

## THE HOLY EUCHARIST.

[An extract from Thiersch's Lectures.]

THE holy Eucharist differs in this from all other sacraments, in the Catholic system, that it is taken to be not only a sacrament, but at the same time also a sacrifice and in this view a real propitiation for the sins of the living and the dead. In comparing the Catholic doctrine with our own then, it must be considered under such twofold aspect, first as a *sacrament* and afterwards as a *sacrifice*.

Taking it up now in the first view, we feel here more than anywhere besides the need of understanding fairly, at the outset, what is to be regarded as the actual Protestant doctrine. This requires us unavoidably to say something of the difference, which rent Protestantism within the first ten years of its history into two churches.

No regard will be had in the case, however, to what has been thought and spoken on the subject of this controversy by certain modern theologians, who let us know more or less plainly that they do not pretend to be governed in their judgment simply by the Bible, or to interpret it with believing admission from itself only and not from a foreign source. From such Protestantism no salvation is to be expected for the cause to which it belongs, and it can have no part, remaining what it now is, in the church of the future. This will know and feel, in proportion precisely to its new experience of the operations and gifts of the Holy Ghost, that it is called to honor in the solemnity of the eucharist a most sacred and unfathomable mystery of Divine love, and that all which pious church teachers of past times have said to magnify it falls short still of the wonders of grace it actually contains.

Looking at our Protestant theology as it now stands, we may say that already all those theologians who profess faith in the real incarnation of the true God in Christ, and submit themselves to the declarations of the Holy Scriptures as infallible oracles of divine wisdom, are more and more agreed in this: That *Zuingli* and *Oecolampadius* went too far, when they found in the Lord's supper *only* a monumental meal, and in the use of it a mere practical demonstration of faith before men; that all those have erred, and do still err, who affirm that the believer receives in the eucharist nothing more than what he has also and may have without it. The necessity of acknowledging a mystery in the sacrament, has become clear for many later theologians particular-

ly from our Lord's discourse in the sixth chapter of John; where the language is so very strong, that all attempts to resolve it into a figurative or simply spiritualistic sense must be turned by it into confusion. The union with Christ which he there promises to his followers, is just the object itself which the eucharist was instituted afterwards to secure.

We may rid ourselves of *Zuingli's* view, however, without falling in with the harsh judgments that are again pronounced against this reformer in our own time from the Lutheran side. We know that he was carried into an extreme with his doctrine, through opposition to the Catholic doctrine and practice as they then stood. He proposed to destroy at once the basis of all that appeared to him an abuse in the sacrifice of the mass and its applications, by denying the actual presence of Christ in the Lord's supper. His error, and that of his followers, stood in this, that they supposed it possible *only* in such way to avoid the abuses, which notoriously prevailed in the church at that time. This consideration does not serve to conceal the error of the view in question; but it so explains it, that while we acknowledge it on the one side to be wrong, we must feel ourselves bound on the other to exercise a becoming indulgence towards the men who first brought it forward.

*Calvin* struck out a middle view between the Lutheran and *Zuinglian*, which enabled him first to fall in with the Wittenberg Concord, and then again to unite with the *Zuinglian* interest in the *Consensus Tigurinus*. Merely to comprehend his theory, and to state it fairly, is by no means an easy task; while a just critical estimate of its actual sense may be said to belong to the very hardest problems of theology. When *Calvin's* doctrine, without opposition at least from *Melancthon*, crept in among the followers of this last in Wittenberg, and led thus to the mighty reaction that followed on the side of strict Lutheranism, the three propositions which became the shibboleth of Lutheran orthodoxy were: the "communication of attributes real and not simply verbal"—an "oral manducation"—and the "manducation of the ungodly." The first of these three propositions, relating to the doctrine of Christ's Person, falls not now in our way; the second and third define the distinction between the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's supper and the Calvinistic. As regards now the proposition that unbelievers also receive the Lord's body, there should be no confessional controversy about it; for it refers to a question, that has no right properly to be presented in the Christian Church. Our Lord did not institute his supper for unbelievers, and their participation in it

is an abnornity, that came not forward in the apostolical age, and is therefore not referred to at all in the New Testament. The apostle speaks indeed of such as partake of the mystery unworthily; they "eat and drink judgment to themselves," by not discerning "the Lord's body." But those unworthy communicants are there not ungodly, not unbelieving. They are believers, who have not made proper preparation. These receive actually the Lord's body; and so much therefore the passage at all events means, that this body is objectively present independently of the communicant's mind, and is received also along with the bread independently of the amount greater or less of his faith and preparation.

