

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

ART. IV.—SOME CURIOSITIES OF PATRISTIC AND
MEDIÆVAL LITERATURE.

PART II.—DOCTRINAL.

BUT it is time for us now to revert to the terms of the famous recantation, "Ego Berengarius." In view of the history before us, it is important to submit them to a careful consideration as interpretative of the words of institution. In doing this, indeed, there may be something repugnant to the feelings of reverential awe with which we would desire to come to the contemplation of what pertains to "these holy mysteries." But we desire to do this with a full sense of the sacredness of the subject, and with as little as possible of what may arouse feelings of bitterness in those who differ from us, and under a strong conviction that the cause of God's truth demands of English Churchmen at the present time to be outspoken on the matter of this burning controversy.

We must observe, then, that the language of this confession, monstrous and revolting as it is felt and acknowledged to be, nay, heretical as (in its natural sense) it is now regarded even in the Romish Communion, expresses really nothing more than is actually contained in the very words which were used by our blessed Lord Himself—if *it be so*, that those words must be understood exactly¹ *ut verba sonant* in a sense excluding everything of trope, or figure, or metaphor; or, in other words, if our Lord's saying is not to be regarded as a *locatio sacramentalis*, a saying, that is, in which the sign bears the name of the thing signified and conveyed by it.

We, of course, maintain that the words of the institution are to be tropically and sacramentally understood—that, in view of the occasion and the surroundings, such an interpretation was natural and obvious, that no other could have been admitted without doing violence to common-sense.² And we

¹ So Thomas Waldensis says of the confession of Berengarius: "Intendebat ergo ecclesia tunc sic credere sicut dixit, nihil plus, nihil minus, sicut et Christus dicens, *Hoc est Corpus meum*" ("De Sac. Euch.," cap. xlii., f. 73; Venice, 1571).

² Bishop Pearson has well said: "We must not so stand upon the propriety of speech, when it is written, 'The word was made flesh,' as to destroy the propriety both of the *word* and of the *flesh*" (On Creed, art. iii.). It is an argument which must be acknowledged to be forcible, even by Romanists. But we may apply the same argument to the words of institution, and say: "We must not so far stand upon the propriety of speech, when it is written, 'This is My Body,' as to destroy the propriety both of the *bread* and of the *body*." (See Turton's Reply to Wiseman, p. 274.)

"Certain it is," writes Bishop Cosin, "that the bread is not the body of Christ any otherwise than as the cup is the New Testament, and the different consequences cannot be drawn from these two not different

appeal in confirmation of this view to the teaching of the Fathers of the early centuries of the Christian Church, as showing that they were so understood by Christians of old time.

It can scarcely be needful to say that this sacramental or tropical sense was held and taught by the great divines of the English Church.¹ But it should be added, for the sake of correcting a too common misapprehension, that nothing was further from their intention than the idea of denying or questioning that the elements are effectual signs for conveying to the faith of the receiver the things which they signify, and whose names they bear in the delivery. There was no questioning among them of the truth that the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper.

We have seen how earlier attempts to exclude the tropical or sacramental sense seem to have recognised the truth that the words could not (without doing violence to common-sense)

expressions. Therefore, as the cup cannot be the New Testament but by a sacramental figure, no more can the bread be the body of Christ but in the same sense" ("Hist. of Transubstantiation," ch. v., § 4).

See Wyclif, "De Eucharistiâ," p. 97.

¹The following extract might be adduced as evidence to show how the doctrine of Berengar corresponded to the doctrine of the Reformed: "Cum dicit Dominus de pane illo, quem primo in privilegium promovit, illud ut esset Corpus Ipsius: hoc, *i.e.*, hæc res, hic panis est meum Corpus non est locutus proprie, quia nec panis ille individuus, quem in eam provexerat dignitatem, ut digne sumptus valeret ad animæ salutem, susceptibilis erat prædicati individui illius Corporis, quod sibi in utero virginis Dei sapientia fabricavit; et ita subjectus terminus, quod est panis, propria perpendendus est locutione, tropicâ prædicatus terminus, quod est in propositione: meum Corpus" ("De Sacrà Cœnâ," pp. 83, 84. Berlin, 1834). And this must clearly determine the interpretation of what he says of the "conversion" in p. 57. He regards "conversion" as admitting a variety of senses—"Est enim multiplex et vera conversio" (p. 57).

