

# OF ACCIDENTS WITHOUT SUBJECT.

## THE TENTH ARTICLE.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

OR that in the sacrament, after the words of consecration, there remain<sup>1</sup> only the accidents and shews without the substance of bread and wine.

[OF THE REMAINING OF THE ACCIDENTS WITHOUT THEIR SUBSTANCE IN THE SACRAMENT.—ARTICLE X. H. A. 1564.]

M. HARDING. THE FIRST DIVISION.

*In this sacrament after consecration (175) nothing in substance remaineth that was before, neither bread nor wine, but only the accidents of bread and wine, as their form and shape, savour, smell, colour, weight, and such-like<sup>2</sup>, which here have their being miraculously without their subject; forasmuch as \*after consecration there is none other substance than the substance of the body and blood of our Lord, which is not affected with such accidents, as the scholastical doctors term it. Which doctrine hath always, though not with these precise terms, (176) been taught and believed from the beginning, and dependeth of the article of transubstantiation. For, if the substance of bread and wine be changed into the substance of the body and blood of our Lord (177) (which is constantly affirmed by all the learned and ancient fathers of the church), it followeth by a necessary sequel in nature, and by drift of reason, that then the accidents only remain. For witness and proof whereof I will not let to recite certain most manifest sayings of the old and best approved doctors.*

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

M. Harding granteth that this doctrine hath no express authority by precise terms, neither in the scriptures, nor in the ancient councils, nor in any old father, Greek or Latin; yet the old fathers, both Greeks and Latins, in their kinds were counted eloquent, and were thought able to utter their doctrine in express and precise words, if there had been then any such doctrine received in the church: wherefore, finding herein such want of all antiquity, we may be bold expressly and in precise terms to say, this seemeth to be a very new doctrine, resting only upon a false position, and a little coloured with drift of reason; which reason, notwithstanding, never entered into man's head within a whole thousand years after that the gospel had been preached. By like position and by like drift the old heretics, the Manichees, held that all that outwardly appeared in Christ was nothing else but accidents; that is, as M. Harding himself expoundeth it, the form and shape<sup>3</sup>, the colour, the weight; and so indeed nothing else but the shew and appearance and fantasy of a body. From such doctors, it appeareth, these men have received their new doctrine. For Doctor Tonsal confesseth, it was first determined in the council of Lateran, which was holden in Rome in the year of our Lord a thousand two hundred and fifteen; and that before that time it was evermore free for any man, without impeachment of his faith, to hold the contrary<sup>4</sup>.

Transubstantiation.

Cuth. Tonst. de Euch. Lib. i. p. 45.

[<sup>1</sup> Remaineth, H. A. 1564.]

[<sup>2</sup> Such the like, 1565, and H. A. 1564.]

[<sup>3</sup> The shape, 1565, 1609.]

[<sup>4</sup> Tonst. de Verit. Corp. et Sang. Dom. in Euch. Lut. 1554. Lib. i. fol. 46.]

Likewise M. Harding's own doctor Gabriel Biel saith: *Quomodo ibi sit corpus Christi; an per conversionem alicujus in illud, an sine conversione incipiat esse corpus Christi cum pane, manentibus substantia et accidentibus panis, non invenitur expressum in canone biblicæ*<sup>5</sup>: "In what sort the body of Christ is there, whether it be by the turning of any thing into that, or, without any turning (or transubstantiation), the body of Christ begin to be there together with the bread, both the substance and accidents of the bread remaining, it is not found expressed in the scriptures." So likewise Duns himself saith: *De sacramentis tenendum est sicut tenet sancta Romana ecclesia. . . [Nam] verba scripture possent salvari, secundum intellectum facilem et veriozem, secundum apparentiam*<sup>6</sup>: "Touching the sacraments, we must hold as the holy church of Rome holdeth. For the words of the scripture might be saved (without transubstantiation), by an easy and truer understanding in appearance." Thus it appeareth by D. Tostal, that this doctrine hath no ground of antiquity; and by Biel and Scotus, that it hath no certain authority of God's word. Upon this foundation, which by their own confession is uncertain, M. Harding buildeth up the whole certainty of this article.

Transubstantiation.

Gab. Biel. de Canon. Lect. 40.

Scot. in iv. Sentent. Dist. 11. Quest. 2.

But he will reply, Christ saith: "This is my body." So the Arian heretics were able to allege as many and as plain words of Christ: *Pater major me est*: "My Father is greater than I." Neither ever was there any heresy so gross, but was able to make some simple shew of God's word. But Christ saith not, This bread is now no bread; or, This bread is transubstantiate into my body; or, My body is really and fleshly contained under the accidents of this bread.

This is my body.

But contrariwise the evangelists do witness, that Christ took bread; and St Paul, after consecration, sundry times calleth it bread; and the holy fathers expressly and constantly affirm, that the bread remaineth still in nature and substance as it did before.

1 Cor. xi.

Nevertheless, in that sense and meaning that Christ spake in, that bread was Christ's body. For in this case we may not consider what bread is in itself, but what it is by Christ's institution. As the body of Christ is his very natural body, so the bread in itself is very natural bread. And yet, by way of a sacrament, the bread both is called and also is Christ's body. So St Paul saith: "The rock was Christ." And St Augustine saith: *Non dicit, Petra significabat Christum; sed, Petra erat Christus*<sup>7</sup>: "He saith not, The rock signified Christ; but, The rock was Christ." The rock naturally and indeed was a rock, as it was before: yet, because it gave water to refresh the people, by a sacramental understanding the rock was Christ. So is it<sup>8</sup> written: *Sanguis est anima*: "The blood is the soul." Which words rightly understood are true; and yet to say, that naturally and really the blood is the soul, it were an error. Unto which words of Moses St Augustine, by way of exposition, resembleth these words of Christ, "This is my body." His words be these: *Possum . . . interpretari præceptum illud in signo esse positum. Non enim dubitavit Dominus dicere, Hoc est corpus meum, cum signum daret corporis sui*<sup>9</sup>: "I may expound that commandment to consist in a sign. For our Lord doubted not to say, 'This is my body,' when he gave a sign of his body." And, to come near to the institution of Christ's supper, St Luke and St Paul say: "This cup is the new testament." Yet was not the substance and nature of the cup changed by any force of these words; neither was that cup indeed and really the new testament. Now, as the rock was Christ, the blood is the soul, the cup is the new testament, remaining notwithstanding each of them in their several nature and substance; even so is the bread the body of Christ, remaining still notwithstanding in the nature and substance of very bread. It is a sacrament that Christ ordained, and therefore must have a sacramental understanding. Verily, as water, remaining still water, is the sacrament

1 Cor. x.

August. in Levit. Quest. 57.

Deut. xii.

August. contr. Adimant. cap. xii.

Luke xxii.

1 Cor. xi.

<sup>5</sup> Gab. Biel, Sacr. Canon. Miss. Expos. Basil. 1515. Lect. xl. fol. 94. 2; where *sit Christi corpus*, and *in ipsum*.]

<sup>6</sup> Joan. Duns Scot. Op. Lugd. 1639. In Sentent. Lib. iv. Dist. xi. Quest. 3. Tom. VIII. pp. 616—9.]

<sup>7</sup> *Petra erat Christna. Non enim dixit, Petra*

*significat Christum.*—August. Op. Par. 1679-1700. Quest. in Heptat. Lib. iii. Quest. lvii. 3. Tom. III. Pars 1. col. 516.]

<sup>8</sup> It is, 1565.]

<sup>9</sup> Id. Lib. contr. Adimant. cap. xii. 3. Tom. VIII. col. 124; where *Dominus dubitavit*.]

[Bread remaineth. 1565.]

Concil. Lat. sub Innoc. III. Anno 1215.

Concil. Florent. Sess. Ult.

Gelas. contr. Eutyech.

Chrysost. ad Cesar. Monach.

Theodor. Dial. primo.

Augustin. ad Infant. Citat. a Beda. I Cor. x.

of Christ's blood; so bread, remaining still bread, is the sacrament of Christ's body.

But the contrary hereof was determined in the council of Lateran in Rome, about the year of our Lord 1215<sup>1</sup>. Howbeit, the determination of that council neither was general, nor was ever generally received. For the Christians in Asia and Græcia, and of all other parts of Christendom, would never agree unto it, as it appeareth by the council of Florence<sup>2</sup>; but evermore refused it as an error. But what special power had that council of Lateran to alter the faith of the church, and to change the sense of God's word, and to make that catholic, that before that time was never catholic, and to make that heresy, that for the space of twelve hundred years and more before was no heresy? Certainly, the old catholic fathers of the primitive church and these young fathers of the church of Lateran agree not together. For Gelasius saith: *Non desinit esse substantia vel natura panis et vini*<sup>3</sup>: "It ceaseth not to be the substance or nature of bread and wine." St Chrysostom saith: *Natura panis in sacramento remanet*<sup>4</sup>: "The nature of bread remaineth in the sacrament." Theodoretus saith: *Christus naturam (panis) non mutat, sed naturæ adjicit gratiam*<sup>5</sup>: "Christ changeth not the nature (of the bread), but unto the same nature he addeth grace." St Augustine saith: *Quod . . . videtis, panis est et calix: quod vobis etiam oculi . . . renuntiant*<sup>6</sup>: "The thing that you see is bread and the cup, which thing your eyes do testify." Here be the plain testimonies of four ancient catholic fathers in this behalf. But these new Lateran fathers contrariwise say: Here ceaseth the substance and nature of bread and wine: the nature of bread remaineth not: Christ changeth the nature and substance of the bread: believe not the witness of your eyes: the thing that you see is not<sup>7</sup> bread. Thus these new fathers, as it may appear, of purpose are contrary to the old. Hereof we may reason thus:

The old catholic fathers understood not this new fantasy of transubstantiation;

Therefore they understood not the remaining of the accidents without substance.

Yet hath M. Harding chosen this as the only foundation of his whole cause.

M. HARDING. THE SECOND DIVISION.

*St Cyprian, that learned bishop and holy martyr, saith thus, In Sermone de Coena Domini: Panis iste, quem Dominus discipulis porrigebat, non effigie, sed natura mutatus, omnipotentia verbi factus est caro*<sup>8</sup>: "This bread, which our Lord gave to his disciples, changed not in shape, but in nature, by the almighty power of the word (he meaneth Christ's word of consecration) is made flesh." Lo, he confesseth the bread to be changed, not in shape or form (for that remaineth), but in nature, that is to say, in substance. And to signify the change of substance, and not an accidental change only, to wit, from the use of common bread to serve for sacramental bread (as some of our new masters do expound that place for a shift), he addeth great weight of words, whereby he far overpoiseth<sup>9</sup> these men's light device, saying that by the almighty power of our Lord's word it is made flesh. Verily they might consider, as they would seem to be of sharp judgment, \*that to the performance of so small a matter, as their sacramental change is, the almighty power of God's word is not needful. And now if this<sup>10</sup> word, factus est, may signify an imaginative making, then why may not Verbum caro factum est likewise be expounded to the

\* This is a blasphemy. For no sacrament can be made without the almighty power of God. With this example M. Harding fighteth against himself.

[<sup>1</sup> Concil. Later. sub Innoc. III. cap. 1. in Crabb. Concil. Col. Agrip. 1551. Tom. II. p. 946.]

[<sup>2</sup> Gen. VIII. Synod. Florent. Sess. Ult. Sanct. Union. Litt. in eod. Tom. III. p. 476. See before, page 534, note 1.]

[<sup>3</sup> Gelas. Episc. Rom. adv. Eutyech. et Nestor. in Mag. Biblioth. Vet. Patr. Col. Agrip. 1618-22. Tom. V. Pars III. p. 671. See before, page 11, note 11.]

[<sup>4</sup> Chrysost. Op. Par. 1718-38. Epist. ad Cesar. Monach. Tom. III. p. 744. See before, page 545,

note 12.]

[<sup>5</sup> Theodor. Op. Lut. Par. 1642-84. Immut. Dial. I. Tom. IV. p. 18.]

[<sup>6</sup> August. Op. Par. 1679-1700. Ad Infant. Serm. cclxxii. Tom. V. cols. 1103, 4.]

[<sup>7</sup> No, 1565.]

[<sup>8</sup> Cypr. Op. Oxon. 1682. De Cæn. Dom. (Arnold.) p. 40.]

[<sup>9</sup> Overpoiseth, 1565, and H. A. 1564.]

[<sup>10</sup> Here this, H. A. 1564.]

defence of sundry old heinous heresies against the true manhood of Christ? Thus, the nature of the bread in this sacrament being changed, and the form remaining, so as it seem bread, as before consecration, and being made our Lord's flesh by virtue of the word, the substance of bread changed into that most excellent substance of the flesh of Christ; of that which was before, the accidents remain only, without the substance of bread. The like is to be believed of the wine.

