

Concordia Seminary - Saint Louis

Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary

Bachelor of Divinity

Concordia Seminary Scholarship

4-15-1930

The Doctrine of the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist with special reference to the Doctrine of Transubstantiation

Fred C. Kreiss

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, ir_kreissf@csl.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv>



Part of the [Religious Thought, Theology and Philosophy of Religion Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Kreiss, Fred C., "The Doctrine of the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist with special reference to the Doctrine of Transubstantiation" (1930). *Bachelor of Divinity*. 683.

<https://scholar.csl.edu/bdiv/683>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Concordia Seminary Scholarship at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Bachelor of Divinity by an authorized administrator of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

Compiler's Note:

This is a copy of the original thesis submitted to the faculty.

Corrections have been made only where indicated by the author.

The original is to be found in the care of the Librarian.

**THE DOCTRINE OF THE REAL PRESENCE OF
CHRIST IN THE EUCHARIST**

with special reference to the Doctrine of Transubstantiation

A Thesis

presented to the faculty of

Concordia Seminary

St. Louis, Missouri

by

Fred C. Kreiss

in partial fulfilment of the

requirements for the degree

of

Bachelor of Divinity

April 1930

Outline

The doctrine of the Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist
--with special reference to the dogma of Transubstantiation

Introduction.

Chapter One: The Eucharist Uncontroverted (60-850 A.D.)

I. The biblical doctrine supreme (60-325 A.D.)

- a) The Apostolic Fathers p. 3.
- b) Post-Apostolic Fathers p. 4.
- c) School of Asia Minor p. 6.
- d) School of North Africa p. 8.
- e) School of Alexandria (spiritual) p. 11.

II. The trend in the Oriental Church after Nicaea.

- a) Preliminary Remarks p. 16.
- b) Fluctuating interpretations gradually leaning toward a materialistic interpretation p. 18.
- c) Stagnation and deterioration p. 24.
- d) Stabilization of the Greek doctrine p. 26.

III. The trend in the Western Church after Nicaea (325-850).

- a) Preliminary Remarks p. 27.
- b) Hilary and Ambrose--sacramental p. 28.
- c) Augustine--symbolical p. 30.
- d) Theological thought divided--peacefully p. 33.
- e) Practise and Life of the Church--influence of Gregory the Great p. 36.

Chapter Two: The Eucharist in Controversy (850-1500 A.D.).

I. Origin of the modern Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation--The Paschasian Controversy.

- a) Introduction p. 40.
- b) Paschasius Radbertus p. 41.
- c) Ratrammus p. 44.
- d) Scope of their influence (respectively) p. 46.

II. The doctrine of Transubstantiation victorious--The Berengarian Controversy.

- a) Introduction p. 50.
- b) Berengarius p. 51.
- c) Lanfranc and the Church p. 54.
- d) The doctrine of transubstantiation an established dogma p. 56.

III. The doctrine of Transubstantiation during the reign of Scholasticism.

- a) First confirmation by the 4th Lateran Council-- (by way of introduction) p. 59.
- b) The word "transubstantiation" p. 60.
- c) Mode of Christ's presence p. 60.
- d) Method of the change p. 61.
- e) Duration of the change p. 61.
- f) Adoration of the host p. 62.
- g) Corpus Christi Festival p. 48.

Conclusion.

Literature

In the order of importance

J. C. Giessler, Compendium of Ecclesiastical History, 4th Ed.
transl. by Sam. Davidson, Edinburgh. 5 Volumes.

Mirbt, Quellen zur Geschichte des Papstums und des Roemischen
Katholizismus, 4te Auflage, Tuebingen.

Seeberg, Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte, Erlangen, 1895, 2 Vols.

Thomasius, Die Christliche Dogmengeschichte, Erlange, 1874-
1889, 2 Volumes.

Harnack, Dr. Ad., Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte, Freiburg,
1894, 3 Volumes.

Kurtz, Church History, Ed. Funk-Wagnalls, 3 Volumes.

K. F. Kahnis, Die Lehre vom Abendmahle, Leipzig, 1851.

P. Kretzmann, The Corpus Christi Festival and its Doctrine,
Theol. Quarterly, Vol. XIX, 1915.

Ayer, Sourcebook for Ancient Church History.

Catholic Encyclopaedia, Volume V.

Introduction

In a Catholic tract of recent date, "The Holy Eucharist Explained" (by Our Sunday Visitor Press, Huntington, Ind.), we read the modest claim that "All Christians for 15 centuries believed the Eucharist to contain the true body and blood, soul and divinity of Jesus Christ, under the appearances of bread and wine" (p. 16); that this is substantiated by the following facts: "In the first place the Greek Church and all the Christian sects of Asia, which are older than Protestantism by 1000 years, believe as we do. Hence such must have been the prevailing belief of Christians during the first centuries. Secondly, writings that come down to us from close successors of the Apostles clearly state the belief of the early Church, and show it to be identical with ours of today." (p. 14.15).

Thus the Church of Rome continues to dupe its lay members by generalizations and gross misrepresentations of historical truth. For this reason we have made it our aim in this essay, not only to show the true origin and development of the Roman doctrine, which is the heart and foundation of its elaborate unchristian system of dogma and worship (in which event we would begin with the 9th century), but also, and especially, to prove from the writings of the Church's teachers, beginning with the apostolic times, that such a doctrine was unknown to them and foreign to their thought and faith for many centuries. For this reason we have made the title of this essay to cover the entire field of the development of doctrine on the presence of Christ in the Eucharist.¹

1. See page 2.

Chapter OneThe Eucharist Uncontroverted60-850 A. D.

I

The biblical doctrine supreme60-325 A. D.

The literature of the Church, during the first few centuries of its existence, shows no deviation from the biblical doctrine. The assertions of Scripture were accepted without questioning. The Church was unanimous in its teachings; and for this reason there was, quite naturally, no such thing as a clearly outlined "dogma" on the Lord's Supper. But this very unanimity, this lack of controversy, left the door wide open for undue speculation, when the tendency to interpret Scripture allegorically became popular, as for instance among the Alexandrians, also along the line of sacramental institutions of the Church. Their speculation, however, never influenced the general teaching and faith of the Church. As such, as we shall see in the course of this chapter.

-
1. Hence it was impossible, for instance, to go into very much detail in regard to the work done by Scholasticism in developing the various aspects of the theory of transubstantiation, or for that matter, the entire "Werdegang" of the dogma, the attitude of theological thought, its acceptance by the masses, its rejection by many, after its fixation by the 4th Lateran Council in 1215 A.D. This, however, would not be necessary to make this essay a complete unit.

a) The Apostolic Fathers.

Among the immediate disciples of the Apostles, only Ignatius of Antioch (d. 130) has a few references to the nature of the contents in the Lord's Supper. Especially noteworthy is the following taken from Smyrn. c. 7. Diese Stelle, says Kahnis, p. 177, gehoert zu den echten, da Theodoretus sie zitiert (Dial. III). There

Ignatius says of the Docetists: *Ἐυχαριστίας καὶ προσευχῆς ἀπέχονται, διὰ τὸ μὴ ὁμολογεῖν τὴν εὐχαριστίαν σάρκα εἶναι τοῦ σωτήρος ἡμῶν Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ τὴν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀμαρτιῶν ἡμῶν κλειόμεν.*

It is evident from this that, while the Docetes regard the body and blood in the Lord's Supper as mere symbolical names, the Church,-- for Ignatius here speaks for the Church--, sees in the consecrated elements the very body of Christ, which suffered on the cross. In the face of this clear evidence, Harnack contends: "dass Ignatius von einer solchen (realistischen) Anschauung weit entfernt sei, vielmehr johaneisch denke." (Harn. I, 203, n. 2). And this because, in several places, Ignatius speaks of the body and blood of Christ in a manner similar to that in which John speaks of them in his 6th chapter. Thus, in Trall. c.8, he identifies the body of Christ with faith, and his blood with love; or in Philad. c.5, the gospel is called the body of the Lord; or, in the same Epistle, c. 1, we read:

ἀἶμα Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἣτις ἐστὶν καρὰ ζωῆς καὶ πληρώματος.

But after a careful study of the context we find that Ignatius, in all these places speaks of the Lord's Supper as little as John spoke of it in Ch. 6. Speaking of the passage from the Letter to Smyrna, quoted above, Thomasius correctly concludes: "Der Wortlaut und der

Gegensatz gegen die gnostischen Doketen sprechen fuer deren realist-ischen Sinn." (Thom. I, 405, n. 1). Fact is that Ignatius and, ac-
cording to his own testimony, the Church of his day taught the real
bodily presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper. But of a change of
substance Ignatius says nothing, nor do we find any indication of
such a change in the literature of the Apostolic Fathers.

b) Post Apostolic Fathers.

Of these, the Apologist Justin (d. 165) is the only source
from which we may glean a few thoughts on the contents of the Lord's
Supper. And concerning him even Harnack will admit: "Es laesst sich
nicht verkennen, dass Justin die wunderbare, vom Logos gewirkte Iden-
titaet des verdankten Brodes mit dem vom Logos angenommenen Leib vor-
ausgesetzt hat." (Harn. I, 203, n. 2). Harnack refers to Justin's

"Apology", c. I, 66, 12: (Quot. Mirbt, p. 11, 14): *Ὁὐ γὰρ ὡς κοινὸν
ἄρτον οὐδὲ κοινὸν πόμα τέατα λαμβάνομεν· ἀλλ' ὄν τρόπον
διὰ λόγου νεοῦ σαρκοποιηθεὶς Ἰησοῦς Χριστὸς ὁ σωτὴρ ἡμῶν καὶ
σὰρκα καὶ αἷμα ὑπὲρ σωτηρίας ἡμῶν ἔσχευ, οὕτως καὶ τὴν
δι' εὐχῆς λόγον τοῦ παρ' αὐτοῦ εὐχαριστηθεῖσαν τροφήν, ἐξ ἧς
αἷμα καὶ σάρκες κατὰ μεταβολὴν τρέφονται ἡμῶν, ἐκείνου
τοῦ σαρκοποιηθέντος Ἰησοῦ· καὶ σὰρκα καὶ αἷμα ἔδιδάχθημεν εἶναι.*

The final *ἔδιδάχθημεν* indicates that this is the commonly
accepted teaching of the Church: the consecrated *τροφή* is the
flesh and blood of the Word made flesh. The comparison with the in-
carnation is made in order to illustrate, not so much the manner or
mode of the presence of the body and blood, as its possibility and

reality. Thomasius: "Offenbar stellt er hier 2 analoge Vorgaenge in Paralele; beide werden durch hoehere Kraft bewirkt, dort die Menschwerdung durch den goettlichen Logos, hier die Eucharistie durch das nicht minder wirksame Weihewort Christi im Munde seiner Kirche."

(Thom. I, 406). Justin does not develop the parallel beyond the true point of comparison, as we find it later in Gregory of Nyssa, who describes the eating of Christ's body as a second incarnation, or a continuation thereof.

It is noteworthy, too, that Justin does not emphasize the power of the priest, but simply states that the elements receive their more exalted content *δὲ εὐχῆς λόγου*, simply the words of institution. (In this connection Harnack correctly says: "Es sieht Justin das wirkliche Fleish Christi im Brote an, bezieht aber nicht die Idee des Opfers auf dasselbe...Beide (Ignatius and Justin) sind von der spaeteren Auffassung entfernt.") (Harn. I, 203, n. 1).

With reference to the words *ἐξ ἧς αἷμα καὶ σάρκες κατὰ μεταβολὴν τρεφόντι ἡμῶν*, Kahnis: "Die Kath. Kirche fand lange in diessem Zusatz...eine Stuetze fuer die Verwandlungslehre. Seit Doellinger hat sie indess die Beweiss Kraft des *κατὰ μεταβολὴν* aufgegeben. Das *κ. μ.* ist ein zu *τρέφοντι* gehoeriger adverbialer Beisatz: Die Elemente werden, wie jede Nahrung, in unsere Leiblichkeit verwandelt, verdaut." (Kah. p. 183). According to Thomasius, too, it means simply: "Eines Leibes und Blutes mit Christo werden." (Thom. I, p. 406).

Thus we conclude that, while on one hand Justin teaches the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, he on the other hand emphasizes that the natural elements are retained. "Sonach haben die lith. Kirchenlehrer (Luther, Gerhard, Quenstedt) ein Recht gehabt, in dieser Stelle ein Zeugniß zu finden fuer die Lehre von der sakramentalen Vereinigung des Leibes und Blutes Christi mit den Elementen, und zwar, nach des Justinus eigener Versicherung, nicht das Zeugnis eines Kirchenlehrers, sondern der Kirche." (Kah. p. 173).