Berengar's sense of "conversio" may be illustrated by the following extract: "Ceterum mutationi in placatum irati similis erat mutatio panis in corpus Christi, quia inefficax erat panis natura ante consecrationem ad vitam æternam, post consecrationem efficax, quia, sicut ad æternitatem amissam in Adam nemo proficeret, nisi verbum caro fieret, ita nemo Christianus ad immortalitatem redit, si per contemptum profanat sacramenta altaris, et quod dicitur panis altaris corpus Christi, eo locutionis dicitur genere, quo dicitur: Christus est summus angularis lapis" (*ibid.*, p. 145. See also pp. 161 *sqq.*). This is the more to be observed, because (though Berengar was considered a heretic by Luther) others, including Mabillon, and Martene, and Durand, think that he held the *præsentia realis*, only denying transubstantiation. (See Gieseler, "Eccl. Hist.," vol. ii., p. 411.)

It was truly said: "Qui hodie sunt Calvinistæ, olim dicti fuerunt Berengariani." (Serarius, "Trihæres," lib. i., cap. v., quoted by Abp. Ussher, "De Christ. Eccles. Succ. et Statu," cap. vii., § 23; "Works," vol. ii., p. 214. See also p. 215.)

be understood to the full *ut verba sonant*, and accordingly interpreted them as meaning something like this: "This bread is adopted by Me, to be incorporated into My flesh, and thus by augmentation to form a part of My body."¹

But ages of ever-growing superstition had followed; and the rust of this superstition had now so far eaten into the faith of the Christian Church that men had been taught to think that religion triumphs in the overthrow of common-sense.² And rejecting altogether the augmentation doctrine, the new doctors would interpret the words of institution *ut verba sonant* to the full, maintaining that the consecrated bread is bread no more, but either the whole body of Christ, or a *portiuncula*³ of that body, the *appearance* of bread alone

¹ See "Curiosities," No. ii.

² "Quo hic ratio infirmior, eò fides fortior. Quo ratio hic minus vel nihil operatur, eò fides plus vel totum operans amplius meretur. Libenter igitur ratio hic succumbat, ut fidei meritum accrescat" (Hildeberti Opera, c. 1106; Paris, 1708). See "Lectures on Lord's Supper," pp. 29-31.

³ The expression "*portiuncula carnis*" is so frequently repeated by Berengarius as the language of Lanfranc that it seems scarcely possible to doubt that it had been used by him. (See "*De Sacra Cœnâ*," pp. 45, 84, 114, 119, 127, 158, 171, 174, 175, 195, 197, 200, 209; Berlin, 1834.) But it is nowhere to be found, we believe, in his "*Liber de Corpore et Sanguine Domini*."

The fact that the exceeding difficulties connected with the idea of "*totum corpus*" seem sometimes to have constrained literalists of Berengar's time to understand, or to acquiesce in the understanding, the "*Hoc est Corpus Meum*" of a "*portiuncula carnis*" shows clearly how far the new and now dominant doctrine was from having yet attained to its full development. The notion of the Real Presence of Christ—"Body, Soul, and Divinity"—*there* (supralocally) on the altar under the form of bread and wine had hardly yet come to the birth. It was to be the outcome of a further growth of superstition. (See "*De Sacra Cœnâ*," pp. 148, 197-199; Berlin, 1834.) Faith had hardly yet been so universally blinded as to believe in the Real Presence of Christ's Human Body and of Christ Himself at the same time on thousands of altars. The witness had not yet died out to the truth that it is "against the truth of Christ's natural Body to be at the same time in more places than one." (See "*De Sacra Cœnâ*," pp. 198, 199.)

The position of Lanfranc is thus represented by Berengar: "*Confringis enim, non superesse in altari panem sensualem, sed portiunculam carnis factæ de pane; hujus portiunculæ carnis colorem, vel, ut verba tua ponam, visibilem speciem, non ipsum subjectum, sed quod in subjecta ea sit, sacramentum esse constituis in prioribus tractatus tui, qui tamen ipse in posterioribus ejusdem tractatus asseris, non esse sacramentum colorem vel speciem portiunculæ carnis, quæ sit port consecrationem in altari, sed ipsam portiunculam, i. e., non quod in ea subjecta sit, sed eam quæ subjectum sit esse sacramentum totius Corporis, quod in cælo est, Christi, eamque ipsam manibus frangi, dentibus atteri. Sed vecordissimum erat, quod de Christi Corpore esse non neges, non negare etiam frangi vel atteri*" ("*De Sacra Cœnâ*," p. 45; Berlin, 1834). And see especially p. 197, where he says, "Non enim totum Christi corpus tu adesse sensualiter in altari dispis."

remaining, that faith may gain victory over the evidence of the senses.