Natura.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

This place of St Cyprian is often and much alleged, as if every word thereof were an argument, as indeed at the sight and first appearance it seemeth vehement, and soundeth much; but, being well weighed and considered, it will appear in substance as it is. Certainly, of annihilations, of removing of natures, of remaining of accidents without subject, which thing M. Harding hath taken to prove, it speaketh nothing. For answer, first, it is plain by these four ancient learned fathers, St Augustine, St Chrysostom, Gelasius, and Theodoretus, that the bread and wine, after the consecration, remain in their nature and substance as they were before. Which thing notwithstanding, it is not the nature of bread that worketh the effect and force of this sacrament, that is, that Christ may dwell in us, and we in him, no more than it is the nature of water, in the sacrament of baptism, that worketh the effect thereof, and maketh us flesh of Christ's flesh, and bone of his bones. And for better evidence hereof, to compare one sacrament with another, St Basil saith: *Gratia (baptismatis) non est ex natura aquæ, sed ex presentia Spiritus*<sup>11</sup>: "The grace of baptism is not of the nature of the water, but of the presence of the Spirit." And therefore Cyril saith: *Quemadmodum viribus ignis, &c.*<sup>12</sup>: "As water, being vehemently heat by the strength of fire, heateth no less than if it were fire indeed; so the water of baptism, by the working of the Holy Ghost, is reformed unto a divine power (or nature)." So Chrysostom saith: *Elizeus potuit undarum mutare naturam, &c.*<sup>13</sup>: "Elizeus was able to change the nature of the water, and made it able to bear iron." Here Chrysostom saith, even as St Cyprian saith, that the nature of the water was changed; yet the very substance of the water remained as before.

Eph. v.

Basil. de Spir. Sanct. cap. xv. η χάρις οὐκ ἐκ τῆς φύσεως ἐστὶ τοῦ ὕδατος. Cyril. in Johan. Lib. I. cap. xlii. Chrysost. de Virtutib. et Vitia. Hom. 8.

Likewise St Ambrose, speaking of God's marvellous working in baptism, saith: *Non agnosco usum naturæ: . . . nullus [est] hic naturæ ordo, ubi est excellentia gratiæ*<sup>14</sup>: "In this case I have no skill of the use of nature: the order of nature hath no rule, where as is the excellency of God's grace." Again he saith: *Est hoc illud magnum mysterium, quod oculus non vidit, nec auris audivit, nec in cor hominis ascendit? Aquas video, quas videbam quotidie. Me istæ habent mundare, in quas sæpe descendi, et nunquam mundatus sum? Hinc cognosce, quod aqua non mundat sine Spiritu*<sup>15</sup>: "Is this that great mystery, that the eye never saw, that the ear never heard, that never entered into the heart of man? I see water, that I saw every day before: is this it that shall make me clean? I have gone oftentimes into it, and was never the cleaner. Therefore understand thou, that water (of his own nature) without the Holy Ghost cleanseth not." And again: *Per prædicationem dominicæ crucis aqua fit dulcis ad gratiam*<sup>16</sup>: "By the preaching of our Lord's cross the water (beside his own nature) is made sweet unto grace." And in this respect St Hilary saith: *Uno Christo per naturam unius baptismi induimur*<sup>17</sup>: "We put upon us only one Christ by the nature of one baptism."

Ambros. de illis qui init. Myst. cap. ix.

Ambros. de illis qui init. Myst. cap. ix.

Ambros. de illis qui init. Myst. cap. iii.

Hilar. de Trin. Lib. viii.

[<sup>11</sup> Basil. Op. Par. 1721-30. Lib. de Spir. Sanct. cap. xv. Tom. III. p. 29.]

[<sup>12</sup> Οὐκ ἔστι γὰρ τρόπος τὸ ἐν τοῖς λέβησιν ἐκχεόμενον ὕδωρ ταῖς τοῦ πυρός ὀμιλήσαν ἀκαταίτην ἐξ αὐτοῦ δύναμιν ἀναμύττεται, οὕτω διὰ τῆς τοῦ Πνεύματος ἐπιρροίας τὸ αἰσθητὸν ὕδωρ πρὸς θεῖον τινα καὶ ἀβύρτον ἀναστοιχειοῦται δύναμιν.—Cyril. Alex. Op. Lut. 1688. Comm. in Joan. Evang. Lib. II. cap. i. Tom. IV. p. 147. See also Op. Insig. Cyril. Alex. in Evang. Joan. a G. Trapezont. traduct. Par. 1508. Lib. II. cap. xlii. fol. 41.]

[<sup>13</sup> Hæc lignum potuit undarum mutare naturam, quas quidem superficie sua quasi tergo ferrum

sustinere cogit.—Chrysost. Op. Lat. Basil. 1547. De Virt. et Vit. Serm. Tom. V. col. 775.]

[<sup>14</sup> Ambros. Op. Par. 1686-90. Lib. de Myst. cap. ix. 59. Tom. II. col. 342; where *ubi excellentia gratiæ est.*]

[<sup>15</sup> Id. *ibid.* cap. iv. 19. cols. 329, 30; where *hoc est illud, and iste me.*]

[<sup>16</sup> ... in hunc fontem sacerdos prædicationem dominicæ crucis mittit, et aqua, &c.—Id. *ibid.* cap. iii. 14. col. 328.]

[<sup>17</sup> Hilar. Op. Par. 1693. De Trin. Lib. viii. 8. col. 952; where *induantur.*]

**Natura.**

Gregor. Nyss. in Vit. Mos. de Sanct. Baptism.

And Gregory Nyssene in like sort: *Natura aquæ præcedente virga fidei, &c. vitam præstat*<sup>1</sup>: "The nature of water (thus considered), the rod of faith going before, giveth life." Otherwise he saith: *Hoc beneficium non aqua largitur, &c., sed Dei præceptum, et Spiritus. Aqua vero subservit ad ostendendam purgationem*<sup>2</sup>: "It is not water (of his own nature) that giveth this benefit, but the commandment of God, and the Holy Ghost. The water serveth to shew us the cleansing of the soul."

Orig. in Matt. cap. xv.

By these examples, I trust it may appear what St Cyprian meant by the change of nature. Verily Origen, that ancient learned father, touching the bread in the sacrament of Christ's body, writeth thus: *Non materia panis, sed super illum dictus sermo, est qui prodest, &c.*<sup>3</sup>: "It is not the matter (or substance) of bread, but the word spoken over it, that doth profit." And therefore St Ambrose likewise saith: *Quanto magis operatorius est [sermo Dei], ut sint, quæ erant, et in aliud commutentur*<sup>4</sup>? "How much more effectual is the word of God, that (the bread and wine) may be (in substance and nature) the same that they were before, and yet be changed into another thing?"

Ambros. de Sacram. Lib. iv. cap. iv.

Notwithstanding this answer unto the discreet reader may seem sufficient, yet M. Harding forceth the matter further with this word, *factus est*. If this word, *factus est*, saith he, may signify an imaginative making, then why may not *Verbum caro factum est* be so expounded? O what simple shifts are these! Is M. Harding able to allege no bar, but that may be pleaded against himself? Or doth he think that this Latin word *facere* must needs signify *transubstantiare*? St Augustine saith: *Nos Christi facti sumus*<sup>5</sup>: "We are made Christs." Leo saith: *Corpus regenerati fit caro crucifixi*<sup>6</sup>: "The body of the man that is regenerate is made the flesh of Christ that was crucified." Beda saith: *Nos ipsi corpus Christi facti sumus*<sup>7</sup>: "We ourselves are made the body of Christ." Origen saith, in like manner of speech: *Spiritus sanctus non in turturem vertitur, sed columba fit*<sup>8</sup>: "The Holy Ghost is not changed into a turtle, but is made a dove." So St Ambrose: *Vieta anima . . . libidine carnis fit caro*<sup>9</sup>: "The soul, being overcome with the pleasure of the flesh, is made flesh." And will M. Harding, upon warrant of this one word, conclude that our bodies be utterly transubstantiate, and substantially and really become the body of Christ? or that the Holy Ghost is verily transubstantiate into a dove? or the soul into flesh? Or in these very words that he hath alleged, *Verbum caro factum est*, "the Word, that is, the Son of God, was made flesh," doth he think that the Son of God left the nature of his Godhead, and was verily transubstantiate into flesh? Doubtless this were a monstrous doctrine, and in old times it was Cerinthus' and Ebion's horrible heresy<sup>10</sup>. Verily Leo saith: *Quamvis . . . Johannes scribat, Verbum caro factum est, . . . Verbum tamen non est versum in carnem*<sup>11</sup>: "Although St John say, 'The Word was made flesh,' yet was not the Word turned (or transubstantiate) into flesh." St Augustine saith of the heretics called Timotheani: *Ad confirmandam hujusmodi impietatem, qua Deum asserunt versum esse a natura sua, cogunt evangelistæ testimonium dicentis, Et Verbum caro factum est. Quod ita interpretantur: Divina natura in humanam versa est*<sup>12</sup>: "These heretics, to confirm their wickedness, whereby they hold that God was changed from his own

August. in Johan. Tractat. 91.

Leon. de Pass. Serm. 14.

Bed. 1 Cor. x. Orig. in Cant. Hom. 2.

Ambros. 1 Cor. v.

August. ad Quodvult. Deum. Epist. Leon. ad Leon. August.

August. ad Quodvult. Deum.

[<sup>1</sup> Gregor. Nyss. Op. Par. 1638. De Vit. Mos. Tom. I. p. 211.]

[<sup>2</sup> Id. In Baptism. Christ. Tom. III. p. 369.]

[<sup>3</sup> Orig. Op. Par. 1733-59. Comm. in Matt. Tom. xi. 14. Tom. III. p. 500.]

[<sup>4</sup> Ambros. Op. Par. 1686-90. De Sacram. Lib. iv. cap. iv. 15. Tom. II. col. 369.]

[<sup>5</sup> Christus facti sumus.—August. Op. Par. 1679-1700. In Johan. Evang. cap. v. Tractat. xxi. 8. Tom. III. Pars II. col. 459.]

[<sup>6</sup> Leon. Magni Op. Lut. 1623. De Pass. Dom. Serm. xiv. col. 176; where *fiat*.]

[<sup>7</sup> Nam et nos ipsius corpus facti sumus.—Ven. Bed. Op. Col. Agrip. 1612. Ad Cor. i. cap. x. Tom. VI. col. 365.]

[<sup>8</sup> Orig. Op. In Cant. Cantior. Hom. ii. 12.

Tom. III. p. 22.]

[<sup>9</sup> Ambros. Op. Comm. in Epist. ad Cor. i. cap. v. v. 5. Tom. II. Append. col. 127.]

[<sup>10</sup> Cerinthiani . . . Jesum hominem tantummodo fuisse, nec resurrexisse . . . asseverantes . . . Ebionæi Christum etiam ipsi tantummodo hominem dicunt.—August. Op. Ad Quodvult. Lib. de Hæ. 8, 10. Tom. VIII. col. 7.]

[<sup>11</sup> Leon. Magni Op. Ad Leon. August. Epist. xxvii. cap. viii. col. 508. Leo quotes this passage from Theophilus Alexandrinus.]

[<sup>12</sup> August. Op. Ad Quodvult. Lib. de Hæ. Tom. VIII. col. 27; where *quæ Deum asserit a sua versum natura*. The Benedictine editors throw this into a note, as being a spurious addition to Augustine's treatise.]

nature (and made man), rack the witness of the evangelist St John, saying, 'The Word was made flesh.' Which word they expound thus: The nature of God was changed into the nature of man." Even thus M. Harding saith: The nature of bread is changed into the nature of Christ's body.

Natura.  
Factus  
est.  
Omnipo-  
tentia.

Where is then that great force of this word, *factus est*, wherein M. Harding seemeth to have such trust? He might better say thus: The Word was made flesh, the nature and substance of the Word remaining still; so the bread is made flesh, the nature and substance of the bread nevertheless remaining still. And in this sort the old learned father Tertullian speaketh touching the same: [*Christus*]

Tertul. contr.  
Marcion.  
Lib. iv.

*acceptum panem et distributum discipulis, corpus suum illum fecit, dicendo, Hoc est corpus meum, hoc est, figura corporis mei*<sup>13</sup>: "Christ, taking the bread, and dividing it to his disciples, made it his body, saying, 'This is my body;' that is to say (saith Tertullian), this is a figure of my body." Thus the holy fathers expound what they meant by these words, The bread is made Christ's body.

Omnipoten-  
tia Verbi.

But St Cyprian further allegeth to this purpose the omnipotent power of God, "which," saith M. Harding, "far overpoiseth all these men's light fantasies." Thus he saith, as though that without this light fantasy of transubstantiation God could not be omnipotent; or as if there were such wonderful weight in his outward shews and empty accidents. But God worketh mightily, and sheweth his power omnipotent, not only herein, but also in all other his holy mysteries, as it is before declared in the fifth article, and the fourth division<sup>14</sup>. Leo saith: [*Christus*]

Leon. Serm.  
4. de Nativ.

*dedit aquæ, quod dedit matri. Virtus enim Altissimi, et obumbratio Spiritus sancti, quæ fecit ut Maria pareret Salvatorem, eadem fecit ut regeneraret unda credentem*<sup>15</sup>: "Christ gave to the water that he gave to his mother. For the power of the Highest, and the overshadowing of the Holy Ghost, that caused Mary to bear the Saviour, the same power hath caused the water to regenerate the believer." To like purpose saith Chrysostom: *Ut Saram non natura, sed Dei promissio fecit matrem, &c.*<sup>16</sup>: "As the promise of God, and not nature, made Sara a mother; even so our regeneration by nature is nothing. But the words of God, which the faithful know, being pronounced by the priest in the bath of water, do form and regenerate him that is baptized, as it were, in his mother's womb." So they were wont to sing at the hallowing of the font: "*Descendat Spiritus sanctus in hanc plenitudinem aquæ, totamque ejus substantiam regenerationis fecundet effectu*<sup>17</sup>:"

Chrysost. in  
Epist. ad Gal.  
cap. iv.