But if it be asked now: Is this participation by the mouth? it is necessary to put aside first some misunderstandings, between those who answer Yes, and those who answer No. It is saying too little, when the Reformed theologians speak of a *cibus mentis* or mental food; since this looks too easily and onesidedly to an activity of reflection, and a presence for memory or at best for the imagination. The right expression has been hit upon here by those Lutheran divines, who require that the body of the Lord shall be owned for a *cibus novi hominis*, an aliment of the new man. For the biblical conception of the "new man," which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness, (not to be confounded with the "inner man,") is so deep and comprehensive, that the nourishment of it carries in it a reference of itself also to the future glorification of our bodies. Only then, and in such form, shall we be new men in the whole, made complete as sons of God and set in the full possession of eternal life. The glorification of the body however, or the resurrection to life, is nothing else than a transformation into the likeness of the glorious body of Christ. But now the sure pledge of our glorification, according to the doctrine of the old church which has its ground also in the New Testament, is given in the holy supper. Here we come upon something, which Calvin seeks indeed to reach, but does not fully reach in fact. An excellent and truly enlightened theologian of the present time has well remarked, that nothing is to be asked of the Reformed church, but that she acknowledge in truth the glorification of Christ's body.

In return however, we must also allow, that every doctrine is false which pretends to place the Lord's body in one category with common objects of sense, and so to fix its presence under definite and circumscriptive local dimensions. The holding of the mystery in this way, will be found in truth to overthrow

again both the mystery itself and the glorification of Christ's body.

We are fully convinced; that Christian theology must make up its mind to the unreserved acknowledgment of an objective mystery in the Christian worship. The words used in the institution of the Lord's supper, taken in connection with the general doctrine of the New Testament, are too powerful a testimony here to be disputed. Those who deny it have allowed themselves to be led in part into the sore blunder, of substituting for the Saviour's mystical language, in the distribution of the sacrament, some other form of speech; either, "This is the communion of the body of Christ," or, "Thy faith in the body of Christ, which was delivered up to death, strengthen thee unto eternal life." This however should be as little tolerated, as a change of the formula of baptism. But the proceeding betrays an uncomfortable shyness in regard to our Lord's words, and rests no doubt on some apprehension that the utterance of them, at so sacred a moment, might still call up again the idea of a real mystery.

Altogether then we have a right to bring no other doctrine here into view as Protestant, in contrast with the Catholic, but that of a true real presence of Christ's body and blood in the sacrament of the altar, of a presence which depends, not on the faith first that we bring along with us, but on the Redeemer's own institution and promise.

In the Catholic church, this doctrine, founded on the Scriptures and ancient tradition, has grown into the dogma of transubstantiation; and what we have to do now is: first, to place transubstantiation, in itself considered, in comparison with the doctrine of the real presence; secondly, to try the consequences that have been deduced from this Roman dogma, the adoration of the host namely and communion in one kind.

The difference between the doctrine of a real presence, with which the earthly elements retain their substance, and the doctrine of transubstantiation, is not so great as is sometimes supposed. That both come very near together, no one has more clearly proclaimed than Luther; we may say indeed; Luther considered the doctrines to be so related that they might well enough stand both together in the church.

This insight into the smallness of the difference between the two doctrines, may be gained in two ways. First, by considering how gradually and quietly the old christian doctrine passed over into the idea of a change of substance; and then, secondly, by comparing this last in its finished scholastic form with the

Lutheran doctrine. It is hazardous, to aim at finding with full definiteness in antiquity, any one of the modern confessional views. Attempts of this sort lead only too easily to an unhistorical judgment. A strict historical and philological analysis of the patristic doctrine shows rather, that this does not move exactly in the track of any of these later systems. It has its own peculiarities, and must be understood and expounded from itself. It is only a very few points out of this rich subject, that we can allow ourselves to touch upon here.<sup>1</sup>

