

Association of Hebrew Catholics Lecture Series
The Mystery of Israel and the Church

Spring 2016 – Series 17

On the Eucharist

Talk #10

Errors Concerning Transubstantiation



© **Dr. Lawrence Feingold STD**

Associate Professor of Theology and Philosophy

Kenrick-Glennon Seminary, Archdiocese of St. Louis, Missouri

Note: This document contains the unedited text of Dr. Feingold's talk.

It will eventually undergo final editing for inclusion in the series of books being published by

The Miriam Press under the series title: "The Mystery of Israel and the Church".

If you find errors of any type, please send your observations to lfeingold@hebrewcatholic.org

This document may be copied and given to others. It may not be modified, sold, or placed on any web site.

The actual recording of this talk, as well as the talks from all series, may be found on the AHC website at:

<http://www.hebrewcatholic.net/studies/mystery-of-israel-church/>



Association of Hebrew Catholics • 4120 W Pine Blvd • Saint Louis MO 63108

www.hebrewcatholic.net • ahc@hebrewcatholic.org

Errors Concerning Transubstantiation

A Gallup poll was commissioned in 1992 by Fr. Peter Stravinskias, editor of *The Catholic Answer*¹ to ask Catholics how they understood the Real Presence and transubstantiation. They were asked which of the following four statements they would agree with:

1) When receiving Holy Communion, you are “really and truly receiving the Body and Blood, Soul and Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, under the appearance of bread and wine.”

2) When receiving Holy Communion, you are “receiving bread and wine, which symbolize the spirit and teachings of Jesus, and in so doing are expressing your attachment to His person and His words.”

3) When receiving Holy Communion, you are “receiving bread and wine in which Jesus is really and truly present.”

4) When receiving Holy Communion, you are “receiving the Body and Blood of Christ, which has become that because of your personal belief.”

The second position is the heresy of Berengarius, Zwingli, and Calvin; the third is that of Luther; and the fourth is that of Melancthon and the Anglicans, as well as Luther.

Unfortunately, only thirty percent of the Catholics interviewed came up with the right answer, infallibly defined by the Church in the Council of Trent. This shows us the great need for a more effective catechesis on the fundamental dogmas of the Catholic faith.

Berengarius

The doctrine of transubstantiation (present in the Fathers of the Church, but without technical terminology) was expressed more clearly when the Church had to combat the heresy of the denial of the Eucharistic conversion of the substance of the bread and wine into the substance of Christ. A denial of the Real and substantial Presence of Christ in the Eucharist became a serious problem in the West only in the eleventh century,² coinciding with a certain rationalist tendency of that time. Berengarius, who was a theologian and an expert in dialectics, dared to deny the possibility of the Eucharistic conversion, which would later be called transubstantiation. Although claiming to hold

¹ See the article by James D. Davidson in *Commonweal*, Oct. 12, 2001, found online at <http://www.freerepublic.com/focus/f-religion/1138340/replies?c=6>.

² The doctrine of Berengarius was a further development of one current of Eucharistic doctrine in the ninth century represented by Retramnus of Corbie and Rabanus Maurus, in a polemic with the more orthodox doctrine of Paschasius Radbertus, who wrote *De Corpore et Sanguinis Domini liber*. For this ninth-century controversy, see O'Connor, *The Hidden Manna*, 85–94.

the faith of the Church concerning the “Real Presence,” Berengarius firmly denied the conversion of the substance of bread and wine into the real substance of Christ, because he thought such a conversion was impossible. He thought it was contradictory to affirm that the host becomes the body of Christ as it is in heaven; for how could the body of Christ which is now in heaven, necessarily limited by space, be in another place, on many altars, and in numerous hosts? Furthermore, he thought it was contradictory for the accidents of bread to remain while the substance of bread was changed into Christ. Therefore, Berengarius thought he had no choice but to view the Eucharist, after the consecration, as a mere symbol or figure of Jesus Christ, through which, “for faith and understanding,” the faithful spiritually receive the Body and Blood of Christ, although the substance of bread and wine remain.³

