

## Consensus

---

Volume 18

Issue 1 *Issues in Church Life*

Article 2

---

5-1-1992

# The eucharistic presence of Christ: losses and gains of the insights of St Thomas Aquinas in the age of the Reformation

Egil Grislis

Follow this and additional works at: <http://scholars.wlu.ca/consensus>

---

### Recommended Citation

Grislis, Egil (1992) "The eucharistic presence of Christ: losses and gains of the insights of St Thomas Aquinas in the age of the Reformation," *Consensus*: Vol. 18 : Iss. 1 , Article 2.

Available at: <http://scholars.wlu.ca/consensus/vol18/iss1/2>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by Scholars Commons @ Laurier. It has been accepted for inclusion in Consensus by an authorized editor of Scholars Commons @ Laurier. For more information, please contact [scholarscommons@wlu.ca](mailto:scholarscommons@wlu.ca).

# The Eucharistic Presence of Christ: Losses and Gains of the Insights of St. Thomas Aquinas in the Age of the Reformation

Egil Grislis

*Professor of Religion*

*The University of Manitoba, Winnipeg*

The interpretation of the eucharistic presence of Jesus Christ among the Protestant reformers during the sixteenth century may be seen as a fragmented appropriation of the insights of the *Summa Theologiae* of St. Thomas Aquinas. While some of the reformers drew from St. Thomas directly, others obtained insights of St. Thomas, preserved in the late medieval Nominalist tradition, or even learned from each other, they formulated their respective positions with the assistance of substantial Thomistic material. It is the thesis of this study that the contemporary ecumenical convergence in regard to Christ's eucharistic presence need not be seen as a novel and somewhat artificial compromise, but may be viewed as a process in recognizing a common heritage even when it is recorded with new accents in a different situation.

## I

The early church did not settle the problem of Christ's eucharistic presence by way of either an ecumenical or a local council. While some theologians clearly preferred the language of eucharistic realism (e.g., St. Justin Martyr, St. Irenaeus, and Cyril of Jerusalem), others asserted the presence of Christ in highly symbolic manner (e.g., Tertullian, Clement and Origen of Alexandria).<sup>1</sup> St. Augustine freely used both patterns of expression. St. Thomas' great contribution was a grand synthesis, which ascribed a central place to eucharistic realism, at the same time fully preserving the use of symbolic expressions.

Insightfully, in accord with the realist tradition, St. Thomas proclaimed: "... in the sacrament of the altar, after the consecration, there is nothing other than the body and blood of Christ".<sup>2</sup> And this was not viewed as a limited or partial presence. Rather, St. Thomas insisted: "the whole Christ is in this sacrament". Moreover, with appropriate qualifications, St. Thomas spoke of the fact that "we have in this sacrament... not only the flesh, but the whole body of Christ, that is, the bones and nerves and all the rest".<sup>3</sup> In using such realist expressions, however, St. Thomas was deeply concerned that his assertions of the real presence would not be mistaken for a naive proclamation of cannibalism (which in the theological jargon of the sixteenth century was known as Capernaite eating, drawing the designation from John 6:52). St. Thomas therefore made it plain, that the real presence of Christ as he had defined it differed from the ordinary presence of a physical object. St. Thomas asserted: "The body of Christ is not in this sacrament in the way a body is in a place. The dimensions of a body in a place correspond with the place that contains it. Christ's body is here in a special way that is proper to this sacrament."<sup>4</sup> With great care, St. Thomas pointed out that Christ's body and blood in the eucharist are not things, e.g.: "... a thing cannot be where it was not before, except by being brought in locally or by something already there being changed into it. For example, a fire is started in a household because either it is brought into it from outside or is newly kindled there. Now it is clear that the body of Christ does not begin to exist in this sacrament by being brought in locally." The truth of this assertion, suggested St. Thomas, can be seen on account of three reasons. They are very important, as they continue to underscore that the eucharistic presence of Christ is not a mere local presence of a physical object:

"First, because it would thereby cease to be in heaven, since everything that is locally moved begins to be somewhere only by leaving where it was. Second, every bodily thing that is moved from one place must pass through all the intermediate places, and there is no question of that in the present case. Third, it is impossible that the one movement of a bodily thing that is being locally moved should end up at the same time in different places; now the body of Christ in this sacrament begins simultaneously to be in different places."<sup>5</sup>

Or, to put it most concisely, "the reality of Christ's body... did not begin to be... [in this sacrament] by local motion (indeed, it is not there as in place...)." <sup>6</sup> Therefore, concluded

St. Thomas, the real presence of Christ in the eucharist could not be detected by any empirical means: "We would never know by our senses that the real body of Christ and his blood are in this sacrament, but only by our faith [sola fide] which is based on the authority of God."<sup>7</sup>

Of course, St. Thomas could not be satisfied by merely discarding the unworthy interpretations of the eucharistic presence of Christ—he also needed to state positively and explicitly in what manner Christ is really present in the eucharist. To accomplish this task, St. Thomas drew upon the idea of a miraculous eucharistic change, present in the Early Church since St. Justin Martyr in the second century, and the Aristotelian concept of substance. Both ideas deserve some further attention. Precisely because the eucharistic transformation is not a natural process, nor an act that depends on human skill but an expression of divine activity, the sixteenth-century Protestant accusations of magic or empty show miss the point. The Aristotelian concept of substance, of course, does not describe a particular piece of matter with a distinctive make-up, but is instead the definition of the essence of an object. The Blackfriars editions of the *Summa Theologiae* glosses substance as "the ultimate reality of which the nature is not to exist in another as in a subject, unlike a modifying accident which is grounded in it."<sup>8</sup>

What the real presence of Christ is in itself, stated not only negatively that it is not carnal, but also positively, St. Thomas formulated by drawing a close comparison to the incarnation. St. Thomas wrote: "Now faith has to do with unseen realities, and just as he offers his divinity to our acceptance as something that we do not see, so in this sacrament he offers his very flesh to us in a like manner."<sup>9</sup> As both supernatural and invisible, the presence is not brought to the altar like a physical object, which would be carried by local motion. Rather, explained St. Thomas: "... since in this statement we have the reality of Christ's body, and since it did not begin to be there by local motion (indeed, it is not there as in a place, as we saw), nothing remains but to say that it begins to be there because the substance of the bread and wine is turned into it." Obviously, this change is "beyond the powers of nature", and hence it is brought about purely by God's power. The result is as follows: "The complete substance of the bread is converted

into the complete substance of Christ's body, and the complete substance of the wine into the complete substance of Christ's blood."<sup>11</sup>

As already noted, this miraculous conversion was not a physical process. St. Thomas explained:

It is obvious to our senses that, after the consecration, all the accidents of the bread and wine remain. Divine providence very wisely arranged for this. First of all, men have not the custom of eating human flesh and drinking human blood; indeed, the thought revolts them. And so the flesh and blood of Christ are given to us to be taken under the appearances of things in common use, namely bread and wine. Secondly, lest this sacrament should be an object of contempt for unbelievers, if we were to eat our Lord under the human appearances. Thirdly, in taking the body and blood of our Lord in their invisible presence, we increase the merit of our faith.<sup>12</sup>

And St. Thomas underscored that "this change is not a formal change, but a substantial one". In other words, "it does not belong to the natural kinds of change". It may be designated "by a name proper to itself—'transubstantiation'".<sup>13</sup>

The Protestant reformers sharply criticized St. Thomas; not even one of them accepted the doctrine of transubstantiation. At the same time, what has been often overlooked, they retained many other, central and peripheral insights of St. Thomas' eucharistic thought. Broadly considered, three distinctive patterns of borrowing emerged: (1) Lutheran, (2) Reformed and Anglican, and (3) Zwinglian.

