

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

that all who profess and call themselves Christians may be led into the way of truth and hold the faith in unity of spirit, in the bond of peace, and in righteousness of life."

In these words of our Church, we pray for unity, but we do not lose sight of truth, nor subordinate its claims to those of peace. Whose heart does not burn at the thought of a united Christendom going forth conquering and to conquer? But we are entrusted with the defence of God's truth, too, and we must defend it.

F. MEYRICK.

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

PART II.—DOCTRINAL (*concluded*).

BUT we have not yet exhausted the curiosities which belong to this retractation of Berengarius. We must not omit to notice the very curious use which was made of it in England three centuries later.

Assuredly we should have been little disposed to expect to find this retractation cited in support of the teaching of Wyclif and the Lollards. Yet in the treatise "De Eucharistiâ," which was written by Wyclif probably some time before 1383, and not long before his death,¹ this confession of Berengarius is pleaded over and over again as a part of Rome's Canon Law, and as a law which availed to bless and not to curse the doctrine which, under the teaching of Wyclif and his followers, was spreading like wildfire among the people of England.

It is certainly a very curious fact that Wyclif, who in his latter days and in the maturity of his views was, like Berengarius, strong in defence of the tropical or figurative exposition of the words of institution,² should cite in support

¹ See Loserth's Introduction to "De Eucharistiâ" (Wyclif Soc.), pp. lx., lxii.; and especially "De Eucharistiâ," p. 117.

² Witness the following: "Quia ex verbis Christi tam de sacramento panis quam calicis patet ipsum locutum fuisse figurative. Nam non dubium quin panem materiale accepit, benedixit et fregit et ex illo manducare precepit, quem demonstravit dicens: Hoc est corpus meum, quod oportet omnino figurative intelligi sicut et verba de calice. Nec dubium quin, sicut panem et vinum materiale assumpsit, sic ipsum sumi tamquam sacramentum mandavit; aliter enim illusorie equivocasset cum ecclesia. Et sic indubie figurative locutus est Job. vi^o (ut patet per Augustinum); unde miror quomodo aliqua subtilitas potest ex relatione ydemptitatis 'quod pro vobis tradetur' excludere locucionem figurativam, cum antecedens locucio foret ad hoc efficacior; ut in isto dicto Joh. xv^o, 1: 'Ego sum vitis vera' foret evidencius quod excludit figuram loquendo

of his contention the very words which were put into the mouth of Berengarius as a distinct renunciation of just that opinion. Yet Wyclif is found contending that the words which in this confession are applied to the true Body and Blood of Christ, cannot possibly be understood otherwise than of that which is the Body and Blood of Christ, not in essence, but in figure.¹ If this is felt to be doing a violence to the natural meaning of language, it must be remembered that, from the standpoint of the newer doctrine, the fully-developed doctrine of Innocent III., some such violence was of necessity done to the words, even by the staunch upholders of transubstantiation. The words of the Romish gloss are sufficient evidence of this. Indeed, in this matter Bellarmine may be said to follow pretty closely the leading of Wyclif.²

ydemptice quam dicendo, sicut dixit implicite quod apostoli sunt palmites que inseruntur in hac vite. Idem enim est dicere: Hoc est corpus meum quod pro vobis tradetur, et: Hoc efficaciter et sacramentaliter figurat corpus meum quod pro vobis tradetur" ("De Eucharistiâ," pp. 115, 116, Wyclif Soc.).

Compare the following: "Sed replicatur per hoc quod responsio ista implicat locucionem istam esse tropicam: 'Hoc est corpus meum,' quod est hereticum, cum tunc foret falsa de virtute sermonis. Sed stulti sic arguentes obliiti racionis argumenti vel consequencie, ideo oportet acute respondere illis iuxta suam stulticiam, negando arguciam tam in materia quam in forma. Locucio autem tropica est verissima, summe catholica et miraculosissime conversiva. Nec est color ex istis concludere quemlibet talem modum loquendi per locum a simili vel quod quidditas aut natura panis et vini corrumpitur pocius quam si peccator convertitur in iustum, ergo natura illa destruitur. Sic, inquam, natura panis melioratur per benediccionem, quia post nudum esse naturale habet superadditum esse sacramentale, ut efficaciter figuret et faciat verum corpus Christi ad quemlibet eius punctum, et sic vere accipit sed tropice predicacionem corporis" (*ibid.*, p. 153).

Thomas Waldensis, in his bitter invectives against Wyclif, constantly regards him as a follower of Berengarius, and identifies the Eucharistic doctrine of the one with that of the other. (See "De Sac. Euch.," f. 101; Venice, 1571. See also f. 72.)

¹ See "De Eucharistiâ," pp. 26, 30, 32, 230.