The most learned instructive treatises on the question, whether antiquity favors the Catholic or the Reformed type of doctrine, are those which came out in France and the Netherlands during the seventeenth century. In looking back to these discussions, we must say with *J. A. Ernesti* (in his *Antimuratori*), that neither of the two parties was able to set antiquity in full unforced harmony with their doctrine. The fathers will not fit themselves to the Reformed scheme, and the oldest of them refuse also to go fully with the Catholic. Very distinct doctrinal expositions occur particularly with these writers, who in the Nestorian and Eutychian controversies have defended the one person in two natures and the two natures in one person. They place the mystery of the eucharist in parallel with this dogma; and this, so as to illustrate the integrity of the two natures in Christ, by the conjunction of the earthly and heavenly elements in the sacrament. Here the heavenly element has not yet come to preponderate so completely over the earthly, as in the doctrine which affirms a change of the earthly substance into the heavenly. And yet this last grew very simply, without any spring and by a sort of natural continuity of thought, out of the other, which also it never wholly supplanted in the church. In its scholastic completion, the tenet of transubstantiation separates

<sup>1</sup> It is affirmed in the later manuals of Dogmatic History, since the time of Semler, that the oldest fathers overlooked, in the doctrine of the Lord's supper, the inseparable union of the divine Logos with the human nature, and assumed that the Logos enters into a union with the elements of bread and wine analogous with the incarnation, so that no reference was had whatever to the presence of the body that suffered, and of the blood that was shed, for our sins. I pronounce this whole representation to be utterly false. It is made up of pure misconceptions, and deserves here no farther respect. For its full refutation, as a deceitful tradition which ascribes to antiquity a doctrine, that would destroy the whole connection of the ancient christian faith, and that would annihilate in particular the most sacred article of this faith, the mystery of the incarnation, I may refer to my article on the Doctrine of Irenæus with regard to the Eucharist, published in *Rudelbach's Journal for Lutheran Theology* for the year 1841.

between the substance and its accidents; while the first is wholly changed, the last remain. The question however, What belongs to the accidents and what is to be counted as the substance of the bread and wine? is a mere school question, and let it be answered one way or another, the answer cannot with propriety be made an article of faith. In the explanation of what is to be included among accidents, particular Catholic theologians go so far, that one can scarcely see more how to distinguish their view in substance from the Lutheran, which stands to the simple proposition, that notwithstanding the real presence bread and wine remain what they are. We find that church fathers like Irenæus always look upon the consecrated bread and wine as still a corporal food, which for unprejudiced thinking implies certainly that the substance of them is not changed. But the Catholics set themselves right with all such representations, by reminding us that the virtue bread and wine have to nourish and strengthen the body is to be reckoned also among their accidents, in which view we have no right to think of transubstantiation as destroying any such property in the elements. When it once comes to this however, transubstantiation in itself considered (without regard to its consequences) can no longer be distinguished for the standpoint of faith from the real presence, and any deviation there may be in it from the sense of the Scriptures, to him who finds this presence in the Scriptures, will not seem to be of any serious account. This feeling has been openly expressed also once and again, in times following the Reformation, by Catholic as well as Lutheran divines. If there is any one among the last who deserves to be named as authority in exegetical matters, it will be allowed to be *J. A. Bengel*. This pious scholar declares, in one of his letters published by Burk, that he would much sooner undertake to prove transubstantiation from the Scriptures, than that view which acknowledges no real presence of Christ's body.

The difference between the Catholic and Lutheran doctrines would be indeed great, if the first pretended to say that the host is changed into a corresponding part of the Saviour's body, and so the wine also into a part of his blood. That apprehensions of this sort, bringing down the mystery into the sphere of common local existence and making it thus a phenomenon of sense, are actually at hand in the Catholic church, may be gathered from the exceptional cases, in which the show of the earthly accidents is reported as actually disappearing at times, so as to allow the sacred blood to be seen as such in the cup. The Catholic church would do well not to require faith in miracles

of this sort; since it is associated with conceptions, that contradict her own better doctrine. For this supposes the glorification of Christ's body, and affirms its presence only under such exalted form, laying particular stress on the thought that the whole Christ, *totus, et integer, Christus*, is present under each of the two kinds (Cong. Trid. Sess. XIII, cap. 3, comp. *ibid*, canon 3).<sup>a</sup> This doctrine is far removed from every Capernaitic view, and only in contradiction to it can any one encourage those miracles of the popular belief, or employ them as proofs for transubstantiation. We only see here again however, how the practice of this church departs from its theory, and perverts truths which this apprehends in a right way; and so long as the case remains thus, it is not to be expected of course that the doctrine of transubstantiation should find on our side generally that toleration to which as a mere theory it is properly entitled.

