

The Doctrine of the Church of England on the Real Presence Examined by the Writings of Thomas Aquinas

By William McGarvey, B.D.

Approved by the President and Council of the Clerical Union of the Maintenance and
Defence of Catholic Principles, at the Request of the Philadelphia Catholic Club.

Milwaukee, WI: The Young Churchman, 1900.

Project Canterbury 2003

Contents

Preface

Many Interpretations of the Term Transubstantiation

Definition of Pope Nicholas II

Definition of Gregory VII

Definition of the University of Oxford

Declaration of Archbishop Arundel

Statements in the Council of Constance

Proclamation in the Reign of Edward VI.

Definition of the Council of Trent

Fifty-two Articles of 1553

Thirty-nine Articles of 1563

That the Outward Signs are Real Entities

That the Substance of Bread and Wine is not Annihilated

That the Body of Christ is Locally only in Heaven, and is not Locally in the Sacrament

That the Body of Christ is not in the Sacrament Corporally

That the Body of Christ is Present only after a Spiritual Manner

That the Body of Christ is Eaten only by Faith

That the Wicked who receive the Sacrament are not Partakers of Christ

Conclusion

Preface.

THE influence exercised by the writings of St. Thomas Aquinas on the wording of our formularies has been generally overlooked, and yet careful study leaves no question of the fact. The Baptismal Office and the Catechism are largely indebted to him for many of their propositions and terms; Articles IX. and XVII. are almost quotations from his works; while most of the other Articles reveal terms and phrases taken from the same source. This similarity of wording is nowhere more strikingly shown than in Articles XXVII. and XXIX. and in the Black Rubric or Declaration on Kneeling. The object of the following pages (which were first read before the Catholic Club of Philadelphia, and which they have thought worthy of appearing in print) is to parallel the statements of these two Articles and this Rubric with the same or similar statements in the works of St. Thomas, and thus to show that the Church of England has committed herself to no proposition on the subject of the Real Presence which has not been substantially laid down by the Angelic Doctor himself. If the Church of England teaches that the nature of bread and wine remain after consecration; that the Body of Christ is locally only in heaven; that it is not, therefore, corporally or naturally in the Sacrament; that it is given after a spiritual manner; that it is only received and eaten by faith; and that the wicked, although they eat the Sacrament, do not eat the Body of Christ and are not partakers of Christ—St. Thomas teaches precisely the same things, and the Church of England has but repeated his statements often in the very same words.

I have confined my attention to the two mentioned Articles and to the Rubric, and have not taken into consideration the teaching of the Communion Office, as no question has ever been raised as to the perfect orthodoxy of its statements. Nor have I touched upon the Sacrifice of the altar. This subject I hope at some time to consider by itself, in connection with what St. Thomas has taught on the same subject.

W. McG.

ST. ELIZABETH'S, PHILADELPHIA,

Lent, 1900.

I. MANY INTERPRETATIONS OF THE TERM “TRANSUBSTANTIATION.”

IN THE sixteenth century all who held fast to the truth of Christ’s presence in the Eucharist under the forms of bread and wine, accepted the term “Transubstantiation” as the verbal symbol of that doctrine, and understood it as implying a conversion of the substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ, and of the substance of the wine into the substance of the blood of Christ, conformably with the decree of the Fourth Council of the Lateran (1216). They did not, however, agree in their understanding of the mode of the conversion. “While all,” says Cardinal Cajetan, “commonly profess that the body of Christ is truly contained under the host, yet concerning the mode in which it is contained many are the opinions.” Some understood by transubstantiation “identity of place, so that where the bread is there is the body of Christ.” Others understood it as implying an “order of succession, so that the body of Christ succeeded the bread which was annihilated.” And some held that the bread was “informed by the form of the body of Christ.”¹ Still other theories are mentioned by Saint Bonaventura and Occam.² The term “transubstantiation,” therefore, did not connote any one sharply denned doctrine of the Real Presence, but was used alike by those who, while accepting the decree of the Lateran Council, held very different opinions as to the meaning of its terms. It is important to remember this in order to have a right understanding of the use of the word in the Articles of Religion.

Of the various scholastic theories with regard to the presence of our Lord in the Sacrament, the most truly spiritual was the one with which the great name of St. Thomas Aquinas is associated. No one can read carefully what he has written on the Real Presence in his many works dealing with that subject, without being impressed with his deep reverence for the words of Holy Scripture, his evident dread of going beyond what is written, and his scrupulous regard to the principle that spiritual things are to be spiritually understood. Popular conceptions of supernatural truth, however, are rarely determined by regard to any such principle. They are only too likely to be formed by the consideration of earthly and natural conditions, with the result, that the truth is so grossly exaggerated and distorted that it can be no longer recognized as the truth. We have had at least one example of this among ourselves. A few years ago, the doctrine

¹ *Commentarii in Summam*, p. 3, ques. 75, art. 1

² Vide Field, *Of the Church*, Vol. II., p. 365.

of baptismal regeneration was the subject of hot dispute between High Churchmen and Evangelicals. The former insisted strenuously upon the doctrine, the latter repudiated it no less strenuously. But by regeneration High Churchmen understood a change of nature, at least they used such expressions as “regeneration of the nature.” In opposing this the Evangelicals adduced the condition of the Christian man as conclusive proof that no such change was wrought by Baptism. They could not deny the evidence, which they had in themselves, that the nature of man is yet fallen and unregenerate. In their zeal against what must be regarded as a gross exaggeration of the grace of Baptism, they were led to make statements which seemed to deny that any change at all was wrought in baptism. Had both parties been acquainted with the clear-cut definitions of Catholic divinity, and had they taken the pains to understand each other, the Church might have been spared the miserable schism of 1874. As a matter of fact, Baptism does not change man’s nature. The change is made in the person, which is delivered from the guilt of original sin, brought into living union with God, and given power to struggle with the nature, and to bring it at length under the dominion of grace.³

The controversy over the doctrine of the Eucharist is not unlike the baptismal controversy amongst ourselves. Just as there was, and perhaps still is, an exaggerated doctrine of the grace of Baptism, so there was an equally gross exaggeration of the change wrought in the Eucharist. There were Churchmen in the days gone by who insisted that the nature of the bread was changed in the Eucharist. There were others, like St. Thomas Aquinas, who taught that the change was not wrought in the nature of the bread, but in the substance of the bread, or in what, according to the scholastic understanding of substance, might be said to correspond to personality in human nature. We are not now concerned with defending the Aristotelian distinction between substance and accidents. It is said to be an exploded metaphysical theory. But be that as it may, one thing is

