

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

he perceives in that liberty the hope of solving the great problem of Nonconformity. Mr. Smith has already done good service to the Church by advocating in this magazine a Declaratory Act as the means for reforming our Convocation. I hope he will add to that service by following into detail his modification of the parochial system. This portion of his paper will startle many; for few, perhaps, have discovered that the Act of Uniformity was a blunder when it was passed, and has been a hindrance to the Church ever since. It is now growing rapidly into old age, but it is dying hard.

WILLIAM MURDOCH JOHNSTON.



ART. II.—HILDEBRAND, LANFRANC, AND BERENGARIUS.

IN the history of the Western Church, as it passed from the darkness and confusion of the Middle Ages to the clearer atmosphere of the twelfth century, the three greatest characters that present themselves to the eye are those of Berengarius, Hildebrand, and Lanfranc—oftener seen in conflict than in union, and originating conflicting influences on the Church of every later age. In Hildebrand we see the great master-builder of that pontifical system whose finished structure (if the developing powers of the papacy can ever enable it to give a finishing stroke to the already over-weighted building) we see existing still among us. In Berengarius we recognise the apostle of that freedom of thought and critical investigation of fact and doctrine which has even a more active development in the present Church; while Lanfranc as faithfully represents the severe conservatism and the devotion to the mere literal sense of Scripture which have still so many votaries even among those who most strenuously resist the doctrines to which it led him, and which gave fatal proof in the deaths of thousands of martyrs in later ages, that “the letter killeth,” while the “spirit” alone “giveth life.”

In the storm of religious controversy which burst over Europe at the time of the Reformation the true features and characters of these remarkable men were so entirely misrepresented, and even distorted, that until our own age they may be said to have been seen “as through a glass darkly.” For every advocate either of the papacy or of the Reformation has accepted the traditional view of them adopted in the heat of the controversy from the earlier combatants, and the historical picture in the hands of controversialists speedily became rather a caricature than a truthful delineation of character and real

life. Thus Hildebrand, the great Church reformer of the Middle Ages, whose theory of an absolute spiritual monarchy, however impracticable, showed a grandeur of conception worthy of a better age, and whose zeal against the simony which reigned everywhere saved the Church from the greatest danger which had arisen in it since the age of the Apostles, has been turned into a monster of cruelty and tyranny. Berengarius, the greatest divine and philosopher, has been represented, on the other side, as an arch-heretic and a resister of every lawful authority; while Lanfranc has been extolled as the defender of the faith and the victor in the cause of orthodoxy in an argument which (even had the reply of his adversary been yet undiscovered) would appear to have failed most signally, and to be on the very face of it a mere *petitio principii*.

The great controversy on the Corporal Presence, in which all three were so deeply involved, had been very imperfectly understood, and has been greatly misrepresented ever since it was reopened at the period of the Reformation. Nor was it until the discovery by Lessing in the Ducal Library of Wolfenbüttel of the final reply of Berengarius to Lanfranc that the doctrine of the former was clearly defined, and the relations in which he stood in regard to Lanfranc and to Hildebrand, both before and after his accession to the papacy, were fully seen.

In this remarkable history and vindication of his entire course we see the three disputants, no longer in that distant position from each other in which they previously stood, but in the closest connection, and the relations they held to one another become not only visible, but conspicuous. We see Hildebrand as the friend and advocate of the philosophical divine, whom he is generally supposed to have regarded from the first as a confirmed and irreconcilable heretic. We see Lanfranc no longer as the triumphant refuter of the heretic, whom he is vainly supposed by Romanist authorities to have crushed altogether by the weight of his arguments; and, lastly, we see Berengarius giving his adversary an overwhelming defeat, and proving from the Canon of the Mass and the prayers of the Church, as well as from the words of Scripture, how absolutely untenable was the doctrine of the Corporal Presence and the destruction of the natural substance of the elements in order to replace them by another. Up to the time of the great Mabillon it was almost universally assumed that the doctrine of Berengarius involved the denial not only of the corporal, but of the real, or spiritual, presence of our Lord in His last institution. He was regarded as the apostle of Zwinglianism and its kindred Calvinism, and supposed to have reduced the Eucharist to a mere lifeless memorial of the

parted Saviour, instead of a living and life-giving application to the faithful recipient of the fruits of His passion and the power of His resurrection. Far from holding so debased a doctrine, Berengarius maintained the reality of the presence, though he insisted on its spirituality. From much documentary evidence, which included that of a MS. in the library of the Abbey of Gemblours, since destroyed by fire, Mabillon proved that Berengarius held the real presence of Christ in the Eucharist, but denied transubstantiation.¹ This fact appears incontestably in his final reply to Lanfranc, to which we shall have frequent occasion to refer.

