OF ADORATION.

THE EIGHTH ARTICLE.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBY.

Or that the people did then fall down and worship the sacrament with godly honour.

[OF THE WORSHIPPING OR ADORATION OF THE SACRAMENT.—
ARTICLE VIII. H.A. 1564.]

M. HARDING. THE FIRST DIVISION.

If the blessed sacrament of the altar were no other than M. Jewel and the rest of the sacramentaries think of it, then were it not well done the people to bow down to it, and to worship it with godly honour. (159) For then were it but bare bread and wine, how honourably soever they speak of it, calling it symbolical, that is, tokening, and sacramental bread and wine.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBY.

M. Harding, as a man overmuch obedient unto his affections, in the beginning hereof calleth us sacramentaries, by which word he understandeth schismatics, heretics, and the enemies of God; and so breaketh up his way into this treatise with unsavoury and bitter talk; and, as a cock that is well pampered with garlic before the fight, he seeketh to overmatch his fellow rather with rankness of breath than with might of body.

And, forasmuch as he striveth to make the world think our doctrine is injurious to the Godhead and glory of Christ; first, we protest that, as we believe that Christ “is the Lamb of God that hath taken away the sins of the world,” and that “there is none other name under heaven whereby we can be saved,” and that, as the prophet Esay saith, “he is the mighty God, the Father of the world, that was to come;” and that, as St Paul saith, “he is God revealed in the flesh;” even so we yield unto him the very honour that is due unto God; and that not only to his Godhead alone, but also to his humanity inseparably joined with his Godhead in one person, sitting now at the right hand of God. Thus we teach the people that “God hath advanced him into all height, and hath given him a name above all names, that at the name of Jesus every knee shall be bowed, all things in heaven, in the earth, and under the earth; and that every tongue shall confess that Jesus Christ is the Lord, in the glory of God the Father.”

Neither do we only adore Christ as very God, but also we worship and reverence the sacrament and holy mystery of Christ’s body; and, as St Augustine teacheth us, baptismum... Christi, ubicunque [est], veneramur; “we worship the baptism of Christ, wheresoever it be.” We worship the word of God, according to this counsel of Anastasius: Dominica verba attende audiant, et fideliter adoren; “Let them diligently hear and faithfully worship the words of God.” Briefly, we worship all other like things in such religious wise unto Christ belonging. But these things we use and reverence as holy, and appointed or commanded by Christ; but we adore them not with godly honour, as Christ himself.

St Ambrose saith of the wise men: *Cognoverunt hanc stellam esse, qua hominem Deumque signabat*; (sed) *adoraverunt parvulum* 5: "They knew this was the star that signified him unto them that was both man and God; but they adoreth the little one (and not the star)."

And whereas M. Harding, as well herein, as also in the rest, untruly and unjustly defameth us, as making the sacraments of Christ nothing else but bare tokens; let him well understand that we do both think and speak soberly and reverently of Christ's sacraments, as knowing them to be the testimonies of God's promises, and the instruments of the Holy Ghost. And, as we make not the sacrament of baptism bare water, notwithstanding the nature and substance of water remain still; so we make not the sacrament of Christ's body and blood bare bread and wine. We use the same words and definitions that St Augustine, and other ancient fathers, and Peter Lombard, and Gratian, M. Harding's own doctors, have used before us: *Sacramentum est signum rei sacrae* 6: *Sacramentum est invisibilis gratiae visible forma* 7: "A sacrament is a token of a holy thing. A sacrament is a form visible of grace invisible." Neither do we hereof make a bare or naked token, as M. Harding imagineth; but we say, as St Paul saith, "it is a perfect seal, and a sufficient warrant of God's promises, whereby God bindeth himself unto us, and we likewise stand bounden unto God, as God is in our God, and we are his people." This I reckon is no bare or naked token. And touching this word *signum*, what it meaneth, St Augustine sheweth in this sort: *Signum est, quod præter speciem, quam inerit sensibus, ait quiddam faciat ex se in cognitionem venire* 8: "A sign is a thing that, besides the form or sight that it offereth to our senses, causeth of itself some other thing to come to our knowledge." And hereof it is called a mystery, or a holy secrecy; for that our beholdest one thing, and our faith another. For example, in baptism our bodily eye seeth water; but our faith, which is the eye of our mind, seeth the blood of Christ, which, as St John saith, "hath washed us from all our sins." Therefore Chrysostom saith: *Incredulus, cum baptismatis lavacrum audist, persuadet sibi, simpliciter esse aquam. Ego vero non simpliciter video quod video, sed anima per Spiritum purgationem; et sepulturam, resurrectionem, sanctificationem, justificationem, redemptionem, adoptionem, ardentiam, regnum cœlorum, Spiritus sature tantum considero. Non enim aspectu judico ea, quæ videunt, sed mentis oculis" 9: "The infidel, when he heareth of the water of baptism, thinketh it to be only plain water; but I, that believe in Christ, do not only and simply see water, but I see the cleansing of the soul by the Spirit of God: I consider Christ's burial, his resurrection, our sanctification, our righteousness, our redemption, our adoption, our inheritance, the kingdom of heaven, and the fulness of the Spirit. For the things that I see I judge not with my bodily eyes, but with the eyes of my mind." Now, will M. Harding say that Chrysostom only for a countenance speaketh thus honourably of the sacrament of baptism, meaning notwithstanding it is nothing else but bare water? Certainly St Augustine saith: *In sacramentis videendum est, non quid sint, sed quid significat* 10: "In sacraments we must consider, not what they be indeed, but what they signify." If that every thing, according to M. Harding's judgment, must needs be accounted bare wherein Christ's body is not really present, then is the sacrament of baptism a bare sacrament; and M. Harding's book must likewise of necessity seem a very bare book: unless perhaps he will say, Christ's body is really inclosed in it. Plato saith: It is the greatest part of Plato's wisdom to discern *aliquid* and *idem*, one and the same thing from another thing:

---


8 Perfite, 1665, 1009.


for of error herein evermore riseth all confusion. But St Augustine saith: Alivd est sacramentum, alivd res sacramentii: "The sacrament is one thing; and the substance of the sacrament (which is Christ's body) is another thing." And, lest M. Harding should shift off this matter and say, as his manner is, that the sacrament is nothing else but the outward form and appearance or shew of bread and wine, Rabanus Maurus hath prevented him in this wise: Sacramentum... in alimentum corporis redigitur: "The sacrament is turned into the nourishment of the body." Therefore, these two things being diverse and sundry, the one the token, the other the thing tokened; the one Christ's body, and the other the sacrament of the same body; the one naturally feeding the body, the other supernaturally feeding the soul; it were great confusion either to make them both one, or else by error to take the one for the other. And for that cause St Augustine saith, as it is before alleged: Ea demum est miserabilis animae servitus, signa pro rebus acciperent: "That indeed is a miserable servitude of the soul, to take signs instead of the things that be signified."

Now, touching the adoration of the sacrament, M. Harding is not able to shew neither any commandment of Christ, nor any word or example of the apostles or ancient fathers concerning the same. It is a thing very lately devise by pope Honorius, about the year of our Lord 1226; afterward increased by the new solemn feast of Corpus Christi day, by pope Urbanus, anno 1264; and last of all confirmed for ever by multitudes of pardoners in the council of Vienna by pope Clement the fifth, anno 1310. The church of Asia and Greece never received it until this day. The matter is great, and cannot be attempted without great danger. To give the honour of God to a creature that is no God, it is manifest idolatry. And "all idolaters," as St John saith, "shall have their portion in the lake burning with fire and brimstone, which is the second death."

M. HARDING. THE SECOND DIVISION.

But now, this being that very bread which God the Father gave us from heaven, as Christ saith: This bread being the flesh of Christ, which he gave for the life of the world.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

M. Harding would seem to have trained all the ancient doctors unto his side, and to that end hath mustered them here in an army all together. Howbeit, of them all there is not one that teacheth us one word of the adoration of the sacrament. Wherewith, if he bring forth only for a shew, they are too many; but, if he bring them as witnesses, they are too few; for touching the case they say nothing. Yet M. Harding, as a man much doubting his reader's memory, whatsoever he hath shortly alleged here, hath elsewhere repeated, and doubled the same in other places of his book; so that, if I would answer all in particular, I should be over tedious. For avoiding whereof, it shall be sufficient to refer myself over to such places, where as these authorities are answered severally more at large.

First, as I have said before, there is not one of all these fathers that willett us to adore the sacrament with godly honour. Which thing, notwithstanding, they were able to have written, if it had been then either used or thought convenient; and M. Harding was able to have found it, if it had been written. The bread of the sacrament is that bread of which Christ speaketh in the sixth of St John; but very material bread indeed, and, as St Cyprian saith, ex multorum granorum...
adunations congregus⁸, "moulded together of the mingling of many corns;" and a sacrament of that bread that came from heaven. But this matter is answered in the fifth article, and in the first, second, and third division.

**M. HARDING. THE THIRD DIVISION.**

[1 Cor. ii. 1. A. 1561.] This being that bread and that cup, whereof whosoever eateth or drinketh unworthily shall be guilty of the body and blood of our Lord.

**THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.**

St Hierome saith: *Dum... sacra... violantur, ipse, cujus sacra... violatur⁹.* "When the sacraments be misused, God himself, whose sacraments they be, is misused." And the greatest abuse and villainy that can happen to any sacrament is, contrary to Christ's institution and the nature of a sacrament, to be honoured instead of God. And St Augustine saith: *Quis indigne accipit baptismam, judicium accipit, non salutem⁠*¹⁰: "Whoso receiveth baptism unworthily receiveth his judgment, and not his health." Wherefore, if M. Harding think this warrant sufficient to prove adoration, then must he also adore the water of baptism.

**M. HARDING. THE FOURTH DIVISION.**

(160) *In... this... sacrament being contained the very real and substantial body and blood of Christ, as himself saith expressly in the three first evangelists, and in St Paul.*

**THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.**

It is a bold enterprise, in the report of these four plain words of Christ, *hoc est corpus meum, to commit⁠*¹² five manifest untruths, and that all together with one breath. Certainly M. Harding well knoweth that neither Christ, nor Paul, nor any of the evangelists, I add further, nor any of the catholic doctors, in this case of the sacrament, ever used any of these terms, either carnally contained, or expressly, or very, or real, or substantial. Only they say, "This is my body," which words the ancient father Tertullian expoundeth thus: "This is a figure of my body¹³."

**M. HARDING. THE FIFTH DIVISION.**

This being that holy eucharistia which Iguatius calleth "the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ, that hath suffered for our sins, which the Father by his goodness hath raised up to life again"¹⁴: this being not common bread, but the eucharistia, after consecration "consisting of two things, earthly and heavenly," as Irenæus saith, meaning by the one (161) the outward form, by the other the very body and blood of Christ, who, partly for the Godhead inseparably thereto united, and partly for that they were conceived of the Holy Ghost, in the most holy virgin Mary, are worthily called heavenly.

**THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.**

What Theodoretus thought in this behalf, it is plain by his own words. For thus he wreteth: *Signa mystica post sanctificationem non recedunt a natura sua.*¹⁷: "The mystical tokens, after the sanctification or consecration, go not from their

---

¹¹ Untruths, 1655, 1690.
¹² Of four plain words to commit, 1655.
¹⁴ Eíxharástia... ἀκέχωσεν, διά τὸ μὴ ἐκο-
¹⁵...λογιῶν τὴν εἴκοσιον σάρκα εἰμί τοῦ Σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, τὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν παθησάντης, ἐν τῇ χρωστήσει ἐκ Πατρὸς ἐγερθεὶς.
own nature: that is to say, remain in substance and nature, as they were before.

By these words we may plainly see Theodoretus' judgment. Howbeit, in all sacraments two things must be considered, whereof, as Irenæus saith, they do consist. The one is earthly, the other is heavenly: the one we see with our bodily eyes, the other we see with the eyes of our faith: the one is in the earth, the other is in heaven. These parts because they are joined in one mystery, therefore oftentimes they scarce names, the one interchangeably with the other. For as Christ's very body is called bread, although indeed it be not bread; so the sacramental bread is called Christ's body, although indeed it be not Christ's body. Therefore, as the sacrament is called Christ's body, even so, according to the saying of Ignatius, it is the flesh of Christ, even the same that hath suffered for our sins, and that the Father hath raised again to life; that is to say, a sacrament of that flesh. In like sort St Chrysostom wretch of the sacrament of baptism: Ostendit hoc loco, idem esse sanguinem, et aquam. Baptisma enim ejus etiam passio ejus est:\footnote{1} "St Paul sheweth in this place that the blood (of Christ) and the water (of baptism) are both one. For Christ's baptism is Christ's passion." He saith, The water and the blood of Christ are both one thing; and that, he saith, was St Paul's meaning. Yet notwithstanding, neither is the water Christ's blood indeed, neither is Christ's blood indeed material water. But thus they borrow each of them the other's name, because they are joined together in one mystery. So is the blood of Christ called water, because it cleanseth: so is the water called Christ's blood, because it is a sacrament of that blood. And, as St Chrysostom saith, "The water of baptism is Christ's blood;" even so Ignatius saith, "The bread is the flesh," and none otherwise. These things are plain, and without cavil.

Therefore St Augustine saith: [Sacramenta] ex... similitudine plerunque etiam rerum ipsarum nomina accipit... Ergo secundum quendam modum sacramentum corporis Christi corpus Christi est; et sacramentum sanguinis Christi sanguis Christi est:\footnote{2} "Sacraments, because of a certain likeness, oftentimes receive the names of the things themselves (whereof they be sacraments). And therefore the sacrament of Christ's body after a certain manner (of speech) is the body of Christ; and the sacrament of Christ's blood is likewise (after a certain manner) the blood of Christ."

But here hath M. Harding taken great pains to wrest and to falsify the plain words of that holy father Irenæus. For that part of the mystery that Irenæus calleth rem terreman\footnote{3} "an earthly thing," that is to say, bread, the same M. Harding, contrary to his author's meaning, calleth "forms," or "accidents," or "shews of bread." For this fond and heathenish kind of speech was not heard of in the church in that holy father's days, but was brought in well near a thousand years afterward, to accompany transubstantiation. But Irenæus in plain wise calleth it a creature. Thus he saith: Sanctificamus creaturam?; "We do sanctify a creature." Offerimus ei... ex creatura ejus\footnote{4} "We offer up unto him of his creature." And that he meaneth not a miraculous creature, as is accidenta sine subjecto, the like whereof was never seen; but he saith simply: Creaturam, quae est secundum nos\footnote{5}; "Such a creature as we have in common use:" such as we see, such as we feel, such as we eat, such as we drink; and, utterly to cut off M. Harding's shifts, he saith: Ex illa auguratione et consitit carnis nostrae substantia?; "Of the same the substance of our flesh is increased and standeth." Therefore it is certain and most manifest by Irenæus, that, as Christ's body is the...
one part of the sacrament, so is material bread the other. Likewise in baptism, as the one part of that holy mystery is Christ's blood, so is the other part the material water. Neither are these parts joined together in place, but in mystery; and therefore they be oftentimes severed, and the one is received without the other. And for that cause St Augustine saith: *Qui discordat a Christo, nec panem ejus manuocat, nec sanguinem bibit; etiam si tantae rei sacramentum ad judicium sua praesumptionis quotidiani indifferenter accipiat*: "Whoso disagreeeth from Christ, neither cateth his bread nor drinketh his blood, although he daily receive the sacrament of so great a thing without difference to the judgment of his presumption."

