantity, and all other natural dimensions. If M. Harding will say nay, Duns himself, his own doctor, will reprove him. His words be plain: Idem corpus localiter et dimensio potest esse in diversis locis. Et Deus potest quodcumque corpus universi convertere in corpus Christi, sicut panem; et facere corpus Christi ubique esse, non solum sacramentaliter, sed etiam localiter et dimensionali: “One body, not only locally and with the natural dimensions of a body, may be in sundry places. And God is able to turn any body in the world into the body of Christ, as well as bread; and to cause Christ's body to be everywhere, not only by way of sacrament, but also by way of place and dimensions.” Which saying seemeth...
also to be well liked and allowed of Durandus. Therefore M. Harding should not thus nicely shrink back, and so dissemble in dark speeches; but should rather boldly and plainly say; Christ's body is in the sacrament, not only substantially, but also locally and by way of place; as having as good warrant for the one as for the other. For it is a catholic man's part to be bold of God's omnipotent power; and whatsoever God, being omnipotent, is able to do, to believe it is already done, without any regard had to his will or promise. If he think it lawful for him without cause to deny this manner of Christ's presence, let him not be offended, if we upon good and just cause deny the other. Verily Alexander de Hales, a great doctor of that side, reckoneth M. Harding to be in a great error in this behalf. This is his resolution: Quidam ponebant corpus Christi esse sub sacramento, non secundum quantitatem, sed hoc positio est erronea: "Some hold that Christ's body is under the sacrament, not according unto quantity; but this opinion is erroneous." Thus much I thought good only to touch; not so much for any great credit of the author, but that it may appear that, notwithstanding all these men would so fain have Christ really and fleshly present, yet they reproue one another of error and ignorance, and cannot agree among themselves in what sort they may have him present. Howbeit, the ancient fathers of the church have written far otherwise in this behalf. For like as Athanasius saith, \textit{Equalis Patri secundum divinitatem; minor Patre secundum humanitatem}; "Christ, according to his divine nature, is equal unto the Father; and according to his manhood is inferior unto the Father," even so saith Gregory Nazianzene: "Christ, according to his body, is within the limitation of place; according to his spirit and Godhead, he is without the limits of any place." But, that any one of all the old fathers ever said, "Christ's body is sometime in one place and sometime in many, sometime limited and sometime not limited," I think it not easy for M. Harding well to prove. As for the difference that he hath devised, of visible and invisible, local and not local, which is both trench and bulwark to maintain this piece, it is a very toy, only meet to beguile children; as neither having foundation in the scriptures or holy fathers, nor effectually serving to prove his purpose. For we reason not of respects and qualities; but, as St Augustine, St Cyril, and other catholic doctors do, of the very nature and substance of Christ's body. Neither can M. Harding well maintain that whatsoever is invisible is therefore of nature infinite, or may be at one time in a thousand places. As touching Christ's being in a mystery, as it requireth no local presence, according to M. Harding's own confession, so likewise it requireth no natural or real body; as hereafter, God willing, it shall be shewed more at large.

M. HARDING. THE SECOND DIVISION.

And how the ancient fathers of the church have confessed and taught both these beings, of Christ in heaven and in the sacrament together, contrary to M. Jewel's negative, by witness of their own words we may perceive. Basil in his liturgy, that is to say, service of mass, saith thus in a prayer: "Look down upon us, Lord Jesus Christ, our God, from thy holy tabernacle, and from the throne of glory of thy kingdom, and come to sanctify us, which sitteth above with thy Father, and art conversant here invisibly; and vouchsafe to impart unto us thine undefiled body and precious blood, and by us to all thy people."
THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

Touching these ancient fathers that here be alleged, notwithstanding the credit of them might well come in question, as namely that Chrysostom in his liturgy prayeth for the emperor of Alexius, which was not born within five hundred years after that Chrysostom was dead; yet will I spare both this, and also all other like advantages, and receive all these authorities as if they were good and perfect without exception.

But first, for the clearer conceiving of the answer hereunto, understand, good christian reader, that by the record of the old fathers Christ is present amongst sundry ways: by his holy Spirit, as Cyril saith; by his grace, as Eusebius Emissonus saith; by his divinity and majesty, as St Augustine saith; by faith dwelling in our hearts, as St Paul saith. Thus is Christ most comfortably present in his holy word, in the mystery of baptism, and in the sacrament of his body. We deny only that gross and fleshly presence that M. Harding here defendeth; wherein we have the authority and consent of the old learned fathers. For, to allege one instead of many, St Augustine saith: Corpus... in quo resurrexit, [in] uno loco esse oportet: “The body wherein Christ rose again must be in one place.”

Here M. Harding, as his manner is, taketh one thing in hand, and proveth another. For to prove that Christ is really and fleshly present in the sacrament, he allegeth the old fathers, that never spake one word of this real or fleshly presence. And therefore, setting such countenance upon the matter with the names of holy fathers, and not once coming near that thing wherein standeth the whole question, he dailith vainly and abuseth the simplicity of the people. For touching Chrysostom and Basil, we grant that Christ, being in heaven in his humanity and in the substance of his body, is nevertheless by his Spirit and grace invisibly present in his sacraments. Which answer, notwithstanding it might serve generally to all these authorities here brought in, yet I have thought it not amiss to consider them all severally as they come.

M. HARDING. THE THIRD DIVISION.

St Chrysostom prayeth with the very same words also in his liturgy or mass: where we read further, that “the priest and the deacon do adore and worship, saying three times secretly, ‘God be merciful to me a sinner;’ and that the people do all likewise devoutly adore”9. Now, sith he will adoration to be made, he acknowledgeth Christ present, whom he granteth to be also at the same time in heaven.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

It is likely, saith Master Harding, that Christ is fleshly present in the sacrament, for that the priest and the people adoreth him. This guess hath very slender hold. For would he that the people should never worship Christ, but only when they have him present before their face? Certainly St Hierome writeth thus of a gentilewoman named Melania: Ad Christi pedes provoluta est10;

---


---

11 C Hom. xi. 12 S 13 T 14 Πιστὸν ἐν τῷ θρόνῳ καὶ τῷ θανάτῳ ἐν οἷς ἔθεσαν ἐφεβαλμένος.
"She fell down and worshipped at Christ’s feet:" notwithstanding she had not Christ there bodily present. Likewise Chrysostom teacheth us to worship Christ in the sacrament of baptism. For thus he saith unto the people: *Et vos, qui accepturi estis baptisma,...tenete pedes Salvatoris: lavate lacrymis: crine turgite*; 11 

“You that will receive baptism, hold the feet of our Saviour: wash them with your tears: wipe them with your hair.” Yet will not M. Harding therefore say that Christ is bodily and carnally present in the water of baptism. Thus the faithful then were taught to worship Christ, although they had him not corporally in real presence. The idolaters worshipped the sun and the moon; yet they pulled them not down from heaven to receive their worship. Therefore M. Harding’s argument of adoration can stand him but in little stead. For we are taught to worship Christ sitting in heaven, not lying bodily present before our eyes.

M. HARDING. THE FOURTH DIVISION.

Which he uttereth more plainly in these words: O miraculum, O Dei benignitatem, &c.: "O miracle, O the goodness of God, who sitteth above with the Father, at that very instant of time is handled with the hands of all, and giveth himself to those that will receive and embrace him. And that is done by no crafty slightness, but openly in the sight of all that stand about. How saith thou, seem these things no better to thee than to be commended and despised?" By which words of St Chrysostom we may see that Christ’s being in heaven maketh no proof that he is not in earth, sith both these verities may well stand together.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

This argument would serve well, if there were none other miracle but carnal presence. But if M. Harding had conferred with the old catholic fathers, he should have found miracles in the sacrament of baptism, no less than in this sacrament of Christ’s body. Leo saith: *[Deus] mirabile nobis sacramentum regenerationis indulsit*; 12 “God hath granted us the marvellous sacrament of regeneration.” So saith Eusebius Emissenus: *Veniant [nunc] qui futura resurrectionis gloriam sitiunt: jam nunc de...remissione peccatorum digno miraculo reficiant fidem suam.* Homo [in] fonte tingeitur, &c. 13: "Let them draw near that thirst after the glory of the resurrection that is to come: even now let them refresh their faith with that worthy miracle of remission of sin. A man is washed in the font." &c. In like sort writeth Chrysostom touching the same: *Nullo pacto de intellectuali per baptismum regeneratione et admirabili partu rationem reddemus. Nam et angeli, qui aduerunt, tam inenarrabilia operis modum minime possunt enarrare. Adjurerunt tantum, et viderunt: nihil autem operati sunt: sed Pater tantum, et Filius, et Spiritus sanctus*; 14: "We are never able to yield a reason of the spiritual regeneration and miraculous birth that we have by baptism. The very angels that were present are not able to utter the manner of that unspeakable work. They were present only, and saw; but they wrought nothing; but only the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost." Here we see a miracle in baptism, and such a miracle as the angels of God are not able to utter it. Yet will not M. Harding say that Christ’s body is therefore present in the water of baptism. So weakly these proofs hang together.

