

WHETHER A MOUSE, &c.

THE TWENTY-THIRD ARTICLE.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

OR that a mouse or any other worm or beast may eat the body of Christ; for so some of our adversaries have said and taught.

[WHAT IS THAT THE MOUSE OR WORM EATETH.—ARTICLE XXIII. H. A. 1564.]

M. HARDING. THE FIRST DIVISION.

*Whereas M. Jewel imputeth this vile asseveration but to some of the adversaries of his side, he seemeth to acknowledge that it is not a doctrine universally taught and received. The like may be said for his next article; and, if it hath been said of some only, and not taught universally of all, as a true doctrine for christian people to believe, how agreeth he with himself, saying after the rehearsal of his number of articles, the same, none excepted, to be the highest mysteries and greatest keys of our religion? For if that were true, as it is not true for the greatest part, *then should this article have been affirmed and taught of all. For the highest and greatest points of the catholic religion be not particular², but of universal teaching.*

* By this rule the greatest points of M. Harding's catholic religion may well come in question.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

Here it appeareth that M. Harding somewhat misliketh his catholic masters, and thinketh it now an error to say that a mouse may eat the body of Christ; and therefore he calleth this part of his own doctrine "a vile asseveration." But, if this asseveration of M. Harding's own doctors and greatest doctors be so vile, then vile were they that first devised it. And yet I cannot well see how he may so lightly recant the doctrine that he was born and brought up in, and condemn his own fellows of villany, without blame.

Howbeit, one good excuse he seemeth to have, that this part of his religion was never universally received nor counted catholic. And therefore he saith it is no key of his religion. If M. Harding will measure all the rest in this sort, I fear me very few parts of his whole religion will prove catholic. And yet the first devisers and setters forth and maintainers hereof took this evermore for a principal key, as without which the rest of their doctrine could not stand. Yet were they evermore accounted both as universal for their learning, and as catholic for their religion, and as constant in the same, as M. Harding.

But indeed the old holy fathers, St Ambrose, St Augustine, St Hierome, St Chrysostom, never heard of this strange doctrine; nor, if they had heard it, would ever have taken it for lock or key of their religion; but would rather have thought him worthy to be locked up as a mad man that would either have taught it, as great numbers have done, or else have doubted of it, as M. Harding doth. Now let us see by whom this doctrine hath been maintained. So, whether it have been holden for catholic or no, it will soon appear.

Yet notwithstanding I must protest beforehand, that the speeches that they have used in this behalf are so blasphemous and so vile that, for the reverence I bear to the glorious body of Christ, I can neither hear them nor utter them without horror.

First of all, Thomas of Aquine saith thus: *Quidam...dixerunt, quod, cum primum sacramentum sumitur a mure vel [a] cane, desinit ibi esse corpus, [et*

[¹ 1565 and H.A. 1564 omit *M.*]

[² Of particular, H.A. 1564.]

sanguis] *Christi: sed hoc derogat veritati [hujus] sacramenti*³: "Some have said that, as soon as the sacrament is touched of a mouse or a dog, the body and blood of Christ straightway departeth from it. But this is a derogation to the truth of this sacrament." By these words M. Harding's judgment is utterly condemned as uttered against the truth and in the derogation of this sacrament.

M. Harding may not well call in question whether this doctor were catholic or no. For Christ said unto him by a vision in his dream: *Bene scripsisti de me, Thoma*⁴: "O Thomas, thou hast written full well of me." And therefore he is called *doctor angelicus*, "an angelical doctor," for that in learning and judgment he so far surmounted all other doctors, and was accounted most catholic.

In the council of Arle it is written thus: *Qui non bene custodierit sacrificium, et mus vel aliquod . . . animal comederit illud, quadraginta dies pœniteat*⁵: "Whoso keepeth not the sacrifice well and duly, and a mouse or any other beast happen to eat it, let him be put to penance forty days." Concil. Arelat. III. can. 6.

Johannes de Burgo saith: *Mus . . . comedens hostiam suscipit corpus Christi*⁶: "The mouse, eating the sacrament, receiveth the body of Christ." Johan. de Burg. de Cust. Euch. cap. x.

Alexander de Hales saith thus: *Quidam dicunt, ubicunque ponantur species, sive in mundo loco, sive in immundo, sive in ventre muris, ibi est corpus Christi. Et in hoc non derogatur corpori Christi, nec sacramento*⁷: "Some say, where-soever the forms be laid, whether it be in a fair place, or in a foul, or in the belly of a mouse, there is the very body of Christ. And this is no hinderance neither to the body of Christ nor to the sacrament." Alex. Par. iv. Quæst. 45. m. 1.

Again he saith: *Si canis vel porcus deglutiret hostiam consecratam integram, non video, quare corpus Domini non simul trajiceretur in ventrem canis vel porci*⁸: "If a dog or a swine should eat the whole host, being consecrate, I see no cause but our Lord's body should enter into the belly of the dog or of the swine."

Gerson saith: *Brutum sumit corpus Christi per accidens, quia sumit illud in quo est*⁹: "A brute beast receiveth the body of Christ, because it receiveth that thing wherein Christ's body is contained." Ger. contr. Floret. Lib. iv.

Bonaventura liketh better the contrary doctrine, as more agreeing, as he saith, both with civil honesty, and also with the judgment of common reason: *Hæc opinio . . . est . . . honestior et rationabilior*⁹.

Peter Lombard, the master of all catholic conclusions, one that taketh upon him to teach all others, when he cometh to this point, he standeth in a mammering, and is not able to teach himself. For thus he saith touching the same: *Quid igitur sumit mus, vel quid manducat?* "What is it then that the mouse receiveth, or what eateth it?" He answereth: *Deus novit*¹⁰: "God knoweth: I know it not." Bon. in iv. Sent. Dist. 13. Quæst. 1. e.

Notwithstanding, his resolution is this: *Sane dici potest, quod corpus Christi a brutis animalibus non sumitur*¹¹: "It may very well be said, that a brute beast receiveth not the body of Christ." But this sentence is reversed, and not thought catholic. For the great faculty of Paris hath given this judgment upon the same: *Hic magister non tenetur*¹²: "Herein the master is not allowed." iv. Sent. Dist. 13.

Therefore, notwithstanding M. Harding's contrary determination, this doctrine hitherto appeareth right good and catholic.

Touching such cases as herein may happen, Antoninus, the archbishop of Florence, writeth thus: *Si mus, aut aliud animal, &c.*¹³: "If a mouse or any Ant. de Def. Miss. iii. Par. Summ. 3.

[³ Thom. Aquinat. Op. Venet. 1595. Summ. Theol. Tert. Pars, Quæst. lxxx. Art. 3. Tom. XII. fol. 262. 2; where *quod statim cum sacramentum tangitur, and quod etiam derogat.*]

[⁴ An account of this vision may be found in the life of Aquinas prefixed to his works. Tom. I. fol. ††. 2.]

[⁵ Ex Arelat. Concil. cap. 6. in Crabb. Concil. Col. Agrip. 1551. Tom. I. p. 631. Conf. Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugd. 1624. Decret. Gratian. Decr. Tert. Pars, De Consecr. Dist. ii. can. 94. col. 1964.]

[⁶ Joan. de Burg. Pup. Ocul. Argent. 1518. Pars iv. De Cust. Euch. fol. 27. 2; where the author proceeds: non sacramentaliter per modum sacramenti.]

[⁷ Alex. Alens. Op. Col. Agrip. 1622. Summ.

Theol. Pars IV. Quæst. xi. Memb. ii. Art. 4. p. 407. There is the idea here, but not the exact words, as above quoted.]

[⁸ . . . brutum non sumit corpus Christi nisi per accidens, scilicet in quantum sumit illud in quo est corpus Christi.—Floret. Lib. Lugd. 1499. Lib. iv. fol. 99. 2.]

[⁹ Bonavent. Op. Mogunt. 1609. In Lib. iv. Sentent. Dist. xiii. Art. ii. Quæst. 1. Tom. V. p. 157.]

[¹⁰ Pet. Lomb. Libr. Sentent. Col. Agrip. 1576. Lib. iv. Dist. xiii. A. fol. 359. 2; where *quid ergo.*]

[¹¹ Id. *ibid.*; where *a brutis animalibus corpus Christi.*]

[¹² Id. inter Error. a Paris. condemn. fol. 450.]

[¹³ Si mus aut aliud animal propter negligentem

other worm or beast happen to eat the sacrament through negligence of keeping, let the keeper through whose negligence it happened be enjoined to penance forty days. And, if it be possible, let the mouse be taken and burnt, and let his ashes be buried in or about the altar. But Peter of Palus saith: 'The mouse's entrails must be drawn, and the portion of the sacrament that there remaineth, if the priest be squeamish to receive it, must reverently be laid up in the tabernacle, until it may naturally be consumed. But the host so found in the mouse's entrails may in no wise be thrown out into the pool, as a certain priest sometime used a fly¹ that he found in his chalice after consecration. But if a man had such a fervent zeal,' saith he, 'that his stomach would serve him to receive the same without horror, there were no way to it, specially if the man were fasting. So St Hugh of Clunice much commendeth Goderanus, a priest, for receiving the like portions cast up again by a leper. But he said afterward, St Laurence's gridiron was nothing so bad.'" Hitherto Antoninus.