## II

From the very beginning of the Reformation, Martin Luther and his direct followers sought to emphasize the real presence of Christ in the eucharist.<sup>14</sup> This, broadly speaking, had also been the powerful affirmation of St. Thomas: "the Eucharist contains... ipsum Christum [Christ Himself]".<sup>15</sup> Or, St. Thomas had quoted St. Ambrose: "just as our Lord Jesus Christ is the real son of God, so the real flesh of Christ is what we receive, and his blood is really our drink."<sup>16</sup> And since the new covenant must surpass the old, St. Thomas had argued further, it "should have something more", namely, "it should contain Christ himself who suffered for us, and contain him not merely as by a sign or figure, but in actual reality



as well." Thus, asserted St. Thomas, Christ "promises us his bodily presence".<sup>17</sup> And the promise is, of course, kept: "The body of Christ remains in this sacrament...";<sup>18</sup> even Judas received the body and blood of Christ.<sup>19</sup>

While Luther's more specific theological reflections on the precise manner of Christ in the eucharistic presence went through several stages,<sup>20</sup> Luther continued to make use of such prepositions as "in", "under", and "with". At times Luther warned his readers explicitly, that he had not proposed a simplistic interpretation:

Of course, our reason takes a foolish attitude, since it is accustomed to understanding the word "in" only in a physical, circumscribed sense like straw in a sack and bread in a basket. Consequently, when it hears that God is this or that object, it always thinks of the straw-sack and the breadbasket. But faith understands that in these matters "in" is equivalent to "above," "beyond," "beneath," "through and through," and "everywhere."<sup>21</sup>

At the same time, the formula-like use of the various prepositions had a specific intent in mind: "... we at times use the formulas '*under* the bread, *with* the bread, *in* the bread.' We do this to reject the papistic transubstantiation and to indicate the sacramental union between the untransformed substance of the bread and the body of Christ."<sup>22</sup> It should be noted that despite his vocal disagreement on transubstantiation, Luther continues to use the concept of substance. Moreover, while Luther placed together three prepositions only once,<sup>23</sup> he ordinarily employed only one or two prepositions at a time. Just such a use can also be found in St. Thomas, e.g.: "Christ himself is sacramentally contained in the Eucharist [in Eucharistia]";<sup>24</sup> "Christ... is contained in this sacrament [in hoc sacramento]";<sup>25</sup> Likewise, on many occasions St. Thomas employed the preposition "under" [sub]: "Christ instituted this sacrament sub specie [under the species of] bread and wine";<sup>26</sup> "wherever this sacrament is celebrated he is present in an invisible way under sacramental appearances [sub speciebus hujus sacramenti]".<sup>27</sup>

Of course, even Luther's vocal objection to transubstantiation—Luther called it "a monstrous word and a monstrous idea"<sup>28</sup>—was rooted in late medieval Catholic tradition which was enamoured with the idea of consubstantiation. Luther reported autobiographically:

Some time ago, when I was drinking in scholastic theology, the learned Cardinal of Cambrai [Pierre d'Ailly, 1350–1420] gave me

food for thought in his comments on the fourth book of the *Sentences*. He argues with great acumen that to hold that real bread and real wine, and not merely their accidents, are present on the altar, would be much more probable and require fewer superfluous miracles—if only the church had not decreed otherwise. When I learned later what church it was that had decreed this, namely the Thomistic—that is the Aristotelian church—I grew bolder, and after floating in a sea of doubt, I at last found rest for my conscience in the above view, namely, that it is real bread and real wine, in which Christ's real flesh and real blood are present in no other way and to no less degree than the others assert them to be under their accidents.<sup>29</sup>

And a little further Luther argued:

And why could not Christ include his body in the substance of the bread just as well as in the accidents? In red-hot iron, for instance, the two substances, fire and iron, are so mingled that every part is both iron and fire. Why is it not even more possible that the body of Christ be contained in every part of the substance of the bread?<sup>30</sup>

Clearly, St. Thomas had not been in favour of consubstantiation; yet he was acquainted with the idea, and had formulated the incisive question: "Does the substance of the bread and the wine remain in this sacrament after the consecration?" His answer was finally negative, on the grounds that if the substance of bread and wine had remained, Christ would have had to say: "Hic est corpus meum [Here is my body]". Instead, Christ said: "Hoc est corpus meum *This is my body*".<sup>31</sup> At the same time, in accord with good scholastic fashion, before the correct answer had been given, St. Thomas had presented the following alternative: "It seems that in hoc sacramento remaneat substantia panis et vini post consecrationem [after consecration in this sacrament the substance of bread and wine does remain]."<sup>32</sup>

In 1519 Luther had vividly described the effects of the eucharist as follows:

The *significance* or effect of this sacrament is fellowship of all the saints. From this it derives its common name *synaxis* [Greek] or *communio* [Latin], that is, fellowship. And the Latin *communicare* [commune or communicate], or as we say in German, *zum sacrament gehen* [go to the sacrament], means to take part in this fellowship. Hence it is that Christ and all saints are one spiritual body, each citizen being a member of the other and of the entire city. All the saints, therefore, are members of Christ and of the church, which is a spiritual and eternal city of God.<sup>33</sup>

Such insights, albeit in a wider perspective, are contained already in the *Summa Theologiae*, where St. Thomas had offered a threefold explanation of the significance of the eucharist:

This sacrament signifies three things. It looks back to the past: in this sense it commemorates the passion of our Lord, which was the true sacrifice.... In regard to the present, there is another thing to which it points. This is the unity of the church, into which men are drawn together through this sacrament. Because of this it is called "*communio*" or "*synaxis*". As Damascene says, *it is called "communion" because by it we are joined to Christ and because we share his flesh and his godhead, and because we are joined and united to one another through that* [*De Fide Orthodoxa*, 4,13; P.G. 94:1153]. It has a third significance with regard to the future. It prefigures that enjoyment of God which will be ours in heaven. This is why it is called "*viaticum*", because it keeps us on the way to heaven. For the same reason it is called "eucharist", that is, "desirable gift of grace", because *the free gift of God is eternal life*, as we read in *Romans* [6:23], or because it really contains Christ, who is full of grace.<sup>34</sup>

Recognizably, Luther had appropriated the second, downplaying or at times even discarding the first and the third significance.

A similar process of selection may be observed in regard to still another statement by St. Thomas, who had written: "Now reality of this sacrament is twofold... one which is signified and contained, namely Christ himself, the other which is signified yet not contained, namely Christ's mystical body, which is the fellowship of the saints."<sup>35</sup> Luther later wrote: "For this sacrament [of the body of Christ], as we shall see, signifies the complete union and the individual fellowship of the saints..."<sup>36</sup> Luther also stated: "That is real fellowship, and that is the true significance of this sacrament. In this way we are changed into one another and are made into a community of love. Without love there can be no such change."<sup>37</sup>

The famous statement by St. Augustine had found a wide circulation, including the *Summa Theologiae*: "Accredit verbum ad elementum et fit sacramentum; The word is added to the element, and this becomes a sacrament."<sup>38</sup> Luther quoted it on several occasions.<sup>39</sup>

In teaching the doctrine of concomitance, St. Thomas had defined it as follows: "But now his blood is not really separated



from his body; consequently his blood is present together with the body under the species of the bread, and his body with the blood under the species of wine: this is in virtue of their concomitance in reality.”<sup>40</sup> However, in responding to an earlier problem, St. Thomas had elaborated:

The change of the bread and wine does not have as its term either the godhead or the soul of Christ. Because of this, neither the godhead nor the soul of Christ is in this sacrament as a result of the sacramental sign; they are there by a natural concomitance. . . . As a result of the sacramental sign, we have under this sacrament—under the appearances of the bread—not only the flesh, but the whole body of Christ, that is, the bones and nerves and all the rest. . . .<sup>41</sup>

Now Luther, while generally accepting the truth of the concomitance,<sup>42</sup> nevertheless scorned the detailed reflections. Luther wrote:

There have also been many who have been concerned about how the soul and the spirit of Christ, and thereby the Godhead, the Father and the Holy Spirit, is in the sacrament. It is a wonder they have not included in their concern the angels also and finally the whole world. All these are the thoughts of idle souls and empty hearts, who forget the words and works of God in this sacrament and give themselves over to their own thoughts and words.<sup>43</sup>

The doctrine of the eucharistic presence of Christ had distinctive devotional implications. St. Thomas had noted: “because out of reverence, nothing touches this sacrament but what is blessed, thus the corporal and chalice, and likewise the priest’s hands.”<sup>44</sup> Moreover, observed St. Thomas:

According to canon law based on a decree of Pope Paul Pius I, *If by carelessness a drop of blood fall on a board of the floor let it be licked up and the board scraped. But if it be the ground let it be scraped up and burnt and the ashes put inside the altar. And let the priest do penance for forty days. If a drop fall on the altar from the chalice, let the minister suck it up, and do penance for three days. If on the altar cloth and it penetrates the second altar cloth, let him do four days’ penance, if to the third, then nine days’ penance, if to the fourth, twenty days’ penance. And let the altar linens be washed three times by the priest, holding the chalice below, then let the water be taken and put by the altar.* It might even be drunk by the minister unless it might be rejected because of nausea. Some priests go further and cut that part of the linen, which they burn and put the ashes in the altar or sacarium.<sup>45</sup>

The young Luther scorned such devotion:

You have heard how I preached against the foolish law of the pope and opposed his precept [Decretum Gratiani, dist. 23, cap. 25], that no woman shall wash the altar linen on which the body of Christ has lain, even if it be a pure nun, except it first be washed by a pure priest. Likewise, when anyone has touched the body of Christ, the priests come running and scrape his fingers, and much more of the same sort. But when a maid has slept with a naked priest, the pope winks at it and lets it go. If she becomes pregnant and bears a child, he lets that pass, too. But to touch the altar linen and the sacrament [i.e. the host], this he will not allow.<sup>46</sup>

The hands of the aged Luther trembled, and in administering wine from the chalice, he spilled some wine on the floor. According to a report, Luther hastily got down to the floor, and licked up the wine which he had spilt.<sup>47</sup>

Yet more than individual fragments of St. Thomas, Luther respected the total eucharistic perspective of Roman Catholicism. If it came to a choice, Luther felt much closer to Rome than to the so-called sacramentarians, i.e., what he regarded as merely symbolic interpreters of the eucharistic presence.<sup>48</sup> While Luther indeed disagreed with Rome on several issues in the interpretation, he deeply appreciated the real presence position of Catholicism.<sup>49</sup> The present concern for the appreciation of Luther's positive relationship to his heritage, however, cannot be seen as an attempt to suggest that Luther's disagreement with Roman Catholicism was not serious and his hostility only occasional. With other reformers Luther found himself at a considerable distance from Rome—a basic position which he shared with other reformers.

### III

At the same time it is an obvious fact that the reformers disagreed among themselves. Yet while John Calvin's criticisms of Luther's understanding of the real presence of Christ in the eucharist necessarily distanced Calvin from Rome on the issues where Luther had concurred with Rome, in other regards Calvin succeeded in appreciating and hence in appropriating dimensions of St. Thomas' eucharistic thought which Luther had either downplayed or even ignored. St. Thomas had written:

The sacraments of the Church have their purpose to serve man's need in his spiritual life. Now the spiritual life runs parallel [conformatur] to that of the body, since bodily things are shadows of spiritual realities. But it is obvious that in the life of the body the first requirement is generation by which man received the gift of life; then comes growth by which he is brought to maturity; so likewise food is also required that a man may be kept alive. Well then in the spiritual life there is Baptism which is spiritual birth and Confirmation which is spiritual growth. Likewise the Eucharist is needed; it is our spiritual food [spiritualis refectio].<sup>50</sup>

Calvin drew a rather similar analogy between physical and spiritual life: "For as in baptism, God, regenerating us, engrafts us into the society of his church and makes us his own by adoption, so we have said, that he discharges the function of a provident householder in continually supplying to us the food to sustain and preserve us in that life into which he has begotten us by his Word." Calvin could also refer to the eucharist as "a spiritual banquet", "invisible food", "food for our souls",<sup>51</sup> and "food for our spiritual life".<sup>52</sup> St. Thomas' understanding had been the same: the "purpose" of the eucharist "is to refresh us spiritually, as bodily nourishment does physically".<sup>53</sup>

Although Calvin, of course, rejected the doctrine of transubstantiation,<sup>54</sup> he did make extended use of scriptural and traditional terms in accord with the realist heritage, e.g.: "the Lord's body was once for all so sacrificed for us that we may now feed upon it, and by feeding feel in ourselves the working of that unique sacrifice."<sup>55</sup> On the other occasions Calvin stated that the believers "eat Christ",<sup>56</sup> "that his flesh is truly food, and his blood truly drink",<sup>57</sup> and "that whoever has partaken of his flesh and blood may at the same time enjoy participation in life".<sup>58</sup> Nor should it be overlooked that Calvin was prepared to use the term "substance", e.g.: "By bidding us take, he indicates that it is ours; by bidding us eat, that it is made one substance with us."<sup>59</sup> And, so claimed Calvin, this was a "true and substantial partaking of the body and blood of the Lord".<sup>60</sup> In another passage Calvin had put it this way: "... from the substance of his flesh Christ breathes life into our souls—indeed pours forth his very life into us—even though Christ's flesh itself does not enter into us."<sup>61</sup> The "does not", so it might be useful to note, is not totally negative, but excludes only physical and hence cannibalistic eating. Thus while the

account of Christ's eucharistic presence is not stated by way of a change of substance, and hence differs from St. Thomas' exposition, it must not be overlooked that St. Thomas also did not teach a physical and local presence, since the risen Christ remained in heaven. This was Calvin's point as well: "the body of Christ from the time of his resurrection was finite, and is contained in heaven even to the Last Day."<sup>62</sup>

At the same time, the symbolic role of the eucharist, to which we must now turn, had also been briefly acknowledged by St. Thomas, namely: "... we do not mean that Christ is only symbolically there, although it is true that every sacrament is a sign..."<sup>63</sup> Calvin delineated this symbolic role with definite care. On the one hand, Calvin had flatly rejected Huldrych Zwingli's misinterpretation of a symbol as a mere illustration.<sup>64</sup> On the other hand, Calvin's own understanding was a dynamic and effective sacramental instrumentality, viz.:

... by showing of the symbol the thing itself is also shown. For unless a man means to call God a deceiver, he would never dare assert that an empty symbol is set forth by him. Therefore, if the Lord truly represents the participation in his body through the breaking of bread, there ought not to be the least doubt that he truly presents and shows his body. And the godly ought by all means to keep this rule: whenever they see symbols appointed by the Lord, to think and be persuaded that the truth of the thing signified is surely present there. For why should the Lord put in your hand the symbol of his body, except to assure you a true participation in it? But if it is true that a visible sign is given us to seal the gift of a thing invisible, when we have received the symbol of the body, let us no less surely trust that the body itself is also given us.<sup>65</sup>

In this connection it needs to be particularly noted that the effective eucharistic instrumentality, as interpreted by Calvin, is not seen as active in its own right. Rather, the eucharist serves on account of the working of the Holy Spirit. The roots of this insight can also be found in St. Thomas, although in a more complex setting. St. Thomas had written: "... the manner of receiving this sacrament is two fold, spiritual and sacramental." The "spiritual eating" St. Thomas had defined as "the purpose or desire of receiving the sacrament." For St. Thomas the role of this desire was essential, because

a man cannot be saved without the desire of receiving this sacrament. Now a desire would be pointless unless it could be fulfilled when the opportunity presents itself. So it is clear that a person is



bound to receive this sacrament, not only by virtue of the Church's ordinance [ex statuto], but also of our Lord's command, *Do this in memory of me* [Lk. 22:19].<sup>66</sup>

According to St. Thomas, spiritual nourishment proceeds from both the desire and the actual partaking, but not in the same intensity: "... it is from the effectiveness" of the "power" of the eucharist "that even by desiring it a person obtains grace whereby he is spiritually alive. Still it is true that when the sacrament itself is really received grace is increased and the life of the spirit perfected."<sup>67</sup>

Yet in emphasizing the significance of the eucharist and teaching that "through its power the soul is spiritually nourished [ex virtute hujus sacramenti anima spiritualiter reficitur],"<sup>68</sup> St. Thomas had not overlooked the ultimate foundation of this power, namely the presence and work of the Holy Spirit. Hence St. Thomas could report the statement of St. John Damascene—"it is only by the power of the Holy Ghost that the change of the bread into the body of Christ takes place"<sup>69</sup>—and then elaborate as follows:

when we say that it is by the power of the Holy Ghost and by it alone that the bread is changed into the body of Christ, we do not rule out the presence of an instrumental power in the form of this sacrament; just like when we say that it is only the craftsman who makes the knife, we do exclude all power from the hammer.<sup>70</sup>