But Chrysostom’s words are very vehement: That Christ is present at the
holy ministration; that every man both toucheth him with his fingers, and also seeth him with his eyes, and that clearly and openly, without guile or error. I grant these words be very vehement, and much exceed the common sense. But here would I learn of master Harding, whether he will take these words plainly and simply as they lie, or else will rather qualify them with a courteous and gentle interpretation. If he follow the rigour of the words, then appeareth there a manifest contradiction; and Chrysostom in uttering one sentence is found clean contrary to himself. For first he saith, "Christ is there invisibly, in such sort as no man can see him;"[1] and yet immediately after, with one breath he saith, "Every man seeth him with his eyes plainly, and without guile or error." Again, by the rigour of the same words, we must needs grant that the people both verily and indeed seeth Christ's very body, and also handleth and toucheth it with their fingers; which is not only a manifest untruth, but also a greater heresy than ever was defended by Berengarius, as it is confessed by the doctors of M. Harding's own side[1]. Indeed, the marvellous effects that God worketh in the faithful, in that dreadful time of the holy communion, wherein the whole mystery of our redemption that we have in the blood of Christ is expressed, Chrysostom calleth a miracle; and therefore the more to stir the people's minds to the consideration of the same, he inflameth his speech with rhetorical amplifications and heat of words. He saith: "Christ is crucified before our eyes: his blood gushed out of his side, and streameth and floweth over the holy table; and the people is therewith made red and bloody."[2] This advancing[3] and ravishing of the mind he calleth a miracle; but of any corporal or fleshly presence he speaketh nothing. By such figurative and fiery speech he meant not that we should understand him precisely according to the sound of his words, but sought only to lift up and enkindle his hearers' minds. So St Paul saith to the Galatians: "Christ was crucified before your eyes." So St Hierome: "Our faces are marked in baptism with the blood of Christ."[4] So saith Tertullian: "We are washed in the passion of our Lord." So St Gregory saith: "Eundem Aegnum Johannes ostendendo, Esaias praedivendo, Abel offerto locutus est: et quem Johannes in ostensione, quem Esaias in locutione, hunc Abel significando in manibus tuis:"[5] "St John the Baptist speke of the same Lamb by pointing, Esaias by seeing, Abel by offering. And the Lamb that John held in his hand by pointing, and Esay by speaking, the same Lamb Abel held in his hand by signifying." These sayings, and other like, are vehement, as is that of Chrysostom; and, as M. Harding knoweth, may not be taken as they lie, but must be mollified with a gentle construction.

M. HARDING. THE FIFTH DIVISION.

The same father confesseth the body of Christ to be in divers places likewise in his homilies ad Populum Antiochenum, most plainly alluding to Elias. Elias, saith he, meloton quidem discipulo reliquit: Filius autem Dei ascends suam nobis carnem dimisit. Sed Elias quidem ecutus: Christus autem et nobis reliquit, et ipsam habens ascendit: "Elias (when he was carried up in the fiery chariot) left to his disciple Elizeus his mantle of sheep's skins: but the Son of God, when he ascended, left to us his flesh. But Elias did put off his mantle; and Christ both left his flesh to us, and also ascending had it with him." Nothing can be spoken more plainly, whereby to shew that we have the same

---


This p other like flesh into land to that when Elia that stood water of...hæreditate auro preti...Elias[8]: "And doubt time Elias was the...below w...of the...saih, Ch...Elias is b...Christ's b...of St Aug...Christi est...body of C...Hereo...Elias, There fleshly pr...
flesh here in earth that was received into heaven, which Christ hath not put off to give it to us. By which doctrine of St Chrysostom (148) we are taught to believe, that Christ's flesh or his body is both in heaven and also in the earth, in how many places soever this blessed sacrament is rightly celebrated.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

This place well considered both openeth itself, and also giveth light unto other like. Chrysostom sheweth in what sort Christ hath both taken up his flesh into heaven, and also left the same here amongst the faithful in the earth; and to that end compareth Elias and Christ together. The story is known, that when Elias was taken up in a fiery chariot, he let down his coat unto Elizeus that stood beneath; who took it up, and by the power of the same divided the water of Jordan. Upon occasion hereof Chrysostom saith: \textit{Tanquam maximam hereditatem Elizeus melotem suscepit. Etenim vero maxima fuit hereditas omnium auro pretiosior. Et erat postea duplex Elias: et erat sursum Elias, et deorsum Elia\'s}: "Elizeus received the coat made of sheep's skins as a great inheritance. And doubtless it was an inheritance more precious than any gold. After that time Elias was double: for there was Elias above, and Elias beneath." Above was the very true Elias in the natural substance and presence of his body; beneath was nothing else but Elias' coat; which coat notwithstanding, because of the powers that were wrought with it, he calleth Elias. Thus Chrysostom compareth Elias with Christ, and Elias' coat with the sacrament; and thus he saith, Christ is above, and Christ is beneath; as he saith, Elias is above, and Elia\'s is beneath. For, as Elias' coat was called Elias, even so the sacrament of Christ's body is called Christ's body. Which saying agreeeth well with these words of St Augustine: \textit{Sacramentum corporis Christi secundum quendam modum corpus Christi est}: "The sacrament of Christ's body, after a certain manner, is the body of Christ," not substantially or really or indeed, but as Elias' coat is Elias.

Hereof M. Harding might well have formed this argument:

Elias, being above, was not verily and indeed present beneath in his coat;

Therefore by Chrysostom's comparison Christ's body is not indeed really and fleshly present in the sacrament.

M. HARDING. THE SIXTH DIVISION.

(149) And whereas many, measuring all things by the common order and laws of nature, believe nothing can be done above nature, and therefore think that the body of Christ, forasmuch as it is of nature finite, cannot by power of God be in many places at once, of which opinion M. Jewel seemeth to himself; it shall not be beside the purpose, though the places already alleged prove the contrary, to recite the testimonies of an old doctor or two, wherein they confess most plainly that which by this article is most untruly denied.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

M. Harding hopeth to win the victory by untrue reports. For with what truth or modesty can he say that we measure all things by the laws of nature, and believe nothing above the judgment of our senses? He knoweth well our doctrine is according to the doctrine of St Cyprian, St Augustine, and other old fathers, that Christ's body is meat for our minds, and not for our bellies; and that the same cannot be eaten with our mouth or teeth, or by any other natural or material means, but only spiritually by faith, which is the mouth of the inner man. He knoweth we teach the people to lift up their hearts, and, as St Chrysostom saith, "to become eagles in this life, and to mount up unto the gates of heaven, even unto the heaven of heavens, and so to draw near to Christ's body." He 14.
knoweth we say Christ is present by his Godhead, by his Spirit, and by his grace, and worketh miraculously in the sacrament of his body, as he doth in the sacrament of baptism. All this it pleaseth M. Harding to call the law of nature and the judgment of our senses. Verily we yield no more unto nature than it is meet we should. Neither do we abridge God’s omnipotent power. But all vain fantasies of man’s heart may not be measured by the power of God. This argument the heretic Praxeneus used against Tertullian. For thus he said: God is omnipotent, and can do it; therefore we must believe that he doth it. But Tertullian answereth him: Si tam abrupte in præsumptionibus nostris hac sententia utamur, quidem de Deo confingere poterimus: quasi fecerit, quasi faceret potuerit. Non autem, quia omnia potest facere, ideo... credendum est illum fecisse:... sed an fecerit, requirendum: “If we use this saying so rashly in our presumptions, we may imagine of God what we list; as though, because God can do it, that therefore indeed he hath done it. But we may not believe that God hath done every thing, because he is able to do it; but rather we must search out whether he have done it or no.” Thus M. Harding’s new catholic faith is called of Tertullian a vain presumption.

M. HARDING. THE SEVENTH DIVISION.

St Ambrose hath these words: Etsi... Christus nunc non videtur in Psal.zxxviii. offerre, tamen ipse offeritur in terris, quando Christi corpus offeritur. Imo ipse offerre manifestatur in nobis, cujus sermo sanctificat sacrificium quod offeritur: “If Christ now be not seen to offer, yet he is offered in earth, when the body of Christ is offered. Yea, it is manifest that himself offereth in us, whose word sanctifieth and consecrateth the sacrifice which is offered.” Now, if Christ’s body be offered in earth, as this father affirmeth, and that of Christ himself, in respect that the sacrifice which is offered is by his word consecrated; then it followeth, Christ’s body to be in so many places as it is offered in. Whereby the way this may be noted, that the sacrifice of the church (150) is not thanksgiving (as our new masters do teach), but sacrificium in cruentum et victimam, and quickening or life-giving sacrifice.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

In all these words there is no mention of carnal presence; and therefore M. Harding’s purpose is hereby but weakly furthered. But, good christian reader, to put thee out of all doubt of St Ambrose’s judgment in this behalf, I beseech thee to consider these words that he writeth upon the gospel of St Luke: Quae sursum sunt, sapite, non qua supra terram. Ergo non supra terram, nec in terra, nec secundum carnem te querere debemus, si volumus invenire: “Seek the things that are above, not the things that are upon earth. Therefore we must seek thee neither upon the earth, nor in the earth, nor according to the flesh, if we list to find thee.” This is St Ambrose’s undoubted and most certain judgment; from which we may not be removed by any amplification or shew of words. If M. Harding will needs force and press the bare letter, as I said before of St Chrysostom, he will make St Ambrose in one sentence plain contrary to himself. For first he saith: Vidimus Principem sacerdotum, &c.: “We have seen (Christ) the Prince of priests coming unto us: we have seen him and heard him offering up for us his blood.” He addeth immediately: Etsi nunc Christus non videtur offerre, &c.: “Although Christ be not seen to offer, yet is he offered in the earth.” If we follow the very force and sound of the words, this contradiction of seeing and not seeing cannot be salved. Wherefore, to avoid this inconvenience, we must say that St Ambrose speaketh of the spiritual eyes of our faith, with which eyes we see Christ indeed offering up himself upon the cross. And thus, as St Ambrose saith, magis videtur, quod non videtur: “the thing is the better seen...”

