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Abstract

This thesis begins by surveying two issues of the Reformation era: namely, the role of images in religion and the controversy on the Eucharist. The Fathers at the Council of Trent responded by affirming the doctrine of the Real Presence in the Eucharist and decreed that by “paintings and other representations the people is instructed, and confirmed in remembering ...the articles of faith.” This thesis examines how Tridentine Eucharistic theology was visually transmitted in a variety of artistic media in France and the Spanish Netherlands between 1561-1640’s, where belief in the Real Presence was challenged by the Calvinist profession of Faith. The Leonard Limosin enamel, *The Triumph of the Eucharist*, ca 1561-62, was possibly the first image in this period to present the Eucharist visually identifying belief in the doctrine of the Real Presence with the Catholic Church. This thesis investigates the occasion, the commissioning and function of that enamel. It explores whether that enamel was in any way typical of the portrayal of the Eucharist in France and the neighbouring Spanish Netherlands in the later sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries. Furthermore, it examines in what other ways Catholic belief in the Real Presence was represented in art in those countries in this period and who were the main patrons of such art. It will be argued that there were recurring themes in those representations of the Eucharist which attested to Catholic belief in transubstantiation. Such belief was visually being authenticated in many of those images by frequent inclusion of the Fathers of the Church and the doctrine of Apostolic Succession.
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The church has long since joined in alliance with you (artists). You have built and adorned her temples, celebrated her dogmas, enriched her liturgy. You have aided her in translating her divine message in the language of forms and figures, making the invisible world palpable....

Message “To Artists” read at the conclusion of Vatican II on December 8, 1965, by Leo Cardinal Suenens.¹

The Council Fathers at Vatican II in their document on “Liturgy” explained the changes being mandated regarding the celebration of the Mass, were made to make the meaning of the Mass “more intelligible.”² While the Fathers at the Council of Trent in the sixteenth century discussed the question of introducing the vernacular into the Mass, no such change was made. Latin continued to be the language of the liturgy until well into the second half of the twentieth century. Thus, it might well be argued that in the aftermath of the Council of Trent, the visual arts played a vital part in transmitting doctrine to the laity, “making the invisible world palpable”. In fact, the Fathers acknowledged such a role in their decree “On the Invocation, Veneration, and Relics of Saints, and on Sacred Images”, when they declared:

...the bishops shall carefully teach this, that, by means of the histories of the mystery of our Redemption, portrayed by paintings or other representations, the people is instructed, and confirmed in the habit of remembering, and continually revolving in mind the articles of faith.³

It is the contention of this thesis that art, through various means, painting, engraving, stained glass and tapestry, was a most effective transmitter of the “mystery of our Redemption”, and in particular of the mystery of the Real Presence in the Eucharist. For hundreds of years the Eucharist had traditionally been represented in art through

images of the Last Supper. Emile Mâle observed that through the Middle Ages artists had focused on the dramatic moment when Christ announced that one of his disciples was to betray him. Now in the polemical climate of the Reformation when the doctrine of transubstantiation was challenged by Protestant Reformers the focus in the Last Supper shifted rather to that moment when Christ took the bread and pronounced the words, “This is my body”. More often the setting of the Last Supper was left aside to focus directly on the chalice and host; and often those elements were portrayed triumphantly held aloft while the chariot of the Church rode roughshod over a mound of heretics.

Late in 1561 or early 1562, French ceramicist, Leonard Limosin, was commissioned to paint an enamel plaque known as *Triumph of the Eucharist*. This may well be the first art piece of the Catholic Reformation to present the Eucharist in this manner. Sixty years later in the Spanish Netherlands, Peter Paul Rubens painted a very similar design for a tapestry in a series on the Eucharist, calling it *The Triumph of the Church*. Rubens’s design was copied, sometimes with minor variations in paintings, engravings and tapestry attesting to the interest in such a presentation of the Church and the Eucharist as originally represented in that Limosin enamel.

There are many questions which the Limosin enamel poses: who might have commissioned such a piece, what was the occasion for such a commission and who are the individuals portrayed in it? Was this design in any way typical of the portrayal of the Eucharist in art in France and the neighbouring Netherlands in the later sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries? In what other ways might the Eucharist have been represented in art in those countries in the Catholic Reformation?

One historian has argued that the Eucharist became “the emblematic focus of the struggle between Catholics and Protestants” in the Reformation of the sixteenth

---


5 This piece, now in the Frick Collection, New York, is titled, *the Triumph of the Eucharist and the Catholic Faith*. 
Certainly, the subject of the Eucharist was on the agenda at all three gatherings of the Fathers of Trent and became the subject of many canons and decrees issued by the Council in its affirmation of the doctrine of transubstantiation.

The question of the role of images in religion was also argued at Trent, and as the quotation in paragraph one here indicates, their legitimacy in portraying the mysteries of our Redemption was affirmed. This thesis brings together two controversies of the Reformation: the debates on the role of images in religion and the theology of the Eucharist, and examines how the doctrine of the Real Presence was transmitted in the visual arts in those two countries, France and the Netherlands, where the doctrine of transubstantiation was challenged by Calvinists.

---

CHAPTER 1

Image Debate

Possibly one of the earliest images in Christian art is one referring to the Eucharist. In the crypt of Lucien in the catacomb of Priscilla, and dating from late in the second century, is a wall drawing of a fish carrying on its back a basket of bread. A wine flask can be detected in the bread-basket. The acrostic, the first letters in Greek of the title, Jesus Christ, Son of God, Saviour, form the Greek word for fish, this with the bread and wine has been interpreted as an allusion to the saying of Jesus, “I am the bread of life” (Jn.6:35). In the Cappella Greca in the same catacomb and dating from early in the third century is a fresco known as “The Breaking of the Bread”. In such representations the early Christians gave visual expression of their faith in the mystery of the Eucharist.¹

However, the place of images in Christian liturgy and piety has often been controversial. Precisely at the time when Christian art began to appear in frescoes in the catacombs, a church assembly, the Council of Elvira (305), and early Fathers such as Tertullian and Origen warned Christians of the danger of images.² At the same time St. Basil defended the value of religious art. Responding to the criticism that the faithful were worshipping images, he argued that the faithful saw through the material artefact and venerated the spirit and example of the saint represented.³ Almost two centuries later, Pope St Gregory, adopting a similar stance handed down what might be regarded as the first authoritative Church teaching on the role of images. Prompted by the action of Serenus, Bishop of Marseilles in destroying some

³ St Basil, On the Holy Spirit, PG 32: 149C.
images in his church because he believed that certain members of his congregation were worshipping them Gregory replied by pointing out their value:

For pictures are used in churches for this reason: that those who are ignorant of letters may at least read what they cannot read in books by looking at the walls. Therefore, my brother, you should have preserved the images and at the same time prohibited the people from worshipping them. 4

The *libri pauperum* dictum of Pope Gregory became the standard teaching, certainly in the Western Church though not without further occasional challenge. Claudius, Bishop of Turin early in the ninth century undertook the destruction of images, which, like Serenus of Marseilles, he considered were being worshipped in the churches of his city. Meantime, in the Eastern Church criticism of images came to a head leading to the iconoclasm there in the eighth century. St. John of Damascus in his *Apologia Against Those Who Decry Images* (726), grounded his defence of the veneration of images on what might be termed an incarnational theology: that God, by taking flesh in Christ, worked out our salvation through matter. "You, who refuse to worship images, would not worship the Son of God, the Living Image of the invisible God." 5 In Book IV of *An Exposition of the Orthodox Faith*, St. John further developed the Incarnation argument noting also the didactic function of images, particularly for the illiterate, their aid to memory, the immanence of prototype in the image and its power to induce reverence, concluding with an appeal to the authority of tradition:

...who is capable of making a likeness of God who is invisible, incorporeal, uncircumscribable and without form? It is an act of extreme folly and impiety to figure God. Hence, the use of images was not practiced in (the times of ) the Old Testament. But since God, out of His innermost mercy, became truly man on account of our salvation, not as He had been seen in human form by Abraham and the Prophets, but verily a man in substance who lived on earth, conversed with men, worked miracles, suffered, was crucified, arose and was carried up to heaven; since all of these things happened truly and were seen by men, they were written down for the remembrance and instruction of us who were not present at the time, so that, though we had not seen, but have heard and believed,

we may be deemed worthy of the Lord’s blessing. Since, however, not everyone knows how to read or has leisure for reading, the Fathers saw fit that these things should be represented in images, like deeds of prowess, to serve as brief reminders; for often, when we are not thinking of the Lord’s passion, we fall to our knees and revere, not the matter, but the One represented; just as we do not adore the matter of the Gospel book or the matter of the cross, but that which is expressed by them...Moreover, the Apostles handed down much that was unwritten, Paul, the Apostle of the Gentiles, tells us in these words; “Therefore, brethren, stand fast and hold the traditions which you have been taught of us, whether by word or by epistle (2 Thessalonians 2:15). And to the Corinthians he writes, “Now I praise you, brethren, that you remember in all things, and keep the traditions as I have delivered them to you” (Corinthians11:2).  

The Second Council of Nicea (787) affirmed the position taken by St. John of Damascus and other iconodules when it decreed that it was “following the divinely inspired teaching of our holy Fathers, and the tradition of the Catholic Church (for we know that this tradition is of the Holy Spirit which dwells in the Church)”, the Council went on to spell out the whole possible range of images:

that venerable and holy images are set up in just the same way as the figure of the precious and life-giving cross; painted images, and those in mosaic and those of other suitable material, in the holy churches of God, on holy vessels and vestments, on walls and in pictures, in houses and by the roadsides; images of our Lord and God and Saviour Jesus Christ and of our undefiled Lady, the holy God-bearer, and of the honourable angels, and of all saintly and holy men.