If any man think it strange that the sacrament is called the body and the flesh of Christ, being not so indeed, let him understand that the written word of God is likewise called Christ's body and Christ's flesh, even the same that was born of the virgin, and that the Father raised again to life, although indeed it be not so. So saith St Hierome: *Quando dict, Qui non comedet carmem meam, et biberit sanguinem meum, [sc.] licet ... in mysterio possit intelligi, tamen verius corpus Christi et sanguis ejus sermo scripturarum est*:"When Christ saith, 'He that eateth not my flesh, and drinketh not my blood, &c.,' notwithstanding it may be taken of the mystery, yet the word of God is more truly the body of Christ, and his blood." Here note, good reader, that by these words of St Hierome the word of God is the body and blood of Christ, and that more truly than is the Veriss.

M. HARDING. THE SIXTH DIVISION.

This being that bread, which, "of our Lord given to his disciples, not in shape, but in nature changed, by the almighty power of the Word is made flesh," as St Cyprian termeth it.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

This authority is answered more at large in the tenth article, and in the second division.

M. HARDING. THE SEVENTH DIVISION.

This being that holy mystery wherein "the invisible priest turneth the visible creatures (of bread and wine) into the substance of his body and blood, by his word, with secret power," as Eusebius Emissenus reporteth.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

This authority is answered in the tenth article, and in the sixth division.

M. HARDING. THE EIGHTH DIVISION.

* This being that holy food, by worthy receiving whereof Christ dwelleth in us naturally, that is to wit, in us * by truth of nature, and not by concord of will only;* as Hilarius affirmeth.

---

[22] August. in Lib. Sent. tom. ii. cap. 32.
[27] August. in Lib. Sent. tom. ii. cap. 32.
[29] August. in Lib. Sent. tom. ii. cap. 32.
CONTROVERSY WITH M. HARDING.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

This authority is answered before, in the fifth article, and the tenth division.¹

M. HARDING. THE NINTH DIVISION.

Again, this being that table whereat "in our Lord's meat we receive the Word truly made flesh of the most holy virgin Mary," as the same Hilary saith.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

This authority, as it nothing hindereth us, so it nothing furthereth M. Harding. We say that at that holy table our faith is directed, not unto a fantasy, but unto the very body and blood of Christ, and tasteth it, and feedeth on it; and that as verily and as effectually as our body feedeth upon material food. And we add further, that whosoever eateth not Christ's flesh, nor drinketh his blood, shall not have everlasting life. But the thing that we receive with our mouth is not the same thing that we receive with our faith. For, as it is before alleged out of St Augustine, aliud est sacramentum, aliud res sacramentorum; "the sacrament is one thing; and the matter or substance of the sacrament (which is Christ's very body) is another thing."

But, being granted that Christ's body is verily and really in the sacrament, yet cannot M. Harding thereof conclude his purpose. His argument standeth thus:

- Christ's body ought to be adored with godly honour:
- Ergo, the sacrament ought to be adored with godly honour.
- This argument is made up of four terms; and therefore in the schools would be counted childish. The error whereof I will the better appear by the like:
- Christ's body ought to be adored with godly honour:
- Ergo, heaven ought to be adored with godly honour.

M. HARDING. THE TENTH DIVISION.

This being that bread which "neither earing, nor sowing, nor work of tillers hath brought forth, but that earth which remained untouched, and H. A. 1556.

was full of the same," that is, the blessed virgin Mary, as Gregory Nyssene describeth.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

Gregory Nyssene in this whole place speaketh not one word, neither of any adoration, nor of the sacrament, but only of Christ's birth of the blessed virgin. These words are alleged and answered before, in the fifth article, and tenth division.¹ Yet shortly, and by the way, these words yield us one good reason against M. Harding. For, whereas Gregory Nyssene saith, the bread of Christ's body cometh not of the labour of tillers, that is to say, of material corn; and nevertheless St Cyprian and St Augustine say, the sacrament is wrought of many corns; of these fathers thus considered together we may conclude that Christ's body and the sacrament are sundry things. The argument that M. Harding can gather of hereof standeth thus:

- Christ was born of the blessed virgin;
- Ergo, we ought to adore the sacrament. For other necessity of sequel out of these words there is none.

¹ See before, pages 474, &c.
² Id. ibid. 13, cols. 954, &c.
⁴ Thereof, 1365.
⁵ Τὸ δὲ σῶμα τοῦ τῶν ἄνθρωπον ὁπότε ἄροις ὁπέ ντε σπορὰ ἐνεύρηκας ἀλλὰ πᾶς τὰ κατά μεν, πλὴρης εἰσίν εἰς τὴν θεία παύσας, ἢ ὅτι τῆς μυστήριου τοῦ ὑπάρχουσαι μνήμην τῆς ἑλπίδος τοῖς προσταταί θεόν μοι τοῖς προσταταί θεόν τοῖς προσταταί θεόν.
M. HARDING. THE ELEVENTH DIVISION.

This being that supper in the which Christ sacrificed himself, as Clemens Romanus, and as Hesychius declareth; who furthermore in another place writeth most plainly that "these mysteries," meaning the blessed sacrament of the altar, "are sancta sanctorum, the holiest of all holy things," because it is the body of himself, of whom Gabriel said to the virgin, 'The Holy Ghost shall come upon thee, and the power of the Highest shall overshadow thee; therefore that holy thing which shall be born of thee shall be called the Son of God;' and of whom also Esay spake, 'Holy is our Lord, and dwelleth on high,' verily in the bosom of the Father.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

Christ, as he had shewed his disciples before, that he must go up to Hierusalem, and there be crucified; so, being at that his last mournful supper, he ordained a sacrament of his death, and took bread, and brake it, and described and expressed before their eyes the whole order and manner of his passion: as if he should have said: Thus shall my body be broken; thus shall my blood be shed. This description of Christ's death, so plain and so lively, Hesychius calleth a sacrifice, that is to say, an exemplar or resemblance of that sacrifice, which he had to offer the day following upon the cross. And indeed, as the bread was Christ's body, so the breaking of the same was Christ's passion. And in this manner of speech the ancient fathers seem to call baptism a sacrifice. Chrysostom saith: Baptismus Christi passio Christi est: "The baptism of Christ is Christ's passion." So Tertullian: Tinguemur in passione Domini: "We be washed in the passion of our Lord." So likewise again Chrysostom saith: Quod crux et sepulchrum fuit Christo, id nobis baptisms factus est: "That is baptism unto us, that the cross and grave was unto Christ." In this sense Hesychius saith: "Christ offered himself at his last supper;" that is to say, by way of a sacrament, and in a mystery, but not indeed, to take away the sins of the world. In like sense the same Hesychius calleth the birth of Christ a sacrifice. These be his words: Sacrificium . .. coeptum Christi appellat incarnationem: "The baked sacrifice he calleth the incarnation of Christ."

Touching this word sancta sanctorum, it is not the outward sacrament that Hesychius calleth by that name, but the very body of Christ itself; which, as St. Augustine saith, is res sacramenti: "the substance and matter of the sacrament." So writeth Origen upon Leviticus: Que est hostia, que pro peccatis offertur, et est sancta sanctorum, nisi unigenitus Filii Dei, Dominus meus Jesus Christus? Ipse solus est hostia pro peccatis, et ipse est hostia, sancta sanctorum: "What is that sacrifice that is offered up for sin, and is the holy of the holy, but the only-begotten Son of God, my Lord Jesus Christ? He only is the sacrifice for sin; and he is the sacrifice, of holy things the most holy." And this he speaketh of the sacrifice that Christ made upon the cross. And therefore he added thus: Quod uno verbo apostolus explicavit, cum dicit, Qui seipsum obtulit Deo: "Which thing the apostle expressed in one word, saying thus: 'Which hath offered up himself unto God'."

Howbeit, not only the sacrament, but also other things appointed unto godly


[12 Esai. in, II. A. 1564.]


[14 Id. ibid. Lib. vi. cap. ii. fol. 13. 2.]


[17 Addieh, 1565.]

[18 Id. ibid.]
use, may be called sancta sanctorum. So it is written and determined by Bonifaci the first: Omne quod Domino consecratur, sive fuerit homo, sive animal, sive ager, vel quicquid fuerit semel consecratum, sanctum sanctorum est Domino 1: “Every thing that is consecrate unto the Lord, be it man, or beast, or lands, or whatsoever, being consecrate, it is holy of the holy unto the Lord.” Neither doth he call the holy mysteries sancta sanctorum in that sense that M. Harding meaneth, for that they are the holiest of all holy things, but because they are appointed for holy people. For thus he expoundeth it himself: [Panis iste, et calix] sancta ... sanctorum sunt. Vides, quomodo non dixerit, sancta tantummodo, sed sancta sanctorum. Ac si diceret, panis iste ... non est communis omnium, nec cujusque indigni, sed sancti est. Quanto magis hoc et de verbo Dei ... dicemus, Hic sermo non est omnium, nec cujusque unicum sanctorum est 2. “This bread and this cup are the holy things of the holy. You see that he saith not only, they are holy things, but he addeth besides, of the holy. As if he would say, This bread is not common to all men, nor to every unworthy; but it is the bread of the holy. How much more may we say the same of God’s word. This word is not of all men, or of every body, but of the holy!” Therefore St. Chrysostom saith, The priest was wont to shew forth the bread in the time of the holy mysteries, and to say, Sancta sanctis, “Holy things for the holy.” And this is the meaning of sancta sanctorum.

As for Clemens of Rome, the apostles’ fellow, as M. Harding everywhere calleth him, he saith not that Christ offered himself at his last supper, but rather far otherwise. Thus he saith: Prorup vos homo factus, et spirituale sacrificial offerens Deo 3: “Christ being made man for us, and offering unto God a spiritual sacrifice.” And in plainer sort he maketh this prayer unto God touching the same: Offerimus tibi Regi et Doce, justa Christi institutionem, hunc panem et hoc pocium 4: “We offer up unto thee, O King and God, this bread and this cup.” He saith not, We offer up really the body of thy Son; but this bread and this cup. Which also he calleth antitypa, that is to say, signa corporis et sanguinis Christi 5, “the tokens or pledges of Christ’s body and blood.” And so Theodoretus writeth hereof: Ecclesia offerth corporis et sanguinis ejus symbola 6: “The church offereth the tokens or signs of his body and blood.”

M. HARDING. THE TWELFTH DIVISION.

On the holy table, where these mysteries are celebrated, the “Lamb of God being laid, and sacrificed of priests unbloodily,” as that most ancient and worthy council of Nice reporteth 7.

THE BISHOP OF SARCIBURY.

As the council of Nice saith, “The Lamb is laid upon the altar,” alluding unto the sacrifices of the old law; even so doth St. Augustine say unto the people: Vos estis in mensa ... vos estis in calice 8: “You are upon the table: you are in the cup.” As the people is laid upon the table, so is Christ laid upon the table. But this authority is answered more at large in the fifth article, and the eighth division 9.

M. HARDING. THE THIRTEENTH DIVISION.

Briefly, in this highest sacrament under visible shape invisible things, soothly the very true, real, lively, natural, and substantial body and blood of our Saviour

[5] Id. ibid. cap. xiii. col. 482.  
[14] Heart  
Christ being contained, as (162) the scriptures, doctors, councils, yea, and the best learned of Martin Luther’s school, do most plainly and assuredly affirm.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

Now soothly, if M. Harding could have found any of all these terms, real, lively, natural, or substantial, either in the scriptures, or in the doctors, or in any council, he would not have spared the allegation. But thus avouching these terms, and so constantly assuring us thereof by these authorities, being nevertheless not able any where to find the same, we must needs think he misreporteth the scriptures, the doctors, and the councils, and much abuses the simple credulity of the people.

M. HARDING. THE FOURTEENTH DIVISION.

This, I say in conclusion, being so, as it is undoubtedly so, we, that remain in the catholic church, and can by no persecution be removed from the catholic faith, whom it liketh M. Jewel and his fellows to call papists, believe verily that it is our bounden duty to adore the sacrament, and to worship it with all godly honour. By which word sacrament, notwithstanding, in this respect we mean not the outward forms, (163) that properly are called the sacrament, but the thing of the sacrament, the invisible grace and virtue therein contained, even the very body and blood of Christ.

And when we adore and worship this blessed sacrament, we do not adore and worship the substance itself of bread and wine, (164) because after consecration none at all remaineth. Neither do we adore the outward shapes and forms of bread and wine which remain; for they be but creatures, that ought not to be adored; but the body itself and blood of Christ, (165) under those forms verily and really contained, lovingly and devoutly do we adore. And therefore, to speak more properly, and according to skill, lest our adversaries might take advantage against us through occasion of terms, where right sense only is meant, we protest and say, that we do and ought to adore and worship the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

If M. Harding be persecuted, as he saith, verily it seemeth a delicate kind of persecution. They of his side did not so persecute others. But Salomon saith: “There be certain that fle when no man followeth them.” Thus did Arius the heretic sometimes complain of his persecutors: Ἄρει, ὅ δεικονερος ... δόκω δι’ ἐπιβ. Λει. τῆς πάντας κοίνωνς αἰθίους: “Arius, that wrongfully suffereth persecution for the truth’s sake, that conquereth all things.”

As for M. Harding’s constancy, which is here brought in as instead of some proof, I will say nothing. Howbeit his friends think so many, so light, and so sudden changes, can scarcely stand well with the title of constancy. Certainly the maintenance of open and known error should rather have some other name. The prophet Zachary saith: Ponebunt ut adamantem cor suum: “They have set their hearts as the adamant stone.” Job saith: Stetit cor ejus sicut inaeus: “His heart stood as a steady.” Yet might not they therefore be called constant. St Hilary saith: Gravis et periculosus est lapsus in multis. Etsi enim se intelligent, tamen pudor exsurgerendi auctoritatem sibi presumat; ut, quod errant, prudentiam velit existimari; quod cum multis errant, intelligentiam esse asserent veritatis: “Falling from God in many men is grievous and dangerous. For albeit

they understand themselves¹, yet, for that they are ashamed to rise again, they therefore take upon them some authority, and will have their error counted wisdom; and that they are deceived with many, they call it the understanding of the truth." Touching the purpose, it appeareth this matter cannot stand without the disordering and confounding of the natural course and sound of words. Sometimes the accidents and shews of bread must be the sacrament, sometimes Christ's body; which, as M. Harding confesseth, indeed is not the sacrament, yet, to maintain this new adoration, must needs become the sacrament. And thus now we have two sacraments together in one sacrament. And yet, in the conclusion, we may not worship the very sacrament, but only Christ's body in the sacrament. And this, as M. Harding telletteth us, is a proper, plain, familiar kind of speech, and according unto skill. Thus he teacheth us to lift up our hearts, and to worship God in spirit and truth. Unless the simple people go to the universities, and learn this new skill, what is accidens absque subjecto, corpus sine loco, locus sine corpore, quantitas sine modo quanti, they cannot skilfully worship Christ's body. Or if they worship without this skill, they worship one thing for another, and become idolaters.

M. HARDING. THE FIFTEENTH DIVISION.

And here thus² much is further to be said, that in the sacrament of the altar the body of Christ is not adored by thought of mind suffered from the Word, but being inseparably united to the Word. For this is specially to be considered, that in the³ most holy sacrament the body and blood of Christ are not present by themselves alone, as being separated from his soul and from the Godhead; but that there is (166) here his true and living flesh and blood joined together with his Godhead inseparably, and that they be as himself is, perfect, whole, and inseparable. Which is sufficiently confirmed by sundry his own words in St John. "I am," said⁵ he, "the bread of life." Again: "This is bread coming down from heaven, that if any eat of it he die not. I am the living bread that came down from heaven; if any eat of this bread, he shall live eternally." And, to shew what bread he meant, he concluded with these words: "And the bread which I shall give is my flesh, which I shall give for the life of the world." By which words he assured us plainly that his flesh which he giveth us to eat is full of life and joined with his Godhead, which bringeth to the worthy receivers thereof immortality as well body of as soul of. Which thing flesh and blood of itself could not perform; as our Lord himself declareth plainly, where he saith, as there it followeth: "It is the Spirit that quickeneth or giveth life: the flesh profiteth nothing. The words which I have spoken to you be Spirit and life." As though he had said thus: The flesh of itself profiteth nothing; but my flesh, which is full of Godhead and Spirit, bringeth and worketh immortality and life everlasting to them that receive it worthily. Thus we understand in this blessed sacrament not only the body and blood of Christ, but all and whole Christ, God and man, to be present in substance, and that for the inseparable unity of the person of Christ; and for this cause we acknowledge ourselves bound to adore him as very true God and man.