[^9] 10. Fu
that is not seen." It is best seen with our faith that is least seen with our body; for our faith is sharper than our eye. And in like sense St Augustine saith: *Non vides, quomodo rubeat para Christi? Interroga oculos tui. Si cruelem vides, attende et cruelem. Si vides quod pendet, attende quod fudit?* "Seest thou not how Christ's portion is red with blood? Ask the eyes of thy faith. If thou see the cross, behold also the blood. If thou see that hangeth, behold also that is shed." Of these eyes and of this sight St Ambrose speaketh; unto which is required neither circumstance of place, nor any manner corporal or fleshy presence. In this sense St Ambrose writeth unto certain holy virgins: *Vestras mentes confidenter altaria dixerim, in quibus quotidie pro redemptione corporis Christus offeretur*; "I may boldly call your minds altars; for that in them Christ is daily offered for the redemption of the body."

Hereof M. Harding reasoneth thus:

*Ergo, Christ's body is at one time in many places. If this argument were good, then would this argument likewise be good: The Lamb, that is, Christ, was offered from the beginning of the world;* Rev. v.  Rev. v. *Ergo, Christ's body was really in sundry places before it was born in the world.*

M. Harding might better have reasoned thus, and have concluded the contrary:

*Christ is not now really and fleshy offered in the earth;* *Ergo, Christ's body is not really and fleshy present in many places.*

But M. Harding saith: "The sacrifice of the church is not thanksgiving, as our new masters teach us." Certainly our sacrifice is the very body of Christ, and that for ever, according to the order of Melchisedech, evermore standing in God's presence, and evermore obtaining pardon for us; not offered up by us, but offering us up unto God the Father. For the same it is our part to offer unto God our sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving. And this is the doctrine, not only of them whom it liketh M. Harding to call new masters, but also of the oldest and most catholic doctors of the church. And, to allege one instead of many, St Augustine hereof writeth thus: *In illis...carnalibus victimis figuratio fuit carnis,...quam [Christus]...fuerat oblaturus,...in isto autem sacrificio [est] gratiarum actio, et commemoratio carnis,...quum pro nobis obtulit* 10;

"In those fleshy sacrifices (of the Jews) there was a figure of the flesh that Christ afterward would offer; but in this sacrifice of the church there is thanksgiving, and a remembrance of that flesh which Christ hath already offered for us." If M. Harding will happily refuse St Augustine, as mistrusted for one of these new masters, yet he may not well 11 refuse his own mass-book. There he himself even at his mass is taught to say: [*Qui* tibi offerimus...hoc sacrificium laudis* 12: "We that do offer up to thee this sacrifice of praise." Wherefore, unless M. Harding will leave his mass, he himself must needs pass in the number of these new masters.

But to conclude, who can better expound St Ambrose's meaning than St Augustine, that was sometime his scholar? He sheweth us by how many ways we may have Christ present among us. His words be these: *Habes Christum et in presenti, et in futuro: in presenti per fidel; in presenti per signum; in presenti per baptismatis sacramentum; in presenti per altaris cibum et potum* 13: "Thou hast Christ both in the time present, and also in the time to come. In the time present thou hast Christ by faith; in the time present by his token; in the time present by the sacrament of baptism; in the time present by the meat and drink of the altar." The like hereof is written also by Origen, 10 Disc. col. 316; where *alique commemoratio est.*

11 Will, 1611.

12 Missal, ad Us. ec Consuet. Sar. Par. 1527. fol. 156. 2.

and that in like order and form of words; saving that he addeth, By the preaching of the apostles; and instead of signum hath these words: *Per gloriosum crucis signaculum*. Verily the same Origen saith: *Si...virtus Jesu una sit cum eis qui congregantur in nomine ejus, non perigrinatur a suis, sed semper prosto est eis*. "If the power of Jesus be together with them that be assembled in his name, he is not away from his own, but is still present with them." And again he saith: *Nihil est contrarium...ipsum Jesum secundum quendam...intellecm esse ubiqw; secundum altum [intellectum]...perigrinatur*; "It is no inconvenience nor ubi contrariety; secundum altum [intellectum]...perigrinatur." Thus many ways, saith St Augustine and Origen, we have Christ present amongst us; and even thus, saith St Ambrose, "Christ is offered in the earth." Whereupon we may conclude thus: We have Christ in faith, in the sign and in the sacrament of baptism, without real or fleshly presence; therefore, we have him likewise without any such real presence in the sacrament of his body.

M. HARDING. THE EIGHTH DIVISION.

We find in Chrysostom a most manifest place for the being of Christ's body in many places at once; so as, though he be offered in many places, yet is he but one Christ, not many Christs. His words be these: *Unum est hoc sacrificium: aliquin hac ratione, quoniam multit in locis offeritur, multi Christi sunt? Neequauam; sed unus ubique est Christus, et hic plenus existens, et illic plenus. Unum corpus. Sicet enim qui ubique offeritur, unum corpus est, et non multa corpora; ita etiam et unum sacrificium*: "This sacrifice is one; else by this reason, sith it is offered in many places, be there many Christs? Not so; but there is but one Christ everywhere, where being here both fully, and there fully also; one body. For as he that is offered everywhere is but one body, and not many bodies, so likewise is it but one sacrifice." By this place of Chrysostom we see what hath been the faith of the old fathers touching this article; even the same which the catholic church proseth at these days, that one Christ is offered in many places, so as he be fully and perfectly here, and fully and perfectly there. And thus we perceive what force their arguments have in the judgment of the learned fathers, by which they take away from Christ power to make his body present in many places at once. St Bernard uttereth the faith of the church in his time, agreeable with this, in these words: Serm. 1120. Sermo de Censa Dominici. Sermon 1120. From whence cometh this, most loving Lord, that we trouble worms, creeping on the face of the earth, yea, that are but dust and ashes, be admitted to have thee present in our hands, and before our eyes, which all and whole sitteth at the right hand of thy Father, which also art present all? in one moment of time from the east to the west, from the north to the south; one in many, the same in divers places; from whence, I say, cometh this? Soothly, not of our duty or desert, but of thy good-will, and of the good pleasure of thy sweetness; for thou hast prepared in thy sweetness for the poor one, O God." In terra sponsum habes in sacramento, in e undis habitura es sine velamento; et hic et ibi veritas; sed hic palliata, ibi manifestata: "In the earth thou hast thy spouse in the sacrament, in heaven thou shalt his presence answer.

This prophet in like manner answered. The Wi present; understand in the words of the ston of the Spirit non so organa, 1 speaketh world, 1 sort is C his right not by a Colom as Jesus illi intra hu Christus 1 Look u


14 Both here, 1565, and H. A. 1564.

15 Perpetui. 1565, and H. A. 1564.

16 Sed, et plissime Jesum, ut &c. super faciem terre; nos, inquam, qui pulvis et eius susum, te presentem habere mereamur pre manibus, pre occu-

17 ibi, qui totus et integer sedes ad dextram Patris? Qui etiam unius horae momento ab orbe solis usque ad occasum, ab aquilone usque ad austrum presto esse omnibus, unus in multis, idem in diversis locis. Unde hoc? inquam? Certe non ex debito, vel ex merito nostro; sed ex voluntate tua, et dulcedinis tuae beneplacito. Parasit enim in dulcedine tua pauperi, Deus.


[19] Id. ib. 7. col. 671; where manifesta.}
thou shalt have him without veil or covering: both here and there is the truth (of his presence); but here covered, there opened."

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

This place is uttered by St. Ambrose, Primasius, Remigius, Haimo, Sedulius, in like manner and form of words, and hath been often alleged and often answered. If it had pleased M. Harding to suffer St. Chrysostom to tell out his own tale, the place had been plain of itself. For thus he saith: Offerimus quidem, sed recordationem facientes mortis ejus. Hoc sacrificium exemplar illius est. Hoc, quod nos facimus, in commemorationem fit ejus, quod factum est. Christus enim alt, Hoc facite in memam commemorationem. . . . Id ipsum semper offerimus: magis autem sacrificii recordationem operamur12: "We offer indeed, but we do it in remembrance of his death. This sacrifice is an exemplar or figure of that sacrifice. The thing that we do is done in remembrance of that thing that was done before. For Christ saith, 'Do this in my remembrance.' We offer up the same thing; nay, rather we work the remembrance of a sacrifice." By thus many sundry ways Chrysostom opened his own meaning. Yet all this M. Harding thought best to dissemble closely, and to pass it in silence. Certainly, the commemoration or figure or remembrance of Christ's death maketh small proof for corporal or bodily presence. True it is that whole Christ is fully at every communion, as Chrysostom saith: not that he is there in fleshly or bodily presence; for so St. Chrysostom saith not; but for that by his grace and holy Spirit he worketh wholly and effectually in the hearts of the faithful.