And, for more likelihood hereof, this is holden as a catholic conclusion of that side: [*Corpus Christi*] *potest evomi*²: "The very body of Christ may be vomited up again."

I protest again, as before, the very blasphemy and loathsomeness hereof unto a godly heart is intolerable. Neither would I have used this unpleasant rehearsal, were it not that it behoveth each man to know how deeply the people hath been deceived, and to what villany they have been brought.

This doctrine hath been published and maintained in schools, in churches, by the school-doctors, by the canonists, by preachers, by bishops, by general councils, and by him that wrote the very Castle and Fort of Faith³. Yet M. Harding doubteth not to say it is a vile asseveration, and was never counted catholic.

These be the imps of their transubstantiation. For, like as Ixion, instead of lady Juno, having the company of a cloud, begat Centauros, that were monstrous and ugly forms of half a man and half a horse joined together; even so these men, instead of God's holy mysteries, companying with their own light and cloudy fantasies, have brought forth these strange, ugly, deformed shapes in religion, loathsome to remember, and monstrous to behold.

M. HARDING. THE SECOND DIVISION.

*Concerning the matter of this article, whatsoever a mouse, worm, or beast eateth, the body of Christ, now being impassible and immortal, sustaineth no violence, injury, ne villany. As for that which is gnawn, bitten, or eaten of worm or beast, whether it be the substance of bread, as appeareth to sense, which is denied, (251) because it ceaseth through virtue of consecration; or the outward form only of the sacrament, as many hold opinion, (252) which also only is broken and chewed⁵ of the receiver, the accidents by miracle remaining without substance: in such cases, happening contrary to the intent and end the sacrament is ordained and kept for, it ought not to seem unto us incredible⁶, the power of God considered, that God taketh away his body from those outward forms, and permitteth either the nature of bread to return, as before consecration, *or the accidents to supply the effects of the substance of bread; as he commanded the nature of the rod which became a serpent to return to that it was before, when God would have it serve no more to the uses it was by him appointed unto.*

custodiam species sacramenti comederit; ille per
cujus negligentiam hoc accidit, debet quadraginta
diebus pœnitere...Et debet mus capi si potest et
comburi, et cinis juxta altare reponi. Sed Pe. de pa.
[P. de Palud. in iv. Sentent. Lib. Par. 1514. Dist.
ix. Quæst. 1. fol. 36. 2.] dicit, quod mus exenterari
debet: et mus quidem comburi et cinis in piscinam
proijci: pars autem hostiæ, si homo eam horret
sumere, debet in tabernaculo reverenter poni, et
tamdiu ibi dimitti quousque naturaliter consumetur.
Ipsa autem hostia nequaquam debet in piscinam pro-
ijci: sicut fecit quidam sacerdos de musca reperta
post consecrationem in calice..... Et si quidem homo
esset tanti fervoris, quod hujusmodi non horreret,
sed sumeret, commendandus esset: si tamen esset

jejunos. Sic beatus Hug. Cluniacus commendavit
Goderanum sumendo partiunculas hostiæ quas le-
prosus cum vilissimo sputo evomuerat: dicens crati-
culam Laurentii fuisse tolerabiliorem.—Anton. Summ.
Basil. 1511. Tert. Pars Summ. Tit. xiii. cap. vi. 3.
fol. P. 7. 2.]

[¹ Flee, 1565.]

[² Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugd. 1624. Decret. Gra-
tian. Decr. Tert. Pars, De Consecr. Dist. ii. Not. in
can. 28. col. 1924.]

[³ Fortal. Fid. Nurm. 1494. Lib. III. Consid. vi.
Imposs. 17. fol. 137.]

[⁴ 1565 omits *simile*.]

[⁵ Chawed, 1565, and H. A. 1564.]

[⁶ Uncredible, 1565.]

De Con. Dist.
2. Si quis.
In Gloss.

Fortal. Fid.
Lib. iii.

Simile 4.

The two
hundred and
fifty-first un-
truth. For
the bread re-
maineth still,
as it is plain
by the old
catholic
fathers.
The two
hundred and
fifty-second
untruth, as
it is fully
proved in the
tenth article.
* The cer-
tainty of M.
Harding's
doctrine.

* *The grave authority of St Cyprian addeth great weight to the balance for this judgment in weighing this matter, who in his sermon de Lapsis, by the report of certain miracles, sheweth that our Lord's body made itself away from some that, being defiled with the sacrifices of idols, presumed to come to the communion ere they had done their due penance. One (as he telleth there), thinking to have that blessed body which he had received with others in his hand, when he opened the same to put it into his mouth, found that he held ashes. And thereof St Cyprian saith: Documento unius ostensum est, Dominum recedere cum negatur⁷: "By the example of one man it was shewed that our Lord departeth away when he is denied." It is neither wicked nor a thing unworthy the majesty of that holy mystery, to think our Lord's body likewise done away in cases of negligence, villany, and profanation.*

* St Cyprian speaketh neither of mice nor of brute beasts, &c.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

O what shifting here is to avoid this miserable inconvenience! Innocentius thinketh it not good to say the mouse eateth Christ's body in the sacrament: but rather he saith, that "Christ, when he seeth the mouse coming, getteth himself away, and leaveth the sacrament⁸." This doctor's judgment M. Harding alloweth before others, and thinketh it best to stand with reason.

Innoc. III. De Offic. Miss. cap. xi.

But what then is it that the mouse eateth? Bread it cannot be; "for that is gone," as they say, "by consecration." It remaineth that the mouse must needs eat the shews and accidents. Howbeit that were a strange kind of feeding. But nothing is strange to M. Harding. Yet shews and accidents cannot nourish. What is it then wherewith the mouse is nourished? M. Harding answereth: Perhaps almighty God by a miracle suffereth the bread to return again to feed the mouse. Or else, if this will not serve, he saith further: Perhaps God worketh another miracle, and by his omnipotent power giveth the very accidents of bread strength to nourish and increase substance, as if it were bread. Thus these men have devised a pretty way to feed mice with miracles.

Thomas of Aquine saith that, if a man take overmuch of the consecrate wine, notwithstanding the substance of the wine be gone, yet he may be overseen by the accidents⁹, and so may happen to be drunken by a miracle.

Thom. in 1 Cor. xi.

Here we see M. Harding answereth only by "perhaps," as being not yet well advised what he may say. Whereby it appeareth his doctrine holdeth no certainty. Therefore, whatsoever he say, we may give no great credit to his tale, nor take it for catholic.

St Cyprian, that is here alleged, maketh no manner mention neither of forms nor of accidents; nor teacheth us that the mouse can eat Christ's body; nor that Christ conveyeth himself away, and leaveth the sacrament; nor that the substance of bread returneth again; nor that the accidents have power to nourish; nor any other like fantasy. Only he saith: God gave that wicked man by that miracle to understand, that for his infidelity and idolatry his grace was so departed from his heart as the sacrament was departed from his hand¹⁰. Therefore this place maketh utterly nothing to M. Harding's purpose. Notwithstanding, he thought it good so in this article to use the name of St Cyprian, as in the article before he used the name of St Cyril, lest he should be thought to pass over any article without a doctor.

Cypr. Serm. 5. de Lapsis.

The best that may be gathered of St Cyprian's words is this, that the wicked receiveth not the body of Christ. Which thing, as it is most true, so it utterly overthroweth the whole substance of M. Harding's doctrine.

Now, good christian reader, that thou mayest see how aptly M. Harding's doctors agree together, notwithstanding so many of them tell us, and hold it for most certain, that a mouse may eat the very body of Christ, and receive

[⁷ Cypr. Op. Oxon. 1682. De Laps. p. 133.]

[⁸ Si vero quærat, quid a mure comeditur... Respondetur, quod sicut miraculose substantia panis convertitur in corpus dominicum cum incipit esse sub sacramento: sic quodammodo miraculose revertitur, cum ipsum ibi desinit esse, &c.—Innoc. Papæ III. Op. Col. 1575. Myst. Miss. Lib. iv. cap. xi.

Tom. I. p. 380.]

[⁹ Et hac ratione species illæ panis et vini possunt nutrire et inebriare, sicut si esset ibi substantia panis et vini.—Thom. Aquinat. Op. Venet. 1595. 1. ad Cor. cap. xi. Lect. iv. Tom. XVI. fol. 75.]