"Let thy Holy Ghost come down into this fulness of water, and let it fill the whole substance thereof with the effect of regeneration." Thus Leo, Chrysostom, and other old fathers, acknowledge the omnipotency of God in the sacrament of baptism; yet did they not think it therefore necessary to transubstantiate the nature and substance of the water. The same St Cyprian (albeit indeed it is not St Cyprian, but a far later writer, as by good proofs it doth appear), writing only of the blessing of the holy oil, allegeth likewise the omnipotent power of God above nature. His words be these: *Sanctificatis elementis, jam non propria natura probet effectum; sed virtus divina potentius operatur: . . . adest veritas signo, et Spiritus sacramento*<sup>18</sup>: "It is not nature that giveth effect unto the element of oil being sanctified, but the power of God worketh more mightily. The truth is present with the sign, and the Holy Ghost with the sacrament." Therefore it was no good catholic divine's part so lightly to shake off these new masters' sacramental changes, as matters of so small weight. It appeareth by these examples, that God therein sheweth his omnipotent power, and yet without any transubstantiation.

Totam sub-  
stantiam.

Now if neither these words, *panis natura mutatus*, nor these words, *factus est*, nor these words, *omnipotentia Verbi*, nor all these words together, be able to prove

Cypr. de  
Unct.  
Chrism.

[<sup>13</sup> Tertull. Op. Lut. 1641. Adv. Marcion. Lib. iv. 40. p. 571. See before, page 447, note 13.]

[<sup>14</sup> See before, pages 454, 5.]

[<sup>15</sup> Leon. Magni Op. In Nativ. Serm. v. cap. v. col. 52; where *facit ut regeneret*. See before, page 455.]

[<sup>16</sup> Καθάπερ γὰρ ἐκείνη μητέρα οὐκ ἡ φύσις ἐργάσατο, ἀλλ' ἡ ἐπαγγελία τοῦ Θεοῦ... οὕτω δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς ἀναγεννήσεως τῆς ἡμετέρας φύσεως μὲν οὐδεμία, τὰ δὲ ῥήματα τοῦ Θεοῦ διὰ τοῦ ἱερέως λεγόμενα, ἄπερ ἰσασι οἱ πιστοί, ταῦτα ἐν τῇ

κολυμβήθρα τῶν ὑδάτων, καθάπερ ἐν νηδῷ τινί, διαπλάττει καὶ ἀναγεννᾷ τὸν βαπτιζόμενον.—Chrysost. Op. Par. 1718-38. In cap. iv. Epist. ad Gal. Comm. Tom. X. p. 711.]

[<sup>17</sup> *Descendat in hanc plenitudinem fontis virtus Spiritus sancti totamque hujus aquæ substantiam regenerandi fecundet effectu.*—Manual. ad Us. Eccles. Sar. Roth. 1555. Bened. Font. fol. 42.]

[<sup>18</sup> Cypr. Op. Oxon. 1682. De Unct. Chrism. (Arnold.) p. 47.]



transubstantiation, as it is clear by that is said already; then is M. Harding's foundation not well laid, and therefore we may the better doubt of his conclusion.

And whereas he saith, These new masters think it sufficient to acknowledge a sacramental changing, and to say, that the bread is changed into the sacrament of Christ's body, and that only for a shift; it may please him to remember that Beda, well near nine hundred years ago, expounded the same in like sort; and yet, that notwithstanding, was never counted neither shifter nor new master. His words be plain: *Panis et vini creatura in sacramentum carnis et sanguinis Christi ineffabili Spiritus sanctificatione transfertur*<sup>1</sup>: "The creature of bread and wine, by the ineffable sanctification of the Spirit, is turned into the sacrament of Christ's flesh and blood."

M. HARDING. THE THIRD DIVISION.

Nothing can be plainer to this purpose than the sayings of St Ambrose: *Licet figura panis et vini videatur, nihil tamen aliud, quam caro Christi et sanguis, post consecrationem credendum est*<sup>2</sup>: "Although," saith he, "the form of bread and wine be seen, yet after consecration we must believe they are nothing else but the flesh and blood of Christ." After the opinion of this father, the shew and figure of bread and wine are seen, and therefore remain after consecration. And if we must believe that which was bread and wine before to be none<sup>3</sup> other thing but the flesh and blood of Christ, then are they no other thing indeed. For if they were, we might so believe. For belief is grounded upon truth; and whatsoever is not true is<sup>4</sup> not to be believed. Hereof it followeth, that, after consecration, the accidents and shews only remain without the substance of bread and wine. In another place he saith as much: *Panis iste*<sup>5</sup>, &c.: "This bread, before the words of the sacraments, is bread: as soon as the consecration cometh, of bread is made the body of Christ." Again in another place he saith most plainly, that "the power of consecration is greater than the power of nature; because nature is changed by consecration"<sup>6</sup>. By this father it is evident that the nature (178), that is to say, the substance of bread and wine, by consecration being changed into the body and blood of Christ, their natural qualities, which be accidents, continuing unchanged for performance of the sacrament, remain without the substance of bread and wine.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

Ambrose's books be extant, and known: among them all these words are not found. Gratian, the reporter of them, either of purpose or for want of discretion, as a man living in a very barbarous and corrupt season, allegeth often one doctor for another, the Greek for the Latin, the new for the old; as may soon appear to the learned reader. This writer, whom M. Harding would so fain have to pass by the name of Ambrose, in this very place purposely depraveth the words of Christ, alleging that for scripture that is not to be found so written in all the scriptures; which is not the manner of St Ambrose's dealing.

But, for contentation of the reader, to answer that thing that seemeth worthy of no answer, we must understand that the bread, the wine, and the water, of their own nature, without further consideration, are nothing else but usual and simple creatures. And therefore St Augustine giveth this general

[<sup>1</sup> Ven. Bed. Op. Col. Agrip. 1612. In Epiph. Dom. Hom. Tom. VII. col. 320; where *ejus* for *Christi*.]

[<sup>2</sup> Ambros. in Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugd. 1624. Decret. Gratian. Decr. Tert. Pars, De Consecr. Dist. ii. can. 74. col. 1954; where *vini hic sit omnino nihil aliud, and credenda sunt*. A note in Gratian says, Ex Lib. iv. de Sacram. cap. iv. et vi; but these words are not to be found in the place thus referred to.]

[<sup>3</sup> No, H. A. 1564.]

[<sup>4</sup> It is, H. A. 1564.]

[<sup>5</sup> *Panis iste panis est ante verba sacramentorum ubi accesserit consecratio, de pane fit caro Christi.*—Ambros. Op. Par. 1636-90. De Sacram. Lib. iv. cap. iv. 14. Tom. II. col. 368.]

[<sup>6</sup> *Probemus... majorem... vim esse benedictionis quam naturae; quia benedictione etiam natura ipsa mutatur.*—Id. Lib. de Myst. cap. ix. 50. Tom. II. col. 338.]

Bed. in Octav. Epiph.

This place is counterfeit, and not to be found in all St Ambrose.

The hundred and seventy-eighth untruth, standing in false interpretation, as shall appear. Accidents perform the sacrament. A strange kind of divinity.

rule touching the same: "In sacraments we must consider, not what they be of themselves<sup>7</sup>, but what they signify<sup>8</sup>." So St Ambrose writeth of the water of baptism: *Quid vidisti? Aquas utique, sed non solas... Apostolus docuit, non ea contemplanda... quæ videntur, sed quæ non videntur*<sup>9</sup>: "What sawest thou (in thy baptism)? water no doubt, but not only water. The apostle hath taught us to behold not the things that be seen, but the things that be not seen." Otherwise, touching the very substance of the bread and the wine, he saith: *Sunt quæ erant*<sup>10</sup>: "They be the same things that they were." And immediately before he calleth the sacrament touching the bread and the wine, which are the material parts thereof, "a common and a known creature"<sup>11</sup>.

August. contr. Maxim. Lib. iii. Ambros. de his qui init. Myst. cap. ii.

Yet nevertheless, touching the effect of the sacrament, we consider not the corruptible natures, or outward elements, but direct our faith only to the body and blood of Christ. St Ambrose himself leadeth us thus to say: *Ante benedictionem verborum cælestium alia species nominatur: post consecrationem corpus [Christi] significatur*<sup>12</sup>: "Before the blessing of the heavenly words, it is called another kind; but after the consecration the body of Christ is signified."

Ambros. de Sacram. Lib. iv. cap. iv. Ambros. de Sacram. Lib. iv. cap. iii. Creatura solennis et nota. Ambros. de his qui init. Myst. cap. ix.

But, M. Harding will reply, thus<sup>13</sup> Ambrose saith: *Figura panis et vini videtur*<sup>14</sup>: "The figure of bread and wine is seen;" therefore we must needs confess there are accidents without a subject. If any old writer, Greek or Latin, learned or unlearned, ever used this word *figura* in this sense, to wit, to signify a shew alone without any substance, then may M. Harding seem to say somewhat. If never any writer used it so, then have we good cause to doubt his conclusion. Verily, to leave other old writers of all sorts, St Ambrose himself saith: [*Christus*] *apparet... in figura humana*<sup>15</sup>: "Christ appeareth in the form or figure of a man." And St Paul saith to the<sup>16</sup> like purpose: *Formam servi accepit*: "Christ took upon him the form of a servant." I think M. Harding will not warrant us, upon the force of these words, that Christ had only the shape and shew, and not the very substance and nature, of a man's body: for in so saying he should seem openly to favour the old condemned heresy of the Manichees. In saying otherwise, this word *figura* cannot further his purpose.

Ambros. in Epist. ad Col. cap. i. Phil. ii.

But St Ambrose saith: *Nihil aliud credendum*<sup>17</sup>: "We must believe there is nothing else." Therefore, saith M. Harding, there is no bread. I marvel he hath no further insight, nor better skill in his own arguments: for here he concludeth a plain contradiction against himself. For, if there be nothing else but the body of Christ, and we must also believe the same, then is there neither form, nor figure, nor weight, nor savour there; which is contrary to M. Harding's own first position; and yet by these words we must needs believe it. The meaning is, as it is before said, that, according to the doctrine of St Augustine, in all sacraments we sequester our minds utterly from the sensible creatures, and with our faith behold only the things that thereby are represented.

For answer to the other two places of St Ambrose here alleged, touching the changing of natures, and making of Christ's body, it may please thee, gentle reader, to remember that it is<sup>18</sup> answered before in the second division hereof<sup>19</sup> unto the words of St Cyprian. I trow M. Harding will not say that the changing of any thing is straightway the corruption of the same. Origen saith: *Si... mutabuntur cæli, utique non perit quod mutatur*<sup>20</sup>: "Albeit the heavens shall be changed, yet the thing that is changed is not therefore utterly abolished and

Orig. *περι Αποκων*, Lib. i. cap. vi.

[<sup>7</sup> Themselves, 1565.]

[<sup>8</sup> August. Op. Par. 1679-1700. Contr. Maxim. Arian. Lib. ii. cap. xxii. 3. Tom. VIII. col. 725. See before, page 467.]

[<sup>9</sup> Ambros. Op. Lib. de Myst. cap. iii. 8. Tom. II. col. 327; where *docuit te apostolus non.*]

[<sup>10</sup> Id. De Sacram. Lib. iv. cap. iv. 15. Tom. II. col. 300; where *erat.*]

[<sup>11</sup> ... *creaturam solemnem et notam.*—Id. *ibid.* cap. iii. 8. col. 367.]

[<sup>12</sup> Id. Lib. de Myst. cap. ix. 54. Tom. II. col.

339.]

[<sup>13</sup> This, 1565, 1609.]

[<sup>14</sup> See above, note 2.]

[<sup>15</sup> Id. Comm. in Epist. ad Col. cap. i. v. 15. Tom. II. Append. col. 264.]

[<sup>16</sup> 1565 omits *the.*]

[<sup>17</sup> See above, note 2.]

[<sup>18</sup> That, that is, 1565.]

[<sup>19</sup> See before, pages 565, &c.]

[<sup>20</sup> Orig. Op. Par. 1733-59. De Princ. Lib. i. cap. vi. Tom. I. p. 71.]



put away." The question between us is not, whether the bread be the body of Christ, or no; but whether in plain and simple manner of speech it be fleshly and really the body of Christ. St Augustine saith: *Secundum quendam modum sacramentum corporis Christi corpus Christi est*<sup>1</sup>: "After a certain manner (of speech) the sacrament of Christ's body is the body of Christ." And St Ambrose himself herein seemeth well and sufficiently to open his own meaning. For thus he writeth, as is before alleged: *Post consecrationem corpus [Christi] significatur: ... post consecrationem sanguis [Christi] nuncupatur*<sup>2</sup>. *In typum sanguinis Christi nos calicem sanguinis mysticum percipimus: carnem et sanguinem, quæ pro nobis oblata sunt, significamus*<sup>3</sup>. *Similitudinem pretiosi sanguinis bibis*<sup>4</sup>. *Est figura corporis et sanguinis Domini*<sup>5</sup>. *In similitudinem... accipis sacramentum*<sup>6</sup>: "After consecration, the body of Christ is signified: after consecration, it is called the blood of Christ:" "We receive the mystical cup of blood, in example of the blood of Christ: we signify the flesh and blood of Christ, that were offered for us. Thou drinkest the likeness of that precious blood:" "It is a figure of the body and blood of our Lord:" "For a likeness or resemblance (of the body of Christ) thou receivest the sacrament." Thus many ways it seemed good to St Ambrose to qualify the heat and rigour of his other words.