In answer to Berengarius, we can say that the Eucharistic conversion is unique and completely above the power of reason to verify. However, as explained above, reason can show that no contradiction is involved with regard to the place of the Body of Christ, for Christ is properly only in one place—heaven—in the way in which a body is circumscriptively measured by a place.⁴ He is in other places in a different way—through being “under” the accidents of the consecrated bread and wine, which are in their own proper places. Similarly, there is no contradiction in the miracle of the accidents of the bread and wine remaining without inhering in a substance, since the power of God can directly sustain them. For anything that a creature can do, God can also do. Thus as the substance of bread and wine formerly sustained the accidents that inhered in them, God can also sustain them directly without the aid of the substance of the bread and wine. Since these things are not contradictory, they are not impossible for God.

Berengarius’ views caused scandal among the faithful, and he was repeatedly forced to recant. In the Council of Rome in 1079 under St. Gregory VII, Berengarius professed the following formula of faith which perfectly expresses the mind of the Church:

I believe in my heart and openly profess that the bread

³ See the letter from Berengarius to Adelman, Bishop of Brescia, quoted in O'Connor, *The Hidden Manna*, p. 100: “I am able to concede that, after the Consecration, the bread and wine themselves have become, for faith and understanding, the Body and Blood of Christ.”

⁴ “Circumscriptive” refers to the way in which the different parts of a body correspond with or are measured by different parts of its place. See the Thomistic thesis 12 (decree *Postquam sanctissimus* of 27 July 1914): “It is also quantity that makes a body to be circumscriptively in one place and to be incapable, by any means, of such a presence in any other place.”

and wine placed upon the altar are, by the mystery of the sacred prayer and the words of the Redeemer, **substantially changed** [*substantialiter converti*] **into the true and life-giving flesh and blood of Jesus Christ our Lord**, and that after the consecration there is present the true body of Christ which was born of the Virgin and offered up for the salvation of the world, being hung on the cross and now sits at the right hand of the Father, and there is present the true blood of Christ which flowed from His side. They are present not only by means of a sign and of the efficacy of the sacrament, but also in the very reality and truth of their **nature and substance**.⁵

This profession of faith is a milestone because it includes for the first time in a Magisterial document the notion of *substantial conversion* as the key to understanding how Christ comes to be truly present in the Eucharist. Although the term “transubstantiation” is not used in this profession of faith, the notion of it is contained in the expression “substantially converted.”

The substantial conversion began to be expressed by the term “transubstantiation” in the following century. It first appears in the papal Magisterium in a letter of Pope Innocent III,⁶ and in the Creed of the Fourth Lateran Council of 1215:

In this Church Jesus Christ is both priest and sacrifice. In the Sacrament of the Altar, under the species of bread and wine, his Body and Blood are truly contained, the bread having been transubstantiated into his Body and the wine into his Blood by the divine power. In order to complete the Mystery of unity, we receive from him what he received from us. And no one is able to confect this Sacrament except the priest who is properly ordained.⁷

The fruits of the controversy over Berengarius were, on the one hand, an increase in the understanding of the dogma of the Real Presence and transubstantiation, as well as a beautiful growth in devotion to the Blessed Sacrament throughout the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, culminating in the Eucharistic teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas and the institution of the feast of Corpus Christi in 1264, for which St. Thomas wrote the liturgical office. However, on the negative side, Berengarius sowed the seeds of doubt that spread to others like John Wycliffe, a heretic of the late fourteenth century who was very influential on Martin Luther.

⁵ Council of Rome, February 11, 1079, D 355. An earlier regional council of 1059 had used a less perfect terminology: “The bread and wine on the altar after the consecration are not only the sacrament but the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ and that they are such not only sacramentally but sensibly and not only sacramentally but in reality to be handled and broken by the hands of the priests and to be chewed by the teeth of the faithful.” Translation in Roch Kereszty, *Wedding Feast of the Lamb*, 132.