[¹⁰ See above, note 7.]

whole Christ, God and man, into his belly; yet others of them contrariwise tell us, and hold it likewise for most certain, that a faithful christian man, be he never so godly, yet cannot receive the body of Christ into his belly. For thus they write: *Certum est quod, quam cito species teruntur dentibus, tam cito in cœlum rapitur corpus Christi*¹: "It is certain that, as soon as the forms of the bread be touched with the teeth, straightway the body of Christ (is not received into the belly, but) is caught up into heaven." And he saith not "perhaps," as M. Harding doth, but, *certum est*, "it is certain and out of question," and therefore catholic.

And Hugo, a great school-doctor, such a one as M. Harding may not well deny, saith thus: *Quando in manibus sacramentum... tenes, corporaliter tecum est [Christus]: quando ore suscipis, corporaliter tecum est... Postquam autem corporalis sensus in percipiendo deficit, deinceps corporalis præsentia quærenda non est*²: "While thou holdest the sacrament in thy hand, Christ is bodily with thee: while thou receivest the sacrament with thy mouth, Christ is bodily with thee. But, after that (the sacrament is passed further, and) thy bodily sense beginneth to fail, thou mayest no longer look for bodily presence." Thus they grant that a mouse may receive the body of Christ into his belly; and yet they deny the same unto a man. Such is the certainty and constancy of this doctrine.

But, to conclude, and to give some certain resolution in this uncertain and doubtful doctrine, it behoveth us to understand that, as St Augustine saith, there is great difference between Christ's body and the sacrament. For the sacrament is corruptible: Christ's body is glorious, and void of all corruption. The sacrament is in the earth: Christ's body is in heaven. The sacrament is received by our bodily mouth: Christ's body is received only by faith, which is the mouth of our soul. And whoso understandeth not this difference understandeth not the meaning of any sacrament.

Now, to apply the same to this purpose: The mouse or other worm may receive the substance of the bread, which is the outward corruptible element of the sacrament; but the very body of Christ itself, which is in heaven, cannot be received but by faith only, and none otherwise.

St Augustine speaketh thus in the person of Christ: [*Ego*] *sum cibus grandium: cresce, et manducabis me*³: "I am the food of great ones: grow, and thou shalt eat me." Again he saith: *Hoc est... manducare illam escam, et illum potum bibere, in Christo manere, et Christum manentem in se habere*⁴: "This is the eating of that food and the drinking of that drink, for a man to abide in Christ, and to have Christ abiding in him."

Chrysostom saith: *Magnus iste panis... replet mentem, non ventrem. Iste panis et noster est, et angelorum*⁵: "This great loaf (meaning thereby the body of Christ, that is in heaven) filleth the mind, and not the belly. This is our bread, and the bread of angels." As the angels receive it, so we receive it.

And, to conclude, so saith St Hilary: "The bread that came down from heaven is not received but of him that hath our Lord, and is the member of Christ⁶."

By the old learned fathers' undoubted judgment this is the only eating of the flesh of Christ; wherein mice, and brute beasts, and wicked men, that are worse than brute beasts, have no portion. And if these holy fathers were now alive, doubtless they would say to M. Harding and to his fellows: *O curvi in terris animi, et celestium inanes!* "O you that lie grovelling on the ground, and have no sense of things above!"

[¹ Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugd. 1624. Decret. Gratian. Decr. Tert. Pars, De Consecr. Dist. ii. Gloss. in can. 23. col. 1922; where *species quam cito dentibus teruntur.*]

[² Hug. de Sanct. Vict. Op. Mogunt. 1617. De Sacram. Lib. II. Pars VIII. cap. xiii. Tom. III. p. 464; where *sensus corporalis.*

Bonavent. Op. Mogunt. 1609. In Lib. iv. Sentent. Dist. xiii. Art. ii. Quæst. 2. Tom. V. p. 158.

Durand. Rat. Div. Offic. Lugd. 1565. Lib. iv. cap. xli. fol. 167.]

[³ August. Op. Par. 1679-1700. Confess. Lib. VII. cap. x. 16. Tom. I. col. 139; where *cibus sum.*]

[⁴ Id. in Johan. Evang. cap. vi. Tractat. xxvi. 18. Tom. III. Pars II. col. 501; where *bibere potum, and illum manentem.*]

[⁵ Chrysost. Op. Lat. Basil. 1547. Ex Matt. cap. v. De Orat. Domin. Hom. Tom. V. col. 716.]

[⁶ The exact words have not been found; but for a nearly similar idea see Hilar. Op. Par. 1693. De Trin. Lib. viii. 42. cols. 972, 3. Conf. Comm. in Matt. cap. ix. 3. col. 648.]

De Consecr.
Dist. 2.
Tribus grad.
In Gloss.

Hugo de Sa-
cram. Lib. i.
Par. 8. cap.
xiii.
Bonavent. in
iv. Sentent.
Dist. 13.
Quæst. 2.
Durand. Lib.
iv.

August. Con-
fess. Lib. vii.
cap. x.

August. in
Johan. Trac-
tat. 26.

Chrysost. ex
varis locis in
Matt. Hom.
9.

Hilar. de
Trin. Lib.
viii.

OF INDIVIDUUM VAGUM.

THE TWENTY-FOURTH ARTICLE.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

OR that, when Christ said, *Hoc est corpus meum*, this word *hoc* pointed not the bread, but *individuum vagum*, as some of them say.

[WHAT THIS PRONOUN *HOC* POINTETH IN THE WORDS OF CONSECRATION.—
ARTICLE XXIV. H. A. 1564.]

M. HARDING.

Whatsoever *hoc* pointeth in this saying of Christ after your judgment, M. Jewel, right meaning and plain christian people (who through God's grace have received the love of truth, and not the efficacy of illusion to believe lying) believe verily that in this sacrament, after consecration, is the very body of Christ, and that upon credit of his own words, *Hoc est corpus meum*. They that appoint themselves to follow your Genevian doctrine in this point, deceived by that ye teach them, *hoc* to point the bread, and by sundry other untruths, instead of the very body of Christ in the sacrament rightly ministered verily present, shall receive nothing at your communion but a bare piece of bread, not worth a point. As for your "some say," who will have *hoc* to point *individuum vagum*, first, learn you well what they mean, and if their meaning be naught, whosoever they be, handle them as you list; therewith shall we be offended never a deal. How this word *hoc* in that saying of Christ is to be taken, and what it pointeth, *we know, who have more learnedly, more certainly, and more truly treated thereof than Luther, Zuinglius, Calvin, Cranmer, Peter Martyr, or any their offspring.

² *Thess.* ii.

The benefit of the Genevian communion.

* M. Harding's good opinion of himself.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

In this article M. Harding only uttereth some part of his choler against them whom it pleaseth him to call Genevians; and vaunteth much of⁸ his own learning, as learned men seldom use to do, with reproach and disdain of others; and in the end, touching the matter, saith utterly nothing. Yet is there not lightly any doubt that amazeth and troubleth the best learned of his side so much as this.

For, their fantasy of transubstantiation presupposed to stand in force, if they say that Christ by this pronoun *hoc* meant the bread that he held in his hand; then must it needs follow, that the very substance of that bread was the very body of Christ. For by this position that must needs be the purport and meaning of these words.

If they say, Christ by the same pronoun meant the accidents and shews of the bread; then must it follow that the same accidents and shews of bread were the body of Christ. But so should an accident be a substance: which error were much worse and far more unsensible than the former.

If they say, this pronoun *hoc* signified the body of Christ itself; then the meaning of these words, "This is my body," must needs be this: "My body is my body." "But this," saith Holcot, "were vainly spoken, and to no purpose⁹." And

Holcot in iv. Sentent. Quæst. 3.

[⁷ 1611, omits *if*.]

[⁸ 1565, 1609, omit *of*.]

[⁹ Per illud pronomen aut igitur illud est corpus Christi vel panis. Si corpus Christi: ergo corpus

Christi est ibi ante finem prolationis formæ. et sic erit transubstantiatio ante prolationem aliorum verborum.—Rob. Holkot sup. Quat. Libr. Sentent. Lugd. 1497. Lib. iv. Quæst. lii. fol. m. vii.]

The Dis-
sension of
Doctors.

by this exposition "Christ's body should be there before the words of consecration were pronounced," and so there should be no virtue or force in consecration; or rather there should be consecration before consecration, and so consecration without consecration.

Upon these few words they have built up their whole religion. This is the foundation of all together. Therefore M. Harding should not so lightly and so disdainfully have passed it over without answer. Otherwise, this change being so great as it is supposed, we shall not know neither what thing is changed, nor whereof Christ's body is made present.

Neither is there any just cause wherefore M. Harding should be thus angry with the Genevians in this behalf. For he knoweth right well that this new fantasy of *individuum vagum* is no part of their doctrine.

But, briefly to touch how pitifully the learned of M. Harding's side have entangled themselves in this case, first of all Gerson saith thus: *Dicendum est, quod hoc demonstrat substantiam panis*¹: "We must say that this pronoun *hoc* signifieth the substance of the bread." By this doctor the substance of bread is Christ's body.