The decided stand of the old Protestantism against this doctrine, had regard mainly to the *consequences* that connect themselves with it. While we go on now to consider these, it will be proper to inquire at the same time how far they are right, who tell us that the same consequences, particularly the adoration of the host and the doctrine of the sacrifice of the mass, flow also from the real presence. This affirmation comes from two different sides; first from the rigidly Reformed, who just to avoid these consequences reject the real presence; and then from the Catholics, who press on the Lutherans the necessity of receiving, along with the real presence, the whole doctrine of which they take it to be a part. Among those who present the matter under this last view, Bossuet above all deserves to be named, on account especially of what he has written on the subject in his *History of the Variations of the Protestant Churches*. (Comp. the sixth book §§. 20-42.)

According to the Catholic doctrine, the change takes place at the moment of consecration and in virtue of it. It exists independently of the distribution and participation of the supper; even after the completion of the whole solemnity, the host still remains the body of the Lord. This conception of a change subsisting for itself and, fully independent of use, was carried

<sup>a</sup> Every Capernaitic conception is already shut out by this, that according to the inviolably settled expression it must be believed: in sanctissimo eucharistiae sacramento contineri vere, realiter et substantialiter, corpus et sanguinem una cum anima et divinitate Domini nostri Jesu Christi, ac proinde totum Christum.—Sess. XIII, can. I. In every Catholic Catechism, this is taught with the same words.

out by the theologians of the middle ages with the strictest consequence, which did not shrink even, as is known, from raising and in part at least affirming the revolting question: an etiam a brutis animalibus sumatur corpus Christi?

The first consequence of the view which takes the presence of Christ to be bound to the consecrated host, is the adoration of the host, not only in the moment of consecration or distribution, but also afterwards, when it is preserved and exhibited in the church for worship, or is carried to a sick person, or is borne in procession as on the festival of corpus-Christi.

These consequences Protestantism avoids, by referring the Saviour's promise, on which rests the belief of his presence, only to the dispensation and reception of the sacrament. For only for this end, and no other, was the ordinance instituted.

This Protestant doctrine then is commonly so fixed, as to admit the real presence only in the moment of participation. We find it so taken precisely by those Lutheran theologians of the present time, who on this ground lay down the rule that the christian should kneel in the moment of taking the communion, but in this moment alone.

We find nearly the same view already among the Waldensians. The proposition among others is ascribed to them: *quod conversio*—this they still held—*non fiat in manu sacerdotis sed in ore sumentis*. In the Calvinistic theory it follows of itself of course, that the presence which it acknowledges is linked to the moment of participation, with which the subjective ascent of the communicant to heaven and his spiritual union with Christ are taken to coincide. But this limitation is not so of course on the Lutheran standpoint. It is thus definitely uttered by Melancthon only; never, to my knowledge, by Luther. It does not fit by any means the connection of the strict Lutheran view. This proceeds, and as I believe correctly, on the idea that the real presence has place in consequence of the administration of the sacrament in conformity with its institution. The one essential part of this administration is taken to be the consecration. Through this the promise of Christ, given once for all, assumes its special application to the elements in hand. The consecration takes place with the words of our Lord: "This is—not, This shall be—my body." Nothing is more natural, when we set out with these premises, than to assume that now the consecration at once also, according to the sound of the words, goes into effect, and is not a mere pre-intimation of what is to become true afterwards in the moment of distribution. This last restriction, to my mind at least, appears exceedingly arbitrary. If we

assume that the promise and the consecration are the efficient cause of the reality of the sacrament, and so far as I can see Luther does assume this, there is no reason at hand for disjoining the effect in time from the cause, and transposing it to a later moment. Luther retained for some time this elevation in connection with the act of blessing. But what meaning could this have for the people, if not to remind them that in virtue of the consecration Christ was already present?

I will not rest here in a mere historical observation. It is my own conviction, that we should put away, in the celebration of the mystery, this arbitrary restriction of it to the moment of distribution. When any of the wine is carelessly spilt, or when at the close of the solemnity what is left of the consecrated elements is allowed to go to common use, it gives the Catholics heavy and it seems to me just offence. It was not permitted to turn any part that was left of the paschal lamb, at the close of the festival, to common use; what remained must be burnt with fire during the same holy night. We also are bound—not to worship what is thus left—but still to preserve it from every sort of desecration.