And bearing in mind the injunction of St. Basil, the Fathers at Nicea were careful to insist on the distinction between worship (lateria) due to God alone and reverence (proskunesis) that may be paid to the saints:

For the more continually these (saintly and holy men) are observed by means of such representations, so much the more will the beholders be aroused to recollect the originals and to long after them, and to pay to the images the tribute of an embrace and a reverence of honour, not to pay to them the actual worship which is according to our faith, and which is proper only to the divine

---

nature...For the honour paid to the image passes to its original, and he that adores an image adores in it the person depicted thereby...7

Thus the Nicene decree affirmed the stance taken by Pope Saint Gregory and St. John of Damascus, and set the argument for the defence of images adopted down the following centuries, though the concept and style of religious painting in the West took a different turn from that of the icon writers in Byzantium.8

While the iconoclastic controversy was settled by the decrees of the Second Council of Nicea, the place of images in Western devotion continued to invoke occasional criticism such as that of St. Bernard of Clairvaux who denounced the excessive ornamentation of churches which attracts the worshipper's gaze and becomes a distraction.9 However, most theologians in the West, such as St. Bonaventure, continued to advance the didactic role of religious images, especially for the illiterate and extended the argument because:

of the sluggishness of the affections so that men who are not aroused to devotion when they hear with the ear about those things which Christ has done for us will, at least, be inspired when they see the same things in figures and pictures...For our emotion is aroused more by what is seen than by what is heard.10

Furthermore, Saint Bonaventure argued images were important; “on account of the nature of memory because those things which are only heard fall into oblivion more easily than those things which are seen.”11 In marked contrast to the argument of later Reformation Reformers, St. Bonaventure maintained that man needed material things as aids to approach the divine; the visible world itself is, in a sense, an ‘image’ of God. God is in the world by His “tracks” as is any artist in his work.

8 Eastern Orthodox Churches, consistent with their reading of the Old Testament prohibition in the Decalogue of “graven images”, have strict criteria regarding icon painting as images on flat surfaces and maintain a ban on three dimensional carved statues.
9 St. Bernard of Clairvaux, ...“we are more tempted to read in the marble than in our books and to spend the whole day wondering at these things rather than in meditating the law of God”, Apologia. Elizabeth Gilmore Holt, Documentary History of Art, Vol I. (New York: Doubleday, 1957), 20.
11 Cit. Garside, Zwingli, 91.
All created things of the sensible world lead the mind of the contemplator and wise man to eternal God...They are the shades, the resonances, the pictures of that efficient, exemplifying, and ordering art; they are the tracks, simulacra, and spectacles: they are divinely given signs set before us for the purpose of seeing God.\textsuperscript{12}

Even the ascetic Saint Bernard was forced to admit "since the devotion of the carnal populace cannot be incited with spiritual ornaments it is necessary to employ material ones."\textsuperscript{13} And no less an authority than St. Thomas Aquinas defended the place of images in Christian worship reiterating the, by then, threefold reason for their role:

...first, for the instruction of the unlettered, who might learn from them as if from books; second, so that the mystery of the Incarnation and the examples of the saints might remain more firmly in our memory by being daily represented to our eyes; and third, to excite the emotions which are more effectively aroused by things seen than by things heard.\textsuperscript{14}

Thus, in time, the material ornaments of images, along with the practice of pilgrimages, came to play an increasingly important role in religious devotion. As Margaret Aston observed, the image was not peripheral to medieval Christianity, "it was a central means for the individual to establish contact with God."\textsuperscript{15}

There is absolutely no doubt that, over time, veneration of images along with the cult of relics and of places of pilgrimage came for many of the faithful to be more a case of superstition than of genuine piety: a situation satirized by Erasmus in many of his \textit{Colloquies}. Since more than one Protestant Reformer acknowledged the influence of Erasmus in contributing towards evolving Protestant attitudes towards images, some consideration should be given to Erasmus’s position on the place of images in Christian worship. Images cannot


\textsuperscript{15} Aston, \textit{England’s Iconoclasts}, 20.
be considered in isolation but must be examined in the context of the sixteenth century polemic on Christian worship. At the heart of the question of images of Mary and of the saints is the question of Christ’s role as exclusive mediator in all divine-human encounters. It is a question of what should constitute true Christian worship and it is this issue which came to a head in the Reformation of the sixteenth century.

The principal characteristic of the life and thought of Erasmus was his desire to restore Christianity to its primitive purity. Armed with a knowledge of Greek and Latin he applied the humanist credo of *ad fontes* to studying the New Testament, especially the Epistles of St. Paul and to the writings of the Early Fathers. The contrast he drew between the early church and the contemporary church transcended more than a humanist’s philological considerations. The approach of a Christian humanist was to strip away the many accretions, which, by the sixteenth century had come to blur the purity of the early Church. Erasmus’s approach to Christian life and practice was a transcendental one. It owed much to the humanist’s understanding of Platonism, a philosophy where the chief end of human existence was the emancipation of the spirit from the material world.

In *The Enchiridion Militis Christiani*, written in 1503, Erasmus’s predilection for the spiritual and inward as opposed to the external and material in religion was best expressed.

> You can only establish perfect piety when you turn away from visible things, which are for the most part either imperfect or of themselves indifferent, and you seek instead the invisible, which corresponds to the highest part of human nature.\(^{16}\)

While the central theme of *The Enchiridion* is the development of a more intimate relationship between the individual soul and God and a disdain for the externals of religion, it is in his *Colloquies* that Erasmus fires his most bitter barbs at what he sees as insincerity and silly superstition. In “The Shipwreck” he has a sailor calling

---

on aid from Our Lady “flattering her with titles the sacred Scriptures nowhere assign to her”, and another promising St. Christopher a wax taper as big as himself, but, “lowering his voice, so St. Christopher wouldn’t hear him...Do you suppose I’m serious? If I once touch land, I won’t give him a tallow candle.” In “A Pilgrimage for Religion’s Sake”, Erasmus suggests that the shrine at Canterbury is a blot upon the memory of the martyr since St. Thomas was always a friend to the poor. “Seriously I wonder sometimes what possible excuse there could be for those who spend so much money on building, decorating and enriching churches.”

It was more than concern with the morality of expenditure on material decorations that concerned Erasmus. He questioned the veneration of the saints and dubious relics, rather than approaching Christ Himself, a concern expressed more eloquently in his poem of 1514, *The Complaint of Jesus*, where he had Jesus complain that the faithful invariably invoke the aid of the saints rather than turning to Him. It was this poem that had a profound impact on Huldrych Zwingli and to which he was to refer in his campaign for the eradication of images in Zurich.

While Erasmus’s position in regard to the veneration of saints and images may be inferred from his emphasis on the spirit in worship as advised in *The Enchiridion* and from the sarcasm of *The Colloquies*, his ultimate stance on images is more directly stated in his debate with Alberto Pio of Carpi. From 1526 to 1532 Alberto Pio and Erasmus debated the appropriateness of venerating sacred images in a series of literary exchanges. The exchange began with Pio’s charge that Erasmus must bear much of the blame for what Pio considered as the tragedy of the Protestant Reformation. Hubert Jedin acknowledges Pio’s defence of sacred images declaring that “up to the Council (of Trent) no one had better confronted the problem in its philosophical-religious aspect with the profundity and care of

---

17 Thompson, *Ten Colloquies*, 84.
the Count of Carpi.” Pio demonstrated that the use of images was supported by the Bible, practised in the early Church and ever since throughout Christendom, and approved by the testimony of church Fathers and by the decrees of popes and general councils. Erasmsus, put on the defensive and given the violence and iconoclasm that by 1525 had occurred, now propounded a more positive theology of images in his two works of 1533, *Explanatio symboli apostolorum sive catechismus* and *De sarcienda ecclesiae concordia*. He accepted the Gregorian adage that images were books for the uneducated but argued the number of images on display in churches seemed excessive. He contended that too much money was being spent on religious art, a criticism voiced by most Protestant iconomarchs. His main complaint was with the superstition that so often accompanied the veneration of images contending that so many Christians treated images in the same way as pagans did their idols. One would have to concede that Erasmus gave only a grudging tolerance to images arguing that Christians should move beyond images to a higher and more spiritual religion.

**Reformers and Images**

One of the earliest outbreaks of Reformation iconoclasm occurred in Wittenberg in 1521, incited by the preaching of Andreas Carlstadt while Martin Luther was absent at the Wartburg. An early follower of Luther, Carlstadt, had by 1521, moved to a more radical position. Carlstadt adopted a strongly spiritual view of worship totally rejecting physical aids especially images, a position shared by other Protestant reformers Zwingli and John Calvin. He stressed from the beginning the absolute primacy of the Word against tradition, and upheld the validity of the Mosaic commandment against images. With Carlstadt openly

---

22 It is interesting to compare this comment of Erasmus with the advice regarding the number and placement of images in churches in the wake of Vatican II. While acknowledging that religious works of art “should nourish faith and piety”, the instruction goes on to stipulate, *They (images) be so placed in churches so as not to distract the faithful from the celebration (of the Eucharist) …They should not be too numerous, there should not be more than one image of the same saint, and the correct order of saints should be observed.* Ralph A. Keifer, *To Give Thanks and Praise: General Instruction of the Roman Missal*, (Washington: Pastoral Press, 1980), 53.
23 Margaret Aston uses this term to distinguish those who in theory oppose religious images from the actual iconoclasts who engage in their violent removal. *England’s Iconoclasts*, 5.
advocating the removal of images of Christ, of the Virgin and the Saints, some Wittenbergers took matters into their own hands and began the violent destruction of images. In January, 1522, he wrote a pamphlet, Of the Putting Away of Images, citing seven biblical passages as spiritual warrant, approving of such destruction. It was this outbreak of violence which prompted Luther’s return from the Wartburg and the break between the two Reformers. Carlstadt was eventually driven out of Saxony, taking refuge first of all in Zurich and then in Basel where he died in 1541.