Gerson contra Floret. Lib. iv.

Occam saith: *Hoc refertur ad corpus Christi*²: "This pronoun *hoc* hath relation to the body of Christ." By this doctor the body of Christ is the body of Christ.

Occam in iv. Sentent. Dist. 13.

Yet Petrus Alliacensis saith: *Hoc demonstrat corpus Christi: alioqui falsa est propositio*³: "*Hoc* pointeth the body of Christ; otherwise Christ's saying is not true."

Pet. Alliacen. in iv. Sentent. Dist. 13. Quæst. 5.

Thomas of Aquine goeth learnedly to work, and expoundeth it thus: *Hoc, id est, hoc contentum sub istis speciebus, est corpus meum*⁴: "This, that is to say, this thing contained under these forms, is my body."

Thom. in iv. Sentent. Dist. 8. Art. 16.

But all these expositions seem to import some inconvenience. For hereby it may be gathered, that the bread is transubstantiated, and, as they imagine, Christ's⁵ body made present before the words of consecration.

Therefore Johannes de Burgo thought it good to help the matter with a disjunctive, in this sort: *Hoc sub hac specie præsens, vel de propinquo futurum, est corpus meum*⁶: "This thing, that either is present already under these forms, or anon will be present, is my body."

Johan. De Burgo. de Forma Verb. requisita, &c. cap. iv.

By all these doctors' judgments the meaning of Christ's words is none other but this: "My body is or shall be my body." "Which exposition," as Holcot saith, "is childish, vain, fantastical, and to no purpose⁷."

Holcot in iv. Sentent. Quæst. 3.

And therefore Holcot himself saith: *Hoc significat quiddam utriusque termino commune; et termino, a quo, et termino, ad quem*⁸: "This pronoun *hoc* signifieth a certain thing that is indifferently common, as well to the bread as to Christ's body." But what thing that indifferent thing should be, it were hard to know.

Holcot eodem loco.

Doctor Durand, seeing all these inconveniences and difficulties, and not knowing how to get out, in the end concludeth thus: *Super hoc dicunt quidam, quod per pronomen hoc nihil significatur; sed illud materialiter ponitur*⁹: "Here-

Durand. Lib. iv.

[¹ Floret. Lib. Lugd. 1499. Lib. iv. fol. 95.]

[² Nothing to the point has been found in Occam on the Sentences. But see Quodlib. G. Hokam. Par. 1487. Quodl. ii. Quæst. 19, fol. g. i.; where the author says: Ad argumentum principale dico, quod profert sacerdos talem propositionem semper tam in principio quam in fine demonstrat corpus Christi.]

[³ P. de Alliaco discusses the questions what Christ meant and what the priest now means by the word referred to, and cites various doctors. Quoting Occam, he says: Uno modo potest dici . . . quod sacerdos significative recipiens dicta verba debet demonstrare per ly hoc corpus Christi, &c.; again: Alio modo dici potest quod non est necesse quod sacerdos rite conficiens aliquid demonstret per ly hoc, &c.—Pet. de Alliaco. sup. Sentent. Par. Quart. Lib. Quæst. Quint. Art. Prim. fol. 250. 2.]

[⁴ . . . aut facit demonstrationem ad intellectum, aut ad sensum. Si ad intellectum, ut sit sensus, Hoc,

id est, significatum per hoc, est corpus meum, tunc, &c. Si autem facit demonstrationem ad sensum, ergo demonstrabit substantiam contentam sub illis speciebus sensibilibus: sed, &c.—Thom. Aquinat. Op. Venet. 1595. In Quart. Sentent. Dist. viii. Quæst. ii. Art. 1. Tom. VII. fol. 42.]

[⁵ Christ, 1609, 1611.]

[⁶ Joan. de Burgo. Pup. Ocul. Argent. 1518. Pars iv. cap. iv. fol. 19.]

[⁷ See before, page 787, note 9.]

[⁸ Sed quæritur quid demonstrat per hoc pronomen hoc. Dico quod illud quod manet sub utroque termino transmutationis: &c.—Rob. Holkot sup. Quat. Lib. Sentent. Lugd. 1497. Lib. iv. Quæst. iii. fol. m. vii.]

[⁹ Durand. Rat. Div. Offic. Lugd. 1565. Lib. iv. cap. xli. 44. fol. 167. 2; where per hoc pronomen nihil demonstratur.]

upon some say that this pronoun *hoc* signifieth nothing at all, but is put materially and absolutely, without any manner signification."

But hereof groweth another doubt greater than any of all the rest. For, if this word *hoc* signify nothing at all, what force then can it have to work consecration?

Innocentius, weighing these things indifferently all together, is driven to say, that "Christ consecrated the sacrament, not by these words, *Hoc est corpus meum*, but by his blessing that went before¹⁰."

Likewise is John Duns driven to say touching the same: *Illa propositio, Hoc est corpus meum, non est consecrativa, nec ut vera, nec ut falsa: sed ut est propositio neutra*¹¹: "This sentence, *Hoc est corpus meum*, is not the sentence of consecration, neither as it is true nor as it is false; but only as it is a sentence neuter between both, that is to say, neither true nor false."

All this notwithstanding, D. Stephen Gardiner, not greatly regarding the authority of any of these doctors, in his first book of the sacrament, intituled "The Devil's Sophistry," writeth thus: "Christ spake plainly, 'This is my body,' making demonstration of the bread¹²." Which last exposition being true, if this pronoun *hoc* signified the material bread that Christ held in his hand, then, by M. Harding's doctrine, that very material bread was indeed and verily the body of Christ.

But, if the same pronoun *hoc* signified not that same material bread that Christ held in his hand, then was not that same material bread changed into the substance of Christ's body.

Thus the best learned of that side are utterly amazed at this matter, and run each man his own way, and know not what may please them best.

Yet M. Harding thinketh it sufficient thus to conclude with a courage: "How that word *hoc* is to be taken, and what it pointeth, we know, who have more learnedly, more certainly, and more truly treated hereof than Luther, Zuinglius, Calvin, Cranmer, Peter Martyr, or any their offspring." If M. Harding and his fellows know so much as here he seemeth to take upon him, he hath the greater cause to give God thanks. Whatsoever he have, he hath received it. God give him grace to use it well!

He would seem not to know who they be that would force us to this fancy of his *individuum vagum*. And therefore he saith: "If their meaning be naught, handle them as ye list." Howbeit, he cannot be so ignorant herein as he would seem to be. For, although perhaps he be not much acquainted with the doctrine, yet he cannot choose but know the doctor: him I mean of whom he hath borrowed good store of matter, sometimes a whole leaf and more together, towards the building of his book.

He, notwithstanding he were once persuaded that Christ by this pronoun *hoc* made demonstration of the bread, yet afterward thought all that not worth a point, but utterly changed his whole mind, and thought it better to say that Christ by the same pronoun *hoc* pointed not the bread that he held in his hand, but only *individuum vagum*. And that, for the better understanding of his reader, he calleth *individuum in genere, individuum entis, unum substantie, unum entis, individuum insignitum, individuum individui*¹³. This fancy he so warranteth and forceth every where, as if Christ's words could bear none other exposition.

Thus therefore he imagineth Christ to say: This thing that ye see me hold in my hand is not two things: it is only one certain thing. But what one certain thing it is, I cannot tell; but sure I am, bread it is not.

[¹⁰ Sane dici potest, quod Christus virtute divina confecit; et postea formam expressit, sub qua posterius benedicerent.—Innoc. Papæ III. Op. Col. 1575. *Myst. Miss. Lib. iv. cap. vi. Tom. I. p. 377. Ab hujus ergo questionis laqueo facile se absolvit, qui dicit, quod Christus tunc confecit quum benedixit.—Ibid. cap. xvii. p. 384.]*

[¹¹ Et si quæras tunc, qualis, aut ut vera, aut ut falsa est propositio conversiva? Dico, quod neque

sic, neque sic: sed tantum ut est propositio neutra.—J. Duns Scot. Op. Lugd. 1639. Lib. iv. Sentent. Dist. viii. Quæst. ii. Tom. VIII. p. 440.]

[¹² ...it cannot be maintained of Christ's words, who spake &c.—A Detection of the Devils Sophistry, Lond. 1546. fol. 24. 2.]

[¹³ Confut. Cavill. in Ven. Euch. Sacr. Verit. Par. 1552. Ad Object. xiii. xiv. xv. foll. 9, &c. 19—21.]

Innoc. r. De Offic. Miss. Par. iii. cap. vi. & cap. xiv. Scot. in iv. Sentent. Dist. 8. Quæst. 3.

The Devil's Sophistry, fol. 24.

D. Stephen Gardiner.

Mar. Anton. Constant.