⁶ See Innocent III, letter to the Archbishop of Paris of Nov. 29, 1202, quoted in O’Connor, *The Hidden Manna*, 185, DS 782.

⁷ Fourth Lateran Council, DS 802, translation in O’Connor, *The Hidden Manna*, 186.

Protestant Errors on the Eucharist

The doctrine of transubstantiation and the Real Presence was defined again more fully in the Council of Trent to combat the errors of Luther and the other “reformers” who fell in various ways into the errors of Berengarius. There is no one Protestant position on the Eucharist, for the different Protestant leaders immediately split into various factions that were violently opposed to one another, and they considered each other heretical.

The one thing uniting the Protestants with respect to the Eucharist was their vehement rejection of transubstantiation (and the sacrifice of the Mass), which they held to be a quintessential “Romish” superstition. They were united only in the belief that the substance of the bread and the wine continue to exist on the altar after the consecration is performed. Luther vigorously maintained belief in some kind of “real presence” in the Eucharist (together with the presence of the bread and wine), while more radical Protestants saw the Eucharist as a mere commemorative symbol.

Ulrich Zwingli and the “Sacramentarians”

Let us begin with the more radical Protestant position which reduces Christ’s “presence” in the Eucharist to a mere symbol. This view was first maintained by Ulrich (or Huldrych) Zwingli, a Catholic priest (ordained 1506) and Swiss Reformer, as well as by Luther’s older colleague, Andreas Karlstadt (ordained a priest in 1510), and their followers. This group of Protestants was blasted by Luther as heretics, to which he gave the name “Sacramentarians.”

This more radical group of Protestants who directly denied the Real Presence had a formidable task to explain the meaning of the four words, “This is my Body.” Karlstadt, who was the first of the Protestants to deny the Real Presence, said that when Christ said, “This is my body,” He was pointing to himself and simply indicating that His body was to be given up for them on the following day! Therefore, according to this interpretation He never meant to affirm that the bread was converted into His body. This interpretation is absurd, for Christ said, “*Take, eat; this is my body*” (Mt 26:26).

Zwingli gave a different interpretation, saying that the “*is*” uttered by Christ should be interpreted to mean “*signifies*.” Thus the words of Christ at the Last Supper should be understood as: “Take, eat, this bread *signifies* my Body.” For Zwingli, the Eucharist is like a ring with a portrait engraved on it that a husband might give his spouse before going on a long journey to remind her of him during his absence.⁸ However, this interpretation (although not quite as absurd as that of Karlstadt) was clearly violating the evident sense of the words—“*This is my body*.”

⁸ This was the analogy used by Zwingli in the Memoir that he addressed to the princes assembled in Augsburg.

Furthermore, we may answer that God is a bit more powerful than the husband in Zwingli's analogy who could only give a ring or a picture to his wife upon leave-taking. The miracle of the Eucharist in which Christ leaves *His very self* as an inheritance to His Church, is perfectly in accordance with God's omnipotence and infinite love for man. Zwingli has reduced God to the level of a mere mortal man. His position clearly continues the rationalist line begun by Berengarius 450 years earlier. He states that the Eucharist is nothing more than a symbol of Christ and His power, which *involves no miracle or mystery*, and serves only to excite our faith and to commemorate Christ's Passion. We may apply to Zwingli the words directed by Our Lord to the Sadducees when they denied the doctrine of the Resurrection: "You err because you know neither the Scriptures nor the power of God" (Mt 22:29).

A sixteenth-century author wrote a book on the various rival Protestant interpretations, which he numbered at about two hundred.⁹ Among them was one radical Protestant, Oecolampadius, who interpreted the word "body" to mean "symbol of my body." Thus the four words of institution would mean: "This is a symbol-of-my-body." Obviously, this attempt is no better than that of Zwingli. Others have understood "body" as referring to Christ's mystical Body, the Church. This makes even less sense, for how can a person receive the whole Church in Communion?