Darkness was covering the earth. But it was surely scarcely possible that, even in dark ages, the human understanding could submit, with no effort of rebellion, to the domination of such a monstrous and novel doctrine¹ as was now being set up as an idol in the Church of Christ. Berengar was the head of the rebellion; and he withstood the dominant party of innovation by going back, not to the doctrine of Damascenus and the first upholders of literalism, but to the earlier doctrine of the Fathers, shielding himself under their authority, and

It is to be noted that the miraculous manifestations alleged to have been seen upon the altar (and which are so seriously treated of by Lombard) were sometimes as of the whole body of a child (or of a lamb), sometimes as of a *portiuuncula* of a body, as "*pars digiti auricularis sanguine cruentata.*" (See "*Mansi*," tom. xix., c. 434, 435; and Bishop Jeremy Taylor, "*Real Presence*," sect. x., § 8; "*Works*," vol. vi., pp. 93, 94, edit. Eden.; and Canon Robertson, "*Hist. of Christian Church*," vol. iv., p. 364; and especially Morton on "*Eucharist*," book iv., ch. ii., §§ 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, p. 217 *sqq.*; and Ussher's "*Works*," vol. iii., p. 76 *sqq.*; see also Scudamore's "*Notitia Eucharistica*," pp. 611, 968, 2nd edit.)

A Romish divine has said of these manifestations that they "are mere fables, suggested by the father of lies." (See Archbishop Wake in Gibson's "*Preservative*," vol. x., p. 17, London, 1848; and Alex. Alens., as quoted in Cosin's "*Hist. Transub.*," cap. vii., § 24, p. 131, A. C. L.; and Wyclif, "*De Eucharistiâ*," p. 20).

In 1687 was published in London (translated from the French) a book full of the most extraordinary stories, entitled "*The School of the Eucharist*, established upon the miraculous respects and acknowledgments, which beasts, birds, and insects, upon several occasions, have rendered to the Holy Sacrament of the altar, by F. Toussain Bridoul, of the Society of Jesus." See also Cosin's "*Hist. of Transub.*," ch. vii., § 22; and Bellarmine, "*De Sacr. Euch.*," lib. iii., cap. viii.; "*De Controv.*," tom. iii., c. 703, 704.

Of one such wonderful story we are told by Wyclif: "*Postquam narratori iste ex narratione et populi devotione fuit ad partem a quodam familiari socio commendatus, confessus est mendacium hoc turpe: Os finxit, inquit, hoc pulchrum mendacium*" ("*De Eucharistiâ*," p. 20; Wyclif Soc.).

These strange stories well suited the doctrine taught by Paschasius and Lanfranc, but they were scarcely in harmony with the teaching of Damascenus and the earlier literalists. And they are quite repugnant to the view of this Sacrament as taught by Augustin, for he gives as an example of transitory signs, "*Sicut panis ad hoc factus in accipiendo sacramento consumitur.*" And then he adds concerning such signs: "*Quia hæc hominibus nota sunt, quia per homines fiunt, honorem tanquam religiosa possunt habere, stuporem tanquam mira non possunt*" ("*De Trin.*," lib. iii., cap. x., §§ 19, 20; *Op.*, tom. viii., c. 803, ed. Ben., Paris, 1688. See also § 21, c. 804).

¹ If we may believe the evidence of competent witnesses, this doctrine was so regarded by its able champion, Cardinal du Perron, who, on his death-bed, declared that in maintaining it he had been defending an ill cause, and expressed, as his own opinion of transubstantiation, "that it was a monster." See Archbishop Wake on Gibson's "*Preservative*," vol. x., p. 9; see also Cosin's "*Hist. Trans.*," ch. vii., § 22.

insisting on the figurative and tropical sense,¹ as giving the only true interpretation of the words of our blessed Lord. Certainly Berengar clearly understood the meaning of a *locutio sacramentalis*, and ably maintained that in that term was contained the true key to the interpretation of the words of institution. Accordingly, the recantation extorted by the dominant party from Berengarius was simply the full and distinct expression of the most literal interpretation of our Lord's words. If what is figurative and tropical is to be rigidly excluded—if the idea of a *sacramentalis locutio* is to be condemned, then (the subtleties of the scholastic philosophy—whatever approaches² may have been made to them—having not yet been generally applied to the doctrine of transubstantiation) the confession, "Ego Berengarius," with all the grossness of its materialistic conceptions, is nothing but an expansion

¹ See "De Sacra Cœnâ," pp. 37, 38, 43, 75, 76, 77, 83, 84, 86, 119, 125 *sqq.*; Berlin, 1834.