³ This distinction between the regeneration of the person and the regeneration of the nature is thus stated by St. Thomas: “Baptism cleanseth the infection of original sin in so far as the infection of the nature redounds upon the person; and, therefore, by Baptism the penalty which is due to the person is taken away, that is, the deprivation of the divine vision. But Baptism does not remove the infection of the nature in so far as that infection is to be referred to the nature itself; this will come to pass in the heavenly country when our nature will be restored to perfect freedom” (*Scriptum in Sent.* II. I. 32. 2). This distinction underlies St. Paul’s teaching with regard to the Christian man, and is the key to its interpretation. It is also brought out sharply in the Office of Baptism wherein the minister so positively declares that the baptized “is regenerate,” and yet prays that this same person “may crucify the old man (i. e., the unregenerate nature) and utterly abolish the whole body of sin” (i. e., the original infection which still remains).

clear, that St. Thomas makes use of that distinction, and, therefore, by the term “Transubstantiation” he excludes all change in the nature of the bread and wine, that, is, in that which is cognizable by the senses. The conversion was in the substance, and “substance as such is not visible to the bodily eye, nor subject to any sense, nor even to the imagination, but to the intellect alone, whose object is quod quid est.”⁴ And the conversion which takes place by consecration, he tells us, “is not like natural conversions, but is altogether supernatural, and effected only by the power of God.”⁵

But here we have an illustration of how little influenced, very often, current theological opinion is by accurate and spiritual teaching. The truly spiritual doctrine of the Real Presence as held by such men as the Angel of the Schools, and by others both before and after his time, made but little impress upon the popular understanding. From the beginning of the Eucharistic controversy in the eleventh century down to the Council of Trent, the popular conception of the Mystery of the Altar was gross in the extreme, and might well have been symbolized by the term “Desubstantiation;” for it most explicitly asserted the non-existence of the nature of bread and wine after consecration, and the corporal presence of Christ.⁶ And this false conception had been so long acquiesced in, that he would have been a bold man who, at the beginning of the sixteenth century, would have ventured to declare publicly that the bread and wine were real entities, and that Christ was not naturally or corporally in the Sacrament, and that the corporal presence of Christ was only in heaven—statements repeatedly, made by St. Thomas, as we shall show, but which, during the period immediately preceding the Reformation, would have been considered sufficient cause for handing one over to the mercies of the secular arm.

II. THE DEFINITION OF POPE NICOLAS II.

THIS gross conception of the change which is wrought in the Eucharist has so completely passed away that it has sometimes been

⁴ *Summa*, III. 76. 7.

⁵ *Summa*, III. 75. 4.

⁶ How gross must have been the popular understanding of the Real Presence when the credulity of the people could be thus imposed upon: “And that year (1545) there stood a priest of Kent at Paul’s Cross for cutting of his finger, and made it to bleed on the host at his Mass for a false sacrifice” (*Chronicle of the Grey Friars of London*, Camden Soc. reprint, p. 48).

questioned whether such a theory ever obtained any general acceptance. It may, therefore, be well to give a few examples of statements which no theologian would think of making now. In the first place, we may cite the often-quoted declaration drawn up by Cardinal Humbert, which Berengar was required to sign by Pope Nicolas, in a synod of one hundred and thirteen Bishops, held at Rome in 1059: "I, Berengar, an unworthy deacon of the Church of Saint Maurice of Angiers, having the knowledge of the true Catholic and Apostolic faith, do anathematise all heresies, especially that one of which I have been suspected, which affirms that the bread and wine upon the altar, after consecration, are only the Sacrament, and not the very Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that the Body of the Lord could not be sensibly, but only in a Sacrament, handled by the hands of the priests or broken and ground by the teeth of the faithful. I consent, also, to the holy Roman and Apostolic See, and with my mouth and heart profess that I hold the same faith concerning the Lord's Table which our Lord and venerable Pope Nicolas, and this holy Synod has, by evangelical and apostolical authority delivered to be held fast and also proved to me, to wit: That the bread and wine which lie upon the altar after consecration are not only a Sacrament, but also the very Body and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that it is sensibly (*sensualiter*), and not in a Sacrament only, but in truth, handled by the hands of the priests, and broken and ground by the teeth of the faithful (*manibus sacerdotum tractari, et frangi et fidelium dentibus atteri*). To which I swear,"⁷ etc. It is exceedingly doubtful whether Berengar believed in the Real Presence in any sense. However that may be, there can, I think, be no question that this profession, which he was compelled to sign, was a most gross and erroneous statement, which no Roman theologian would think of making to-day.

III. THE DEFINITION OF GREGORY VII.

BERENGAR, having lapsed, was brought before Pope Gregory VII. in a Synod held in 1079. He again recanted and signed another profession of faith. Gregory was too good a theologian to judge Berengar by the formula imposed by his predecessor Pope Nicolas, or to require a fresh assent to it. He drew up a new declaration for subscription, from which he omitted the test phraseology of the previous declaration. This document reads as follows: "I, Berengar, believe in my heart and confess with my mouth that the bread and wine which are laid on the altar are substantially

⁷ Labbe et Cossart, *Concilia*, tom. ix., p. 1101.

converted into the true, proper, and life-giving flesh and blood of Jesus Christ our Lord, through the mystery of the sacred prayer and the words of our Redeemer; and after consecration there is the true body of Christ which was born of the Virgin, and which for the Salvation of the world was offered on the Cross, and which sitteth at the right hand of the Father; and there is also the true blood of Christ which was shed from His side; and that, not only in sign and virtue of the Sacrament, but in property of nature and truth of substance," etc.⁸

The exclusion from this profession of faith of the statement that "the Body of Christ is sensibly handled and broken and ground by the teeth" is most noteworthy, and shows that Pope Gregory's doctrine was far removed from that popular conception of the Real Presence which found such explicit expression in the declaration of Pope Nicolas. Gregory deemed it sufficient for a right faith that one should believe that the bread and wine are substantially converted into the substance of the Body and Blood of Christ, without any statement as to a corporal or sensible presence, or as to the non-existence of the nature of the bread and wine.⁹ But this fell so far short of what was commonly believed, that Gregory would seem to have had some misgivings as to whether such a definition would be regarded as an adequate declaration of the truth, or Berengar's subscription to it a sufficient proof of orthodoxy, for he thought it necessary to draw up a bull threatening with excommunication anyone who should thereafter charge Berengar with heresy. The popular mind, however, was not satisfied, and a suspicion was created that Gregory himself was more or less in sympathy with Berengar. And this feeling was appealed to by a council of schismatical Bishops held at Bisse in 1088, who in their desire to throw odium on the Pope, charged him, among other things, with "bringing into question the Catholic and Apostolic faith concerning the Body and Blood of the Lord, and of being an old disciple of the heretic Berengar;"¹⁰ an accusation which was frequently repeated afterward by the enemies of the Pope.

IV. DEFINITION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

⁸ Labbe et Cossart *Concilia*, tom. x., p. 378.

⁹ It is not without significance that in Denzinger's *Enchiridion Symbolorum et Definitionum* (6th ed.), while the declaration which Gregory VII. required Berengar to sign is given as an authoritative document of the Roman Church, the declaration imposed by Nicholas II., which was not one whit less authoritative, is altogether omitted and no reference made to it.