Now, if M. Harding, as his manner is, will call all these naked signs and bare figures, let him then remember, he maketh sport and game at St Ambrose, his own doctor. But the sacraments of Christ, notwithstanding they be signs and figures, as they be commonly called of the old<sup>7</sup> fathers, yet are they not therefore bare and naked. For God by them, like as also by his holy word, worketh mightily and effectually in the hearts of the faithful. Touching the force of God's word, St Ambrose writeth thus: *Vidimus, ... et oculis nostris perspeximus, et in vestigia clavorum ejus digitos nostros inseruimus. Videmur enim nobis vidisse, quem legimus, spectasse pendentem, et vulnera ejus spiritu ecclesie scrutante tentasse*<sup>8</sup>: "We have seen him and beholden him with our eyes, and have thrust our fingers into the very holes of his nails. For we seem to have seen him whom we have read, and to have beholden him hanging on the cross, and with the feeling spirit of the church to have searched his wounds." So saith St Cyprian: *Cruci hæremus, [et] sanguinem sugimus, et intra ipsa Redemptoris nostri vulnera figimus linguam*<sup>9</sup>: "We cleave to the cross, and suck up the blood, and thrust our tongues even within the wounds of our Redeemer." And in this respect St Ambrose saith: *Baptismus est mysterium, quod oculus non vidit, nec auris audivit, nec in cor hominis ascendit*<sup>10</sup>: "Baptism is (not bare water, but) a mystery, that the eye never saw, the ear never heard, nor never entered into the heart of man." In respect hereof the element of water seemeth nothing. Even so in respect of Christ's body and blood, that are represented, the bread and wine seem nothing. Thus St Ambrose saith, in either sacrament "the power of consecration is greater than the power of nature:" thus "by consecration nature is changed."

## M. HARDING. THE FOURTH DIVISION.

According to<sup>11</sup> the which meaning Theodoretus saith: *Videri et tangi Dialog. 2. possunt, sicut prius; intelliguntur autem ea esse, quæ facta sunt, et creduntur*<sup>12</sup>: "The bread and wine may be seen and felt, as before consecration; but they are understood to be the things which they are made and believed."

[<sup>1</sup> August. Op. Par. 1679-1700. Ad Bonifac. Epist. xviii. 9. Tom. II. col. 267.]

[<sup>2</sup> Ambros. Op. Par. 1686-90. Lib. de Myst. cap. ix. 54. Tom. II. cols. 339, 40.]

[<sup>3</sup> ... in edendo et potando carnem &c. significamus novum testamentum in his consequenti &c.... In cujus typum nos calicem mysticum sanguinis... percipimus.—Id. Comm. in Epist. ad Cor. i. cap. xi. v. 26. Tom. II. Append. col. 149.]

[<sup>4</sup> Id. de Sacram. Lib. iv. cap. iv. 20. Tom. II. cols. 370, 1.]

[<sup>5</sup> Id. ibid. cap. v. 21. col. 371; where *figura est*.]

[<sup>6</sup> Id. ibid. Lib. vi. cap. i. 3. col. 380.]

[<sup>7</sup> All the old, 1565.]

[<sup>8</sup> Id. Expos. Evang. sec. Luc. Lib. v. cap. vii. 97. Tom. I. col. 1378.]

[<sup>9</sup> Cypri. Op. Oxon. 1682. De Cæn. Dom. (Arnold.) p. 41.]

[<sup>10</sup> Hoc est illud magnum mysterium, &c.—Ambros. Op. Lib. de Myst. cap. iv. 19. Tom. II. cols. 329, 30.]

[<sup>11</sup> Unto, H. A. 1564.]

[<sup>12</sup> Theodor. Op. Lut. Par. 1642-84. Inconfus. Dial. ii. Tom. IV. p. 85.]

August.  
Epist. 23.

Ambros. de  
Sacram. Lib.  
Myst. cap. ix.  
Ambros.  
1 Cor. xi.

Ambros. de  
Sacram. Lib.  
iv. cap. iv.  
De Sacram.  
Lib. iv. cap. v.

Ambros. in  
Luc. Lib. v.  
cap. vii.

Cypri. de  
Cæn. Dom.

Ambros. de  
his qui init.  
Myst. cap. iv.

## THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

Here, good christian reader, I beseech thee to consider thus much by the way. In the university of Oxford, and in the late solemn disputation holden there against that godly father and martyr of blessed memory, Doctor Cranmer, the archbishop of Canterbury, the authority of this father Theodoretus was utterly refused in open audience, for that he was a Grecian, and therefore not thought to judge catholicly of the sacraments, according to the late determination of the church of Rome. Which thing notwithstanding, it appeareth M. Harding hath now reconciled him, and made him catholic. Howbeit, this thing seemeth very strange, that one man, in the uttering of one sentence, without any manner altering or change of word, should be both an heretic and a catholic, both together.

Concerning the greatest substance hereof, this place of Theodoretus is answered before, in the eighth article, and in the twenty-eighth division<sup>13</sup>. Here he saith that "the bread and the wine are seen and touched, as they were before." Hereof M. Harding concludeth thus: *Ergo*, there is neither bread nor wine remaining, but only accidents and shews without substance. This argument of itself is strange and wonderful, and the more for that it concludeth plain contrary, not only to the meaning, but also to the express and evident words of Theodoretus. For thus his words lie: *Qui seipsum appellavit vitem, ille symbola et signa, quæ videntur, appellatione corporis et sanguinis honoravit; non naturam mutans, &c.*<sup>14</sup>: "He, that calleth himself the vine, honoured the signs and tokens (whereby he meaneth the sacraments), that be seen, with the name of his body and blood; not changing the nature thereof, &c." And again: *Signa mystica post sanctificationem non recedunt a natura sua. Manent enim in priori substantia*<sup>15</sup>: "The mystical signs after the consecration depart not from their own nature. For they remain in their former substance."

Now let us compare this text with M. Harding's gloss. Theodoretus saith, "The bread and wine depart not from their own nature:" M. Harding saith, They depart utterly from their own nature. Theodoretus saith, "The bread and wine remain in their former substance:" M. Harding saith, There remain only the shews and accidents of bread and wine, without any their former substance. It is a bold gloss, that thus dareth to overthrow the manifest meaning of the text. I trow such dealing should be rectified by a writ of error.

Of these plain words of Theodoretus we may well conclude thus against M. Harding: The substance of the bread and wine remaineth still as it was before; therefore the accidents and shews of bread and wine be not there without their substance. For the rest, how these mystical signs be understood and believed to be the body and blood of Christ, it is answered before, in the eighth article, and twenty-sixth<sup>16</sup> division.

## M. HARDING. THE FIFTH DIVISION.

In Lib. Sent. Prosperi, De Consec. Dist. 2. cap. Nos autem.

"We do not in like sort," saith St Augustine, "take these two forms of bread and wine after consecration, as we took them before: sith that we grant faithfully, that before consecration it is bread and wine that nature hath shaped; but after consecration that it is the flesh and blood of Christ that the blessing hath consecrated<sup>17</sup>." In another place he saith that this is not the bread which goeth into the body (179) (meaning for bodily sustenance), but that bread of life qui animæ nostræ substantiam fulcit<sup>18</sup>, "which sustaineth the substance of our soul."

Substance and nature not changed. Anno 1554.

Theodor. Dial. 1. Immutabilis.

Theodor. in Dial. 2. Inconfusus.

The hundred and seventyninth untruth. For Rabanus saith: "Sacramentum in alimentum corporis redigitur<sup>19</sup>."

<sup>13</sup> Here is an error: it should be the twenty-sixth division. See before, pages 547, &c.]

<sup>14</sup> Theodor. Op. Immut. Dial. i. Tom. IV. p. 18.]

<sup>15</sup> Id. Inconfus. Dial. ii. Tom. IV. p. 85.]

<sup>16</sup> 28, 1565.]

<sup>17</sup> August. in Lib. Sentent. Prosp. in Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugd. 1624. Decret. Gratian. Decr.

Tert. Pars, De Consecr. Dist. ii. can. 41. col. 1932. See before, page 545, note 8.]

<sup>18</sup> August. Op. Par. 1679-1700. Serm. lxxxiv. 3. Tom. V. Append. col. 152. See below, page 572, note 5, also before, page 128, note 1.]

<sup>19</sup> Rab. Maur. Op. Col. Agrip. 1626-7. De Instit. Cleric. Lib. i. cap. xxxi. Tom. VI. p. 11.]

## THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

The former of these two places may be easily discharged by that is answered before to the words of St Ambrose, in the third division hereof. St Augustine speaketh of the changing and advancing<sup>1</sup> of the natures of bread and wine unto a spiritual and divine use, and not of the abolishing of the same. As for accidents and shews standing without subject and substance, he saith nothing. True it is, the bread, before the consecration, was nothing else but bare and common bread; now it is advanced<sup>2</sup>, and made a sacrament of Christ's body and blood; not by nature, but by consecration, above nature. Chrysostom saith: *Oculis intellectus ista perspicimus. Nihil enim sensibile tradidit nobis Christus, &c. Sic et in baptismo*<sup>3</sup>: "Let us behold these things with the eyes of our mind; for Christ hath delivered to us nothing that is sensible, &c. So likewise in baptism." I think M. Harding will not deny but the water in baptism is a thing sensible; likewise, that the bread and wine in the holy mysteries, or, at the least, the accidents and shews thereof, are things sensible. But St Chrysostom withdraweth us from the bread, the wine, the water, and all other like things, that be sensible, to the consideration of the body and blood of Christ, that are not sensible: in comparison whereof, all the rest are consumed, and seem nothing.

Touching the second place, the words be written both in St Augustine, and also in a book that is commonly known by the name of St Ambrose *de Sacramentis*, the meaning whereof nothing toucheth, neither the bread, nor the wine, but only the body and blood of Christ, which thereby are represented. And therefore this place, so unadvisedly chosen, can little further M. Harding's fantasy of empty accidents, hanging, I know not how, without substance.

The words be plain of themselves<sup>4</sup> without further exposition. *Non iste panis, . . . qui vadit in corpus, sed ille panis vitæ æternæ, qui animæ nostræ substantiam fulcit*<sup>5</sup>: "Not this bread that passeth into the body, but that bread of everlasting life, that strengtheneth the substance of our soul." M. Harding knoweth that the sacrament is received into our bodies. Rabanus saith: *Sacramentum . . . ore percipitur, . . . [et] in alimentum corporis redigitur*<sup>6</sup>: "The sacrament is received with the mouth, and is turned to the nourishment of the body." But the body of Christ, as St Cyprian saith, *est cibus mentis, non ventris*<sup>7</sup>, "is meat for the mind, not for the belly." So St Augustine saith: *Panis . . . iste interioris hominis querit esuriam*<sup>8</sup>: "This bread seeketh the hunger of the inner man." *Intus bibendo felix sum*<sup>9</sup>: "Drinking in my heart within, I am made happy." Tertullian saith: *Ruminandus intellectu, et fide digerendus [est]*<sup>10</sup>: "That meat ought to be chewed with understanding, and to be digested with faith." Likewise Chrysostom: *Magnus iste panis, qui replet mentem . . . non ventrem*<sup>11</sup>: "This great bread, that filleth the mind, and not the belly." Of this bread St Ambrose speaketh, and not of the sacrament, that is received into the body. Wherefore it appeareth, M. Harding was not well advised how little this place would make for his purpose. The old father Origen saith: *Accidit, ut simpliciores quidam, nescientes distinguere, . . . quæ sint, quæ in scripturis divinis interiori homini, quæ vero exteriori deputanda sint, vocabulorum similitudine falsi, ad ineptas quasdam fabulas et figmenta inania se contulerint*<sup>12</sup>: "It happeneth that simple folk, being not able to discern what things they be in the holy scriptures that are to be applied to the inner man, and what to the utter, being deceived by the likeness of words, turn themselves into<sup>13</sup> vain imaginations and foolish fables."

Chrysost. in  
Matt. Hom.  
83.

Ambros. de  
Sacram. Lib.  
v. cap. iv.

Rab. Maur.  
Lib. i. cap.  
xxxii.

Cypr. de Cæn.  
Dom.  
August. in  
Johan.  
Tractat. 26.  
August. in  
Johan.  
Tractat. 25.  
Tertull. de  
Resur. Carn.  
Chrysost. ex  
varis locis  
in Matt.  
Hom. 9.

Orig. in  
Prolog. in  
Cant. Cantic.

[<sup>1</sup> Avancing, 1565.]

[<sup>2</sup> Advanced, 1565.]

[<sup>3</sup> Chrysost. Op. Par. 1718-38. In Matt. Hom. lxxxii. Tom. VII. p. 787.]

[<sup>4</sup> Themselves, 1565.]

[<sup>5</sup> Ambros. Op. Par. 1686-90. De Sacram. Lib. v. cap. iv. 24. Tom. II. col. 378.]

[<sup>6</sup> Rab. Maur. Op. Col. Agrip. 1626-7. De Instit. Cleric. Lib. i. cap. xxxi. Tom. VI. p. 11.]

[<sup>7</sup> Cypr. Op. Oxon. 1682. De Cæn. Dom. (Arnold.) p. 44. See before, page 141, note 11.]

[<sup>8</sup> August. Op. Par. 1679-1700. In Johan. Evang. cap. vi. Tractat. xxvi. l. Tom. III. Pars II. col. 494.]

[<sup>9</sup> Id. ibid. Tractat. xxv. 17. col. 493.]

[<sup>10</sup> Tertull. Op. Lut. 1641. De Resur. Carn. 37. p. 406.]

[<sup>11</sup> Chrysost. Op. Lat. Basil. 1547. Ex Matt. cap. v. De Orat. Domin. Hom. Tom. V. col. 716.]