For a clearer declaration hereof I will not let to recite a notable sentence out of St Augustine, where he expoundeth these words of Christ: "Then if ye see the Son of man go up where he was before." "There had been no question," Trad. 77. saith he, "if he had thus said: If ye see the Son of God go up where he was before. But whereas he said, 'The Son of man go up where he was before;' what, was the Son of man in heaven before he began to be in earth? Verily here he said, 'Where he was before;' as though then he were not there when he spake these words. And in another place he saith: 'No man hath ascended into heaven but he that descended from heaven, the Son of which is in heaven.' He said not was; but the Son of

---

¹ Themselves, 1565.
² This, 1565 and H. A. 1564.
³ This, H. A. 1564.
⁴ Perfit, 1565 and H. A. 1564.
⁵ Saith, 1565, 1600, and H. A. 1564.
⁶ 1565 omits for.
⁷ Tract. 77.
[This, 1605 omits for.]
man, saith he, 'which is in heaven.' In earth he spake and said himself to be in heaven. To what pertaineth this, but that we understand Christ to be one person, God and man, not two; lest our faith be not a Trinity, but a quaternity? Wherefore Christ is one, the Word, the soul, and the flesh, one Christ; the Son of God and the Son of man, one Christ: the Son of God ever, the Son of man in time; yet one Christ, according to the unity of person, was in heaven, when he spake in earth. So was the Son of man in heaven, as the Son of God was in earth. *The Son of God in earth in flesh taken, the Son of man in heaven in unity of person*.

Thus for St Augustine.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

It is true that Christ's body and his Godhead are joined inseparably, and therefore must be adored both together. For we may not divide the Godhead from the manhead, and so imagine two sundry Christs, the one to be honoured, the other to stand without honour, as did the heretic Nestorius. But as the body and soul of man, being joined both in one, are honoured both together; so must the humanity and divinity of Christ, being joined both in one, likewise be honoured both together.

Otherwise to say, as the heretic Nestorius said, "Thomas touched him that was risen again, and honoured him that raised him up," it were great blasphemy.

Nevertheless, notwithstanding the body and Godhead of Christ be joined in one person, yet are they distinct and sundry natures; the one finite, the other infinite; the one in place, the other incomprehensible without place; the one a creature, the other the Creator. Neither is there any godly honour due unto the body of Christ in respect of itself, but only for that it is joined in one person with the divinity. All these things be true and out of question.

Likewise, the words, that Christ spake in the sixth chapter of St John, and are here alleged by M. Harding, are undoubtedly true; howbeit, not according to the simple sound and tenor of the letter; for that, as St Augustine saith, were *flagitium et facinus*; "an heinous wickedness." And, as Origen saith: "It would kill the soul." And therefore Christ himself expounded his own meaning touching the same: "It is the Spirit that giveth life: the flesh profiteth nothing. The words that I have spoken be Spirit and life." Which words St Augustine expounded thus: *Spiritualiter intelligite, que locutus sum. Non hoc quoque quod videtis, manu eorum est*; "Understand ye spiritually the things that I have spoken. Ye shall not eat this body that ye see." Likewise Chrysostom: *Secundum spiritum verba mea audienda sunt: qui secundum carmen audit, nihil lucraturus, nihil utilitatis applicabit*; "My words must be heard spiritually; whoso heareth..."
them carnally, or according to the flesh, getteth nothing, nor hath any profit by them." He saith further by way of objection against himself: *Quid ergo est carnaliter intelligere? Simpliciter, ut res dicuntur; nege aliud quicquam cognitare?* 1: "And what is meant by these words, To understand according to the flesh?" He answereth: "It is to understand simply and plainly, even as things be spoken, and to think upon nothing else." Thus therefore Christ said, to cut off their carnal cogitations: "The words that I spake are Spirit and life." As if he should say: Neither is my flesh meat, nor my blood drink, to enter into your mouths and to feed your bodies. But if your souls be hungry, I am spiritual meat to feed you; if your souls be thirsty, I am spiritual drink to refresh you. To this purpose St. Chrysostom saith thus: *omnia tibi Christus factus est; mensa vestimentum, domus, caput, et radix, &c.*: "Christ is become all things unto thee; thy table, thy apparel, thy house, thy head, and thy root, &c." 2 St. Paul saith, 'As many of you as are baptized in Christ, ye have put on Christ,' behold, how Christ is made thy apparel. And wilt thou learn how he is become thy table? He saith, 'Whoso eateth me shall live through me;' and that he is thy house, he saith, 'Whoso eateth my flesh dwelleth in me, and I in him;' and that he is thy root, again he saith, 'I am the vine, and you are the branches.'" So saith Gregorius Nyssenus: "Christ unto the strong is strong meat; unto the weaker sort he is herbs; and unto infants he is milk." So saith Origen: *Neminus: quia verba Dei et caro dicitur, et panis, et lac, et olea, et pro mensura credentium, vel possibilitate summentum, et diversa nominatur.* 3: "Marvel not; for the word of God is called both flesh, and bread, and milk, and herbs; and, according to the measure of the believers, and the possibility of the receivers, is diversely named." And likewise Gregory Nazianzen: *Quemadmodum Dominus noster Jesus Christus appellatur vita, via, panis,* 4 *vitis, lux vera, et mille alia, sic etiam appellatur gladius:* "Like as our Lord Jesus Christ is called the life, the way, the bread, the wine, the true light, and a thousand things else, so is he also called the sword." Now as Christ is bread, even so in like manner of speech he is a sword, and none otherwise. Thus is Christ unto us a spiritual table, a spiritual apparel, a spiritual house, a spiritual head, a spiritual root, spiritual meat, spiritual herbs, spiritual milk, spiritual flesh, light, way, bread, wine, and light. And to this end Christ saith: "My words be Spirit and life." Hitherto the words of Christ, that be here alleged, weigh very little of M. Harding's side. Besides all this, saith that whole Christ, both God and man, is really, substantially, and carnally in the sacrament. This thing, because he is not able any way to prove, he presumeth of himself by authority, as though it were already proved. It shall be good to give him a day to consider the matter and to prove it better. In the mean season the substance of his reason standeth thus: The humanity and divinity of Christ are joined together in one person; *Ergo,* we must adore the sacrament with godly honour.

### M. HARDING. THE SIXTEENTH DIVISION.

Hereupon he expoundeth these words, "It is the Spirit that quickeneth or giveth life; the flesh availleth nothing," thus: "The flesh profiteth nothing, but the only flesh. Come the Spirit to the flesh, and it profiteth very much. For if the flesh should profit nothing, the Word should not be made flesh to dwell among us." 5: "For this

1. [1 Id. ibid. p. 278.]
2. [1 1565 omits &c.]
3. [1 ...πάντα τοῦ ὁ ἅγιος γίνεται, καὶ τρόφιμα, καὶ λίταρι, καὶ οἶκος, καὶ κεφαλή, καὶ χούκα. ὡς οὖν γὰρ ἐν ἡμῖν ἐπιπέδωθε, ἡμῖν ἐνδέχεσθαι οὖν τοὺς ἱμάτια τοῦ γένους. καὶ οὓς καθίσται, διὸ τρέφων μοι, φρέσκον, κάκαννον γίνεται εἰς ἑαυτόν. ὥστε δὲ καὶ οἶκος σου γίνεται, διὸ τρέφων μοι τὴν σάρκα ἐν ἑαυτῷ, καὶ σάρκως ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ. καὶ ὡς χούκα, πλίθη φρέσκος, ἐγώ ἐγὼ ἀνθρώπων, οἷς τὰ κλήματα. — Id. ad Illam. Catech. ii. Tom. ii. p. 236.]
6. [1 There is a passage in which many appellations of Christ are enumerated, and among others, that of sword, but it is in an oration or homily on Matt. xix. See Gregor. Naiian. Op. Par. 1778-1840. Orat. xxvii. 4. Tom. i. pp. 647, 8.]
7. [1 Vine, 1655, 1699.]
8. [1 Amsterg., H. A. 1606.]
10. [1 Oiko χεῖρος αὐλίνου Ἀλέγου, καὶ φέρεις, ὦτι ἐνυτία, ὦτι
OF ADORATION.

unity of person to be understood in both natures (saith the great learned father Leo), we read that both the Son of man came down from heaven, when as the Son of God took flesh of that virgin of whom he was born; and again, it is said that the Son of God was crucified and buried, whereas he suffered these things not in the Godhead itself, in which the only-begotten is coeverlasting, and consubstantial with the Father, but in the infinitude of human nature. Wherefore we confess all in the creed also, the only-begotten Son of God crucified and buried, according to that saying of the apostle: "For if they had known, they would never have crucified the Lord of majesty.""

According to this doctrine, Cyril us writing upon St John saith: "He that eateth the flesh of Christ hath life everlasting. For this flesh hath the Word of God, which naturally is life. Therefore he saith: 'I will raise him again in the last day.' For I, said he, that is my body, which shall be eaten, will raise him again. For he is not other than his flesh. I say not this because by nature he is not other, but because, after incarnation, he suffereth not himself to be divided into two natures." By which words he reproveth the heresy of wicked Nestorius, that went about to divide Christ, and of Christ to make two sons; the one the Son of God, the other the son of Mary, and so two persons. For which Nestorius was condemned in the first Ephesine council, and also specially for that he said (167) we receive in this sacrament only the flesh of Christ in the bread, and his blood only in the wine, without the Godhead; because Christ said, 'He that eateth my flesh,' and said not, that he eateth or drinketh my Godhead, because his Godhead cannot be eaten, but his flesh only. Which heretical cavil Cyril us doth thus avoid. "Although (saith he) the nature of the Godhead be not eaten, yet we eat the body of Christ, which verily may be eaten. But this body is the Word's own proper body, which quickeneth all things; and, inasmuch as it is the body of life, it is quickening or life-giving." Now he quickeneth us, or giveth us life, as God, the only fountain of life. Wherefore such speeches uttered in the scriptures of Christ, whereby that appeareth to be attributed to the one nature which appertaineth to the divine, and contrariwise, according to that incomprehensible and unspeakable conjunction and union of the divine and human nature in one person, are to be taken of him inseparably, inasmuch as he is both God and man; and of this or that other nature only, as being separated from the other. For through cause of this inseparable union, whatsoever is appertaining or peculiar to either nature, it is rightly ascribed, yea, and it ought to be ascribed to the whole person: and this done, as the learned divines term it, per communicationem idiomatum. And thus Cyril us teacheth how Christ may be eaten, not according to the divine, but human nature, which he took of us; and so likewise he is of christian people adored in the sacrament according to his divine nature. And yet not according to his divine nature only, as though that were separated from his human nature, but his whole person together, God and man. And his precious flesh and blood are adored for the inseparable conjunction of both natures into one person, which is the hundred and sixty-seventh sentence. For neither was there any such error defended by Nestorius, not any such error ever moved in that council.

Jesus Christ, God and man: "whom God hath exalted (as St Paul saith) and hath given him a name which is above all names," that at the name of which every knee shall bow, of things in heaven and things on earth. Amen.

of Jesus every knee be bended, of the heavenly and the earthly things, and of things beneath, and that every tongue confess that our Lord Jesus Christ is in glory of God the Father;" that is, of equal glory with the Father. And "when God (saith St Paul) bringeth his first-begotten into the world, he saith, And let hab. 1
Psal. xcvii.
all the angels of God adore him." St John writeth in his Revelation, Rev. x.
that he heard all creatures say, "Blessing, honour, glory, and power, be to him which sitteth in the throne, and to the Lamb for ever. And the four and twenty elders fell down on their faces, and adored him that liveth until worlds of worlds."

THE BISHOP OF SARCISBURY.

I marvel M. Harding would bestow so many waste words to so small purpose. These authorities be all true, and, saving only that of the council of Chalecston, touching Nestorius, all truly alleged. But every thing that is true maketh not by and bye proof sufficient in every case. Pliny the second giveth good sad counsel, that whosoever will take in hand to write a book have evermore a good eye unto his title, or to the purpose whereof he writeth, lest he happen to wander and to run at random. As now M. Harding seemeth to shoot fair, although a great way from the mark. For in all these words there is no manner mention, neither of the sacrament, nor of the adoration thereof, nor of any other thing thereto belonging: unless M. Harding upon occasion of these words will reason thus:

The Son of man came down from heaven;
Ergo, we must adore the sacrament.

The words of Cyril be likewise true. "Christ's flesh is joined with the Godhead, and therefore it naturally giveth life." And when Christ said, "I will raise him up at the last day;" he meant, even as Cyril saith, that his flesh that we eat shall raise us up at the last day. For whatsoever favour or mercy we have from God, we have it only by the flesh of Christ. St Augustine saith:
Mortalis factus est immortalis, ut, peracta sua morte, nos sacer faciat immortales:
"He that is immortal became mortal, that through his death he might make us immortal." Again he saith: Nos non efficiemur participe divinitatis ejus, nisi ipse factus fuisset participe mortalitatis nostrae: "We could not be partakers of his Godhead, unless he had been partaker of our mortality." All these words be true, as containing nothing else but the exposition of these words of Christ:
He that eateth my flesh and drinketh my blood shall live for ever.

But M. Harding, to make these words of Cyrilus to serve his turn, hath imagined two great errors: the one is that Christ's body cannot be eaten, but only in the sacrament; the other is that, unless we receive Christ's body with our mouth, and swallow it down into our belly, we eat it not: as though either Christ or these holy fathers had meant a carnal or fleshly eating. This whole doctrine is horrible and full of desperation. For M. Harding's position being true, that no man shall be partaker of that blessed resurrection, only such as have eaten Christ's body in the sacrament, what then shall become of Christian children that have departed this life, never having received the sacrament? Who shall raise them up again at the last day? Or doth M. Harding believe, that such little ones, being baptized, and so the members of Christ, shall never rise again, but lie dammed for ever, only because they have not received the sacrament?

Verily, Christ in these words, as it is witnessed by all the holy fathers, speaketh not of the sacrament, but of the spiritual eating; with our faith; and in this behalf utterly exclueth the corporal office of our body. Therefore St Augustine saith: Crede, et manducasti: "Believe, and thou hast eaten." And again: Illud manducare, refici est:... illud bibere, quid est nisi vivere? "That

eating is to be refreshed; and that drinking, what is it else, but to live?” Likewise St Basil saith: *Est spiritualis in interni hominis, quo recipitur verbum vite, quod est panis qui de celo descendit*⁹: “There is a spiritual mouth of the inner man, wherewith is received the Word of life, which is that bread that came down from heaven.”

And touching our rising again from the dead he saith: ῥῶς ἡ δύναμις ἡνωμένη ἐστὶν ἐκ τῆς ἁπάντως ἀνωτάτου¹⁰: “Our baptism is a strength or power to resurrection.” So St Augustine: *Nemini dubitandum est, sc.¹¹: “No man may doubt, but every man is then made partaker of the body and blood of Christ, when in baptism he is made the member of Christ’s body.” Likewise St Chrysostom: “In baptism we are incorporate unto Christ, and made flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bones.”¹² Thus by faith we eat the body of Christ, and that not by way of imagination or fantasy, but effectually, verily, and indeed; and therefore Christ shall raise us up again at the last day.