This being premised, we are able to enter upon the history of the controversy with a clear view of the parts which were filled in it by the three principal actors.

The animosity of Lanfranc against Berengarius, according to his own statement, arose in the following manner. Berengarius had been denounced as holding heretical opinions on the Eucharist to Pope Leo and a Council he was holding at Rome. These opinions were set forth in a letter addressed to Lanfranc, then residing at the Abbey of Bec, in Normandy, and appeared to involve him also in the suspicion of holding the same doctrine. "Itaque factum est, ut non deterior de te quam de me fuerit orta suspicio, ad quem videlicet tales literas destinaveris." The ambitious Italian, looking onward towards the English Primacy, was evidently alarmed at the association of his own name with that of the heretic who was condemned unheard by the Council, and from this time his personal animosity was manifested towards him in the bitterest and most implacable form. Pascasius had recently written his work in defence of a corporal presence in the Eucharist, and in opposition to the doctrine of Scotus, of which Berengarius was the vigorous defender. A careful examination of this treatise indicates that the nature of the presence was by no means clearly defined, and that the spiritual doctrine was still (as it were) struggling for life under the scholastic subtleties which were being woven around it. In the seventeenth chapter (*De Corp. et Sang. Dom.*) Pascasius qualifies the carnal view he had given of the Sacrament in the fifteenth, in these memorable words: "It is not the visible quantity which is to be estimated in this mystery, but the spiritual virtue of the Sacrament. . . . For the woman in the gospel who touched the hem of Christ's garment derived more therefrom than the crowd which pressed upon His whole body, because she conceived Him more in the mind and believed in Him

¹ Mabillon in *Præf. ad Sæc. VI.*, *Bened.*, tom. II., p. 107 (v. Lessing, "Berengarius," *Turon.*, Pt. III., pp. 16, 17.

through faith. Therefore we ought to think not how much is pressed by the teeth, but how much is received through faith and love. . . . Wherefore it is necessary that he who eats the body of Christ should receive by faith of the fulness of His divinity; whence the Apostle saith, 'Of His fulness we have all received.' " This passage, among many others, clearly shows that Pascasius believed that the presence in the Sacrament was relative, and not absolute, and that only those who received by faith received the reality of the body and blood of Christ.

So spiritual in many important passages is the doctrine laid down by Pascasius in his celebrated treatise that its Roman editors in the "Bibliotheca Patrum" are frequently obliged to admonish its readers to read it carefully and understand it rightly. By which they mean, to read it in a non-natural sense, and to understand it in an opposite meaning to that which the writer has expressed. His work, however, was the signal for the opening of that controversy which seems doomed to last as long as Christianity itself, and fills the darkest page in its history.

The discovery of the final reply of Berengarius to Lanfranc has cast a deep shadow over the veracity and integrity of the great English primate. It shows us, moreover, the violence and intimidation which forced from the alleged heretic at the peril of his life the recantation of a doctrine which there can be no question that he held until his death, though unable to propagate it in his later course. When Berengarius began to spread his doctrine "the hypocrisy of Lanfranc" (writes Lessing in his learned discourse) "became darker and more odious than before" (p. 79). A refreshing contrast was presented to the bitterness and implacability of his attack upon his adversary, in the conduct and course of Hildebrand towards the subject of this virulent persecution. During the pontificate of Leo, Hildebrand was sent as a legate of the Pope to the Church of Tours on special ecclesiastical business. Instead of meeting Berengarius, as he had been met before, with threats and even personal outrage and violence, the papal representative met him with a gentleness and kindness worthy of the better ages of Christianity. "He came to me," writes Berengarius, "not with swords and staves, but with Christian tenderness in the name of the Lord. Having clearly learned the truth, he persuaded me to go to Pope Leo, whose authority might repress the envy of the proud and the tumult of the foolish; but as regarded the present circumstances, if the Bishops who had assembled desired to speak at once on the Eucharist, there might be given into their hands the works of many different writers with the special passages marked, which Hildebrand

had caused to be brought together. . . . When the assembly was over I might go with Hildebrand to the Pope, as was mentioned before.”¹