[<sup>12</sup> Orig. Op. Par. 1733-59. In Cantic. Canticor. Prolog. Tom. III. p. 28; where *similitudinibus*.]

[<sup>13</sup> To, 1565, 1609.]

M. HARDING. THE SIXTH DIVISION.

No man can speak more plainly hereof than Cyrillus Hierosolymitanus, an old author who wrote in Greek, and is extant, but as yet remaining in written hand, and common<sup>14</sup> to the sight of few learned men: his words be not much unlike the words of the school doctors. Præbetur corpus ἐν τύπῳ... ἄρτου, in specie, sive figura panis. Item, præbetur sanguis ἐν τύπῳ οἴνου<sup>15</sup>: "Christ's body," saith he, "is given us in form or figure of bread. Again, his blood is given us in form of wine." A little after these words he saith thus: μὴ πρόσεχε οὖν, ὡς ψιλοῖς τῷ ἄρτῳ καὶ τῷ οἴνῳ, &c.: Ne mentem adhibeas quasi pani et vino nudis: sunt enim hæc corpus et sanguis, ut Dominus pronunciauit. Nam tametsi illud tibi sensus suggerit, esse [scilicet panem et vinum nudum], tamen firmet te fides, et ne gustatu rem dijudices, quin potius pro certo ac comperto habe, omni dubitatione relicta, esse tibi impartitum corpus et sanguinem Christi<sup>16</sup>: "Consider not," saith this father, "these as bare bread and wine. For these are his body and blood, as our Lord said. For, although thy sense report to thee so much, that it is bare bread and wine, yet let thy faith stay thee, and judge not thereof by thy taste, but rather be right well assured, all doubt put apart, that the body and blood of Christ is given to thee." Again he saith thus in the same place: Hæc cum scias, et pro certo et explorato habeas, (180) qui videtur esse panis, non esse, sed corpus Christi; item, quod videtur vinum, non esse, quanquam id velit sensus, sed sanguinem Christi, ac de eo prophetam dixisse, Panis cor hominis confirmat; firma ipse cor, sumpto hoc pane, utpote spirituali<sup>17</sup>: "Whereas thou knowest this for a very certainty, that that which seemeth to be wine is not wine, albeit the sense maketh that account of it, but the blood of Christ, and that the prophet thereof said, 'Bread strengtheneth the heart of man;' strengthen then<sup>19</sup> thyself<sup>20</sup> thy heart, by taking this bread as that which is spiritual." And in the<sup>21</sup> III, Catechesi this father saith: Panis eucharistiæ post invocationem sancti Spiritus non amplius est panis nudus et simplex, sed corpus, &c.<sup>22</sup>: "The bread of the sacrament, after prayer made to the Holy Ghost, is not bare and simple bread, but the body of Christ."

It is not bare bread; ergo, it is bread.

The hundred and eightieth untruth, standing in wilful corruption of the author's words and meaning, as shall appear.

Now, sith that by this doctor's plain declaration of the catholic faith in this point we ought to believe, and to be verily assured, that the bread is no more bread after consecration, but the very body of Christ, and the wine no more wine, but his precious blood, though they seem to the eye otherwise, though taste and feeling judge otherwise, and, to be short, though all senses report the contrary; and all this upon warrant of our Lord's word, who said these to be his body and blood, and that (as he teacheth) not in the bread and wine; and further, sith we are taught by Eusebius<sup>a</sup> Emisenus, in homilies<sup>23</sup> of Easter, to believe

<sup>a</sup> Newly set abroad and justly suspected.

[Transubstantiation. H. A. 1564.]

again, creaturas converti in substantiam corporis Christi<sup>25</sup>, "the creatures of bread and wine to be turned into the substance of our Lord's body and blood," which is the very transubstantiation; and sith Chrysostom<sup>b</sup>

[In Liturgia. H. A. 1564.]

saith, panem absumi, "that the bread is consumed away" by the substance of Christ's body; <sup>c</sup> and Damascene, bread and wine transmutari

<sup>b</sup> In comparison of Christ's body, that is represented, the bread is nothing.

<sup>c</sup> Such a supernatural change there is in the water of baptism, and in all sacraments.

[<sup>14</sup> Commen, 1565, and H. A. 1564.]

[<sup>15</sup> Cyril. Hierosol. Op. Par. 1720. Catech. xxii. Myst. iv. 3. p. 320.]

[<sup>16</sup> Id. ibid. 6. p. 321.]

[<sup>17</sup> Ταῦτα μαθῶν, καὶ πληροφορηθεὶς ὡς ὁ φαινόμενος ἄρτος οὐκ ἄρτος ἐστίν, εἰ καὶ τῇ γεύσει αἰσθητὸς, ἀλλὰ σῶμα Χριστοῦ· καὶ ὁ φαινόμενος οἶνος οὐκ οἶνός ἐστιν, εἰ καὶ ἡ γεύσει τοῦτο βούλεται, ἀλλὰ αἷμα Χριστοῦ· καὶ ὅτι περὶ τούτου ἔλεγε παλαιὸς Δαβὶδ ψάλλον, Καὶ ἄρτος καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου στηρίζει, τοῦ ἰλαρῆναι πρόσωπον ἐν ἑλαίῳ· στηρίζου τὴν καρδίαν, μεταλαμβάνων αὐτοῦ ὡς πνευματικοῦ· καὶ ἰλαρῆνον τὸ τῆς ψυχῆς

σου πρόσωπον.—Id. ibid. 9. p. 322.]

[<sup>18</sup> See below, page 579.]

[<sup>19</sup> Thou, H. A. 1564.]

[<sup>20</sup> Theeself, 1565.]

[<sup>21</sup> H. A. 1564, omits the.]

[<sup>22</sup> Id. Catech. xxi. Myst. iii. 3. pp. 316, 7.]

[<sup>23</sup> His homilies, H. A. 1564.]

[<sup>24</sup> Nec dubitet quisquam... creaturas... in dominici corporis transire posse naturam.—Euseb. Emis. Lut. Par. 1547. De Pasch. Hom. v. fol. 47. 2.]

[<sup>25</sup> ...tibi novum... non debeat videri, quod in Christi substantiam terrena et mortalia committantur, &c.—Id. ibid. fol. 45.]

supernaturaliter<sup>1</sup>, "to be changed above the course of nature;" and *Theophylact*, the bread<sup>2</sup> transelementari in carnem Domini<sup>2</sup>, "to be quite turned by changing of the elements," that is, the matter of<sup>3</sup> substance it consisteth of, "into the flesh of our Lord;" and that<sup>5</sup> in another place, ineffabili operatione transformari, etiamsi panis nobis videatur<sup>6</sup>, "that the bread is transformed and<sup>3</sup> changed into another substantial form (he meaneth that of our Lord's body) by unspeakable working, though it seem to be bread; finally, sith that the Greek doctors of late age affirm the same doctrine, among whom

\**Samona* useth for persuasion of it the similitude which *Gregory Nyssene* and *Damascene* for declaration of the same used before, which is, that in consecration such manner transubstantiation is made, as is the conversion of the bread in nourishing, in which it is turned into the substance of the nourished<sup>7</sup>; *Methonensis*, like *St Ambrose*, would not men in this matter to look for the order of nature, seeing that *Christ* was born of a virgin beside all order of nature, and saith that our Lord's body in this sacrament is received under the form or shape of another thing, lest blood should cause it to be horrible<sup>8</sup>; *Nicolaus Cabasila* saith, that this bread is no more a figure of our Lord's body, neither a gift bearing an image of the true gift, nor bearing any description of the passions of our Saviour himself, as it were in a table, but the true gift itself, the most holy body of our Lord itself, which hath truly received reproaches, contumelies, stripes, which was crucified, which was killed<sup>9</sup>; *Marcus Ephesius*, though otherwise to be rejected, as he that obstinately resisted the determination of the council of Florence concerning the proceeding of the Holy Ghost out of the Son, yet a sufficient witness of the Greek church's faith in this point, affirming the things offered to be called of *St Basil* antitypa, that is, the samplers and figures of our Lord's body, because they be not yet perfittly consecrated, but as yet bearing the figure and image, referreth the change or transubstantiation of them to the Holy Ghost, donec Spiritus sanctus adveniat, qui ea mutet<sup>10</sup>: These gifts offered (saith he) be of *St Basil* called figures, "until the Holy Ghost come upon them, to change them." Whereby he sheweth the faith of the Greek church, that, through the Holy Ghost in consecration, the bread and wine are so changed, as they may no more be called figures, but the very body and blood of our Lord itself, as into the same changed by the coming of the Holy Ghost. Which change is a change in substance, and therefore it may rightly be termed transubstantiation, which is nothing else but a turning or changing of one substance into another substance.

<sup>4</sup> Even so *Theophylact* saith: "Nos transelementamur in Christum<sup>4</sup>."

\* These four, *Samona*, *Methonensis*, *Cabasila*, and *Marcus Ephesius*, are late writers, void of credit, yet all enemies to transubstantiation.

This *Marcus Ephesius* wilfully depraveth *St Basil's* words.

Two sorts of consecration; the one perfitt, the other unperfitt.

Lib. iv. De Orthodoxa Fide, cap. xiv. In Marc. xiv.

In Matt. xxvi.

[The treatises of these Greek writers have been set forth of late by one *Claudius de Sanezes*. H. A. 1564.]

Cap. xxvii.

[Transubstantiation. H. A. 1564.]

#### THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

This *Cyrillus Hierosolymitanus* is an old author newly set forth. I will not call his credit into question; notwithstanding many of his considerations be very

[<sup>1</sup> *Damascen. Op. Par.* 1712. De Fid. Orthod. Lib. iv. cap. xiii. Tom. I. p. 270.]

[<sup>2</sup> *Theophyl. Op. Venet.* 1754-63. In Marc. Comm. cap. xiv. Tom. I. p. 249.]

[<sup>3</sup> Or, H. A. 1564.]

[<sup>4</sup> See below, page 577, note 12.]

[<sup>5</sup> H. A. 1564, omits that.]

[<sup>6</sup> Id. in Matt. Comm. cap. xxvi. Tom. I. p. 146.]

[<sup>7</sup> Spiritus sanctus descendit, et... panem et vinum in corpus et sanguinem Christi μεταβαλλει, id est, commutat, non minus quam hepar convertit alimentum in corpus alicujus hominis.—*Samon. Discept. sup. Verit. Corp. et Sang. Christ. in Sacr. Euch. in Mag. Biblioth. Vet. Patr. Col. Agrip.* 1618-22. Tom. XI. p. 477. See also ad calc. Lit. Sanct. Patr. Par. 1560. fol. 26. 2.]

[<sup>8</sup> Quid requiris causam et ordinem naturæ panis transmutationis in Christi corpus, et aquæ vini que in sanguinem; cum supra naturam, rationem, mentem, et cogitationem, ex virgine sit natus? ... scias oportet... Deum... hoc fecisse... ne aversarentur multi arrhabonem æternæ vitæ, et ægre ferrent, carnem et

sanguinem intinentes.—*Nic. Episc. Methon. De Corp. et Sang. Christ. in Mag. Biblioth. Vet. Patr. Tom. XII. Pars i. p. 1192.* See also ad calc. Lit. Sanct. Patr. foll. 25, 6.]

[<sup>9</sup> ... panis enim non amplius figura dominici corporis, neque donum ferens imaginem veri doni, neque ferens aliquam descriptionem ipsius Sævatoris passionum tanquam in tabula: sed ipsum verum donum, ipsum sanctissimum corpus Domini, quod omnia illa vere suscipit, probra, contumelias, vibices; quod crucifixum, quod interfectum.—*Nic. Cabas. Liturg. Expos. cap. xxvii. in Mag. Biblioth. Vet. Patr. Tom. XIV. p. 149.*]

[<sup>10</sup> Idcirco et *Magnus Basilius*... antitypa vocat proposita dona, nimirum quasi nondum perfecta per ea verba, verum adhuc typum quandam et imaginem ferentia. Itaque deinceps statim Spiritus sanctus adveniat precatur, faciatque panem quidem ipsum preciosum corpus; calicem autem, ipsum preciosum sanguinem.—*Marc. Ephes. ad calc. Lit. Sanct. Patr. fol. 28.*]

much like to M. Harding's judgment in this article, that is to say, like *accidens sine subjecto*, "a shew of words without substance." He seemeth both in words and sense fully to agree with Chrysostom, Ecumenius, and other Greek fathers, that never understood this M. Harding's new religion. He shutteth up the hearers' bodily eyes, wherewith they see the bread and wine; and borroweth only the inner eyes of their minds, wherewith they may see the very body and blood of Christ, which is that bread that came from heaven. And herein, notwithstanding his words be quick and violent, the more to stir and inflame the hearts of them unto whom he speaketh, yet he himself in plainest wise openeth and cleareth his own meaning. For thus he writeth: *Ne consideres, tanquam panem nudum: Panis eucharistiæ non est amplius panis simplex et nudus*<sup>11</sup>: "Consider it not as if it were bare bread: The bread of the sacrament is no longer bare and simple bread." Which words are naturally resolved thus: It is bread; howbeit not only bare bread, but bread, and some other thing else beside. So, where they of M. Harding's side are wont to say, *Papa non est purus homo*<sup>12</sup>, "The pope is not a bare man;" I trow their meaning is not that the pope is no man, but only that he is a man, and yet, besides that, hath another capacity above the condition and state of common men. Of these words of Cyrillus we may well reason thus by the way: The sacrament is not only or bare bread; therefore it is bread, albeit not only bare bread. And thus the same Cyrillus, that is brought to testify that there remaineth no bread in the sacrament, testifieth most plainly to the contrary, that there is bread remaining in the sacrament.