While, like Carlstadt, Luther sought to simplify worship and emphasised the role of the Word, he nevertheless allowed a place for images since “fallen man lives in his five senses’, he therefore needs ‘an outward sign beside the words (VI. 359).” For the renewed Christian, images, in Luther’s opinion, were simply neutral or optional. Martin Chemnitz writing in 1565 explained Luther’s attitude towards images that represented true and useful histories as among the adiaphora, that is, things neither commanded nor forbidden by God, which therefore Christians may observe or decline to observe without sin. However, Chemnitz went on to point out that Luther maintained that the worship of images was forbidden and condemned by the Word of God. In contrast to both Carlstadt and Huldrych Zwingli, Luther would allow in worship whatever scripture had not singled out as forbidden and the Wittenberg editions of Luther’s Bible were generously illustrated. However, his theology of sola fides left no room for venerating the Virgin and the saints as intercessors, accepting saints simply as examples of faith and rejecting totally the cult of relics, an attitude, no doubt, engendered by witnessing the almost farcical relic collection of Frederick the Wise of Saxony.

It was in Zurich where the question of the place of images in Christian worship was more comprehensively debated. Huldrych Zwingli had arrived in Zurich late in 1518 and in January 1519, he preached officially for the first time in the Great

25 Auski, 349.
26 Fred Kramer trans. Martin Chemnitz, Examination of the Council of Trent, Part IV, (St. Louis: Concordia, 1986) 55-56
Minster. Charles Garside in his detailed study of Zwingli provides us with a description of how the Minster in Zurich was adorned on the eve of the Reformation with its seventeen altars, frescoes, images, sculptures of saints Christopher, Felix and Regula, the relics of the latter two being contained in elaborate reliquaries over the high altar.27 “The whole interior of the church faithfully mirrored the two major aspects of popular piety immediately prior to the Reformation: the cult of Mary and the saints, and the insistence of the people on experiencing religion visually.”28 Garside maintains that this kind of piety with its cultic devotion to saints along with pilgrimages grew with incredible rapidity in the last years of the fifteenth and early years of the sixteenth centuries. The phenomenon may have had something to do with the usual fears associated with millenarianism but some writers have observed that books of instruction for the pastoral clergy in this era consistently stressed the importance of the intercessory role of Mary and the saints.29

Zwingli, like Erasmus, was a humanist scholar who yearned for a revival of Christianity through a return to the pure sources of the Scriptures. Before his arrival in Zurich he had already expressed his opposition to the current emphases in the contemporary church on ceremonials and accretions that obscured the pure philosophy of Christ. In this he identified with Erasmus’s call for worship in spirit, but Zwingli was to carry such a belief to more radical conclusions. Soon after his arrival in Zurich, Zwingli began to preach openly against what he deemed as sensuous worship. The attack began not against images but against ecclesiastical music. The reasoning prompting the abolition of music in worship was essentially the same as that demanding the removal of images. He argued for the immaterial purity of worship. Music, for Zwingli, himself a gifted musician and composer, was a thoroughly secular art and one suited for man’s domestic life, not for his religious life, an attitude shared by that other major Reformer, John Calvin, but not by Martin Luther for whom congregational singing played a large role in his reformed

28 Garside, Zwingli, 89.
29 Herman Siebert, Beiträge zur Vorreformatorischen Heiligen-und Reliquienverehrung (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1907, cit. Garside, Zwingli, 89.)
liturgy. Zwingli’s evolving program to discover true worship depended upon his reformulation of the nature of belief itself. “It is the mind which prays” (Z. III. 854); “Faith is utterly unrelated to anything involving sensation (Z. III. 798).” His central text is John IV.24 “God is Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth.” It was this distinction Zwingli made between the material and the spiritual aspects of what he deemed true Christian worship which determined also his attitude towards the Eucharist. He rejected entirely the notion of a bodily Real Presence and affirmed the idea of a spiritual commemoration as an expression of faith.

While Zwingli had preached against veneration of images soon after his arrival at the Minster in Zurich, he never countenanced their destruction unless with magisterial authority. However, his sermons and those of his friend and follower, Leo Jud, at the church of St. Peter’s, roused a response in sporadic acts of iconoclasm in 1523. Further encouragement to iconoclasm was provided by the publication in the vernacular of a pamphlet by Ludwig Hatzer, The Judgment of God Our Spouse as to How One Should Hold Oneself Towards all Idols and Images, according to the Holy Scriptures. Hatzer quoted 33 texts from the Old Testament condemning the worship of images. In like manner Zwingli drew on a strictly biblical basis for his rejection of images. In his Commentary on True and False Religion, Zwingli cited no less than thirty six passages in Scripture as his criteria and such references were not restricted to the Old Testament but included the following from the New Testament: 1Cor. 5:10; Acts 15:29; ICor. 8:1-8; I Cor.10:19: I Cor.12:2; Gal. 5:20; I Thess. I: 9; I Pet. 4: 3; I John 5: 21. And Hatzer rejected the Gregorian dictum that images are books for laymen asserting “That is human folly. Gregory says such things, but God does not.” Likewise, Zwingli wrote:

And when some people say that man is taught by images, and influenced to piety, this is an idea of their own. For Christ nowhere
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30 References here are to volume, page and line number in Huldrych Zwingli’s Samtliche Werke, Berlin-Zurich, 1905, as cit. in Garside, Zwingli, 89
32 Garside, Zwingli, 114.
taught this method of teaching, and He certainly would not have omitted it if He had foreseen that it would be profitable.\textsuperscript{33}

As to the argument that images may induce reverence and moral improvement by emulating the example of the saint portrayed, Hatzer replied:

\begin{quote}
O hypocrite! All the images on earth carried to one pile cannot by a hair make you more pious or more reverent or draw you toward God. For Christ speaks in John 6.44: “No one comes to me unless God my heavenly Father draws him.’...If anyone here still wishes to decorate a temple, let him give diligently to the poor who are a living temple.\textsuperscript{34}
\end{quote}

Zwingli too, drew upon the obligation to support the poor rather than expend money on images, an argument reminiscent of St. Bernard and of Erasmus. And in typical mode drawing on Biblical reference, Zwingli wrote:

\begin{quote}
For when Christ in reply to the insulting words of Judas said to all his disciples (Jn.12:8), “The poor ye have with you always; but me ye have not always, and ye can do good to them,” He turned away all material service from Himself to the poor.\textsuperscript{35}
\end{quote}

The ensuing disorder of unauthorised acts of iconoclasm finally forced the City Council of Zurich to act. Following two Public Disputations in 1523 on the image question and the associated question of the Mass, the Council reached a decision. In 1524 the systematic removal of images from the churches in Zurich began with the approval of the Council. In line with Zwingli’s advice, the images were either burnt or melted down to provide money for distribution to the poor. It should be noted here that this was an intervention by a lay body, one which ignored the traditional church structures for settling what was essentially an ecclesiastical dispute.

Zwingli’s ultimate statement of his rationale for rejection of images was made in his \textit{Answer to Valentine Compar} published in 1525. There he distinguished between what he deemed true Christian belief and a false Christian belief.

\textsuperscript{33} Zwingli, \textit{Commentary on True and false Religion}, 331.

\textsuperscript{34} Garside, \textit{Zwingli}, 115.

\textsuperscript{35} Zwingli, \textit{Commentary on True and False Religion}, 331.
Only those are believers who know truly in their hearts that they should go to God alone in all their affairs. For they know that power over all things is in His hands alone, and that such power can be in the hands of no one else except in His. For they know that there can be no God except Him. Thus help, protection, grace, death, and life may rest in no one’s hands except His.36

Thus Zwingli reasoned that veneration of saints, and hence of images, was a failure to rely on God alone. Praying to men and women, such as Saint Paul or Saint Barbara, meant, for him, distributing to them portions of God’s power. This for Zwingli was making “idols” of these saints. While Erasmus did not go so far as to call such veneration as turning saints into “idols”, he did severely criticize the practice in The Enchridion since “This kind of piety, (which), does not refer either our fears or our desires to Christ, is hardly a Christian practice.” He saw in this little difference “from the superstitions of the ancients.” 37

While Luther might be regarded as pursuing a considered middle course in liturgical matters concerning music and images, the other major Reformer, John Calvin, more closely resembled the stand of Zwingli on images. Calvin added no new arguments to those of Zwingli. He too invoked the Old Testament prohibition of idols in the Decalogue and like Zwingli, maintained, “Since God is Spirit, He deserves to be worshipped spiritually.”38 The over-riding concern for Calvin was the glory of God, and any reduction of God who is “immeasurable and incomprehensible” to a material object, is “an insult to his Majesty”.

We believe it wrong that God should be represented by a visible appearance, because He Himself has forbidden it (Ex. 20:4) and it cannot be done without some defacing of His glory. Therefore it remains that only those things are to be sculptured or painted which the eyes are capable of seeing: let not God’s majesty, which is far above the perception of the eyes, be debased through unseemly representations.39

36 Garside, Zwingli, 163.
38 John Calvin, The Institutes of the Christian Religion Book I, Chp. XI. Henry Beveridge, trans. from the original Latin and French, (Edinburgh: Calvin Translation Society, MDCCC.XLIX)
Along with the other Reformers, Calvin refuted Pope Gregory’s adage of images as the books for the uneducated, declaring, “That whatever men learn of God from images is futile, indeed false,” when right teaching is through instruction in the Scriptures. And, probably Calvin had in mind many of the contemporary images of St. Mary Magdalene or St. Sebastian, two of the more popular saints of the period, when he castigated “papists” who dedicated pictures or statues to saints “what are they but examples of the most abandoned lust and obscenity?” The Fathers at Trent certainly took steps to correct that aspect with their insistence on “decorum” in their ultimate decree on the veneration of images. Calvin also took issue with the distinction that “papists” might make between dulia (reverence) and worship, denouncing such as a case of crass semantics and “foolish evasion”.