² Algerus, *e.g.*, maintains: "Sicut Deus in omnibus est mirabilis, sit et in istis. Facit enim in suo Sacramento accidentales qualitates existere per se, quod in cæteris est impossibile. . . Quid mirum si sine substantiæ fundamento facit qualitates existere?" ("De Veritate Corporis Dom.," lib. ii., f. 66; edit. D. Erasmus, Friburg Brig., 1530).

And somewhat later, Anselm (sometimes regarded as the first of the Schoolmen) wrote: "Quare autem Corpus Christi cum sit inviolabile et incorruptabile, qua ratione hoc esse potest ut dentibus atteratur, et etiam a foricibus corrodatur. Sed secundum definitiones sanctorum Patrum est intelligendum panem super altare positum per illa solemnia verba in Corpus Christi mutari, nec remanere substantiam panis et vini, speciem tamen intelligendum est remanere, formam scilicet, colorem et saporem: secundum speciem remanentem quædam ibi fiunt quæ nullomodo secundum hoc quod est possunt fieri, scilicet quod atteritur, quod uno loco concluditur, et a foricibus roditur, et in ventrem trajicetur" (Epist. cvii.; Op., p. 453; Paris, 1721).

Wyclif's interpretation of similar words quoted from Anselm will be found in his "De Eucharistiâ," p. 130.

Somewhat later, Hugo de Sancto Victore wrote: "Per verba sanctificationis vera panis et vini substantia in verum Corpus Christi et sanguinem convertitur, solâ specie panis et vini remanente, et substantia in substantiam transeunte. Conversio autem ipsa non secundum unionem sed secundum transitionem credenda est" ("De Sacramentis," lib. ii., pars viii., cap. ix.).

For Wyclif's comment on this, see "De Eucharistiâ," p. 75 (Wyclif Soc.).

Hildebertus Turonensis also asks (if the treatise "De Sacramento Altaris" is really his): "Numquid ei [rationi] capabile est qualiter substantia panis et vini in substantiam corporis et sanguinis Domini conversa, non tamen conversa sunt pariter, sed manent immutata, sine panis et sine vini substantia, tam panis, quam vini accidentia? Quomodo accidentia sine subjecto, vel hæc accidentia in quo nata sint sine subjecto? Via in istis est ignota rationi, sed non penitus ignota fidei" (Op., c. 1106; Paris, 1708).

These all were before the "Master of the Sentences," and were doubtless preparing the way for the subtle distinctions of scholasticism.

of the true and only sense of the words which were spoken by our Lord. They are nothing more than an explanatory periphrasis of the words, "Take, eat, this is My Body." If that which is seen, given, and taken by the hand and eaten by the mouth be indeed not sacramentally, but really the Body of Christ, then is that Body ground with the teeth in the mouth of the communicant.

We ask to have this well considered. We desire to have it very carefully examined.

And then we wish our readers to see this quite clearly, that the contention between Berengar and his opponents turns altogether on the question whether the words of institution are to be understood figuratively or literally.

Berengar maintains—and his position is well understood—that the true interpretation is figurative, tropical, sacramental. That this was his contention is implied in the very words of his recantation.

The Council insists that nothing is tropical—that the true interpretation is only and wholly literal. When we have this—the true *status controversiæ* of that day—before us, then and not till then are we in a position to estimate the full significance of the historical facts which we have been contemplating. When we have seen clearly the true point at issue between the contending parties, we can hardly fail to see the importance of the fact that Hildebrand expressed his approval (in some sort) of Berengar's tropical, figurative interpretation; and that, according to the testimony of Pope Gregory VII., the Blessed Virgin herself, by a revelation from heaven, condemned the novelties of the literalist doctrine—condemned them as making an addition to faith, an addition to be rejected as having no warrant in the sacred Scriptures of truth.