¹⁰ Labbe et Cossart, *Concilia*, tom. x., p. 390.

IN the latter part of the fourteenth century, the chancellor and certain doctors of Oxford, in order to meet the rising tide of Wycliffianism, put forth a definition in which they explicitly assert not only that the substance of bread does not remain but also, it would seem, that the nature of bread does not remain. And they were not content with declaring that Christ was present essentially and substantially; but they further assert that he was present “corporally by a true corporal presence.” This declaration reads as follows: “We therefore declare . . . that by the sacramental words rightly pronounced by the Priest the bread and wine on the altar are transubstantiated or substantially converted into the body and blood of Christ, so that after the consecration there doth not remain in the venerable Sacrament the material bread and wine which were there before, according to their two substances or natures (*substantias seu naturas*), but only according to their species; under which species the true body and blood of Christ is really contained, not only figuratively or in trope, but essentially, substantially, and also corporally (*corporaliter*). So that Christ is there truly in His proper corporal presence (*in sua propria praesentia corporali*).¹¹ We have here an example of the popular doctrine of transubstantiation rejected by the Twenty-third Article of Religion. Let it be noted that in this definition “substance” and “nature” are identified. Before consecration it is declared that the bread and wine are present in their “substances or natures,” after consecration, they do not remain in their “substances or natures.” It is such a doctrine as this that the Article well describes as overthrowing the very nature of a Sacrament.

V. DECLARATION OF ARCHBISHOP ARUNDEL.

COMING to the next century (1413), we have the definition of transubstantiation which Lord Cobham was required by Archbishop Arundel to assent to: “The faith and determination of the holy Church touching the blissful Sacrament of the Altar is this: That after the sacramental words be once spoken by a priest in the Mass, the *material* bread, that was before bread, is turned into Christ’s very body; and the *material* wine, that was before wine, is turned into Christ’s very blood; and so there remaineth in the Sacrament of the Altar, from thenceforth, no *material* bread nor *material* wine which were there before the sacramental

¹¹ *Definitio facta per Cancellarium et Doctores Universitatis Oxonii de Sacramento Altaris contra opiniones Wickliffianas, Anno Domini 1381*. Lyndwood, Provinciale App. p. 59.

words were spoken.”¹²

In answer, Cobham declared: “I believe that in the Sacrament of the Altar is Christ’s very body in form of bread, the same that was born of the Virgin Mary, done on the Cross, died and buried, and that the third day arose from death to life, which is now glorified in heaven.”¹³ But this would not suffice his examiners. They asked whether he believed that “after the sacramental words be uttered there remaineth no bread, but only the Body of Christ,” and “whether it were material bread after the consecration or not.” In answer he said that, “in the Sacrament of the Altar is Christ’s very body and bread also, as I believe the bread is the thing that we see with our eyes. The body of Christ which is His flesh and blood is there under hid and not seen but in faith.”¹⁴ They pressed him to know whether the bread “were material or not.” Upon his refusal to assert that that which he saw in the Sacrament was not material bread, he was adjudged a heretic.

VI. STATEMENTS IN THE COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE.

WE have the same idea of a material change and apparently the identification of “substance” with “material bread,” in the processes of the trial of John Huss exhibited in the Council of Constance. He is charged, not so much with denying the Real Presence, as for defending the proposition “that after the consecration of the host at the altar there remaineth material bread or the substance of bread (*panis materialis vel substantia panis*). And there is given the evidence of witnesses who declared that they had heard him assert that “after consecration there remaineth material bread or the substance of bread (*panis materialis vel substantia panis*) in the Sacrament.”¹⁵ Again, in the forty-five articles drawn up in the same Council, by Pope Martin V., for the examination of heretics, they are to be asked whether they believe “that after consecration by the priest, there is in the Sacrament of the Altar, under the veil of bread and wine, no longer material bread or material wine, but that the same is altogether Christ.” (*non sit panis materialis et vinum materiale, sed idem per omnino Christus*).¹⁶ And elsewhere there is another decree which condemns the proposition that Christ is not in the Sacrament “identically and really by a *proper corporal presence*.”

¹² Fox, *Acts and Monuments*, Ed. 1837, Vol. III., p. 328.

¹³ p. 330.

¹⁴ p. 331.

¹⁵ Labbe et Cossart, *Concilia*, tom. xii. p. 131.

¹⁶ *Ibid*, p. 135.

VII. PROCLAMATION IN THE REIGN OF EDWARD VI.

In the first year of the reign of Edward VI., we have the royal proclamation against those who speak irreverently of the Sacrament of the Altar. We cite this document because it makes distinct reference to the gross and also to the spiritual doctrine of Transubstantiation. Some persons, says the proclamation, “search and strive unreverently whether the Body and Blood aforesaid is there really or figuratively, locally or circumscriptly, and having quantity and greatness, or but *substantially and by substance only*, or else but in a figure and manner of speaking; whether His blessed body be there, head, legs, arms, toes and nails, or any other ways, shape and manner, naked or clothed; whether He is broken or chewed, or He is always whole; whether the bread there remaineth as we see, or how it departeth.”¹⁷ Here (1) those who held to the “local and circumscript presence, having quantity and greatness” and subject to being “broken and chewed,” are clearly distinguished from (2) those who held that Christ was in the Sacrament “substantially and by substance only,” while both schools are distinguished from (3) the new teachers who taught that Christ was only present “in figure and manner of speaking.”

VIII. DEFINITION OF THE COUNCIL OF TRENT.

We now reach the Council of Trent. Its decree was set forth in 1551. We might naturally have expected that in its anxiety to assert the reality of Christ’s presence in the Eucharist against the unbelieving Zwinglians and Calvinists, it would have been led to make use of the test phraseology which until then had been used in dealing with suspected heretics, and that such words as “corporally” and “corporal presence,” if not stronger terms, would have certainly found a place in the decree of the Council. On the contrary, however, the Fathers were guided by the greatest moderation, and adopted the truly spiritual phraseology of St. Thomas, whose works were there enthroned in their midst. Their definition is as follows: “In the first place the holy Synod teaches, and openly and simply professes that in the bountiful Sacrament of the holy Eucharist, after the consecration of the bread and wine, our Lord Jesus Christ, Very God and Very Man, is really and substantially contained under the form of those sensible things. For there is no repugnance between these two things, that our Saviour should always be seated at the right hand of the Father in heaven according to the mode of natural existence, and that nevertheless He should be in many

¹⁷ Cardwell, *Annals*, I., p. 27.