The position of John Calvin was remarkably similar: in the place of the instrumental power of the sacrament Calvin spoke of the effective symbol, and pointed to the Holy Spirit as the one who enabled the partaking of the substance of Christ's body:

Even though it seems unbelievable that Christ's flesh, separated from us by such great distance, penetrates to us so that it becomes our food, let us remember how far the secret power [arcana virtus] of the Holy Spirit towers above all our senses, and how foolish it is to wish to measure his immeasurableness by our measure. What then, our mind does not comprehend, let faith conceive: that the Spirit truly unites things separated in space.<sup>71</sup>

In another passage Calvin put it this way: Christ "feeds his people with his own body, the communion of which he bestows upon them by the power of the Spirit."<sup>72</sup> Again, Calvin stated: "... a serious wrong is done to the Holy Spirit, unless we believe that it is through his incomprehensible power that we come to

partake of Christ's flesh and blood."<sup>73</sup> Hence although Calvin indeed preferred to speak about a "spiritual eating", he did not view it as opposite to "true and real eating": "For us the manner is spiritual because the secret power of the Spirit is the bond of our union with Christ."<sup>74</sup>

In describing the direction of the encounter and partaking at the eucharist, Calvin at times spoke in terms of a *descent*: "For if we see that the sun, shedding its beams upon the earth, casts its substance in some measure upon it in order to beget, nourish give growth to its offspring—why should the radiance of Christ's spirit be less in order to impart to us the communion of his flesh and blood?"<sup>75</sup> At other times Calvin witnessed to an *ascent*: "For, in order that pious souls may duly apprehend Christ in the Supper, they must be raised to heaven."<sup>76</sup>

Having stressed the agreement, we have not intended to overlook the notable disagreement as well. While St. Thomas appears to have begun his theologizing from the presence of Christ on the altar and with the concern that the true miracle of the presence be not downgraded into a brutally simplistic presence of a mere body, Calvin seems to have started his reflections with the assumption that since the ascension Christ is in a far-away heaven and the true miracle is that despite the distance, the believer receives the substance of Christ's flesh and blood. At the same time, since both theologians share in the belief that ultimately it is the Holy Spirit that enables a genuine communion in fact and not only in belief or memory, on the most central issue Calvin has remained in the realist tradition.

A similar position—at times the direct result of dependence on Calvin—may be said to be characteristic of Elizabethan Anglicanism. Yet there are distinctively employed perspectives and expressions that are characteristically Anglican. Namely, the Anglicanism of the Elizabethan age, consistently critical of transubstantiation, argued against it and St. Thomas by utilizing in depth the insights of the Early Church. Hence its style was more devotional than scholastic, and more concerned with spirituality than theology.

The basic outline of the Anglican position was supplied by the Thirty-Nine Articles of the Church of England, published in Latin in 1563 and in English in 1571. In article 25, without

any mention of the name, Huldrych Zwingli's illustrative symbolism was acknowledged as the sacraments were described as "badges or tokens of Christian men's profession", yet the description was immediately qualified. Namely, the sacraments are "not only badges" etc., "but rather they be certaine sure witnesses and effectuall signes of grace and Gods good wyll towardes vs, by which he doth worke inuisible in vs, and doth not only quicken, but also strengthen and confirme our fayth in hym."<sup>77</sup> It may be noted that the official and normative statement did not supply a specific explanation of the manner of the eucharistic presence apart from affirming both the illustrative symbolism and the effective instrumentality of the sacraments.

Without attempting to summarize the eucharistic views of all the wise and learned Elizabethan Anglican theologians, three scholars will be singled out as typical in their variegatedness. All three shared the conviction that the sacrament is not only illustrative but also an effective means of grace. Freely and repeatedly they spoke of the body and blood of Christ as present, yet declared the sacramental eating to be a spiritual process, undertaken in faith. The role of the Holy Spirit, if not always central, was consistently significant.

John Jewel (1522–1571), the bishop of Salisbury, declared:

we teach the people, not that a naked sign or token, but that Christ's body and blood indeed and verily is given unto us; that we verily eat it; that we verily drink it; that we verily be relieved and live by it; that we are bones of his bones, and flesh of his flesh; that Christ dwelleth in us, and we in him [Eph. 5; 1 Jn. 4]. Yet we say not either that the substance of the bread or wine is done away; or that Christ's body is let down from heaven, or made really or fleshly present in the sacrament. We are taught, according to the doctrine of the old fathers, to lift up our hearts to heaven, and there to feed upon the Lamb of God. Chrysostom saith: *Ad alta contendat oportet, qui ad hoc corpus accedit* [Epist. I ad Cor., Hom. 24]: "Whoso will reach to that body must mount on high." St. Augustine likewise saith: *Quomodo tenebo absentem? Quomodo in coelum manum mittam, ut ibi sendentem teneam? Fidem mitte, et tenuisti* [In Johan. Evang., 11, Tractat. 1.4]: "How shall I take hold of him, being absent? How shall I reach up my hand into heaven, and hold him sitting there? Send up thy faith, and thou has taken him." Thus spiritually and with the mouth of our faith we eat the body of Christ and drink his blood, even as verily as his body was verily broken, and his blood verily shed upon the cross.<sup>78</sup>

Just how such upward reaching might be possible created no difficulties for Jewel, as he, in the Augustinian tradition,

relied on faith to accomplish this task. In fact, Jewel supplied a text which sounded like Augustine: *Postquam ex mortuis resurrexit, et ascendit ad Patrem, est in nobis per Spiritum* [cf. De Trinitate, 15.31]: "After that Christ is risen from the dead, and ascended unto his Father, he is in us by his Spirit."<sup>79</sup> In other words, faith, enlivened by the Holy Spirit, enable the communion with Christ.

Alexander Nowell (c. 1507–1602), dean of St. Paul's, as had St. Thomas,<sup>80</sup> observed the similarity between the bodily and spiritual sustenance: "... the Lord's Supper, like as food, must be often used".<sup>81</sup> Nowell, as Jewel before him, acknowledged the present distance between the believers and the body of Christ—a characteristic Reformed position: "We must lift our souls and hearts from earth, and raise them up by faith to heaven, where Christ is."<sup>82</sup> The possibility of such reaching up was again attributed to the work of the Holy Spirit: "... so, when we rightly receive the Lord's Supper, with the very divine nourishment of his body and blood most full of health and immortality, given to us by the Holy Ghost, and received of us by faith, as the mouth of our soul, we are continually fed and sustained to eternal life..."<sup>83</sup>

Richard Hooker (c. 1554–1600), the Master of the Temple, in his illustrious *Of the Laws of the Ecclesiastical Polity*, continued to appreciate John 6:53 as the key for the understanding of the eucharist presence: "*Except ye eat the flesh of the Sonne of man and drinke his blood yee have no life in you.*"<sup>84</sup> The so-called "*real participation* of Christ and of life in his bodie and bloode",<sup>85</sup> as Hooker understood it, occurred through the eucharist. Seeking unity rather than further division, the irenic Hooker looked first to what still remained as a common faith despite the controversies, and noted that "noe side denieth but that the *soule of man* is the reciptacle of Christes presence".<sup>86</sup> Hence Hooker concluded: "The reall presence of Christes most blessed bodie and bloode is not therefore to be sought for in the sacrament, but in the worthie receiver of the sacrament."<sup>87</sup> Consequently, believed Hooker, the real change occurred not in the elements, but in the person of the believing receiver!—"... the effect thereof *in us* is a reall transmutation of our soules and bodies from sinne to righteousness, from death and corruption to immortalitie and life."<sup>88</sup> The role of the Holy Spirit Hooker did not explore merely at the moment of the eucharistic



celebration, but described as supportive of the total Christian existence, beginning with baptism. His accent, if anywhere in particular, lay on the sanctified life following after the eucharist: "... to whome *the person of Christ* is thus communicated to them he giveth by the same sacrament his holie spirit to sanctifie them as it sanctifieth him which is their head."<sup>89</sup>

Thus while Anglican theology of the latter part of the sixteenth century did not exhibit a direct and positive impact of the thought of St. Thomas Aquinas, it may nevertheless be seen as standing in a distant and in the final analysis positive relation, insofar as its Early Church roots and Calvinist association assured the retention of much common material, albeit in a distinctive shape of its own.