We cannot be surprised if at first sight this should seem to some as an overstatement of the case, and a scarcely credible account of the attitude of the Pope towards one whom Papists must regard as among the chief of heresiarchs.

But, while we do not wish to imply that Hildebrand's own views were necessarily identical with those of Berengar, we hold it impossible to doubt that the Pope must have known well what the doctrine of Berengar really was when he showed himself desirous of securing something like toleration for the man whom he so highly esteemed, in spite of the clamour which called him a heretic.

And we submit that this curiosity of mediæval literature cannot be fairly studied without seeing another example of the way in which the Romish doctrine of the Eucharist has been consolidated by accretions—the result of men's thoughts,

thinking to make perfect what in the Divine revelation was imperfect, and developing doctrines which are a human addition to the faith once for all delivered unto the saints.

The gloss has yet to be accounted for. It need not detain us long. It belongs to the expression of a later development of Eucharistic doctrine. After the fourth Lateran Council of 1215, in which Innocent III. decreed the doctrine of transubstantiation, the novel views grew rapidly, and quickly bore fruit—fruit which surely would have shocked the piety of Christians of old time. *They* had never dreamt of the elevation of the Host for purposes of adoration. *They* had never thought of carrying about the Host on high as a present Deity. *They* had known no festival of *Corpus Christi*. How could they, since they spoke of the consecrated elements as the figures, and signs, and antitypes of the Lord's Body and Blood?

But the ages of the higher scholastic theology followed on, and scholasticism has been designated "the knighthood of theology." This was a period, in some sense, of intellectual activity, but of activity which strangely submitted (for the most part) to be restrained by the iron fences of canon law. As the result, we have to contemplate some curious anomalies. The scholastic doctors—speaking generally—do not seem to have stumbled at the teaching of Christ's Human Body being at the same time on ten thousand earthly altars,¹ and at the

¹ Very surprising is the following argument of T. Aquinas: "Manifestum est, quod Corpus Christi non incipit esse in hoc sacramento per motum localem. Primo quidem, quia sequeretur quod desineret esse in cælo: non enim quod localiter movetur, pervenit de novo ad aliquem locum, nisi deserat priorem. Secundo, quia omne corpus localiter motum, pertransit omnia media: quod hic dici non potest. Tertio, quia impossibile est quod unus motus ejusdem Corporis localiter moti terminetur simul ad diversa loca: cum tamen in pluribus locis Corpus Christi sub hoc sacramento simul esse incipiat; et ideo relinquatur, quod non possit aliter Corpus Christi incipere esse de novo in hoc sacramento, nisi per conversionem substantiæ panis in ipsum" ("Summa," quæst. lxxv., art. ii., pars iii., vol. ii., p. 205; Ludg., 1663. See also p. 207, and quæst. lxxxiii., art. v.). Here is recognised an impossibility in the nature of things. But the impossibility is not in the being of One Body at the same time in heaven and on many altars on earth, but only in this being brought about "per motum localem." As if it were easier to believe its being brought about by transubstantiation than by motion! Compare the teaching of the Tridentine Catechism, pars ii., cap. iv., § 37.

So Bonaventura has before him the objection: "Corpus Christi in cælo existens, habet ibi terminum suæ substantiæ: ergo impossibile est quod sit secundum veritatem in hoc sacramento: ergo si est ibi, est solum in signo." And thus he answers it: "Quamvis Corpus Christi terminum habeat in cælo quantum ad existentiam naturalem, non tamen habet quantum ad potestatem conversionis, secundum quam alibi potest Corpus converti in ipsum: et ideo illa virtute supernaturali fit alibi, quâ aliud convertitur in ipsum" (Bonaventura, "In Sent.," lib. iv., dist. x., pars i. art. i., quæst. i.; Op., tom. v., p. 109; Lugd., 1668).

same time on God's right hand in heaven, though they seem to have understood this in a sense which it is not always easy to apprehend or to realize, and though they can hardly have been ignorant that such teaching was utterly irreconcilable

Again : "Si quæretur ratio, quare Corpus Christi est in plurimis locis, credo quod hæc sit ratio, quia plura convertuntur in ipsum totum, et pluribus locis" (quæst. iii., p. 100 ; see also p. 114).