While Calvin was opposed to violent iconoclasm it was in the Netherlands where Calvinism found some of its most fervent adherents, that some of the most violent iconoclasm of the Reformation took place in the second half of the sixteenth century. On July, 1566, a worried government agent in Kortrijk reported to the Regent, Margaret of Parma:

> the audacity of the Calvinist preachers in this area has grown so great that in their sermons they admonish the people that it is not enough to remove all idolatry from their hearts; they must also remove it from their sight. Little by little, it seems, they are trying to impress upon their hearers the need to pillage the churches and abolish all images.

Between 10-18 August, rioters in over half a dozen towns in western Flanders entered churches and smashed the images found there. As David Freedberg observed, “Almost everywhere there was a relentless determination to do away with the idols and everything associated with idolatrous practice.” Political and social factors along with religious zeal, undoubtedly played a role, as
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40 Calvin, Institutes, I.XI. 5. Beveridge, 105.
41 Calvin, Institutes, I.XI. 7. Beveridge, 106.
42 Calvin, Institutes, I.XI. Xi. Beveridge, 111.
43 Letter from F. de la Baze, cit. in Geoffrey Parker, The Dutch Revolt (Harmondsworth: Pelican, 1979), 75.
44 David Freedberg, Iconoclasm and Painting in the Revolt of the Netherlands (New York: Garland publishing, 1988), 133.
demonstrated in the riots of August 1566 in Antwerp.\textsuperscript{45} Hatred of Spain, anticleericalism, hopes for loot, all were meshed with religious issues. The statue of the much hated Duke of Alva was pulled down with as much fervour and celebration as the destruction of religious images and statues.

Further destruction of churches and images at the hands of unpaid and uncontrollable militia known as “the Spanish Fury” occurred in November, 1576. And later in 1581, the Calvinist control of the Antwerp City Council resulted in that year in the \textit{stille beelderstorm} or quiet iconoclasm which saw the peaceful removal of images from churches there. In that same year the \textit{reconquista} of the Netherlands by Alexander Farnese, Duke of Parma, was under way and Antwerp finally capitulated in August 1584, and the Southern Provinces were effectively regained for the Spanish Crown. A new era of church restoration and of new foundations could now begin, churches that would be lavishly decorated venerating Mary and the saints and visually transmitting Tridentine sacramental theology.

\textsuperscript{45} Iconoclasm as an act of political revolt was not restricted to the Netherlands but occurred in many parts of France as well as in many cities of Switzerland. Carlos Eire, \textit{War Against the Idols} (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986).
Iconoclasm in England

Across the Channel too, the iconoclasts were gaining ground. However their success there fluctuated with the zig-zag pattern peculiar to the Reformation in England. As Richard Marks observed, “the fate of images,’ in England, ‘was sealed by fits and starts and reversals and counter-reversals of policy, the result of differing and sometimes conflicting ideologies.”46 The views of Continental Reformers had been infiltrating into England, particularly at the University of Cambridge, from the early twentieth while the debate on images was not new there. There were still pockets of Lollardy with its traditional rejection of images but new critics and defenders were emerging. The first edition of Thomas More’s Dialogue Concerning Heresies appeared in 1529. Its full title is of some significance here as regards the image question: A dyaloge of syr Thomas More khyghte...wherein he treatyd dyvers matters, as of the veneration & worship of ymages and relyues, prayng to sayntys, goyng on pilgrimage, wih many othere things. 47 A second, expanded edition of More’s Dyalogue appeared in 1531, incorporating a response to a recently circulated treatise on spirituality, The Image of Love written by John Ryckes, a Cambridge graduate and recently turned Franciscan Observant. The Image was not rejecting images per se, but more on Erasmian lines, critical of an over-focus on externals and ceremonials in devotional life at the expense of true spiritual love. However, as the 1530’s progressed the attack on images took on a more radical tune.

When Henry VIII made his break with Rome in 1534, he sought to retain what he regarded as essential Catholic doctrines: belief in the real Presence, the seven sacraments, invocation of Mary and the saints, Purgatory and a celibate clergy. But by the late 1530’s, Henry had succumbed to his more protestant advisers, his Archbishop of Canterbury Thomas Cranmer, his chief minister Thomas Cromwell and Bishop Hugh Latimer. Latimer had been appointed Lenten preacher to the King in 1534 and a year later was made Bishop of Worcester. In

---

June 1536 Latimer preached a sermon before Convocation in which he denounced shrines, relics, the cult of saints, the proliferation of saints’ days and the worship of images. In August that same year came the first of a series of royal Injunctions marking the first official pronouncements of the reign on the subject of devotional images. This was the work of Thomas Cromwell in which the clergy were urged not to ‘set forth or extol any images, relics, or miracles...nor allure the people by any enticements to the pilgrimage of any saint.’\(^48\)But such suppression of images, including removal of rood screens, was met with much popular opposition. Eamon Duffy has argued that well into the 1530’s “the vigour, richness and creativity of late medieval religion was undiminished, and continued to hold the imagination and elicit the loyalty of the majority of the population.”\(^49\)

However, while Thomas Cromwell had the King’s ear the destruction of images, of rood screens and from 1537, the suppression of monasteries and of Chantries continued. A further set of royal Injunctions, more radical than anything before, was issued in September 1538. All ‘feigned’ images in parish churches which were the object of pilgrimage were to be removed, “no candles, tapers, or images of wax (were) to be set afore any image or picture...”\(^50\) With the fall and execution of Cromwell there was a partial reversal to a more temperate religious policy possibly engendered by a fear of social unrest which was frequently the outcome of enforced religious change. However, no such fear held back the advisers of the new young Edward who ascended the throne on the death of Henry in 1547.

The accession of Edward VI marked the beginning of the most radical religious policy yet seen in England and in the judgement of Richard Marks even surpasses reformist zeal in Zurich and Strasbourg.\(^51\) From the outset images
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\(^{50}\) Frere and Kennedy, *Visitation Articles, II 38*, cit. Marks, *Image and Devotion*, 262.

\(^{51}\) Marks, *Image and Devotion*, 263.
were a focus of attack. The new royal Injunctions of July 1547 banning shrines, all externalised gestures before images and the holding of processions, sanctioned organized iconoclasm at the parish level. The 1552 Second Book of Common Prayer went far further than the Book of 1549, and in Eamon Duffy’s view “represented a determined attempt to break once and for all with the Catholic past.”52 All sacramentals such as holy water, anointing with chrism oils, the sign of the cross over the bread and wine were forbidden. The celebration of Communion was no longer at an altar but now at a plain table set in the body of the church. There was no preservation of the communion bread and wine. All this attested to the taking up of Archbishop Cranmer’s Homily on “Good Works Annexed unto Faith” where he inveighed against “the ungodly and counterfeit religions…and papistical superstitions and abuses: beads, lady psalters, rosaries…” going on to proscribe such traditional practices as candles, holy water, processional palms for which there was no place in ‘purified ’ Protestant worship.53 While Henry VIII’s Chantries Act of 1545 was limited in scope and purpose, prompted more from financial considerations, the Edwardine Chantries Act of 1549 justified dissolutions not on economic grounds but on the basis of religious principle. As Eamon Duffy points out unlike the earlier Henrician Act, the preamble to the 1549 Act stated baldly that what was wrong with Chantries was not any maladministration, but their whole end and purpose, “phantasising vain opinions of purgatory and masses of satisfaction for the departed.”54 Furthermore, the suppression of the monasteries destroyed many shrines which of their nature were centred on an image of one kind or another. The destruction of images was but one aspect of a religious policy aimed at securing a purity of worship which placed obedience to scriptural commandments above any respect for tradition.

52 Duffy, _The Stripping of the Altars_, 472.
54 Duffy, _The Stripping of the Altars_, 454.
In July 1553 when Mary Tudor succeeded to the throne the first thing she did, setting a precedent for what was to be official policy for the next five years, was to order that a crucifix be openly set up in the chapel at Framlingham Castle in Suffolk, where she then was. The Marian restoration of Catholic worship and practice was a popular move in many parishes. Christopher Haigh has observed that often parishes ran ahead of official policy, restoring altars, images, roods, bells and candles. On the other hand Protestant reform had gone so far in some parishes that any restoration was met with actual opposition. Robert Whiting, in a detailed study of wills during the Marian regime, has shown that donations to images were rare in parishes in south west England alike with wills from York and Durham dioceses, and with Mary's untimely death official assault resumed in 1559.

Queen Elizabeth I might be described as a moderate Protestant, but efforts to retain Catholic ritual and practices were rebuffed by her Protestant Bishops. Elizabeth favoured crosses and successfully resisted repeated efforts to remove a cross from the royal chapel, and a royal proclamation of September 1560 went some way to preserving funeral monuments. But these were structures that had been erected with purely commemorative intent and not for religious purposes. By 1577 a William Harrison observed that in English parish churches “all images...and monuments of idolatry are removed, taken down and defaced.”