Absolute proof for this claim may be found in Apol. I, c. 85, where Justin describes the celebration of the Lord's Supper and, after relating how the elements are consecrated, says: *διὰ κόνυα διδοῦσιν ἑκάστῳ τῶν παρόντων μεταλαβεῖν ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑυχαριστήματος ἄρτου καὶ οἴνου τῶν ὕδατος, καὶ τοῖς οὖν παροῦσιν ἀποπέφουσιν.* (Quot.: Gle. I, 172, n. 2). As St. Paul (1 Cor. 11, 26-28) still calls the consecrated elements "bread and wine," so Justin.

c) School of Asia Minor.

To illustrate the absolute orthodoxy of this school also on the question now under discussion, it will suffice to quote its most illustrious representative, Irenaeus, bishop of Lyons in 178 A.D. He clearly teaches a real sacramental presence, using it as a proof against the denial of a bodily resurrection. He argues thus, Advers. Haereses IV, 18, 5: *Ὡς γὰρ ἀπὸ γῆς ἄρτος προλαμβάνομενος τὴν ἑκκλήσιον τοῦ θεοῦ οὐκέτι κοινὸς ἄρτος, ἀλλ' εὐχαριστία, ἐκ δύο πραγμάτων συνεστηκυῖα, ἐπιγείου τε καὶ οὐρανόθεν, οὕτως καὶ τὰ σώματα ἡμῶν μεταλαμβάνοντα τῆς εὐχαριστίας μηκέτι εἶναι ψάδρα τὴν ἐλπίδα τῆς εἰς αἰῶνας ἀναστάσεως ἔχουσα.*

According to this, there are two parts in the Eucharist: the earthly, which does not lose its substance ($\text{οὐκ ἔτι κολυβός ἄρτος ἐστίν} =$ it is bread, but not κολυβός , -- ἀλλ' εὐχαριστία), and the heavenly, which presents itself after the words of institution (ἔκκλησις). As regards the idea that the Lord's Supper imparts something like a germ of immortality, assuring us of our resurrection, it is beyond the scope of this paper to discuss it here. This idea is found in most of the antignostic writers of this period, e.g., Ignatius, who calls the consecrated bread a $\text{ψάρμακον ἀθανασίας ἀντίδοτος τοῦ μὴ ἀποθάνειν}$. -- Another very interesting reference of Irenaeus to the Lord's Supper tells us of the ritual in connection with the celebration of the Eucharist. After a prayer of thanksgiving For God's mercy in commanding the earth to bring forth the fruits which are used as the natural elements in the Eucharist, there follows a prayer to the Holy Spirit that he may reveal the bread as the body of Christ, and the cup as His blood: $\text{Προσφέρομεν γὰρ τῷ θεῷ τὸν ἄρτον καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τῆς εὐλογίας, εὐχαριστοῦντες αὐτῷ ὅτι τῇ γῆ ἐκέλευσε ἐκφύσει τοὺς κάρπους τούτους εἰς τροφήν ἡμετέραν, καὶ ἐνταῦθα τὴν προσηγορίαν τελέσαντες ἐκκαλοῦμεν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον, ὅπως ἀποψήνη τὴν οὐσίαν ταύτην καὶ τὸν ἄρτον σῶμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ καὶ τὸ ποτήριον τὸ αἷμα τοῦ Χριστοῦ, ἵνα οἱ μεταλαμβάνοντες τούτων τῶν ἀντιτύπων τῆς ἀφέσεως τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν καὶ τῆς ζωῆς αἰωνίου}$ (Irenaei fragm. II, ed. Pfaffii quot.: Gie I, 173 n. 15). Here again τυχεῖν .

Irenaeus teaches the sacramental presence, neither more nor less. It

1. Ad Ephes. c. 26, quot.: Mirbē, p. 5, 2. Similarly Tertullian, Acc. to Harnack, I, p. 436.

is not a prayer that the Holy Spirit may change the elements, but that he reveal them as earthly elements still; but with a heavenly content, the true body and blood of the Lord. It is the real body and blood, for Irenaeus makes the efficacy of the sacrament dependent, not only upon faith, but upon the presence of the body of Christ: ὅπως ἀποψήνη τὸν ἄρτον σῶμα... ἐν τυχῶσιν . Besides, other quotations, above, make this interpretation imperative. And so we have here a significant example of the use of terms such as ἀντίτυπον in the early Christian literature. It cannot be taken in its modern sense. But more of this later. -- (It might be well also to call attention to the fact that Irenaeus speaks of the unconsecrated elements as a *δυσία*, (*δυσία* refers back to τοὺς κάρπους τούτους). This is an unmistakable allusion to the oblations, to the fact that the material elements used for the celebration were free-will offerings ('sacrifices') brought by the members of the congregation. It is upon such statements, that the Church of Rome bases its doctrine of a sacrifice of the Mass).

d) The School of North Africa.

To the Western representative of the School of Asia Minor we might, in this place, add the two outstanding western theologians of this period, Tertullian (ca 240) and Cyprian (d. 258). Both schools were soundly biblical in their theology, as well as in their method of combating Gnostic philosophy. Thus, for instance, we find that Tertullian, no less than Irenaeus, "emphasized (against Docetan and Gnostic heresy) the reality of Christ's body, that is the substan-

tial identity of Christ's human nature with our humanity." (Harnack I, p. 552). This explains why these theologians, unlike Origen, kept clear of all symbolical interpretation of biblical doctrine. So also of the doctrine of the Eucharist. There are indeed phrases and expressions in the writings of both Tertullian and Cyprian which apparently point to a symbolical interpretation. So e.g. Tertullian, Adv. Marc. IV, 40: "Acceptum panem et distributum discipulis, corpus illum suum fecit, 'hoc est corpus meum' dicendo, id est figura corporis;"¹ and again Adv. Marcion I, 14: "Panem quo ipsum corpus suum repraesentat;"² or De Orat. 6: "quod et corpus meum in pane censatur: hoc est corpus meum."³ But such expressions must be interpreted in the light of other passages, where Tertullian clearly teaches the real presence of Christ's body and blood, e.g. De Resur-

-
1. Thomasius, I, 411: "Nun kann zwar 'figura' Bild, bildliches Zeichen, Typus bedeuten und bedeutet es auch oefters bei Tertullian, aber ebenso haeufig ist es nachweisbar *μορφή*, Gestalt, Erscheinungsform, und bedeutet 'figurare' soviel als formare, gestalten, Gestalt geben...Der Zusammenhang der Stelle, andere Stellen, sowie die ganze sonstige realistische Ausdrucksweise des lateinischen Kirchenlehrers spricht dafuer." -- Note also the "fecit" panem corpus."
 2. (Quot. Thom. I, p. 409). Thomasius interprets "repraesentat" as follows: "Durch das Brot vergegenwaertigt er seinen Leib; er stellt ihn als gegenwaertig dar, er 'bewirkt seine Gegenwart'; denn dies ist nachweisbar bei Tertullian die Bedeutung von 'repraesentare', zuweilen praesentare, in der Schrift gegen Marcion. Er lehrt mithin, dass durch das Brot des Abendmahls der Herr die wirkliche Gegenwart, seines Leibes bewirke." (I, p. 409).
 3. (Quot.: Thom. I, 408). Thomasius (I, p. 409): "Das will sagen: 'Christi Leib wird mit dem Brote in Eins gerechnet, unter einem Begriff mit demselben zusammengefasst.' So bestaetigt es das eigene Wort des Herrn: 'hoc est corpus meum'".

rectione, c. 8: "Caro corpore et sanguine Christi vescitur, ut et anima de deo saginetur." (Quot.: Kah. p. 194). Both a physical and a spiritual eating of Christ's real body are indicated here. The physical eating of the body and blood cannot be denied, else there cannot be a spiritual eating either, and the sentence here quoted is void of meaning. So also de Pudicitia, c. 9: "Ita exinde opinitate dominici corporis vescitur, eucharistia scilicet." The Eucharist is practically identified with "the glory of the Lord's body." -- Kahnis erroneously concludes: "So bleibt denn ein Dualismus zwischen dieser (figuerlichen) Auslegung und dem Bekenntniss des Tertullian stehen" (p. 194). But this dualism or contradiction is not real. Even Harnack says: "Wie Justin und Irenaeus zwei Dinge in der heiligen Speise erkannten, ein irdisches und ein himmlisches, den wahren Leib Christi, ebenso Tertullian, dem faelschlich eine 'symbolische' Lehre aufgebuerdet wird. Die Untersuchungen Leimbachs ueber den Sprachgebrauch Tertullians haben dies ueber jeden Zweifel erhoben." (Harn. I, p. 436 and n. 2). It is also certain, beyond the shadow of a doubt, that the idea of a transubstantiation was absolutely foreign to the mind of Tertullian.

It would be preposterous to deny that Cyprian taught the real presence. And yet, even in his writings we find expressions which to the modern reader would suggest a symbolical interpretation; for instance when, in his Epist. ad Caecilium, he says: "Videmus in vino vero ostendi sanguinem Christi," or: "Vinum quo Christi sanguis ostenditur." (Quot.: Kah. p. 200). It must be

remembered that for seven full centuries the doctrine of the Eucharist was never brought into controversy, and there was no danger of misunderstanding. Harnack, p. 435.436: "Ein Problem (ob realistisch oder symbolisch) ist, soviel wir zu urteilen vermoegen, von niemandem empfunden worden...Das Symbol ist das Geheimnis, und das Geheimnis war ohne Symbol nicht denkbar. Wir verstehen heute unter Symbol eine Sache, die das nicht ist, was sie bedeutet; damals verstand man unter Symbol eine Sache, die das in irgend welchem Sinne ist, was sie bedeutet." In this light, all phrases such as "ostenditur, figura, *συμβολον, τύπος* etc. must be understood as not denying the reality of the presence of the body and blood in the elements, although the elements as such are also described as types and symbols of those things which they really contain after consecration. This is evident from the very "contradictions" which are apparently found in the writings of the Fathers,, as we have seen above. Going back to Cyprian, we note the earnestness with which he emphasizes the real heavenly content in the Eucharist, as for instance in De Oratione: "Ne dum quis abstentus. separetur a Christi corpore, procul remaneat a salute." (Quot.: Kah. p. 147. 201). Surely, then, there must be in the Eucharist a body of Christ other than the "spiritual" flesh and blood (which, according to John 6, we receive outside of the Eucharist). -- It was Cyprian who first advocated the communion of Children, falsely assuming its absolute necessity from John 6. (Cf. Testim. III, 25). And it was Cyprian who began to develop the sacrificial character of the Eucharist in its more advanced

stage, e.g in Ep. 63 ad Caecilium: "Ille sacerdos vice Christi vere fungitur, qui id quod Christus fecit imitatur et sacrificium verum et plenum tunc offert in ecclesia Deo patri." (Quot.: Mirbt, p. 30, 4). The office and power of the priest is magnified, the "sacrifice" no longer denotes the oblations, but the consecrated host has become the object of the sacrifice. Says Harnack: "In dem 63ten Brief Cyprians laesst sich noch beobachten, wie das "calicem in commemorationem domini et passionis offerre" in das "sanguinem Christi offerre" uebergeht." (Harn. I, p. 428, n. 2). This is important, because after all the approaching decline of the doctrine of the real presence goes hand in hand with the increasing emphasis on the power of the priest and the sacrificial character of the Eucharist. Cyprian's views already indicate the trend in the wrong direction. Although the teachers of the Church were far from assuming a transubstantiation, yet by emphasizing the priestly power, the magical effect of communion (child-communion), and the honor due to the consecrated elements, which were thought to remain sacred even after the celebration of the Lord's Supper, men like Cyprian contributed to the development of a superstitious attitude, on the part of the laity at least, toward the Lord's Supper and its visible constituents. And it is small wonder that, with the popular conception growing more and more superstitious as the darkness of the Middle Ages settled upon the Church (four or five centuries later), future and less intelligent teachers and priests adapted their theology to the understanding, or rather misunderstanding, of the common people. But not yet.

e) Alexandrian School.