John Calvin

John Calvin has a position that is more radical than Luther's and continues the line of Zwingli and the Sacramentarians, although he tried to make it seem more acceptable to the Lutherans so as to take away the appearance of division among the Protestants. He wrote to Melancthon:

It is of the utmost importance that no suspicion of the divisions that are among us come to the attention of future centuries. For it is the most ridiculous thing imaginable that after dividing ourselves from the rest of the world, we were so little in agreement among ourselves right from the beginning of our Reform.¹⁰

Like Berengarius and Zwingli, Calvin thought the Catholic dogma of the Real Presence was in contradiction with the glorious state of Christ's body physically present in heaven, and held that Christ is present in the Eucharist only as a symbol which has *a certain power to strengthen our faith*. Calvin emphasizes in this way the presence of a

spiritual power of Christ in the Eucharist, which Zwingli did not so clearly acknowledge.

In order to make peace with the Lutherans, Calvin maintained a certain mysterious "dynamic" presence of Christ in the Eucharist *through faith*. By receiving the Eucharist in faith, one receives the spirit of Christ and a certain power of Christ to vivify our faith. This is indeed true, but it is much too little. The problem with Calvin's position is in what he denies: Christ's substantial and corporeal presence in the Eucharist.¹¹ All of the sacraments have the spiritual power to give us the grace of Christ and strengthen our faith. However, the Eucharist not only contains the power of Christ to give grace, but it contains Christ Himself, whole and entire, the author of grace and the author of our faith.

The Calvinist view therefore, like that of Zwingli, corresponds to the second option from the Gallup poll: when receiving Holy Communion, you are "*receiving bread and wine, which symbolize the spirit and teachings of Jesus, and in so doing are expressing your attachment to His person and His words*" and thus nourishing your faith.

The positions of Zwingli, Karlstadt, Calvin, and their followers, were rejected by the Council of Trent with the following infallible condemnation:

If anyone denies that the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ and, therefore, the whole Christ is truly, really, and substantially contained in the sacrament of the most holy Eucharist, but says that Christ is present in the Sacrament only as in a sign or figure, or by his power: let him be anathema.¹²

Luther's Position on the Real Presence

Luther's position on the Eucharist consists in attempting to maintain belief in the Real Presence while denying the Catholic dogma of transubstantiation, on the one hand, but also denying the more radical Protestant heresy of reducing Christ's presence in the Eucharist entirely to the level of a mere symbol, on the other. Luther, with his characteristic virulence, rejected both of these teachings as heresies and blasphemies, and sought an intermediate position.

It is not clear why Luther rejected transubstantiation so forcefully. Perhaps it was because of his passionate rejection of scholastic theology in general, and Thomism in particular. However, he never wished to directly deny the Real Presence, because of the force of the words of Christ in the institution of the Eucharist (and perhaps also simply because the doctrine appealed to his heart). He wrote to the Christians of Strasburg in 1524: "I am caught, I cannot escape, the text is too forcible."¹³ He gave three different although complementary explanations to justify the Real Presence, while denying transubstantiation. The tragedy

⁹ Christopher Rasperger, *Ducentæ verborum, 'Hoc est corpus meum' interpretationes* (Ingolstadt, 1577).

¹⁰ John Calvin, cited in E. Mangenot, *Dictionnaire de théologie catholique: contenant l'exposé des doctrines de la théologie catholique, leurs preuves et leur histoire/commencé sous la direction de A. Vacant; continué sous celle de E. Mangenot; avec concours d'un grand nombre de collaborateurs*, "Eucharistie," vol. 5 (Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1903-1950 [i.e. 1899-1950]), p. 1342.

¹¹ Calvin's position was condemned in the Council of Trent.

¹² Council of Trent (1551): DS 1651.

¹³ De Wette, II, 577.

is that this cannot be coherently done, for transubstantiation is the only foundation for the Real Presence in the full Catholic sense.