other places sacramentally present amongst us in His substance, by a mode of existence which, although it can scarcely be expressed in words, we can by our minds when illuminated by faith, conceive to be possible to God, and which we are bound most constantly to believe. . . . This has ever been the faith in the Church of God, that immediately after the consecration the very body of our Lord and His very blood are present together with His soul and divinity under the form of bread and wine; but the body under the form of bread, the blood under the form of wine by the power of the words; and the body under the form of wine, and the blood under the form of bread, and the soul under each by virtue of that natural connection and concomitance whereby the parts of the Lord Christ who has risen from the dead now to die no more are united together; and likewise His divinity, on account of that wonderful hypostatic union with His body and soul....Since Christ our Redeemer declared that to be His body which he offered under the form of bread, it has accordingly been always firmly believed in the Church of God, and this holy Synod again declares that by the consecration of the bread and wine there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of His blood. Which conversion is conveniently and properly called Transubstantiation by the Catholic Church.”¹⁸

This is all the Council of Trent said with regard to the mode of the Real Presence, and how far it falls short of the until then current teaching on the subject will, I think, be seen at once. It does not say that the substance of the bread is annihilated, or that the nature of the material bread is changed, or that the species are not real entities, or that the body of Christ is present sensibly or naturally, or corporally, or by a proper corporal or natural presence, or, much less, that it is handled and broken. On the contrary, it expressly declares that it is in heaven that Christ is present after a natural mode of existence, and that in the Eucharist his presence is Sacramental and after a mode of existence which only the mind, illuminated by faith, can perceive as possible to God. The moderation of the Tridentine decree when compared with such definitions as those of Nicolas III., Martin V., and the University of Oxford is most significant. It was in a word the complete triumph of the spiritual view of transubstantiation for which St. Thomas had so strongly argued.

But let us hear Veron’s exposition of the teaching of the Council. After quoting the decree, he says: “Nothing but this, nor anything different to this, on the reality of the Presence is of faith, because nothing but this is

¹⁸ *Concil. Trid. Sess. XIII. c. I. III. IV.*

proposed by the Council. I will now make a few observations on this most important and most difficult of subjects, with a view to render the belief of this doctrine of the Catholic Church less difficult to those who differ from us in religion.” He then proceeds to say that consistently with the teaching of the Council “it may be said that the body of Christ under the symbols of the Eucharist is a spiritual body and not a natural body, and that Christ there present may be called a quickening spirit and not a living soul.” “Not only may the body of Christ under the symbols be called a spiritual body, and Christ himself a spirit, but the body of Christ may be said to be under the symbols in a spiritual manner or spiritually, and not in a natural or corporal manner, that is neither corporally nor carnally.” “All that I have said of a spiritual body and of a spiritual mode of existence under the species, may also be said for the same reasons of the reception and manducation, namely, that Christ, who, according to the Council, is eaten sacramentally, may be said to be eaten spiritually and in a spiritual manner, and not carnally or in a carnal manner, although He be received by the mouth of the body.” After citing the words of the Council on Transubstantiation, he adds: “Nothing else is of faith on the subject because nothing else is found in our Creed, in the Council of Trent, or in any other General Council.” “It is not of the faith, nay, more it is blasphemy to assert, that in this mystery, bread is transubstantiated into the body of Christ in the same way as the bread we eat is transubstantiated into our bodies; or that by transubstantiation it is brought to pass that the matter of bread begins to exist under the form of the body of Christ, just as the matter of bread that is eaten, by nourishing us begins to subsist under the form of the human body.” “Nor is it of faith that the bread and wine are annihilated.”¹⁹ This interpretation of the Tridentine decree is not peculiar to Vernon. It is the generally accepted view of the great theological writers of the Roman Church.

It is clear, then, that the low materialistic views of Transubstantiation which had widely prevailed during the Middle Ages were not adopted by the Council, and find not one word of countenance in its decree. This I think we are bound in all fairness to acknowledge. And Doctor Pusey, speaking of this decree of the Council of Trent, says frankly: “No words could express more exactly the faith of those who believe in the Real Presence than these words.” And speaking of the term “transubstantiation,” while regretting the use of the terms of philosophy in stating the doctrine of the Real Presence, he nevertheless says: “Since the object of the word ‘transubstantiation’ is to secure that our Lord’s words,

¹⁹ Veron, *Regula Fidei*. Ed. Brunner, p. 108.

‘This is My body, and this is My blood,’ should be taken in their strictest sense, it seems that you (*i. e.*, the Romans) are in no way concerned with anything except the *quidditas rei*, the *ousia*, the essence of the thing—‘that,’ whatever it is, which is.” And “if the species (*i. e.*, that which the Roman Church also believes to remain as the Outward veil of our blessed Lord’s Presence) retains those natural powers of nourishing and refreshing, then, as I have for many years said, I can see no contradiction; there is nothing, the existence of which the Church of England (while she says that ‘the bread and wine remain in their very natural substances’) can mean to affirm, the existence whereof the Council of Trent can mean to deny, when it affirms ‘the conversation of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of His blood.’”²⁰

IX. THE FIFTY-TWO ARTICLES OF 1553.

WE NOW turn our attention to the formularies of the Church of England. Both the spiritual and carnal doctrines of the mode of the Real Presence were covered, as we have observed, by the general term, “transubstantiation,” and were both alike opposed by Zwinglians and Calvinists. During the short reign of Edward the Sixth, those who, in the words of the Proclamation cited above, taught that Christ was present only “in figure and manner of speaking,” and therefore denied all presence of Christ under the outward forms of the Sacrament had been steadily gaining ground in England, so that in 1552, when the second Prayer Book was set forth by the civil authority, we have, at least in the later editions of it, a rubric which rejects not merely this or that view of the Real Presence, but “*any* real and essential presence.” And in 1553, when the Forty-two articles were issued, we find in them an explicit recognition and denial of both views of transubstantiation. The doctrine of a local presence is rejected in these words: “Forasmuch as the truth of a man’s nature requireth that the body of one and the selfsame man cannot be at one time in diverse places, but must needs be in some certain place; therefore the

²⁰ *Eirenicon*, III., pp. 79-82. What a contrast does this judgment of Doctor Pusey present to the efforts of a recent writer, who strives to fasten upon the Tridentine definition of Transubstantiation the charge of “Nihilianism” and the like, notwithstanding the history of the formulation of the decree, and the explicit disavowals of the recognized theologians of the Roman Church. Surely, we may urge here, in the words of Professor Sanday, “the solemn duty which we owe alike to God and man, a duty at no time more imperative than at the present, to use the utmost care in ascribing to others such opinions only as are really theirs.”

body of Christ cannot be in many and diverse places.” Thus far the article but denies what St. Thomas himself rejects. It does not, however, stop here; it proceeds to deny the Real Presence, however understood: “And because, as holy Scripture doth teach, Christ was taken up into heaven, and there shall continue unto the end of the world, a faithful man ought not either to believe or openly to confess the real and bodily presence, as they term it, of Christ’s flesh and blood in the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper.”²¹ Nothing can save this latter statement from the note of heresy. Its language is clear and explicit, and it was generally recognized that it “expressly oppugned and took away the Real Presence in the Eucharist.”²² Fortunately, however, these Articles of 1553 were not set forth by the authority of the Church of England. “The Articles of 1553 were drawn up by individuals appointed by the king, totally independent of the Convocation.” “Their title is so ambiguously worded as to lead to the notion that the Articles had been prepared, or at least sanctioned, by the Convocation of 1552; but this was not the case. They were neither submitted to the Convocation nor confirmed by any act of Parliament. Nevertheless, it was certainly the intention of the king and of the Archbishop to require the subscription of the clergy to them; but the period between their promulgation and the death of the king was so short that this intention could hardly have been carried into effect in a single instance.”²³