M. Harding’s error, as I have said, resteth herein, that he imagineth that Christ’s body cannot be eaten, but only in the sacrament, and that by mean and office of our bodily mouth. But, as it is before alleged out of Rabanus Maurus: “The sacrament is received outwardly with the mouth of our body; but the body of Christ is received into the inner man, and that with the spiritual mouth of our soul.”¹³ And thus both may the sacrament be received without Christ’s body, and also the body of Christ may be received without the sacrament.

Hitherto M. Harding hath not once touched one word of adoration.

Concerning Nestorius, M. Harding in the drift of his tale hath handsomely couched in a great untruth. For, whereas he saith Nestorius held this opinion, that in the sacrament of the bread we receive only Christ’s body without his blood, and in the cup the blood of Christ alone without the body; neither did Nestorius, notwithstanding he were an heretic, ever hold this peevish error, nor is there any such record either in the council of Ephesus, that here untruly is he alleged, or in any other old council or ancient father.

But the right of M. Harding’s cause hangeth of such evidence as never was found in any record. If there be any such canon to be found in that whole council, or any mention thereof made in any of all the ancient doctors, let M. Harding shew it, that we may believe him. If, having alleged it so constantly and so often, he be able utterly to shew nothing, let him give men leave to think that he abuseth the world with vain titles, and meaneth no truth.

Although he might be bold freely to devise matter against Nestorius, as being an heretic, yet he should not thus report untruth of a general council.

But Cyril also saith further: “We cannot eat the Godhead of Christ; it is his manhood only that is eaten.” Hereby M. Harding thinketh he is able to overthrow our whole doctrine of spiritual eating, that is wrought by faith. For thus he will reason:

By your doctrine eating of Christ’s body is believing:
But Cyril also saith we cannot eat God:
*Ergo,* by your doctrine we cannot believe in God.

Thus he thinketh we are driven to confess a great inconvenience. This reason seemeth to have some shew. And therefore I beseech thee, good reader, to consider both the parts thereof, and also the answer.

Eating, in common use of speech, is the receiving of food and sustenance, and the turning of the same into the substance of our bodies; and by a metaphor, or an extraordinary kind of speech, is often used for the spiritual eating and turning of heavenly food to the refreshing and nourishing of our souls. By neither of these ways it can rightly be said that we eat the Godhead. For neither can we receive the majesty of God’s divine nature, neither turn the same into the
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[⁹ Basil. in Psal. xxiii. Tom. 1. p. 144.]
[¹⁰ Id. Hom. in Sanct. Baptism. Tom. II. p. 114.]
[¹¹ See before, page 132, note 2.]
[¹³ By the mean, 1565.]
[¹⁴ See before, page 132, note 2.]
[¹⁶ Manhead, 1565.]
To eat God.
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De substance of our nature. But we may receive and eat and feed upon the humanity and body of Christ, and become bone of his bones and flesh of his flesh, so as he may dwell in us and we in him. Wherefore, notwithstanding Christ be both God and man, yet we have not our feeding and life of Christ in respect of his Godhead alone, but first and principally in respect of his humanity, in that he was made man, and became “partaker of flesh and blood,” and was crucified, and shed his blood, and yielded up his spirit upon the cross. This is our spiritual feeding: herein standeth our whole life. Therefore St Paul saith: Quod nunc vivo in carne, in fide vivo Filii Dei, qui dedit semetipsum pro me: “That I live now in the flesh, I live in the faith of the Son of God, that hath given himself for me.” And again: “God forbid that I should rejoice in any thing, saving only in the cross of Jesus Christ.” Likewise St Peter: “There is none other name given unto men under heaven whereby they may be saved, but only the name of Christ Jesus.” Thus, as Cyril saith, “we have our life and feeding, not of the Godhead, but of the manhood of Christ.”

And therefore it is very well noted upon the decrees: [Christus] per hoc est factus noster panis, et sustentatio, et vita...quia assumptit carmem nostram: “Christ in this is become our bread, and our sustenance, and our life, because he hath taken our flesh.”

But M. Harding will say: According to the judgment of Cyrilus, “we cannot eat the Godhead”; yet nevertheless we do believe in God; ergo, contrary to your doctrine, believing and eating are not both one. Verily, it appeareth both by Cyrilus himself, and also by a general consent of other old learned fathers, that we cannot either know God, nor believe in God, nor call upon God, as he is in himself in his divine majesty, but only as it pleased him to become like unto us, and to take upon him our mortal nature. St Chrysostom saith: Illum, si in nuda deitate venisset, non colum, non terra, non maris, non utra creature sustineri potuisset: “If God had come in his manifest divinity, neither the heaven, nor the earth, nor the sea, nor any creature could have borne his presence.” So St Hilary: Cognitus fieri Deus homini, nisi assumpto homine, non potuit. Quia incoegnobilitatem cognosceri, nisi per naturam nostram, natura nostra non potuit: “Unless God had taken man, he could never have been known unto man. For him that cannot be known, our nature, saving only by mean of our own nature, could never have known.” Likewise saith Cyrilus: “Christus non alter erit adorabiliis, nisi credamus, quod ipsum Verbum...caro factum sit: “Christ is not otherwise to be adored, unless we believe that the very Word was made flesh.” Likewise saith St Augustine: Respice altitudinem ipsius: In principio erat Verbum, §c.6: “Behold the higness of him: In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and God was that Word.” Behold the everlasting meat: but the angels and high powers and the heavenly spirits feed upon it. But what man can attain unto that meat? What heart can be meet for it? Therefore it was necessary that the meat should turn into milk, and so should come unto us little ones.” It followeth: Quomodo ergo de ipso pane pasxit nos Sapiencia Dei? Quia Verbum caro factum est, et habitavit in nobis: “How then did the Wisdom of God feed us with that bread?” He answereth: “Because the Word was made flesh and dwelted in us.” Again he saith: Ita Verbum incarnatum factum est nobis receptibile; quod recipere non veleremus, si Filius aequalis Deus non se exanimaret formam servi accipiens: “Thus were we able to receive the Word incarnate, which we could not receive unless the Son, being equal unto the Father, Deus erat Verbum. Ece cubus sempiternus: sed manducare angeli, manducare supernus virtutes, manducare celestis spiritus;...Quis autem homo posset ad illum cubum? Unde cor tam idoneum illi cibo? Oportebat ergo ut mensa illa lacosceret, et at parrulos perennet.—August. Op. Par. 1679-1700. In Psalm. xxxiii. Enarr. i. 6. Tom. iv. col. 211: [7 That, 1565.]

[8] Id. ibid. [9] Id. in Psalm. cxi. Enarr. 12. Tom. iv. col. 1238; where ita nobis Verbum.]
had abused himself, receiving the form of a servant." I pass over other allegations to like purpose. This therefore is the meaning of Cyril: We are not able neither to receive, nor to know, nor to believe in, nor to adore, nor to eat, not to feed upon the divine majesty of God, being pure and simple in itself; but our knowledge, our faith, our food, and our life is in this, that Christ hath taken our mortal nature, and joined the same inseparably in one person to his Godhead.

M. HARDING. THE SEVENTEENTH DIVISION.

But it shall be more tedious than needful to recite places out of the scriptures for proof of the adoration of Christ, there may of them be found so great plenty: yet, because Luther was either so blind, or rather so devilish, as to deny the adoration, where notwithstanding he confessed the presence of Christ's true and natural body in the sacrament, I will here recite what the sacramentaries of Zurich have written against him therefore. "What (say they), is the bread the true and natural body of Christ, and is Christ in the supper (as the pope and Luther do teach) present? Wherefore then ought not the Lord there to be adored, where ye say him to be present? Why shall we be forbidden to adore that which is not only sacramentally, but also corporally, the body of Christ? Thomas toucheth the true body of Christ raised up from the dead, and falling down on his knees, adoreth, saying, 'My God, and my Lord.' The disciples adore the Lord as well before as after his ascension. Matt. xxviii. Acts i. And the Lord in St John saith to the blind man: "Believest thou in the Son of God? and he answereth him, saying, Lord, who is he, that I may believe in him? And Jesus said to him, Thou hast both seen him, and who speaketh with thee, he is it. Then he saith, Lord, I believe; and he adored him." Now if we were taught our Lord's bread to be the natural body of Christ, verily we would adore it also faithfully with the papists." Thus much the Zwinglians against Luther: whereby they prove sufficiently the adoration of Christ's body in the sacrament, and so consequently of Christ himself, God and man, because of the inseparable conjunction of his divine and human nature in unity of person, so as, where his body is, there it is joined and united also unto his Godhead; and so there Christ is present perfectly, wholly, and substantially, very God and man.

For the clear understanding whereof the better to be attained, the scholastics have profitably devised the term concomitantia, plainly and truly teaching, that in this sacrament, after consecration, under the form of bread is present the body of Christ, and under the form of wine his blood, ex vi sacramenti; and with the body, under form of bread, also the blood, the soul, and Godhead of Christ; and likewise with the blood, under the form of wine, the body, soul, and Godhead, ex concomitantia, as they term it, in shorter and plainer wise uttering the same doctrine of faith, (168) which the holy fathers did in the Ephesian council against Nestorius.

Whereby they mean that where the body of Christ is present, by necessary sequel, because of the indivisible copulation of both natures in the unity of person, (forasmuch as the Word made flesh never left the human nature), there is also his blood, his soul, his Godhead, and so whole and perfect Christ, God and man. And in this respect the term is not to be misliked of any godly-learned man, though some new masters scoff at it, who fill the measure of their predecessors, that likewise have been offended with terms for the apter declaration of certain necessary articles of our faith, by holy and learned fathers in general councils wholesome devises. Of which sort been these, homousion, humanatio, incarnatio, transsubstantiatio, &c. Now here is to be noted how the Zwinglians, whom M. Jewel followeth, in the article of adoration confute the Lutherans; as, on the other side, the Lutherans in the article of the presence confute the Zwinglians. As though it were by God's special providence, for the better stay of his church, so wrought that both the truth should be confessed by the enemies.

[10 Nor, 1565.]
[11 Answered, 1565, and H. A. 1564.]
[12 H. A. 1564, omits were.]
[13 This, 1565, and H. A. 1564.]
[14 Is it, 1565, and H. A. 1564.]
[15 Perfectly, 1565, and H. A. 1564.]
[16 Perfite, 1565, and H. A. 1564.]
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of truth, and also for uttering of untruth the one should be condemned of the other; that by the war of heretics the peace of the church might be established, and by their discord the catholic people might the faster grow together in concord.

Now, having sufficiently proved by the scriptures, and that with the Zwinglians also, adoration and godly honour to be due unto Christ’s body, wheresoever it pleased his divine majesty to exhibit the same present: let us see whether we can find the same doctrine affirmed by the holy and ancient fathers.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

Whereas M. Harding thus checketh us with some dissension that hath been between Doctor Luther and Doctor Zwinglius, touching this matter of adoration, I may justly say unto him, as one sometime said unto Philippus the king of Macedon, entreatest a peace between Peloponnesus and the rest of Greece: “Go first and conclude a peace in thine own house at home.” For at the same time his own wife Olympias and his own son Alexander were known to live in deadly dissension; and therefore he seemed no fit instrument to conclude a peace between others.

M. Harding should have remembered that the greatest buttresses and pillars of his gospel, since the first beginning of his new doctrine, have evermore lived in contradiction, and could never yet be reconciled. He should have remembered that his own doctors, and chiefest doctors, pope Innocentius and Scotus, teach contrary doctrines; that Scotus is against Thomas; Ockam against Scotus; Petrus de Alliaic against Ockam; and the nominals against the reals; and not only thus, but also Scotists against Scotists, and Thomists against Thomists, at civil war within one band; and that touching the very words of consecration and other like matters, both great and many, whereof to shew the particulars it would be tedious. But the matters hang still in mortal enmity, and are never like to be reconciled. Having such bloody fields at home, M. Harding should not be so ready to reproach others for some one or other matter of dissension.

It were much to be wished, (and God of his mercy so grant it, if it be his holy will!) that the gospel of Christ may pass forth freely without any such occasion of offence or hindrance. Howbeit, from the beginning it hath been otherwise. For even at the first planting of the gospel, whiles the martyrs’ blood was yet warm, there were some that said, “I hold of Paul; some others that said, I hold of Peter;” and thus were they divided among themselves. St Paul “withstood and gainsayeth Peter unto his face.” St Hierome chargeth St Augustine with heresy; St Augustine willeth St Hierome to recant; St Hierome despiseth St Ambrose, and findeth fault with St Basil; St Cyprian in judgment is contrary to St Cornelius; Pope Sabinius would have burned all St Gregory’s his predecessor’s books. Hereby it appeareth that saints have been against saints, and martyrs against martyrs, even in matters and cases of religion.

And hereof heretics and other wicked and godless people have evermore taken occasion to slander the gospel. Marcius the heretic thought he had found contrarieties between the new testament and the old; and therefore said, he was able to prove falsehood in the scriptures. St Hierome saith: Hunc locum nobis objectit Julianus Augustus, de dissonantia evangelistarum: “This place, of the disagreeing of the evangelists, the heathen emperor Julianus charged us withal.” Again he saith: Sceleratus Porphyrius in primo libro, quem scriptis adversus nos, objectit, Petrum a Paulo esse reprehensum, quod non recto pede incederet ad evangelium: “That wicked man Porphyrius, in the first book that

\[1\] Grewe, 1565, and H. A. 1564.
\[5\] Hieron. in Process. in Epist. ad Gal.
\[6\] Socrat. 1700. Lib. i. c.
\[7\] Sozom. i. 1706. Comm. Lib. i. in Matt. cap. i. Tom. IV. Pars i. col. 7.
\[8\] Hieron et alius, opus in Bibl. cum G. 1502. Pars i. 6.
\[9\] False.}

\[10\] Avancin
he wrote against us, laid to our charge that Peter was rebuked of Paul, for that he walked not uprightly towards the gospel." So Socrates⁸ and Sozomenus⁹ say, that the Christians because of their dissensions were scorned at of the infidels in open assemblies and market-places, and pointed at with their fingers.

Notwithstanding, such diversity of judgment, as it is an offence unto the weak, and an occasion of ill unto the wicked that seek occasions against God; even so unto the godly it is occasion of much good. For unto them that God hath called according to his purpose, all things help and further unto good.

Nicholas Lyra saith: *Expositorum diversitas excitat attentionem*¹⁰: "The diversity of expositors stirreth up attention in the hearers, and causeth them to consider that men be men, and see unperfitly, as in a glass, as having received faith only by measure; and therefore to search and examine the scriptures, and not to glory in men; that whoso will glory may glory in the Lord."

These two worthy members of God's church, whom it liketh M. Harding thus to control, never differed or disserted in any foundation or principle of the christian faith, but only of one certain conclusion and phrase of the scriptures.

Either of them knew and confessed that Christ's body ought to be adored with godly honour, for that it is joined in one person with the divinity. But the one of them saith, notwithstanding Christ's body be present in the sacrament, yet it is not there to that use and purpose to be honoured; neither have we any warrant of God's word so to honour it. So is Christ's body in us naturally, really, corporally, carnally, substantially, and indeed. Yet may we not therefore one kneel down to another, so to adore Christ, being there present, with godly honour. Thus the whole disagreement of these two learned fathers stood only in this one point, of the manner of Christ's presence. Otherwise their whole hearts were joined and bent together to the disclosing of falsehood¹¹ and hypocrisy, and to the advancing¹² of God's glory.

We wonder not, as M. Harding thinketh, at his strange term, *concomitantia*, which he hath here brought in as a special stay of his ruinous doctrine; notwithstanding St Paul hath charged us to beware of such new-fangled wicked words: but we wonder to see the same term so childishly applied to so vain a purpose. Indeed these terms, *homousios*, *humanatio*, *incarnatio*, are not found expressed in the scriptures. Yet is the sense and meaning of the same terms, as Epiphanius saith, easy every where to be found¹³.