#### IV

Since Huldrych Zwingli denied both the real presence of Christ in the eucharist in any formulation (i.e., not limiting his denials to transubstantiation) and the effective dynamic of the eucharist symbols, Zwingli's distance from St. Thomas was the greatest of all reformers. Yet the point should not be overstated. Zwingli's eucharistic views were complex and underwent a considerable change. In the last phase of his life Zwingli increasingly stressed the presence of Christ on account of Christ's divine nature. It is not inconceivable that this was merely a verbal difference from a presence through the Holy Spirit.<sup>90</sup>

At the same time, notwithstanding his wide distance from Rome, Zwingli incorporated in his thought a rather considerable amount of Thomistic insights.<sup>91</sup> In the first place should be noted the fact that St. Thomas himself was very well aware that the eucharistic presence of Christ could be also denied:

Some people... declared that Christ's body and blood were only symbolically in this sacrament. But we must reject this position as heretical, because it is contrary to the words of Christ. For this reason Berengarius, who was the first to hold this erroneous view, was compelled to retract and to accept what is a truth of faith.<sup>92</sup>

Zwingli, misinterpreting the Catholic tradition as teaching a physical and hence a local presence, rejected it quickly<sup>93</sup> and offered his own blunt counter-point:<sup>94</sup> "And do we desire to feed on his natural body like cannibals?"

St. Thomas' principle—"when the reality comes its figure ceases [quod veniente veritate cessat figura]"<sup>95</sup>—was employed by Zwingli to bring home a different argument. Assuming the truth of the figure/sign, Zwingli denied the presence of Christ's eucharistic reality: "Now the sign and the thing signified cannot be one and the same. Therefore the sacrament and the body of Christ cannot be the body itself."<sup>96</sup> In another passage, writing to the emperor, Zwingli put it this way:

The sacraments we esteem and honour as signs and symbols of holy things, but not as though they themselves were the things of which they are the signs. But who is so ignorant as to try to maintain that the sign is the thing which it signifies? If that were the case I would need only to write the word "ape" and your majesty would have before him a real ape.<sup>97</sup>

St. Thomas, of course, had refuted the argument that on account of his ascension Christ cannot be eucharistically present; yet he had recorded it as follows: "... as Augustine teaches, commenting on John, *If I do not go away, the Counsellor will not come to you* [Jn. 16:7]. Christ is not then by bodily presence in the sacrament of the altar."<sup>98</sup> Zwingli, by contrast, fully accepted the refuted suggestion: "But if Christ is now seated at the right hand of God, and will sit there until he comes at the last day, how can he be literally in the sacrament?"<sup>99</sup> "But if Christ is seated there, he is not present here."<sup>100</sup>

For St. Thomas, remembrance was only one of the three dimensions of the holy eucharist. Nevertheless it is certain that St. Thomas took the idea of remembrance very seriously and proclaimed it devoutly. He introduced the subject matter by observing: "This sacrament signifies three things." Then St. Thomas specified as the first of the three: "It looks back to the past: in this sense it commemorates the passion of the Lord, which was the true sacrifice..."<sup>101</sup> Furthermore, noted St. Thomas: "... the last words said, especially by friends when parting, are best remembered; particularly at the parting of friends is the affection of love most sensitive; and the more our affections are involved the more things are deeply impressed upon our soul."<sup>102</sup> Huldrych Zwingli adopted this memorialist perspective as the only valid one. He wrote:

The Paschal Lamb was eaten the night before the smiting and passing over, and yet then and in the years to come, it was to be the representation of the Lord's Passover. In the same way Christ instituted the remembrance of his death the night before he died, and

that remembrance of his death, instituted before he died, is to be observed by all believers until he comes.<sup>103</sup>

St. Thomas had emphasized the significance of Christian fellowship in love;<sup>104</sup> a rather similar note can be found in Zwingli: "... the Supper signifies all the divine favour bestowed upon us in Christ, and also that in thankfulness we are to embrace our brethren with the same love with which Christ has received and redeemed and saved us."<sup>105</sup> With even a greater intensity Zwingli turned to the role of spiritual eating—taken out of a full Thomistic context<sup>106</sup>—and made use of it as the ordinary way of describing the fruits of the eucharistic memorial. Often Zwingli used the expression "spiritual eating" in order to contrast real presence and literal eating, e.g.: "... in the Lord's Supper the natural and essential body of Christ in which he suffered and is now seated in heaven at the right hand of God is not eaten naturally and literally but only spiritually...."<sup>107</sup> Zwingli explained the positive meaning of spiritual eating as follows:

To eat the body of Christ spiritually is equivalent to trusting with heart and soul upon the mercy and goodness of God through Christ, that is, to have the assurance of an unbroken faith that God will give us the forgiveness of sins and the joy of eternal salvation for the sake of his Son, who gave himself for us and reconciled the divine righteousness to us.<sup>108</sup>

At the same time the eucharist served to join faith and love in an ongoing experience of the ecclesial community. Zwingli wrote:

So then, when you come to the Lord's Supper to feed spiritually upon Christ, and when you thank the Lord for his great favour, for the redemption whereby you are delivered from despair, and for the pledge whereby you are assured of eternal salvation, when you join with your brethren in partaking of the bread and wine which are the tokens of the body of Christ, then in the true sense of the word you eat him sacramentally.<sup>109</sup>

Thomistic roots may be recognized also for some of the less central insights of Zwingli. Namely, St. Thomas had recorded the following statement for discussion and refutation: "No body can be in several places at once."<sup>110</sup> Zwingli accepted this argument in reference to the eucharist: "The body of Christ is not in several places at one and the same time any more than our bodies are."<sup>111</sup> But Zwingli's relation to St. Thomas was

not always necessarily negative. Thus Zwingli made use of the already noted<sup>112</sup> Thomistic analogy between food and spiritual strength. Zwingli called attention to the "... analogy between the signs and the things signified". Zwingli noted: "In the Supper there is a twofold analogy. The first is to Christ. For as the bread supports and sustains human life, and wine makes glad the heart of man, so Christ alone sustains and supports and rejoices the soul when it has no other hope."<sup>113</sup>

Zwingli also made use of the beautiful insight originally recorded in the *Didache*.<sup>114</sup> In St. Thomas' version it read as follows: "... consider the effect of this sacrament in terms of the whole Church. The Church is the gathering together of all the different baptized faithful; in the same way *bread is made of different grains of wheat and wine flows together from different grapes*, as the Gloss on I Corinthians 10,17 puts it."<sup>115</sup> Zwingli re-stated this as follows: the "... analogy is to ourselves. For as bread is made up of many grains and wine of many grapes, so by a common trust in Christ which proceeds from the one Spirit the body of the Church is constituted and built up out of many members a single body, to be the true temple and body of the indwelling Spirit."<sup>116</sup>

## V

Without exhausting the list of references, hence more illustratively rather than completely, this brief study leads to the following observations.

In recent scholarship it has been fashionable to defend the Catholicity of the Protestant reformers. Without a doubt, it has been valuable to recognize that often enough, instead of a radical and new departure, the reformers rather faithfully—even though fragmentarily—interpreted the Catholic tradition. In particular, the Catholic heritage of the reformers has been explored in terms of the more immediate sources, hence with attention to both late medieval thought and the influence of fellow reformers. While not discounting the significance of the immediate surroundings, this brief study calls attention to the fact that—directly or indirectly—St. Thomas Aquinas has supplied the major paradigms for the understanding of the



eucharistic presence of Christ. The differences among the reformers can therefore be appreciated as fragmentary appropriations of Thomistic insights. While it is not within the scope of this study to speculate whether the Thomistic synthesis might again prove sufficient for an ecumenically minded age, it is in place to observe that in the sixteenth century the origins of its variegated eucharistic thought can be traced to a disintegration of the Thomistic synthesis. At the same time it is to the credit of the original clarity of St. Thomas' insights, that the fragments—real presence, spiritual presence, and memorial—could serve as a base for the construction of new paradigms for the eucharistic theology, which have served effectively for at least four centuries.