Upon the accession of Elizabeth, the Prayer Book of 1552 was subjected to revision, when the Black Rubric which so explicitly denied any real and essential presence in the Sacrament was cut out, the old words of administration were restored, and the Mass vestments authorized. The rubric was indeed put back in the Prayer Book in 1662, but with a most notable alteration. For the words, “any real and essential presence,” the revisers substituted the words, “any corporal presence,” thus clearly recognizing the distinction between the carnal and spiritual views of the Eucharist, and explicitly refusing to deny the real and essential presence, while rejecting with St. Thomas the doctrine of a corporal presence.²⁴

²¹ Hardwick, *A History of the Articles*, app. III.

²² *Zurich Letters*, p. 165.

²³ Lamb, *An Historical Account of the 39 Articles*, p. 4.

²⁴ The Black Rubric or Declaration on Kneeling found at the end of the English Communion Office is not in our American Prayer Book. But no one will seriously contend that its omission implies a doctrinal departure from the Church of England, or that anyone is free to teach the corporal presence rejected by the Rubric. One might just as well maintain that the omission of the form of absolution found in the English Visitation of the Sick implies a rejection of some part of the teaching of the Church of

X. THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES OF 1563.

WHEN the Fifty-two Articles came before Convocation in 1563, the clause quoted above, denying the Real Presence, was omitted. And although an effort was made to substitute a similar statement, the synod would not listen to the proposition. In place of the negative declaration directed against the conception of a localized presence, which might well have been allowed to remain, there was inserted the positive statement that “the Body of Christ is given, taken and eaten only after a heavenly and spiritual manner,” thus explicitly asserting the Real Presence while guarding against an earthly conception of the mode of that presence. That the emphasis laid, by the use of the word “only,” on the spiritual mode of the presence of Christ’s Body, was not intended to detract from the reality of that presence is evident from the words of Bishop Guest, who had drawn up this paragraph of the article. The word “only,” he tells us, was put in “to this end, to take away all gross and sensible presence; for it is very true that when Christ’s Body is taken and eaten, it is neither seen, felt, smelt, nor tasted to be Christ’s Body, and so it is received and eaten, but after a heavenly and spiritual, and no sensible, manner.”²⁵

And to make it still more clear that the synod did not mean to reject every doctrine of the Real Presence coming under the name of Transubstantiation, it inserted in the second paragraph of the article the words, “overthrow-eth the nature of a sacrament” (a clause not found in the Articles of 1553), as descriptive of the particular theory of Transubstantiation which was rejected. It is of the nature of a sacrament to have both an outward sign and an inward part. Now no theory of transubstantiation overthrows the nature of a sacrament by denying the reality of the presence of the inward part. The article is evidently referring to the assertion of the non-reality of the outward sign, and accordingly says, and rightly says, that such doctrine of transubstantiation overthroweth the nature of a sacrament.

When, therefore, the article says that transubstantiation overthroweth the nature of a sacrament, inasmuch as it denies the reality of the outward sign, we see at once that the word “substance” is not used as St. Thomas and the Council of Trent use it, in its strict Aristotelian

England with regard to priestly Absolution. The omission of the Rubric from our Prayer Book is only one of the many inexplicable alterations made in 1789, the reason for which is hard to imagine.

²⁵ Perry, *Some Historical Considerations*, p. 199, cf. p. 193.

sense, but as the equivalent of “nature.” It is used with the same meaning in the Black Rubric, as is evident from the adjective, “natural,” where it is said that “the sacramental bread and wine remain in their very natural substances.” This use of the word “substance” as the synonym for “nature” is not peculiar to the Thirty-nine Articles and the Black Rubric. The term is so used, as we have already seen, in the Definition of the University of Oxford, where it is expressly declared that ‘after consecration, the material bread and wine do not remain according to their two substances or natures.’ Now, this very definition was incorporated by Lyndwood among the collection of documents in the English body of canon law. And the Church of England in the sixteenth century, desiring to repudiate precisely this gross view of transubstantiation, used the word substance in the sense in which it is used in the canon law, and declared that ‘transubstantiation, or the change of the substance of bread and wine, overthroweth the nature of a sacrament.’

The article on the Lord’s Supper as thus amended was altogether different from the original form in which it appeared in 1553. And the significance of the omissions and additions made in it did not go unnoticed. It was perceived that while the earlier form of the article had expressly rejected Transubstantiation however understood, the present article asserted the Real Presence, and only objected to the gross view of Transubstantiation. How distasteful the new form of the Article was to the Protestant party is evident from a letter of Humphrey and Sampson, written to Bullinger in 1566, in which, complaining of the many “blemishes” found in the Church of England, they mention that “the article composed in the time of Edward VI. respecting the spiritual eating which expressly oppugned and took away the Real Presence in the Eucharist, and contained a most clear explanation of the truth, is now set forth amongst us mutilated and imperfect.”

We will now parallel the statements of the Article and of the Black Rubric with the teaching of St. Thomas, arranging them in their logical order.

XI. THAT THE OUTWARD SIGNS ARE REAL ENTITIES.

IN THE first place, the Church of England teaches that the substance or nature of bread and wine in the Eucharist remains after consecration. This proposition is implied in the declaration that ‘Transubstantiation (or the change of the substance of bread and wine in the “Supper of the Lord) overthroweth the nature of a sacrament,’ and is explicitly laid down by the

assertion that “the sacramental bread and wine remain still in their very natural substances.” We have seen that the word “substance” in both places is not used in the Aristotelian sense in which it is used by the schoolmen and the Council of Trent, but as the equivalent of “nature.” Now St. Thomas, no less than the article and the rubric, repeatedly maintains, in language no less explicit, that the outward signs in the Sacrament have not been changed, and are not mere illusions, as the following quotations testify.