The death of Leo, which happened soon after, prevented this journey from being accomplished. In the meantime the Bishops at Tours carried on a process of interrogation in order to extract from Berengarius a confession of the corporal presence, alleging that he believed in his heart a doctrine he would not confess with his lips. Yielding at last to their importunities, he confessed upon oath this doctrine: “The bread and wine of the altar are, after their consecration, the body and blood of Christ.” “Hildebrand,” he repeats, “the legate of the Roman Church, had gathered together books from all parts in order to settle the question on the Eucharist,” an evident proof that it was still an open question so far as the mode of the presence was concerned, and that the famous passages which so clearly disprove transubstantiation in the writings of the fathers, and in the canon of the mass itself, were not yet held to be of no authority in the determination of this important question. To these, as well as to the Scriptures, Berengarius carries up his appeal with singular force and argumentative skill. Hildebrand appears to have had a decided leaning to the Berengarian doctrine, and was accused by his adversaries of so far holding it as to be involved in the same alleged heresy. The life of the Pope, by his bitter enemy, Cardinal Benno, though it charges him with a series of outrages and cruelties which find no corroboration in any other of his biographers or contemporaries, contains one charge which, taken in connection with the acts of the Council which deposed him, cannot be altogether without foundation. “The same presumptuous man enjoined a fast on the cardinals in order that God might determine which was the right faith concerning the body of the Lord, that of the Roman Church or Berengarius. And he sought for the sign which was shown to St. Gregory in order to confirm the faith of a certain woman, when the bread received the form of a finger. And he sent two cardinals, Atto and Cuno, to the church of St. Anastasia in order that they might in company with Suppo, the arch-priest of the same church, observe a three days’ fast, and that each of them during the period should sing psalms and masses in order that Christ might show them the aforesaid sign, which never happened at all.”² Wibertus, the anti-pope, and his council at Rome treated him on account of his Berengarian

¹ Lessing, “Berengarius,” p. 143 (Carlsruhe, 1824).

² “Vita et Gesta Hildebrandi” (published with the first edition of the Commentaries of Pius II. on the Council of Basle, without place or date), pp. 89—100.

tendency as a declared hæresiarch. After the second retraction of Berengarius, he indicated his friendly feeling towards his former *protégé* by issuing a bull of anathema against "all who injure Berengarius," that "son of the Roman Church," "or who call him a heretic." Probably this was directed against Lanfranc and his followers, whose hatred against Berengarius seemed to survive to the very last. It is notable that there never appears to have been any cordiality between Hildebrand and Lanfranc, and, indeed, at one period the relations between them, on the ground of the disinclination of the Archbishop to visit Rome, became seriously strained. It is very probable that the different parts they had taken in the Berengarian controversy contributed to this estrangement. It is equally remarkable that while Berengarius speaks of the conduct of Pope Nicholas to him as barbarous and unchristian, "casting him as to wild beasts; to cruel and pitiless minds which would not listen to the spiritual refreshment from the body of Christ, and even closed their ears at the very word spiritual," he always speaks with respect and gratitude of Hildebrand, who was evidently desirous rather to settle the question by an appeal to the great men of a better age than to trust its solution to councils or bodies of men who decided the doctrine by violent and tumultuous methods, and retractations enforced by mere terrorism. The insults and reproaches which Lanfranc heaps upon his adversary on the ground that he had broken the oath which was thus under the threat of death imposed upon him, shows the character of the English primate in an aspect from which we cannot but regard it with the greatest aversion. "Would it not have been better," he exclaims, "if you thought you had the true faith to have closed an honest life in death, than to have perjured yourself?" And then he breaks forth into the cruel words ("grausam und böhnisch," as Lessing well describes them): "O! infelix homo; O! miserrima anima, cur te credere jurabas quae tantopere inter se dissidere intelligebas?" "Why?" retorts Berengarius; "why from fear—from a weakness I could not control. But if on this account I am an unhappy man, a lost soul, so would Aaron and Peter be also. Aaron, when from fear of the murmuring of the people he made an idol; Peter, when through fear of a maid he denied the Master whom so short a time before he had so supernaturally witnessed" (p. 165).