Again, in answer to the objection : "Corpus Christi . . . est in pluribus [locis] per miraculum : Ergo similiter per miraculum potest incorruptibile frangi," he answers. "Non est simile de esse in pluribus locis, quia ibi nulla est contradictio : hic autem sic" (dist. xii., quæst. i., pars i., art. ii., p. 143).

Very surprising also is the efficacy which some of the Schoolmen seem to have attributed to the word "sacramentaliter." Sayings which in themselves they might have allowed to be impossible and inconceivable become, in their view, credible and conceivable if only understood *sacramentaliter*. It seems almost as if, because difficulties may be easily removed by understanding language *sacramentaliter* in the sense of *in signo tantum*, the same effect might be produced by the same word understood in a sense inclusive of *in veritate rei*. The following may be taken as an example : "Ad illud quod objicitur, quod est ibi localiter, dicendum quod aliquid dicitur ibi esse localiter, aut quia est secundum corporalem præsentiam, aut secundum commensurationem Corpori debitam. Primo modo est ibi localiter, secundo non, immo tantum in cælo ; unde Innocentius distinguit esse localiter contra esse sacramentaliter" (Bonaventura, "In Sent.," lib. iv., dist. x., pars i., art. i., quæst. iv. ; Op., tom. v., p. 111). Compare the Council of Trent, sess. xiii., ch. i.

But Nicolaus de Niise concludes : "Posset Corpus Christi esse in pluribus locis non solum sacramentaliter, sed etiam localiter, patet ex dictis" (Tract. VI., pars iii. ; "De Euch.," quæst. ii. ; "Resol. Theol.," f. 497 ; Paris, 1574). And of the objection he rightly declares : "Æque concludit contra esse sacramentaliter, sicut contra esse localiter" (*ibid.*). He says : "Plura tempora non possunt esse simul, sic autem non de locis" (*ibid.* See Thomas Waldensis, "De Sac. Euch.," f. 123).

And in this view he was followed by Bellarmine. (See Bellarmine, "De Euch.," lib. i., ch. ii. ; "De Controv.," tom. iii., c. 459 ; Ingold., 1601).

Well was it said by Bishop Jeremy Taylor : "Aquinas hath yet another device to make all whole, saying that one body cannot be in divers places *localiter* but *sacramentaliter*, not locally but sacramentally. But first I wish the words were reverse, and that I could tell the meaning of being in a place locally and not locally, unless a thing can be in a place and not in a place, that is, so as to be in that it is also out : but so long as it is a distinction, it is no matter—it will amuse and make way to escape, if it will do nothing else. But if by being sacramentally in many places is meant figuratively (as before I explicated it), then I grant Aquinas's affirmative ; Christ's Body is in many places sacramentally, that is, it is represented upon all the holy tables or altars in the Christian Church. But if by sacramentally he means naturally and properly, then he contradicts himself, for that is it he must mean by *localiter* if he means anything at all. But it matters not what he means, for it is sufficient to me that he only says it and proves it not, and that it is not sense ; and, lastly, that Bellarmine confutes it as not being home enough to his purpose, but a direct destruction of the fancy of transubstantiation ; *Si non posset esse unum Corpus localiter in duobus locis, quia divideretur a seipso, profecto nec esse possit sacramentaliter eadem ratione.* I might make

with some very clear and distinct statements of the ancient Fathers. They do not seem to have felt any difficulty in applying to the glorified Body of the Saviour above what was spoken of the Body as crucified and the Blood as poured out—

advantage of this contestation between two so great patrons of transubstantiation if I did need it, for Aquinas says that a body cannot be in two places at once locally, Bellarmine says then neither can it be sacramentally; it were easy, then, to infer that therefore it is in two places no way in the world." ("Real Presence," sect. xi., § 21; "Works," edit. Eden., vol. vi., pp. 111, 112. See also p. 109; and Bramhall's "Works," A. C. L., vol. i., pp. 18, 19; and Crakanthorp, "Defens. Eccles. Angl.," pp. 285-287, A. C. L.).

Compare the words of the Tridentine decree: "Neque enim hæc inter se pugnant, ut ipse Salvator noster semper ad dextram Patris in cælis assideat, juxta modum existendi naturalem; et ut multis nihilominus aliis in locis sacramentaliter præsens sua substantiâ nobis adsit" (sess. xiii., cap. i.)—words in which, according to the history of Pallavicini, "abstinere Synodus voluit eâ quæstione, quæ inter Aquinatis et Scoti sectatores agitur, utrum idem Corpus divinitus possit pluribus in locis eo collocationis modo, quo in uno per naturam est, collocari" (lib. xii., cap. vi., pars ii., p. 116). Observe also the expression, "Sacramentaliter ac realiter," in canon viii., sess. xiii.