² "The Roman Council under Pope Nicholas II. defined that not only the Sacrament of Christ's body, but the very body itself of our blessed Saviour, is handed and broke by the hands of the priest, and chewed by the teeth of the communicants: which is a manifest error, derogatory from the truth of Christ's beatific resurrection and glorification in the heavens, and disavowed by the Church of Rome itself. But Bellarmine, that answers all the arguments in the world whether it be possible or not possible, would fain make the matter fair and the decree tolerable; for, says he, the decree means that the body is broken, not in itself, but in the sign; and yet the decree says that not only the Sacrament (which if anything be is certainly the sign), but the very body itself is broken and champ'd with hands and teeth respectively" (Bishop Jeremy Taylor, "Liberty of Prophesying," sect. vi., § 10; "Works," edit. Eden, vol. v., p. 458).

Joannes Parisiensis argued that the confession could not apparently be made intelligible, "nisi per panis assumptionem, et idiomatum com-

But the artillery of Wyclif's vehement denunciation was directed especially against the idolatry¹ which he clearly saw in the newly-defined doctrine of transubstantiation. The novelty of that doctrine he would expose with an unsparing hand. The existence of accidents without a subject was a notion which—though he had long striven to defend it—he had now utterly rejected. That the substance of bread and wine after consecration had ceased to exist—this he had become fully convinced had never formed a part of the faith of the Christian Church of earlier ages.² In this position he fortified himself by appealing to the teaching of the ancient Fathers; but he appealed also—and on this point he quite fairly appealed—to the "Ego Berengarius." He contended that that declaration was still a part of the Canon Law,³ and that, according to this, there remained on the altar after consecration no mere accidents⁴ of a subject which no longer existed, no mere

municationem." He adds: "Ista igitur confessio Berengarii paneitatem remanere et assumi confirmat" ("Determinatio," p. 96. See especially Alix's Preface, pp. 17 *sqq.*; London, 1686).

¹ See "De Eucharistiâ," pp. 26, 142, 143, 317 (Wyclif Soc.).

² At the head of the Forty-five Articles of Accusation for which Wyclif's memory was condemned at the Council of Constance stand these three:

"1. Substantia panis materialis, et similiter substantia vini materialis, manet in sacramento altaris.

"2. Accidentia panis non manent sine subjecto in eodem sacramento.

"3. Christus non est in eodem sacramento indentice et realiter in propria præsentia corporali."

See "Mansi," tom. xxvii., c. 632, 635.

And these very same propositions had been set first among the ten condemned as heretical in the Council at London summoned by Archbishop Courtnay against Wyclif in 1382. (See Du Pin, "Eccles. Hist.," vol. xiii., p. 116; London, 1699.)

Yet from Wyclif's own words we have the assurance that in his earlier years he had been holden in the bonds of the scholastic doctrine. See Loserth's Introduction to "De Eucharistiâ," Wyclif Soc., pp. iv., v. He declares: "Licet quondam laboraverim ad describendum transubstantiationem concorditer ad sensum prioris Ecclesiæ, tamen modo videtur mihi quod contrariantur, posteriore Ecclesiâ aberrante" ("De Euch.," p. 52, Wyclif Soc.).

Almost all his works later than 1380 give repeated evidence of the change in his views (Intro., p. ix.).

³ See "De Eucharistiâ," pp. 4, 5, 32, 117.

⁴ "Super quo textu dat glossa pro regula ut omnia referas ad species ipsas, ita quod iste sit sensus: profiteor non panem et vinum sed species panis et vini per se positas non solum esse sacramentum nec corpus Christi, sed sub illis contineri corpus Christi. Et sic confessio Berengarii est impossibilis et heretica de virtute sermonis, sed debet glossari per suum contradictorium, cum hereticum sit quod panis et vinum remaneant post consecrationem sacramentum, sed sunt res aliene nature, non panis et vinum sed accidentia que non possunt esse corpus Christi, sed in illis est corpus Christi" ("De Eucharistiâ," p. 225, Wyclif Soc.).

species of absent bread and wine, but bread and wine themselves in their own true nature and substance.

It must be borne in mind that the one point which Wyclif is concerned to insist upon is this permanence after consecration of material bread and wine. And he quite fairly and rightly argues that this permanence is implied in the assertion that after consecration *the bread and wine are the Body and Blood of Christ* (see especially "De Eucharistiâ," pp. 117, 125, 230, 231). He is fully sensible that there is an apparent inconsistency in the latter part of the recantation. And he acknowledges the difficulty of bringing into harmony with his interpretation the "non solum sacramentaliter sed in veritate . . . dentibus atteri." But he replies that these words *must* be equivocally interpreted (see p. 230), and appeals to the *glossa ordinaria* in support of this view. And he adds that the former opinion of Berengarius (the view renounced in his recantation) would *now* be approved in three particulars (particulars *then* condemned as heretical), viz., (1) that the white object after consecration remains only a sacramental sign; (2) that it is not the Body of Christ; (3) that the Body of Christ is not the object of the senses, nor the subject of fraction ("De Eucharistiâ," pp. 34, 35, Wyclif Soc.).