Neither was that name first devised in the council of Nice. For long before the time of that council it¹⁴ was used by Origen, and by other ancient learned bishops; as appeareth well from Socrates, whose words be these: *Doctos quosdam ex veteribus et illustres episcopos... homouisi dictione usus esse cognovimus*¹⁵: "We know that of the old writers certain learned men and notable bishops have used this word homousion." And therefore St Augustine saith not, This name *homousios* was invented or devised; but, "This name was confirmed and established in the council of Nice." Therefore M. Harding, as well herein as also elsewhere, hath reported untruth.

As for transubstantiation, it is numbered here among these words, *homousios*, *humanatio*, and *incarnatio*, as Judas is numbered among the apostles. God wot, a very young name, newly brought at last into the world about twelve hundred years after the birth of Christ, at what time king John was king of England; neither had it any manner face or foundation in the word of God. Yet was the same name given a long while before any such child was thoroughly born. For, as it appeareth by the council of Florence, the east church of Graecia and Asia

---

⁹ Sozom. in cod. Lib. i. cap. xvi. p. 349.
¹¹ Falsehead, 1665.
¹² Avanueg, 1665.
¹⁴ Is, 1611.
received it not, nor never would receive it until this day; neither be the first inventers and devisers of it fully resolved upon the same.

For this word *transubstantiation* signifies a passing or turning of one substance into another. But that, they think, were not tolerable to say, that the substance of bread is changed into the substance of Christ’s body. And therefore Duns himself utterly refuseth and shunneth it; and thinketh it better to hold, that the bread departeth and geteth itself away, and that then in place of it succeedeth Christ’s body. And this is now the common opinion of the schools. But this kind of change cannot in any wise be called *transubstantiation*, but rather *cessio*, *annihilatio*, *successio*, or *substitutio*. Therefore M. Harding must go and seek a new name; for transubstantiation will not serve so well. Thus, after twelve hundred years’ study, they have found out a thing, and yet cannot hitherto tell what to make of it. Yet must their determination herein be compared even with the councel of Nice. Verily, cardinal Beno, that was then alive, saith that pope Gregory the seventh appointed three days’ fast, and a solemn procession, to the end he might have some sign from heaven for the certainty hereof; and yet in the end concluded without any revelation at all.

Now, touching this new fantasy of *concomitantia*, after they had once devised a new religion, it was necessary, for aid of the same, to devise also new words. Whereas Christ saith, “This is my body;” they say, “This is my body and my blood.” Where Christ saith, “This is my blood,” they say, “This is my blood and my body;” and in either part, they say, is whole Christ, God and man. If ye demand how they know it, they say, not by the word of God, but by this new imagination of *concomitantia*. So likewise M. Harding here confesseth that he cannot prove the adoration of the sacrament by any warrant of the scriptures, but only, I, trow, by his *concomitantia*.

M. HARDING. THE EIGHTeenth DIVISION.

What the apostles taught in their time concerning this article, we may judge by that we read in Dionysius, that was St Paul’s scholar, and for that it is to be believed. He adoreth and worshippeth this holy mystery with these very words: Sed, O divinum penterum sanctumque mysterium, cec.: “But, O divine Eccles. Hierarch. and holy mystery, which couchest open to the coverings of signs laid over thee, utter thy light to us openly and plainly, and fill our spiritual eyes with the singular and evident brightness of thy light.”

THE BISHOP OF SARBURY.

I marvel M. Harding would ever allege this place for the adoration of the sacrament. For doth he think that whatsoever is so called upon is therefore adored with godly honour? Or hath he forgotten that in his church of Rome they use thus to salute the holy oil, Ave, sanctum oleum? “All hail, O holy oil?” Or hath he forgotten that he himself in his church thus saluteth a cross of wood, Ave, rex noster? “All hail, our king?” Or that he maketh his prayer and petition to the same material wooden cross in this wise: O crucia, ace, specunica, hoc passionis tempore: aux pro justitiem, reque dona veniam: “All hail, O cross, our only hope in this time of the passion; give thou increase of righteousness unto the godly, and give thou pardon unto sinners?” Or shall we think therefore, either that he giveth godly honour unto a corruptible creature.

[1] Gen. vii. Synod. Sesa. Utit. Sanct. Union. Lit. in Crabb. Concil. Col. Agrip. 1551. Tom. III. p. 476: where all that is said on the eucharist is, that the body of Christ is truly consecrated in both leavened and unleavened bread, and that either may be used according to the respective practice of churches.
[4] That is, he believed, H. D. 1564; that it is to be believed, 1611.
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or that Christ is there present hidden under the form of wood? This might suffice to answer this place of Dionysius. I think M. Harding doth remember that Epiphanius saith: "The sacrament is a thing unsensible," that can neither see us nor hear our prayer. And he knoweth that Pachymers, the Greek paraphrast, in this sense expoundeth the words of Dionysius: O divinum et sacrarium mysterium. Aftaur illuid, tanquam ren animatum, &c.8: "He speaketh unto the sacrament, as if it were a thing endued with sense and life. And well. For so Gregory the great divine saith: O magnum et sanctum pascha: 'O great and holy passover.' For our Lord Jesus Christ, as he is our passover, so is he that holy mystery. And unto him the bishop directeth his speech." Unto him, being in heaven, not unto the thing that presently lieth before him upon the table. And that this was Dionysius' very meaning, it appeareth by that immediately went before: Ingratiamur ab effectis ad causas9: "Let us enter from these outward effects into the causes;" that is to say, let us withdraw our eyes from the visible sacraments, and spiritually let us behold Christ, whose sacraments they be, and who by the same is represented. In like manner Dionysius speaketh of the consecration of the oil: Adducamus vela, &c.10: "Let us remove the vails, and behold that spiritual brightness itself," &c. By which spiritual brightness doubtless he meant Christ. Thus he teacheth us with our bodily eyes to see one thing, and with our spiritual eyes to see another; with our bodily eyes the things that be present; with our spiritual eyes the things that be absent. For the more likelihood hereof let us consider what words St Andrew useth to the very material wooden cross of his execution. Salve crux, &c.11: "All hall, thou cross, that here standest thus long looking for me. I come merrily unto thee. For I know thy secrecy: I know thy mystery: I see in thee the things that are promised unto me of my Lord. Receive thou me, O thou chosen cross, that am thus humble for my God; and help the poor servant unto his Master." Here are plain words of invocation; here is manifest adoration. Yet may the force of these words make us believe that St Andrew indeed gave godly honour to a cross of tree?

But, because M. Harding seemeth to make some account of this place of Dionysius, let us answer one mystery by another. St Ambrose speaketh thus to the water of baptism: O aqua, quae humano aspersum sanguine, &c.12: 'O thou water that hast washed the world, stained with man's blood. O thou water that deservedst to be a sacrament of Christ. Thou beginnest, thou fulfillest the perfect mysteries," &c. Must we needs think, because St Ambrose thus speaketh unto, and calleth upon the water, that therefore either the water had ears, and heard him, or Christ himself was there corporally present in the water? Doubtless, both bread and water are material elements, and void of life: therefore, as St Ambrose spake unto the one, even so and none otherwise did Dionysius speak unto the other. But forasmuch as M. Harding seemeth for Amphilochois' sake to brook well all news that come from Verona, let us see with what devotion they teach us there to call upon our lady's girdle. The words of the prayer are these: O veneranda zona, . . . fac nos heredes aeternae et beatae vitae: et hanc nostram vitam [ab] interitu . . . conserva . . . Tuam hæreditatem, tuum populum O interemerata zona interemerata conserva. . . Habeamus te vires et auxilium; murum et propugnaculum; portum et salutare refugium:13: 'O blessed girdle, make us the inheritors of ever-
lasting and blessed life; and keep our present life from destruction. O unspeckled girdle of the unspeckled virgin, save thine inheritance; O save thy people. Be thou our strength, our help, our wall, our fort, our haven, our refuge.” This prayer beareth the name of one Euthymius, as it is supposed, an ancient learned Greek father, set forth this last year by Aloysius Lipomansus the bishop of Verona, and printed both in Venice and in Lovaine in two great huge volumes of like stuff. And lest the matter should seem to want earnest, the good catholic father and learned bishop of Verona, Lipomansus, hath specially marked the place in the margin in this sort: O quam magna et mira petit a veneranda zona! “O how great, and how marvellous things he desireth of this blessed girdle!” All this notwithstanding, I trow M. Harding will not say that either Euthymius or Lipomansus would have us to worship our lady’s girdle with godly honour.

M. HARDING. THE NINETEENTH DIVISION.

Origen teacheth us how to adore and worship Christ in the sacrament before we receive it, after this form of words: Quaando sanctum cibum, &c.²: Hom. s. in De- vereus Evangelii Iocet.

“When thou receivest the holy meat, and that uncorrupt banquet, when thou enjoyest the bread and cup of life, thou eatest and drinkest the body and blood of our Lord: then our Lord entereth in under thy roof. And therefore thou also, humbling thyself, follow this centurion or captain, and say: ‘Lord, I am not worthy that thou enter under my roof.’” For where he entereth in unworthily, there he entereth in to the condemnation of the receiver.”

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

O how easy a matter it is to deceive the ignorant! Origen in that whole place speaketh not one word, neither of worshipping the sacrament, nor of Christ’s real or corporal being therein, nor of material¹ entering into our bodies. But, taking occasion of the centurion, that thought himself unworthy to receive Christ into his house, he sheweth by what ways and means Christ useth to enter into the faithful. And two special ways he expressly nameth in that place: the one when any godly man cometh to us; the other when we receive the holy communion. His words be these: Quando sancti et Deo acceptabiles ecclesiarum antistes, &c.²: “When holy bishops, acceptable unto God, enter into thy house, then by them the Lord doth enter. And be thou persuaded that thou receivest God himself. Another man is, when thou receivest that incorruptible and holy banquet.” Thus, by this holy father’s judgment, as Christ entereth into us by a bishop or holy man, even so he entereth into us by the receiving of the holy mysteries. And so likewise he saith in the first homily of the same book: Per evangelistarum et apostolorum pradicationem, &c.⁶: “God is with us by the preaching of the evangelists and apostles, by the sacrament of his holy body and blood, and by the sign of the glorious cross. By all these things God cometh to us, and is in us; as he himself saith: ’Behold, I am with you all days, until the consummation of the world.’” Thus in the old testament, when the ark of God was lifted up, it seemed God himself was lifted up. And therefore, in lifting up thereof, the priests said, Exsurgat Deus: “Let the Lord arise;” and when the ark was brought into the camp, they said, “God himself was come;” and when the ark was taken, they said, “The glory of Israel was taken.”

¹ Id. ibid. p. 292; where quam mira et magna.
³ Thy, 1565.
⁴ His material, 1565.
⁵ Acceptabilis, 1611.
⁶ Id. ibid. Hom. i. p. 291. See before, page 499. The author proceeds: Per ista ergo omnia nobiscum Deus, et ad nos atque in nobis, scilicet ipsa sit: Ecce ergo roburum sum omnibus diebus usque ad consummationem seculi.”
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Neither may we think that Origen meant any corporal or real entering of Christ into our houses. His own words and exposition are to the contrary. For thus he writeth in the same place: *Tantum die verbo: . . . tantum veni verbo: verbum aspectus tuus est, opusque est consummatum: . . . ostende absens corpore, quod presens spiritu consummari potest:* "Only, O Lord, speak thou the word: only come by the word: thy word is thy sight, and a perfitæ work: being absent in thy body, shew that thou art able to make perfect, being present in spirit." So saith Christ: "I and my Father will come unto him, and will make our abode in him." In which words we may not conceive any material or corporal coming. Therefore, whencesoever Christ entereth thus into our house, whether it be by some holy man, or by the sacrament of his body, or by the sign of the cross, or, as St Augustine saith, by faith, or by the sacrament of baptism, Origen teacheth us to humble our hearts, and to say at every such coming or presence: "O Lord, I am not worthy that thou shouldest thus enter into my house." If M. Harding will gather hereof that Origen teacheth us to adore the sacrament, then must he also say that Origen likewise teacheth us to adore the bishop, or any other godly man, and that even as God, and with godly honour.

M. HARDING. THE TWENTIETH DIVISION.

What can be thought of St Cyprian, but that he adored the invisible thing of this sacrament, which is the body and blood of Christ, seeing that he confesseth the Godhead to be in the same, no less than it was in the person of Christ, which he uttereth by these words? Panis iste quem Dominus discipulis porrigebat, &c.\(^8\): "This bread, which our Lord gave to his disciples, changed not in shape, but in nature, by the almighty power of God, is made flesh. And as in the person of Christ the manhood was seen, and the Godhead was hidden; even so the divine essence hath unspeakably infused itself into the visible sacrament."

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

This place of St Cyprian is often alleged by M. Harding as matter invincible; and to answer it severally in every place it would be tedious. Wherefore I thought it good to refer thee, gentle reader, to the second division of the tenth article, and to the fourth division of the twenty-first article, where it shall be answered more at large. Howbeit, thus much may we note by the way, that St Cyprian in this place speaketh not one word of the adoration of the sacrament. As for M. Harding’s guesses, they import no proof. By the way, as St Cyprian saith the divine essence, as M. Harding turneth it, infuseth itself into the visible sacrament; so doth Paulinus say of the water of baptism: *Concipit unda Deum*: "The water conceiveth or receiveth God." And St Augustine, speaking likewise of baptism: *Sacramento suo divina virtus assistit*: "The divine power of God is assistant unto the sacrament."

M. HARDING. THE TWENTY-FIRST DIVISION.

Chrysostom hath a notable place for the adoration of Christ’s body in the sacrament, in his commentaries upon St Paul, where he affirmeth also the (169) real presence and the sacrifice. "Let us not, let us not," saith he, "be willing impatiently to kill ourselves. And when thou seest that body set forth, say with thyself: ‘For cause of this body I am no longer earth and ashes; no

\[^7\] Id. ibid. Hor. v. p. 308.
\[^8\] Thy. 1565, 1609.
\[^13\] Theeself, 1565.
\[^14\] Avanceth, 1565.
longer captive, but free. This body, fastened (on the cross) and beaten, was not overcome with death." After this he exhorteth all to adore and worship our Lord's body in the sacrament. * * * This body," saith he, "the wise men worshipped in the stall; and having taken a long journey, being both wicked and aliens, with very great terror and trembling adored him. Wherefore let us follow at least those aliens—us, I say, that are citizens of heaven. For they, whereas they saw but that stall and cabin only, and none of all the things thou seest now, came, notwithstanding, with the greatest reverence and fear that was possible. But thou seest it not in a stall of beasts, but on the altar; not a woman to hold it in her arms, but a priest present, and the Holy Ghost plentifully spread upon the sacrifice!" This father in his mass maketh a prayer in presence of the blessed sacrament, almost with the same words that St. Basil did: Attende, Domine Jesu Christe, Deus noster, &c. 2: "Look upon us, O Lord Jesus Christ, our God, from thy holy tabernacle, and from the throne of the glory of thy kingdom, and come to sanctify us; who sittest on high with the Father, and art here invisibly with us; and make us worthy by thy mighty hand, that we may be partakers of thy unspotted body and precious blood, and through us all the people."

In the same Chrysostom's liturgy or mass a most evident testimony of adoration of the sacrament is thus uttered: Sacerdos adorat, et diaconus in eo quo est loco, ter secreto dicentes: Deus propitius est, &c. 4: "The priest adoreth, and the deacon likewise in the place where he standeth in, saying three times secretely: 'God be merciful to me a sinner.' So the people, and likewise all, make their adoration devoutly and reverently."