“Nothing [in the Eucharist] which appeals to the senses is changed . . . That the body and blood of Christ might be had for spiritual and divine refreshment, and not as common meat and drink, and that horror might not be provoked by the eating of human flesh and blood, it is received under the species of bread and wine. Nevertheless, we do not say that this so comes to pass, as if these species were only the mere fancy of the beholder, as is the case in the illusions of magic, because nothing unreal is becoming the truth of this Sacrament.”²⁶ “In this Sacrament there is no deception, nor anything fictitious. For the senses are not deceived, because they have only to judge concerning the sensible species which are verily there, even as they are shown by the senses.”²⁷ “In this sacrament of truth, the senses are not deceived concerning those things which they are capable of judging.”²⁸

XII. THAT THE SUBSTANCE OF BREAD AND WINE IS NOT ANNIHILATED.

USING the word “substance” in its Aristotelian sense (in which sense “substance is not visible to the bodily eye, nor subject to any sense, nor even to the imagination, but to the intellect alone, whose object is quod quid est”), St. Thomas teaches that there is a conversion of the substance of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of Christ. Yet, as he will not allow that such conversion implies any change in the outward signs, so he will not allow that it implies any annihilation of the substance, or of any other part of the bread and wine: “Some, thinking it impossible that the substance of bread and wine should be converted into the Body and Blood of Christ, have taught that by consecration the substance of bread or of wine is either resolved into the preajacent matter, or annihilated.....But this cannot be, for no other mode can be given by which the true Body of Christ begins to exist in the Sacrament, except by the conversion of the

²⁶ *Contra Graecos*, Opus. III. 8.

²⁷ *Scriptum in Sent.*, lib. IV. dist. 11, ques. 1, ad prim.

²⁸ *Summa*, III. 77. 7.

substance of bread into the Body of Christ, which conversion is denied if the annihilation of the substance of bread, or its resolving into the pre-jacent matter is laid down. Moreover, there is no reason to give why such annihilation or resolving should be caused in the Sacrament, for the effect of the Sacrament is signified by the form, and neither of these [*i. e.*, the annihilation or the resolving] is implied in these words of the form, ‘This is My Body.’ Therefore it is evident that the above proposition is false.”²⁹ “In the consecration of the bread, there is not any annihilation, but there is a transubstantiation of the bread into the body of Christ.”³⁰

XIII. THAT THE BODY OF CHRIST IS LOCALLY ONLY IN HEAVEN, AND IS NOT LOCALLY IN THE SACRAMENT.

THE next proposition in order is from the Black Rubric. It declares that the Body of Christ is not in the Sacrament as it is in heaven; that is, that it is not in the Sacrament locally, naturally, nor corporally: “No adoration is intended, or ought to be done . . . unto any corporal presence of Christ’s natural flesh and blood. For . . . the natural body and blood of our Saviour Christ are in heaven, and not here; it being against the truth of Christ’s natural body to be at one time in more places than one.” All these statements are in perfect accord with the doctrine of the Angelic Doctor, as will appear from the following passages:

“EVERY two places are distinguished the one from the other according to certain contrarities of place, which are, above and below, before and behind, on the right hand and on the left. Now, God cannot bring it to pass that two of these contrarities should be together at the same time, for this would imply contradiction. And for this reason, God cannot cause that the same body should be locally in two places at the same time.”³¹

“That one body should be at the same time locally in two different places is not possible, even by a miracle. Therefore, the Body of Christ is not on the altar locally.”³²

“A body is in place where its dimensions are commensurate with the dimensions of the place; and according to this, the Body of Christ is not present except in one only place, that is in heaven (*secundum hoc*

²⁹ *Summa*, III. 75. 3.

³⁰ *Quodlibetales*, lib. V., ques. 6, art. 11.

³¹ *Quodlibetales*, lib. III., ques. 1, art. 2.

³² *Scriptum in Sent.*, lib. IV., dist. 44, ques. 2, art. 2, ad quar.

corpus Christi non est nisi in uno loco tantum, scilicet in coelo).³³

“It is impossible that the Body of Christ should be made present under the Sacrament by a local motion, because if this were so, it would follow that the Body of Christ would cease to be in heaven whenever the Sacrament was celebrated.”³⁴

“In no way is the Body of Christ locally in this Sacrament.”³⁵

XIV. THAT THE BODY OF CHRIST IS NOT IN THE SACRAMENT CORPORALLY.

“The Body of Christ is not under the host naturally but sacramentally, and therefore is not there as located in place.”³⁶

“The corporal presence of Christ was withdrawn from the faithful by the Ascension (*praesentia corporalis Christi fuerit subtracta fidelibus per ascensionem*), but the presence of His divinity is always with the faithful, as He says in the last chapter of Matthew, ‘Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world.’ For He who ascended into heaven did not leave His adopted ones, as says Pope Leo. But the ascension of Christ into heaven, whereby *His corporal presence was withdrawn* from us, was more profitable for us than His corporal presence could have been.”³⁷

“‘Now I am no more in the world.’ This to be understood as meaning that He would no longer be in the world by a corporal presence (*quod jam not fit in mundo praesentia corporali*), because it was about come to pass that He who had been in the world corporally, would leave it. ‘But these’—that is, the disciples—are in the world—that is, by a corporal presence. ‘And I come to Thee according as I am man, to the participation of Thy glory, and for exaltation to Thy right hand. And therefore it is meet that I should pray for them from whom I am about to depart corporally.’”³⁸

“Christ in His *corporal presence* has left the world and gone to heaven” (*Expositio in Canticis Canticorum*, cap. I.).

“The Body of Christ *as it is natural is in heaven*, and according as it is sacramental it is on earth. But that, according to one and the same

³³ Ibid. lib. IV., dist. 10, ques. 1, art. 1, ad quin.

³⁴ *Contra Gentiles*, lib. IV., cap. 63.

³⁵ *Summa*, III. 76. 5.

³⁶ *De Sacramento Eucharistiae*, Opus LIX., cap. 3.

³⁷ *Summa*, III. 57. 1.

³⁸ *Expositio, in Joannem*, cap. XVII. lec. 2.

mode of speaking, the same body in point of number should be in different places, seems altogether impossible by the common law of nature
“The Body of Christ as it is *de se* is in one place only after the manner of a corporal nature.”³⁹

As St. Thomas will not allow that the Body of Christ is present in the Eucharist after the manner of a body, he likewise will not admit that it can be discerned by the senses, or be subject to injury of any kind. Pope Nicolas decreed that the body of Christ is “sensibly handled by the hands of the priests, and broken and ground by the teeth of the faithful.” Alongside of such a statement let us set down the teaching of the spiritually-minded Doctor.

“It would savour of credulity and the greatest irreverence if it were asserted that the Body of Christ was eaten after the manner of bodily food, so that the very Body of Christ was torn and ground by the teeth; but nothing of this sort takes place in sacramental manducation.”⁴⁰

“It cannot be said that the true Body of Christ is broken, because, in the first place, it is incorruptible, and impassible; and secondly, because it is whole under each particle.”⁴¹

The same is laid down in his hymn *Lauda Sion*: “Of the substance is no rending; in the sign our act hath ending. When we break; nor change, nor spending e’er befalls the Signified.”

Accordingly, when he comes to consider certain miracles in which Christ was said to have appeared visibly and naturally, as a little child, in the Sacrament, he will not admit that these were really manifestations of the Body of Christ. Such apparitions, he holds, took place probably “on the part of those beholding them,” and “no change took place in the Sacrament”; or there was some change in the colour or form of the accidents. But he is clear that “the Body of Christ, cannot be seen in its proper form except in one place, in which it is definitely contained. Therefore, since it is seen in its proper form and adored in heaven, it is not seen under its proper form in this Sacrament.”⁴²

From the above citations it is abundantly evident that St. Thomas held that the local, natural, and corporal presence of the Body of Christ was only in heaven; and that Body of Christ was only sacramentally,

³⁹ *De Sacramento Eucharistiae*, Opus. LIX., 8.