Thus are they driven to wander in vanities, and to seek up strange and monstrous forms of speech, such as the ancient catholic doctors never knew, lest they should seem plainly and simply to say, as the learned father Tertullian saith: *Hoc est corpus meum, hoc est, figura corporis mei*¹: "This is my body, that is to say, this is a figure of my body;" or, as it is written in their own decrees: *Vocatur corpus Christi, id est, significat [corpus Christi]*²: "It is called the body of Christ, that is to say, it signifieth the body of Christ."

Tertull. contra Marcion. Lib. iv. De Consecr. Dist. 2. Hoc est. In Gloss.

Hieron. in Esai. Lib. ii. cap. v.

St Hierome saith: *Tam diu . . . quærunt hæretici nova veteribus [ad]jungere, et eadem recentioribus immutare, donec [eos] et sensus humanus et verba deficient*³: "The manner of heretics is so long to mingle and blend new things with the old, and still to alter new for new, until both their wits and their speech begin to fail them."

Here note, good reader, that in this whole article M. Harding hath alleged no manner doctor, nor old nor new. The reason thereof is this, for that of the old doctors he had none to allege, and of his new doctors he was ashamed.

[¹ Tertull. Op. Lut. 1641. Adv. Marcion. Lib. iv. 40. p. 571. See before, page 447, note 13.]

[² Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugd. 1624. Decret. Gratian. Decr. Tert. Pars, De Consecr. Dist. ii. Gloss. in

can. 48. col. 1937. See before, page 503, note 13.]

[³ Hieron. Op. Par. 1693-1706. Comm. Lib. ii. in Isai. Proph. cap. v. Tom. III. col. 49; where *et sermo deficiat*.]

WHETHER THE FORMS BE THE SACRAMENT.

THE TWENTY-FIFTH ARTICLE.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

OR that the accidents, or forms, or shews of bread and wine be the sacraments of Christ's body and blood, and not rather that⁴ bread and wine itself.

[WHO ARE THE SACRAMENTS OF CHRIST'S BODY AND BLOOD, THE ACCIDENTS, OR THE BREAD AND WINE.—ARTICLE XXV. H. A. 1564.]

M. HARDING. THE FIRST DIVISION.

Forasmuch as, by the almighty power of God's word pronounced by the priest in the consecration of this sacrament, the body and blood of Christ are made (253) really present, the substance of bread (253) turned into the substance of the body, and the substance of wine into the substance of the blood; the bread (which is consumed away by the fire of the divine substance⁵, as Chrysostom saith, and now is become the bread which was formed by the hand of the Holy Ghost in the womb of the virgin, and decocted with the fire of the passion in the altar of the cross⁶, as St Ambrose saith) cannot be the sacrament of the body, nor the wine of the blood. Neither can it be said that the bread and wine⁷ which were before are the sacraments, for that the bread is become the body, and the wine the blood, and so now they are not; and if they be not, then neither be they sacraments. Therefore, that the outward forms of bread and wine which remain be the sacraments of Christ's body and blood, and not the very bread and wine itself, it followeth by sequel of reason, or consequent of understanding, deduced out of the first truth, which of St Basil, in an epistle ad Sozopolitanos, speaking against certain that went about to raise up again the old heresy of Valentinus, is called τὸ ἐν διανοίᾳ ἀκολουθῶν⁹. Of which sequel of reason in the matter of the sacrament many conclusions may be deduced in case of want of express scriptures. Which way of reasoning Basil used against heretics, as also sundry other fathers, where manifest scripture might not be alleged.

The two hundred and fifty-third untruth, ever presumed, and never proved.

In Homil. Paschali.

De Cons. Dist. 2, cap. Omnia.

Epist. 65. [In Latino codice⁸.]

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

M. Harding presumeth that his new fantasy of transubstantiation must needs stand for good. And therefore, imagining that the bread and wine are wholly removed, and cannot be the sacraments, he thinketh he may well conclude that the forms and shews that are left behind must needs be the sacraments. But this error is soon reproved by the consent of all the old catholic fathers of the church. St Augustine saith: *Quod videtis, panis est*¹⁰: "The thing that ye see (speaking of the sacrament) is (not a form or an accident, but) very bread."

August. ad Infant.

[⁴ The, H. A. 1564.]

[⁵ Ἄλλ' ὡσπερ κηρὸς πυρὶ προσομιλήσας οὐδὲν ἀποουσιάζει, οὐδὲν περισσεύει· οὕτω καὶ ὡδε νόμιζε συναλισκεσθαι τὰ μυστήρια τῆ τοῦ σώματος οὐσία.—Chrysost. Op. Par. 1718-38. De Pœnit. Hom. ix. Tom. II. col. 350. Conf. Op. Lat. Basil. 1547. De Euch. in Encæn. Admon. Sum. Tom. III. col. 919.]

[⁶ ... illum utique intelligo panem, qui manu sancti Spiritus formatus est in utero virginis, et igne passionis decoctus in ara crucis.—Ambros. in Corp.

Jur. Canon. Decret. Gratian. Decr. Tert. Pars, De Consecr. Dist. ii. can. 74. col. 1954.]

[⁷ And the wine, H. A. 1564.]

[⁸ Basil. Op. Par. 1721-30. Ad Sozop. Epist. cclxi. (al. lxxv). 3. Tom. III. p. 402.]

[⁹ These words are not in H. A. 1564. They appear in H. A. 1565.]

[¹⁰ August. Op. Par. 1679-1700. Serm. cclxxii. ad Infant. Tom. V. col. 1103. See before, page 776, note 11.]

Chrysost. ad St Chrysostom¹, Theodoretus², Gelasius³, and other learned fathers confess by
 Cesar. manifest and express words, that "there remaineth still in the sacrament the
 Gelas. contra very nature and substance of bread and wine." Therefore this doctrine is built
 Eutyeh. upon a false ground, and cannot stand.
 Theodor. Dial. 1 et 2.

But Chrysostom saith: "The bread is consumed by the force of the divine presence." And St Ambrose, saith M. Harding, reporteth the same. It is great frowardness, whatsoever any one or other of the fathers happen to utter in vehemency and heat of talk, to dissemble the manner of their speech, and to draw and force the same violently to the rigour of the letter. Paulus saith: *In fraudem [legis facit], . . . qui, salvis verbis legis, sententiam ejus circumvenit*⁴: "He doth wrong to the law, that, following only the bare words, defraudeth the meaning of the law."

St Cyprian saith: *Passio Christi est sacrificium quod offerimus*⁵: "The sacrifice that we offer is the passion of Christ."

Chrysostom saith: *Baptisma Christi sanguis ejus est*⁶: "The baptism of Christ is Christ's blood."

And again he saith: *In mysteriis sanguis ex Christi latere hauritur*⁷: "In the time of the holy communion the blood of Christ is drawn out of his side."

St Gregory saith: [*Christus*] *iterum in hoc mysterio moritur*⁸: "In this mystery (of the holy communion) Christ is put to death again."

I trow, M. Harding will not so straitly force us to believe, only upon the sight of these bare words, either that the holy communion is Christ's passion, or that the water of baptism is Christ's blood, or that Christ is slain and put to death in the time of the holy mysteries, or that Christ's blood at that time is drawn and poured from his side; and that without help of figure, verily, really, and indeed.

By such manner of amplification and kind of speech St Chrysostom saith, "The bread is consumed;" not for that there remaineth in the sacrament no bread at all, but for that, in comparison of the death of Christ, that there is laid forth and represented before us, the material bread seemeth nothing. For otherwise Chrysostom most plainly confesseth that the nature of bread remaineth still. These be his words: *In sacramento, manet natura panis*⁹: "In the sacrament there remaineth still the nature of bread."

And as he saith, "The bread is consumed;" even so in the same place he seemeth to say, the priest is consumed. His words be these: *Ne putes, te accipere divinum corpus ab homine*¹⁰: "Think not that thou receivest the divine body of a man."

And to like purpose he speaketh of the sacrament of baptism: *Non baptizaris a sacerdote: Deus ipse tenet caput tuum*¹¹: "Thou art not baptized of the priest: it is God himself that holdeth thy head."

Thus the holy fathers, entreating of the sacraments, use to advance¹² our minds from the sensible and corruptible elements to the cogitation of the heavenly things that thereby are represented. And therefore Chrysostom saith: *Mysteria omnia interioribus oculis videnda sunt*¹³: "We must behold all mysteries with our inner eyes;" which inner eyes doubtless have no regard to any corruptible and outward thing.

Hereby the feebleness of M. Harding's sequel may soon appear.

True it is that he further saith: "In case of want of the scriptures, we may

[¹ Chrysost. Op. Par. 1718-38, Epist. ad Cesar. Monach. Tom. III. p. 744. See before, page 545.]

[² Theodor. Op. Lut. Par. 1642-84, Tom. IV. Immut. Dial. i. Inconf. Dial. ii. pp. 18, 85.]