In the same father is another prayer, which the Greek priests do use to this day at their adoration of Christ's body in the sacrament, and it is expressed in these words: * * Domine, non sum dignus, &c. 5: "Lord, I am not worthy that thou enter under the filthy roof of my soul. But as thou tookest in good part to lie in the den and stall of brute beasts, and, in the house of Simon the leper, receivedst also a harlot and a sinner like me coming unto thee; vouchease also to enter into the stall of my soul, void of reason, and into my filthy body, being dead and lepers. And as thou didst not abhor the soul of a harlot, kissing thine undefiled feet; so, my Lord God, abhor not me, though a sinner, but vouchease of thy goodness and benignity that I may be made partaker of thy most holy body and blood."

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURRY.

The answer that is already made unto Dionysius and Origen may also serve to that is here alleged of Chrysostom. Yet, for some further declaration of Chrysostom's meaning, it may please thee, good christian reader, to understand that Chrysostom, in the very same homily here alleged, writeth thus: Quid significat panis? Corpus Christi 6: "What doth the bread signify? The body of Christ." And in his homilies upon St. Matthew he writeth thus: In istis vasis non est verum corpus

---


2. [Chrysost. Lit. in Lit. Sanct. Patr. Par. 1500. p. 103. See before, pages 485, 5.]

3. [In quo, A. H. 1664.]

4. [Id. ibid.]

5. [Καὶ οὔ, οἷον εἰμὶ ἄξιος, ἵνα ἐν τῷ πνεύματι σπουδαίες τῆς ὑπάρξεως μου ἐπισκόπησίς ἄλλῳ εὐκράτειαν ἐν πνεύματι, καὶ φθόγγον ἡμῶν κατάληψις, καὶ εἰς τὴν Σμίλικιον τοῦ λευκοῦ, καὶ τῷ ἑαυτῷ τῷ πόρῳ τῆς ἁμαρτίας προσεκόπτως καὶ ταταξάμενος αὐτὸν κατάληψις, καὶ εἰς τὴν ἐστίνος τοῦ ἑκάστου κατάληψις τῶν ἁμαρτίων σου πόρους, ὦ ἄνωθεν, ἀλλ' ἐκείνος ἰδού μὲν τούτῳ καταλαμβάνων σοι καταλαμβάνεις μόνον, ἀλλ' ἐκείνος καταλαμβάνεις μόνον καταλαμβάνεις μόνον καταλαμβάνεις μόνον. —Id. ibid. pp. 104, 5.]

6. [Id. in Epist. 1. ad Cor. Hom. xxiv. Tom. X. p. 213. The Greek text is, τῷ γὰρ ἔστιν ὁ ἐρωτότων.]
Christi, sed mysterium corporis ejus continetur: “In these vessels is not the very body of Christ, but a mystery of his body is therein contained.” And therefore, in the same homily upon the epistle to the Corinthians, he withdraweth the minds of the people from the sensible elements of the bread and the wine, and lifteth them up by spiritual cogitations into heaven. Thus he speaketh unto the people: Ubi cadaver, hie aquilae. Cadaver est Domini corpus propter mortem... Aquilas autem appellarit, ut ostendat, ad alta eum oportere contendere, qui ad hoc corpus accedit: “Where as the carcasse is, there are the eagles. The carcasse is the Lord’s body, because of his death. But eagles he nameth to shew, that he must flee on high that will come near to that body.” Afterward he addeth thus: Ascende ergo ad celi portas, et diligenter attende; imo non coli, sed coli colorum: et tune, quod dicimus, intueberis: “Therefore go up unto the gates of heaven, and mark diligently; nay, I say not to the gates of heaven, but of the heaven of heavens: then shalt thou see the things that I speak of.” Thus therefore that godly father Chrysostom dealeth with his people, as if they were already in heaven, and willeth them to behold, not the bread and wine, which are things corruptible, but the very body and blood of Christ; not the outward sacrament, but the substance of the sacrament; not the things that lie present before them, but the things that, touching bodily presence, are away. For in the holy communion there is none other sight laid before us, but only the cross and death of Christ, and that Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of the world. “And the very cogitation hereof,” saith St Augustine, “so moveth our hearts, as if we saw Christ hanging presently before us upon his cross.”

In this wise therefore, having removed the people’s hearts into heaven, and placed them even in the sight of Christ, he saith further unto them: For this body’s sake thou art no longer dust and ashes; this body hath made thee free; this body was broken for thee upon the cross; this body must we adore, as the wise men did; this body not now upon the earth, but at the right hand of God in heaven; this body that thou seest with thy spirit, and touchest with thy faith, whereof the sacrament thou receivest is a mystery. So saith Emissenus: Sacrum Dei tuæ corporis... fide respice,... mente continge, cordis manu... suspice: “With thy faith behold the holy body of thy God, touch it with thy mind, receive it with the hand of thy heart.”

But M. Harding will reply, Chrysostom saith: “As Christ was in the stall, so is he now upon the altar; and as he was sometimes in the woman’s arms, so is he now in the priest’s hands.” True it is Christ was there, and Christ is here; but not in one or like sort of being. For he was in the stall by bodily presence; upon the holy table he is by way of a sacrament. The woman in his arms held him really; the priest in his hands holdeth him only in a mystery. So saith St Paul: “Christ dwelleth in our hearts;” and no doubt the same Christ that lay in the stall. It is one and the same Christ; but the difference standeth in the manner of his being there: for in the stall he lay by presence of his body; in our hearts he lieth by presence of faith.

If this exposition seem to M. Harding over exquisite or curious, then will I say further: Christ is so upon the table as the faithful people is upon the table. St Augustine, speaking to the people, saith thus: Vos estis in mensa,... vos estis in calicem: “You are upon the table, you are in the cup.” But the people is not there grossly, really, and indeed, but in a mystery. Even so is Christ’s body upon the table, not grossly, not really, or indeed, but in a mystery. And as Chrysostom saith, “The priest holdeth Christ in his hand;” even so St Gregory saith, “Abel held Christ in his hand;” and that four thousand years before Christ was born; and yet, not a bare sign, or a naked token, but the very same Christ
that Esay saw, and that John Baptist pointed with his finger. For thus stand his words: *Quem Johannes in ostensione, quem Esaias in locutione, hunc Abel significando in manibus tenuit*. Thus Chrysostom saith the priest holdeth Christ in his hand, as John Baptist held him, as Esay held him, as Abel held him.

And that this was Chrysostom's meaning; it appeareth by the very form and order of his words; for he saith: Thou seest the Holy Ghost: thou seest and touchest that princely body. Thus he speaketh of a spiritual seeing and touching, wherewith we see and touch things, be they never so far absent from us. For otherwise, touching bodily sight, M. Harding knoweth the Holy Ghost cannot be seen; and by his own doctrine the body of Christ is then invisible.

But lest M. Harding take occasion hereof to say, This is a fantastical and a vain kind of seeing; let him remember the words that St Hierome writeth to Paula and Eustochium, touching their abode at Bethlem: *Magas... tria deferentes munera in visione beatis oculis vidistis*. *Ipsa eadem munera... jide Deo obtulisti*; ... *cum isdem magia Deum puerum in praecepto adorasti*; 2: "Thou sawest with thy happy eyes the wise men carrying their three sorts of presents: thou tookest the same presents and offeredst them unto God by faith: with the same wise men thou adoredst God being a child in the manger." She saw the wise men, and yet saw them not: she received their presents, and yet received them not: she adored the child in the manger, and yet the child was not there. Thus she did, not verily or indeed, and yet not vainly, nor by way of fancy notwithstanding; but truly and effectually, by presence of faith.

Thus did the wise men see Christ: thus do we now see Christ. Thus did they worship him: thus do we worship him. They saw him and worshipped him, being in earth: we see him and worship him, being in heaven. They had him bodily present: we have him bodily absent, and present only to our faith.

And in this behalf St Ambrose saith: *Magis videtur, quod non videtur*; 3: "It is best seen that is not seen." That is to say, we see more certainly with our faith than we can see with the eyes of our body. For our bodily eye may deceive us; but the eye of our soul, which is faith, cannot deceive us.

M. Harding's reason hereof standeth thus: The priest at the time of the holy ministration said, "O God, be merciful to me, being a sinner:" and, "Look upon us, O Lord Jesus Christ our God, from thy holy tabernacle, and from the throne of thy glory:" ergo he made his prayers and gave adoration to the sacrament. Of the same premises he might much better conclude the contrary: The priest withdrew his mind from these sensible and corruptible elements, and adored Christ being in heaven in his tabernacle, and in the throne of his glory; ergo, he did not adore the sacrament.

M. HARDING. THE TWENTY-SECOND DIVISION.

St Ambrose, after long search and discussion how that saying of the prophet might be understood, "Adore and worship ye his footstool, because it is holy," at length concludeth so as by the footstool he understandeth the earth; because it is written, "Heaven is my seat, and the earth is my footstool:" and because the earth is not to be adored, for that it is a creature, by this earth he understandeth that earth which our Lord Jesus took in the assumption of his flesh of the virgin Mary; and hereupon he uttereth those plain words for testimony of the adoration: *Itaque per scabellum terra intelligitur, per terram autem caro Christi, quam hodie quoque in mysteriis adoramus; et quam apostoli in Domino Jesu... adorantur*; 4: "And thus by the footstool earth may be

---

understood, and by earth the flesh of Christ, which even now-a-days also we adore in the mysteries, and the apostles adored in our Lord Jesus.”

St Augustine’s learned handling of this place of the psalm, “Adore ye his footstool, because it is holy,” maketh so evidently for this purpose, that of all other authorities, which in great number might be brought for proof of the same, it ought least to be omitted. The place being long, I will recite it in English only. His words be these: “Adore ye his footstool, because it is holy.” See ye, brethren, what that is he biddeth us to adore. In another place the scripture saith:

Isai. iv. 6. ‘Heaven is my seat, and the earth is my footstool.’ What, doth he then bid us adore and worship the earth, because he said in another place, that it is the footstool of God? And how shall we adore the earth, whereas the scripture saith plainly, ‘Thou shalt adore thy Lord thy God;’ and here he saith, ‘Adore ye his footstool?’ But he expoundeth to me what his footstool is, and saith: ‘And the earth is my footstool.’ I am made doubtful; afraid I am to adore the earth, lest he damn me that made heaven and earth. Again, I am afraid not to adore the footstool of my Lord, because the psalm saith to me: ‘Adore ye his footstool.’ I seek what is his footstool, and the scripture telleth me: ‘The earth is my footstool.’ Being thus wavering, I turn to Christ, because him I seek here, and I find how without impurity the earth may be adored. For he took of earth, because flesh is of earth, and of the flesh of Mary he took flesh. And because he walked here in flesh, and that very flesh he gave us to eat to salvation, and no man eateth that flesh except first he adore it; it is found out how such a footstool of our Lord may be adored, and how we not only sin not by adoring, but sin by not adoring. Doth not the flesh quicken and give life? Our Lord himself said, when he spake of the commendation6 itself of that earth: ‘It is the Spirit that quickeneth; but the flesh profiteth nothing.’ Therefore, when thou bestowest thyself7, and fallest down to every such earth, behold it not as earth, but that holy One, whose footstool it is that thou dost adore, for because of him thou dost adore. And therefore here he added: ‘Adore ye his footstool, because it is holy.’ Who is holy? He for whose love thou dost adore his footstool. And when thou dost adore him, remain not by cogitation in flesh, that thou be not quickened of the Spirit. For ‘the Spirit,’ saith he, ‘quickeneth; and the flesh profiteth nothing.’ And then, when our Lord commended this unto us, he had spoken of his flesh, and had said: ‘Except a man eat my flesh, he shall not have in him life everlasting’8.”

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

St Ambrose and St Augustine, as they agree together for the exposition of the psalm, so touching the matter itself, neither do they any wise disagree from

[6 1611 omits not.]
[7 Condemnation, 1609, and 1611.]
[7 The一部self, 1665.]
[8 Et adorate scabellum pedum ejus, quoniam sanctus est...videte frater, quid nos jubet adorate. Allo loco scripturam dicitur, Colum mihi sedes est, terra autem scabellum pedum meorum. Ergo terram nos jubet adorate, quia dixit allo loco quod sit scabellum pedum Dei? Et quomodo adorabimus terram, cum dicit aperte scripturam, Dominum Deus tuum adorate? Et hic dicit, Adorate scabellum pedum ejus: exponens autem mihi quod sit scabellum pedum ejus, dicta, Terra autem scabellum pedum meorum. Anceps factus sum: timeo adorate terram, ne damnet me qui fecit calum et terram: tunc timeo non adorate scabellum pedum Domini mei, quia psalmus mihi dicit, Adorate scabellum pedum ejus. Quero quod sit scabellum pedum ejus; et dicta mihi scriptura, Terra scabellum pedum meorum. Fluctuans converto me ad Christum, quia ipsum quero hic; et invento quomodo sine impietate adoratur terra, sine impietate adoratur scabellum pedum ejus. Suscipit enim de terra terram; quia caro de terra est, et de carne Marie carnem accepit. Et quia in ipsa carne hic ambulant, et ipsum carnem nobis manducandum ad salutem dedit; nemo autem illum carnem manducat, nisi prius adoraverit; inventum est quemadmodum adoraret tale scabellum pedum Domini, et non solum non pecemos adorando, sed pecemos non adorando. Nuncquid autem caro vivificat? Ipse Dominus dicit, cum de ipsa commendatione ejusdem terrae loquatur, Spiritus est qui vivificat, caro autem nihil probat. Ideo et ad terram quamlibet cum te inclinas atque protermis, non quasi terram intuearis, sed illum sanctum, cuius pedum scabellum est quod adoratas; propter ipsum enim adoratas; idea et hic subjicit, Adorate scabellum pedum ejus, quoniam sanctus est. Quin sanctus est? In quibus honorare adoratas scabellum pedum ejus. Et cum adoreras illum, ne cogitatione remanses in carnis, et ab Spiritu non vivificeres: Spiritus est enim, inquit, qui vivificat; caro autem nihil probat. Tunc autem, quando hic Dominus commendavit, de carne sua locutus est, et dixerat: Nisi quis manuexeret car- nem meam, non habebit in se vitam aeternam.—August. Op. Par. 1679–1700. In Psalm. xcviii., Enarr. 9. Tom. IV. cols. 1064, 5.]
CONTROVERSY WITH M. HARDING.

us, nor any wise agree with M. Harding. They teach us humbly to adore Christ's flesh; but they teach us not to adore the sacrament of Christ's flesh. Thus M. Harding hath taken a needless labour to prove a matter that is already proved; but the thing that he should have proved he toucheth not. This is too bold abusing of the simple reader, to bear him in hand that these godly fathers teach us to adore the sacrament, that spake not one word of adoring the sacrament.

But M. Harding will say: We must adore the flesh of Christ. We grant; we believe it; it is our faith; we teach the people, as the old learned fathers did, that no man eateth that flesh but first he adoreth it; and that he deadly offendeth God, and is wicked, and guilty of the Lord's body, that adoreth it not.

But, as we eat it, so we adore it. We eat it sitting in heaven at the right hand of God: thither we lift up our hearts, and there we adore it. St Ambrose saith: Stephanus in terris positus, Christum tangit in celo: "Stephen, standing in the earth, toucheth Christ being in heaven." Again he saith: Non... corporali tactu Christum, sed fide tangimus: "We touch Christ by faith, and not by corporal touching." And, as we touch Christ, so we see him; that is, with the spiritual eyes of our faith, and not otherwise. So St Ambrose saith in the place before alleged: Stephanus intra celos Dominum servit absenter: "Stephen seeth Christ being absent within the heavens." And for proof hereof, that all that glorious sight was mere spiritual, and not offered to the corporal eye of the body, St Augustine saith that St Stephen stood then under a roof before the judges, and saw the heavens open, when with his bodily eyes he was not able to look up and to see the heavens. There we see Christ's body; there we approach unto it; there we touch it; there we taste it; there we eat it; there we adore it. And doth M. Harding think that the religion of Christ is so gross and so sensible that we cannot eat or adore his body, unless it lie corporally present before our eyes?