St. Augustine and other learned fathers have used the like manner of speech, and in the same seem fully to express Chrysostom's mind. St. Augustine writeth thus: Veritas una est, qua illustrantur animae sanctae: sed quoniam multa sunt animae, in ipsis multa veritates dici possunt; sicut ab una facie multa in speculis imagines apparent13: "There is but one truth wherewith the blessed souls are lightened. But, forasmuch as the souls be many, it may be said, that in the same are many truths; as sundry images appear in sundry glasses, notwithstanding the face be one." Again, St. Augustine saith: Sapientia Dei, Verbum Dei, Dominus Jesus Christus ubique presens est: quia ubique est veritas, ubique est sapientia. Intelligit quis in oriente justitiam: intelligit quis in occidente justitiam. Nuncuid alia est justitia, quam ille intelligit, alia, quam ist14? "The Wisdom of God, the Word of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, is everywhere present; for the truth is everywhere, and wisdom is everywhere. One man understandeth righteousness in the east, another understandeth righteousness in the west; and doth the one of them understand one righteousness, and the other another?" So likewise, and somewhat near to the manner of Chrysostom's speech, Origen speaketh: Et hodie in hac congregacione Dominus loquitur; et non solum in hac, sed etiam in alio coetu, et in toto orbe docet Jesus, quern orbis, per quo doceat15: "And even this day, in this congregation, the Lord speaketh; and not only in this, but also in another company, and in the whole world, Jesus teacheth, seeking instruments by which he may teach." In this sort is Christ present at the holy ministration, because his truth, his wisdom, his righteousness, his word is there present, as the face is present in the glass; not by any bodily or fleshly presence. In this manner St. Ambrose writeth: Caelum aspice: Jesus illic est. Terram intuere: Jesus adest. . . . Si ascenderis in coelum, Jesus illic est: si descenderis ad infernum, adest. Hodie, cum loquor, nuncum est: intra hunc punctum, intra hoc momentum. Et si in Armenia nunc loquatur Christus, Jesus adest. Nemo enim dicit Dominum Jesum, nisi in Spiritu sancto17: "Look up into the heaven: there is Jesus. Behold the earth: Jesus is there.

[11 Also there, H. A. 1584.]
[14 Id. In Johan. Evang. cap. viii. Tractat. xxxv. 4; where alius in occidente.]
If thou mount up into heaven, there is Jesus: if thou go down into hell, Jesus is present. Even now while I speak, Jesus is with me, even at this hour, even at this minute. And if any christian man speak now in Armenia, so far hence Jesus is with him. 'For no man saith, The Lord Jesus, but in the Holy Ghost.'

And such kind of presence at one time in sundry places is avouched by St Chrysostom, not only of Christ's body, which is immortal and glorious, but also of any other godly mortal man. For thus he writeth: 'Vidisti caritatis excellentiem, quemadmodum unum hominem inexcupabiliem reddat, et multiplicet: et quernadmodum unus in multis locis esse possit; idem et in Perside, et Rome. Nam quod natura non potest, potest caritas. Nam eum hoc quidem hic erit, hoc autem illuc. Quin potius integer hic, et integer illuc. Itaque si milie habeas amicos, vel duo millia, perpende quosrum possit potentia pervenire. Vides quemadmodum caritas res sit augmentativa. Hoc enim est mirabile, quod unus facit milieculum.'

Thou hast seen the excellent working of charity, how it multi- feth a man, as it were in a castle, and multiplieth him, and, being one man, maketh him many. Thou hast seen how one man may be in many places; one man in Persia, and the same man in Rome. For charity can do that nature cannot do. Of one man one portion shall be here, and another portion there. Nay rather, he shall be whole here, and whole there. Therefore, if one man have a thousand friends, or two thousand, consider, how far he may reach by his power. Thou seest how that charity is a matter of increase. And this is a wonder, it maketh one man to be a thousand-fold more than he is, and as if he were a thousand men.

The same answer may serve also for St Bernard; howbeit his authority in this case is not great, as living in the very time of corruption, at the least eleven hundred years after Christ, and so five hundred years at the least without the compass of the first six hundred years.

M. HARDING. THE NINTH DIVISION.

Thus all these fathers, as likewise the rest, confess as it were with one mouth, that Christ sitteth at the right hand of his Father, and yet is here present in the sacrament the same time; that he is in heaven and in earth at once; in many and divers places, one, and the same is everywhere offered, the one true sacrifice of the church. And this article is by them so clearly and plainly uttered, that (151) figures, significations, tropes, and metaphors, can find no appearance or colour at all. Whereby the new masters' reasons seem very preevish: Christ is ascended; ergo, he is not in the sacrament. Christ is in heaven sitting at the right hand of his Father; ergo, he is not in earth. Christ's body is of nature finite; ergo, it is contained in a place circumscriptionally; ergo, it is not in many places.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBY.

M. Harding needeth no great study to answer our arguments. It is sufficient for him to pronounce by authority, 'these new masters' arguments be all preevish.' Verily, it appeareth by the whole substance and course of M. Harding's book, that he hath some good pretty skill in preevish arguments; otherwise he could not have them and use them in such plenty. But the old learned fathers oftentimes and commonly used such arguments of Christ's humanity; and yet were they never reproved as preevish for the same, but only by heretics. St Augustine saith: 'Donec seculum finiatur, sursum est Dominus; sed tamen etiam hic nobis est veritas Domini. Corpus enim, ... in quo resurrexit, [in] uno loco esse oportet; "Until...

[9] id. 1 Tom. II. col.
the world be ended, the Lord is above; yet notwithstanding, even here is the truth of the Lord. For the body wherein he rose again must needs be in one place." St Cyril us saith: *Christus non poterat in carne versari cum apostolis, postquam ascendisset ad Patrem?* "Christ could not be conversant with his apostles in his flesh, after that he had ascended unto his Father." So St Augustine, writing against the heretic Manichee, that seemed much to savour of M. Harding’s error, saith: [Christus] seundum pravestiam... corporalem, simul et in sole, et in luna, et in cruce esse non potuivi: "Christ, according to the presence of his body, could not be both in the sun, and in the moon, and upon the cross at one time." Again he saith: [Christus] venturus est, illa angelica voce testante, quemadmodum ire visus est in calum, id est, in eadem carnis forma atque substantia; cui profecto immortalitatem dedit, naturam non abutuit: "Christ shall come again, as it is witnessed by the angel, even as he was seen to go into heaven; that is, in the same shape and substance of his flesh; unto which flesh as he hath given immortality, so hath he left unto it the same nature that it had before." Thus St Augustine. And further he saith, that "whoso holdeth that Christ's body is both in heaven and in earth at one time, utterly dissolveth and destroeyeth the nature of the body of Christ." To be short, and not to overcharge the reader with allegations, St Augustine seemeth to give a special note by way of prophecy touching the same. For thus he saith: *His...dictis mox ascendit in calum: praeunire voluit aures nostras adversus eos, quos, procedentibus temporebus, essu recturos esse previccrat, et dicturos, Ecce hic...Christus, ecce ille: quibus ne crederemus, adnonuit. Nec uella insignis causatio est, si crediderimus adversus vocem Pastoris [nostri] tam claram, tam apertam, tam manifestam, ut nemo vel obtusus, et tardus corde, posit dicere, Non intellexer": "These words spoken, he ascended into heaven. Hereby he gave our ears a praeunire against them, which he foretold us would rise in process of time, and say: 'Behold, here is Christ; behold, there is Christ.' Unto whom he warned us we should give no credit. Neither have we now any manner excuse, if we believe them against the voice of our Shepherd, being so clear, so open, and so plain, that no man, be he never so heavy or dull of heart, can justly say, I understood him not." Thus the old catholic doctors thought they might warrant the arguments for good and effectual, that they took of Christ's humanity, and of the natural substance of his body. But perhaps they must all go for new masters, and their arguments likewise be condemned for peevish.

Let us therefore consider the arguments that M. Harding and his company have founded hereupon. Thus therefore reason they: Christ is ascended into heaven in his humanity: "the heavens must hold his body," as St Peter saith, "until all things be restored." St Paul saith, "Our conversation is in heaven, from whence we look for our Saviour Jesus Christ." Christ saith, "I leave the world, and go to my Father: " "the poor ye shall still have among you, but me ye shall not have;" *ergo*, say they, Christ is still here in the world in his corporal and fleshly presence. Christ's body is of nature and substance finite; *ergo*, it is in places infinite. Christ hath two sorts of bodies: one only local; all the rest of the other sort not local. It is in place, yet it occupieth or filleth no place. It is a very natural man's body; yet it is neither round, nor square, nor thick, nor broad, nor short, nor long. It hath in it no distance or difference of parts, as between eye and eye, or eye and ear, or head and foot; but eye, ear, arm, hand, heel, toe, head, and foot are all together, and each is other, and all is one. In ten thousand several places Christ's body is full and whole; and yet all these are but one

---


[10] *Secundum hanc formam non est putandus ubique diffusus. Cavendum est enim, ne ita divinitatem adstramus hominis, ut veritatem corporis peteramus.—Id. ibid. See also ibid. 9, 18, 41. cols. 689, 3, 92.]