⁴⁰ *Scriptum in Sent.*, lib. IV. dist. 10, ques. 1, art. 1.

⁴¹ *Summa*, III. 77. 7.

⁴² *Summa*, III. 76. 8.

although really, present under the forms of bread and wine in the Eucharist. And while there is a sense in which Christ may be said to be corporally in the Sacrament inasmuch as His Body is present, although not after the manner of a body, yet St. Thomas refrains from the use either of “corporally” or “corporal presence,” when speaking of the mode of Christ’s presence; in not one instance have I been able to find that he uses either of these terms. As has been already pointed out, a like restraint was exercised by the Council of Trent in drawing up its decree. It seems to me clear that the Church of England, in rejecting the corporal and natural presence of the Body of Christ in the Sacrament, and in asserting that such presence is only in heaven, is but rejecting what St. Thomas himself rejected, and asserting what he asserted.

XV. THAT THE BODY OF CHRIST IS PRESENT IN THE SACRAMENT ONLY AFTER A SPIRITUAL MANNER.

THE next proposition in order is from the Article, in which it is declared that “the Body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten only after a heavenly and spiritual manner.” As the Church of England agrees with St. Thomas in teaching that the presence of Christ in the Sacrament is not local, natural, or corporal, so likewise she agrees with him in holding that this presence is after a spiritual manner, and is also received after a spiritual manner.

“The Body of Christ is not in the Sacrament in the manner in which a Body is in place, that is, commensurate with the place by its dimensions, but in a certain spiritual manner, which is proper to this Sacrament.”⁴³

“‘The words which I speak unto you, they are spirit and life.’ By these words Christ did not give his disciples to understand that his true flesh is not delivered to be eaten by the faithful, but he spake them because it is not delivered to be eaten carnally, that is, as bodily food is eaten in its proper form; and because it is received in a certain *spiritual manner*.”⁴⁴

“Says Augustine, If thou understandest the words of Christ concerning His flesh *spiritually*, they are spirit and life to thee; but if thou understandest them carnally, they are still spirit and life, but not to thee.”⁴⁵

⁴³ *Summa*, III. 75. 1.

⁴⁴ *Contra Gentiles*, IV. 68.

⁴⁵ *Summa*, III. 75. 1. ad quar.

On this point we will subjoin a passage from the great Thomist Cardinal Cajetan, than whom there is no one who so faithfully reflects the mind of the Angelic Doctor: He says that “the Body of Christ has a *spiritual mode* of existence in this Sacrament, because there is indeed in the Sacrament the true Body, but it does not exist after the manner of a body in the Sacrament. In heaven it exists after the manner of a body, but in the Sacrament it does not exist after the manner of a body (in that it does not occupy place), but in a *spiritual manner*, as incomprehensible to the human understanding as is the mode of union of the Word of God with the humanity which He assumed, or as is the mode in which God is Triune in Persons—things which nevertheless we believe, although we do not fully understand them. And, likewise, the very Body of Christ is eaten in the Sacrament, but not corporally, but spiritually. And this is to say, that corporal manducation does not masticate the Body of Christ, although it crushes the sacramental species of the Body of Christ, under which the Body is contained; but it is spiritual manducation *which is done by the soul*, which has to do with the body of Christ existing under the Sacrament.”⁴⁶

XVI. THAT THE BODY OF CHRIST IN THE SACRAMENT? IS EATEN ONLY BY FAITH.

THE Article next declares that “the mean whereby the body of Christ is received and eaten is faith.” It will be observed that it does not say that the body of Christ is made present by faith, because it is by virtue of the words of consecration that it is made present; nor does it say that it is “given by faith,” because it is by the outward sign or *sacramentum* that it is given; but it says that it is “received and eaten by faith.” Here, again, the article but reechoes the teaching of St. Thomas:

In the first place, since the sacramental conversion by which to Body of Christ is made present “differs from all the conversions which are in nature,”⁴⁷ he teaches, “That the Body and Blood of Christ are in the Sacrament, is able to be comprehended neither by the senses nor by the intellect, but *by faith alone* which rests upon the divine authority.”⁴⁸

“In order to understand the excellency and heavenly dignity of this wonderful Sacrament, it is to be noted that although all the sacraments of the Church have their effect by the faith of the passion of Christ, and also

⁴⁶ *De Eucharistiae*, V.

⁴⁷ *Expositio in I ad Cor.*, cap. XI., lec. 6.

⁴⁸ *Summa*, III. 75. 1.

from faith and through faith profit only the faithful unto salvation, this is nevertheless to be said *most specially* of the Sacrament of Faith. Therefore, in the canon it is called the mystery of faith, that is, the most holy secret manifest to faith only.’⁴⁹

“The Eucharist is not given to any except the faithful; nay, more, *unbelievers ought not to be admitted to witness the celebration of this Sacrament*, and, therefore, in the primitive Church, when there were many catechumens, they were allowed in the Church until the Gospel and then dismissed.’⁵⁰

“To eat sacramentally may be understood in two ways: in the first way, as the adverb is used of the act of eating with reference to what is eaten, and in this sense, whoever receives the species eats sacramentally, that is, he receives that which is sacramentally in the Eucharist, to-wit, the true Body of Christ; in the second way, as the adverb determines the act of eating on the part of the one eating, and in this sense, he only eats sacramentally who uses this food as a visible sacrament. The *unbeliever* because he errs concerning that which is signified in this Sacrament, does not use the species as a Sacrament since he does not believe that Christ is contained under this Sacrament. And, therefore, such an one *does not eat sacramentally*. And since this act [*i. e.*, of receiving the Sacrament] has reference to the one receiving rather than to what is received the second way of understanding sacramental manducation is the more proper one. Therefore, according to this sense, it is to be said that the unbeliever who believes not in the thing (rem) of this Sacrament, does not eat sacramentally.’⁵¹

XVII. THAT THE WICKED WHO RECEIVE THE SACRAMENT ARE NOT THEREBY MADE PARTAKERS OF CHRIST.

BUT it has been urged that the Twenty-ninth Article is utterly inconsistent with a belief in a real objective presence of Christ in the Sacrament, and that this article must interpret the preceding one, which we have just considered. The teaching of Catholic theology is that every communicant, whether good or bad, receives orally the Body and Blood of Christ, under the outward sign. But the Twenty-ninth Article in contradiction of this, as it is thought, declares that “the wicked and such as be devoid of a lively faith, although they do carnally and visibly press with their teeth, as St.

⁴⁹ *De Sacramento Eucharistiae*, Opus. LXI. 1.