The Catholic Response

Although the official response of the Catholic Church to the Reformers’ rejection of images did not come until the closing session of the Council of Trent in December 1563, Catholic theologians and philosophers had been writing in defence of images since the very beginning of the Reformation, but they sharply disagreed among themselves on the issue of veneration. Perhaps the first to respond was Johannes Eck whose treatise De Non Tollendis Christi et Sanctorum Imaginibus, contra Haeresin Foelicianam sub Carlo Magno damnatum et sub Carlo V renascentem Decisio appeared in Ingolstadt in 1522. It is not certain whether this was a direct response to Carlstadt’s treatise of a year earlier but Eck had heard of the iconoclasm that had taken place in Wittenberg. As its title suggests Eck was drawing on historic precedent in his argument and followed the usual Catholic position rejecting the Mosaic prohibition of images and adopting the incarnational argument of St. John of Damascus.

Then there was the running debate from 1526 to 1532 between Erasmus and Alberto Pio resulting in some moderation on Erasmus’s part (see above p.7). Other theologians, while accepting that the Old Testament prohibition did not carry through to the New, differed among themselves on the philosophical understanding of an image and the degree of veneration that might be accorded.

57 For details of these efforts to remove the cross and candlesticks in the royal chapel see Aston, *England’s Iconoclasts*, 313-314.
images. Perez de Ayala in his *De divinis traditionibus* (1548) rejected the argument of St. Thomas Aquinas and maintained by contemporary scholastics, of how veneration proceeded to the prototype. Ayala argued that the scholastics’ concept suggested there was some godly quality in the image. This, he said, was sacrilegious suggesting that there was the possibility of Christians being guilty of idolatry, or at the very least, of superstition in their worship of images. For Ayala, images were a *ceremonial* or optional, a position similar to Luther’s. He was prepared to honour images in the way of respect than of adoration.\(^{58}\)

In the year 1552 in Rome, a group of interested theologians, including Perez de Ayala, gathered to discuss images. Matthew Ory disagreed with Ayala on the question of veneration. Ory supported the scholastic stance stating that images of Christ and the saints must be adored with the same kind of adoration as by what is represented in them. The scholastics believed the proof of their thesis lay in the Aristotelian argument of the double motion of the soul towards images: one motion stops in the image, while another motion, which justifies the veneration, proceeds beyond the image towards its prototype. Ory did admit the possibility there was a danger for the common people of worshipping the image as God, of believing that there is ‘power’ in the image but that one should not worry if simple and illiterate people do not know how to define images.\(^{59}\)

Another theologian, Ambrogio Catarino, Bishop of Minori and Archbishop of Conza, while stating at the outset that there was no Catholic who did not approve of the use of images “for memory, doctrine, and arousal of the mind” challenged the traditionally accepted view of Pope Gregory.\(^{60}\) Catarino maintained that while Pope Gregory permitted the existence of images he rejected any veneration of them. Catarino addressed himself particularly to the problem of abuses in images. The first of these was the issue of decorum,
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\(^{59}\) Scavizzi, *Controversy*, 68.

something the eventual Tridentine decree did address. He disapproved of representations which were false, invented, or apocryphal and the way in which lascivious and provocative paintings filled some of the churches of his time, a complaint which theologian, Johannes Molanus was also, to take up later.

With the spread of Calvinism in France and outbreaks of iconoclasm there, the need for an official Catholic stand on images was becoming urgent. The issue was addressed both at the Colloquy of Poissy in 1561 and in the following conference of theologians at St. Germain-en-Laye at the beginning of the following year. A decree formulated at Poissy recommended the following:

“...if any superstition has crept into them (images), let them be rejected and if anything obscene, false, ludicrous or immodest has been sculpted or painted in them, (the bishops) should see that they are amended.”

At the further colloquium at St. Germain-en-Laye a far more lively debate ensued between the Protestants and the Catholic theologians. The Calvinist party, led by Theodore Beza, wanted the removal of all images since, as Beza argued, it was impossible to have images without abuses developing. Guiseppe Scavizzi has observed three distinct groups among the Catholics present. One group he termed the “Neutrals”, maintained that it should be forbidden to put any image except the cross on the altar. All other images, they argued, should be removed and put on the walls of churches where “it will be impossible to worship, salute, kiss or dress them with flowers...” Nor should such images be carried in street processions. Diego Lainez, then the General of the Jesuits, submitted a document that was far more conservative than the “Neutrals”, declaring that to put images on altars or to carry in processions was not forbidden by Scripture, but has always been done for reasons of instruction, memory, the stirring of emotions and also for the imitation of Christ and the saints. He went on to recommend that the theologians at the colloquium should avoid defining any decree on images or any other matter pertaining to

---

63 G. Scavizzi, 73.
Catholic doctrine because everything must be submitted to the judgement of the Council at Trent.

The major group of theologians from the University of the Sorbonne took a stand similar to Lainez. Their sentence also dealt with the misuse of images such as believing that images could contain some divinity or power. They also recommended that no new image be set up in churches unless with the permission of the bishop. The sentence of the Sorbonne theologians ended with a statement justifying the cult of the saints as intercessors. It was their document which was to become the basis of the ultimate decree on the subject at Trent. With no compromise with the Calvinists at San-Germain, a new wave of iconoclasm broke out in France. Claude de Saintes, Sorbonne theologian, wrote in his Discours sur le saccagement des églises catholiques, published in 1562, (interestingly dedicated to Charles de Guise), that the iconoclasts in St. Médard in Paris, "left no image behind without striking its head off, like the head of a living saint."\(^{64}\)

It was no surprise then, that it was the French party at Trent which moved to have the doctrine of images defined. In January, 1563, a French petition for reform in the veneration of images was put before the council. It postulated:

\[
\text{As iconoclasts have arisen in our times, men who believe that images must be destroyed, thus causing serious unrest in many places, the council should take care to have the people informed about what is to be retained in the veneration of images and make a point of doing away with the superstitious customs and abuses that have come about in the veneration of these images. The same should also be done in the case of indulgences, pilgrimages, the relics of the saints and the so-called brotherhoods.}^{65}\]

It was not until the closing session of the Council, in December 1563, that the Council finally addressed the question of images.\(^{66}\) The decree is noteworthy for its introductory reference to the authority of Tradition and in particular, to the


\(^{65}\) H. Jedin, The Crisis, 146.

\(^{66}\) See appendix 1 for the full text of the decree “On the invocation and veneration of saints, on the relics of saints, and on sacred images”. A decree on Indulgences was also passed later in this session.
oecumenical Council of Nicea II. The decree also went on in its opening sentences to acknowledge the role of Our Lady and the saints as intercessors, a point made by the Sorbonne theologians in its sentence at the colloquium at St. Germain-en-Laye. On the vexed question of veneration, the decree affirmed:

...not that any divinity or virtue is believed to be in them by reason of which they are to be venerated or that something is to be asked of them, or that trust is to be placed in images, as was done of old by the Gentiles who placed their hope in idols; but because the honour which is showed them is referred to their prototype which they represent, so that by means of the images which we kiss and before which we uncover the head and prostrate ourselves, we adore Christ and venerate the saints whose likeness they bear.67

It was left to later writers, theologians, bishops, painters to amplify in their Treatises or Instructiones the provisions of that decree and to apply them to Counter Reformation art and architecture. Of this Tridentine decree, Guiseppe Scavizzi has commented. “The decree of the Council of Trent is a dividing line in the controversy on images because it separates forever the Protestant from the Catholic world.”68 Even more so in separating “the Protestant from the Catholic world” were the Council’s decrees which affirmed the doctrine of transubstantiation and the Real Presence in the Eucharist (the subject of the following chapter). The Protestants’ rejection of images was but one aspect of their efforts to make religion more spiritual. While Jean Calvin did not go all the way with Zwingli’s reduction of Holy Communion to merely a “commemoration” of the Lord’s Supper, he argued that a “real communion” with Jesus Christ was effected through the secret virtue of His Holy Spirit; “The Spirit alone causes us to possess Christ completely and have Him dwelling in us”.69

One earlier decree approved in the twenty third- session, and one which indicated that the Fathers at Trent had learnt something from their Protestant adversaries, was to legislate on the better education of the clergy. The decree

68 Scavizzi, The Controversy on Images, 78.
69 J. Calvin, Institutes, IV, 17, 12.
providing for the establishment of diocesan seminaries has frequently been judged by church historians as one of the more significant decrees of the Council. Along with the better education of the clergy went the obligation of bishops and priests “to preach” as their first duty but no concerted effort at mass literacy characterised Catholic reform. In fact, the vernacular translation of the Bible, which characterised Protestant Reform, was notably absent in Catholic circles. As Margaret Miles has observed, “the attempt of the Protestant reformers to suppress the earlier image-centred worship and to replace it with an exclusively linguistic worship, did not have a counterpart in the Roman Catholic reform.” On the contrary, if anything, there was an intensification of the use of images in the Church, for devotional, educational and one might say, for propaganda uses. With the rejection of the vernacular and the liturgy continuing to be conducted in Latin, images were, as ever, books for the “unlearned” and now more so, to counter what was judged as “heresy”. Catholic belief in Purgatory, in the Virgin and the saints as intercessors, in the role of the sacraments as sources of saving grace all were transmitted visually in the centuries following the closure of the Council. The sacrament of Penance, through the portrayal of saints Peter, Mary Magdalene and Jerome in the role of penitents was a popular subject. Adopting the notion of St. Robert Bellarmine that tears conveyed true contrition, it was probably no accident that St. Peter in tears became a subject in this era. Even more popular in the aftermath of Trent, came images of a triumphant Church, identified with the Eucharist, trampling underfoot its Protestant enemies. It could be argued that the first example of such an image, (fig. 3), appeared as the final attempt on the part of the Catholic Church in France failed to reach any agreement with the Huguenots on the theology of the Eucharist.

70 Margaret Miles, Image as Insight: Visual Understanding in Western Christianity and Secular Culture, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1985), 119.
Figure 3 Leonard Limosin, *The Triumph of the Eucharist and of the Catholic Faith*, ca. 1561.