It would take too long a space were we to attempt to follow Berengarius in his refutation of the errors and falsehoods of Lanfranc in his work on the sacrament. Every fact is so distorted in that violent polemic, that it would be almost as easy to convict it from the testimony of contemporary historians as from the rejoinder of Berengarius himself. We

are less, however, interested in the history of the controversy than in the clear understanding of the conflicting doctrines out of which it arose. The doctrine of transubstantiation had not at the time of Berengarius been brought into connection with the conflicting systems of the nominalists and realists, and with the philosophy (falsely so called) of the schools. It had a ruder and coarser form, and there was no attempt made by its advocates to shelter themselves under the subtle distinctions of substance, accident, extension, and similar terms. The change effected by consecration involved in their conception of it a destruction of the natural element by "absumption," corruption, or annihilation, and the production of a new creation, by some mysterious process of generation. Berengarius defines the popular view which Pascasius and Lanfranc advocated in these words: "Panem et vinum per corruptionem vel absumptionem sui, in particulam Carnis Christi sensualiter transire et sanguinis."¹

The advocates of the material change, among whom was Humbertus, hesitated not to maintain the blasphemous proposition that the body of Christ was still liable to corruption; and it was this same Humbertus who forced Berengarius into that recantation before Nicholas II., which he confessed afterwards was made with his hands, and not his conscience, in the imminent danger of death. The form of this confession is given in the third part of the *Decretum* (or *Concordantia*) of Gratian, and runs thus: "I agree with the holy Roman Apostolic See," etc., and profess that "after the consecration there is not only the sacrament, but also the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that it is sensually" (*sensualiter*) "not only sacramentally, but in truth handled and broken in the hands of the priests, and bruised" (or masticated, *atteri*) "by the teeth of the faithful."² This revolting confession, which, even the Roman advocates admit, brings in a more dreadful heresy than that which it condemns,³ was altered to the following form under Gregory VII., when he succeeded to the Papacy, and runs thus:

"I, Berengarius, believe and confess that the bread and wine are, by the mystery of consecration and the words of our Redeemer, substantially changed into the true and proper and quickening flesh and blood of Jesus Christ our Lord, and that after the consecration it is the true body of Christ which was

¹ Lessing, p. 86.

² The "Glossa Ordinaria," the popular commentary of the pre-reformation times, admits, "quod oportet confessionem Berengarii sanè intelligi quia aliter foret novissimus error pejor priore ab ecclesiâ damnata tanquam hæretico."—Wiclif, *De Euchar.*, c. II.

³ *De Consecr. Dist. II.*, c. 142.

born of the Virgin, and which, offered for the salvation of the world, did hang on the cross, and which sits at the right hand of the Father—and the true blood of Christ, which was poured out from His side, not only by a sign and virtue of the Sacrament, but in its proper nature and truth of substance.”

This was subscribed at the close of Berengarius' life when he was eighty years of age; but it is alleged by contemporary historians that, to his latest breath, he continued in the belief and propagation of his true doctrine. And its popularity was proved by the fact that it spread through every part of Europe until the period when Wiclif (in 1380) attacked the doctrine of transubstantiation in his work “*De Eucharistiâ*,” a work of solid learning and great argumentative skill.

The apparent desertion of Berengarius, whom he had protected through evil report and good report, by Gregory VII., is easily explained by the extreme difficulty in which the schism in the Papacy had placed the Pope, and the charge of heresy which the Council, under the Anti-Pope Wipertus (or Guibertus), had brought against him. It would seem that it was rather to clear himself from the suspicion of heresy than to renew the charge against his ancient friend that this confession, born, as it was, out of due season, and altogether ignoring the former one, was exacted from the aged friend of the Pontiff—and probably in order to enable him to throw over him the shield of his protection, which he did immediately after in the bull already alluded to. It is indeed difficult to believe that Hildebrand had any sympathy with Lanfranc in his controversy with Berengarius, and doubtless he was well acquainted with the crushing reply which the Archbishop had received from the victim of this long persecution. No intelligent person, reading the attack and the rejoinder with impartiality, could for a moment fail to see that, both on scriptural, patristic, and ritual grounds, the triumph of Berengarius was complete.