⁵⁰ *Expositio in S. Matt.* cap. XXVI. 26.

⁵¹ *Scriptum in Sent.*, lib. IV., dist. 9, ques. 1, art. 2, ad sec.

Augustine say-eth, the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, yet, in no wise, are they partakers of Christ (*Christi participes efficiuntur*).” And the title of the article asserts more explicitly that “the wicked eat not the Body of Christ in the use of the Lord’s Supper.” Therefore it is concluded that the Church of England does not believe in an objective presence in the Eucharist, but only such a presence as was taught by Calvin, and which is known as virtualism.

As a matter of fact, however, there is nothing whatever, either in this article or in its title, which is at all inconsistent with the doctrine of the Real Presence, as taught by St. Thomas, for every word of it is found in his writings. Let it be observed, that it is not said that the wicked do not *receive*, but that they do not *eat*, the Body of Christ. It does not say that the wicked, and such as be devoid of a lively faith, are in no wise *receivers* of Christ, but that they are in no wise *partakers* of Christ, that is, sharers in Christ. Now, we have in this use of words a striking illustration of the care with which our Articles were drawn up. The Twenty-ninth Article was evidently penned by one acquainted with the terminology of the schools, and he chose his words accordingly, and took care to go not one step beyond what was commonly taught by the Thomist divines. When St. Thomas speaks of the outward act of receiving the Body of Christ he uses the verb *accipere* or *sumere*; but when he speaks of the interior act of appropriating the rem of the Sacrament, he uses the verb *percipere*. Accordingly he says that the wicked, as well as the just, *accipiunt* or *sumunt* the Body of Christ; but they do not *percipiunt* the Body of Christ. This distinction in the use of these terms is generally preserved throughout his works. We will now give a few passages which prove that the teaching of the Article and of St. Thomas is identical:

“The first mode of eating the Body of Christ is Sacramental only, which is the way wicked Christians eat it, because they, receiving (*sumentes*) the venerable Body into mouths polluted by mortal sin, close their hearts with their unclean and hard sins, as with mire and stone, against the effect which conies from the influence of His virtue and goodness. . . These eat, and yet *they do not eat*. They eat because they receive (*sumunt*) sacramentally the Body of the Lord, but, nevertheless, *they eat not*, because the spiritual virtue—that is, the salvation of the soul they do not partake (*non percipiunt*). . . . ‘There is,’ says Gregory, ‘in sinners and in those receiving unworthily the true Flesh and true Blood of Christ in efficacious essence, but not in wholesome efficiency.’ ‘He who is at variance with Christ,’ says Augustine, *neither eats His Flesh nor drinks His Blood*, and though he daily receives (*sumat*) the Sacrament of

so great a thing, he receives it unto judgment. They are at variance with Christ who, averting the purposes of their heart from him, turn them to sin. And such may be said, to be truly wretched to whom so great a good oftentimes comes, and yet, who never receive or partake (*accipit sive percipit*) of any spiritual gain therefrom.’⁵²

“The perfect mode of receiving (*sumendi*) the Sacrament is when one so receives (*suscipit*) that he partakes (*percipit*) of its effect. It may happen that one is impeded from partaking (*percipiendo*) of the effect of this Sacrament, and such reception (*sumptio*) of the Sacrament is imperfect. Accordingly, as what is perfect is distinct from what is imperfect, so sacramental manducation is distinguished from that spiritual manducation by which one partakes (*percipit*) of the effect of the Sacrament, whereby a man is conjoined with Christ through faith and charity.’⁵³

“Not everyone who eats the Flesh and drinks the Blood of Christ abideth in God, because, as Augustine sayeth, there is a way of eating that Flesh and drinking that Blood whereby he who eats and drinks abides in Christ and Christ in him. But the man who so eats is he who receives not only the Sacrament, but who also eats the very Body and drinks the very Blood of Christ. There is another way, whereby he who eats does not abide in Christ, nor Christ in him; it is when men with deceitful hearts approach this Sacrament, for the Sacrament hath no effect in a deceitful heart. And he is deceitful who interiorly does not correspond to that which is outwardly signified. In the Sacrament of the Eucharist there is signified that Christ is incorporated in him who receives it. He, therefore, who has not in his heart the desire for such a union, and does not strive to remove everything which stands in the way to this end, is deceitful, and, therefore, Christ abideth not in him, nor he in Christ.’⁵⁴

So anxious is St. Thomas to guard against the supposition that the reception of the Sacrament necessarily implies a participation in the Body and Blood of Christ, that he thinks it well to explain that when St. Paul says “we are all partakers of that one Bread,” it is meant that we are all partakers “by a *worthy reception*—that is, a spiritual and not a mere Sacramental reception.”⁵⁵ And it was, no doubt, with a desire to accentuate the same truth that he inserted in the office for Corpus Christi as the eighth lesson the passage from St. Augustine, referred to and partly quoted by our

⁵² *De Sacramento Altaris*, cap. XVII.

⁵³ *Summa*, III. 80. 1.

⁵⁴ *Expositio in Joannem*, cap. VI. lec. 7.

⁵⁵ *Exposition super I. ad Corinthios*, cap. X. lec. 4.

Article. It is as follows: “He who abideth not in Christ, and hath not Christ abiding in him, doth not spiritually eat His Flesh nor drink His Blood, although he may carnally and with his teeth press the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ, but rather eateth and drinketh the Sacrament of so great a thing to his own condemnation.”

Considering, then, all that St. Thomas says in the above quotations with regard to the reception of the Sacrament, can any words sum up his teaching more fully and accurately than those of our Articles? “Such as rightly, worthily, and with faith, receive the same, the bread which we break is a partaking (communicatio) of the Body of Christ, and likewise the cup of blessing is a partaking (communicatio) of the Blood of Christ”;⁵⁶ and those who receive otherwise “do not eat the Body of Christ,” and are “in no wise partakers of Christ.”

XVIII. CONCLUSION.

WE HAVE now completed our examination of the doctrinal statements of the Church of England on the Real Presence. To me it is perfectly clear from the history of the two Articles we have considered, and of the Declaration on kneeling, and also from the above comparison of their statements with those of St. Thomas Aquinas, that neither the Articles nor the rubric do more than reject a theory of Transubstantiation argued against by the Angel of the Schools himself. More than this, there is not one proposition in the Articles or the Black Rubric on the Real Presence which has not its exact parallel in his writings. And this agreement is not merely in general statement, but in the use of the very same terms and phrases.

⁵⁶ Cardinal Vaughan and the English R. C. Bishops criticise this statement of the Article that “the bread which we break is a partaking of the Body of Christ,” and find fault with the proposition that “the Body of Christ is received by faith,” apparently not knowing that they were criticising a quotation of Holy Scripture written by divine inspiration (1 Cor. x. 17), and rejecting a proposition taken from the very Doctor whose works Leo XIII. in a special Bull had enjoined them to study some years ago. Vide *A Vindication of the Bull Apostolicae Curae*, p. 65.