When Origen "warned against bringing his own spiritualistic interpretations of Scriptural doctrines before the common people," (Gle. I, p. 234) there was as yet no idea of a transubstantiation even among them, the faith in which he heared to destroy, but simply the scriptural faith in the sacramental presence. The great Alexandrian School, however, in its fight against the antichristian Gnosis, became guilty of a daringly speculative tendency. Clement (d. 220) and Origin (d. 254) introduced the "pneumatical" or allegorical interpretation of Scripture doctrine into their own 'gnosis'. So also in regard to the doctrine of the Eucharist. Harnack explains: "Clemens und Origenes 'spiritualisieren' deshalb, weil sie das Fleisch und Blut Christi selbst spirituell fassen (Logoschristologie)... Origenes hat sich allerdings unzweideutig 'spiritualistisch' ausgedrueckt, aber fuer ihn lagen die religioesen Mysterien und die gesammte Person Christi in dem Gebiete des Geistes, und demgemaess ist seine Abendmahlslehre nicht "symbolisch" (in the modern sense), sondern seiner Lehre von Christus conform:"¹. (Harn. I, pp. 436.437) wherever we hear the "word of God," we drink the blood of Christ. In this way, also we must understand the statement of Clemens Alexandrinus. Paed. II: *μυστικὸν ἄρα σύμβολον ἢ γραφὴ αἵματος ἁγίου οἶνον ὠνόμασε.* (Quot: Kah. p. 203). Thus also, if Origen, in

1. The Reformed, in order to claim Origen as their predecessor in the "symbolical" interpretation of the L.S. must also conform their christological tenets to the "logos-christology" of Origen.

his Commentary on Matthew, ser. 85 says: "Non enim panem illum visibilem quem tenebat in manibus corpus suum dicebat Deus Verbum sed verbum, in cujus mysterio fuerat panis ille frangendus: Nam corpus Dei Verbis aut sanguis quid aliud esse potest nisi verbum quod nutrut et verbum quod laetificat cor," (Quot.: Seeb. I, 115). But while Origen thus interprets Scripture in a spiritual, allegorical manner, it seems that he did not deny the truth of the literal meaning (although to him the spiritual meaning was of immensely greater importance), at least he himself uses it, for instance in his writing Against Celsus, VIII, 33: *Ἄρτους ἐδούσαμεν σῶμα γενομένους δὲ τὴν εὐχὴν ἄγιον τι καὶ ἅγιον τοὺς μὲν ἰγίουσ προδύσεως αὐτῷ χρωμένους.* (Quot.: Seeb. I, 115 n. 1). Thomasius: "Er nennt da, wo er zur Gemeinde redet, die Elemente einfach Leib und Blut; er sagt in Matth. serm. 19: 'Manducant pascha immolatum Christum pro nobis--bibunt sanguinem ejus.'" (Thom. I, 414). And furthermore, as was pointed out above, his philosophy is not intended for use in the instruction of the laity; he admits that the Church in general does not share his views (nor does he expect it or want it), since he declares his doctrine to be the doctrine of the *πλοῦστεροι* over against the plain (and no less saving) faith of the *ἀπλοῦστεροι* or *ἀνεραδιότεροι* ("the innocent ones").¹ "Origenes weiss wohl, dass seine Theorie nicht die gemeinkirchliche ist. Er unterscheidet dieselbe von der seinigen als die Meinung der Einfaeltigen. Insofern ist er uns ein Zeuge fuer die Herrschaft der realistischen Anschauung." (Thom. I, 414).

1. Cf. hom. in Lev. IX, 10.

Whatever we may think of Origen (and it is certain that his ideas are far removed from any thought of a transubstantiation!), his influence in the Church, as far as the spiritual interpretation is concerned, was negligible. The Greek fathers of the Nicene period still called themselves disciples of Origen, but there is a decided tendency among the New Alexandrians to return to the simple literal teachings of the Church. Kahnis: "Wir bemerken schon bei den naechsten Schuelern des Origenes ein solches Zurueckgehen in das Kirchliche Leben." (Kah. p. 206).

The Trend in the Oriental Church after Nicaeaa) Preliminary Remarks.

In order to understand the entire situation during this period, it is well to keep in mind that the Church was engaged in a battle for life or death against heretics who attacked the very foundations of Christianity, especially considering the great controversies concerning the person of, and the two natures in, Christ. There was as yet no elaborate system of dogma, esp. not in the department of the sacraments. "Es hat in der griechischen Kirche ein 'Dogma' vom Abendmahl so wenig gegeben, wie ein 'Dogma' von der Gnade." (Harn. II, 415). Giessler correctly says: "The passion with which the question of the relation of the Son to the Father was discussed made this doctrine so much the test of orthodoxy, almost exclusively so, that they never thought during the Arian controversy of limiting freedom of inquiry on other subjects...The universally received articles of the Christian faith in the beginning of the 4th century were still so simple as to admit of very different modes of interpretation." (Gie. I, pp. 361-328). -- Hence the entire terminology in this field is perplexing, since it is not uniform and not always carefully chosen, since it was not a matter of controversy. There is a wide use of allegorical terms and phrases. Harnack therefore rightly remarks: "Eine rein symbolische Auffassung hat es nie gegeben; denn sie ist immer friedlich verbunden gewesen mit einer Praxis, der eine sehr realistische Auffassung zu Grunde lag. Was wir jetzt 'Symbol' nennen, ist etwas ganz anderes als das, was die

alte Kirche so nannte." (Harn. II, 429, n. 2). We find that this "Praxis" is fast becoming, not merely realistic, but materialistic. The Eucharist more and more gains importance as the center of worship, and increasingly so in its adaptation as a sacrifice. This period then, at least in the Oriental Church, is a period of transition, especially beginning with Cyril of Jerusalem, who introduced the idea of a *μεταβολή*, --a sort of transformation rather than a transubstantiation: Thomasius says: "Um recht stark hervorzuheben, dass die Irdischen Elemente nach der Consecration nicht mehr gemeines Gerd und Wein sind, sondern Fleisch und Blut Christi, gebrauchten sie (die Lehrer jener Zeit) den Ausdruck *μεταβολή*, der jedoch keineswegs im strengen Sinne gemeint ist (Transubstantiation), sondern nur sagen will, dass die irdischen Elemente zu etwas anderem werden, als sie zuvor waren (Transformation). Gewiss hat auch die combination mit der Idee des Opfers dazu gewirkt." (Thom. I, p. 416). Undoubtedly the growth of the materialistic conception was also promoted by the linking up of the doctrine of the Incarnation with the Eucharist, such as the proposition of Gregory of Nyssa that the incarnation continues in the Lord's Supper. Harnack, however, goes too far when he claims: "Man ist im Bezug auf das Abendmahl Jahrhunderte lang (beginning with this period) appolinaristisch, monophysitisch, nicht dyophysitisch gewesen." (Harn. II, p. 427).

b) Fluctuating interpretations gradually leaning toward a materialistic conception.

While we can thus perceive the direction in which the Eastern Church as such is going, we will as yet look in vain for statements which expressly describe the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist as a transubstantiation. Athanasius (d. 373) merely reaffirms the belief of the Church in the sacramental presence when he says, *Ad Maxim*, phil. 2: "Wir werden vergoettlicht, indem wir nicht an dem Leibe eines Menschen teilnehmen, sondern den Leib des Logos selbst empfangen." (tr.: Harn. II, 420, n.1). There is, of course, the queer idea as to the effect of the Eucharist, as we find it in the early Fathers who spoke of the consecrated elements as "germs of immortality," but the presence of the body is described simply as sacramental. -- At the same time we find that a distinction is made between a physical eating of the body of Christ, and a spiritual, symbolical, eating in the sense of Origen, or rather in the sense of John 6. So the Alexandrian Basil the Great, bishop of Caesarea (d. 379), in *Epist.* 8, 4: Σάρκα καὶ αἷμα πᾶσαν αὐτοῦ τὴν μυστικὴν ἐπιδημικὴν ὡ νόμασε καὶ τὴν ἐκ πρακτικῆς καὶ φυσικῆς καὶ νεολογικῆς συνέστωσαν διδασκαλιῶν ἐδήλωσε, δι' ἧς τρέφεται ψυχὴ καὶ πρὸς τὴν τῶν ὄντων τέως θεωρίαν παρασκευάζεται. (Quot.: Seeb. I, 245). To this Seeberg remarks: "Aehnlich reden auch andere Lehrer von geistiger Nahrung oder geistigem Genuss des Fleisches Christi. Aber eine wirkliche Gegenwart Christi soll damit nicht in Abrede gestellt werden."

Side by side with this and similar terminology, we find contemporary expressions which dangerously border on a materialistic conception of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist. And both were tolerated! This extreme realism is found especially in writings intended for guides in the instruction of the masses; which gives us an idea as to where the life and practise of the Church was drifting. Thus it is that the Church of Rome apparently finds it rather easy to point to Cyril of Jerusalem (d. 386) as one "who taught transubstantiation." This, however, without reason or proof, if we keep in mind the wide use and meaning of the terminology used in his day,^{1.} and if we carefully examine the text. In his *Mystag. Catech.*, Cyril compares the Eucharist with the miracle of Cana. Ch. 4, 3 he says, that in the Lord's Supper the priest implores God: τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα ἀποστείλει ἐπὶ τὰ προκείμενα, ἵνα ποιήσῃ τὸ μὲν ἄρτον σῶμα Χριστοῦ, τὸν δὲ οἶνον αἷμα Χριστοῦ. Πάντως γὰρ οὐ εἴαν ἐφάπαρτο τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα τοῦτο ἡγιάζεται καὶ μεταπέμπεται. (Quot.: Seeb. I, 246). This he illustrates with the miracle at Cana, to show the power of Jesus to change (μεταβάλλειν) the elements just as well as he could change (μεταβάλλειν) the water into wine. Cyril evidently wishes to illustrate the power of Christ, not the method of the "change". But he is careless in the choice of illus-

1. Giessler II, p. 48, n.15: "We find the expressions μεταβολή, μεταβάλλειν, μεταπέμπειν, μεταμορφώσθαι, μεταστοιχείωσθαι; but similar expressions with regard to the consecrated oil and the baptismal water: Muenscher's Dogmengesch. IV, S. 387-352. Wundemann II, 417.

trations. In the passage just quoted he uses *μεταβάλλειν* together with *ἡγιάζειν*. He means a change of character, not of substance. In the 3rd and 5th chapter he speaks of the consecrated bread as *οὐκίτε ἄρτος λίτος* (common) or *ψιλοῦς* (simple), which shows that Cyril does not exclude the presence of bread and wine altogether according to their substance. (Quot.: Kah. p. 211). And

when, in Ch. 4 again, he continues: *Ἐν τύπῳ γὰρ ἄρτου δίδοται σοι τὸ σῶμα καὶ ἐν τύπῳ οἴνου δίδοται σοι τὸ αἷμα, ἵνα γένη μεταλλαβῶν σώματος καὶ αἵματος Χριστοῦ σῶσωμος καὶ συναίματος αὐτοῦ*, (Quot.: Seeb. I, 246),

we note without a shade of doubt that Cyril believes bread and wine to remain after consecration. For bread and wine are pictures as a type of the body and blood, these elements are received as types, and yet the real body and blood are received at the same time, since the effect is, to make the partaker *σῶσωμος* and *συναίματος* with Christ. A strong expression is found in the same book, Catech. V, 9: "Da du nun belehrt und ueberzeugt bist, dass das sichtbare Brot nicht Brot ist, obgleich es dem Geschmack so vorkommt, sondern der Leib Christi, und der sichtbare Wein nicht Wein ist, obgleich es dem Geschmack so erscheint, sondern Blut Christi, so staerke dein Herz."¹

To this Thomasius remarks: "Man kann den Gedanken einer Verwandlung nicht staerker aussprechen. Dennoch ersieht man aus den angefuehrten Stellen, dass der Ausdruck noch nicht im strengsten Wortsinn gemeint ist; denn Cyril sagt dasselbe von dem Myron der Taufe und

1. Tr.: Harn. II, p. 432. (found correct in Thom. I, p. 417).

der Salbung Aarons, ohne dabei an eine Absorption des iridischen Elementes zu denken. Indessen, das Wort (*μεταβάλλειν*) war einmal gesprochen und wirkte weiter." (Thom. I, 417). And Harnack: "Dergleichen Ueberschwaenglichkeiten gehoerten damals noch der Liturgik und Katechetik an, nicht der Theologie. Aber das Wunder von Kana und die Brodvermehrung wurden jetzt, wie auch die Bildwerke des 4ten Jahrhunderts zeigen, den Lehrern wichtig." (Harn. II, 432). The miraculous element is emphasized and illustrated with false analogies from Scripture, where a change of substance takes place. It is evident that in the minds of the uneducated the consecration of the elements meant a physical change; and it seems that this notion was rather encouraged by the clergy, and by the extremely realistic language of some theologians.

So also the great catechist, Gregory of Nyssa (d. 394), in his "Great Catechetics," C. 37: *Καλῶς οὖν καὶ νῦν τὸν τῷ λόγῳ τοῦ θεοῦ ἀγαθόμενον ἄρτον εἰς τὸ σῶμα τοῦ θεοῦ λόγου μεταποιεῖσθαι πιστεύομεν* Quot.: Seeb. I, 246). Although an ardent Origenist, he clearly teaches the real presence, in words, however, which are subject to misunderstanding. But we do not believe that *μεταποιεῖσθαι* can be construed to mean a change of substance. But throughout the argumentation of Gregory we notice that Scripture recedes into the background, and speculative proof based on Aristotle is drawn into theology: "Hier musste bereits Aristoteles herhalten, um den Beweiss zu liefern." (Harn. II, p.433). The following quotation shows how far Gregory of Nyssa is led away by his speculation. He pictures the distribution of the body of Christ

in the bodies of the believers as a continuation of the process of incarnation: Ἐπεὶ οὖν τοῦτο τὸ μέρος ἢ νεόδοχος ἐκείνη σὰρξ πρὸς τὴν σύστασιν ἑαυτῆς παρεδέξατο, ὁ δὲ πανερωνεὺς θεὸς διὰ τοῦτο κατέμιξεν ἑαυτὸν τῇ ἐπικλήρῳ τῶν ἀνθρώπων φύσει, ἵνα τῇ τῆς νεότητος κολυωνίᾳ συνδαπανηθῇ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον, τούτου χάριτι πάντες τοῖς πεπιστευκόσι τῇ οἰκοδομίᾳ τῆς χάριτος ἑαυτὸν ἐνοσπίρει διὰ τῆς σαρκός, ἧς ἡ σύστασις ἐξ οἴνου τε καὶ αἵτου ἐστί.