Bare  
bread.  
Bare oil.

Catech.  
Myst. 4.

And, although this answer of itself might seem sufficient, yet, good christian reader, for thy better satisfaction, I pray thee further to understand that, as this Cyrillus speaketh here of the sacrament of our Lord's body and blood, even so, and in like phrase and form of words, he speaketh of the oil that they call holy, of the water of baptism, and of other ceremonies. Of the oil he writeth thus, and further by the same expoundeth his meaning touching the sacrament: *Vide, ne illud putes esse unguentum tantum. Quemadmodum enim panis eucharistiæ, post sancti Spiritus invocationem, non amplius est panis communis, sed corpus Christi; sic et sanctum hoc unguentum non amplius est unguentum nudum, neque . . . commune, . . . sed est charisma Christi*<sup>13</sup>: "Beware thou think not this to be oil only. For as the bread of the sacrament, after the invocation of the Holy Ghost, is no longer common bread, but the body of Christ; so this holy oil is no longer bare or common oil, but it is the grace of Christ." By these words there appeareth like change in the one as in the other. As the oil is the grace of Christ, so is the bread the body of Christ; and as the nature and substance of the oil remaineth still, although it be not bare or common oil, so the nature or substance of the bread remaineth still, although it be not common or bare bread.

Cyrl. in  
Catech. Myst.  
Tert.

In like sort he writeth of the water of baptism: *Non tanquam aquæ simplici studeas huic lavacro: . . . ne aquæ simplicitati mentem adhibeas*<sup>14</sup>: "Behold not this bath as simple water: consider not the simplicity of the water." Of these conferences of places we may well gather thus: The water in the holy mystery of baptism, notwithstanding it be not bare and common water, yet nevertheless continueth still in the nature and substance of very water; so likewise the bread in the holy mystery of Christ's body, notwithstanding it be not bare and common bread, yet nevertheless in nature and substance is bread still.

Cyrl. in  
Illuminat. 3.

But Cyrillus saith, it is no bread, it is no wine, notwithstanding it appear so unto the senses; Chrysostom saith, the substance of bread is consumed; Emissenus saith, it is turned into the substance of Christ's body; and Damascenus and Theophylactus, latter<sup>15</sup> writers of no great credit, avouch the same.

It is plain that both Cyrillus and all other old learned fathers labour evermore, with all vehemency and force of words, to sequester, and pull their hearers from the judgment of their senses, to behold that bread that giveth life unto the

[<sup>11</sup> Cyril Hierosol. Op. Par. 1720. Catech. xxii. Myst. iv. 6. p. 321; Catech. xxi. Myst. iii. 3. pp. 316, 7.]

[<sup>12</sup> . . . Romanus pontifex qui non puri hominis, sed veri Dei vicem gerit in terris.—Innoc. III. in Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugd. 1624. Decretal. Gregor. IX.

Lib. 1. Tit. vii. cap. 3. col. 217.]

[<sup>13</sup> Cyril Hierosol. Op. Catech. xxi. Myst. iii. 3. pp. 316, 7.]

[<sup>14</sup> Id. Catech. iii. 3, 4. pp. 40, 1.]

[<sup>15</sup> Later, 1565, 1609.]



**Spiritual.**  
**Nothing**  
**in com-**  
**parison.**  
**The oil is**  
**Christ.**

Catech.  
Myst. 4.  
Catech.  
Myst. 4.  
The transla-  
tor hath  
turned it,  
"Quod Chris-  
tus est Domi-  
nus;" being,  
as I judge,  
deceived by  
the likeness  
of these two  
words,  
Χριστός  
and Χρισ-  
τός.  
In Catech.  
Myst. 5.

world. And therefore he calleth it spiritual bread; and of Christ's blood he saith thus: *Bibe vinum in corde tuo, spirituale scilicet vinum*<sup>1</sup>: "Drink that wine (not with thy bodily mouth, but) in thy<sup>2</sup> heart; I mean that spiritual wine." Again he sheweth wherefore the Jews were offended with Christ, and openeth the very cause of the grossness of their error: *Judæi, non audientes verba Christi secundum Spiritum, scandalizati abierunt retro, eo quod existimarent sese ad humanarum carnis esum incitari*<sup>3</sup>: "The Jews, not hearing Christ's words according to the Spirit, were offended, and went from him, for that they thought they were encouraged to eat man's flesh." Again he saith: *Gustate et videte quod suavis est Dominus. Num hoc corporeo palato, ut istud dijudicetis, vobis præcipitur? Nequaquam; sed potius certa fide*<sup>4</sup>: "Taste and see that the Lord is delectable. What, are you commanded to judge this with your bodily mouth? No, not so; but with undoubted faith."

In this sense the water in baptism giveth place to the blood of Christ, and of itself seemeth nothing; likewise the bread in the sacrament of Christ's body giveth place to the body of Christ, and in respect thereof is utterly nothing. Which thing concerning the water of baptism Paulinus seemeth to express thus:

Fonsque novus renovans hominem; quia suscipit, et dat  
Munus: sive magis quod desinit esse per usum,  
Tradere divino mortalibus incipit usu<sup>5</sup>.

Chrysost. in  
Psal. xxii.

Likewise Chrysostom: *Non erit aqua potationis, sed sanctificationis*<sup>6</sup>: "It shall not be water to drink (as it was before), but water of sanctification" (as before it was not). This is the very substance of the sacraments; in respect whereof the corruptible elements of bread, wine, and water, are consumed, and taken for nothing.

Chrysost. de  
Fide et Lega.

This thing Chrysostom expresseth notably to the eye by this example: *Lanae, cum tinguntur, naturæ suæ nomen amittunt, et tincturæ nomen accipiunt; et non ultra vocas lanam, sed vel purpuram, vel coccinum, vel prasinum, &c.*<sup>7</sup>: "Wool, when it is dyed, loseth the name of his own nature, and taketh the name of the colour; thou callest it no longer wool, but purple, or scarlet, or green, &c." Notwithstanding the very substance of wool remaineth still.

Pachym. in  
Dionys. de  
Eccles. Hierarch. cap. iv.  
μύρον γὰρ  
ὁ Χριστός.

And so Pachymeres saith: "The holy oil is no longer called oil, but it is turned into Christ." His words be plain: *Oleum enim est Christus*<sup>8</sup>: "For the oil is Christ." Not meaning thereby that the oil is no oil, but only that in respect of Christ, that thereby is signified, the oil is consumed; and appeareth nothing. So Paulus, that famous learned lawyer, saith: *Res [una] per prævalentiam trahit aliam*<sup>9</sup>: "One thing by force of greater weight draweth another with it."

ff. De Rei  
Vendica-  
tione. In  
rem. Paul.

Thus therefore saith Cyrillus: "The bread that we see is now not bread, but Christ's body; and the wine that we see is now not wine, but Christ's blood." As if he should say, these elements or creatures are not so much the things that they be indeed, as the things that they represent. For so St Augustine saith generally of all sacraments, as it hath been alleged once or twice before: "In sacraments we may not consider what they be indeed, but what they signify<sup>10</sup>." And to the same end St Ambrose saith: *Magis videtur, quod non videtur*<sup>11</sup>: "It is better seen than that is not seen." And all this is wrought, both in the mystery of baptism, and also in the mystery of Christ's body, not by the work or force of nature, but by the omnipotent power of the Spirit of God, and by the warrant of Christ's word.

August.  
contr.  
Maxim. Lib.  
iii.  
Ambros. de  
iis qui init.  
Myst. cap. iiii.

[<sup>1</sup> Cyril. Hierosol. Op. Par. 1720. Catech. xxi. Myst. iv. 8. p. 322; where τὸν οἶνόν σου ἐν καρδίᾳ ἀγαθῇ.]

[<sup>2</sup> They, 1565.] [<sup>3</sup> Id. ibid. 4. pp. 320, 1.]

[<sup>4</sup> Id. Catéch. xxiii. Myst. v. 20. p. 331.]

[<sup>5</sup> Paulin. Op. Ant. 1622. S. Fel. Natal. Dec. xxv. p. 622; where quod suscipit.]

[<sup>6</sup> Chrysost. Op. Lat. Basil. 1547. Expos. Psal. xxii. Tom. V. col. 710.]

[<sup>7</sup> Id. Op. Par. 1718-38. De Fid. et Leg. Nat. Serm. Tom. I. p. 828. This is spurious.]

[<sup>8</sup> Τὸ δὲ μύρον ἐστὶν ὁ Χριστός.—Dionys. Areop. Op. Antv. 1634. De Eccles. Hierarch. Pachym. Paphr. cap. iv. 11. Tom. I. p. 353.]

[<sup>9</sup> Paul. in Corp. Jur. Civil. Amst. 1663. Digest. Lib. vi. Tit. i. 23. Tom. I. p. 145; where alienam rem trahit.]

[<sup>10</sup> August. Op. Par. 1679-1700. Contr. Maxim. Arian. Lib. ii. cap. xxii. 3. Tom. VIII. col. 725. See before, page 467.]

[<sup>11</sup> Ambros. Op. Par. 1686-90. Lib. de Myst. cap. iii. 15. Tom. II. col. 328.]

Thus Emissenus, thus Damascene, thus Theophylact say the bread is changed into the substance of Christ's body; I mean, even so as the same Theophylact saith: "We ourselves are transelemented (and transubstantiate) into the body of Christ." For thus he imagineth Christ to say: *Miscetur mihi, et transelementatur in me*<sup>12</sup>. And in like sort Chrysostom, speaking of the corruption and renewing of the world, saith thus: *Opus erat quasi reelementationem quandam fieri*<sup>13</sup>: "It was needful that the elements were (transubstantiate, or) made new." So St Peter saith: *Efficimur consortes divinæ naturæ*: "We are made partakers of the divine nature." And a heathen writer saith: *Homo transit in naturam Dei*<sup>14</sup>: "A man is turned into the nature of God."

Theophyl. in Gen. Hom. vi. cap. Johan.

Chrysost. in Gen. Hom. 25.

2 Pet. i.

Mercurius Trismegistus in Esculapio.

All these, and other like phrases of speech, must be qualified with a sober and a discreet construction; otherwise, according to the simple tenour of the words, they cannot stand. Therefore St Chrysostom, entreating of the exposition of the scriptures, saith thus: *Divina opus est gratia, ne nudis verbis insistamus. Nam ita hæretici in errorem incidunt, neque sententiam, neque auditoris habitum inquirentes. Nisi enim tempora, locos, auditorem, et alia hujusmodi consideremus, multa sequentur absurda*<sup>15</sup>: "We have need of God's heavenly grace, that we stand not upon the bare words. For so heretics fall into error, never considering neither the mind (of the speaker) nor the disposition of the hearer. Unless we weigh the times, the places, the hearers, and other like circumstances, many inconveniences must needs follow." Verily Bertramus, an ancient writer, saith: *Ipse, qui nunc in ecclesia, &c.*<sup>16</sup>: "He that now in the church by his omnipotent power spiritually turneth the bread and the wine into the flesh and blood of his body, the same invisibly made his body of the manna that came from heaven; and of the water that flowed from the rock, invisibly he made his own blood." Thus, as the fathers say manna was made Christ's body, or the water in the wilderness was made his blood; even so they say the bread and wine are likewise made Christ's body and blood.

Chrysost. in Johan. Hom. 39.

Bertram. de Sacram. Euch.

Manna made Christ's body.

Now that it may thoroughly appear, even unto the simple, what the godly fathers meant by such extraordinary use of speech, it shall not be from the purpose to report certain words of Gregorius Nyssenus touching the same, and that in such order as they are written. Thus therefore he saith: *Nam et hoc altare, &c.*<sup>17</sup>: "This altar whereat we stand is by nature a common stone, nothing differing from other stones whereof our walls be built and our pavements laid; but, after that it is once dedicate to the honour of God, and hath received blessing, it is a holy table and an undefiled altar, afterward not to be touched of all men, but only of the priests, and that with reverence. Likewise the bread, that first was common, after that the mystery hath hallowed it, is both called and is Christ's body; likewise also the wine Christ's blood. And whereas before they were things of small value, after the blessing that cometh from the Holy Ghost, either of them both worketh mightily. The like power also maketh the priest to be reverend and honourable, being by mean of a new benediction divided from the common sort of the people." Hereby we see, as the altar,

Gregor. Nyss. de Sanct. Baptism.