[11] *This, 1565.]

body. Thus one is many, and many are one: above is beneath, and beneath is above: local is not local, and not local is local; and all this without the authority either of God’s holy word, or of any one old catholic father. These be M. Harding’s catholic conclusions; even the very same that were used and avouched by Eutyches, Apollinaris, Manichæus, and other like heretics in old times; and therefore they may not now be counted peevish. And that thou mayest the better feel the savour and soundness of these men’s doctrine, I beseech thee, gentle reader, to consider these words of Robert Holcot, a great doctor of that side: *Si fuissent mille hostis in mile locis [so tempore, quo Christus peependit in cruce,] Christus fuiasset crucifixus in mile locis*: “If there had been a thousand hosts in a thousand places at that very time when Christ hung upon the cross, then had Christ been crucified in a thousand places.” Again he saith: *Pono, quod tempore illo, &c.*: “I suppose that at the same time the soul of Christ, departing from his body upon the cross, had come unto and rested at one of the said hosts. If so, then had Christ’s body been both quick and dead in one time.” Thus much D. Holcot. Here hast thou, good reader, a taste of M. Harding’s doctrine, in respect whereof all other doctrine must needs be condemned and cast as peevish. Alas! they wander up and down in mere vanities, and, as St Paul saith, they would be the seven doctors of the law, “not understanding neither what they say, nor what they affirm.” Verily, St Augustine saith: *Quando... de forma servi cogitas in Christo, humanam effigiem cogita, si est in te fides*: “When thou thinkest of the form of a servant in Christ, think of the form of a man, if thou have any faith in thee.”

This matter, saith M. Harding, is so clearly uttered by these fathers, that figures, significations, tropes, and metaphors can have no place. M. Harding would not thus have said, if he had any regard unto his reader. By the very order and tenor of these fathers’ words, Christ cometh, and yet cometh not. Christ is not seen, and yet is seen. Christ is touched with hands, yet man can touch him. Every man seeth him without guile or error, yet no man seeth him. Elias is above, and, at the same time, the same Elias is beneath. Elias’ coat is called Elias. Chrysostom and Ambrose are fain both to correct the rigour of their speech, and to use these words, memory, exemplar, commemoration, and remembrance. And what is there here else but figures? Yet, saith M. Harding, “significations and figures here can have no place.” It is too great tyranny, so much to mock and abuse God’s people.

**M. HARDING. THE TENTH DIVISION.**

In making of which slender arguments, they will not seem to acknowledge whose body it is, even that which is proper to God, whose power is over all, and to whom all things obey.

**THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.**

Yes, undoubtedly, we acknowledge the body of Christ to be the body of the Son of God, and therefore the body of very God. Yet nevertheless we know, and M. Harding also ought to know, that the same body of Christ is a creature, and therefore no God. And surely, if M. Harding had well considered the principles of his own doctrine, he might soon have found out the folly of this reason. For Albertus Magnus, his own doctor, is full against him. Thus he writeth: *Corpus Christi non est in pluribus locis ratione unionis, sed ratione consecrationis, quia consacratur in pluribus locis*: “The body of Christ is not in many places by
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[4] *Pono quod tempore illo quod anima Christi fuit separatam a corpore venias in opus, sed ipse Christi sub ipsis speciebus; tune antem corpus Christi fuit animatum in a vel non? &c.—Holcot. ubi supr.*
[5] In one, 1565, 1600.
[9] In one, 1565, 1600.
[13] [EV]
mean of the union it hath with the Godhead, but by mean of the consecration, because it is consecrate in many places." Thus Albertus wrote of Christ's body, contrary to M. Harding's meaning, notwithstanding he was not ignorant whose body it was.

Indeed Eutychianus saith: *Hæc...fallendi simplices atque ignorantes hereticis occasio est*, &c.10: "This occasion heretics have to beguile the simple and the ignorant, that the things that are spoken of Christ according to his manhood11, they imagine the same to be spoken according to the infirmity of the divine nature; and because Christ, being one person, speaketh all things of himself, they say he spake all things of his Godhead." Thus Eutychianus saith M. Harding's reason served well heretics in old times, therewith to beguile the people then, as he doth now. So the old heretics Saturninus, Manicheus, and Marcion denied the verity of Christ's flesh, because it is joined and united to the Godhead.

So Athanasius and Epiphanius say that the heretic Apollinaris held and taught the people, that Christ's body was of one substance with the deity.12

In consideration of the same union, the emperor Justinian was led into the heresy of certain that were called *διφυώροςκευομαι*, and held that Christ's body was evermore glorious, and without corruption. So likewise was Eutyches deceived: likewise the godly learned father St Hilary, as it is said before. All these heresies and errors sprang only of M. Harding's reason, for that the authors and maintainers thereof, yielding reverence unto Christ's body as duty required, overmuch considered whose body it was.

It is indeed, as I said before, the body of God. But St Augustine saith: *Non...quod in Deo est, est ubique, ut Deus*, &c.15: "Whatsoever is in God is not therefore everywhere, as God is." And again: *Cavendum est...ne ita divinitatem astram hominis, ut veritatem corporis auferamus*, &c.16: "We must beware that we do not so defend the Godhead of the man, that we destroy the truth of his body." And therefore Epiphanius, expressing the state of Christ's immortal body as it is now in heaven, writeth thus: *Sedet ad dextram Patris*, &c.17: "He sitteth at his Father's right hand in glory, not putting away his body, but joining the same in spiritual condition in the perfection of one Godhead; even as our bodies, that now are sown according to the flesh, shall be raised again according to the spirit." So saith the godly martyr Vigilius: *[Caro Christi], quando in terra fuit, non erat...in celo; et nunc, quia est in celo, non est utique in terris*, &c.18: "The flesh of Christ, when it was in the earth, was not in heaven; and now, because it is in heaven, is not verily in the earth." This holy father assuredly it avoucheth it for true, and saith: "Verily it is not in the earth;" and his reason is only this: "Because it is in heaven." And he concludes thus at the last: *Hæc est fides et professio catholica, quam apostoli tradiderunt, martyres roboreaverunt, et fideles hucusque custodiant*:19 "This is the catholic profession and faith, which the apostles have delivered, the martyrs have confirmed, and the faithfull hitherto do continue." Thus the old catholic fathers in old times believed and wrote of Christ's body; and yet they had not forgotten whose body it was.
M. HARDING. THE ELEVENTH DIVISION.

But because M. Jewel, and they of that sect, seem to set little by [Truth conferred by the enemy of truth, H. A. 1564.] these fathers, though very ancient, St Bernard excepted, and of the church holden for saints, I will bring forth the authority of Martin Bucer, a late doctor of their side, though not canonize for a saint as yet, for that I know. This new father, whom they esteem so much, and was the reader of divinity in Cambridge in king Edward's time, very vehemently, and for so much truly, affirmeth the true real presence of Christ's body in the sacrament. For he saith: "Christ said not, This is my spirit, this is my virtue; but, 'This is my body.' Wherefore we must believe," saith he, "Christ's body to be there, even the same that did hang upon the cross, our Lord himself." Which in some part to declare, he useth the similitude of the sun for his purpose, contrary to M. Jewel's negative, to prove Christ's body present, and that really and substantially, in what places soever the sacrament is rightly ministered. His words be these: Ut sol vere uno in loco in celi visibilis circumscriptus est, radix tamen suis praesens vere et substantialiter exhibetur ubilibet orbis; ita Dominus, etiamis circumscibatur uno loco celi arcani et divini, id est, gloria Patris, verbo tamen suo et sacris symbolis, vere et totus ipse Deus et homon, praesens exhibetur in sacra caena, coque substantialiter: quam præsentiam non minus certo agnoscit mens credens verbis his Dominii et symbolis, quam oculi vident et habent solem prescentem demonstratum, et exhibitum suæ corporalis lucem. Reris ista arcana est, et novi testimoni, res fidei: non sunt igitur habita admissione cognitione de praesentatione corporis, qua constat ratione hujus vitæ etiam patibilis et fluxae. Verbo Domini similitudinentem inherandum est, et debet fides sensum defectu præbere supplementum. Which may thus be Englished: "As the sun is truly placed determinately in one place of the visible heaven, and yet is exhibited truly and substantially by his beams every where abroad in the world; so our Lord, although he be contained in one place of the secret and divine heaven, that is to wit, the glory of his Father, yet for all that, by his word and holy tokens, he is exhibited present in his holy supper truly, and himself whole, God and man, and therefore substantially or in substance. Which presence, the mind giving credit to these our Lord's words and tokens, doth no less certainly acknowledge, than our eyes see, and have the sun present shewed and exhibited with his corporal light. This is a secret matter, and of the new testament; a matter of faith: therefore herein thoughts be not to be admitted of such presentation of the body, as consisteth in the manner of this life, possible and transitory. We must simply cleave to the word of our Lord; and, where our senses fail, there must faith help to supply." Thus we see how Bucer, in sundry other points of faith both desired and also a debtor, confirmeth the force of this article pithily and plainly. Such is the force of truth, that oftentimes it is confessed by the very enemies of truth.