(Quot.: Harn II, 433.434). The substance (σύνστασις) of the body

in the Eucharist is derived from the bread and wine, to be distributed or dispersed throughout the believers, and thus Christ incarnates himself again. As weird as this picture may be, yet in reality it claims nothing more than the presence of the true substance of Christ's body and blood in the bread and wine. Harnack interprets this passage as describing the consecration proper as a continuation of the incarnation (but then it would be an impanation!); (Harn. II, p. 433) however, the words plainly show that the distribution of the body of Christ through those of the believers is compared with the incarnation (πεπιστευκόσι ἑαυτὸν ἐνοσπίρει)

-- Still, we are impressed with the fact that there is a steady advance in the materialistic presentation of the doctrine of the real presence. Hand in hand with this goes the realistic conception of an "unbloody sacrifice." Gregory of Nazianzen (d. 390), next to the other Gregory the main representative of the Cappadocian School, in his letter to bishop Amphilocheus, begs his friend to pray for him ὅταν ἀναλαμβάνω τομῇ σῶμα καὶ αἷμα τέμνης δεσπολικόν, φωνὴν ἔχων τὸ ξίφος. (Kah. p. 208). And yet he calls

the bread and wine *τύποι, ἀντίτυπα* (Orat. VIII, 17.18) -- clearly showing how innocently such terms were used by the Fathers.

-- But if the Catechists, in their guide-books for the instruction of Catechumens, expressed themselves so profusely and carelessly, how much more so the orators in their sermons. Thus Chrysostom (d. 407)

e.g. in Homil. in Johann. 46: *ὈΥΚ ἸΔΕῖΝ αὐτὸν μόνον παρέσχε τοὺς ἐπιθυμοῦσι, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀφάσσει, καὶ φάσει, καὶ ἐμπλήσει τοὺς ὀδόντας τῆ σαρκὶ καὶ σὺμπλακῆναι καὶ πᾶνον ἐμπληθῆαι πάντα.* (Quot.: Thom. I, 418, n.2).

It is hard to speak more realistically without becoming vulgar.

In Homil. in Matth. 82, 4, Chrysostom speaks of a *μετὰ ῥυθμίσειν* (transform, umgestalten) and a *μετασκευάσειν* (change, turn something into a different form). (Quot.: Harn. II, p. 434). In

regard to these terms, Thomasius says: "Worunter auch nicht keine Transubstantiation im roemischen Sinne, sondern eine Transformation zu verstehen ist." (Thom. I, p. 419). (It is interesting to note that

Chrysostom strongly condemns the withdrawing of the cup: Epist. II

ad Cor. hom. 18: *Πάντες ἀξιούμεθα τῶν αὐτῶν. Ὁυ καθάπερ ἐπὶ τῆς παλαιᾶς τὰ μὲν ἱερεὺς ἤσκιε, τὰ δὲ ὁ ἀρχόμενος, καὶ νέμις οὐκ ἦν τῷ λαῷ μετέχειν, ὡν μετέειχεν ὁ ἱερεὺς: ἀλλ' οὐ νῦν· ἀλλὰ πᾶσιν ἐν σῶμα προκείται, καὶ ἐν ποτήριον:*

In the Church of the New Testament both clergy and laity receive the same, both body and blood). (Quot.: Gie II, p. 48-50, n. 15).

c) Stagnation and deterioration.

From the 5th century on, the Oriental Church produced nothing new in the way of research. It was at a stand-still as far as the development of a system of dogma is concerned. While in its theoretical theology it had arrived at no such thing as a "doctrine of transubstantiation," yet it had so impressed upon the minds of the masses the mystery of the *μεταβολή* in the Eucharist, the power of the priest in completing the "sacrifice," that in time to come theology almost automatically adapted itself to the popular opinion. The Council of Constantinople in A.D. 754 could still condemn image worship on the basis that in the Lord's Supper Christ left in the elements the only true "picture" of Himself: "he instituted the Eucharist as a τύπος and remembrance of himself" (Mansi XIII, p. 261ff). Now the Council undoubtedly did not mean to deny the real presence. It was not speaking about that. But already in 787 the second Nicene Council condemned even the use of this term: "Keineswegs habe Christus, die Apostel, oder die Vaeter das durch dem Priester dargebrachte unblutige Opfer ein Bild genannt (*εἰκόνα*), sondern Leib und Blut Christi selbst. Vor der Weihe heissen die Elemente *ἀντίτυπα*, nach derselben Leib und Blut Christi, was sie auch wirklich sind." (Kah. p. 216). There is nothing wrong with this statement, but it may well be understood in the light of the teaching of John of Damascus (c. ca 760), the last great authority in Greek theology, the Eastern Exponent of Scholasticism, whose word became law in the Church of the Orient. It is evident that he has left the truth of the sacramental presence, for he clearly teaches that the body in

the Lord's Supper is not the body of Christ which is in heaven, but that the elements are changed and the body of Christ created for the purpose. In his *Orthod. Fid.* IV, 13 he first denies that the elements are merely *τύπος σώματος καὶ αἵματος*, but affirms that: *σῶμα ἐστὶν ἀληθῶς ἠγασμένον νεότητι τὸ ἐκ τῆς ἁγίας παρθένου σῶμα, οὐχ ὅτι τὸ ἀναληφέν σῶμα ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ κατέρχεται, ἀλλ' ὅτι αὐτὸς ὁ ἄρτος καὶ οἶνος μεταποιοῦνται εἰς σῶμα καὶ αἷμα νεοῦ.*

(Quot.: Seeb. I, p. 246). This is neither the transubstantiation in the Roman sense, nor is it a sacramental presence. Harnack correctly says: "Der Eucharistische Leib ist der von der Jungfrau geborene selbst, aber nicht durch eine Transubstantiation, als ob der Leib Christi aus dem Himmel ploetzlich herabfahre und in dem Raum der Elemente trete, sondern durch Transformation und Assumption, aehnlich wie es bei der Incarnation zugegangen ist. Der Brot-leib wird in den wahrhaftigen Leib aufgenommen und so mit ihm identisch." (Harn. II, p. 438). This interpretation seems, to me, more adequate and correct than the opinion of Thomasius, who takes *μετὰ ποιοῦνται* in the severest meaning and accuses John of Damascus of teaching a pure and complete Transubstantiation: "Hier haben wir eine Verwandlung im eigentlichsten Sinne...es ist dies der Punkt, an welchem die bisherige Vorstellung in die Mittelalterliche Transubstantiation uebergeht." (Thom. I, p. 421). The doctrine of John of D., in short, seems to be an identification of the body and blood with the bread and wine, rather than a transubstantiational conception. The small difference in theory, of course, is no difference in practise. It

is significant that the idea of a transubstantiation made its presence felt in the Western Church only a few decades later (the delay being due to the influence of Augustine)..

d) Stabilization of the Greek doctrine.

As the development of doctrine in general, in the East, so the evolution of the Greek dogma on the Eucharist, (if one may speak of such a thing at all), comes to its close in John of Damascus. Although the Damascene himself did not teach an absolute Transubstantiation in the Roman Catholic sense, the Greek Church itself found no difference. During the Middle Ages the Greek "theologians" made no alterations, attempted no further dogmatical definition of this mystery. Nicolas of Methone (ca 1200) alone sought to explain what is left of the natural elements after consecration: "Merely the outward form or appearance, for the sake of the human weakness of those who partake." (Kah. p. 217). After the Reformation, the Greek Church cast its vote for the Roman doctrine: "Das Bekenntniss des Dositheus, 1629 A.D. (decret. XVII), kann nicht genug Worte finden, um im Gegensatz zu der Unwissenheit der Lutheraner und Reformierten die Verwandlung einzupraegen (*μεταβάλλειν, μετανοούων, μεταποιεῖν, μεταρρύθμισιν*)" (Kah. p. 217).

(The Greek Church differs from the Roman in this (i.e. the doctrine of..), that the change in the consecration is ascribed, not to the power of the priest, but to the power of the Holy Ghost; the sacrament is given in both forms; children are admitted, yea, they must commune; unleavened bread must be used).

III.

The trend in the Western Church after Nicaea325-850 A.D.a) Preliminary remarks.

While the Eastern Church thus rapidly moved toward a coarse stagnation of individual thought, burying its theology in a maze of superstitious ideas, and its practise in superstitious customs, interpreting Christian doctrine, after its decline, to fit the mentality of ignorant masses; the Occidental Church, though steeped in almost equally superstitious practises, was blessed with teachers who succeeded in stemming the tide for awhile, long after the East had given way before it. Special credit is due to men like Hilary, Jerome, Ambrose, but especially to St. Augustine, whose influence in western theology remained supreme for almost a thousand years.^{1.} It is through his influence also, that the doctrine of transubstantiation found no entrance into the leading theological thought until the 11th century. On the contrary, St. Augustine and many of his disciples went to the other extreme and practically gave up the belief in the real substantial presence.

1. Seeberg: "Die beherrschende theol. Autoritaet des Mittelalters ist Augustin...Indessen, Augustinus Formeln beherrschen wohl die Theologie, aber die Theologen beherrschen nicht die Formeln" (I, 2).

b) Hilary and Ambrose--sacramental.

Hilary of Poitiers (d. 366) gives us an interesting explanation of the effect of the consecration in *De Imitandis*, c. 8: "Ante benedictionem verborum coelestium (the consecration) species nominatur (the bread): post consecrationem corpus Christi significatur." (Quot.: Kah. p. 219). In other words, the bread before consecration is called a "species," that is a picture or type of the body of Christ; but after the consecration it is more than a mere "species" or figura: 'corpus Christi significatur'. This illustrates the use of 'significare' in the patristic literature. With it, Hilary does not deny that the bread really is the body of Christ, but rather affirms it. He expresses his faith in the real presence also elsewhere, e.g. in *De Trinitate*, VII, c. 13: "Verum nos verbum carnem cibo dominico sumimus...Qui naturam carnis nostrae jam inseparabilem sibi homo natus assumpsit et naturam carnis suae ad naturam aeternitatis sub sacramento nobis communicandae admiscuit; ita omnes unum sumus." (Quot.: Thom. I, 422, n. 1 or Kah. p. 219). From the fact of the real and substantial presence Hilarius proves that our communion with Christ is indeed more than ordinary: that it is an "unitas naturae," as the context shows (Thom. I, 422), just as Ignatius used it as a proof for the resurrection. Now, as then, the real presence is a commonly accepted fact, since it serves as a basis for argument. In Hilarius we find no trace or indication of any idea approaching transubstantiation.

Ambrose (bisho of Milan in 314) taught the real presence in terms so vigorous and realistic, that we are almost reminded of, for instance, Chrysostom. So in *De Fide* IV, C. 10, 5: "Nos autem quotiescumque sacramenta sumimus, qua per sacrae orationis mysterium in carnem transfigurantur et sanguinem." (Quot.: Mirbt, p. 57, 31). Similarly also in *Lib. de Mysteriis*, C. 9, 50: "Quod si tantum valuit sermo Eliae, ut ignem de coelo deponeret, non balebit Christi sermo, ut species mutet elementorum,? De totius mundi operibus legisti: 'Quia ipse dixit, et facta, sunt; ipse mandavit, et creata sunt' (Ps. 148, 5). Sermo ergo Christi qui potuit ex nihilo facere quod non erat, non potest ea quae sunt in id mutare, quod non erant? Non enim minus est novas rebus dare quam mutare naturas?" (Quot.: Mirbt, p. 57, 37). We have here three terms: figura, species, naturae, to denote that which, according to Ambrose, is changed. All these are but rarely used to denote substance, essence. More often they express the idea of form, character, content. Thomasius says: "So bestimmt hier Ambrosius von einer 'Umwandlung' (mutare naturas, transfigurare) redet, eine Absorbierung der irdischen Elemente scheint er doch nicht zu meinen." (Thom. I, 423). This is substantiated by statements in *De Sacram.*, e.g. in lib. IV, C. 1, 3: "Ne veluti quidam esset horror cruoris (blood) sed maneret gratia redemptionis, idea in similitudinem quidem accipis sacramentum, sed vere naturae gratiam virtutemque consequeris." (Quot.: Mirbt p. 58, 8). This almost suggests the other extreme. Considering the quotations combined, it is most natural to assume that Ambrose denied neither the real presence of bread and wine nor the substantial presence of body

and blood, but believed simply that: "Antequam consecretur, panis est; ubi autem verba Christi accesserint, corpus est Christi."