In truth, the "Ego Berengarius" was much more a contradiction and condemnation of the subsequent transubstantiation of scholastic philosophy than it was of the doctrine which had been maintained by Berengar. And Wyclif's word was fully justified: "Quod in tempore successit credendi varietas, sic quod illud quod tunc fuit articulus fidei jam est falsum" (*ibid.*, p. 32).

Indeed, Berengar himself had not failed to see how the language of his confession gave a handle to such an argument as that which Wyclif used: "Dicens ergo Humbertus ille tuus, panem, qui ponitur in altari, post consecrationem esse Corpus Christi, panem propria locutione, Corpus Christi tropica accipiendum esse constituit, et illud quidem recte, quia ex auctoritate Scripturarum" ("De Sacrà Cœnâ," p. 86; Berlin, 1834).

The truth is that the confession is inconsistent with itself. No intelligible interpretation can be given to it without doing violence to either the earlier or the later portion of it. If the language of the earlier portion is allowed to override that of the later, then—though not without very forcible violence being applied to the later—the confession must be understood to be a condemnation of transubstantiation, seeing that what is ground with the teeth must still be the substance of bread. If (as is most natural) the latter part is allowed to have the pre-eminence, then—in spite of the testimony to the substance of bread—we have the teaching of a substance too completely

transubstantiated to be allowed by the upholders of transubstantiation, and of a presence too grossly material to be endured by the subsequent teachers of the Real Corporal Presence in the Sacrament.

See Sutlivius, "De Missâ Papistica," lib. ii., cap. ix., p. 212; London, 1603.

The example of Wyclif was not followed, we believe, by any of the great divines of the English Reformation. Some of them,¹ indeed, wrote approvingly of Berengar's sacramental views. But their references to the language of his recantation are mainly for the purpose of showing the discrepancies of the Romish doctrine, and the difficulty of reconciling the statements made at different times, or at the same time, by different doctors, in support of the doctrine of the Mass.

And we could hardly make this difficulty more apparent than by setting beside the words of Berengar's confession, as inserted in the "Decretum" of Gratian, the following ancient *dictum* ("the very barbarous gloss," as Bishop Jewel calls it: "Works," vol. i., p. 503), which may be said to gather up the teaching of the ancient Fathers on the subject, and which has strangely been suffered to hold its place among the glosses appended to the "Decretum":² "Id est, cœleste sacramentum,

¹ See, e.g., Jewel, "Works," vol. i., pp. 193, 458, P. S. edit.

² This very remarkable *dictum* is the gloss on the following words, quoted as from Prosper's "Liber Sententiarum Aug.": "Sicut ergo cœlestis panis *qui Christi caro est*, suo modo vocatur Corpus Christi, cum re vera sit sacramentum Corporis Christi . . . vocaturque ipsa immolatio carnis, quæ sacerdotis manibus fit, Christi passio, mors, crucifixio, non rei veritate, sed significante mysterio; sic sacramentum fidei, quod baptismus intelligitur, fides est."

On this extract Dean Goode has observed: "The words in italics are clearly corruptions of the original, being wholly inconsistent with the remainder of the passage, and also with the views of Augustin expressed in the passage referred to" ("On Euch.," vol. i., p. 263; see also p. 241).

Wyclif well said: "Notandum quod inter omnia decreta sanctorum istud decretum cum glossa sua magis facit pro nostra sententia. . . Recoleret, inquam, de textu Augustini, ubi dicit de omnibus modis contendere approbandum quod *caro est carnis et sanguis est sanguinis sacramentum*; et illam carnem vocat iste sanctus celestem *panem qui vere est Corpus Christi suo modo*; tunc enim verecundaretur de glossa quam hic addidit, hoc est: *improprie dicitur Corpus Christi suo modo, sed non rei veritate*. Beatus autem Augustinus exponit se ipsum quod ille panis sacratus videtur esse Corpus Christi modo signi, cum tropice et sacramentaliter vere significat Corpus Christi. Nec dubium quin Augustinus intendit per panem naturam panis, non accidens, quod tam expresse asserit non posse per se esse" ("De Eucharistiâ," pp. 224, 226, Wyclif Soc.).

Of the words as quoted in the "Decretum," it has been said: "These formal words, as Gratian allegeth them, are not found in any one place together in S. Austen or S. Prosper: howsoever, the sense and sentence is well collected out of Saint Austen, as also out of Saint Prosper" (Featly's "Appendix to the Fisher's Net," p. 61, margin). Dr. Featly

quod vere representat Christi carnem, dicitur Corpus Christi, sed improprie. Unde dicitur suo modo, sed non rei veritate, sed significati mysterio, ut sit sensus, vocatur Corpus Christi, id est significat"¹ ("Decret.," pars iii.; "De Consec.," dist. ii., can. xlviii., c. 1278; edit. Venice, 1567).