Fight not with the church, M. Jewel. Fight with them whom you have followed in departing from the church, who nevertheless, by force of truth, is driven against you to confess the truth in those most plain words: Vere et totus ipse Deus et homon, praesens exhibetur in sacra caena, coque substantialiter: "In this holy supper himself, God and man, is exhibited present truly and whole, and therefore substantially.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

God's name be praised! neither do we refuse the judgment of the ancient fathers in these cases; neither hath Master Harding, for ought that may yet appear, any just cause thereby to vaunt himself of the same. Here he allegeth the authority of Doctor Bucer, even as the heretic Exarches sometime, to maintain his heresy, alleged St Cyprian, or as the Nestorian heretics alleged the authority

of the Nicene desire that he was his real similitude question. Of the hea of Christ, God, like so few and so few indeed being absent here upon in the very mercy for our body: here presence heaven, no faces, in coming do our congress in the matter quaier colo: "No but Steph saith: No by any box intra colo within the dicationem, signaculum and apostle of his cro exulatum, qu exire: "I ment, whit find a pla thus he w cum in in mayest no heart, in t &c. Sed o but Christ et utro exclusus: is the Lor

[1 Exem. Apolog. in C. p. 866.]
[3 Id ibi]
[4 Maxix Lnt. 1623. l. 6. col. 612.]
of the Nicene council. For notwithstanding Doctor Bucer, to avoid contention as a man desirous of peace, was content to yield unto certain indifferent terms, as Osius that learned father sometime did in the council of Ariminus to the Arians; yet was his resolution herein evermore thoroughly and fully known. And the very similitude or example that useth of the sun putteth the matter out of all question. For like as the body or compass of the sun, being in one certain place of the heavens, reacheth out his beams, and giveth influence into the world; even so Christ, the sun of justice, being in heaven in one place at the right hand of God, likewise reacheth out his beams, and giveth his influence into the faithful, and so feedeth them, not by bare imagination or fantasy, but truly, substantially, and indeed. And as the sun is more comfortable, and more refresheth the world, being absent, by his beams, than if his very natural substance and compass lay here upon the earth; even so the body of Christ, being in the glory of his Father, in the very substance and nature of our flesh, and there evermore entreating mercy for our sins, is much more comfortable unto us, and more quickeneth both our bodies and souls by his heavenly and spiritual influence, than if it were here present fleshly before our eyes. And as the sun, not coming down from heaven, nor leaving his place, is nevertheless present with us in our houses, in our hands, and in our bosoms; even so Christ, being in heaven, not coming down, nor leaving his room there, yet nevertheless present with us in our congregations, in our hearts, in our prayers, in the mystery of baptism, and in the sacrament of his body and blood. Therefore St. Ambrose saith: Maria, ... quia querebat in terra, tangere non potuit: Stephanus tertig, quia querebat in celo: "Mary could not touch Christ, because she sought him upon the earth; but Stephen touched him, because he sought him in heaven." And again he saith: Non enim corporali tactu, sed fide tangimus: "For we touch not Christ by any bodily mean, but by our faith." And therefore again he saith: Stephanus intra celos Dominum cernit absentem: "Stephen seeth Christ, being absent, within the heavens." So saith Origen: Per evangelistarum et apostolorum predicationem, per sui sancti corporis et sanguinis sacramentum, per gloriosum crucis signaculum... nobiscum Deae: "God is with us by the preaching of the evangelists and apostles, and by the sacrament of his body and blood, and by the glorious sign of his cross." So St. Augustine: O stulta infidelitas persequentis! Si quae est exilia, quo Christianus jubetur ire, prius si potes inveni, quo Christus cogatus exire: "O the fond infidelity of this persecutor! If thou seek a place of banishment, whither thou mayest command a christian man to go; first, if thou can, find a place from whence thou mayest command Christ to depart." And again thus he writeth unto the godly widow Italicia: Non debes te desolatum arbitrari, cum in interiore homine habeas Christum presentem per fidentem in corde tuo: "Thou mayest not think thyself to be desolate, while thou hast Christ present in thy heart, in the inner man, by faith." So again: Non... est Judeus, non est Graecus, &c. Sed omnis et in omnibus Christus: "There is no Jew, there is no gentile; but Christ is all and in all." In like sense St. Hierome saith: Tangat... digitus et ulter exibus. Domini est terra, et plenitudo ejus. Christus loco non tenetur inclusus: "Let him push us with his finger; and we will forth willingly. The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof. Christ is not holden prisoner in any place.
Thus is Christ present among us: thus we feel him: thus we see him. But all this is the work of faith: it needeth no fleshly or local presence. Therefore St Augustine saith: *Non recte tangitam, id est, non recte in illum crediatur?* "He is not touched well: that is to say, he is not believed well." So saith St Bernard: [*Tangitur, sed affectu, non manu; voto, non oculo; fide, non sensibus*]: "He is touched, but with devotion, not with hand; with zeal, not with eye; with faith, not with sense." And thus we say, we have Christ present, not, as M. Harding saith, only for a minute of an hour, wherein is neither savour nor comfort; but verily, effectually, and, if he be delighted with that word, substantially, and for ever, even unto the consummation of the world. Neither doth he deny that Christ is present, that denieth this imagination of gross and fleshly presence. Origens saith: *Si..., virthus Jesus congregatur cum his, qui congregatur in nomine ejus, non peregrinatur a suis, sed semper presto est eis*: "If the power of Jesus be together with them that are gathered in his name, then is he not absent from his own, but is evermore present with them."

By these few I trust it may appear that we neither are departed from the church of God, nor fight against the church. But you, M. Harding, under this glorious title of the church, think to carry yourself invisible. Howbeit, there be two sorts of faiths, so are there two sorts of churches; one the true, the other false. Your church, being as now utterly void of God's word, is as a lantern without light. Leo, writing against such as you be, saith thus: *Ecclesia nomine armanini, et contra ecclesiam dimicat* 8: "Ye arm yourselves 7 with the name of Satan," 7 fight not, M. Harding, thus against God: fight not against your own conscience. It is hard for you thus to kick against the pricks. The more ye fight, the more ye bewray your own nakedness. These colours and shadows must needs fade; God with his truth will have the victory. Amen.

**M. HARDING. THE TWELFTH DIVISION.**

Now to be short, whereas the chief arguments that be made against the being of Christ's body in many places at once be deduced of nature, in respect that this article seemeth to them to abolish nature; *it may please them to understand that God, who is author of nature, can by his power do a body with that which is above the nature of a body, nature not destroyed, but kept and preserved whole. Which Plato the heathen philosopher would soon have been induced to believe, if he were alive; who, asked what was nature, answered: Quod Deus vult: "That which God will." And therefore we believe that Enoch and Elias, yet mortal by nature, do by power of God live in body, and that above nature. Abacuc was by the same power caught up, and in a moment carried from Jeru to Babylon, his nature reserved whole. St Peter by God according to nature walked on the earth; the same by God besides nature walked upon the waters. Christ, after condition of nature assumed, suffered death in body; the same Christ by his divine power entered with his body in to his disciples through doors closed.

**THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.**

Our proofs are grounded, not only upon natural reason, but also upon the express and known will of God. And by such arguments the learned fathers were wont in old times to dispute of Christ's humanity against Apollinarius, Manicheus, Eutyches, and other like heretics, without controulment. For natural reason, holden within her bands, is not the enemy, but the daughter of God's

---

[3] It, 1611.
Yet must Plato’s name serve to prove all M. Harding’s fantasies? Plato saith: “Nature is whatsoever God will.” Must we therefore conclude that cold is hot, white is black, accident without subject, subject without accident, a body is no body, a nature finite is infinite? What a strange kind of philosophy hath M. Harding found out! It is a simple weapon that these men will refuse to serve their turn.

The philosophers called Epicurei held this fantasy, that God sitteth in heaven idly and at ease, never encumbering or troubling himself with the rule of the world; and that therefore nature ruleth itself only by chance, and at adventure, without any certain direction of God’s government; and that whatsoever is done therein is no part of God’s doing. Contrariwise, the philosophers called Stoici held another fantasy, that God himself is nothing else but nature, and that therefore all things are wrought by necessity and force of destiny, and that God is able to work no miracle, nor to do any thing contrary to the common course of nature. Both these follies Plato reproved by this short answer: Natura est, quod Deus vult. His meaning is, that nature is subject and obedient unto God, and that there is neither chance nor necessity in the course of nature; but all things are ordered by God’s appointment, and natural causes are only the instruments of God’s will. And therefore some compare nature to the horse, and God to the horseman, that bridleth her and turneth her whither he listeth. And for the same cause Origen saith: Anima mundi est virtus Dei: “The soul of the world is the power of God.” And St Basil saith: “The world is the school of our souls, to lead us to know God.” Therefore God was able by his power to divide the sea, to pull back and to stay the sun, to open the earth, to make the water of Jordan to stand as a wall, to stay the fire from burning and the water from drowning. If any man list to know the cause hereof, there is none other but God’s will. In this sense the philosopher Simonides was wont to say: Solus Deus est metaphysicus: “God alone is supernatural.” And Pindarus for the same called God ἀπορρόφων, “the best or skilfullest artificer.” Likewise St Augustine saith: Quomodo est... contra naturam, quod Dei fit voluntate, cum voluntas tanti... Conditoris sit cuiuscunque rei natura? “How is it against nature, that is done by God’s will, seeing the will of so noble a Creator is the nature of every thing?” This undoubtedly was Plato’s meaning. Now let us examine M. Harding’s reasons.