The foundation of his argument is laid in the obvious truth that wherever any person or material object is blessed or consecrated, it is elevated to a higher state, which could not be affected by the corruption, destruction, or annihilation of it, which would rather debase than dignify it. Grace does not destroy nature, but adds to it a gift which it did not possess before—in the words of Theodoret: *οὐ τὴν φύσιν μεταβαλὼν, ἀλλὰ τὴν χάριν τῇ φύσει προστεθεικῶς* (Dial. I.). St. Ambrose (or the early writer of the treatise which goes by his name) compares the sacramental change to the conversion of a wicked servant into a son of God. “Denique” (he addresses him), “*tu ipse eras, sed eras vetus creatura; postquam consecratus*

es, nova creatura esse cœpisti." From this, as a first principle, he concludes that, "as Christ, when made flesh, took that which He was not before, not losing that which He was, so the consecrated bread on the altar loses its vileness, loses its uselessness, but does not lose its natural properties, to which, as their seat and foundation, dignity and efficacy have been Divinely added."¹

The argument of Berengarius, which, though full of strong points, is destitute of the strict order and regularity which characterize the writings of a later period, closes with an appeal to the Canon of the Mass, and the prayers of the Roman Ordinal, which, at every period of this prolonged controversy, have formed one of the strongholds of those who maintain the ancient doctrine of the Church against its mediæval corruptions. That venerable ritual contains in itself the most irrefragable proofs of the modern character of the Romanism of to-day, and of the spiritual truths which its materialism has so fatally obscured. Its venerable antiquity and sacred character have prevented it from being tampered with in order to bring it into correspondence with the later theology of Rome, and the advocates of these innovations have only been able, like Bossuet, to explain away, as far as they could, the evidence it brings against their new dogmas.²

We may here present to the reader the words of Berengarius himself: "Even if every other argument were taken away, the doctrine of Lanfranc is brought to nought by that one prayer alone which is put forth in the Missal by every priest after the Roman order in silence: 'Thee therefore most merciful Father, through Jesus Christ Thy Son our Lord, we suppliantly beseech and pray that Thou wilt accept and bless these gifts,'—which words, 'accept and bless,' how can Lanfranc fail to see, cannot signify the removal, overthrow or destruction, but the exaltation to a higher state? Whence Augustine writes on the Psalms, 'When God blesses us, He makes us holier, makes us happier.' With what absurdity does Lanfranc interpret the words that follow, 'receive graciously,' as though they meant, 'graciously consume, destroy, overthrow'! What madness could conceive that the words which follow—'This oblation do Thou O God in everything deign to make blessed, accepted, ratified, and a rational service'—ought to be interpreted, 'that Thou wouldst deign to consume, overthrow and destroy the oblation by the corruption of the substance,' which must necessarily refer to the bread

¹ Berengarii de Sacra Cœnâ, p. 98 (Berol.), 1834.

² *Vide* Bossuet, "Explication de quelques difficultez sur les prières de la Messe, à un nouveau catholique" (Paris, 1689).

and wine, as though in no manner Thou hadst blessed it, in nothing hadst made it more effectual, in nothing hadst advanced it to a greater dignity; above all, when the author of the prayer proceeds, 'that this oblation may be made (or become) to us the body and blood of Thy beloved Son. . . .' For it is not to be conceived that one who has just prayed 'that Thou wouldst accept and bless,' and then 'that it may be made to us the body and blood,' could hold it to be so made otherwise than by accepting and blessing it. The words which follow, 'He took the bread and blessed it,' must be interpreted, 'He advanced it to a higher privilege than it had before. He brake it, gave it, and said, Take, eat, this (that is, this thing, this bread) is My body, which words could in nowise consist with the truth if you take away the bread from the Sacrifice of Christ. . . .' The words which follow, 'We offer unto Thy divine Majesty of Thine own blessings and gifts,' must necessarily mean of Thy creatures of bread and wine, which must as necessarily refer to the actual bread in its natural sense. For this alone was capable of being sanctified by the prayers of the priest, which the mystical bread which came down from heaven could by no means be, for this would rather sanctify the priests themselves. After he has distinguished the holy bread from common and not hallowed bread, lest the distinction should not be sufficient, he adds, 'the bread of eternal life,'—that is, conferring or promoting eternal life. For before the Supper of our Lord Jesus Christ, ordinary and visible bread was enough to support our failing life. But that He might restore to the soul eternal life, He instituted His Supper, calling the things that are not as those that are, the small things the things that are great. What follows—'On which vouchsafe to look with propitious and serene eye,'—leads me to ask, How can it possibly appear . . . that the Church can think it necessary or becoming to entreat God the Father to 'look with propitious and serene countenance' on the whole body of Christ, or a part of it, which, as it is advanced to a state of incorruption and impassibility, has no place remaining for propitiation? In the sentence which follows—'And accept it as Thou deignedst to accept the gifts of Thy righteous son Abel and the sacrifice of the patriarch Abraham, and that which Thy high-priest Melchisedec offered unto Thee'—how truly does the light shine out of darkness, while the doctrine of Lanfranc comprehendeth it not? For who can be so insane, so besotted, as to listen to anyone who should compare the body of Christ with the lambs of Abel or the bread and wine of Melchisedec, so as to make it probable or worthy of God for every priest to supplicate the Father that He might accept the incomparably