Luther's first explanation is known as "consubstantiation" or "com-panation." This holds that the bread and wine remain, but that somehow Jesus comes into them through faith and *co-exists with them*. Thus the consecrated host would be both bread and Christ at the same time.

Note that even Luther himself, who gloried in sticking to the plain sense of Scripture, was forced to interpret the words of institution against their natural sense, understanding them to mean: or "*Here in this bread is my body,*" or "*Here present in, with, or under the bread is my Body.*" On the contrary, Christ said "*This is my Body.*" Therefore, the substance indicated by the pronoun "this" is no longer bread, but Christ's body.

Luther's position is obviously not the Catholic view. The bread *becomes* the Body of Christ, is *converted* into the Body of Christ, but we cannot say that the Body of Christ is *in* the bread. Nor do the words of Christ affirm this.

This view of Luther—consubstantiation or companation—corresponds to the third option in the Gallup poll mentioned above: When receiving Holy Communion, you are "*receiving bread and wine in which Jesus is really and truly present.*" Ten percent of Catholics chose this option in that poll. This error of consubstantiation was infallibly condemned by Trent:

If anyone says that in the sacred and holy sacrament of the Eucharist there *remains the substance of bread and wine together with the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ*, and denies that wonderful and singular conversion of the *whole substance of the bread* into the Body, and of the *entire substance of the wine* into the Blood, the species (appearance) of the bread and wine only remaining, a change which the Catholic Church most fittingly calls *transubstantiation*: let him be anathema.¹⁴

Luther was in a terrible bind, denying transubstantiation but seeking to affirm the Real Presence. In what seems to be a kind of intellectual desperation, he sought support for his doctrine of consubstantiation in a second doctrine known as "ubiquitism." He reasoned that the humanity of Christ is united to the divinity, and since the divinity is omnipresent, giving being to all things, so also the humanity of Christ must be present in all things. In consequence, therefore, He is also present in the Eucharist in the consecrated bread and the wine.

The obvious problem with this solution is that if it were to prove anything it would prove too much, for it would hold that the Body of Christ is present also in the unconsecrated host, and indeed in all of our food and in everything else, and that we should venerate all of reality as Catholics venerate the Blessed Sacrament. This doc-

trine eliminates the distinction between the sacred and the profane, between the sacraments and nature. The fact that the *divinity* of Christ is present in all places through His power, giving them being, in no way implies that the human Body of Christ is equally present in all places, for the two natures of Christ remain distinct, each with its own properties. Luther's error here consists in confusing and fusing the two natures, which was the earlier heresy of monophysitism.

A third error of Luther and other Protestants is the restriction of the "Real Presence" to the moment in which the sacrament is received in faith. Thus there would not be an abiding presence of Christ in the sacrament conserved in the tabernacle. It seems that this error was not the original thought of Luther, but rather the position of his disciple Melancthon, who convinced Luther to accept it in the Confession of Wittenberg of 1536 in order to develop a compromise position that could unite the various Protestant factions. This position clearly is incompatible with the objective nature of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist and tends toward the Calvinist "dynamic" view. It also makes the presence of Christ dependent not on the words of consecration of the priest who speaks in the person of Christ, but on the personal faith of the person who receives communion.

This view of Melancthon corresponds with the fourth option in the Gallup poll: When receiving Holy Communion, you are "*receiving the Body and Blood of Christ, which has become that because of your personal belief.*" Twenty-three percent of Catholics subscribed to this heretical view. This view is also infallibly condemned in the Council of Trent:

If any one says that after the consecration the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ are not present in the marvelous sacrament of the Eucharist, but are present only in the use of the sacrament while it is being received, and not either before or after; and that the true body of the Lord does not remain in the consecrated hosts or particles that are kept or are left over after communion: let him be anathema.¹⁵

Anglican View

Although the Anglican Church allows great doctrinal liberty to her members, common Anglican doctrine on the Eucharist is taken from Luther. Anglicans (and Episcopalians) generally teach that Christ is "really present" in the Eucharist in a manner similar to Luther, and they restrict His presence to *the moment in which the Eucharist is consumed in faith*, and only for the person who consumes it in faith. Therefore, it is a presence that is more subjective than objective. This interpretation tends inevitably towards the Calvinist view that holds the Eucharist to be only a symbol of Christ, without objective presence.