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

[⁴ Paul. in Corp. Jur. Civil. Amst. 1663. Digest. Lib. 1. Tit. III. 29, Tom. I. p. 78.]

[⁵ Cyr. Op. Oxon. 1682. Ad Cæcil. Epist. lxiii. p. 156; where *passio est enim Domini*.]

[⁶ Chrysost. Op. In Epist. ad Hebr. cap. ix. Hom.

xvi. Tom. XII. p. 159. See before, page 518, note 4.]

[⁷ Id. De Pœnit. Hom. ix. Tom. II. col. 349.]

[⁸ Gregor. in Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugd. 1624. Decret. Gratian. Decr. Tert. Pars, De Consecr. Dist. ii. can. 73. col. 1963.]

[⁹ Chrysost. Op. Epist. ad Cesar. Monach. Tom. III. p. 744. See before, page 545.]

[¹⁰ Id. De Pœnit. Hom. ix. Tom. II. p. 350.]

[¹¹ Id. in Matt. Hom. I. Tom. VII. p. 517.]

[¹² Avance, 1565.]

[¹³ Id. in 1. Cor. cap. ii. Hom. vii. Tom. X. p. 51. Id. in Matt. Hom. lxxii. Tom. VII. p. 787.]

De LL. et Senatuscon. et Lon. Con. Contra.

Cypr. Lib. ii. Epist. 3.

Chrysost. in Epist. ad Hebr. Hom. 16. Chrysost. in Encæn.

De Consecr. Dist. 2. Quid sit sanguis.

Chrysost. ad Cesar.

In Encæn.

Chrysost. in Matt. Hom. 51.

Chrysost. in 1 Cor. cap. ii.

Chrysost. in Matt. Hom. 83.

sometime guide ourselves by discourse and drift of reason¹⁴." Notwithstanding St Augustine saith: *Hæc consuetudo periculosa est*¹⁵: "The custom hereof is very dangerous." But in this case M. Harding wanteth neither the scriptures nor the authority of ancient doctors.

August. de Doctr. Christ. Lib. iii. cap. xxviii.

It is plain by the manifest words of St Paul, of St Chrysostom, of St Augustine, of Theodoretus, of Gelasius, and of other more holy fathers, both Greeks and Latins, that in the sacrament, after the words of consecration, the very nature and substance of the bread remaineth still. It were much for M. Harding to forsake all these, and to trust only to a bare shift of simple reason.

M. HARDING. THE SECOND DIVISION.

*And whereas there must be a likeness between the sacrament and the thing of the sacrament (for, if the sacraments had not a likeness of things whereof they are sacraments, properly and rightly they should not be called sacraments*¹⁶; as the sacrament of baptism, which is the outward washing of the flesh, hath a likeness of the inward washing of the soul), and no likeness here appeareth to be between the forms that remain and the thing of the sacrament, (for they consist not, the one of many corns, the other of grapes, for thereof cometh not accident, but substance;) hereto may be said, it is enough that these sacraments bear the likeness of the body and blood of Christ, forasmuch as the one representeth the likeness of bread, the other the likeness of wine, which St Augustine calleth (254) *visibilem speciem elementorum*¹⁷, "the visible form of the elements."

August. Epist. 22, ad Bonifacium Episc.

De Cons. Dist. 2, cap. Hoc est quod dicimus.

A strange resemblance. The two hundred and fifty-fourth untruth. For St Augustine by these words meant the very substance of bread. August. Epist. 23, ad Bonifac.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

What meaneth M. Harding, thus to encumber himself with these vain and miserable follies? St Augustine saith: "A sacrament must have a resemblance or likeness of that thing whereof it is a sacrament. For without this resemblance or likeness," he saith, "a sacrament is no sacrament¹⁸."

Therefore M. Harding cometh in with his fantasy, and telleth us that his forms and accidents are the resemblance and likeness of the body of Christ. But, alas! wherein standeth this comparison of resemblance and likeness? Or wherein are M. Harding's accidents and Christ's body like together? Certainly M. Harding himself, notwithstanding he can say many things, yet he cannot truly say that Christ's body is either round, or plain, or white, or thin, or any way like unto his accidents.

Yet must there be a certain likeness in effects between the sacrament and the thing itself whereof it is a sacrament. Of which effects the one is sensible, and wrought outwardly to the body; the other is spiritual, and wrought inwardly in the mind. As, for example, in the sacrament of circumcision the outward visible cutting in the flesh was a resemblance of the inward spiritual cutting of the heart. In the sacrament of baptism the outward washing of the body is a resemblance of the inward spiritual washing of the soul.

Likewise in the sacrament of the holy communion, as the bread outwardly feedeth our bodies, so doth Christ's body inwardly and spiritually feed our souls. Thus is feeding an effect common unto them both. And therein standeth the resemblance and likeness of the sacrament. Therefore Rabanus Maurus saith: *Quia panis corporis eor confirmat, ideo ille congruenter corpus Christi nominatur; et, quia vinum sanguinem operatur in carne, ideo illud refertur ad sanguinem*¹⁹: "Because the bread confirmeth the heart of our body, therefore is the same

Raban. Maur. Lib. i. cap. xxxi.

¹⁴ See before, p. 791.]

¹⁵ August. Op. Par. 1679-1700. De Doctr. Christ. Lib. iii. cap. xxviii. 39. Tom. III. Pars i. col. 56.]

¹⁶ Id. Ad Bonifac. Epist. xxviii. 9. Tom. II. col. 267. See before, page 503, note 11.]

¹⁷ Id. in Lib. Sentent. Prosp. in Corp. Jur. Canon. Decret. Gratian. Decr. Tert. Pars, De Consacr. Dist. ii. can. 48. col. 1936; where *visibili*

elementorum specie.]

¹⁸ See above, note 16.]

¹⁹ Ergo quia panis corporis eor firmat, ideo ille corpus Christi congruenter nuncupatur. Vinum autem quia sanguinem operatur in carne, ideo ad sanguinem Christi refertur.—Raban. Maur. Op. Col. Agrip. 1626-7. De Inst. Cler. Lib. i. cap. xxxi. Tom. VI. p. 12.]

conveniently called the body of Christ; and, because wine worketh blood in our flesh, therefore the wine hath relation unto the blood of Christ."

Now, if M. Harding, touching this effect of feeding, will compare his accidents with Christ's body, then must he say that we eat accidents, and drink accidents, and be fed with accidents, and live by accidents; even as in the inner man we eat Christ, and drink Christ, and be fed with Christ, and live by Christ. Otherwise he must confess that, touching the effect of feeding, his accidents have no resemblance of Christ's body, and therefore can in no wise be called sacraments.

But, saith M. Harding, the accidents represent the likeness of bread; and the bread that was representeth the body Christ¹. Here is another subtle drift of M. Harding's reason; from accidents to bread, and from bread to Christ's body. And so we have here fancy upon fancy, and one likeness upon another; but neither scripture, nor council, nor doctor, either Greek or Latin, or old or new, to avouch the same.

But here appeareth a marvellous perverse order in nature. For, by M. Harding's drifts, neither can the bread signify Christ's body, but only when the bread is abolished and nothing left to signify; nor can these accidents signify the bread, but only when there is no bread remaining there to be signified. And so the effect of M. Harding's drift and of this resemblance passeth from nothing to nothing, and standeth in nothing.

Here it behoved M. Harding to have foreseen the inconveniencies that might have followed. For, if the accidents of the bread be the sacrament, forasmuch as in one piece of bread there be sundry accidents, it must needs follow of these positions, that in one piece of bread be sundry sacraments, and so sundry sacraments in one sacrament. Innocentius himself espied this inconvenience; and therefore he demandeth this question: *Cum sint multæ species, quomodo non sunt multa sacramenta?*²

But this resemblance or likeness St Augustine calleth *visibilem speciem elementorum*, "the visible form of the elements." By which words, saith M. Harding, he meant only the shews and accidents of the bread. Indeed St Augustine's words be true; but M. Harding's exposition is not true. For St Augustine by this word *species* meant not the outward forms or shews, as it is supposed, but the very kind and substance and nature of the bread.

So St Ambrose saith: *Ante benedictionem verborum cœlestium alia species nominatur; post consecrationem corpus [Christi] significatur*³: "Before the blessing of the heavenly words it is called (not another form or another shew, but) another kind or nature; but after the consecration Christ's body is signified." Which thing may also plainly appear by St Augustine himself in the same place. For thus he writeth: *Panis, qui corpus Christi est, suo modo vocatur corpus Christi, cum re vera sit sacramentum corporis Christi, &c. Vocaturque ipsa immolatio carnis [Christi], quæ sacerdotis manibus fit, Christi passio, mors, crucifixio; non rei veritate, sed significante mysterio*⁴. He saith, (not the form, not the shew, not the accident, but) "The bread, that is the body of Christ (not verily or indeed, but) after a manner, is called the body of Christ; whereas it is indeed a sacrament of the body of Christ, &c. And the oblation of the flesh of Christ, that is made with the priest's hand, is called the passion, the death, and the crucifying of Christ; not in truth of the matter, but by a mystery signifying."