higher offering no otherwise than He has accepted the incomparably lower one? In the following words, 'Command these things to be carried by the hands of Thy angel to Thine altar on high,' I ask, What other things could the Church have in mind but that the bread and wine should be borne to the sublime altar of God? . . . In the words which follow—'through whom always Thou Lord dost create all these good things, sanctify, vivify and bless them'—what can 'these good things' mean, unless it be the creatures of bread and wine, which the divine power ever sets forth for human sight, and sanctifies and gives life to, by the spiritual efficacy of religion?—sanctifies, gives life to and blesses, although they are corruptible and visible, invisibly making them capable of blessing, sanctifying and enlivening the children of light in the churches. The prayer that the sacrifice of the people of God may be carried into the presence of the Divine Majesty, means that the very angels, who are the temples of God, in whom the Deity dwells, rejoice worthily in the acts of the Christian people, the Divine Majesty beholding their joy in His temple, wherein He is ever present with them."

The conviction that thousands in every age of the Church's history have interpreted and used the prayers of the mass in this spiritual meaning cannot but be a source of consolation to those who have succeeded them in the open profession of the same evangelical belief. To these prayers the earlier Reformers turned in defence of their eucharistic doctrine, and Luther himself is said to have derived from the commendation of the body of Christ to the ministry of angels the earliest perception of the true nature of the presence of Christ in the Sacrament, whose glorified body could need no such angelic intervention.

The ancient commentators on the "Canon of the Mass"—Alcuinus, Walafridus, Rupertus, Amalarius, and all the mediæval ritualists—confirm the view which Berengarius expressed on the nature of the presence which is implied in all its prayers; and we may well entertain the hope that this ancient and beautiful ritual may be the means of extricating the Church of Rome from the labyrinth of human subtlety in which the simple and beneficent institution of the Last Supper has been hidden for centuries from its faith.¹

The doctrine of Berengarius gained life and strength in every subsequent age, and by its vigorous advocacy in the great treatise of Wiclif has become the inalienable inheritance

¹ The writer offered once to prove to his late friend, Canon Rock, the greatest ritualist of the Roman Church in England, the absolute incompatibility of the Canon of the Mass and the doctrine of the ancient ritualists with the modern doctrines of his church.

of our Church. It found an eloquent expression in the writings even of the famous Puritan Dr. Owen who held against the Zwinglian debased interpretation of the words of our Lord—the doctrine of the reality of His presence in this His last gift to the Church. He shows with his usual beauty of illustration that it represents to us the threefold office of Christ as our prophet, priest, and king: “For the institution of this ordinance was in the close of His ministry, or prophetic office, on the earth, and in the entrance of the exercise of His priestly office, in offering Himself a sacrifice unto God for the sins of the Church. Between them both, and to render them both effectual unto us, He interposed an act of His kingly office in the institution of this ordinance.”¹ How greatly this threefold view of Christ in His last gift to mankind is darkened by the doctrine of a corporal presence, in which the visible priest is substituted for the invisible and a carnal for a spiritual communion must be obvious to every one who thinks seriously on the end and design of the institution and the reason for its perpetual obligation. Nor can we be too grateful to those who from the darkness and gloom of mediæval superstition kept the light of truth burning, and have handed down to us their testimony, often sealed with their martyrdom; among whom none has been more influential than Berengarius, whose name will ever find a place among the noblest of those who in every age have laboured “to vindicate truth from an ignominious bondage,” and like the prophets of the former Church, were as “a light that shineth in a dark place,” heralding the dawn of a brighter day.

ROBERT C. JENKINS.

ART. III.—THE SERVANT OF CHRIST.

X. LOYALTY.

THE warm-hearted, vigorous, and practical old Apostle who told us to “Honour the king,”² lived under one of the very worst and wickedest rulers who ever disgraced mankind. Nero was already stained with every kind of vice and infamy. Even the heathen world was ashamed of his enormous immorality. He had already poisoned his brother-in-law, the heir of the Roman empire. He had already murdered his mother. He had already had his wife put to death on a false charge of adultery. The year after St. Peter wrote these words, when the great fire took place which destroyed two-

¹ Sermons, fol. edit., 1721, p. 510.

² 1 Pet. ii. 17.