[<sup>12</sup> Theophyl. Op. Venet. 1754-63. In Joan. Comm. cap. vi. Tom. I. p. 595.]  
 [<sup>13</sup> ...έχρησθη...ώσπερ άναστοιχειώσιν τινα γενέσθαι.—Chrysost. Op. In cap. vii. Gen. Hom. xxv. Tom. IV. p. 239.]  
 [<sup>14</sup> Mercur. Trismeg. Pœmand. Par. 1554. cap. x. p. 43; where is the passage that most probably is meant.]  
 [<sup>15</sup> Chrysost. Op. In Joan. Hom. xl. Tom. VIII. p. 236.]  
 [<sup>16</sup> Ipse namque, qui nunc in ecclesia omnipotentī virtute panem et vinum in sui corporis carnem, et proprii cruoris undam spiritualiter convertit, ipse tunc quoque manna de cœlo datum corpus suum, et equam de petra profusam proprium sanguinem, invisibiliter operatus est.—Ratramn. Lib. de Corp. et Sang. Dom. Oxon. 1838. cap. xxv. p. 14.]  
 [<sup>17</sup> Ἐπει καὶ τὸ θρσαιστήριον τοῦτο τὸ ἅγιον,

ᾧ παρεστήκαμεν, λίθος ἐστὶ κατὰ τὴν φύσιν κοινός, οὐδὲν διαφέρων τῶν ἄλλων πλακῶν, αἱ τοῦτε τοίχους ἡμῶν οἰκοδομοῦσι, καὶ καλλωπιζοῦσι τὰ ἐδάφη· ἐπειδὴν δὲ καθιερώθη τῇ τοῦ Θεοῦ θεραπείᾳ, καὶ τὴν εὐλογίαν ἐδέξατο, ἐστὶ τράπεζα ἁγία, θρσαιστήριον ἄχραντον, οὐκέτι παρὰ πάντων ψηλαφηόμενον, ἀλλὰ μόνον τῶν ἱερέων, καὶ τούτων εὐλαβουμένων. ὁ ἄρτος πάλιν ἄρτος ἐστὶ τέως κοινός· ἀλλ' ὅταν αὐτὸν τὸ μυστήριον ἱερουργήσῃ, σῶμα Χριστοῦ λέγεται τε καὶ γίνεται. οὕτως τὸ μυστικὸν ἔλαιον, οὕτως ὁ οἶνος, ὀλίγοντινὸς ἄξια ὄντα πρὸς τῆς εὐλογίας, μετὰ τὸν ἅγιον σμὸν τὸν τοῦ Πνεύματος, ἐκάτερον αὐτῶν ἐνεργεῖ διαφόρως. ἡ αὐτὴ δὲ τοῦ λόγου δύναμις καὶ τὸν ἱερέα ποιεῖ σεμνὸν καὶ τίμιον, τῇ καυνότητι τῆς εὐλογίας τῆς πρὸς τοὺς πολλοὺς κοινότητος χωριζόμενον.—Gregor. Nyss. Op. Par. 1638. In Baptism. Christ. Tom. III. p. 370.]

Greek  
church.  
Figure.

which in some places both for steadiness and continuance was made of stone, was changed from the former state, and yet remained stone still; and as the priest or bishop was changed from that he was before, and yet remained in substance one man still; so, by the judgment of this ancient father, the bread and wine are changed into Christ's body and blood, and yet remain bread and wine in nature still.

And forasmuch as M. Harding, to make good and to maintain this his new error, hath here alleged together nine doctors of the Greek church as subscribing and well agreeing thereto; understand thou, good christian reader, for the better information and direction of thy<sup>1</sup> judgment, that the Grecians never consented to the same from the first preaching of the gospel there until this day, as it is easy to be seen in the last action of the general council holden at Florence<sup>2</sup>. And Duns himself, having occasion to entreat hereof, writeth thus: [*Ad hanc sententiam*] *principaliter . . . videtur movere, quod de sacramentis tenendum est, sicut tenet sancta Romana ecclesia; . . . ipsa autem tenet, panem transubstantiari in corpus, et vinum in sanguinem*<sup>3</sup>: "To this determination this thing seemeth specially to lead, that we must hold of the sacraments as the holy church of Rome holdeth," &c. For confirmation hereof he allegeth, not the Greek church, as knowing it had evermore holden the contrary; but only the particular determination of the church of Rome, concluded first in the council of Lateran, in the year of our Lord a thousand two hundred and fifteen, and never before.

And Isidorus, the bishop of Russia, for that, after his return home from the council of Florence, he began to practise both for unity herein, and also in all other causes, to be concluded between his churches and the church of Rome, was therefore deposed from his office, and utterly forsaken of all his clergy<sup>4</sup>. So well they liked this new device of transubstantiation.

M. Harding will reply, Cyrillus saith, *ἐν τῷ ἄρτῳ*, which he expoundeth, *In specie vel figura panis*, "In the form or figure of bread." And this, as he imagineth, is as much as accidents without subject. What manner consideration leadeth him hereto, I cannot tell. But it is most certain, that by this very way the old heretics were led into their errors. Marcion the heretic held that Christ appeared not in the very natural body of a man, but only in a fantasy or shew of a man's body: and, to prove the same, he used M. Harding's reason. For it is written, said he: *In similitudinem hominum factus est et figura inventus ut homo*: "He was made after the likeness of men, and found in figure (which M. Harding expoundeth, 'in shews and accidents') as a man." And St Ambrose saith: *Nec sibi blandiatur virus Apollinare, quia ita legitur, Et specie inventus, ut homo*<sup>5</sup>: "Let not that heretic Apollinarius<sup>6</sup> flatter himself for that it is thus written, 'He was found in figure and form as a man'." Here we see M. Harding is driven to fight with old heretics' weapons; otherwise his friends would not judge him catholic. St Ambrose saith, Christ appeared *in figura humana*<sup>7</sup>, "in the figure of a man." Origen saith: *Christus est expressa imago et figura Patris*<sup>8</sup>: "Christ is the express image and figure of his Father." Again St Ambrose saith: *Gravior est . . . ferri species, quam aquarum natura*<sup>9</sup>: "The form of iron is heavier than the nature of the water." And Gregory Nyssene

[<sup>1</sup> They, 1565.]

[<sup>2</sup> Gen. viii. Synod. Sess. Ult. Sanct. Union. Litt. in Crabb. Concil. Col. Agrip. 1551. Tom. III. p. 476. See before, page 534, note 1.]

[<sup>3</sup> Joan. Duns Scot. Op. Lugd. 1639. In Lib. iv. Sentent. Dist. xi. Quæst. 3. Tom. VIII. p. 616; where *autem ipsa*.]

[<sup>4</sup> The author intended is Lodovicus Vartomannus Bononiensis, qui et Romanus Patritius, Navig. Æthiop. &c. in Nov. Orb. Basil. 1555; but no reference to the fact mentioned has been there found. See, however, M. a Michov. Tractat. de duab. Sarmat. Lib. ii. cap. i. in eod. pp. 473, 4. This last author is cited for the same fact by Jewel elsewhere.]

[<sup>5</sup> Ambros. Op. Par. 1686-90. Ad Sabin. Epist. xvi. 8. Tom. II. col. 986; where *Apollinarius*.]

[<sup>6</sup> Apollinarius, 1565.]

[<sup>7</sup> Id. Comm. in Epist. ad Col. cap. i. v. 15. Tom. II. Append. col. 264.]

[<sup>8</sup> In the chapter referred to, Origen quotes Heb. i. 3: *splendor gloriæ, et figura expressa substantiæ ejus*; and repeatedly afterwards uses the words *imago* and *figura* applied to Christ.—Orig. Op. Par. 1733-59. De Princ. Lib. i. cap. ii. 5, &c. Tom. I. pp. 55, &c.]

[<sup>9</sup> Ambros. Op. Lib. de Myst. cap. ix. 51. Tom. II. col. 339; where *aquarum liquor*. See also De Sacram. Lib. iv. cap. iv. 18. Tom. II. col. 370.]

Concil. Flor.  
Sess. Ult.  
Joan. Scot.  
in iv. Sentent.  
Dist. 10.

Concil. Lat.  
sub Innoc.  
iii. Anno  
1215.

Roman.  
Patrit. in  
Hist. de Novo  
Orbe.

Phil. ii.

Ambros. Lib.  
vii. Epist. 48.

Ambros. ad  
Col. i.  
Orig. περί  
Ἀρχῶν,  
Lib. i. cap. ii.  
Ambros. de  
his qui init.  
Myst. cap. iii.

saith: *Sacerdos... quod ad speciem externam attinet, idem est qui fuit*<sup>10</sup>: "The priest, as touching his appearance or outward form, is the same that he was before." Gregor. Nys. de Sanct. Baptism. And will M. Harding gather hereof that Christ, or a piece of iron, or a priest, is nothing else but an accident or a shew without substance?

Besides all this, M. Harding is fain to falsify Cyrillus, his own doctor, and to allege his words otherwise than he found them<sup>11</sup>. For, whereas in the common Latin translation it is written thus, *Sciens panem hunc, qui videtur a nobis, non esse panem, etiamsi gustus panem esse sentiat*, "Knowing that this bread that is seen of us is no bread, albeit our taste do perceive it to be bread;" M. Harding hath chosen rather to turn it thus: *Cum scias, qui videtur esse panis, non esse, sed corpus Christi*: "Knowing that the thing that seemeth to be bread is no bread, but the body of Christ." Wherein he hath both skipped over one whole clause, and also corrupted the words and meaning of his author. For Cyrillus saith: "With our outward eyes we see bread." M. Harding saith: "It appeareth or seemeth only to be bread." Cyrillus saith: "Our taste perceiveth (or knoweth) it to be bread." This clause M. Harding hath left out both in his Latin translation, and also in the English. But speaking of the cup, he turneth it thus: "Albeit the sense make that account of it." Corrupt doctrine must needs hold by corruption. For it is certain Cyrillus meant thus: "That, as we have two sorts of eyes, corporal of the body, and spiritual of the mind; so in the sacraments we have two sundry things to behold, with our bodily eyes the material bread, with our spiritual eyes the very body of Christ." And thus the words of Cyril agree directly with these words of St Augustine: *Quod... videtis, panis est: ... quod... etiam oculi vestri renuntiant. Quod autem fides vestra postulat instruenda, panis est corpus Christi*<sup>12</sup>: "The thing that you see is bread; which thing your eyes do testify. But touching that your faith would be instructed of, the bread is Christ's body;" in such sort and sense as is said before. M. Harding of purpose falsifieth and corrupteth the old fathers.

Samona, Methonensis, and Cabasilas are very young to be alleged or allowed for doctors. As for Marcus Ephesius, he seemeth well to brook his name: for his talk runneth altogether *ad Ephesios*. For, whereas St Basil in his liturgy, after the words of consecration, calleth the sacrament *ἀντίτυπον*<sup>13</sup>, that is to say, a token or a sign of Christ's body; this doctor Marcus imagineth of himself that St Basil speaketh thus of the bread before it be consecrate. A very child would not so childishly have guessed at his author's meaning. Yet M. Harding herein seemeth not much to dislike his judgment. Howbeit he knoweth that the bread before consecration is neither sacrament nor sign of Christ's body; no more than any other common baker's bread. Otherwise, it should be a sign, and signify nothing; and a sacrament, before it were consecrate and made a sacrament.

Yet D. Stephen Gardiner seemeth to consider better and more advisedly of the matter. For he thinketh it likely that Basil's liturgy was disordered, and that set behind that should have been before; and that one ignorant simple scribe corrupted all those books throughout the whole world<sup>14</sup>. M. Harding saith, St Basil calleth the bread *ἀντίτυπον*, a sign or token, before it be perfitly consecrate; as if there were two sorts of consecration, the one perfit, the other unperfit. And yet he knoweth it is commonly holden in the schools, that the very beginning and end of consecration is wrought, not by degrees, but in an instant. Steph. Gardiner. ad Object. 185.

<sup>10</sup> Gregor. Nys. Op. Par. 1638. In Baptism. Christ. Tom. III. p. 370.]

<sup>11</sup> See before, page 573, note 17.]

<sup>12</sup> August. Op. Par. 1679—1700. Serm. cclxxii. Tom. V. cols. 1103, 4.]

<sup>13</sup> ...προσθέντες τὰ ἀντίτυπα τοῦ ἁγίου σώματος καὶ αἵματος τοῦ Χριστοῦ σου, κ.τ.λ.—Basil. Lit. in Lit. Sanct. Patr. Par. 1560, p. 58. These words occur in a prayer immediately after the words of consecration.]

<sup>14</sup> Damascenus Græcus de hoc verbo (*ἀντίτυπος*) ita refert, Basilium in sua liturgia usum fuisse, sed ante sanctificationem: quod etsi in nostris exem-

plaribus aliter reperiatur hactenus; tamen valet Damasceni testimonium, ut nobis referat illorum temporum catholicam de eucharistia fidem, secundum quam post consecrationem crederemus veram corporis et sanguinis Christi præsentiam, non solam figuram, quam sonus verbi (*ἀντίτυπον*) videtur insinuare. Itaque fieri probabiliter potest, ut quum illis temporibus non typis, ut nunc, sed librorum singulari opera, exemplaria liturgiæ Basilii divulgarentur, verbum illud (*ἀντίτυπον*) a sciolo fuerit loco motum, quasi non commode post consecrationem collocatum.—Confut. Cavill. in Ven. Euch. Sacr. Verit. Par. 1552. Ad Object. 185. foll. 125, 6.]

Thus consecration is no consecration; no sacrament is a sacrament; that is a sign is no sign; that is no sign is a sign; books be corrupted and disordered; that cometh after that should go before, and that is before that should come after. And yet all these shifts will scarcely serve to help out a common error.

## M. HARDING. THE SEVENTH DIVISION.

The hundred and eighty-first untruth. For this infallible faith was unknown to the primitive church, and openly refused of the Greek church in the council of Florence.

*Sith for this point of our religion we have so good authority, (181) and being assured<sup>1</sup> of the infallible faith of the church, declared by the testimonies of these worthy fathers of divers ages and quarters of the world; we may well say, with the same church against M. Jewel, that in this sacrament after consecration there remaineth nothing of that which was before, but only the accidents and shews, without the substance, of bread and wine.*

## THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

The certainty of this article resteth only upon the most uncertain ground of transubstantiation: the determination whereof, forsomuch as it is not much more than three hundred years old, nor necessarily gathered of the force of God's word, as Duns himself confesseth, nor ever any where received saving only in the church of Rome, therefore is neither so infallible as M. Harding maketh it, nor so ancient, nor so catholic.