According to Lutheran and Anglican rite, the christian kneels when he receives the sacrament. The Lutheran doctrine allows, that this signifies an adoration of the present Christ. Against the proposition of the Catholic church that Christ is to be worshipped in the eucharist, I would not know what to object, if it had merely this meaning, that in the solemnity of the eucharist we should pray to him as there present. And to restrict this worship to the moment of the distribution of the sacrament, repressing it in the interval between the consecration and the distribution, is something to my judgment and to my feeling wholly without reason. The adoration at the moment of consecration is an observance of the ancient church, as we may learn from Chrysostom. To this observance I find nothing to object.

In taking the ground that the Protestant service might and should approach the ancient usage, I may seem to have made a very important concession to Catholicism. With so much the greater force apparently may it urge upon us its other consequences.

But from this very standpoint, these may and must be rather refused and disowned. In the first place, Protestantism has the holy scriptures and christian antiquity on its side, when it stands to the principle that our Lord instituted his sacrament for the use of the solemnity of which he gave the example, not that a part of it should be withdrawn from its proper destination, and

kept for worship whether in the church or in public procession. When the church notwithstanding makes such use of the host, it is a liberty not sanctioned by antiquity. True, this was not Protestant here either in its practice. The ancient church knew nothing of a communion for the sick as we now have it, when the minister at the bed of the dying, and in the family circle perhaps, goes through a full celebration of the supper. The ancient usage was rather, as is known, that from the bread consecrated at the public celebration in the church a portion was carried also by the deacons to the sick. Nay, it might be shown that even as early as the third century, the practice prevailed of preserving also a part of the consecrated bread, to be used by the dying in cases of subsequent need. But such preservation is still always for the purpose, not of adoration, but of actual use.

If it be contended now however, that it follows of itself that the host should be honored with worship also in the interval of its preservation, I must deny it. Where religious transactions are in question in regard to which the conscience needs to be well grounded, we are bound to exercise the greatest caution towards ourselves and towards the forms that offer themselves for our devotion, and to keep closely to the bounds that are prescribed to us by the pattern set before us in the scriptures and ecclesiastical antiquity. We can not, and dare not, allow to the church, the right of introducing new modes of worship, however plausible the conclusions on which they are made to rest. The church, in case even she might indulge individuals in any such form of worship, should never make it a law for all nor raise it into a test of orthodoxy.

While we oppose here the requisitions of the Catholic church, it does not follow that we must characterise the adoration of the host, in or out of the mass, as idolatry. We know how commonly this has been done among Protestants. Even the Heidelberg Catechism does not hesitate, to stigmatize the entire mass as "an accursed idolatry." But if I may speak out openly what I think in this matter, I must confess that I would wish to have no part in such invectives. I cannot rid myself of the impression, which was made upon me some time since by the word of one of our great poets: "Woe to him who calls a religious service idolatry, the object of which is Christ"—at least in the mind of the worshipper. One who has ever at all brought home to himself that the Catholic is convinced of the Redeemer's actual presence in what he thus honors, must shrink certainly from representations that identify such worship with heathenism. Just as little may its parallel be found in that less repre-

hensible form of idolatry, which Jeroboam introduced into Israel when he caused molten calves to be set up at Dan and Bethel, that Jehovah the God of Israel might be worshipped through them as images or symbols. Neither is the worship which was afterwards rendered to the brazen serpent, (Nehushtan,) once erected by Moses in the wilderness as a sign of salvation, to be drawn here into comparison. I know but one analogy that we may fairly bring from the Old Testament. Only in the place which the Lord should choose for his name to dwell there, were sacrifices to be offered. So it was commanded in the Mosaic law. Nevertheless the Israelites transgressed this restriction laid upon them by God, nearly at all times down to the first destruction of Jerusalem, and sacrificed not only in Jerusalem or Shiloh, but also on the high places. And this Samuel also did; who notwithstanding was a judge and prophet of the Lord. Although too he observed not the prescribed rule, he was not at once visited with condemnation, but stood under Divine indulgence. So is it also here. The work of the host, as it has place in the Catholic church, transgresses the right bounds. No one who is better informed should take part in it. No one should be forced to it. Still, those who have not such better knowledge, and suppose themselves to be honoring Christ in this way, are to be regarded as under Divine indulgence.