M. HARDING. THE THIRD DIVISION.

Thus the forms of bread and wine are the sacraments of the body and blood

[¹ Body of Christ, 1565, 1609.]

[² Sed queritur, Utrum species panis et veritas corporis unum sunt sacramentum, an diversa sint sacramenta? &c. He concludes: Potest non incongrue responderi, quia omnia simul accepta sunt unum eucharistiæ sacramentum, eo quod nullum sacramentum solum significet per se, sed omnia simul panis speciem repræsentant, quæ corpus Christi con-

tinet et significat.—Innoc. Papæ III. Op. Col. 1575. Myst. Miss. Lib. iv. cap. xxxviii. Tom. I. pp. 392, 3.]

[³ Ambros. Op. Par. 1686-90. Lib. de Myst. cap. ix. 54. Tom. II. col. 339.]

[⁴ ...panis, qui vere Christus caro est, suo &c.—August. in Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugd. 1624. Decret. Gratian. Decr. Tert. Pars, De Consecr. Dist. ii. can. 48. col. 1937.]

Innoc. De Offic. Miss. cap. xxxviii.

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

De Consecr. Dist. 2. Hoc est, quod dicimus.

of Christ, not only in respect of the thing signified, which is the unity of the church; but also of the thing contained, which is the very flesh and blood of Christ, John vi. whereof the Truth itself said: "The bread that I shall give is my flesh, for the life of the world."

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

In the end M. Harding, not only without any authority either of scriptures, or of councils, or of doctors, but also without any manner shew or drift of reason, concludeth in this sort: "Thus the forms of bread and wine are the sacraments of the body and blood of Christ." Thus M. Harding bringeth in his conclusion without premises. By M. Harding's judgment St Augustine was not well advised, when he called the holy mystery *sacramentum panis et vini*⁵, "the sacrament of bread and wine." He should rather have called it, by this construction, "the sacrament of forms and shews." And whereas St Augustine saith, *Accedat verbum ad elementum, et fit sacramentum*⁶; whereby he meaneth that the bread itself is made a sacrament; M. Harding will rather expound it thus: "Let the word come to the element or creature of bread; and then the accidents thereof are made a sacrament."

De Fid. ad Petr. cap. xix.

August. in Johan. Tractat. 60.

Verily, touching the wine, Christ himself calleth it, not forms or accidents, but "the fruit," or, as Cyprian termeth it, "the creature of the vine," *creaturam vitis*⁷.

Matt. xxvi.

Cyp. Lib. ii. Epist. 3.

St Cyprian calleth the bread after consecration *panem... ex multorum granorum adunatione congestum*⁸, "bread made (not of forms and accidents, but) of the (substance and) moulding of many corns."

Cyp. in Orat. Dom.

St Cyril saith: "*Credientibus discipulis fragmenta panis dedit*⁹: "Christ unto his disciples, being in him, gave (not accidents or shews, but) fragments or pieces of bread."

Cyril. in Johan. Lib. iv. cap. xxiv.

Irenæus saith: "Of the same bread and wine after consecration *augetur et consistit carnis nostræ substantia*¹⁰, is increased and consisteth the substance of our flesh."

Iren. Lib. v.

Here must M. Harding needs say, as Marcus Constantius said before him, that accidents are the fruit of the vine¹¹; that corns and grapes be likewise accidents; that fragments and pieces of bread be nothing else but accidents; that the substance of our bodies is nourished and increased and standeth by accidents. Thus are their accidents *fuga miserorum*. They can prove and reprove all by accidents; and without their accidents they can do nothing. And thus, as bad surgeons, they make one salve to serve for all sores.

Ad Object. 27.

St Gregory saith: *O Timothee, depositum custodi, devitans profanas vocum novitates. Quia cum laudari hæretici, tanquam de excellenti ingenio, cupiunt, quasi nova quædam proferunt, quæ in antiquorum patrum libris veteribus non tenentur. Sicque fit, ut, dum videri desiderant sapientes, miseris suis auditoribus stultitiæ semina spargant*¹²: "O Timothy, keep that thou hast received; and beware of the wicked novelties of words. For these heretics, seeking the commendation of the excellency of their wit, bring forth new things, that in the old books of the ancient fathers are not found. And so it happeneth that, while they would be taken for wise men, they scatter amongst their poor hearers the seeds of folly."

Greg. in Job. Lib. xviii. cap. xiv.

Certainly, M. Harding and his fellows, as of shews they have made sacraments, even so of the holy sacraments and whole religion of Christ they have left nothing to the simple people but a sight of shews.

⁵ August. Op. Par. 1679-1700. Lib. de Fid. ad Petr. cap. xix. Tom. VI. Append. col. 30; where *sacristium*.]

⁶ Id. in Johan. Evang. cap. xv. Tractat. lxxx. 3. Tom. III. Pars II. col. 703; where *accedit*.]

⁷ ... *creatura vitis*.—Cyp. Op. Oxon. 1682. Ad Cæcil. Epist. lxxiii. p. 152.]

⁸ Id. ad Magn. Epist. lxxix. p. 182. See before, pages 516, 7, note 8.]

⁹ Cyril. Alex. Op. Lut. 1638. In Joan. Evang.

Lib. iv. cap. ii. p. 360. See before, p. 580, note 6.]

¹⁰ Iren. Op. Par. 1710. Contr. Hær. Lib. v. cap. ii. 3. p. 294.]

¹¹ ... *quid prohibet Christum appellare accidentia vini in sacramento genimen vitis, quum ex ipsa vite orta sint?*—Confut. Cavill. in Ven. Euch. Sac. Verit. Par. 1552. Ad Object. 27. fol. 28. 2.]

¹² Gregor. Magni Papæ I. Op. Par. 1705. Moral. Lib. xviii. in cap. xxviii. B. Job. cap. xxvi. 39. Tom. I. col. 573; where *quia dum*, and *sapientes desiderant*.]

OF HIDING AND COVERING.

THE TWENTY-SIXTH ARTICLE.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

OR that the sacrament is a sign or token of the body of Christ, that lieth hidden underneath it.

[OF THE UNSPEAKABLE MANNER OF THE BEING OF CHRIST'S BODY AND BLOOD UNDER THE FORMS OF BREAD AND WINE.—ARTICLE XXVI. H. A. 1564.]

M. HARDING.

Forma.
Operta.

The two hundred and fifty-fifth untruth. For the outward form was never by any old father called the sacrament.

That the outward form of bread, (255) which is properly the sacrament, is the sign of the body of Christ, we confess, yea, of that body which is covertly in or under the same, which St Augustine calleth *carnem Domini* In Libro Sentent. Prosperi. *forma panis opertam*¹, “the flesh of the² Lord covered with the form of bread.” But what is meant by this term “lieth,” we know not. As through faith grounded upon God's word we know that Christ's body is in the sacrament; so, that it lieth there or underneath it, (by which term it may seem a scoff to be uttered to bring the catholic teaching in contempt,) or that it sitteth or standeth, we deny it. For lying, sitting, and standing, noteth situation of a body in a place, according to distinction of members and circumscription of place, so as it have his parts in a certain order correspondent to the parts of the place. But after such manner the body of Christ is not in the sacrament, but without circumscription, order, and habitude of his parts to the parts of the body or place environing. Which manner of being in is above all reach of human understanding, wondrous, strange, and singular, not defined and limited by the laws or bounds³ of nature, but by the almighty power of God. To conclude, the being of Christ's body in the sacrament is to us certain; the manner of his being there to us uncertain, and to God only certain.

THE BISHOP OF SARISBURY.

The entry of this article is the conclusion of the last. So artificially M. Harding's untruths are woven together. “The outward form of bread,” saith he, “is the sacrament.” But withal he should have added, that this form and manner of speech is only his own, peculiar only to himself and certain his fellows of that side; never used by any of all the old doctors and fathers of the church, either Greek or Latin, or learned or unlearned, or catholic or heretic, or one or other.

These words of St Augustine are alleged and answered before⁴. That holy learned father never said, neither that the forms and accidents be the sacrament, nor that Christ's body is really hidden under the same; nor in this place speaketh any one word at all of any accidents.

But the words wherein M. Harding is deceived are these, *forma panis*: which words signify not the outward forms and accidents, as he untruly expoundeth them, but the very kind and substance of the bread. So St Paul saith: *Christus, cum in forma Dei esset, formam servi accepit*: “Christ, being in the form (or nature) of God, took upon him the form (or nature) of a servant.” By which words St Paul meant, that Christ was very God in substance, and that he took upon him the very substance of a man. So St Hierome

In the twelfth article and fourteenth division.

Phil. ii.