What a remarkable witness is here against the mediæval corruptions of the faith! And this on the pages of the "Decretum" of Gratian! This appended to Rome's Canon Law! What a striking testimony to the simple truth as held by the Fathers, as contended for by Berengar, as upheld by the Reformed Church of England!

Let the reader be asked to weigh well the meaning of these words, and then endeavour to reconcile them with the confession of Berengarius, and we are sure he will then find nothing wanting to make perfect the *curiosity* which has been the subject of this paper.

Surely we have here a Romish witness to the ancient Catholic and Apostolic faith of the Eucharist—the faith which, cleared from the superincumbent weight of mediæval superstition, from the augmentation notions of Damascenus, from the more grievous errors of Paschasius, from the materialism of "Ego Berengarius," from the dialectic subtleties of the scholastics, from the transubstantiation of Innocent III. and the Tridentine Council, was set on high by the English Reformation, and witnessed for to the death by our English Reformers.

This paper cannot be more fitly brought to a close than by a quotation from Bishop Jeremy Taylor. Speaking of the words of institution, he says: "We have reason not to admit of the literal sense of these words, not only (1) by the analogy of other sacramental expressions in both Testaments—I mean that of circumcision and the Passover in the Old, and baptism

argues: "In this allegation, unless you will tax Gratian with false quoting, there is a threefold cable, which cannot easily be broken. First, S. Austen's authority, out of whom S. Prosper collecteth this sentence; secondly, S. Prosper's, who in effect relates it, and approves it; and thirdly, Gratian's, who inserts it into the body of the Canon Law, and citeth both for it. The words both of Gratian and the gloss here are so clear against your real presence of Christ's Body, under the accidents of bread and wine, that never any Protestant spake more expressly and directly against it" (*ibid.*, pp. 61, 62).

¹ Although these glosses cannot be cited as forming any part of the Canon Law, yet the "Decretum" of Gratian bears conspicuously on its title-page the words, "Unà cum Glossis et Thematibus prudentum, et Doctorum suffragio comprobatis . . . Glossis receptis a vitio repurgatis" (Venice, 1567). In the same edition, the Preface (by Hieronymus Messaggius, Jur. Cons.) declares: "Illud [opus] ad vetustorum exemplarium fidem doctissimorumque virorum adnotationibus accuratissime recognitum, ut quasi ab infantia ad integram ætatem excrevisse et adolevisse ad hanc sui perfectionem videatur."

as Christ discoursed it to Nicodemus in the New Testament—but also (2) because the literal sense of the like words in this very article introduced the heresy of the Capernaïtes; and (3) because the subject and predicate in the words of institution are diverse and disparate, and cannot possibly be spoken of each other properly. (4) The words in the natural and proper sense seem to command an unnatural thing, the eating of flesh. (5) They rush upon infinite impossibilities, they contradict sense and reason, the principles and discourses of all mankind, and of all philosophy. (6) Our blessed Saviour tells us that ‘the flesh profiteth nothing’; and (as themselves pretend) even in this mystery, that ‘His words are spirit and life.’ (7) The literal sense cannot be explicated by themselves, nor by any body for them. (8) It is against the analogy of other Scriptures. (9) It is to no purpose. (10) Upon the literal sense of the words, the Church could not confute the Marcionites, Eutychians, Nestorians, the Aquarii. (11) It is against antiquity. (12) The whole form of words in every of the members is confessed to be figurative by the opposite party. (13) It is not pretended to be verifiable without an infinite company of miracles. . . . (14) It seems to contradict an article of faith, viz., of Christ’s sitting in heaven in a determinate place, and being contained there till His second coming” (“Real Presence,” sect. vi., § 11; “Works,” vol. vi., p. 67; edit. Eden).

N. DIMOCK.

ART. IV.—CHURCH REFORM.¹

IT may be safely predicted that, just as the mention of the sixteenth century is always associated with the word “Reformation,” so the nineteenth century will ever, at any rate in this country, be connected with the idea of “Reform.” It has witnessed Reform Bills without number, reforms in almost all our civil and secular institutions, and no small amount of reform in our ecclesiastical system. The improvements effected in the Church (by which expression I mean throughout this paper “the Church of England”) about the commencement of the present reign, by the establishment of the Ecclesiastical Commission, the commutation of the tithes, and the passing of the first Pluralities Act and the Church Discipline Act, amounted to little short of a revolution. After that came a lull; but as the decades rolled by, important

¹ A paper read before the South-Eastern Clerical and Lay Church Alliance, on June 18, 1895, by P. V. Smith, LL.D., Chancellor of the Diocese of Manchester.