¹⁴ Council of Trent, Session 13, canon 2 (italics mine).

¹⁵ Council of Trent, Session 13, canon 4.

This doctrine has great practical consequences regarding the cult of the Eucharist. One immediate consequence of this minimal and subjective interpretation of the Real Presence is the Anglican practice of throwing away unused hosts and unconsumed portions of the consecrated wine after Communion. St. Elizabeth Ann Seton, who was a convert from the Episcopalian Church, was horrified at this practice even before her conversion. However, we know that the Anglicans have not had a valid Eucharist since the sixteenth century when they lost the Apostolic Succession and thus the sacrament of Holy Orders.¹⁶

An inevitable consequence of this Protestant view is the absence of all types of Eucharistic adoration, for if they do not hold Christ to be present except at the moment of communion, there can be no adoration apart from communion. All Protestants, whatever their differences, tend to agree in this rejection of Eucharistic adoration.

The Council of Trent vigorously reaffirmed the great merit of Eucharistic adoration:

There can be no doubt, then, that the faithful of Christ, in accordance with the perpetual custom of the Catholic Church, venerate this most holy Sacrament with the worship of latria which is due to the true God. . . . For in this Sacrament we believe that the same God is present whom the eternal Father brought into the world, saying of him: “And let all the angels of God adore him” (Heb 1:6). It is the same God whom the magi fell down and worshipped and, finally, the same God whom the apostles adored in Galilee as Scripture says (see Mt 28:17).

The holy Council furthermore declares that the custom which has grown up in the Church of God of honoring this great and adorable Sacrament with special worship and solemnity on a particular feast day each year, and the custom of carrying the Sacrament in procession through the streets and public places with reverence and respect, are good and very religious customs.¹⁷

Jansenism

The Jansenists were a heretical strain of Catholics active in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries who sought to incorporate Calvinist ideas regarding grace and free will into the Catholic faith. With regard to the Eucharist, they introduced two errors. They were fiercely opposed to frequent Communion by the faithful, thus denying proper access to the fountain of grace that is the Eucharist. In addition, without directly denying the doctrine of transubstantiation, they simply proposed to let the term fall into oblivion, teaching the fact of the Real Presence without mentioning that word. This pastoral strategy was condemned by Pius VI in the Bull *Auctorem fidei* of 1794, as “pernicious and injurious to the exposition of the truth

of the Catholic faith with regard to the dogma of transubstantiation and such as to promote heresy.”

Paul VI, in *Mysterium fidei* 24, likewise maintains the importance of the term “transubstantiation:

And so the rule of language which the Church has established through the long labor of centuries, with the help of the Holy Spirit, and which she has confirmed with the authority of the Councils, and which has more than once been the watchword and banner of orthodox faith, is to be religiously preserved, and no one may presume to change it at his own pleasure or under the pretext of new knowledge.

Contemporary Rejections of Transubstantiation

The importance for Catholic theology of a right philosophy of creation has been illustrated recently in attempts to reinterpret transubstantiation on the basis of an idealist philosophy. In the 1960s and 1970s certain dissenting theologians proposed to replace the venerable term of “transubstantiation” by modifying it to “trans-signification” or “trans-finalization.” Although these terms may sound more sophisticated than the original Protestant positions of Zwingli or Calvin, they in fact mean the same thing.

The theologians who propose this new theory are influenced by the philosophy of existentialism, according to which the objective “being” of things is rejected and the “*substance*” of things is identified with the *significance* they hold for us. According to this idealist and subjectivist philosophical position, the real presence (together with all objective realities) loses its objective meaning, and transubstantiation becomes equated with trans-signification. The problem is that this philosophy is completely incompatible with the Catholic faith, and also with common sense itself. A false human philosophy is being followed above the Word of God as interpreted by the infallible Magisterium of the Church.