[¹ August. in Lib. Sent. Prosp. in Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugd. 1624. Decret. Gratian. Decr. Tert. Pars, Dist. ii. can. 48. ccl. 1937. See before, page 617.]

[² Our, 1565, 1609, and H. A. 1564.]

[³ Bonds, 1565, and H. A. 1564.]

[⁴ See before, pages 618, 9.]

expoundeth the same words, speaking in the person of Christ: *Declinavi ad eos deserens regna cælorum, ut cum eis vescerer, assumpta forma servi*⁵: "I went down to them, leaving the kingdom of heaven, that I might eat with them, having taken the form of a servant." I think M. Harding will not say, Christ took a body of forms and accidents, that he might be conversant and live with men. So St Augustine saith: *Secundum hanc formam non est putandus ubique diffusus*⁶: "Christ (not according to the shews or accidents of his body, but) according to this kind, this nature, and this substance of his body, may not be thought to be poured and spread into all places." Thus St Paul, St Augustine, St Hierome, and other learned fathers use this word *forma* for nature and substance, and not for accidents.

Hieron. in Osee, Lib. iii. cap. ii.

August. ad Dard. Epist. 57.

And as touching the other word, *operta*, "covered," St Augustine meaneth not thereby that Christ's body is really contained and covered under the said form or kind of bread, but only that it is there as in a sacrament or in a mystery. In this sense St Augustine saith: *Gratia Dei in veteri testamento velata latebat*⁷: "The grace of God lay hidden covered in the old testament." And again: *In veteri testamento occultabatur novum, id est, occulte significabatur*⁸: "The new testament was hidden in the old, that is to say, it was secretly signified in the old."

August. de Spir. et Lit. cap. xv.

August. de Baptism. contr. Donat. Lib. i. cap. xv.

Here, lest M. Harding should take these words strictly and grossly, as he doth the rest, and say, the new testament indeed and really was covered in the old, St Augustine himself hath prevented him, and opened his own meaning in this wise, as it is said before: *Occultabatur, . . . id est, occulte significabatur*⁸: "It was covered, that is to say, it was secretly signified." By which exposition, being St Augustine's, M. Harding might have learned likewise to expound these words: *Caro operta forma panis, id est, occulte significata*: "The flesh covered in the form or substance of bread; that is to say, privily signified in the form or substance of bread."

But M. Harding thought it best to leave the matter, and to make his quarrel to the words: "This word *lieth*," saith he, "importeth a scoff wherewith to bring his catholic teaching into contempt." Verily, this must needs be a marvellous tender and a miserable doctrine, that may no ways be touched without suspicion of a scoff. But why is he more angry with us for uttering these words, "lieth hidden," than he is with his own doctors uttering the same?

In his gloss upon the decrees it is written thus: *Species panis, sub qua latet corpus: . . . species vini, sub qua latet sanguis*⁹: "The form of bread, under which is hidden the body; the form of wine, under which is hidden the blood." These be his own fellows' words: they are not ours.

De Consecr. Dist. 2. Hoc est. In Glossa.

Willihelmus Haffiginensis, one of M. Harding's new doctors, saith thus: *Querite Dominum, dum inveniri potest. In templo invenitur materiali: ibi latet sub specie panis*¹⁰: "Seek the Lord while he may be found. He is found in the material church of stone: there he is hidden under the form of bread."

Will. Haffig. in Sermon. de Advent. Vixit Anno 1300.

Another like doctor saith thus: *Ibi est corpus Christi in tanta quantitate, sicut fuit in cruce. . . . Unde mirum est, quomodo sub tam modica specie tantus homo lateat*¹¹: "The body of Christ is there as great in quantity as he was upon the cross. Therefore it is marvellous how so great a man can be hid under so small a form."

Ludolph. in Vit. Christi, Par. ii. cap. lvi.

[⁵ Hieron. Op. Par. 1693-1706. Comm. Lib. iii. in Osee Proph. cap. xi. Tom. III. col. 1313. See before, page 618, note 2.]

[⁶ August. Op. Par. 1679-1700. Lib. ad Dard. seu Epist. clxxxvii. cap. iii. 10. Tom. II. col. 681.]

[⁷ Id. Lib. de Spir. et Lit. cap. xv. 27. Tom. X. col. 100. See before, page 618, note 12.]

[⁸ Id. De Baptism. Contr. Donatist. Lib. i. cap. xv. 24. Tom. IX. col. 92. See before, page 595, note 15.]

[⁹ Corp. Jur. Canon. Decret. Gratian. Decr. Tert. Pars, De Consecr. Dist. ii. Gloss. in can. 48. col. 1937.]

[¹⁰ Of this author, under the name of Guilelmus Affigemensis, an account may be found J. A. Fabric. Biblioth. Lat. Med. et Inf. Ætat. Patav. 1754. Tom. III. p. 137. See also Oudin. De Script. Eccles. Lips. 1722. Tom. III. col. 50. It is said that he flourished about A.D. 1260; and that some of his works were preserved in manuscript at the monastery in which he lived. This appears to have been not far from Brussels. See Lud. Guicciardin. Belgic. Deser. Amst. 1652. pp. 125, 6.]

[¹¹ Ludolph. de Saxon. Vit. J. Christ. Lugd. 1510. Pars ii. cap. lvi. fol. N. viii. 2.]

If this word "hidden" so necessarily import a scoff, then must M. Harding needs think that his own doctors scoff at him, and laugh him to scorn. Certainly it is no indifferent dealing, the words being all one, so favourably to allow them in his own books, and so bitterly to dislike them in all others.

Perhaps he will say, it is no catholic form of speech to say Christ *lieth* in the sacrament. And yet I see no great reason but it may stand as well with the catholic doctrine to say Christ *lieth* in the sacrament, as Christ *sitteth* in the sacrament. Yet Johannes à S. Andrea, a great doctor, and a special patron of that side, is well allowed to write thus, and that without any manner controlment or suspicion of scoff: *Id...temporis contentio nulla erat, utrum corpus Christi insideret eucharistiæ*¹: "At that time there was no strife whether Christ's body were sitting in or upon the sacrament, or no." Thus was it lawful for him to write; and his writings are taken for good and catholic.

But M. Harding saith: Christ's body is in the sacrament without circumscription or respect of place, strangely, wondrously, and singularly, and by the might of God's omnipotent power; and the manner of his being there is known only unto God. These be fair and orient and beautiful colours, but altogether without ground; and, to use the terms of M. Harding's religion, they are nothing else but accidents and shews without a subject.

It is a strange and a marvellous matter, that, this presence of Christ in the sacrament being so certain and so singular, as M. Harding seemeth to make it, yet all the old learned catholic fathers should so lightly pass it over in silence, without any manner mention, as if it were not worth the hearing; or that M. Harding should so assuredly and so certainly know it, and yet God himself should not know it; or that God should know it, and yet, being a matter so singular and so necessary to be known, should never reveal the same to any either of the learned fathers or of the holy apostles, or make them privy to that knowledge.

Indeed it behoveth us to humble our hearts unto the miracles and marvellous works of God. But every M. Harding's fantasy is not a miracle. The heretic Praxeas said, even as now M. Harding saith: *Deo nihil est difficile*: "Unto God nothing is hard." But Tertullian, that learned father, answered him then, even as we now answer M. Harding: *Si tam abrupte in præsumptionibus nostris utamur hac sententia, quidvis de Deo confingere poterimus*²: "If we so rashly use this sentence to serve our presumptions (or fantasies), we may imagine of God what we list."

St Stephen saw Christ in heaven "standing;" St Paul saith, Christ is now at the right hand of God "sitting;" which thing also we confess in the articles of our faith. But in the sacrament, saith M. Harding, Christ is present without any manner such circumscription or circumstance or order of place; that is to say, as great in quantity as he was upon the cross, and yet neither standing, nor sitting, nor lying, nor leaning, nor kneeling, nor walking, nor resting, nor moving, nor having any manner proportion or position of his body, either upward or downward, or backward or forward; a very body, and yet not as a body; in a place, and yet not as in a place.

This is M. Harding's catholic doctrine, without scripture, without council, without doctor, without any liking or sense of reason. Yet must every man receive the same at M. Harding's hand as the singular, strange, wonderful, omnipotent work of God.

To conclude, Christ's body is in the mystical bread of the holy communion, not really, or corporally, or in deed, as M. Harding fancieth, but as in a sacrament and in a mystery; even as the blood of Christ is in the water of baptism.

Johan. à S.
Andr. in
Epist. ante
Liturg.

Tertull.
contr. Prax.

Acts vii.
Col. iii.

[¹ Id autem temporis contentio nulla fuit, an verum corpus Christi sacræ eucharistiæ insideret.—
Joan. a Sanct. Andr. in Epist. ante Liturg. Sanct.

Patr. Antv. 1560. fol. 2. 2.]

[² Tertull. Op. Lut. 1641. Adv. Prax. 10. p. 641.
See before, page 490.]