Frick Collection New York.
CHAPTER 2

The Controversy on the Eucharist

If there was debate over the place of images in Christian worship no theological issue, not even justification, was more keenly debated in the Reformation era than the meaning of the central Christian rite of the Eucharist. When French Catholic Bishops met with Calvinists at Poissy in 1561, the Reformation was already into its second generation. The controversy over the Eucharist had not been confined to a debate between Catholics and Reformers but controversy existed between and among the Reformers themselves. While the Catholic Church had consistently maintained a belief in the Real Presence of Christ in the consecrated species of the bread and the wine, the Colloquy at Marburg back in 1529 had angrily disclosed the different understandings among the first generation of Reformers.

As early as 1520 Martin Luther in his tract *The Babylonian Captivity of the Church*, while still claiming the Eucharist to be a sacrament, rejected the Thomistic terminology of transubstantiation but accepted the idea of a Real Presence. He complained of the Roman Catholic tradition of withholding the cup from the laity and went on to denounce “the third captivity of this sacrament’ and by far ‘the most wicked abuse of all, that the mass is a good work and a sacrifice.” 71 This position was maintained by all Protestant Reformers as a consequence of their doctrine of “sola fides”, but no agreement was ever reached on the theology of the Eucharsist.

---

In 1524 Huldrych Zwingli contended that to interpret Christ’s word “is” (est) at the Last Supper to mean “is” tortures the word into “an unnatural meaning.” For Zwingli the Lord’s Supper was a memorial or symbol and a thanksgiving for Christ’s sacrifice. True to his stress on faith, understanding “in spirit and in truth”, Zwingli could not countenance a material reality in the bread of the Eucharist.

Martin Bucer in Strasbourg took a position somewhere between the Zwinglian and Lutheran interpretations. Bucer’s understanding of the presence of Christ in the Eucharist, like so much of his theology, unfolded over time partly in response to disputes with other Reformers. In 1532 he expressed the view that the body and blood of Christ were “truly present and offered in the holy communion” but he attacked the view that the body and blood of the Lord were present “in a physical way”, once the words of consecration had been recited. The Holy Spirit is essentially in the believer who has faith before he receives the sacrament and to whom he makes present what the sacrament signifies: thus Bucer changes the emphasis from the objective Eucharistic bread and wine to the spiritual disposition of the recipient. Œcolampadius from Basel insisted on a symbolic meaning in Christ’s words “This is my body”, because the flesh profits nothing and the body of Christ had ascended into heaven. Such was the position Zwingli and Œcolampadius maintained in their meeting with Luther at Marburg in 1529. No consensus between these differing interpretations was reached at that colloquy. Luther adamantly asserted his interpretation of a corporeal presence. Article 10 of the Lutheran Augsburg Confession of 1530 stated categorically:

> It is taught among us that the true body and blood of Christ are really present in the Supper of our Lord under the form of bread and wine and are there distributed and received. The contrary doctrine is therefore rejected.

---

73 Edward Muir contends that with his humanist education, Zwingli was, with the phrase “This is my body”, applying here a “metonymy” which substitutes the “name” or “sign” of one thing for the name of another thing. *Ritual in Early Modern Europe* (Cambridge & N.Y.: Cambridge university Press, 1997), 173.
Reflecting on that Marburg meeting Calvin, in his *Short Treatise on the Holy Supper of Our Lord* in 1541, blamed Luther for “his failure to explain himself more clearly, instead, assailing with his accustomed vehemence” those who contradicted him. “The other party (Zwingli and Œcolampadius), he judged to be

...so bent on declaiming against the superstitious and fanatical views of the Papists touching the local presence of Jesus Christ within the sacrament and the perverse adoration consequent upon it, \(^{76}\)

they pushed their case too single-mindedly on asserting that the bread and wine were merely “signs” of the body of Christ. For Calvin, they failed to teach that “the reality is conjoined with them.”

For Calvin, there was a real difficulty of ever explaining the presence of Christ in the Supper for it was “so mysterious and incomprehensible”, or again, “this communion which we have with the body of Christ is a thing incomprehensible, not only to the eye but to our natural sense.”\(^{77}\) One constant in Calvin’s view of the Lord’s Supper, is his rejection of a “carnal presence” in the Eucharist. This he emphatically stated in his first edition of *The Institutes* and maintained through each subsequent edition. Calvin argued that since Christ was made like us in all things except sin (Heb.4:15), his body therefore has its own fixed dimensions, has flesh and bone and “is limited by the general characteristics of all human bodies, and is contained in heaven until Christ return in judgment.”\(^{78}\) This was to be the same stand Theodore Beza was to take in his confrontation with the Cardinal of Lorraine at the Colloquy at Poissy. Thus Calvin rejected both the Lutheran view of ubiquity and, for him, “the Papist wondrous transubstantiation”.\(^{79}\) It is highly likely the proliferation of stories of bleeding hosts that seemed to multiply in the later Middle Ages and the failure of the Church authorities to discountenance them, would have repelled Calvin and other Reformers and may have played a part in their absolute rejection of the idea of a Real Presence

---

\(^{76}\) John Calvin, *Short Treatise on the Holy Supper of Our Lord*, parg. 58  
\(^{79}\) For an explanation on the terms “ubiquity” and “transubstantiation” see appendices 2 and 3.
in the Eucharist.\textsuperscript{80} Such stories, in fact, had led Thomas Aquinas to note that while the body and blood of Christ were really present in the sacramental species of bread and wine, this presence was not a “natural” one based on the local, physical (‘quantitative) dimensions of Christ’s body.\textsuperscript{81} Thus Calvin condemned as superstitious and unscriptural the preservation and adoration of the consecrated bread as “absurd things which appear to be either unworthy of Christ’s heavenly majesty, or incompatible with the reality of his human nature.”\textsuperscript{82}

While rejecting any carnal presence, Calvin totally distanced himself from a Zwinglian merely commemorative view of the sacrament. He wrote:

> The bread is given to us to figure the body of Jesus Christ, with command to eat it, and it is given to us of God, who is certain and immutable truth. If God cannot deceive or lie, it follows that it accomplishes all which it signifies. We must truly receive in the Supper the body and blood of Christ.\textsuperscript{83}

Calvin argued “...that to deny that a true communication of Jesus Christ is presented to us in the Supper, is to render this holy sacrament frivolous and useless, an execrable blasphemy unfit to be listened to.”\textsuperscript{84} This “true” communion with Jesus Christ, for Calvin, occurs “through His Spirit so that we may be made one in body, spirit and soul with him.” Citing Paul’s Letter to the Romans (8:9) he concluded “that the Spirit alone causes us to possess Christ completely and have him dwelling in us.”

In his Commentary on Corinthians Calvin expanded on the role of the Holy Spirit:

> ...that participation in the body of Christ, which, I affirm, is presented to us in the Supper, does not require a local presence, nor the descent of Christ, nor infinite extension, nor anything of that nature, for the Supper being a heavenly action, there is no absurdity in saying, that Christ, while remaining in heaven, is received by us. For as to his communicating himself to us, that is effected through the secret virtue of his Holy Spirit, which can not merely bring together,

\textsuperscript{80}Caroline N. Bynum reports there were about 100 cases of bleeding host miracles in Southern Germany between 1300-1550, and most were overwhelmingly anti-semetic. “Bleeding Hosts in Late Medieval Northern Germany,” The Medieval History Journal, vol. 7, No. 2, 227-241 (2004)

\textsuperscript{81} Summa Theologiae 3.76.8.

\textsuperscript{82} Calvin, The Institutes IV, 17, 32

\textsuperscript{83} Calvin, Short Treatise, 16

\textsuperscript{84} Calvin, Short Treatise, 12
but join in one, things that are separated by distance of place, and far remote.”

**The Colloquy at Poissy**

This was precisely the theology of the Eucharist that Theodore Beza expounded at the Colloquy at Poissy where an attempt was made to reach an understanding between Catholics as represented in the Church in France and the Huguenots. Such an understanding, it was hoped, would avert the possibility of civil war in France. This meeting at Poissy had been convened by the Regent, Catherine de’ Médici, in a desperate attempt to reach a compromise with the Huguenots and so avoid the continuing violence and civil disorder which accompanied the spread of Calvinism in France.

Catherine’s attempt to secure a measure of toleration for the Huguenots at a meeting of the Parlement in Paris in July 1561, had met with almost unanimous opposition. Charles de Guise, the Cardinal of Lorraine, spoke last at that gathering and argued that religious dissent was equally dangerous to Church and State. While he opposed the death penalty for what he described as simple heresy advocating rather, banishment for peaceful heretics, he adamantly rejected any suggestion of granting places of worship to the Huguenots.

Such was the background to the Regent’s next move. A royal summons had already gone out to the hierarchy of France for a meeting in Paris ostensibly to decide who would attend the reconvened General Council of the Church and the policies to be there pursued. That proposed meeting had been postponed and the rendezvous transferred from Paris to Poissy. Unknown to the Catholic Bishops, Catherine had begun negotiations with the Calvinists to send representatives to that meeting, and she issued a personal invitation to Peter Martyr Vermigli, the ex-Augustinian now a

---


leading pastor in the reformed church in Zurich. Theodore Beza accepted the appointment to head the Calvinist contingent.