Nature is whatsoever God will: Elias and Enoch are yet alive in their bodies: Abacuc was caught and carried to Babylon: St Peter walked upon the sea; ergo, Christ’s body is at one time in a thousand places. These arguments hold a posse ad esse, and might have stood the heretics Manicheus and Euthyches in some good stead; but in catholic schools they have no place.

But how is M. Harding so well assured of God’s will? How knoweth he that God will have Christ’s body to be in a thousand places at one time, to be everywhere, to be infinite, to be no body? Verily, the ancient fathers, for any thing that may appear, never knew it. Contrariwise he might have said, God’s holy will was that Christ should take the natural substance of a man’s body, and that “in all things he should be like unto his brethren,” and that his body should be a creature, and, as St Augustine saith, should be in one place. This is God’s known and express will; therefore by Plato’s judgment this is nature. Certainly St Augustine saith, as it is before alleged: Christus corpori suo immortalitatem dedit, naturam non abstulit: “Christ gave immortality to his body; but he took not from it the former nature of a body.” Thus much hath M. Harding gotten by the authority of Plato.

M. HARDING. THE THIRTEENTH DIVISION.

Christ at his last supper according to nature sat down with his twelve disciples, and among them occupied a place at the table visibly; by his divine power there he held his body in his hands invisibly: (152) for, as St Augustine saith, in Expositione Psal. xxiii., “he was borne in his own hands.” where nature gave place, and his own body was in more places than one. Verily, non est abbreviata manus Domini, “the hand of our Lord is not shortened;” his power is as great as ever it was. And therefore let us not doubt but he is able to use nature finite infinitely; specially now, the nature of his body being glorified after his resurrection from the dead. And as the living is not to be sought among the dead, so the things that be done by the power of God above nature are not to be tried by the rules of nature.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBY.

St Augustine saith: Christus ferebatur in manibus suis: “Christ was borne in his own hands.” These words are often alleged, and seem to the view at sound somewhat of M. Harding’s side: but, being well weighed and considered, they discharge themselves, and are soon answered. First, it is known and confessed that St Augustine, in reporting these words, either by mean of the translation, or by some other error, was much overseen, and alleged that for scripture that indeed neither is any portion of the scripture, nor elsewhere to be found. For where he saith David was borne in his own hands, the very text is this: Collabebatur in manibus eorum: “He went reeling in their hands.” And so St Basil allegeth and expoundeth the same place: παραφρόγκων εἰς τὸν χεραὶ τῶν οἰκτήων: “Carried along in the servants’ hands.” And thus St Augustine, being deceived in the text, was faint to force the same to some violent construction.

Yet, saith M. Harding, St Augustine’s words be plain: “Christ was borne in his own hands.” It is neither indifferent nor true dealing thus to nip and to prune the doctors’ sayings; and, alleging a few words, to leave out the rest, and especially such words as be material, and able to give light unto the whole. For St Augustine not Christ bare himself really, substantially, and indeed in his own hands, as is here untruly supposed; neither, as Master Harding hath added of his own, “by his divine power, or invisibly,” but contrariwise he expoundeth himself by these words: Ipse se quodammodo portabat: “In a manner and after a sort he carried himself.” This word quodammodo in the schools is called terminus diminius, which oftentimes in reasoning breedeth error. For these words, quodammodo, “after a sort,” and vere, “verily or indeed,” are ever contrary. So saith St Augustine: Sacramentum corporis Christi seculum quendam modum...
corpus Christi est: the sacrament of Christ's body in a certain sort is the body of Christ. And this sort or manner he expoundeth thus: Nisi enim sacramenta similitudinem quandam earum rerum, quorum sacramenta sunt, habereant, omnino sacramenta non esse: “Unless sacraments had some likeness of those things whereof they be sacraments, they should utterly be no sacraments.”

Likewise saith Bertramus: Secundum quendum modum corpus Christi est. Modus hic in figura est, et [in] imagine: “The sacrament after a certain manner is the body of Christ: this manner standeth in a figure and in a representation.” So likewise the very barbarous gloss upon the decrees expoundeth the same: Celeste sacramentum, quod vere representat corpus Christi, dicitur corpus Christi, sed impropre. Unde dicitur, suo modo: sed non rei veritate, sed significante mysterio; ut sit sensus, Vocatur corpus Christi; id est, significat [corpus Christi]: “The heavenly sacrament, which verily doth represent the flesh of Christ, is called Christ's body; but not in plain kind of speech. Therefore St Augustine saith, suo modo, after a sort; which is not in the very truth of the matter, but by a mystery signifying, that the meaning be thus: It is called the body of Christ, because it signifies the body of Christ.” Touching the thing that Christ held in his hand, St Augustine confesseth it was bread; for thus he writeth: Quamvis ... panem, quem Dominus gestavit in manibus, oculos suis non aspexerint: “Albeit they never saw with their eyes the bread that the Lord held in his hands.” Yet the same bread, because it is a sacrament of Christ's body, “after a sort,” as St Augustine saith, is also called Christ's body. Thus doth St Augustine oftentimes use this word quodammodo. For example, he writeth thus: Ecclesia, ... quos lucrata fuerit aliquo modo, [eos] manu cucurrit quodammodo: “The church after a sort eateth them whom by any mean she hath gotten.” And again upon the same psalm: Quid est ... herere cornibus, nisi quodammodo crucifi grant: “The church is called Christ’s body, because it is walked upon by the horns, but after a sort to be crucified? Therefore this is a figure of Christ.” In this sense St Augustine saith Christ, quodammodo, “after a sort,” not verily or indeed, but in a sacrament or in a figure, bare himself in his hands.

But M. Harding will reply, St Augustine saith thus: [Hoc] quomodo intelligatur in ipso Davide secundum literam, non inventimus; in Christo autem inventimus: “How this may be taken in David himself, according to the letter, we find not; but in Christ we find it.” Therefore he will say, this must be verified in Christ, “even according to the letter.” This error riseth of the misunderstanding of these words of St Augustine, secundum literam; which sometime are used for the literal sense, or the very sound of the bare words; sometime for the historical sense, that is to say, for the course and tenor of the story. Now saith St Augustine, that David should any way bear himself, secundum literam, “according to the story written of him,” it doth not appear; but that Christ, “after a sort,” that is, by way of a sacrament, thus carried himself, even in the story of the gospel, which is to say, secundum literam, it doth appear. And that these words secundum literam be oftentimes thus used, any man may soon perceive that shall diligently note and consider the ancient fathers. First, St Augustine in the place alleged, uttereth this matter of David in this sort: In Regnorum libris, ubi omnia nobis scripta sunt, quae pertinent ad res gestas Davidis: “In the books of the Kings, where as all things are written to us that pertain to the doings of David, this thing we find not.” And again in the same place: Christus cum commendaret corpus et sanguinem suum, humiliatae suam commendavit, in eo, feati mystero, and vocatur Christi corpus.
Being in a mystery.

Hierom. in Psal. cx. et cxii.
Gregor. in Jamb. Lib. xiii. cap. vi.

Being in a mystery requires no corporal or real presence.

The hundred and fifty-third untruth. For these words of Augustine and Gregory pertain nothing to the sacrament.


quod in ipsa historia scriptum est in illo quasi furore Davidis: “When Christ was recommended unto us his body and blood, he recommended unto us his humility in that thing that is written in the very story touching that madness of David.” This is that St Augustine meant by these words, secundum literam. Now that this word litera is often taken for the story, it doth many ways appear. St Augustine saith thus: Ambrosius cum tractaret [huc locum] ait: Nec historia nec litera doet, Mariam gladio finissive vitam; “Ambrose, writing hereof, saith thus: Neither the story nor the letter doeth teach us that Mary was slain with a sword.” So St Hierome: Escam dedit timentibus se: “He gave food to them that fear him.” In the time of hunger he fed Elias; in the wilderness he rained manna unto the Jews: he addeth, [et] hoc secundum literam, “and this according to the letter,” which is, according to the story. So likewise St Gregory: Subditur, quod de eo minime scriptum legitur; effudit in terram visceras mea: ex qua re nescesse est, ut, dum hoc juxta literam incenire non possimus, ea quae in verbis ejus secundum historiam sonant, juxta spiritum inquiramus. Thus St Augustine useth these words secundum literam, not for the literal sense, as these men would fain have it, but for the record and knowledge of the story written of David. M. Harding should have remembered, that misunderstanding of his doctor maketh not sufficient proof. Howbeit, it is much to be feared that M. Harding of purpose left out this word quodammodo; and not of ignorance, but wittingly and willingly misrepresented and falsified St Augustine’s meaning. Certainly St Augustine hath not one of all these words, neither “by divine power,” nor “invisibly,” nor “nature gave place,” nor “Christ’s body was in more places than one.”