Time will not suffer me to say so much as might be said to the contrary. St Paul acknowledgeth very bread remaining still in the sacrament, and that such bread as may be divided and broken; which words cannot without blasphemy be spoken of the body of Christ itself, but only of the<sup>2</sup> very material bread. Christ likewise after consecration acknowledgeth the remaining of very wine, and that such wine as is pressed of the grape. For thus he saith: "I will drink no more of this generation of the vine." Chrysostom saith: *In similitudinem corporis et sanguinis, Christus nobis panem et vinum secundum ordinem Melchisedech ostendit in sacramento*<sup>3</sup>: "Christ shewed us (not accidents, or qualities, but) bread and wine in the sacrament, according to the order of Melchisedech, as all likeness<sup>4</sup> or figure of his body and blood." Again he saith: *Christus, quando hoc mysterium tradidit, vinum tradidit... [non bibam] inquit, ex hac generatione vitis; quæ certe vinum producit, non aquam*<sup>5</sup>: "Christ, when he delivered this mystery, delivered (not shews or accidents, but) wine. Christ saith (after consecration), 'I will no more drink of this generation of the vine.' Doubtless the vine bringeth forth wine, and not water." Cyrillus saith: *Christus credentibus discipulis fragmenta panis dedit*<sup>6</sup>: "Christ gave to his faithful disciples fragments or pieces of bread." I pass by St Cyprian, St Augustine, Gelasius, Theodoretus, and other ancient and holy fathers; according unto whose most plain words and authorities, if there be bread remaining in the sacrament, then is there somewhat else besides accidents. What M. Harding may say, that saith so much, it is easy to see; but that shews and accidents hang empty without the substance of bread and wine, none of the old fathers ever said.

## M. HARDING. THE EIGHTH DIVISION.

God's omnipotent power to bear up accidents.

*And this is a matter to a christian man not hard to believe. For if it please God the almighty Creator, in the condition and state of things thus to ordain that substances created bear and sustain accidents; why may not he, by his almighty power, conserve and keep also accidents without substance, sith that the very heathen philosophers repute it for an absurdity to say, Primam causam non posse id præstare solam, quod possit cum secunda: that is to say, "that the first cause (whereby they understand God) cannot do that alone which he can do with the second cause," whereby they mean a creature?*

[<sup>1</sup> Thus assured, H. A. 1564.]

[<sup>2</sup> 1565 omits *the*.]

[<sup>3</sup> Chrysost. Op. Lat. Basil. 1547. Expos. Psal. xxii. Tom. V. col. 712; where *Christi panem*, and *nobis ostenderet*.]

[<sup>4</sup> A likeness, 1565.]

[<sup>5</sup> Chrysost. Op. Par. 1718-38. In Matt. Hom. lxxxii. Tom. VII. p. 784.]

[<sup>6</sup> Cyril. Alex. Op. Lut. 1638. In Joan. Evang. Lib. iv. cap. ii. Tom. IV. p. 360. See also Op. Insig. in Evang. Joan. a G. Trapezout. tract. Par. 1508. Lib. iv. cap. xiv. fol. 95.]

## THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

Cicero saith: "A simple poet, when he cannot tell how to shift his matters, imagineth some god suddenly to come in place a little to astonne the people; and there an end." So M. Harding, finding himself much encumbered with his accidents, is fain to bring in God with his whole omnipotent power, to hold them up. Children in their<sup>7</sup> schools are taught to know, that an accident hath no being without a subject. Which rule, being otherwise evermore true, hath exception, as M. Harding saith, only in this sacrament, wherein be the accidents and shews of bread and wine, and yet no subject. For they are not in the bread; because, as he saith, that is gone; nor in the air, for that cannot be seen; nor in Christ's body, for that is not round, &c. So there is a white thing, yet nothing is white; and a round thing, yet nothing is round. Therefore, forasmuch as these accidents neither are able to stand alone, nor have any subject there to rest in; for that cause, M. Harding saith, they be sustained by the power of God.

One saith: *Nec deus intersit, nisi dignus vindice nodus incidit*<sup>8</sup>: "Never bring forth any god in a tragedy, to play a part, unless it be upon some occasion of great matter, meet for a god to take in hand." St Paul saith: *Deus portat omnia verbo virtutis sue*: "God beareth all things by the word of his power." And the heathen poets imagine that Atlas holdeth up the heavens. But for God the Creator and Cause of all causes, to come from heaven to hold up accidents, it seemeth a very simple service.

M. Harding's reason standeth thus: God is omnipotent;  
Ergo, accidents in the sacrament stand without subject.

## M. HARDING. THE NINTH DIVISION.

And that this being of accidents without substance or subject in this sacrament, under which, the bread not remaining, the body of Christ is present, may the rather be believed, it is to be considered that this thing took place at the first creation of the world, after the opinion of some doctors, who do affirm that that first light which was at the beginning until the fourth day (182) was not in any subject, but sustained by the power of God, as him liked. For that first light and the same<sup>9</sup> were as whiteness, and a body whited<sup>10</sup>, saith St Basil. Neither then was Wickliff yet born, who might teach them that the power of God cannot put an accident without a subject. For so he saith in his book De Apostasia, cap. 5, as Cochleus reporteth<sup>11</sup>. Hereof it appeareth out of what root the gossellers of our country spring; who, smatching of the sap of that wicked tree, and hereby shewing their kind, appoint bounds and borders to the power of God, that is infinite and incomprehensible. And thus by those fathers we may conclude that, if God can sustain and keep accidents with substance, he can so do without substance.

Basilus Hexæm-  
eron, Hom. 6.  
Damasc. Lib. ii.  
cap. vii.  
Paulus Burgensis  
Gen. l.  
Lib. ii. Hist. Hus-  
sitarum.

The hundred  
and eighty-  
second un-  
truth.  
For St Basil  
plainly saith  
the contrary.

## THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

It is great violence to force an ancient father to bear false witness, and specially against himself. This report of St Basil's meaning is as true as is that long peevish fable, so often alleged under the name of Amphilochius, that is to wit, a vain shew without substance. And because M. Harding only nameth Damascene and Paulus Burgensis in his margin, as being afraid to touch their words, he may remember that Damascene saith: *Non aliud est ignis, quam lux*,

Damascen.  
Lib. ii. cap.  
vii.

[<sup>7</sup> The, 1565, 1609.]

[<sup>8</sup> Hor. de Art. Poet. vv. 191, 2.]

[<sup>9</sup> The sun, H. A. 1564.]

[<sup>10</sup> Πρῶτον μὲν οὖν ἐκ τοῦ τὰ σύνθετα πάντα οὕτω παρ' ἡμῶν διαίρεισθαι, εἰς τε τὴν δεκτικὴν οὐσίαν, καὶ εἰς τὴν ἐπιουμβῶσαν αὐτῇ ποιότητα. ὡς οὖν ἕτερον μὲν τὴ φύσει ἢ λευκότης, ἕτερον δὲ τὸ λελευκασμένον σώμα, οὕτω καὶ τὰ νῦν

εἰρημένα διάφορα ὄντα τῇ φύσει ἢνωται τῇ δυνάμει τοῦ κτίσαντος.—Basil. Op. Par. 1721-30. In Hexæm. Hom. vi. 8. Tom. I. p. 51.]

[<sup>11</sup> Hic sæpe dixi, quod nec Deus nec homo potest facere accidens sine subjecto.— Artic. Wicl. De Apost. cap. v. in Cochl. Hist. Hussit. Mogunt. 1549. Lib. ii. p. 90.]



*ut quidam aiunt*<sup>1</sup>: "The fire is nothing else but the light, as some men say." And Burgensis saith: *Quidam tradunt lucem fuisse nubem lucidam*<sup>2</sup>: "Some men write that the light was a bright cloud." By these expositions it appeareth, that either the fire or the cloud was a subject to receive the light. Certainly neither Burgensis, nor Damascene, nor Basil ever said that the light stood without a subject. Therefore that note in the margin might well have been spared. But it is an easy matter with shew of names to deceive the simple.

St Basil saith, the light was in the world before the sun was made. Therefore it was, and had his being, without the sun. His words stand thus: *Aliud quidem est, &c.*<sup>3</sup>: "The brightness of the light is one thing; and the body subject unto the same (that is, the sun) is another thing. And say not now unto me, It is impossible to divide these things asunder. For I say not, that thou or I can possibly divide the body of the sun from the light. Yet notwithstanding the things that we may part asunder only by imagination, the same things God, the Creator of nature, is able to sunder verily and indeed." Hereof M. Harding gathereth his reasons thus:

The light was not in the sun; *ergo*, it was in nothing.

It was not in the sun; *ergo*, it was not in the air.

It was not in the sun; *ergo*, it was an accident without a subject.

This error cometh of the equivocation or double taking of this word, "being in." For one thing may be in another, as in an instrument, as the light is in a candle; which is the similitude that Basil useth. The same thing may be in another, as in a subject, as light in the air. This diversity considered, now let us weigh M. Harding's reason.

The light (saith he) was not in the sun, as in an instrument to carry it about the world;

*Ergo*, it was not in the air as in a subject.

This argument seemeth very light. A man may easily and sensibly with his fingers feel the folly of it in the dark. Verily, St Basil's words to the contrary shine so clear, that I marvel M. Harding could not or would not see them: For thus he writeth before in the same book: *περιελάμπητο δὲ ἀήρ' μᾶλλον δὲ ἐγκραμμένον ἐαυτῷ ὄλον διόλου εἶχε τὸ φῶς*<sup>4</sup>: *Illustratur aer: vel potius lumen sibi totum et in totum permistum habuit*: "The air was lightened, or rather it had the whole light wholly mingled with itself." Again he saith: "The world was invisible, because the air was without light<sup>5</sup>." St Basil saith: "The light was in the air, and that wholly through the whole," as in a subject; yet M. Harding forceth St Basil to say contrary to himself: The light was only an accident without subject, and was stayed in nothing. Now judge thou, good christian reader, what credit thou mayest give to M. Harding's words in reporting of the ancient doctors.

But he saith: "God's power is infinite and incomprehensible. Therefore he is able to sustain accidents." This error springeth of misunderstanding St Basil's words. For whereas St Basil writeth thus: *τότε . . . οὐ κατὰ κίνησιν ἡλιακὴν, ἀλλὰ ἀναχεομένου τοῦ πρωτογόνου φωτὸς ἐκείνου . . . ἡμέρη ἐγένετο*<sup>6</sup>: *Dies tum fiebat, non per motum solarem, sed diffuso illo primigenio lumine*: "The day was made, not by the moving or passing of the sun, but by pouring abroad the first light;" it appeareth that instead of *ἀναχεομένου*, which is, "poured abroad," M. Harding by error read *ἀνεχομένου*, which is, "borne up, or sustained." But he may not well maintain his accidents by shifting of words, or by misunderstanding or corrupting of his doctors.

[<sup>1</sup> Damascen. Op. Par. 1712. De Fid. Orthod. Lib. II. cap. vii. Tom. I. p. 163.]

[<sup>2</sup> *Quidam enim dicunt illam lucem fuisse quandam nubem lucidam.*—Bibl. cum Gloss. Ord. et Expos. N. de Lyra, Basil. 1502. In Gen. cap. i. Addit. (Burg.) Pars I. fol. 30. 2.]

[<sup>3</sup> Καὶ μηδενὶ ἀπιστον εἶναι δοκεῖται τὸ εἰρημένον, ὅτι ἄλλο μὲν τι τοῦ φωτὸς ἢ λαμπρότης, ἄλλο δὲ τι τὸ ὑποκείμενον τῷ φωτὶ σῶμα...καὶ μή μοι λέγε ἀδύνατα εἶναι ταῦτα ἀπ' ἀλλήλων

διαρῆσθαι. οὐδὲ γὰρ ἐγὼ τὴν διαίρεσιν τοῦ φωτὸς ἀπὸ τοῦ ἡλιακοῦ σώματος ἐμοὶ καὶ σοὶ δυνατὴν εἶναι φημι, ἀλλ' ὅτι ἂ ἡμῖν τῇ ἐπινοίᾳ ἐστὶ χωριστά, ταῦτα δύναται καὶ αὐτῇ τῇ ἐνεργείᾳ παρὰ τοῦ ποιητοῦ τῆς φύσεως αὐτῶν διασπῆναι.—Basil. Op. Par. 1721-30. In Hexaem. Hom. vi. 3. Tom. I. pp. 51, 2.]

[<sup>4</sup> Id. *ibid.* Hom. ii. 7. p. 19.]

[<sup>5</sup> Id. *ibid.* 1. p. 13.]

[<sup>6</sup> Id. *ibid.* 8. p. 20.]

That is here alleged of Wickliff, and of his offspring, as it sheweth much choler, so it maketh small proof. We know that God is omnipotent, and able not only to sustain accidents, but also to restore the dead from the grave, yea, although he be putrefied within himself, and fight against the Spirit of God. But Tertullian saith: *Non...quia omnia potest facere, ideo...credendum est, illum fecisse:...sed, an fecerit, requirendum*<sup>7</sup>: "We may not believe that God hath done all things, because he can do them; but rather we must see whether he have done them or no." For arguments taken of God's omnipotent power were a ready buckler in old times to serve Praxeas, and Eutyches, and other like heretics.

---

[<sup>7</sup> Tertull. Op. Lut. 1641. Adv. Prax. 10. p. 641.]