## Notes

- <sup>1</sup> Arthur Vööbus, "The Eucharist in the Ancient Church" in Helmut T. Lehmann, ed., *Meaning and Practice of the Lord's Supper* (Philadelphia: Muhlenberg Press, 1961) 39–72; Willy Rordorf, et al., *The Eucharist of the Early Christians*, trans. Matthew J. O'Connell (New York: Pueblo Publishing Company, 1978); Egil Grislis, "The Manner of Christ's Eucharistic Presence in the Early and Medieval Church," *Consensus: A Canadian Lutheran Journal of Theology*, 6/4 (1980) 3–14.
- <sup>2</sup> *Summa Theologiae*, Blackfriars in conjunction with Eyre & Spottiswoode, London, and McGraw-Hill Book Company, New York, 1965, subsequently referred to as "B"; ST 3.74.8; B 58:48–49, cf. ST 3:75.2.
- <sup>3</sup> ST 3.76.1; B 58:94–95.
- <sup>4</sup> ST 3.75.2; B 58:58–59.
- <sup>5</sup> ST 3.75.2; B 58:60–63.
- <sup>6</sup> ST 3.75.4; B 58:70–71.
- <sup>7</sup> ST 3.75.1; B 58:54–57; cf. ST 3.76.7. Pre-ecumenically it was fashionable to overstate the difference between St. Thomas and Luther, e.g.: "How different is the faith of Luther in the words of the sacrament. His is a faith in the Gospel, a faith that is not only the acceptance of a dogma, but the acceptance of Christ," Herman Sasse, *This Is My Body: Luther's Contention for the Real Presence in the Sacrament of the Altar* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1959) 108. More recently oversimplification has gone the other direction. Thus John Stephenson thinks that in speaking of "sola fides", "Aquinas had voiced the strikingly Lutheran sentiment that 'faith alone' is competent to convince the heart of the presence of the sacred body and blood in the Holy Supper..." "Martin Luther and the Eucharist," *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 36/4 (1983) 451. For a balanced and insightful statement, cf. Joseph Peter Wawrykow, *The Role of Faith in the Eucharistic Doctrine of Thomas Aquinas in the Summa Theologiae*, M.A. thesis, University of Manitoba, 1980.

- <sup>8</sup> B 59:187. For the history of the term, cf. Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1978) 3:202–204; Salvatore Bonano, *The Concept of Substance and the Development of Eucharistic Theology to the Thirteenth Century* (Washington, D.C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1960); David Burr, *Eucharistic Presence and Conversion in Late Thirteenth-Century Franciscan Thought*, Transactions of the American Philosophical Society, 74/3 (Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society, 1984).
- <sup>9</sup> ST 3.75.1; B 58:56–57.
- <sup>10</sup> ST 3.75.4; B 58:70–71.
- <sup>11</sup> ST 3.75.4; B 58:72–73, cf. ST 4.75.8.
- <sup>12</sup> ST 3.75.5; B 58:74–75.
- <sup>13</sup> ST 3.75.5; B 58:72–73. Cf. James F. McCue, “The Doctrine of Transubstantiation from Berengar through Trent: The Point at Issue,” *Harvard Theological Review*, 61 (1968) 385–430; Jaroslav Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition: A History of the Development of Doctrine* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1985) 4:299; for an account of some modern Catholic interpretations, Edward Schillebeeckx, *Christ the Sacrament of the Encounter with Christ* (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1963); *The Eucharist*, trans. N.D. Smith (New York: Sheed and Ward, 1968), and “Transubstantiation, Transfinalization, Transignification,” in R. Kevin-Seasoltz (ed.), *Living Bread, Saving Cup* (Collegeville, MN, 1982) 175–189.
- <sup>14</sup> *D. Martin Luther Werke: Kritische Gesamtausgabe (Weimarer Ausgabe)* (Weimar: Hermann Böhlau Nachfolger, 1883 ff) [abbreviated as WA], 23:64–283 and 26:261–509; *Luther’s Works: American Edition* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press and St. Louis: Concordia Publishing House, 1961) [abbreviated as LW], 37:13–150 and 37:161–372 are Luther’s two most expressive statements on the real presence of Christ. Hermann Sasse has noted that “No one can understand Luther unless he has understood his fight for the real presence,” *This is My Body: Luther’s Contention for the Real Presence in the Sacrament of the Altar* (Minneapolis: Augsburg Publishing House, 1959) 11; at the same time, Luther was an outspoken opponent of the sacrifice of the mass and a critic of its liturgy: Notker M. Halmer, “Der literarische Kampf Luthers und Melanchthons gegen das Opfer der heiligen Messe,” *Divus Thomas*, 21 (1943) 63–78; Francis Clark, *Eucharistic Sacrifice and the Reformation* (Westminster, MD: Newman Press, 1960); Günther Wenz “Die Lehre vom Opfer Christi im Herrenmahl als Problem ökumenischer Theologie,” *Kerygma und Dogma*, 28/1 (1982) 7–41; Gottfried Jordahn, “Martin Luthers Kritik an der Messliturgie seiner Zeit,” *Archiv für Liturgiewissenschaft*, 26/1 (1984) 1–17.
- <sup>15</sup> ST 3.73.1, reply 3; B 58:6–7.
- <sup>16</sup> ST 3.75.1, sed contra; B 58:54–55; Ambrose, *De Sacramentis*, 6.1; PL 16:473.

- 17 ST 3.75.1; B 58:56–57.
- 18 ST 3.76.6, reply 3; B 58:114–115.
- 19 ST 3.81.2; B 59:92–93.
- 20 Gottfried G. Krodel, “The Lord’s Supper in the Theology of Young Luther,” *The Lutheran Quarterly*, 13 (1961) 19–33; for Luther’s final position, Norman Nagel, “The Presence of Christ’s Body and Blood in the Sacrament of the Altar According to Luther,” *Concordia Theological Monthly*, 39 (1968) 227–238; for an overview of Luther’s several positions, Egil Grislis, “The Manner of Christ’s Eucharistic Presence According to Martin Luther,” *Consensus: A Canadian Lutheran Journal of Theology*, 7/1 (1981) 3–15.
- 21 WA 26:341:13–19; LW 37:230.
- 22 *Formula of Concord, Solid Declaration, Lord’s Supper*, 7.35, in *The Book of Concord*, trans. and ed. by Theodore G. Tappert, et al. (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1959) 575.
- 23 WA 26:447:14ff., LW 37:306; cf. Hans Grass, *Die Abendmahlslehre bei Luther und Calvin* (Gütersloh: C. Bertelsmann, 1954) 127.
- 24 ST 3.73.5; B 58:18–19.
- 25 ST 3.73.6; B 58:22–23; cf. 3.74.3, sed contra; 3.80.2.
- 26 ST 3.74.1; B 58:26–27.
- 27 ST 3.75.1, reply 2; B 58:58–59.
- 28 WA 6:509:28–29; LW 36:31.
- 29 WA 6:508:7–16; LW 36:28–29; Leif Grane provides the text of d’Ailly and a thoughtful commentary on the entire statement by Luther, cf. “Luthers Kritik an Thomas von Aquin in De captivitate Babylonica,” *Zeitschrift für Kirchengeschichte*, 80 (1969) 3, fn. 7; for an overview of Luther’s critique of Aristotle, cf. Willigis Eckerman, OSA, “Die Aristoteleskritik Luthers: Ihre Bedeutung für seine Theologie,” *Catholica* (Münster) 32 (1978) 114–130.
- 30 WA 6:510:4–8; LW 36:32; J. Heywood Thomas, “Logic and Metaphysics in Luther’s Eucharistic Theology,” *Renaissance and Modern Studies*, 23 (1979) 147–159; David C. Steinmetz, “Scripture and the Lord’s Supper in Luther’s Theology,” *Interpretation*, 37/3 (1983) 255; Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition*, 4:57–59; Karl Rahner, who is prepared to say that “otherwise than with regard to transubstantiation, there is no essential difference between Catholic and the Lutheran faith,” is also ready to report candidly the danger of a Lutheran position: “It is an effort to confine the action of God to the purely divine sphere; it does not intervene to change anything where the things of the world are—the bread, morals, the grave and so on” (*Theological Investigations* [London: Darton, Longman & Todd; New York: The Seabury Press, 1974] 4:294 and 306; cf. Gerhard Gäde, “‘Das Herrenmahl’ und die eucharistische Realpräsenz,” *Catholica* (Münster), 35/4 (1981) 295. The most thorough statement is by Hartmut Hilgenfeld, *Mittelalterlich-traditionelle Elemente in Luthers Abendmahlschriften* (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1971).