(De Sacram. IV, C. 5, 23: Mirbt, p. 58, 7.

c) Augustine--symbolical.

It is different with Augustine. To him the sacrament as such is merely a 'sacred sign' which bears a certain resemblance to the spiritual things which it typifies. This definition is brought out with special clearness in his Epist. 98 ad Bonifacium, Par. 9: "Nempe saepe ita loquimur ut, Pascha propinquante, dicamus crastinam vel perendinam Domini passionem, cum ille ante tam multos annos passus sit, nec omnino nisi semel illa passio facta sit. Nonne semel immolatus est Christus in se ipso, et tamen in sacramento non solum per omnes Paschae solemnitatis, sed omni die populis immolatur? Nec utique mentitur, qui interrogatus eum responderit immolari. Si enim sacramenta quandam similitudinem earum rerum, quarum sacramenta sunt, non haberent, omnino sacramenta non essent. Ex hac autem similitudine plerumque etiam ipsarum rerum nomina accipiunt. Sicut ergo secundum quendam modum sacramentum corporis Christi corpus Christi est, sacramentum (sacred sign!) sanguinis Christi sanguis Christi est, ita sacramentum fidei fides est." (Quot.: Gie. II, p. 48, n.15). A sacrament, then, is merely a name given to a sacred institution, which contains a certain similarity to those things of which they are sacraments, just as the Easter cycle is called the "Passion of Christ," although in fact it is only the

celebration of His passion, a memorial!¹ In this sense Jesus could call the bread and wine his body and blood: "Non enim Dominus dubitavit dicere 'hoc est corpus meum,' cum signum daret corporis sui" (Contra Adimantum Manich. C. 12). (Quot.: Gie. II, p. 49, n. 15). The elements are "signacula (symbols) quidem rerum divinarum visibilia" (De Cat. rud. 26, 50). (Quot.: Seeb. I, 294). Ad Ps. III he calls the bread and wine: "figuram corporis et sanguinis sui." (Quot.: Bie. II, p. 49, n.15). While others used similar expressions without the least indication of a symbolical interpretation (cf. Hilarious, p.), yet, in the case of Augustine the use of these terms becomes suspicious when we consider his erroneous conception of the sacraments in general. And especially so when we direct our attention to that peculiar view of Augustine, which practically stamps him as the forerunner of Calvinism: the doctrine according to which the human nature of Christ is localized in heaven. We find it expressed in Ep. 187, 12, 31: "Ubique totum praesentem esse non dubites tanquam deum...et in loco coeli propter veri corporis modum." (Quot.: Seeb. II, p. 296). So also in Tract. in Joh. 26: "Quando caro domini erat in terra, certe non erat in coelo; et nunc cum sit in coelo, non est in terra." (Quot.: Thom. I, 585, 2). From this clear evidence, Thomasius draws the final conclusion: "Er ist also Symboliker im eigentlichsten Sinne." -- The true eating of the body and drinking of the blood is, according to Augustine,

1. Cf. Ayer, p. 450: "Augustine's general definition of a sacrament is, that it is a sign of a sacred thing, a "sacrum signum": De Civit. Dei, lib. X."

the spiritual communion with Christ: "in Christo manere et illum manentem in se habere" (In Joh. tr. 26, 18; De Civit. Dei XXI, 25,4). (Quot.: Seeb. II, 296). Thus Augustine, in his interpretation of the nature of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist, evidently follows John 6, which does not speak of the Lord's Supper. In another place (De Doctr. Christ. III, 16, 24) he explains his idea of a spiritual eating, as follows: "Suaviter atque utiliter reconendum in memoria quod pro nobis caro ejus crucifixa et vulnerata sit." (Quot.: Seeb. II, 296). That this spiritual eating is, to him, the essence of the Eucharist, is evident from his denial of the fact that even the unbeliever receives the true body and blood of Jesus: "Qui non manet in Christo, et in quo non manet Christus, procul dubio nec manducate carnem ejus, nec bibit ejus sanguinem, etiamsi tantare rei sacramentum ("sacrum signum tantae rei"!) ad iudicium sibi manducat et bibit." (in Joh. tract. 26, 18. Quot.: Gie. II, p. 49, n. 15). However, the very fact that Augustine speaks of an "eating and drinking to damnation," that he speaks of the Lord's Supper as of a "salubris refectio" (Sermo 131, 1); the fact that he spoke of the Lord's Supper in the very highest terms and wishes to detract in no way from their blessed significance to the devout partaker,¹ seems, in a way, to justify the opinion of Kahnis, who says: "Augustinus war ohne Zweifel in der Abendmahlslehre sich nicht klar. Ohne festen Standpunkt hat er verschiedenartige Auffassungen

1. De Peccat. Merit, et rem. II, 26 (Thom. I, 584, 3): "Quod accipiunt (catechumeni), quamvis non sit corpus Christi, sanctum tamen est, quoniam sacramentum est."

angestreift." But then he cannot escape the conclusion: "Im Ganzen muss Augustin fuer einen Vorgaenger Calvins erklaert werden." (Kah. p. 221). So also Thomasius, as we have seen above, although he too finds many expressions which he calls "Anklaenge an seinen Lehrer Ambrosius." (Thom. I, 585, n.3). But that is all they are, too. The bulk of Augustine's statements on this question make it imperative to classify him as a mild "spiritualist" as far as his doctrine on the Lord's Supper is concerned.

d) Theological thought divided--peacefully.

It is noteworthy that expressions denying the real presence, as those of Augustine were as far as we know, never attacked or controverted. The Church was engaged in controversies which made dubious statements such as these seem insignificant, especially since they were spoken by the foremost theologian of the Church, whose orthodoxy was never questioned and his sincerity beyond suspicion. For Augustine never spoke of the Holy Sacrament except in terms of the highest praise and piety. Furthermore, The Church was used to the terminology in which Augustine moved, without, however, attaching to it the meaning in which Augustine used it.

Besides, he did not stand alone in his interpretation of the doctrine of Christ's presence in the Eucharist. There were others who followed him blindly. Chrysologus, the "Latin Chrysostom," bishop of Ravenna (d. 450), says in his Epist. ad Caesarium (directed against Eutyches) "Antequam sanctificetur panis, panem

niminamus, divina autem illum sanctificante gratia, mediante sacerdote, liberatus est quidem appellatione panis, dignum autem habitus est dominici corporis appellatione, etiamsi natura panis in ipso permansit."¹ Here, however, the forceful expression, the emphasis on a certain new element which enters after consecration through divine grace, would point to the fact that Chrysologus considers it as something more than a mere change of "names". Whatever he means, and it seems as though he retains the conception of a sacramental presence, one thing is certain: he does not deny the real presence of the bread and wine. Again, and much more certainly and strongly, the Augustinian interpretation is found in the writings of a Pope, Gelasius I (492-496). In his 'De Duabus in Christo Naturis,' III, 14, we read: "Certe sacramenta quae sumimus corporis et sanguinis Christi divine res est propter quod et per eadem divinae efficimur consortes naturae, et tamen esse non desinit substantia vel natura panis et vini."² Et certe imago et similitudo corporis et sanguinis Christi in actione mysteriorum celebrantur." (Quot.: Gie. II, 147, n.22 or Mirbt, p. 86, 32). The Roman Church, in Canon 2 of the 13th Session of its Tridentine Council, anathematized its own Pope, for surely the denial of the doctrine of transubstantiation cannot be couched in stronger terms than these! How Gelasius, however, can

1. Quot.: Gie. II, 50, n.15.

2. Thomasius, I, 586: "Dass der Ausdruck 'Verwandlung' uebrigens damals schon haeufig in dem spaeteren Sinne genommen wurde, ersieht man daraus, dass Bischof Gelasius I von Rom es fuer noetig haelt, sich ausdruecklich dagegen zu erklaren."

in one breath call the consecrated elements a "picture and semblance of the Body of Christ," and yet affirm that by eating them we are made "consortes naturae divinae," is hard to comprehend, and here again it would not be impossible to assume that to him the terms 'imago' and similitudo' conveyed a higher meaning than they would to us, who are by necessity bound to guard against vague terms and phrases, since among us these terms are the object of controversy. Shortly before the time of Gelasius, his predecessor Leo the Great (440-461) left no doubt as to his belief in the real presence, saying: "Hoc enim ore sumitur quod fide creditur" Sermo 91, 3 on Joh. 6, 53). (Quot.: Thom. I, 585). During the 6th century we still find the realistic and symbolical interpretation side by side. Caesarius of Arles (d. 543), otherwise one of the most ardent students of Augustine, teaches the real presence of the body and blood in the very strongest terms: "Quid autem mirum est, sic ea, quae verba potuit creare, possit verbo creata convertere?" (Quot.: Kah. p. 220). This convertere need not be taken as meaning a conversion or change of substance; it is more natural to interpret it as a mere change from unconsecrated elements to the sacramental host in the scriptural sense. -- One of Caesarius' contemporaries and a fellow student of Augustine, Facundus of Hermiane (No. Africa), again approaches the ideas of the master: "Sicut sacramentum corporis et sanguinis eius, quod est in pane et poculo consecrato, corpus eius et sanguinem dicimus: non quod proprie corpus eius sit panis, et poculum sanguinis, sed quod in se mysterium corporis eius et sanguinis contineant. (Pro Defens. III, C. 9, 5). (Quot.: Gle. II,

p. 147, n.22). Just how much "proprie" excludes, and "mysterium" includes, is unclear. Very likely as much as with the spiritual teacher of Facundus, Augustine. At any rate, the idea of a transubstantiation finds no place in the higher class of theology even during the 6th century, while the symbolical and realistic (sacramental) interpretations live together in apparent harmony.

e) Practise and Life of the Church; influence of Gregory the Great.

Beginning with the 7th century we note that things are beginning to change. (The period between the 7th and 11th cent. may be classified as a period of transition). A spirit of gross materialism seems to take hold of the Western Church as it did, somewhat earlier, of the Eastern branch. While the theologians of the following period endeavored to follow Augustine, they were often incapable of understanding him, and gradually fell victims to the general trend which was already painfully evident among the uneducated clergy and the masses, namely the appetite for the sensuous, the superstitious, the marvelous. Long before this time, superstition had taken hold to the religious lives of the devout. Ambrose already relates a story of his brother Satyrus who, being caught in a shipwreck, tied the holy bread together with his prayerbook around his neck, 'craving for no other protection' (De Obitu fratris sui Satyri, C. 13). And Augustine tells similar miraculous stories concerning the sacred host. (Cf. Gke. II, p. 50, n.17). Such tales did not influence their teaching, while they filled the minds of the simple. "How much the sensuous tendency of public worship was farther de-

veloped in this period says Giessler, and how many new superstitious notions sprung from it, is best seen in the writings of Gregory the Great (590-604), a man who, with much real piety, had also very many monkish prejudices and great credulity...It was an age which longed for the marvellous." (Gie. II, p. 141). Gregory, next to Augustine, exerted the greatest influence on early Medieval thought. His theology differed from that of Augustine in its greater realistic and less speculative tendency. "In his Sacramentarium, he gave that form to the Roman liturgy relative to the Lord's Supper, which it has substantially retained ever since," showing how easily it could be adapted to the ultra-realistic conception of the Roman doctrine of transubstantiation. But although Gregory upholds the real presence in the very strongest terms, it is difficult to point to any clear expression of the idea of a transubstantiation, whereas we can readily see the doctrine of the sacrifice of the Mass looming up in large proportions, as for instance in the prayer recorded in Libr. Sacr. Praef., V. : "Vere dignum et justum est...tibi hanc immolationis hostiam offerre, quae offertur a plurimis et unum Christi corpus sancti spiritus infusione perficitur: singuli accipiunt Christum Dominum: et in singulis portionibus totus est, nec per singulos minuitur, sed integrum se praebet in singulis...unum Christi corpus efficimur."¹ The priests throughout the Church effect the same one body of Christ; we note the extreme realism, the strong emphasis on the power of the priest, the sacrificial character

1. Quot. Kahnis, P. 220.

ascribed to the act of consecration, and we can well see how the masses were influenced by a liturgy of this sort. If we study the following passage, we will find how the sacrificial character of the Eucharist begins to take the place of its character as a sacrament, the true benefit of the Lord's Supper is found in the Mass, the immolation, rather than in the eating and drinking. Note also the strong emphasis on the power of the priest: Dialogi IV, 58: "Pro nobis iterum in hoc mysterio oblationis immolatur. Ejus quippe ibi corpus sumitur, ejus caro in populi salutem partitur, ejus sanguis non jam in manus fidelium, sed in ora fidelium funditur...Quis enim fidelium habere dubium possit in ipsa immolationis hora ad sacerdotis vocem caelos aperiri, summis ima sociari, terrena coelestibus jungi, unumque ex visibilibus atque invisibilibus fieri?" (Quot.: M₁r₁b₁t, 101, 13). Again, it seems doubtful whether Gregory, with all these grossly realistic phrases, really thinks of a change of substance in the Eucharist; he uses the terms sociari, jungi, unum..fieri (ex duobus) to denote the miracle that takes place during the consecration. And yet, Gregory did much, not only to confirm the false notions of a sacrifice in the Mass, of priestly power, and of the purgatory (Gie. II, p. 145), but also to promote the wrong conception of the doctrine of the real presence. For all these superstitions went hand in hand, one supporting the other. They are the earmarks of a growing materialistic, sensuous conception of the Christian religion. We can well see the point of Seeberg's conclusion: "Die Theologen der Karolingischen Zeit haben zwar als Augustines gern den sinnbildlichen Character des Abendmahls hervor-

gehoben. Andererseits bewirkte des zunehmende religiöse Materialismus, der am sinnlich Wunderbaren das Merkmal der Religion fand, sowie die Steigerung des Opfergedankens, dass die Vorstellung von einer Verwandlung immer festere Umrisse erhielt. In der Volksidee war es so, und auch in der Sprache der Theologen redete man von einem "consecrare in substantium corporis et sanguinis Christi (Alcuin, Ep. 41, 163.90)." (Seeb. II, 20.21). -- This then takes us to the 9th century, which marks the real turning-point in the doctrine of the Lord's Supper, to the Paschasian Controversy.