An air of ambiguity lay over the conference from the start. Was this a meeting to discuss a reform agenda for the General Council of the Church? Was it a gathering of a National Church Council which Rome and the papal nuncio, Cardinal Viterbo, feared might be the case? Those fears seemed to be realised when the Chancellor of France, Michel De l’Hôpital opened the first session and addressing the Catholic bishops, (the Calvinists were not to arrive for another three weeks), informed them they were to propose comprehensive measures for the pacification of the realm by the healing of the religious divisions which force had failed to quell. De L’Hôpital went on to claim that the delay in the reconvening of the General Council had necessitated a National Council, and that it was not unprecedented, nor unreasonable, for the King to seek a national prescription for national ills. However, the designation 'National Council', was unanimously repudiated by the bishops who also insisted that discussion be limited to reform and correction of abuses declaring that doctrinal questions be reserved for the General Council now assembling at Trent. For the next three weeks questions of reform occupied the bishops and theologians at Poissy. Meanwhile the Calvinist delegates began arriving at St. Germain, a comfortable distance from Poissy, and were anxiously awaiting Beza’s arrival from Geneva.

Theodore Beza arrived at St. Germain on August 22. He attended an informal meeting the following evening in the apartments of Anthony of Navarre in the presence of the Regent and other notables including the Cardinal of Lorraine. Almost from the start the Cardinal turned the conversation to the question of the Real Presence in the Eucharist. Beza, while repudiating the sacramentarianism of the Zwinglians and Anabaptists, also rejected the doctrine of transubstantiation. And once the formal sessions of the Colloquy began on September 9th, the gulf between the parties on the Eucharist was made immediately obvious.

---

86 The very young Charles IX had succeeded to the throne following the death of his brother, Francis II in December, 1560, and Catherine de Médici had secured the Regency.
87 46 Bishops attended this gathering including 4 Cardinals out of 113 that were expected. That is more than half of the hierarchy failed to put in a personal appearance
The engraving (Figure 4) identifies all the major players at the colloquy. Note the prominence accorded to the Cardinal of Lorraine, (the red arrow identifies the Cardinal). The Calvinist party, in Henry Evennett’s phrase, stand “in a kind of extempore jury box, comporting themselves with dignity’, a task he observed, ‘much facilitated by the circumstance that they were not permitted to seat themselves.” One might suggest that they look more like prisoners in the dock than members of a jury!

![Figure 4 - Le colloque tenu a Poissy Tortorel & Périsin engraving](image)

The young King Charles IX opened the colloquy addressing the gathering as follows:

_Messieurs_, I have summoned you from various parts of my kingdom so that you may advise me on what my chancellor will propose to you. I beg you to set aside all prejudice so that we may achieve something which will bring peace to my subjects, honour to God, the salving of consciences and public tranquillity. I desire this so much that I have decided to keep you here until you have reached a settlement that will enable my subjects to live in unity and peace
with each other, as I trust you will do. By acting thus you will make it possible for me to protect you as my royal predecessors have done.  

Beza was the first to address the gathering. He gave, by all accounts, a restrained presentation of the reformed doctrines held by the Calvinists. He attacked the doctrine of purgatory, defended the sole mediatory role of Christ and upheld justification by faith, while giving a careful exposition of the place to be assigned to good works. In presenting the Calvinist doctrine on the Eucharist he denied “that we believe what some people have mistakenly said that we teach: namely, that communion is just a remembrance service of Christ’s death.” He went on to expound Calvin’s teaching that it is through the coming together of Faith, Spirit and Word that we have a real communion with Christ. He argued that the idea of transubstantiation contradicts the truth of Christ’s humanity and ascension into heaven:

But if we look at the distance between the places (as we must do when it is a question of his corporeal presence and his humanity considered separately), we say that his body is as far removed from the bread and wine as the highest point of heaven is removed from the earth.”

At this assertion there were cries of “Blasphemy” from the Catholic Bishops. Beza’s account of the gathering went on to say “...others got up to leave, but they could do nothing more because of the king’s presence.  

It was the Cardinal of Lorraine who was delegated to reply in eight days to Beza’s address. The bishops insisted a reply was not to be argumentative so much as an authoritative statement of Catholic belief. And such was the Cardinal’s address and his presentation is generally regarded as having been scholarly and moderate in tone. He avoided the scholastic language of transubstantiation and insisted on a literal

---

91 Beza’s Account of the Colloquy, Lindberg, The European Reformations Sourcebook, 196.
interpretation of Christ’s word at the Last Supper. He pointed to the evidence of belief held since the Apostolic era, quoted texts from the Councils of Nicaea and Ephesus, from the early Fathers and theologians down the centuries, while admitting that a literal interpretation of our Lord’s words constituted an unfathomable mystery. If these words, “This is my body, this is my blood”, do not mean what they say, why are they repeated alike in all respects by three evangelists and by the apostle Paul. We believe then, and we confess in accordance with the words of Scripture and the holy fathers, that the body and blood of Jesus Christ is present, shown, and received by the ineffable working of the grace of God and the power of this Holy Spirit.

The Cardinal’s speech was regarded, by the Catholics present at the colloquy, as an oratorical triumph. Diego Lainez, General of the Jesuits, spoke in a later session in defence of the Real Presence explaining the Catholic doctrine that our Lord is present Body, Soul and Divinity in the host and in all hosts, and in every particle of each host, without being in a local or circumscribed fashion or filling any definite quantity of space. Though discussions continued for some weeks with Lorraine introducing the Lutheran Augsburg Confession in the hope of getting Beza to subscribe to that as a condition of continuance, the Colloquy ended in a stalemate. The Cardinal’s introduction of the Lutheran Confession on the Eucharist was viewed with suspicion by many on the more conservative side of the Catholic party and by Calvin who saw it as a ruse to exacerbate Calvinist- Lutheran divisions. It could well be argued that it was a desperate attempt to provide a point where some compromise might be reached. The real difficulty would seem that the conference was conducted on lines akin to a University disputation and in such a polemical atmosphere mediation became impossible.

---

92 Charles Evennett, *The Cardinal of Lorraine and the Council of Trent* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1930), 323, comments on this absence of the word “transubstantiation” and the separation of the term Real Presence from Aristotelian metaphysics in the Cardinal’s address, as indicative of a desire to put the case for Catholic doctrine in a way least likely to offend the peculiar susceptibilities of the Reformers without prejudice to Catholic orthodoxy.


94 C. Evennett, *The Cardinal of Lorraine*, 322


Following the failure of the Colloquy at Poissy, the Regent, Catherine de Médici, sponsored a further colloquy between Catholic and Reformed theologians at the royal chateau of St-Germain-en-Laye in January and February 1562. Although six items were set on the agenda only the first, on images, was actually discussed. As was noted above in Chapter 1, Théodore Beza denounced images as idolatry and specifically prohibited by the Decalogue and argued the veneration of images was unknown in the early church. Jean Pelletier and the Jesuit General, Diego Lainez, defended the Catholic position and cited paintings in the Roman catacombs as evidence of early Christian usage. Discussions were soon suspended at St. Germain-en-Laye and a rash of iconoclasm followed in France provoking that Discours by Claude De Sainctes as cited above in Chapter 1. With the failure of this last attempt to reach some sort of compromise with the Calvinists, the French bishops then prepared to attend the Council of Trent.

The Council of Trent and the Eucharist

Charles de Guise arrived at the general council on 13 November, 1562, with twelve bishops, three abbots, and eighteen theologians. The council had been meeting since reconvening in January of that year. This was to be the final gathering of the council which closed on December 4th, 1563. At that session all the decrees and canons that had been affirmed at this and all previous sessions of the Council, were formally approved. It was left then for the Pope to issue final ratification.

The importance of the doctrine of the Eucharist was attested by the fact that Eucharistic issues were raised at all three gatherings of the council. At the seventh session back at the meeting in Bologna in July 1547, in the decree concerning the sacraments, the Eucharist was named as one of the seven. It was at the second meeting of the council, in 1551-52, when decrees on the Eucharist, on Transubstantiation and on the Reservation of the sacrament were approved.98 The preamble to the decree on the Most Holy Eucharist declared its intention “to uproot

---

98 In view of the introduction by the Cardinal of Lorraine of the Lutheran Augsburg Confession on the Eucharist into discussions at Poissy in 1561, it should be noted there were no French delegates at the 1551-52 gathering of the council.
the ‘cockles’ of execrable errors and schisms, which the enemy in these troubled
times of our has ‘sown’ (Matt.13:25), in the doctrine of the faith, in the use and
worship of the sacred Eucharist…”

Chapter 1 at the thirteenth session of the council, 11th October, 1551, affirmed the
document of the Real Presence when it declared:

... the holy council teaches and openly and plainly professes that
after the consecration of bread and wine, our Lord Jesus Christ, true
God and true man, is truly, really and substantially contained in the
august sacrament of the Holy Eucharist under the appearance of
those sensible things.99

That chapter, referring to the Reformers’ teachings on the Eucharist, concluded by
detesting “as satanical (those) untruths devised by impious men.” Chapter III,
affirmed “The Excellence of the Most Holy Eucharist Over the Other Sacraments”
because “the other sacraments then first have the power of sanctifying when one uses
them, while in the Eucharist there is the Author Himself of sanctity before it is
used.”100

Chapter IV, on Transubstantiation, relying on Thomas Aquinas’ formulation declared:

...that by the consecration of the bread and wine a change is brought
about of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the
body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of wine into the
substance of His blood. This change the holy Catholic Church
properly and appropriately calls transubstantiation.101

The council also affirmed the practice of “reserving the Holy Eucharist in a sacred
place”, and the practice that “every year on a fixed festival day that it be borne
reverently and with honour in processions through the streets and public places.”102
The Fathers then proceeded to anathematise in the Canons that followed, any who
denied this doctrine of the Real Presence and the attendant liturgical practices
asserting

...whereas it is not enough to declare the truth, unless errors be
exposed and repudiated, it has seemed good to the holy Synod to