- 31 ST 3.75.2, reply 1; B 58:62–63.
- 32 ST 3.75.2, objection 1; B 58:58–59; cf. objections 2 and 3; B 58:60–61.
- 33 WA 2:743:7–14; LW 35:50–51.
- 34 ST 3.73.4; B 58:14–17.
- 35 ST 3.80.4; B 59:44–45.
- 36 WA 2:742:33–743:1; LW 35–50.
- 37 WA 2:748:23–26; LW 35:58.
- 38 *Tractatus super Joannem*, 80.3; PL 35:1840; ST 3.78.5; B 58:186; *Summa Theologica: First Complete American edition in three volumes literally translated by Fathers of the English Dominican Province* (New York: Benzinger Brothers, Inc., 1947) 2:2477.
- 39 *Smalcald Articles*, 3.5 *The Book of Concord*, p. 310; John Calvin, *Institutes*, 4.14.4; Ronald S. Wallace, *Calvin's Doctrine of Word and Sacrament* (Edinburgh and London: Oliver and Boyd, 1953) 135.
- 40 ST 3.81.4, reply 2; B 59:98–99.
- 41 ST 3.76.1, reply 1 and 2; B 58:94–95.
- 42 As Hermann Sasse, *This Is My Body*, p. 96, has pointed out, Luther accepted the principle of concomitance (e.g., “Who has ever doubted that the whole Christ is under either species?” WA 6:139:25f.; WA 6:151:29ff; WA 6:152:26), but objected against it only as a source of the *communio sub una* (WA 26:495; WA 39/1:27:4 ff).
- 43 WA 11:449:34–450; LW 36:297.
- 44 ST 3.82.4; B 59:108–109.
- 45 ST 3.83.6, reply 7; B 59:182–183.
- 46 WA 10/3:41:5–14; LW 51:88.
- 47 “The folk memory of Halle preserved the information that, during his stay, [in late January, 1546] Luther not only preached but also celebrated and administered the Sacrament of the Altar. Fatigued by the effort of distributing the chalice to a large congregation, and troubled by a trembling hand, the Reformer dropped some consecrated wine onto the floor of the sanctuary. Karl Loewe reports that, ‘Luther placed the chalice on the altar, fell on his knees and licked up the wine so as to avoid stepping on it. At this, the whole congregation erupted into loud sobs and tears.’” [Quoted in Karl Anton, *Luther und die Musik*, 3rd ed. (Zwickau: Johannes Hermann, 1928) 59–60], John Stephenson, “Martin Luther and the Eucharist,” *Scottish Journal of Theology*, 36/4 (1983) 448.
- 48 Justo L. González, *A History of Christian Thought* (Nashville & New York: Abingdon Press, 1975) 3:58–59; Pelikan, *The Christian Tradition*, 4:200.
- 49 Luther had written in the *Confession Concerning Christ's Supper*, 1528: “Therefore, the fanatics are wrong, as well as the gloss in Canon Law, if they criticize Pope Nicholas for having forced Berengar to confess that ‘the true body of Christ is crushed and ground with the teeth.’ Would to God that all popes had acted in so Christian a fashion in all other



- matters as this pope did with Berengar in forcing this confession." WA 26:442-443; LW 37:300-301. Erwin Iserloh, "Die Abendmahlslehre der Confessio Augustana, Ihrer Confutatio und Ihrer Apologie," *Catholica* (Münster), 34 (1980) 20 observes that the affirmation of the real presence by the Augsburg Confession in art. 10 was favourably accepted by Catholics (cf. *Confutatio*, in *Corpus Catholicorum*, Münster: Aschen-dorff, 1978, 33:100-101), which is not surprising, since the Augsburg Confession relied on the formulation by the Fourth Lateran synod of 1215.
- 50 ST 3.73.1; B 58:4-5.
- 51 *Institutes*, 4.17.1; Petrus Barth and Guilelmus Niesel (eds.), *Joannis Calvini Opera Selecta* (München: Chr. Kaiser, 1962) [subsequently referred to as OS], 5:342:9,21,27; John T. McNeill (ed.), *Calvin: Institutes of the Christian Religion*, trans. Ford Lewis Battles, The Library of Christian Classics, 21 (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1960) [subsequently referred to as LCC], 21:1360. Francois Wendel, *Calvin: Origins and Development of His Religious Thought*, trans. Philip Mairet (New York and Evanston: Harper & Row, 1963) 332, observes that "the parallel that is drawn between the receiving of elements and the nourishment of the soul by the body of Christ is already to be found in Bucer's *Evangelical Commentary*, expressed in terms very close to those employed by Calvin." While it is indeed possible that Bucer, a former Dominican who knew St. Thomas well, was the transmitter of this insight, it is more likely that Calvin knew the reference directly.
- 52 *Institutes*, 4.17.3; OS 5:344:26; LCC 21:1363.
- 53 ST 3.73.2; B 58:8-9.
- 54 *Institutes*, 4.17.12-16; OS 5:355-363; LCC 21:1372-1379. Calvin was aware that according to St. Thomas Christ was not physically present, cf. Henry Chavannes, "La présence réelle chez saint Thomas et chez Calvin," *Verbum Caro*, 13/50 (1950) 151-170; Kilian McDonnell, OSB, *John Calvin, the Church, and the Eucharist* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967) 238, referring to *Institutes* 4.17.13.
- 55 *Institutes*, 4.17.1; OS 5:343:7-9; LCC 21:1361. Yet Calvin was prepared to speak about the presence of the flesh of Christ, cf. Ronald N. Gleason, *The Westminster Theological Journal*, 45/2 (1983) 289.
- 56 *Institutes*, 4.17.4; OS 5:345:20; LCC 21:1363.
- 57 *Institutes*, 4.17.8; OS 5:350:15-16; LCC 21:1368.
- 58 *Institutes*, 4.17.9; OS 5:350:32-33; LCC 21:1369.
- 59 *Institutes*, 4.17.3; OS 5:344:13-15; LCC 21:1362. For a definition of Calvin's view of substance, cf. Wilhelm Niesel, *Calvins Lehre vom Abendmahl* (München: Chr. Kaiser, 1935) 50, ftn. 103; Jean Cadier, *La doctrine Calviniste de la sainte cène* (Montpellier, 1951) 23-24; G.S.M. Walker, "The Lord's Supper in Theology and Practice of Calvin" in *John Calvin*, Courtenay Studies in Reformation Theology, 1 (Appleford, Abingdon, Berkshire: Sutton Courtenay Press, 1966) 134-138; McDonnell, *John Calvin, the Church, and the Eucharist*, 232-248, 304-306.