End of Chapter One.

Chapter TwoThe Eucharist in Controversy.

850-1500 A.D.

I.

Origin of the modern Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation--The Paschasian Controversya) Introduction.

The 9th century brought a new phase into the history of the development of doctrine: A controversy on the Lord's Supper, which hereto fore had been an uncontroverted institution of the Church. Dogmas, in the strict sense of the word, were produced or developed by the Church only upon provocation, so to speak, as the result of great controversies. Seeberg correctly says: "Dogmen im vollen Sinne waren doch auch fuer das Mittelalter nur die Trinitaets- und Zweinaturen lehre. Zu diesen Dogmen hat das spaetere Mittelalter nur den Gehorsam gegen die Kirche, das Sakramentsdogma, speziell die Busse und das Abendmahlsdogma gefuegt." (Seeb. II, p. 1, note 1). And again: "Die ate Kirche hat kein Dogma vom Abendmahl hervorgebracht. Ungeschieden gingen zwei Vorstellungen nebeneinander her, die man als metabolische und symbolische zu bezeichnen pflegt." In the preceding chapters we concluded that this classification is almost too general, hence inaccurate. The most that can be said is, that we can distinguish between two tendencies in opposite directions;

we find leanings (we are now speaking about the Church in the West) toward the metaphorical interpretation, and an outspoken symbolical interpretation only in Augustine and several of his pupils, while the greater part of the theologians took to the simple Scripture doctrine of a sacramental presence. Now, however, while the Paschasian Controversy did not as yet result in the fixation of an actual dogma, it at least brought the entire question of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist to the foreground, and revealed strong leanings toward that interpretation, which was soon destined to become the official Roman Catholic doctrine.

b) Paschasius Radbertus.

The controversy was provoked by Paschasius Radbertus, Abbot of Corbey (d. 865), himself, when in his book "De Corpore et Sanguine Domini," the first monograph on the Lord's Supper, written in 831 and presented to Charles the Bald in 844 A.D., he developed almost completely the doctrine of transubstantiation, as it is now known. Simond, in his "Vita Paschacii," confesses: "Genuinem ecclesiae catholicae sensum ita primus explicuit (Radbertus), ut viam caeteris aperuit, qui eodem argumento multa postea scripserunt." (Quot.: Gie. II, p. 285, n.4). What this argument was, we shall see in the following. Basing his entire proposition on Ps. 135, 6, he states his doctrine clearly in these words: "Omnis enim quaecumque voluit fecit in caelo et in terra: et quia voluit, licet in figura panis et vini maneat, haec sic esse ormino, nihilque aliud quam caro

Christi et sanguis post consecrationem credenda sunt" (Ch. 1). (Quot.: Gie. II, p. 295, n.4). Nothing remains of the bread and wine but the outward appearance, and these only "um den Unglaeubigen nicht das Heiligste preiszugeben, um Schauder zu verhueten, um den Glauben zu ueben" (C. 13). (Kah. p. 226). Furthermore: "Quia Christum vorari fas dentibus non est, voluit in mysterio hunc panem et vinum vere carnem suam et sanguinem consecratione Spiritus Sancti potentialiter creari, creando vero quotidie pro mundi vita mystice immolari, ut sicut de Virgine per Spiritum vera caro sine coitu creatur, ita per eundem ex substantia panis ac vini mystice idem Christi corpus et sanguis consecratur." (C. 4). (Quot.: Gie. II, 295, n.4). The possibility of the creation of Christ's body in the sacrament is thus based on the fact of the Virgin-birth, and the necessity of the change of substance is shown from the purpose which Paschasius ascribes to this change: to establish a basis for the sacrificial character of the Eucharist. Here already we have an indication of the importance of the doctrine of transubstantiation in the Roman system; (and the Roman Scholastics soon began to realize the necessity of such a doctrine as a foundation for the central institution of the Church, the Mass). Paschasius is still moderate in his estimate of the process of consecration. From the 12th chapter we gather that "The priest is not as yet pictured as the creator of the body and blood of Christ. The change is effected by the creative Word of God and the power of the Holy Spirit alone." (Kah. p. 226). But that it is, beyond all doubt, a change of substance, is evident from the words quoted above from chapter 1,

also from the following, in Ch. 8: "Substantia panis et vini in Christi carnem et sanguinem efficaciter interius commutatur." (Quot.: Gie. II, 295, n.4). Radbertus even goes so far as to declare, in Ch. 14, "that the body and blood of Christ in several instances were actually revealed to doubters or to special favorites of God in their true form," without even the appearance of bread and wine. (Kah. p. 226). Seeberg points out that Radbert is not an absolute transubstantiationist. He says: "So realistisch das klingt, so bewegt sich doch Radbertus in dem Gedankenkreise Augustins, wenn er den Genuss des Abendmahls behandelt. Da ist es ein "spirituale", das "in spiritu" verstanden werden will." (Seeb. II, p. 22). Paschasius indeed makes this statement (in Ch. 5, 1), but his only purpose is, to exclude unbelievers from receiving the Lord's body and blood: "Nisi per fidem et intelligentiam quid praeter panem et vinum in eis gustantibus supit" (c. 8, 2). (Quot.: Seeb. II, 22). It is probable that Radbert supposes that the consecrated elements return to their original substance when they come in contact with unbelieving lips. For he undoubtedly teaches the doctrine of transubstantiation in its almost fully developed form. At the same time, it seems that he wishes to reconcile the Augustinian view with the opinion which is prevalent among the lower clergy and the laity and which is slowly making its presence felt also in the ranks of the teachers of the Church. Thomasius says: "So sucht Paschasius die 2 bisher nebeneinander hergehenden Auffassungen zu verbinden, ohne sie jedoch wirklich zu vermitteln, denn die beiden Seiten seines Systems willen sich nicht recht decken. Die Realitaet der Leiblich-

keit Christi im Abendmahl wird in Krasser Weise behauptet, und doch wird an entscheidenden Punkten, wie dort, wo es sich nun den Genuss der Ungläubigen handelt, von jener Grundlage abgewichen." (Thom. II, 38). With all his good intentions, his attempt was a dismal failure, and served only to hasten the development of an ultra-materialistic conception of the real presence.

c) Ratramus.

But as yet the Paschasian doctrine was merely a theory on a question in which the Church as such had as yet taken no official stand. Radbertus was soon put on the defensive. His main opponent was Ratramus, a monk in the cloister of Corbey (over which Paschasius presided), who was ever ready to attack his abbot. Being commanded by the Emperor Charles the Bald to state his opinion on the doctrine set forth by Radbert,¹ Ratramus, in his reply, brought out the symbolical interpretation of Augustine in its extreme form. (This book, "De Corpore et Sanguine Domini liber ad Carolum Regem", was, 200 years later, erroneously attributed by Berengarius to the pen of John Scotus Erigena, and was condemned as the work of the first great Scholastic by the Council of Vercelli in 1050.² It stands in the index librorum prohibitorum of 1559). Ratramus cites Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustine as witnesses to the 'fact' that the

1. This shows that the Church as yet took a neutral stand in the debate. It was a private, academic controversy.

2. Gie. II, p. 287, n.6, or Kah. p. 228.

the body of the Eucharist is not the same in which Christ was clothed: "Est quidem corpus Christi, sed non corporale sed spirituale; est sanguis Christi, sed non corporalis sed spiritualis." (Quot.: Gie. II, p. 287, n6). Or stronger still: "De vero corpore Christi dicitur, quod sit verus Deus et verus homo, qui in fine saeculi ex Maria virgine genitus haec autem de corpore Christi, quod in Ecclesia per mysterium genitur, dici non possunt, secundum quendam modum corpus Christi esse cognoscitur. Et modus iste in figura est et imagine, ut veritas res pisa sentiatur." (Quot.: Ibid).

In other words, we have the plain Calvinistic view (Augustinian) of the Lord's body and blood as a mere spiritual body. Ratramnus does not wish to deny the "presence" of body and blood, but they are present only according to their strength and efficacy: He says in Par. 2: "Verum unam eademque res secundum alied species panis et vini consistit, secundum aliud autem corpus et sanguis Christi. Secundum namque, quod utrumque corporaliter contingitur, species sunt creaturae corporea, secundum potentiam vero, quod Spiritualiter factae sunt, mysteria sunt corporis et sanguinis Christi."1. Hence we have the presence of body and blood, but not the real presence; we have, as Augustine would say, the "virtus sacramenti" (potentiam), but not the "res sacramenti" (quod corporaliter contingitur), the latter being merely earthly elements. So far Ratramnus.

1. Quot.: Ibid.

d) Scope of their (respective) influence.

While the doctrine of Paschasius Radbertus may have appealed to the minds of the ordinary, more or less ignorant, monks, priests, and laymen, who undoubtedly had long regarded the elements in the Lord's Supper in the same superstitious light; still among the learned theologians of this period the Paschasian theory founds yet very little support, and we find the "greater lights" falling in line with Ratrammus (with a few glaring exceptions), and opposing the Abbot of Corbey. Especially noteworthy among these is Rabanus Maurus of Fulda, the most distinguished scholar of his age. He discusses the subject in controversy especially in his essay "De Institutione Clericorum". Quoting from Augustine's 'De Doctr. Christ.' (III, c. 16), he says: "Figurata ergo est, praecipiens passioni Domini esse communicandum; et suaviter atque utiliter recolendum in memoria, quod pro nobis caro ejus crucifixa sit," (Lib. III, c. 13). (Quot.: Gie. II, p. 286, n.5). This spiritual eating of the body and blood of the Lord is the essence of the Eucharist: "Quia panis corpus confirmat (in the sense of "typifies"), ideo ille corpus Christi congruenter nunc@patur (it is "designated" as the body of Christ); vinum autem, quia sanguinem operatur in carne, ideo ad sanguinem Christi refertur: haec autem dum sunt visibilia, sanctificata tamen per Spiritum Sanctum in sacramentum divini corporis transeunt." (Lib. I, 3. 31). (Quot.: Ibid.). This is a restatement of Augustinianism, in a way; but it is questionable whether Rabanus meant to deny absolutely the real presence of the body and blood (note the words: "dum sunt visibilia...tamen...sanctificate...

transeunt in sacramentum"). In an Epistle to the Abbot Eigil of Prueen he attacks merely the Paschasian doctrine of the presence of the historical body and blood of Christ, but admits that in the Eucharist the body of Christ is "potentially created;" only the Eucharistic body differs from the historical, not in essence, but in species: "non naturaliter, sed specialiter aliud esse," (Seeberg). (Quot.: Epist. ad Egilonem, Seeb. I^I, p. 24). But it is an attack upon the transubstantiation idea.

In general, the opponents of the Paschasian doctrine gave ample evidence of the Augustinian influence, which still dominated the theology of this age. With but few exceptions, the purely spiritual interpretation prevailed in the anti-Paschasian camp. Florus Magister, for instance, "De Expositione Missae": "Prorsus panis ille sacrosanctae oblationis est Christi corpus, non materie vel specie visibili, sed virtute et potentia spirituali." (Quot.: Gie. II, 289, n.8). Thus we could continue to quote statements in opposition to the theory of Radbert, from the pen of the foremost men of this period: Scotus Erigena, Christian Druthmar, Walafried Strabo.¹ It is evident that the doctrine of transubstantiation, in this controversy, had merely asserted its presence, but had as yet found little support among the educated. But it could not fail to gain a foothold ever there. The question relation to the presence of Christ in

1. (Cf. Gie. II, 289, note 8). Kahn, p. 290: "Paschasius bekennt selbst in dem Brief an Grudegard, dass viele nicht eine wirkliche Gegenwart des Leibes Christi annahmen.... Er nennt sehr bedeutende Namen: Scotus Erigena, Rabanus Maurus, Strabo, Florus Magister," etc.

the Eucharist had been brought to the foreground, had become the subject of discussion.^{1.} And very soon Paschasius no longer stood alone. There were those who clearly spoke for the doctrine which we now call "transubstantiation." Thus, for instance, the famous Hincmar, bishop of Rheims (d. 882)^{2.} and his learned contemporary Haimo of Halberstadt. Nothing could be stronger than this statement of Haimo: "Substantia, id est natura panis et vini substantialiter convertatur in aliam substantiam, id est in carmen et sanguinem". (Quot. Seeb. II, p. 25).