"Modus existendi sacramentalis, et tamen simul verus et realis, non poterat melius explicari, quam illo adverbio *substantialiter*" (Bellarmine, "De Sac. Euch.," lib. i., cap. ii.).

It may be added, however, that in Wyclif's time there seems to have been a prevalent suspicion that the writings of Aquinas had been largely tampered with by the *pseudo-fratres*, who, for filthy lucre's sake, desired to be inquisitors of heresy. (See "De Eucharistiâ," cap. v., p. 139, Wyclif Soc.) Wyclif himself understands the "sacramentaliter" of Aquinas (pp. 232, 233) in a sense which he can himself approve (p. 268), adding: "Patet de Corpore Christi, quod est dimensionaliter in cælo et virtualiter in hostia ut in signo" (p. 271).

And this view he sets in contrast with that of Duns Scotus (the Doctor Subtilis): "Ponens quod stat idem Corpus in numero multiplicari dimensionaliter simul tempore per quotlibet loca non communicantia" (p. 232; see also p. 149).

But it may be doubted whether Wyclif rightly apprehended the full teaching of Aquinas on this point. See the language of Aquinas in pars iii., quæst. lxxv., art. i.: "Dicendum, quod Corpus Christi non est eo modo in hoc sacramento, sicut Corpus in loco, quod suis dimensionibus loco commensuratur: sed quodam speciali modo, qui est proprius huic sacramento. Unde dicimus, quod Corpus Christi est in diversis altaribus non sicut in diversis locis, sed sicut in sacramento. Per quod non intelligimus, quod Christus sit ibi *solum sicut in signo*, licet sacramentum sit in genere signi: sed intelligimus Corpus Christi hic esse *secundum modum proprium huic sacramento*." See Bellarmine, "De Euch.," lib. i., ch. ii.; "De Controv.," tom. iii., c. 460; Ingold., 1601.

For Wyclif's own view of "*Sacramental Presence*," see "De Eucharistiâ," pp. 83-87, 98, 104, 109, 111, 121, 123, 308, and especially p. 148. It is sometimes somewhat ambiguously expressed, and his language needs to be interpreted or cleared from misapprehension by such distinct utterances as the following: "Infinita sunt argumenta propter que dicit catholicus quod Corpus Christi est ibi virtualiter et in signo, non Corpus Christi ut est in cælo, sed signum ejus vicarium" ("De Euchar-

of the Body and Blood as separated in the condition of death. But that the glorified Body of the Son of God (which was never to be suffered to see corruption) should be subjected to the

istia," p. 303, Wyclif Soc.). This is the expression of a very different notion from that of Aquinas, and of one in agreement with that of Jeremy Taylor.

It should be observed that the anathema of the Council of Trent lies against those who maintain that the Presence is only "ut in signo, vel figura, aut virtute" (Sess. xiii., canon i.).

Perhaps the seeming inconsistencies in Wyclif's language may have resulted from a certain indistinctness or hesitancy in his views on the subject. In his "De Apostasia" he speaks of Berengar's doctrine (which possibly he misunderstood; see "De Apostasia," p. 187) as an error to be condemned (pp. 68, 79, Wyclif Soc.). And Professor Lechler has maintained that he "believes and teaches a true and real objective presence." ("John Wiclif," vol. ii., p. 189, Lorimer's translation; see also pp. 186, 187, 202, 203). Yet one who has carefully studied the subject has said: "I think we may come to the conclusion that the Realist Wyclif and the Nominalist Berengarius held objectively the same views on the Eucharist, and only varied in their manner of expounding it" ("Tractatus de Apostasia," Wyclif Soc., Dziewicki's Introduction, pp. 35, 36).

What he says in condemnation of the Docetism of transubstantiation (Lechler, ii., pp. 187, 202, 203) would seem to apply with equal force to Aquinas' view of Real Presence, whether bread remained or not. It is true, indeed, that sometimes his language would seem to be almost an anticipation of Lutheran doctrine. See Lechler, ii., pp. 189, 190, 204.