In the known controversy, how far a Protestant also may participate in the kneeling before the sanctissimum of the Catholic church, two cases, in my opinion, should be distinguished. It is a general christian principle, that the reality and efficacy of a sacrament does not depend on the personal worthiness of the administrator; according to Protestant view he cannot even by a false intention vitiate the reality of the transaction. Hence then the solemnity of the mass must be acknowledged as a true celebration of the Lord's supper, and the presence of Christ in it firmly held. If this be so, a Protestant who sees no ground for restraining this presence to the moment of distribution, may feel himself spontaneously moved to kneel along with the rest at the time of consecration; he may not consider it right to give offence on this point to those with whom he worships. But what might prevent him from such compliance, and so from attendance on the mass altogether, would be the fact, that according to a very widely extended conventional view, kneeling at the mass is taken as a sign of going over to the Roman church or of agreement with its whole system of faith. It is quite another matter however, where Protestants are required to kneel also when the host is carried in procession or borne to the sick.

As a second consequence proceeding from the doctrine of transubstantiation, we turn our attention now to the *communion under one kind* and the *doctrine of concomitance*. Those two points are thus related. The communion of the laity, and of non-officiating priests, under one kind, gained prevalence in the western church first as a custom or usage. Afterwards the scholastic theology sought to justify this usage, as well as all other parts of the existing system. This was done by the proposition, that the whole Christ is present under each of the two kinds, that the presence of his body cannot be thought of without that of his blood and *vice versa*. The use is a matter of discipline. This theory is a matter of doctrine, and was raised into a dogma by the council of Trent. The use may be changed again by the church; the dogma however, by which it is justified, has been irrevocably pronounced.

Isolated cases of a communion under the species of bread alone, are to be found in antiquity. Here belongs the custom, already noticed, of conveying to the sick a portion of the consecrated bread.\* Of a communication of the cup going along with such instances, no trace that I know of is on record. Still these occasions are to be regarded only as cases of necessity. When the cup is withdrawn here and there in the Oriental churches, it is also by such necessary exception, and not as rule and law. Only in the Western church has the withdrawal been raised to any such character, and this too at a time when the opposition to transubstantiation, as urged by Ratramn and Berengarius, was no longer heard. It goes to show the vast distance which had come to hold in the view of the middle ages, between the laity and the priest when officiating at the altar. But still this thought is by no means sufficient, to explain the rise of the usage. It grew mainly, no doubt, out of an extreme fear of profaning the sacred blood. The danger of profanation, by spilling, was much greater in handing the cup, than in the case of the host. Möhler refers the withdrawal of the cup also to a certain diffidence which the laity felt about using what was so

\* When in the case of the holy supper thus, what had place originally only as a necessity for the sick came to be in the western church the reigning custom, namely communion under one kind, the fact forms a remarkable historical parallel with the course of things in regard to the rite of baptism. Anciently baptism was administered by aspersion only to the sick (*baptismus clinicorum*;) but afterwards this became in the west the reigning mode. The oriental (Greek) church on the other hand has retained, as the communion in both kinds, so also the form of baptism by immersion.

sacred, in view of their own unworthiness; in which view it must be thought of as a voluntary measure on the part of the people themselves, rather than as imposed upon them by priestly pride. This is the most favorable derivation of the usage for the Catholic church, and altogether it is not historically improbable. But when it is brought forward in the way of apology, it should be remembered that such diffidence with regard to using the means of grace which Christ has provided for all believers, is in itself false and wrong. It is the same sort of diffidence, that led many in the ancient church to put off their baptism as long as possible, the same sort of diffidence that hinders the pious Catholic from admitting the witness of adoption which the Holy Ghost works in the consciousness of believers; it is the same humility that leads him to turn to the saints for help, rather than to the Saviour himself. The feeling of unworthiness is in itself good; but in all these cases it is misled, and lacks the illumination that is shed abroad in the heart by full confidence in the Saviour's grace.

Communion under one kind, the source of the great Hussite commotions after the decree of Constance, was an evil which it was confidently trusted would find its remedy from the council held at Trent. On this point, above all, the Protestants wished to have a hearing in the body. The council fell in with this wish. In the thirteenth session (11th Oct. 1551), after all beside, had been settled in relation to the eucharist as a sacrament, the decision of four articles, of which three referred to the withholding of the cup, was deferred till the arrival of the Protestant delegates, for whom also a safe conduct was ordered.<sup>4</sup> In the fifteenth session (25th Jan. 1552), and still later, after an almost ten years' interruption of the council, on the 4th of March 1562, the safe conduct was renewed. Finally in the twenty-first session (16th July 1562), the four articles were decided fully in the sense of the Catholic tradition, the first three thus against the Protestants. Only these two questions were still left: "Whether the reasons which led to the withdrawal of the cup continue so of force, that the use of it may on no ground be allowed