We conclude: The great majority of the learned theologians indeed were not ready to accept a doctrine such as this, but Radbertus had spoken the word which gave clear utterance to the ecclesiastical feeling of the age; the protest of so many great authorities might delay, but could not destroy its effect." (Kurtz I, p. 545, Par. 3). The trend of the times lay in the direction to which all the superstitious practises and notions pointed, which were slowly creeping into the Church, especially in connection with the Lord's Supper. "It was easy to see, says Giessler, that it ('this mystical and apparently pious doctrine of Paschasium') only needed times of darkness, such as soon followed, to become general." (Gie. II, p. 290). And such times of darkness were indeed in the

1. Seeberg (II, p. 25): "Das Abendmahl war Gegenstand der theologischen Betrachtung geworden, ohne dass man ueber die noch unklare Position Radberts hinauskam."

2. Cf. Gie. II, p. 290, n.9.

offing. A mere sample to illustrate the religious ignorance of the times, is the crude anthropomorphism of the clergy of Vicenza, during the 10th century: "Ratherius relates how these ignorant neighbors of his believed God to be a corporeal being, because the Bible speaks of him as possessing eyes, ears, hands, feet, etc." (Gie. II, p. 391, Note 8). It is easy to see, that a superstitious doctrine such as the theory of transubstantiation found the ground upon which it fell ready and prepared for a promising seeding, and an easy harvest two centuries later. Indeed, as Kahnis remarks: "Die Kraft der paschastischen Lehre lag in ihrer Volkstuemlichkeit. In Jahrhunderten, wie den 10ten und 11ten war dies die Entscheidende Macht...Diese Lehre sollte siegen im Berengarischen Streit."

(Kah. p. 230).

II.

The Doctrine of Transubstantiation Victorious--
The Berengarian Controversy.

a) Introduction.

"In the next two centuries (the 10th and the 11th) there was no material change in the status of the controversy. About the middle of the 12th century the concept of Paschasius had not yet been accepted generally" (Kretzmann, Theol. Quart. XIX, p. 9). But the controversy again flared up when Berengarius practically challenged the Church to decide on its position, by developing a doctrine so contrary to the view of Radbert, which at this time enjoyed wide-spread acceptance, that the Church was practically forced to a fixation of its teaching on the Lord's Supper. This finally resulted in the decisions of the 4th Lateran Council, where the doctrine of transubstantiation became the official, established dogma of Roman Catholicism. Seeberg aptly sums up the consequences of the Berengarian Controversy: "Die Lehre vom Abendmahl hat ihre scholastische Gestalt empfangen in Folge der Angriffe, welche ein Vorläufer der Scholastik wider die kirchlich werdende (radbertische) Theorie richtete, -- Berengar von Tours. Das Abendmahl ist durch diese Kämpfe zu einem theologischen Lieblingstoff, und die Lehre Radberts -- in noch vergeblicher Form -- zur Kirchenlehre geworden." (Seeb. II, pp. 58.60).

b) Berengarius.

At the time of the controversy, according to Giessler, "theological opinion was divided into three camps: 1) the followers of Paschasius; 2) others who taught at least the corporeal presence of Christ, without entering into a more subtle development of the subject; and 3) those who still maintained a merely spiritual presence." (Gie. II, 397f). Of the latter, Berengarius, a teacher at the cathedral school of Tours, in 1050 A.D. engaged in a dialectic dispute concerning the Eucharist with Lanfranc, at that time a monk in Bec, later Archbishop of Canterbury. In his Epist. ad Lanfr., Berengarius declared against Paschasius, in favor of the alleged John Scotus Erigena (whom he confused with Ratramnus): "Si haereticus habes Joannem (Scotum), cujus sententias de Eucharistia probamus, habendus tibi est haereticus Ambrosius, Hieronymus, Augustinus, ut de caeteris taceam." (Gie. II, p. 400, n.9). Basing his arguments especially on John 6 and Augustine, he emphatically denied any corporeal presence of the body and blood of Christ, in unmistakable terms, such as 'significant,' 'similitudo', 'signum, figura, pignus,' rejecting the Paschasian doctrine on the basis "Dass die Lehre der Gegner auf 'duae carnes' fuehre, einen himmlischen und einen sakramentalen." (Seeb. II, p. 59). On the strength of this letter, which Lanfranc submitted to a Council held in Rome in 1050, Berengarius was condemned without a hearing by this council. This sentence was repeated during the same year by the council of Vercelli, which also publicly condemned the writings of Ratramnus, defended by Berengarius as the work of John Scotus. This indicates the wide-

spread, almost general leaning toward the Radbertain doctrine,-- so general indeed, that Milo Crispinus in his "Life of Lanfranc," could say "that he journeyed to Rome in the cause of a certain clergyman named Berengarius, who taught, on the Sacrament of the Altar, other than the Church holds." (Quot.: Gie. II, p. 400, n.9). As a result of the decisions of the two councils, public opinion was turned against Berengarius, although he still had many individual friends who, however, were afraid of lending their support to so dangerous a cause. Berengarius for a while succeeded in convincing his friend Hildebrand, then a papal legate at the Synod of Tours in 1054, of his orthodoxy, by making an oral and written confession: "Panis atque vinum altaris post consecrationem sunt corpus Christi et sanguis." (Quot.: Gie. II, 402, n.12). But to this he evidently did not subscribe without a mental reservation, as we shall shortly see.

When Berengarius, relying on the powerful aid of Hildebrand (who himself came under the suspicion of 'heresy'), ventured to appear before the synod of Rome, in 1059, and was there forced, by the rough violence of Cardinal Humbert, to subscribe to a creed truly "capernaitic",¹ he denounced the entire procedure bitterly upon his return to France. (Bernaldus quotes him as follows:

1. The confession runs thus: "Consentio Romanae Ecclesiae,--scilicet panem et vinum, quae in altari ponuntur, post consecrationem non solum Sacramentum, sed etiam verum corpus et sanguinem Domini nostri esse, et sensualiter non solum Sacramento, sed in veritate manibus sacerdotum tractari, frangi, et fidelium dentibus atteri."

"Pope Leo were not a pontifex, but a pompifex and pulpifex (flesh-monger), the Holy Roman Church a council of vanity and a church of maligners, and the Holy See not apostolic, but a seat of Satan.) (Quot.: Gie. II, p. 404, n.14). A heated correspondence followed; both sides developed their doctrine still more fully and clearly. Continuing his debate against Lanfranc in his book "De Sacra Coena," Berengarius explains how he understood his confession at Tours and Rome: "Non minus tronica locutione dicitur: panis, qui ponitur in altari, post consecrationem est corpus Christi, et vinum sanguis; quam dicitur: Christus est leo, Christus est agnus; Christus est summus angularis lapis." (Quot.: Gie. II, p. 405, n.16). The change which takes place in the Eucharist is merely a change in efficacy, in virtue, in a power imparted by divine sanctification: "Panis consecratus in altari amisit vilitatem, amisit inefficaciam, non amisit naturae proprietatem...Fit panis quod nunquam ante consecrationem fuerat, commune quidam, beatificum corpus Christi, sed non ut corpus Christi esse nunc incipiat per generationem." -- but as man becomes a 'nova creatura' from a 'Vetus creatura,' and a 'filius fidelio' from a 'filius perditionis'." (Quot.: Gie. II, p. 405, n.16). His main purpose, according to this, is to defend the real presence of bread and wine, but unhappily he goes too far in the other direction, ascribing to the consecration merely a power to change the spiritual value and quality of the elements by adding a spiritual body and blood of Christ.¹ It is Calvinism pure and simple, based,

1. Dr. Kretzmann (Theol. Qu. XIX, p. 9): "Berengarius opposed only the idea of transubstantiation, but did not deny the real presence." This, I believe, is too conservative. Better with Thomasius (II, p. 44): "Berengar leugnete in der That nicht blos die Vorstellung von einer Brotverwandlung, sondern von jeder leiblichen Gegenwart Christi im Abendmahl."

also, on the same arguments used by Augustine and later on, by the Reformed theologians: "Ist er (der Leib Christi) da (zur Rechten Gottes), so kann er nicht zugleich auf Erden sein.. Wie kann man von Gott denken, er lasse den ewigen Leib Christi immer von neuem entstehen, den unvergaenglichen verzehrt werden, da es ja etwas Schaendliches ist, Menschenflesch zu essen." (Quot. tr. Kah. p. 237).

c) Lanfranc and the Church.

The strength in the Roman opposition against Berengarius lay in this very fact that he took refuge to dialectics and rational argumentation. (Seeberg: "Die Schaerfe, mit der Berengarius das Abendmahl zu einer 'figura' machte, die rationalistische Methode seiner Begrueudung empoerten"). (Seeb. II, p. 59). His opponents made the most of this error of hhe heretic. Lanfranc was especially commanded "ut plus sacris auctoritatibus, quam argumentis probaret." (Gie. II, p. 399, n.9). This he did in a rather flimsy fashion, but at least he could, with much pomp and rhetorical eclat point out: "Relictis sacris auctoritatibus, ad dialecticam confugium facis... sed testis mihi Deus est." (De Euch. C. 7). (Quot.: Gie., II, p. 406, n.17). To the rational interpretation of Berengarius, Lanfranc, as the champion of the ultra-conservative party, replied in typical realistic "transubstantiational" language. In his essay "De Eucharistia" we read statements such as these culled from Ch. 18: "Credimus^{1.} terrenas substantias converti in essentiam Domini corporis, reservatis ipsarum serum speciebus (i.e. 'appearances, Scheinleib'), et quibusdam aliis qualitatibus, ne percipientes cruda et cruenda

horrerent, et ut credentes fidei praemia ampliora perciperent,...
ut vere dici possit, et ipsum corpus, quod de Virgine sumptum est,
 nos sumere, et tamen non ipsum; ipsum quidem, quantum ad essentiam
 veraeque naturae proprietatem atque naturam: non ipsum autem, si
 spectis panis vinisque speciem, caeteraque superius comprehensa."
 (Quot.: Gie. II, p. 405, n. 16). This then is, according to Lan-
 franc, the teaching of the Church (and he claims in the same chapter
 that the Church has taught thus "a priscis temporibus") (Seeb. II,
 p. 60): 1) After the consecration there is nothing left of the ele-
 ments but the appearance, and certain qualities (taste, etc); 2)
 These remain only in order to make eating and drinking pleasant, and
 to test the faith of the partakers; 3) The substance is changed
 into the essence of Christ's body; 4) The sacramental body differs
 from the virgin-born body only in this that the former is clothed in
 the outward appearance of bread and wine. Lanfranc went even beyond
 the doctrine of Paschasius; by drawing the logical consequence that
 even unbelievers receive the true body and blood of Christ, not to
 salvation, but to damnation, (for he makes a distinction between
 oral and spiritual eating): "Est quidem etiam peccatoribus et indigae
 sumentibus vera Christi caro verusque sanguis, sed essentia non
 salubri effieientia" (Ch. 20). (Thom. II, p. 50, n.2). And this
 is the doctrine which the councils of this period upheld, whild con-
 demning the doctrine of Berengarius. It was Berengarius' own fault
 that he lost his battle. Whether it was vincere or not the Catholic
 party at least outwardly showed evidences of more piety and apparent-
 ly greater orthodoxy; which could not help but impress the "innocent

bystanders," the unexperienced, and influence them against the 'heretic'. Berengar lacked moral strength. In danger, he retracted; out of danger, he was bold, hurling bitter invective against any and all of his opponents. At the synod of Rome (1078) Gregory VII attempted to restore Berengar's orthodoxy and his standing in the Church by means of a confession couched in general terms; but at a second synod held the following year, also at Rome, he was compelled (in order to save his own reputation from the taint of protecting heresy) to demand of his former friend a confession of faith similar to the one forced upon Berengarius in 1059, and acceptable to the stricter party, which by now had gained full control over the Church. The Catholic Encyclopaedia is wrong, however, when it says: "Berengar repaired the public scandal he had given by a sincere retraction made in the presence of Pope Gregory VII at a Synod held in Rome in 1079, and died reconciled to the Church,"¹ for Berengarius "immediately recalled his forced confession"² and died in exile on the island St. Come, near Tours, in the year 1088. He died of a broken heart.

d) The doctrine of transubstantiation an established dogma.