Verily St Augustine saith: Si resurrexisset cum Christo, dicit fideli, dicit corpus et sanguinem Domini accipientibus, Si resurrexisset cum Christo, quae sursum sunt sapite, ubi Christus est in dextra Dei sedens: quae sursum sunt quaret, non quae super terram: "If ye be risen again with Christ, St Paul saith unto the faithful, and unto them that receive the body and blood of Christ, If ye be risen again with Christ, savour the things that be above, where Christ is sitting at the right hand of God: seek the things that be above, and not the things that be upon the earth." And in this very matter M. Harding alleged he saith: Spiritualiter intelligite, quod locutus sum. Non hoc corpus, quod videtis, manuecaturi estis: "Understand you spiritually that I have said unto you. You shall not eat (with your bodily mouths) this body of mine that ye see." Thus St Augustine in the same place expoundeth and openeth his own meaning. Doubtless, as the wicked may dishonour Christ, so may the godly honour him. But the wicked, as St Paul saith, do crucify the Son of God being in heaven; and Christ, being in heaven, saith unto Paul being in the earth beneath, 'Saul, Saul, why dost thou persecute me?' Therefore the godly, being in earth, may likewise adore and honour Christ being in heaven.

But they will reply, St Ambrose saith: "We do adore Christ's flesh in the mysteries." Hereof groweth their whole error. For St Ambrose saith not, We do adore the mysteries, or the flesh of Christ really present, or materially contained in the mysteries; as it is supposed by M. Harding. Only he saith: "We adore Christ's flesh in the mysteries;" that is to say, in the ministration of the mysteries. And doubtless it is our duty to adore the body of Christ in the word of God, in the sacrament of baptism, in the mysteries of Christ's body and blood, and wheresoever we see any step or token of it, specially in the holy mysteries of conversation directed Hierome: Christ is in the soul, in the soul. And Ambrose
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mysteries; for that there is lively laid forth before us the whole story of Christ's conversation in the flesh. But this adoration, as it is said before, neither is directed to the sacraments, nor requireth any corporal or real presence. So St Hierome saith: "Paula adored Christ in the stall," and that he himself adored Christ in the grave. And St Chrysostom teacheth us to adore Christ's body in the sacrament of baptism. Yet neither was Christ's body then really present in the stall, or grave; nor is it now present in the water of baptism. Thus St Ambrose saith: "We adore the flesh of Christ in the mysteries."

M. HARDING. THE TWENTY-THIRD DIVISION.

Again, St Augustine sheweth the manner and custom of his time touching the adoration of Christ in the sacrament, writing thus ad Honoratum upon the verse of the 21st Psalm, Edent pauperes, et saturabantur, that is, "The poor shall eat, and be filled," and upon that other, Manducaverunt et adoraverunt omnes divites terrae, "All the rich of the earth have eaten, and adored." "It is not without cause," saith he, "that the rich and the poor be so distinguished, that of the poor it was said before, 'The poor shall eat, and be filled; and here (of the rich), 'They have eaten, and adored, all that be the rich of the earth.' For they have been brought to the table of Christ, and do take of his body and blood; but they do adore only, and be not also filled, forasmuch as they do not follow him."

In Psalm xxii. Likewise in his exposition upon that psalm: "All the rich also," saith he there, "of the earth have eaten the body of the humbleness of their Lord; neither have they been filled as the poor, until the following. But yet they have adored and worshipped (170) it," that is, by adoration they have acknowledged Christ their Lord there present.

THE BISHOP OF SARCIBURY.

This place may be passed over with the former answer. St Augustine here speaketh of the adoring of Christ, and not one word of the adoring of the sacrament. The whole drift of his talk standeth in an allegory of hungering, eating, filling, and adoring. We hunger Christ; we eat Christ; we be filled with Christ sitting in heaven; and likewise we adore and worship Christ sitting in heaven.

But St Augustine saith: Comedunt pauperem: "They eat Christ being poor." We know that Christ is now no longer in the dispensation of his poverty. "God hath exalted him, and given him a name above all names, and made all things subject to his feet." But St Augustine calleth him poor, for that he so humbled himself, and became obedient unto the death, even unto the death of the cross. In this respect of his cross, of his death, of his poverty we embrace him; we live by that body that was broken for us; we be refreshed by that blood that was shed for us. And thus we eat Christ, and be relieved, and have our life by him only in respect of his blood-shedding, and of his poverty.

The poor that have refused and forsaken themselves eat Christ sitting in heaven, and are filled with him. But the rich eat him and adore him likewise sitting in heaven; but they are not filled. They see that Christ is the very true Messias that was looked for; they see that all things are fulfilled that were written of him in the prophets, and that his name is published unto the ends of the world; they believe that there is none other name under heaven whereby they can be saved. Therefore they profess his name; they believe in him; they eat him and adore him. But they make some account of the world; they forsake
not themselves; they follow not Christ; and therefore they are not filled with him. Thus doth St Augustine expound his own meaning: Inde erat piscator, &c. “Of those poor was Peter, and John, and James, and Matthew the publican. They did eat and were filled; for they suffered the same things that they had eaten. Christ gave to them his supper; he gave to them his passion: he is filled that followeth the same.” Hitherto St Augustine speakeoth not one word of adoration, either of the sacrament, or of Christ’s body, as being really present in the sacrament. Therefore M. Harding was the more blame-worthly thus to add words of his own unto St Augustine, and so utterly to falsify and to corrupt his meaning. It is no good catholic point so to use the old fathers. Verily, whereas St Augustine writeth thus: Nec sicut pauperes saturati sunt usque ad imitationem; sed tamen adoraverunt; “Neither were they filled as the poor, even unto the following; and yet notwithstanding they adored;” M. Harding addeth thereto of his own a pretty little “it,” which he found not in St Augustine; and so maketh it up thus: “But yet they have adored and worshipped it;” and, as if it were good text of St Augustine, afterward he furnishteth it out with this exposition or commentary of his own: that is, “They have acknowledged by adoration Christ their Lord there present.” His friends will hardly think there is so much cunning in his dealing. He cannot lightly lack authorities, as long as he can thus shape them of his own. But St Augustine knoweth not neither this commentary, nor this text, nor ever gave M. Harding to understand of this corporal presence. As it is said and proved before, we see Christ, and worship Christ sitting in heaven. Certainly St Augustine, who best knew his own mind, saith thus: Habet aurum; sed nondum tenes presentem Christum; “Thou hast gold; but thou holdest not yet Christ present.” St Augustine saith: “Christ is not here present.” M. Harding’s commentary saith: “Christ is here present.” Now let the reader consider whether of these two he will believe.

M. HARDING. THE TWENTY-FOURTH DIVISION.

Furthermore, writing against Faustus, the heretic of the Manichees’ sect, amongst other things he sheweth how the ethnicks thought that Christian people for the honour they did before the blessed sacrament, that is, of bread and wine consecrated, did honour Bacchus and Ceres, which were false gods honoured of the gentiles for the invention of wine and corn. Whereof may justly be gathered an argument, that in those days faithful people worshipped the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament, under the forms of bread and wine. For else the infidels could not have suspected them of doing idolatry to Bacchus and Ceres.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

This guess hath neither sense nor savour in it; and therefore I marvel that M. Harding, being learned, and having, as he saith, such store and choice of other, would ever use this for an argument. For the very children in grammar-schools can tell him that the heathens, that adored Bacchus and Ceres as their gods, yet notwithstanding never gave godly honour to bread and wine. And Cicero himself, being an heathen, was able to say: Quis tam stultus est, ut id quo vestrunt, credat esse deum? “Who is so very a fool that will believe the thing that he eateth to be his god?” And in like sort Juvenal, an heathen poet, scorneth at this folly: O sanctas gentes, quibus hac nascentur in agris numina? “O happy is that people that gods hath growing in their fields!” The heathens in their rude gentility thought that Bacchus and Ceres had first found out and taught them the use of
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bread and wine, whereas before they fed of acorns, and drank water; and therefore, in remembrance and witness of so great a benefit, they honoured the one with bread and the other with wine. But that they ever honoured the elements of bread and wine, I think M. Harding is not able well to shew; therefore he might have formed his argument in this sort: The Christians were thought to honour their sacraments, as the heathens honoured bread and wine: but the heathens never honoured bread and wine with godly honour;

Ergo, the Christians never honoured their sacraments with godly honour.

M. HARDING. THE TWENTY-FIFTH DIVISION.

De Consecr. Dist. 2. can. Nol autem. One other most evident place touching this honour and adoration we find in him rehearsed by Gratian, Lib. Sentent. Prosp. “We do honour;” saith he, “*in form of bread and wine which we see, things invisible, that is to say, flesh and blood.* Neither take we likewise these two forms as we took them before consecration: sith that we do faithfully grant that before consecration it is bread and wine, which nature hath shaped; but after consecration flesh and blood of Christ, which the blessing (of the priest) hath consecrated*.”

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

First, this authority here alleged is not to be found, neither in St Augustine, in whose name it is brought, nor in the Sentences of Prosper. As for Gratian, M. Harding knoweth he is a common falsifier of the doctors; and therefore his credit in such cases cannot be great. Notwithstanding, touching the matter, we know that bread, wine, and water, of themselves* be nothing else but corruptible and simple creatures. If we conceive none otherwise of them than we be of themselves, then all our sacraments be in vain. Therefore the godly fathers labour evermore to draw us from the outward visible creatures to the meaning and substance of the sacraments. And to that end St Augustine saith: In sacramentis videndum est, non quid sit, sed quid significat10: “In sacraments, we must consider, not what they be indeed, but what they signify.” So it is written in the council of Nice: Vide aqum? Cogita divinam vim in aqua latet11: “Seest thou the water of baptism? (it is not that it was before). Consider thou that heavenly power that lieth hidden in the water.” So Chrysostom saith: *Antequam sanctificetur panis, panem nominamus; divina autem sanctificante illum gratia, mediatrice sacerdotis, liberatus est quidem ab appellatione panis; dignus autem habitus est dominici corporis applicatione; etiam natura panis in illo remanerit12: “The bread, before it is sanctified, is called bread; but, being sanctified by the heavenly grace, by mean of the priest, it is delivered from the name of bread, and thought worthy of the name of the Lord’s body, notwithstanding the nature of bread remain in it still.” Thus, as Chrysostom saith, the bread remaineth still bread, in his former kind and substance, without any such transsubstantiation or change of nature as is now imagined. The words be plain: M. Harding cannot deny them. And yet, notwithstanding, it is not the thing it was before, because it is also called the Lord’s body. So likewise saith St Augustine: Quisunque in manna Christum intellexerunt, eundem quem nos spirituale cibum manducavere13: “As many as in manna understood Christ, they did eat the same

---


*[9] Themself, 1655.]


spiritual meat that we eat” (that is, the very body of Christ): and so unto them manna was Christ’s body, and not the same thing it was before. And for better declaration hereof, Bertramus saith: Christus ut nunc panem convertit in corpus suum, ita tum mannae de calo datum suum corpus invisibiliter operatur est: “Christ, as he now turneth the bread in his body, even so then in like sort the manna that fell from heaven, invisibly he made his body.” Thus, as the bread is Christ’s body, even so was manna Christ’s body; and that invisibly, and by the omnipotent power of God. Thus are the elements of manna, of the bread, of the wine, and of the water, changed, and are not as they were before; and therefore in every of the same we honour the body of Christ invisible, not as really and fleshly present, but as being in heaven. This whole matter, and the causes thereof, St Augustine seemeth to open in this wise: Signacula quidem rerum divinarum esse visibilia, &c.: “Let the newly-christened man be taught that sacraments be visible signs of heavenly things, and that the things themselves that he seeth not must be honoured in them, and that the same kind and element (bread, wine, water) is not to be taken as it is in daily use. Let him also be taught, what the words mean that he hath heard, and what is hidden (and to be believed) in Christ, whose image or likeness that thing (that is, that sacrament) beareth.” He addeth further: Deinde monendus est ex hac occasione, ut si quid etiam in scripturis audiat, quod carnaliter sonet, etiam si non intelligat, credat tamen spirituale aliud significari: “Moreover, upon occasion hereof he must be taught that, if he hear any thing even in the scriptures that sound carnally, yet he think there is some spiritual thing meant by it.”

M. HARDING. THE TWENTY-SIXTH DIVISION.

Leaving a number of places that might be alleged out of the ancient fathers for the confirmation of this matter, to avoid tediousness, I will conclude with that most plain place of Theodoretus, who, speaking of the outward signs of the sacrament, saith, that notwithstanding they remain after the mystical blessing (171) in the propriety of their former nature, as those that may be seen and felt no less than before; yet they are understood and believed to be the things which are made by virtue of consecration, and are worshipped with godly honour. His words be these: Intelliguntur ea esse, qua facta sunt, et creduntur, et adornatur, ut Dialog. 2. quae illa sint, quae creduntur: “These mystical signs,” saith he, “are understood to be those things which are made; and they are believed and adored as being the things which they are believed to be.” With which words Theodoretus affirment both the real presence, and also the adoration: the real presence, in that he saith these outward signs or tokens after consecration to be made things which are not seen, but understood and believed; whereby he signifieth the invisible thing of this sacrament, the body and blood of Christ: adoration he teacheth with express terms, and that because, through power of the mystical blessing, the signs be in existence and in deed the things which they are believed to be, soothly the body and blood of Christ. For, otherwise, God forbid that christian people should be taught to adore and worship the insensible creatures, bread and wine! Of which he saith that they are adored, not as signs, not so in nowise, but as being the things which they are believed to be. Now I report me to the christian reader, whether this adoration of the sacrament, whereby we mean the godly worship of Christ’s body in the sacrament, be a new device, or no, brought into the church but lately, about three hundred years past, as M. Jewel maketh himself sure of it in [Post, 90. H. A. his sermon 4].

[1] Ipse...qui nunc...panem...in suo corporis carnem...convertit, ipse tune quaque manna de calo datum corpus suum...invisibiliter operatur est.—August. Op. Par. 1679-1700. Lib. de Catech. Rur. cap. xxvi. 50.,
[5] Idem. 1553.,
[6] Id. ibid.; where intelligit, and spiritale.
[7] Id. ibid.,
[8] Id. ibid.,
[9] August. Tom. II. c 3.,
[10] Furt. 1555.,
[12] Amb. iv. cap. iii.,
THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

By these words of Theodoret, M. Harding thinketh himself able to prove both real presence and also adoration of the sacrament; and I doubt not but the discreet reader shall soon perceive he hath proved as well the one as the other. Touching real presence, Theodoretus speaketh nothing; no, not one word. His manner of speech seemeth rather to incline to transubstantiation; whereunto notwithstanding Theodoretus is an enemy, and thinketh it a great folly, proceeding of ignorance, as it shall appear. And whereas Theodoretus imagineth two men to reason together by way of a dialogue, a catholic man and an heretic, M. Harding is fain, for defence of his doctrine, to take part with the heretic, and to use his arguments as if they were catholic. For thus the heretic there saith, even as M. Harding now saith: *Symbola dominici corporis et sanguinis alia quidem sunt ante invocationem sacerdotis; sed post invocationem mutantur, et alia sint?* "The sacraments or signs of Christ's body and blood are one thing before the blessing of the priest; but after the blessing they are changed, and made other things." And he speaketh of the change of substance as M. Harding doth. The catholic man maketh answer: *Signa mystica post sanctificationem non recedunt a natura sua. Manent enim in priori substantia, et figura, et forma?* "Nay, marry, the mystical signs after the blessing (of the priest) depart not from their own nature. For they remain in their former substance, and figure, and form." He saith further: "Yet the same bread and wine, remaining as they were before, are understood and believed and adored as the things that they are believed."