- 60 *Institutes*, 4.17.19; OS 5:365:19–20; LCC 21:1382.
- 61 *Institutes*, 4.17.32; OS 5:391:17–20; LCC 21:1406; “Calvin himself, when speaking in terms of the distribution of Christ’s own flesh and blood, frequently exchanges the words flesh and blood with the word power (*vis, vigor, virtus*) which is given from the flesh and blood of Christ,” Ronald N. Gleason, *The Westminster Theological Journal*, p. 291; cf. Joachim Rogge, *Virtus und Res: Um die Abendmahlswirklichkeit bei Calvin* (Stuttgart: Calwer Verlag, 1965) 60–67; according to Gerhard Gäde, “Das Herrenmahl,” p. 294, Calvin’s position was recorded by the Council of Trent as “tantum modo esse in eo . . . virtute” [DS 1651] to which the Council opposed “substantialiter” [ibid.].
- 62 *Institutes*, 4.17.26; OS 5:378:17–18; LCC 21:1393; cf. *Institutes*, 4.17.27.
- 63 ST 3.75.1; B 58:58–59.
- 64 *Institutes*, 4.17.6 and 11.
- 65 *Institutes*, 4.17.10; OS 5:352:10–22; LCC 21:1371; cf. *Institutes*, 4:17.14.
- 66 ST 3.80.11; B 59:80–81; McDonnell, *John Calvin*, p. 306, has observed: “The eating of the sacrament is for Thomas, as for Augustine, a spiritual eating. This is not meant to exclude real eating, but simply to exclude a material eating [cf. ST 3.75.1, ad 1]. In all of his dogmatic assertions, Thomas guards against that which Calvin fears—a species of sacramental realism which is in fact not at all sacramental but quite clearly crude religious materialism.”
- 67 ST 3.79.1, reply 1; B 59:6–7.
- 68 ST 3.79.1, reply 2; B 59:6–7.
- 69 *De Fide Orthodoxa*, 4.13; PG 94:1141 and 1145; ST 3.78.4, obj. 1; B 58:182–183.
- 70 ST 3.78.4, reply 1; B 58:184–185. Recent ecumenical statements ordinarily formulate the consensus in regard to Christ’s eucharistic presence by underscoring the operative role of the Holy Spirit, cf. Edward J. Kilmartin, “The Active Role of Christ and the Holy Spirit in the Sanctification of the Eucharistic Elements,” *Theological Studies*, 45/2 (1984) 225–253. Such an emphasis, however, does not need to be viewed as a basic departure from an earlier tradition, despite Karl-Hermann Kandler, “Abendmahl und Heiliger Geist: Geschieht Jesu Christi eucharistisches Wirkendurch den Heiligen Geist?” *Kerygma und Dogma*, 28/3 (1982) 215–228.
- 71 *Institutes*, 4.17.10; OS 5:351:25–29; LCC 21:1370. As McDonnell, *John Calvin*, p. 257, has pointed out, Calvin was not “an innovator in this matter. Calvin found the doctrine of the Holy Spirit as the bond of our union with Christ in the Eucharist in a sermon Erasmus attributed to John Chrysostom . . .” It is nevertheless McDonnell’s view, p. 378, that Calvin has overstated his case.
- 72 *Institutes*, 4.17.19; OS 5:365:1–4; LCC 21:1381.
- 73 *Institutes*, 4.17.33; OS 5:391:28–30; LCC 21:1405.
- 74 *Institutes*, 4.17.33; OS 5:392:12–16; LCC 21:1405. David Willis is prepared to defend the orthodoxy of Calvin: “The whole Christ is really and substantially present in the eucharist by the power of the

Spirit—which is very different from saying that we have only a ‘spiritual presence’ of Christ in the eucharist.” “The Reformed Doctrine of the Eucharist and Ministry and Its Implications for Roman Catholic Dialogues,” *Journal of Ecumenical Studies*, 21/2 (1984) 299.

- 75 *Institutes*, 4.17.12; OS 5:356:3–7; LCC 21:1373; cf. *Institutes*, 4.17.24 and 28.
- 76 *Institutes*, 4.17.36; OS 5:399:19–21; LCC 21:1412.
- 77 Philip Schaff, *The Creeds of Christendom* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1919) 3:502.
- 78 *Controversy with M. Harding*, Art. 5, “Of the Real Presence,” in John Ayre (ed.) for the Parker Society, *The Works* (Cambridge: The University Press, 1845) 1:448, cf. 2:1118 and 1124.
- 79 *Ibid.* 1:477.
- 80 Cf. above, fn. 50.
- 81 G.E. Corrie (ed.) for the Parker Society, *A Catechism*, trans. Thomas Norton (Cambridge: The University Press, 1853) 212.
- 82 *Ibid.* 213.
- 83 *Ibid.* 214.
- 84 W. Speed Hill (ed.), *The Folger Library Edition of The Works of Richard Hooker* (Cambridge, MA and London: The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 1977), *Of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, 5.67.1; 2:330:27–28.
- 85 *Ibid.* 5.67.2; 2:331:24.
- 86 *Ibid.* 5.67.2; 2:331:27–29.
- 87 *Ibid.* 5.67.6; 2:334:30–32.
- 88 *Ibid.* 5.67.7; 2:336:7–9.
- 89 *Ibid.* 5.67.7; 2:336:2–5.
- 90 Walther Köhler, *Zwingli und Luther: Ihr Streit um das Abendmahl nach seinen politischen und religiösen Beziehungen*, 1924 (rep. New York and London: Johnson Reprint Corporation, 1971) 1:671–682, 826; Fritz Blanke, “Zwinglis Sakramentanschauung,” *Theologische Blätter*, 11/1 (1921) 12–18, rpr. in *Gemeinschaft mit Jesus Christus: Vorträge und Voten zu Theologie, Kirche und ökumenische Bewegung* (München: Chr. Kaiser Verlag, 1964) 136–143; Fritz Schmidt-Clausing, *Zwingli als Liturgiker: Eine liturgiegeschichtliche Untersuchung* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck üprecht, 1952); J. Schweizer, *Reformierte Abendmahlsgestaltung in der Schau Zwinglis* (Basel: Verlag Friedrich Reinhardt, [1954]); Bard Thompson, “Zwingli’s Eucharistic Doctrine,” *Church History*, 4/2 (1961) 134–143; Stefan Niklaus Bosshard, *Zwingli-Erasmus-Cajetan: Die Eucharistie als Zeichen der Einheit* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1978); E. Grötzing, *Luther und Zwingli: Die kritik an der mittelalterlichen Lehre von der Messe—als Wurzel des Abendmahlsstreites* (Zürich and Köln: Benzinger Verlag, and Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus Gerd Mohn, 1980).
- 91 Hermann Sasse has observed, although overstating the case, that Zwingli “was at heart a Thomist, which he remained even as a Reformer—a Thomist for whom revelation never can contradict reason,” *This Is My Body*, 117–118.

- 92 ST 3.75.1; B 58:56-57; cf. 3.75.1, obj. 1 and reply 1.
- 93 *Fidei Christianae Expositio* in Huldrici Zuinglii *Opera: Completa Editio Prima*, ed. by Melchior Schuler and Johannes Schulthess (Zürich, Ex Officina Schulthessiana, 1841) 4,2:55 [subsequently abbreviated as S and S]; *Zwingli and Bullinger: Selected Translations with Introductions and Notes* by G.W. Bromiley, The Library of Christian Classics, 24 (Philadelphia: Westminster Press, 1953) [abbreviated as LCC], 24:261.
- 94 S and S 4:2:56; LCC 24:261.
- 95 ST 3.83.2, reply 2; B 59:138-139.
- 96 *Huldreich Zwinglis Sämtliche Werke*, Corpus Reformatorum, 91 (Zürich: Theologischer Verlag, 1982) [subsequently CR], 4:794:11-12.
- 97 S and S 4,2:46; LCC 24:247-248.
- 98 ST 3.75.1, obj. 1; B 58:54-55.
- 99 CR 4:829:20-22; LCC 24:214.
- 100 CR 4:832:7-8; LCC 24:216.
- 101 ST 3.73.4; B 58:14-15.
- 102 ST 3.73.6; B 58:20-21.
- 103 CR 4:845:15-20; LCC 24:226.
- 104 Cf. above, fn. 34.
- 105 S and S 4,2:46; LCC 24:249.
- 106 Cf. above, fn. 50.
- 107 S and S 4,2:51; LCC 24:254.
- 108 S and S 4,2:53; LCC 24:258.
- 109 S and S 4,2:54; LCC 24:259.
- 110 ST 3.75.1, obj. 3; B 58:54-55.
- 111 S and S 4,2:54; LCC 24:255.
- 112 Cf. above, fn. 50 and 106.
- 113 S and S 4,2:56-57; LCC 24:263.
- 114 9:1-5; *The Apostolic Fathers: With an English Translation* by Kirsopp Lake (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, and London: William Heinemann, 1912) vol. I, Loeb Classical Library.
- 115 ST 3.74.1; B 58:26-27, referring to *Glossa Ordinaria*. Augustine In Joan. 6.56, Tract. 26; PL 35:1614.
- 116 S and S 4,2:57; LCC 24:263; Zwingli certainly had precedent, as Wendel notes: "From Luther's *Sermon upon the true and sacred body of Christ* of 1519, which had appeared in Latin in 1524, Calvin borrowed his ideas upon union with Christ, and upon the unity of the Christians represented by bread which is made up of a multitude of seeds" (*Calvin: Origin and Development of His Religious Thought*, pp. 330-331).