While Lanfranc, as the spokesman of the Church, backed by councils and a half-hearted Pope, championed the doctrine of transubstantiation against the rational denial of the real presence, there

1. Cath. Encycl. Vol. V., P. 577.

2. Gie. II, p. 409.

were some, friends of Berengar and otherwise, who gave expression to views which sought to find an intermediary position avoiding both extremes. Some of these were as erroneous as the doctrines which they tried to avoid, others again gave evidence to the fact that the simple biblical view of a sacramental presence had not as yet died out. Thus, for instance, we note the touching appeal of Eusebius Brunonis, who in his letter to his friend Berengar declares: "Mann solle einfach an die Schrift sich halten, nicht die Vaeter, sondern das Evangelium muesse entscheiden:" (Tr. Kah. p. 239) "Relictis turbulentis disputationum rivulis de ipso fonte necessarium haurire. Quod est: Dominus Jesus, pridie quam nocte pateretur, etc.? Panem post consecrantis in haec verba sacerdotis sacrationem verum corpus Christi, et vinum eodem modo verum sanguinem esse credimus et confitemur. Quod si quis hoc qualiter fieri possit inquirat, non ei secundum naturae ordinem, sed secundum Dei omnipotentiam respondemus." (Quot.: Gle. II, 408, n.20). He speaks neither for transubstantiation, nor for the spiritual interpretation. All he cares for is only this that he can believe the true body of Christ to be present in the Eucharist. According to Guitmund¹ there were others who departed from the accepted teaching in various ways; he says, De Corpore et sanguine Christi, lib. 1: "Some of the 'Berengariani' hold that bread and wine are 'somehow, so to speak immanated'; others, that bread and wine are partly decomposed, partly remain; others, that bread and wine are changed to

1. Guitmund himself was a disciple of Lanfranc.

body and blood but that, when it comes to eating and drinking, they are rechanged." (Cf. Gie. Ibid., also Seeb. II, 59, n.1). However, we find that the friends of Berengar gave him little support. They kept their hands out of the controversy, some (Eusebius Bruno) cautioned him to be moderate. The party which stood for the doctrine of transubstantiation had the hierarchy on its side, and very likely also the large majority of theologians. In view of the action of the councils, it is correct to say that with the close of the 11th century transubstantiation was the accepted doctrine.

III.

The doctrine of Transubstantiation during the reign of Scholasticism.

a) The doctrine of transubstantiation received its first confirmation under Innocent III by the fourth Lateran Council, of 1215 A.D., in its "Confession of Faith," Cap. 1: "Corpus et sanguis in sacramento altaris sub speciebus (appearances) panis et vini continentur, transubstantiatis pane in corpus et vino in sanguinem potestate divina." (Quot.: Gie. III, 316, n.7). Thus, in terse clear terms, the Church expressed its faith in this doctrine once and for all. But while the Church thus declared its stand, the doctrine developed by Paschasius, Lanfranc, and others, went through the hands of the Scholastics, where it received its finishing touches.¹ "Was am Ende des 11ten Jahrhunderts gesiegt hat, das wird im Zeitalter der Scholastik durchgefuehrt...Die hoechste kirchliche Auktoritaet, die hierarchische Praxis, die scholastische Wissenschaft, der Volksgeist, die Kunst reichen sich die Haende, um jene Lehren festzusetzen, weiter zu fuehren, dem kirchlichen Leben einzupraegen." (Kah. p. 250.251). The doctrine was delved into and viewed from all angles. For it was a doctrine which appealed to the Scholastics, "with whose purely intellectual cast of mind that material explanation of the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist corresponded better than the mystic view." (Gie. III, p. 315, n.5).

1. Seeberg defines Scholasticism as "die logische und dialektische Verarbeitung des ueberkommenen Dogmas...um seine Vernuenftigkeit nachzuweisen (II, 3^o).

b) The word "transubstantiation," which was used by the 4th Lateran Council, was not coined till the latter part of the 11th century. As far as we can tell, Peter Damianus first used it in his *Expositio can. Missae*. Also Hildebert, Archbishop of Tours, in his *sermo XCII*; the verb "transubstantiare" is first found in the "*tract. de Sacram. Altaris*," cap. 14, of Stephen of Autun (1113-1129), "where the words, *hoc est corpus meum*, are explained: *panem, quem accepi, in corpus meum transubstantiari.*" (Quot. *Gie.* III, 315, n.5).

c) But there were other questions which began to agitate the minds of some Scholastics. As to the mode of Christ's presence: "in the hands of the Scholastics, the doctrine (of transubstantiation) was made to define more closely that the whole Christ was present in both kinds. Already Peter Damianus...declares himself to this effect, but not decidedly. The first to assert it with certainty was Anselm of Canterbury (d. 1109)." (*Gie.* III, 316, n.6). He says in *Epist. lib. IV, Ep. 107*: "*In utraque specie totum Christum sumi.*" (Quot.: *Ibid.*). (This, together with the doctrine of concomitancy,¹ finally lead to the withdrawing of the cup. "The universal acceptance of this idea--already advocated by Anselm, Robert Tulleyn, a.o.--

1. Seeberg (II, 115): "Vorhanden sind (nach Thomas Aquinas) wahrer Leib und Blut Christi, wobei die Seele Christi und seine Gottheit nicht ex vi sacramentali, sondern ex reali concomitantia da sind....Hieraus hat man die sich immer mehr verbreitende Kelchentziehung fuer die Laien gerechtfertigt (Th. Acqu. au. 76a, 1; Qu. 80 a. 12).

did not take place, however, till after the time of Thomas Aquinas (d. 1274), whose influence was almost decisive." (Kretzm. Theol. Qu. XIX, p. 12).

d) Even after the confirmation by the 4th Lateran Council, a manifold controversy rose up, especially the controversy on the method of the change. "In regard to this," says Giessler, "Peter Lombard lists two opinions: 1. that substance is changed into substance in such a manner, that the one essentially becomes (fiat) the other, or, (as Innocent III wrote in 'de sacro altaris mysterio') that the substance of bread and wine is either resolved into pristine matter (praejacentem materiam) or reverts into nothing; 2. that under the accidentals under which before was the substance of bread and wine, after consecration is found the substance of body and blood, ...that the bread goes over (transit) into the body of Christ; for where the bread is, there is now the body of Christ." (Gie. III, p. 316, n.8). The second view was especially advocated by Thomas Aquinas: "Die Substanz des Brotes hoert auf zu bestehen, und die Accidenzien desselben bleiben zurueck: et ideo relinquitur, quod accidentia in hoc sacramento manent sine subjecto (Summa III, qu. 77, art. 1) (Thom. II, p. 230). This explanation remained supreme and was commonly accepted, since Thomas Aquinas had spoken.

e) As regards the question of the duration of the change, it would be bewildering to enter into all the minute, often childish, details and difficulties suggested by scholastic ingenuity.

"Robert Pulleyn met with no assent to his assertion that only the bread which was actually received in the Lord's Supper was the body of Christ; but in the 12th century the opinion of Peter Lombard was still generally received "Quod a brutis animalibus corpus Christi non sumitur, etsi videatur" (Lib. IV, dist. 13). (Gie. III, 317, n.8). The question of what would happen if a mouse eats the consecrated bread, was discussed widely. Innocent III held "that in such cases, in the place of the substance of the body 'aliquid miraculose creatur,' and Bonaventura abhorred to think that 'in ventre muris vel cloaca sit corpus Christi.'" (Gie., Ibid.). Thomas Aquinas decided the question through his influence by affirming that the host is the body of Christ even in the stomach of a mouse, but that this 'would not be a sacramental eating: "Nec hoc vergit in detrimuntum dignitatis corporis Christi... praesentis quum mus aut canis non tangat ipsum corpus Christi secundum propriam speciem, sed solum secundum species sacramentales." (Thomas. II, p. 235, n.3).

f) But this question of the duration of the change had a very important practical application, even as the entire doctrine of transubstantiation is a foundation stone of the entire Roman system. The practise of adoring the consecrated host even outside of the communion-celebration is naturally based on the doctrine that the body of Christ is there present at all times. And this practise was coming into its own just at this time, esp. beginning with the 13th century. "Gregory X was the first to definitely command such

adoration, in his *Caeremoniale Romanum*: "In elevatione vero corporis Christi--prosternant se ad terram, et adorent reverenter in facies cadendo." (Gie. III, 325, n. 14). Hand in hand with this doctrine and practise went the miraculous stories, with which the Roman clergy fired the imagination of the ignorant, driving them into the grossest kind of superstition. Fraudulent miracles of bleeding hosts were often repeated before the eyes of the common people." These frauds, says Giessler, continued to be not only tolerated, but even encouraged by the Popes," (Gie. V, p. 64, n.10), by the granting of indulgences for pilgrimage to places where such frauds were perpetrated.

g) And finally, the establishment of the Corpus Christi Festival (*festum corporis domini*) by Pope Urban IV in the "Bulla *Transiturus*," in 1264 A.D. was an evident outgrowth of the desire of the Roman Church to establish the doctrine of transubstantiation. Dr. Kretzmann aptly says: "The doctrine...was the center, the very core, of the Roman Catholic doctrine. It was a stronghold which had to be held at all costs, how that it had been established and its importance recognized. The object of the special unusually high pardon (60 days) was to make the festival as attractive as possible to the great mass, to get the laity interested, and also to impress them with the greatness of the power of the pope and the priest." (Theol. Qu. XIX, p. 82.83).

Conclusion

The doctrine of transubstantiation was therefore, already during the 12th and 13th centuries, so well established, in the life of the Church by the hierarchy, in the theology of the Middle Ages by Scholasticism, that neither the sceptical attitude of the modernists among the Scholastics (Duns Scotus, Occam, D Ailly, and others),^{1.} nor the direct denial of 'heretics' and 'heretical' sects (Wycliff, Waldenses, Beghards)^{2.} could uproot the superstition, which had gained mastery over the Mediaeval Church. And when the Reformation sounded forth its warning against this unbiblical doctrine, the Roman Church was but driven deeper into its obstinate determination to hold to that which was the very heart and life of its anti-Christian system. The Mediaeval doctrine of the Eucharist was accepted

-
1. Seeberg: "Die Transubstantiation stand Kirchenrechtlich fest, die Theologie des ausgehenden Mittelalters hat an ihr keine Freude gehabt," (II, p. 190) "Der scotischen Anschauung von den Sakramenten kann die Transubstantiation nur mühsam eingegliedert werden. Duns hat an der T. nur festgehalten, weil sie Dogma war," (II, p. 114, n.1). "Occam macht darauf aufmerksam, dass die Ansicht, dass die Substanzen von Brot und Wein erhalten bleiben, 'multum rationabilis ist: nec contrarium illius habetur in canone bibliae, nec includit aliquam contradictionem corpus Christi plus coexistere substantiae panis' (Quod lib. IV, 35). Trotzdem will er im Hinblick auf die 'romana ecclesia' bei der Tr. bleiben (sacr. alt. 1, 5)." -- "Für Möglichkeit der Erhaltung der irdischen Substanzen treten viele ein, z.B. Durand, Biel, Thomas von Strasburg, Johann von Wesel, d'Ailly, Wessel." (II, p. 188.189).
 2. Wycliff considers tr. as "a new, pagan doctrine." He says: "Hostia consecrata, quam videmus in altari, nec est Christus, nec aliqua sui pars, sed efficax sui signum ." (Cf. his 12 conclusions on Tr., I). (Gie. IV, p. 246, n.17).

The Waldensians only partially contradicted Rome: "Dicunt

"in toto et in fine" by the Council of Trent in its 13th session. It bases its claim on divine, and especially human authority. But; "Die Abendmahlslehre, die das Tridentinum bekennt, ist allerdings aus der Tradition genommen, aber aus der Tradition des Mittelalters. Von einer die Substanz der Elemente auflösenden Verwandlung weiss die ganze alte Kirche nichts, wussten im 9ten Jahrhundert noch die erleuchtetsten Kirchenlehrer nichts." (Kahnis, p. 265). The student of the history of the doctrine of the Eucharist will, if unbiased, invariably come to this conclusion. With Berengar and Seeberg we close with this conviction: "Die 'multitudo ineptorum', die Logik der (mittelalterlichen Theologen und die Hierarchie haben dieses Dogma hervorgebracht." (Seeberg, II, p. 62).

The End.

(Waldensii) quod transubstantiatio non fiat in manu indigne con-
 ficientis, sed in ore digne sumentis..item, quod Missa nihil sit,
 quia Apostoli canu non habebant. (Pseude-Rainerius, "Summa," c.
 3. Cf. Gie. III, p. 463, n.28). The pantheistic Beghards taught
 "Quod corpus Christi aequaliter est in quolibet pane, sicut in
 pane sacramentali." (John of Strasburn (M_osh. 1, p. 225) quot.:
 Gie. III, p. 470, n.35).