M. HARDING. THE FOURTEENTH DIVISION.

And that all absurdities and carnal grossness be severed from our thoughts, where true christian people believe Christ’s body to be in many places at once, (Being in a mystery. “H. A. 1564.”) they understand it so to be in a mystery. Now to be in a mystery is not to be comprehended in a place, but by the power of God to be made present in sort and manner as he himself knoweth, verily so as no reason of man can attain it, and so as it may be shewed by no examples in nature. Whereof that notable saying of St Augustine may very well be reported: O homo, si rationem a me poscis, non erit mirabile... exemplum quieritur, non erit singulare: that is, “O man, if (153) (herein) thou require reason, it shall not be marvellous: seek for the like example, and then it shall not be singular.” (If God’s working be comprehended by reason,) saith Holy Gregory, “it is not wondrous: neither faith hath need, whereto man’s reason giveth proof.”

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

Being in a mystery, as it is before answered, like as it requireth no circumstance or necessity of place, so it requireth no bodily or real presence. Contrariwise, if Christ’s body were present indeed, and that in such gross and fleshly sort as is here conceived, then were it no mystery. For to be present in a mystery, and to be bodily and fleshly present, are taken for contraries. And therefore the gloss saith, as is before alleged: Sacramentum dicitur corpus Christi, non rei veritate, sed significante mysterio: “The sacrament of Christ’s body is called Christ’s body, not by truth of the matter, but by a mystery signifying.”

[1] Id. Enarr. ii. 4. col. 216; where we find commendat occurring twice, and David.]
[2] It is that, 1565, 1009.
[3] Id. in Fest. Assumpt. B. Mar. Serm. cxxiii. 3. Tom. V. Append. col. 344; where littere docent, and vitam finisse. This is not a genuine sermon of Augustine.
But, whereas it is further said that this mystical presence is known only unto God, and, I trow, to M. Harding, and to no man beside; all this is nothing else but religious folly, imagined only to astonne and amaze the simple. For the scriptures and holy fathers are acquainted with no such mystery. The sacrament of baptism is a mystery, even as is the sacrament of Christ’s body; and, as Christ is present in the one, so is he also present in the other; that is to say, truly, verily, effectually, and indeed; howbeit, not in this gross manner of M. Harding’s fleshly presence. The places of St Augustine and St Gregory concern only Christ’s incarnation, the union of the divinity and the humanity, and other such articles and grounds of christian religion, wherein nature and reason utterly have no place; and therefore, being spoken of one thing, are applied by M. Harding unto another. Neither is M. Harding able truly to say, that in any of all those places there is either mention once made or one word spoken of the sacrament. Wherefore it seemeth M. Harding would purposely mislead his reader, and teach him to reason in this sort:

Christ was miraculously incarnate of the blessed virgin;

Ergo, Christ’s body is really and fleshly in the sacrament.

True it is that the faith of our religion cannot be proved by discourse of reason. But every fantasy may not go for christian faith. St Paul saith: Fides ex auditu; auditus ex verbo Dei: “Faith cometh by hearing; hearing cometh by the word of God.” Certainly M. Harding’s new faith or fantasy in the time of the old catholic fathers was neither christened nor known in the world; as may appear by their own witness of good record. For besides others, whom in this treatise I have touched upon occasion by the way, St Augustine writeth purposely hereof unto Dardanus in this wise: Noli...dubitare, ibi nunc esse hominem Christum Jesum, unde venturus est, &c.: “Doubt thou not but Christ Jesus, as man, is there from whence he shall come; and have thou in remembrance, and faithfully hold the christian confession, that he is risen from the dead; that he is ascended into heaven; that he sitteth at the right hand of his Father; and that from thence, and from no where else, he shall come to judge the quick and the dead, even as he was seen going into heaven; that is, in the same form and substance of his body; to which body undoubtedly he hath given immortality, but hath not taken from the same the nature of a body. According to this form (of man) we may not think that Christ is poured abroad into all places. For we must beware we do not so defend the Godhead of the man, that we destroy the truth of his body.” Again: Unus Christus Jesus; ubique, per id quod Deus est; in celo autem, per id quod homo; “Christ Jesus is one person, and the same every where, in that he is God; but he is in heaven, in that he is man.” Again he saith: Semper quidem divinitatem nobiscum est; sed, nisi corporaliter abiret a nobis, semper ejus corpus carnalitervideretur: “Christ by his Godhead is ever with us; but, unless he had departed away bodily from us, we should evermore carnally see his body.” These words are specially to be noted. If Christ were bodily here, he should carnally be seen: therefore, by St Augustine’s judgment, if Christ were bodily present in the sacrament, we should see him carnally in the sacrament. Again: Et abiit, et hic est; et reddidit, et nos non deseruit. Corpus enim suum intulit ex celo; majestatem [autem] non abstulit mundo: “He is gone, and yet is here. He is returned to his Father, and yet hath not forsaken us. For he hath carried his body into heaven; but he hath not taken his majesty from the world.” Again: Pauperes semper habebitis vobiscum: “The poor ye shall have ever...”[


[15] Pauperes, &c., me aitem non semper habeitis. Accipiant hoc et boni, sed non sint sollicitati: loquebatur enim de presentia corporis sui. Nam secundum majestatem suam, secundum Providentiam, secundum ineffabilem et invisiblern gratiam, impletur quod ab eo dictum est, Ecece ego...
more with you, but me ye shall not have.' Let good men hear this, and not be careful. For this he spake of the presence of his body. For according to his majesty, according to his providence, according to his unspeakable and invisible grace, it is fulfilled that he said, 'I am with you always until the consummation of the world.' But according to the flesh that the Word received, according to that he was born of the virgin, according to that he was taken of the Jews, according to that he was nailed to the cross, according to that he was taken down, and lapped in a shroud, and laid in the grave, and rose again, and showed himself; in this respect it is true that he said, 'Ye shall not even have me with you.'"

Likewise again: Dominus consolatur nos, qui ipsum jam in colo sedentem manu contracte non possessus, sed fide contingere: "The Lord doth comfort us, that cannot touch him with our hand, sitting now in heaven, but may touch him notwithstanding with our faith." And again: Si illi propterea crediderunt, quia tenebantur et palpaverunt, nos quid facimus? Jam Christus ascendit in coelum, et non est venturus, nisi in fine, ut judicet de vivis et mortuis: "If they therefore believed in Christ, because they held him and touched him, what do we then? For Christ is now ascended into heaven, and will not come in the end, to judge the quick and the dead." So saith Origen: [Christus] secundum divinitatis suæ naturam non peregri natu [a nobis]: sed peregri natu secundum dispensationem corporis, quod suscepistis: "Christ,according to the nature of his Godhead, is not a stranger unto us; but he is a stranger to us touching the dispensation of the body, which he hath received." Again: Nec...est homo qui ubicunque duo vel tres in ejus nomine fuerint congregati, &c.: "It is not Christ, as man, that is wheresover two or three be gathered in his name; neither is Christ, as man, with us always until the consummation of the world." So likewise saith St Hierome: Christus non est corporaliter in ecclesia: surgens enim a mortuis, ascendit in coelum: "Christ is not now bodily in the church; for, being risen from the dead, he is ascended into heaven."

I pass over St Ambrose, St Gregory, St Cyril, St Basil, Vigilius, Fulgentius, Didymus, Beda, and other like ancient fathers. Thus were they then resolved of Christ's body, and this they took to be the catholic faith.

Yet neither were they therefore condemned for new masters, nor followed they only the judgment of nature, nor led they the world with peevish reasons, nor, touching Christ's body, had they forgotten whose body it was, nor were they counted the enemies of God's omnipotent power, nor were they then thought to fight against the church. But M. Harding, with his new-devised fantasy, is a patron and a maintainer of the Manichees, of the Apollinarists, of the Eutychians, and other more horrible and old condemned heretics.

vobiscum sum usque in consummationem seculli.

Secundum carmem vero quam Verbum assumisti, secundum id quod de virgine natus est, secundum id quod a Judaeis prehensus est, quod ligno confixus, quod de cruce depositus, quod ligna intarsi, quod in sepulcro conditus, quod in resurrectione manifestatus, non semper habebitis vobiscum.—Id. ibid. cap. xii. Tractat. i. 13. cols. 639, 4.

[1] Evermore have, 1565.
[3] Id. in Epist. Johan. cap. i. Tractat. i. 3. Tom. III. Pars ii. col. 828; where consolatus.

[4] Id. ibid. cap. ii. Tractat. ii. 1. col. 836; where si enim propterea illis, and facielis.
[6] Nec, &c. in nomine ejus, &c. Neque homo nobiscum est omnibus diebus usque ad consummationem seculli.—Id. ibid.