Here, good christian reader, note by the way, M. Harding saith: The nature and substance of the bread and wine is utterly abolished and done away; but the catholic man saith: "The same nature and substance remaineth still as it was before.

M. Harding will reply: But these signs are honoured. Even so St Augustine saith: *Baptismum, ubicunque est, veneratur?* "We honour baptism, wheresoever it be." But for answer hereto, understand thou, good reader, that Theodoret was a Greek bishop, and that the Greeciens never used to give godly honour to the sacrament until this day. Further understand thou, that St Ambrose touching the sacrament writeth thus: *Venisti ad altare: vidisti sacra menta posita super altare: et ipsum quidem miratus es creaturam. Tamen creatura solennis et nota?* "Thou camest to the altar: thou sawest the sacraments laid upon the same, and didst marvel at the very creature. Yet is it a creature used and known."

Here St Ambrose calleth the sacrament a creature, and that twice together in one place. I think M. Harding will not have us believe that Theodoretus, being so godly a man, gave godly honour unto a creature.

But Theodoretus saith they are honoured. This is already answered in the last objection. For, as St Augustine teacheth us, "in sacraments we must consider, not what they be indeed, but what they signify?" And in this sense they are understood and believed and adored, as by signification being or representing the things that are believed. St Augustine saith: *Sacramenta sunt ... verba visibilia?* "Sacraments be visible words." But words are oftentimes put for the things that are signified by the words. So saith St Hilary: *Verba Dei sunt illa quae enuntiant?* "The words of God be the very things that they utter or signify." So Christ saith: "My words be spirit and life:" because they be instruments of spirit and life. And so Origen saith: *Hoc quod modo loquimur ... solemnem et notam.*
CONTROVERSY WITH M. HARDING.

"sunt carnes Christi": "The very words that I now speak are the flesh of Christ." Even in this sort the sacraments are the flesh of Christ, and are so understood and believed and adored. But the whole honour resteth not in them, but is passed over from them to the things that be signified.

M. Harding will say, by this construction adorantur is as much to say as non adorantur; "they are honoured," that is, they are not honoured, but only lead us to those things that must be honoured. Herein is none inconvenience. For so it appeareth Theodoretus expoundeth his own meaning. His words immediately following are these: Confer ergo imaginem cum exemplari, et videbis similitudinem. Oportet enim figuram esse veritati similem: "Compare therefore the image (that is, the sacrament) with the pattern (that is, with Christ's body). For the figure must be like unto the truth." Theodoretus calleth the sacrament an image, a resemblance, and a figure. I think M. Harding will not say that images, resemblances, and figures, be worthy of godly honour. And hereunto very aptly agreeth St Augustine's lesson touching the same: Qui...adorat utile signum dicinit institutum, cujus vim significacionemque intelligit, non hoc veneratur, quod videt et transit, sed illud potius, quo talia caneta referenda sunt: "He, that worshippeth a profitable sign appointed by God, and understandeth the power and signification of the same, doth not worship that thing that is seen with the eye and passeth away, but rather he worshippeth that thing unto which all such things have relation." Here St Augustine thinketh it none inconvenience to say, we worship the sign, and yet worship it not. And this he speaketh, not only of the sacrament of Christ's body, but also of the sacrament of baptism. For so he saith further in the same place: Sicuti est baptismi sacramentum, &c.4: "As is the sacrament of baptism and the celebration of the body and blood of the Lord: which sacraments every man, when he receiveth them, being instructed, knoweth whereto they belong, that he may worship them, not with carnal bondage, but with the freedom of the Spirit." I might add hereto the words of that most fond and lewd second council of Nice: Venerandas imagines perfecte adoramus; et eos, qui secus consinentur, anathematizamus:5 "We do perfectly adore the reverend images, and do accuse them that profess otherwise." And yet afterward they say: Honor imaginii exhibitus referetur ad prototypum:6 "The honour given to the image [(is not given to the image, but)] redoundeth unto the pattern." Thus that council saith: "Images are honoured:" that is to say, they are not honoured.

Now let us examine what construction M. Harding maketh upon these words:

1. Theodoretus saith: "The bread and the wine leave not, or be not change, from their former nature:" that is to say, by this new exposition, they utterly leave their former nature.

2. "They remain still in their substance:" that is to say, saith M. Harding, they remain not in their substance.

Further M. Harding saith:

3. The accidents of bread and wine be the signs of Christ's body: the bread and the wine be no signs.

4. The visible accidents are made the invisible body and blood of Christ: the bread and wine are made nothing.

5. The signs be made the very self thing that is signified, and that in existence, and in deed. And so one thing at one time and in one respect is substance and accident, visible and invisible, and, as they term it in the schools, fundamentum and terminus; which was ever wont to be called a monster in nature. So many errors are scarce sufficiently to maintain one error.

6. Tom. II. p. 559; where carnes sunt Verbi Dei.
Diai. II. Tom. IV. p. 853.
Lib. III. cap. xii. Tom. XIII. Pars I. col. 49; where veneratur for adorat.
[4] Si ecnti est baptismi sacramentum, et celebratio
corporis et sanguinis Domini: que unusquisque
cum percipit, quo referantur immittus agnoscit, ut ea
carnaliter servifice, sed spiritualiter potius liberate
veneratur.—Id. ibid.
also in Concil. Stud. Labb. et Cossart. Lat. Par.
1671-2. Tom. VII. cols. 556, 76.
[7] This clause is inserted from 1563.
[8] Porro episcopum, tribus modis est: &
Dom. in Eo.
cols. 240, &
cum se S}
Now I trust the Christian reader will soon consider how soundly M. Harding hath discharged his promise, and proved the adoration of the sacrament. Verily, of all these doctors that he hath here alleged (Theodoretus only excepted, in whom he would seem to have some colour of aid, who also is already clearly answered), there is not one that any way may be thought to touch, either the worshipping of the outward sacrament itself, or of Christ, as present in the sacrament.

The greatest doctors of that side say that, unless transubstantiation be concluded, the people cannot freely worship the sacrament without occasion of idolatry. Now it is known that transubstantiation is a new fantasy, newly devised in the council of Lateran in Rome: and D. Tonstal saith that, before that time, it was free and lawful for any man to hold the contrary. Wherefore it is likely that before that time there was no such adoration: otherwise it must needs have been with great danger of idolatry. But after that, as it is said before, pope Honorius took order, and gave commandment that the people should adore; pope Urbanus added thereto a new solemn feast of Corpus Christi day; and pope Clement confirmed the same with great store of pardons. This is the antiquity and petite degree of this kind of adoration.

M. HARDING. THE TWENTY-SEVENTH DIVISION.

[Gen. xxviii.]

And whereas, utterly to abolish this adoration, he calleth great danger of idolatry, in case the priest do not truly consecrate; thereto may be answered, that Jacob stood in no danger of conscience for that, by the procurement of Laban, he lay with Lea instead of Rachel; neither for the same was he to be charged with adcopy, because he meant good faith, and thought himself to have the company of his wife Rachel. So idolatry is not to be imputed unto him that worshippeth Christ with godly honour in the bread not consecrate, which of good faith he thinketh to be consecrate. Touching this case, St Augustine hath this notable saying: "We have need," saith he, "to put a difference in our judgment, and to know good from evil, forasmuch as Satan, changing his shape, sheweth himself as an angel of light, lest through deceit he lead us aside to some pernicious things. For, when he deceiveth the senses of the body, and removeth not the mind from true and right meaning, wherein each man leadeth a faithfull life, there is no peril in religion. Or if when he feigneth himself good, and doth or saith those things that of congruence pertain to good angels, although he be thought to be good, this is not a perilous or sickly error of Christian faith. But when as by these things he beginneth to bring us to things quite contrary, then to know him from the good Spirit, and not to go after him, it standeth us much upon diligently to watch and take heed." Thus St Augustine. Thus much for the adoration of the sacrament, or rather of Christ in the sacrament, may suffice.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

The great danger and horror of idolatry that hereof riseth, M. Harding thinketh may easily be salved by the example of Rachel and Lea: and thus he bringeth in God's mystical providence for defence of open error; and thus teacheth us instead of Rachel to take Lea, and to honour a creature instead of
God. Wherein it shall be necessary briefly to touch how many ways, even by their own doctrine, the poor simple people may be deceived, and yield the honour of God to that thing that in their own judgment is no God.

Thus therefore they say: If the priest chance to forget to put wine into the cup, and so pass over the consecration without wine; Or if the bread be made of any other than wheaten flour, which may possibly happen; Or if there be so much water in quantity, that it overcome and alter the nature of the wine; Or if the wine be changed into vinegar, and therefore cannot serve to consecration;

Or if there be thirteen cakes upon the table, and the priest for his consecration determine only upon twelve, in which case, they say, not one of them all is consecrate;

Or if the priest dissemble or leave out the words of consecration; or if he forget it, or mind it not, or think not of it—in every of these, and other like defect[s], there is nothing consecrate; and therefore the people, in these cases honouring the sacrament, by their own doctrine giveth the glory of God to a creature, which is undoubted idolatry.

And, that the folly hereof may the better appear, one of them writeth thus: *Quod si sacerdos, §c.:* "If the priest, having before him sundry cakes at the time of consecration, do mind only and precisely to consecrate that only cake that he holdeth in his hand, some say the rest be not consecrate; but say thou, as Duns saith, they be all consecrate." Yea, further he saith: "If the priest do precisely determine to consecrate only the one half part of the cake, and not likewise the other half, that then, the cake being whole, that one part only is consecrate, and not the other."  

Pope Gregory saith: "If the priest be a known adulterer or fornicator, and continue still in the same, that his blessing shall be turned into cursing; and that the people obeying not this most wholesome precept commit idolatry."  

In this case standeth the simple people: so many ways and so easily they may be deceived. For notwithstanding they may in some part know the priest’s life and open dealing, yet how can they be assured of his secret words, of his intention to adore the substance of the bread and wine?

But the simple people, under a Sarisburian doctrine, *debet praecratione iis et ita esse precise consecrate, but done as a thing which we kneel down to; but saith, the *sine tu decet* God’s person of honour a

Yet n

Ergo, it, Thou: but thee; but knew what I

St. Matthew that is written to be Christ: "No," said Christ: "I do not adore est: audias ut verifer heard that did not so wise, it is time dem was, with an orator, not appointed him that demand with a simple man to be receive the script

[3] Materia necessaria eucharistica est panis frumentarius: qua sine illo non potest fieri consecratio...Queritur hic utrum possit confici ab acetum...Dicit: "Si sit jam perfecte acetum, quod non possit confici ex acetum...Aliquot enim utrum ab aqua vinectar, consecratio impeditur...Queritur si sint quindecim hostiae consecratione supra altare, et sacerdos non e creatum esse nisi duodecim: utrum ullam quindecim erunt consecrate. Berengarius archiepiscopus Compostellanae...ad istud dubium respondet cum distinctione tali: aut intendit praecepe consecratio duodecim et non plures, et non determinat quin sint illae duodecim. Et tunc dicit idem Berengarius quod nulla est consecratio.—Froset. Lib. Lugd. 1499. Lib. iv. fol. 94, 5, 6.  
[5] Praevidit quis de inacuto presbytero videtur, qui...missam celebrare se fingat...gravior...videtur offendere...cum...non solum Deo...sed populo, quem decipit, se astrictat.—Innoc. III. in Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugd. 1624. Decretal. Gregor. IX. Lib. III. Tit. xil. cap. 7. col. 1374.  
[9] People knowing his life, and nevertheless hearing his mass, commit, 1553.  
[10] Si qui sunt presbyteri...qui in crimen fornicationis jacent, interdicimus eis: Si qui vero in suo peccato perseverare maluerint...beneficio eorum veritatem in maledictionem...qui vero hauc saluberrimum preceptum obsolete nobis...idolatria peccatum incurrere.—Gregor. VII. in Corp. Jur. Canon. Decret. Gratian. Decr. Prim. Pars, Dist. lxxxi. can. 15. cols. 988, 9.]
intention, of his mind, and of his will? Or if they cannot, how can they safely adore the sacrament without doubt and danger of idolatry?

But they themselves see well it cannot be; and therefore have devised a simple poor help of their own. They say: We may not adore the sacrament, but under a condition, that is to say, if it be consecrate. And so saith Thomas Sarisburiensis: *Nullus, quantumcumque sit simplex, vel quantumcumque sit discretus, debet precise credere, hoc esse corpus Domini; sed cum haec conditione, si in consecratione rite sit acta omnia.* Alius enim asserit de creatura, quod ipsa sit Creator; et ita estes idololatris. "No man, be he never so simple, or never so wise, ought precisely to believe that this is the body of our Lord that the priest hath consecrate, but only under this condition, if all things concerning the consecration be done as appertained. For otherwise he shall avouch a creature to be the Creator: which were idolatry." By this doctrine M. Harding teacheth the people thus to kneel down and to adore the sacrament: "If thou be God indeed, then I worship thee; but, if thou be not God, then I will not worship thee." Thus, Abnobius saith, the heathens in old times were wont to call upon Jupiter: *Sive tu deus es, sive tu dea* [es]. Whether thou be a god or a goddess, we call upon thee. Thus God's people is led to give the honour of God they cannot tell unto what, and to honour a creature instead of God.

Yet must all this be excused by the example of Rachel and Lea. As if M. Gen. xxix. Harding would reason thus: Jacob, by God's special providence, knew Lea instead of Rachel;

*Ergo,* we may safely adore a bare creature with godly honour, and say unto it, Thou art our God: thou madest heaven and earth: we have none other God but thee; and all this without peril of idolatry. He would not thus dally, if he knew what it was to bestow God's glory upon that thing that is no God. Certainly, this is not the worshipping of God "in spirit and truth."

St Martin was much more circumspect in this case, as may well appear by that which is written of him. For when the devil came unto him, and took upon him to be Christ, and therefore required him to bow down, and to give him honour; "No," said St Martin, "I cannot tell whether thou be Christ or no. Unless I see Christ in the same shape and form that he was crucified in upon the cross, I will not adore him in any wise." St Augustine saith: *Audistis quia Messias Christus est: audistis quia Christus unctus est. Non... sic posuit [Jacob] lapidem unctum, ut veniret et adoraret: aliqui idololatris est, non significatio Christi;* "Ye have heard that Messias is Christ; ye have heard that Christ is the Anointed. Jacob did not erect the anointed stone to the intent to come and to adore it. Otherwise, it is idolatry, and not a signification of Christ." Theophilus, being sometimes demanded wherefore he would not adore the emperor, as the manner then was, with godly honour, made answer thus: *Quia non ad hoc institutus est imperator, ut adoretur, sed ut legitimo honore honoreetur;* "Because the emperor is not appointed to the end we should honour him as God, but that we should give him that honour that unto him appertaineth." So, if M. Harding will likewise demand wherefore we adore not the sacrament with godly honour, the godly simple man may make him this answer: Because it was ordained reverently to be received, and not to be adored, as a sacrament, and not as God. For in all the scriptures and holy fathers we have neither commandment to force us

---

[10 Thom. in Lib. Ill. Sent. Dist. IX. Quest. i. Art. 2. Tom. VII. fol. 37.]
hereto, nor example to lead us hereto. We adore the body of Christ, not only for the turning of an hand, while the priest is able to hold up the sacrament, and that with doubt of ourselves, whether we do well or no; which thing is utterly uncomfortable, and dangerous, and full of terror to the conscience; but we worship that blessed and glorious body, as that blessed martyr St Stephen did, being in heaven at the right hand of the power of God, and therefore without doubt and danger; and that at all times and for ever; and we believe and confess that Jesus Christ, even in the nature and substance of our flesh, is the Lord in the glory of God the Father.