<sup>4</sup> These four articles were as follows: 1. An necessarium sit ad salutem, et divino jure praeceptum, ut singuli Christi fideles sub utraque specie ipsum venerabile sacramentum accipiant. (On this it was already decided at Constance, that it is not required to receive in both kinds.) 2. Num minus sumat qui sub altera quam qui sub utraque communicat. 3. An erraverit sancta mater ecclesia, laicos et non celebrantes sacerdotes sub panis tantum specie communicando. 4. An parvuli etiam communicandi sint.

to any?" and secondly: "If in any case there were reasons to allow the cup to a nation or kingdom, whether any, and if so what, particular conditions should go along with the grant?" The determination of both these points was reserved by the council for a later occasion. There was still hope thus, that the wish of the Emperor, Ferdinand I., would be regarded, and a main difficulty in the way of church union be removed. But these expectations also were disappointed, when the body resolved, at the close of its twenty-second session (17th Sept. 1562), to leave both questions unsettled, and to refer the whole matter to the Pope.<sup>5</sup> decrevit (S. Synodus) integrum negotium ad sanctissimum dominum nostrum esse referendum,—qui pro sua singulari prudentia id efficiat, quod utile reipublicae Christianae, et salutare potentibus usum calicis fore judicaverit. To such melancholy conclusion came the whole transaction, which had been regarded with so much expectation.

The council pronounced an anathema on any one who should say, that the church was not moved by just grounds and reasons to establish communion only under the species of bread for the laity and non-officiating priests. But what these weighty and good grounds were, was not said. And the fact is, that if anything is not to be justified, it is the pernicious decree of Constance.

The church has changed the institution of Christ, and vindicated this change by theories that belong to the schools, and that can lay the ground for no article of faith. In the sphere of genuine church faith and life, questions like that concerning the concomitance ought not to be brought forward. It is enough here to know, how Christ instituted his supper.

We can allow indeed, nay we must do so after Luther's example, that the Catholic also receives a true eucharist. He finds himself, so long as his church forbids him the cup, in a state of necessity, similar to that of the dying in the ancient church. For that which men withhold from him, the Lord himself, can

<sup>5</sup> This *Decretum super petitione con excois calicis* is purposely not placed along with the doctrinal decrees of the twenty-second session, but after the *decretum de reformatione*, to intimate that the object of it belongs to the sphere of discipline.

<sup>6</sup> The Emperor, who well knew that any permission yet to be obtained from the Pope would not have the favorable effect, that was to be expected from a decision of the Council, said to some prelates who were present when he received information of this decree: "Gentlemen, I have done all that I could to save my people; now look to it in your turn, you who have most at stake in the matter."—Comp. Sarpi, *Hist. du Conc. de Trente*.



secure to him a compensation. But this does not say, that the church, entrusted with the dispensation of the Divine mysteries, has the right to put her members in such necessity. Rather the law, as it still stands, is the heaviest and most just stone of offence. This precisely is the abuse, which as experience teaches brings the purpose of leaving the Catholic church with many to full ripeness, and in truth no other evil in it can well be said to furnish so fair occasion for this step.

So far as I know, the bishops have power in single cases, where the transition of a Catholic to Protestantism may be prevented by this and by no other means, to allow an individual the use of the cup. In the case of the *Maronites* and of the *United Greeks*, Rome allows regularly communion in both kinds, as well as the marriage of priests. The Pope has authority unquestionably to extend both allowances to other nations also, nay to the entire Roman communion. His not having done so since the council of Trent, cannot cut off every hope that a better time may still come. Möhler himself expresses hopes that look this way. It is not indeed christian, but as men now are it is still natural and easy to be explained, that favours are refused to enemies which would be granted to friends. If the Protestants could only assume a more peaceable attitude towards the Catholic church, the desire of the best men on the first side might possibly make an impression on the best men of the other side, which could not be made by the most urgent demands of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. With the present temper of the parties, and the tumultuary conduct of those Catholics who seek the restoration of the cup, there is but small prospect indeed of such a result; only when the relations of the world are brought to such a form, that all Christians may see where they have their true friends and proper allies, will there be room to look for an adjustment also of this difficulty. Till then we must persist, on our side, in a calm but still earnest and firm protest against the withdrawal of the cup.

*Translated by J. W. N.*