In 1965, Paul VI, in the encyclical *Mysterium fidei* 10-12, called attention to these errors which were beginning to circulate among theologians. He writes:

For We can see that some of those who are dealing with this Most Holy Mystery in speech and writing are disseminating opinions on Masses celebrated in private or on the dogma of transubstantiation that are disturbing the minds of the faithful and causing them no small measure of confusion about matters of faith, just as if it were all right for someone to take doctrine that has already been defined by the Church and consign it to oblivion or else interpret it in such a way as to weaken the genuine meaning of the words or the recognized force of the concepts involved.

To give an example of what We are talking about, it is not permissible to extol the so-called “community” Mass in such a way as to detract from Masses that are celebrated privately; or to concentrate on the notion of sacramental sign as if the symbolism—which no one will deny is certainly present in

¹⁶ See Leo XIII, encyclical On the Nullity of Anglican Orders *Apostolicae curae* of 1896.

¹⁷ Council of Trent, Session 13, chapter 5.

the Most Blessed Eucharist—*fully expressed and exhausted the manner of Christ's presence in this Sacrament*; or to discuss the mystery of transubstantiation without mentioning what the Council of Trent had to say about the marvelous conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the Body and the whole substance of the wine into the Blood of Christ, as if they involve nothing more than “*transignification*,” or “*transfinalization*” as they call it; or, finally, to propose and act upon the opinion that Christ Our Lord is no longer present in the consecrated Hosts that remain after the celebration of the sacrifice of the Mass has been completed.

Everyone can see that the spread of these and similar opinions does great harm to belief in and devotion to the Eucharist [*italics mine*].

These errors mentioned by Paul VI are typical Protestant errors concerning the Eucharist, already condemned by the Council of Trent, although now clothed with a new terminology and a new philosophical justification taken from existentialism. The Pope refutes the notion of transignification as follows:

As a result of transubstantiation, the species of bread and wine undoubtedly take on a new signification and a new finality, for they are no longer ordinary bread and wine but instead a sign of something sacred and a sign of spiritual food; but they take on this new signification, this new finality, precisely because they contain a new “reality” which we can rightly call ontological. For what now lies beneath the aforementioned species is not what was there before, but something completely different; and not just in the estimation of Church belief but in reality, since once the substance or nature of the bread and wine has been changed into the body and blood of Christ, nothing remains of the bread and the wine except for the species—beneath which Christ is present whole and entire in His physical “reality,” corporeally present, although not in the manner in which bodies are in a place.¹⁸

Summary of Teachings on the Real Presence and Transubstantiation

What follows is a summary of the principal truths that have been explained above and which have all been infallibly defined:

1. Christ is present in the Eucharist, whole and entire, with a substantial presence.
2. At the words of the consecration, the substance of the bread and the wine are converted into the substance of Christ, a unique conversion fittingly called *transubstantiation*. Only this doctrine offers a coherent explanation of the real and substantial presence of our Lord in the Most Blessed Sacrament.
3. The substance of the bread and wine do not remain after the consecration.
4. Christ's substantial presence under the consecrated species remains as long as the appearances of bread and wine have not been corrupted and transformed into something else (as occurs in digestion after some 10 or 20 minutes).
5. Christ is contained whole and entire under each species. One who receives only the Host or only the Chalice still receives the whole Christ.
6. Christ is contained whole and entire in every part of either species. Thus a broken particle of the host or a drop of wine from the chalice contains the whole Christ.
7. Christ present in the Eucharist is entitled to the adoration and the worship of latria proper to God alone.
8. Because the Eucharist deserves the worship of latria, it is very fitting for the Church to institute and promote Eucharistic adoration.

¹⁸ *Mysterium fidei* 46.