Yet it is scarcely possible not to see that the difference between the views of Wyclif and Luther was deep and radical. Professor Lechler himself has said: "When it is affirmed with emphasis that the Body of Christ in the Supper can only be spiritually seen, received, and enjoyed, but not corporeally, because it is only present spiritually, and when, in consequence, it is only to believers that a real participation of the Body of Christ in the Supper is attributed, while to the unbelieving, on the contrary, such a participation is denied, it is at this point that the difference of Wyclif's Eucharistic doctrine and Luther's falls with the strongest light upon the eye" (vol. ii., pp. 194, 195).

We think it clear that Wyclif's sense of "sacramental" was very different from that of Aquinas (see especially "De Apostasia," p. 189, Wyclif Soc.). The question of participation by unbelievers is the crucial test of the doctrine of the Presence.

Mr. Matthew is quoted as saying: "Neither Lechler nor anyone else can get a satisfactory and clear exposition, for the simple reason that Wyclif did not know what it was, though he thought he knew what it was not" ("Apostasia," Wyclif Soc., Intro., p. xxxvi.). But whatever want of distinctness there may be in Wyclif's teaching of "what it was," we do not think there was any doubt at all in his mind as to what it was not. His "Sacramental Presence" was undoubtedly no merely figurative or symbolical presence, no presence of empty signs. It was a virtual and effectual presence—nay, a true Real Presence—to the faith of the soul. If it included (or sometimes seemed to include) more than this, it certainly excluded the "Sacramental Presence" of the Romish doctrine (see especially "De Apostasia," p. 185, Wyclif Soc.).

On the whole subject of this note, see Albertinus, "De Eucharistia," lib. i., cap. xxvii.; and Bishop Jewel's controversy with Harding, art. vi.; "Works," vol. i., pp. 480 *sqq.*, P. S. edit.

degradation of lesion¹ and mastication in the mouths of the faithful—this was an idea which was not to be endured. In fact, the later Romish theologians were entirely at one with Berengarius in his repudiation of the natural meaning of the “Ego Berengarius.” The following words of his contain a truth to which *they* would have assented: “Qui affirmat, Corpus Christi vel pro parte, vel pro toto manibus sacerdotum tractari super altare, manibus frangi, dentibus atteri, excepto, quod ad sacramentum pertinet, contra veritatem loquitur et dignitatem doctrinæ Christi; qui affirmat, Corpus Christi, postquam ad dexteram patris sedit, vulnerari non posse, vel frangi, vel atteri, excepto, quod ad sacramentum pertinet, secundum veritatem loquitur” (“De Sacrà Cœnâ,” p. 289; Berlin, 1834). But this was in distinct opposition to the teaching of Lanfranc (see p. 283; see also pp. 118, 200, 201, 206).

And this teaching had to be maintained side by side with the condemnation of Berengarius and the defence of the literal sense of the words of institution.

In the teaching of this later development of Roman theology, the literal interpretation must still be maintained against Berengarius. A trope or a figure is not to be thought of. But the doctrine of those who condemned Berengarius—the language which they made him utter as expressive of the then orthodox faith—this is now to be condemned as more heretical (in its natural sense) than the doctrine of Berengar himself.²

N. DIMOCK.

(To be continued.)

¹ See Berengar, “De Sacrà Cœnâ,” pp. 118, 200, 201, 206. Guitmundus defends the language of the “Ego Berengarius” by distinguishing between *pressure* and *wounding*, understanding the *atteri* only in the sense of *touching* and *pressing*. He says: “Qui se palpandum et post resurrectionem manibus obtulit, dentes propter immunditiam non vitabit. . . . Tangi namque naturale est carni, lædi autem infirmitatis est. Ita ergo potest Christus et dentibus tangi, ut quacunq̄ pressura dentium jam non valeat lædi” (“De Veritate Corporis Christi,” ff. 9, 10; Friburg Brig., 1529).

² Some later writers, however, still maintained that Christ's body is present in the Sacrament naturally and sensibly. (See Jewel's “Works,” vol. i., p. 446, P. S. edit.; and Cranmer on “Lord's Supper,” pp. 46, 380 *sqq.*.)

The Thomists maintained that though the accidents remained without a *substantial* subject, they were not without an *accidental* subject—“quantitati inesse tamquam accidentali subjecto.” (See Benedict XIV., “De Sacrif. Missæ,” cccxiv.)