99 Rev. H.J. Schroeder trans. Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent (Rockford, Ill. : Tan Books,
1978), 73.
100 Schroeder, 74.
101 Schroder, 75. See also appendix 3 on Transubstantiation.
102 Schroeder, 76-77
subjoin these canons, so that all, now that the Catholic doctrine has been made known, may also understand what heresies are to be avoided and guarded against.\textsuperscript{103}

As Brian Gerrish starkly put it, at Trent, “Transubstantiation was not negotiable.”\textsuperscript{104}

The Eucharist was at the heart of the Catholic liturgy of the Mass and Tridentine decrees reaffirmed the doctrine of the Mass as a Sacrifice, the singular status of the celebrant priest, the prayers of the Canon, and that “the Mass is propitiatory both for the living and the dead.”\textsuperscript{105} Private masses were approved and instructions were given for the vesting of the priest and the Mass was not to be celebrated in the vernacular. The Tridentine decrees thus categorically ran counter to the rejection of the Mass as a sacrifice by all the Protestant Reformers. In the Schmalkaldic articles, Luther referred to the Mass as “the greatest and most terrible abomination” and ‘the worst of all papal idolatries’, because it detracted from the sacrificial death of Christ on the cross as the only basis of our eternal salvation. Calvin too, opposed what he likewise saw as the works-righteousness of the Roman Mass and devoted the whole of Chapter 18 in \textit{The Institutes} to a castigation of the Catholic practice of addressing the Eucharist as a sacrifice. There, and again in his \textit{Commentary on Corinthians} he vehemently denounced such practice as “a sacrilegious abomination, a diabolical invention.” The Roman Mass for Calvin was a “blasphemy against Christ, a suppression of Christ’s Passion,”\textsuperscript{106} to which the Fathers at Trent responded:

\begin{quote}
If any one saith, that, by the sacrifice of the Mass, a blasphemy is cast upon the most holy sacrifice of Christ consummated on the cross; or, that it thereby derogated from, let him be anathema. (Canon IV, Twenty–second session)
\end{quote}

And again, anathema to

\begin{quote}
...anyone (who) says that the sacrifice of the mass is one only of praise and thanksgiving; or that it is a mere commemoration of the
\end{quote}

\textsuperscript{103} Denzinger 882, 270
\textsuperscript{105} Twenty-Second session of the Council, Schroeder, 145
sacrifice consummated on the cross but not a propitiatory one...(Canon III, Twenty-second session)

Ultimately these decrees of the council were incorporated into The Profession of Faith of the Council of Trent:

...I also profess that in the Mass there is offered to God a true, proper sacrifice of propitiation for the living and the dead, and that in the most holy sacrament of the Eucharist there is truly, really, and substantially present the body and blood together with the soul and divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ, and that there takes place a conversion of the whole substance of bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood; and this conversion the Catholic Church calls transubstantiation. I also acknowledge that under one species alone the whole and entire Christ and the true sacrament are taken.107

That Tridentine Profession of Faith was repeated likewise in The Catechism of Pius IV (1564). Question XXXV affirmed “After Consecration, none of the substance of the Matter of this Sacrament remains.” Question XXXVI asserted “Transubstantiation, approved by Councils, has its foundation in the Scriptures.” The answer to this “Question” drew on the authority of the Lateran Council and the Council of Florence and went on to declare that “By the Council of Trent, however, it was more explicitly defined.”

Undoubtedly, there were preachers at the time of the reformation who created an impression that the Mass was a “good work” providing for a human contribution to Christ’s expiatory sacrifice. The traffic in chantry benefices and Mass stipends which Francis Clark observed as an “excessive multiplication of votive and requiem Masses for the sake of gain” would have provided fuel for the Evangelicals’ castigation of calling the Mass a sacrifice.108 This paper argues that the vehemence of the debate on the Real Presence in the Eucharist and on the sacrifice of the Mass, is reflected in the many paintings, engravings, tapestries and stained glass commissioned in the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, portraying a triumphal church, identifying itself with the Eucharist, trampling underfoot those “impious men’ who subscribed to those “satanical untruths”. The art and architecture of churches constructed in this

107 From the Bull of Pius IV, Inunctum nobis, Nov.13, 1565, cit. Denzenger, 302
period gave visual witness to those Tridentine doctrines of the Real Presence and the Mass as a sacrifice.

In stark contrast to the Baroque architecture characteristic of Catholic churches where sanctuary and altar were separated and elevated above the main body of the church, often adorned with a dramatic altar piece of a Crucifixion, the Protestant church resembled a more simplified meeting place, unadorned of any images and focused on pulpit rather than altar. An early example of a Catholic church’s layout attesting to the Tridentine emphasis on the Eucharist was the Church of St. Walburga built in Antwerp in 1610. Rubens’s great triptych, (now in the Antwerp Cathedral as the Church of St. Walburga no longer exists), measuring 21 ft. wide and 15 ft. high, representing the raising of the Cross, the Crucifixion, and the Deposition was the backdrop to an altar elevated far above the nave by an imposing flight of steps. A pelican in gilt wood crowned the whole edifice.109

In countries where the Reformation established itself, painters turned more to domestic and landscape genres and portraits rather than religious subjects. Rembrandt’s great paintings of The Supper at Emmaus, The Prodigal Son and his vast output of engravings on Biblical incidents were more the exception than the rule. Admittedly in Germany where the Lutheran confession established itself, paintings were never entirely obliterated in churches and Cranach’s images illustrated the Lutheran Bible.

---

109 The pelican is an emblem of the Blessed Sacrament stemming from a legend where it was claimed that a pelican revived its dying fledglings by piercing its breast and feeding them with its blood. The emblem occurs frequently in conjunction with images or chapels dedicated to the Blessed Sacrament; see for example the Chapel of the Blessed Sacrament in St. Patrick’s Cathedral, Melbourne.
CHAPTER 3

Leonard Limosin, *Triumph of the Eucharist*

In the Frick Collection in New York there is an enamel plaque (Fig. 5), signed Léonard Limosin, and known as *Triumph of the Eucharist and of the Catholic Faith*. It is undated, but recent scholarship dates the commissioning some time between late 1561 and 1563.\(^{110}\) This plaque was formerly in the Pierpont Morgan Collection before it came to the Frick Collection. While in the Pierpont Morgan Collection it was on exhibition in the Victoria and Albert Museum, from 1905 to 1912, and in the Metropolitan Museum of Art, from 1914 to 1916. Its previous collection history is a blank so far as can be discovered. There is no known record of its commissioning, and correspondence with Thierry Crépin-Leblond, Director, Musée National de la Renaissance in Ecouen, France, January 2009, confirmed that.\(^{111}\) All the figures in the Frick enamel have been identified by Andrew Ritchie and many other art historians, as members of the Guise family, by comparison with other known and authenticated Limosin enamel portraits of the Guise family, in the Louvre and Cluny museums.\(^{112}\) While there is no dispute as to the fact that the persons portrayed are, in fact, all members of the Guise family, there is dispute as to the precise identification of some figures and this will be considered later in this chapter. It would seem not unreasonable to presume that this enamel was commissioned by a member of the Guise family, particularly, as members of the family are known to have been significant patrons of art in their day.\(^{113}\) This Frick enamel may well be the first example in the Reformation era of an image identifying the Faith of the Catholic Church with affirmation of the Real Presence in the Eucharist. It may also shed light

---


\(^{111}\) “La provenance ancienne de cette Plaque émaillée n’est malheureusement pas connue”. Email reply to kathmccarthy@netspace.net.au, from Thierry Crépin-Leblond, 24 January 2009.


on the religious/ political situation in France in the early 1560’s. Fig. 6 compares a painting by Rubens, over sixty years later, with the Frick enamel.

![Fig. 5 Leonard Limosin, Le Triomphe de l’Eucharistie. H. 7.75 ins; L. 10ins. Frick Collection, New York](image1)

The Rubens painting, *The Triumph of the Church*, now in the Prado, was a modello for a tapestry design, one of 23 tapestries in the Eucharist Series, commissioned in 1625.

![Fig.6 Peter P. Rubens, The Triumph of the Church. Prado, Madrid](image2)
by the Infanta Isabella, Archduchess of the Spanish Netherlands. \(^{114}\) That tapestry and its commissioning will be the subject of chapter 5, sufficient here to note the salient points of similarity. Both employ the “triumph” motif to accentuate the significance to be given to the Eucharist; and the chariot rides rough shod over heretics in fig.5, and in fig.6 over personifications of Ignorance and Heresy; both feature the Eucharist held aloft; in fig. 5 as in the host and chalice, in fig. 6, the host is encased in a monstrance; and in both, the Church is personified as a female holding the Eucharist. The significant difference is that in fig. 5 there appear no Papal insignia and the female as the personification of the Church can be identified as a particular person, namely, Antionette de Bourbon, the widow of the Duke of Guise.

In the Frick enamel, seated in the triumphal chariot, a female figure holds aloft in her left hand a chalice with host, and in her right hand a cross with the crown of thorns, symbols of the Passion. This figure, representing the Faith of the Church (ecclesia), Antoinette de Guise (1493-1583) is the mother of François, Charles and Louis. She is wearing widow’s garb and her late husband Claude, first Duke de Guise (1496-1550) is standing below the chariot with his hand on the hilt of his sword evoking his family’s fight in defence of the catholic faith. The figure on the extreme left, with his hands on the chariot wheel, is François, the then Duke de Guise (1519-63). The figure, in the centre beside the late Duke, has been identified by Andrew Ritchie, Sophie Baratte and Jeanne Harrie as Louis de Guise.\(^{115}\) That identification is arrived at by their assuming that the person on the far right and holding a book, is Charles, the Cardinal of Lorraine, thus leaving the other clerical figure to be his brother, Louis, Cardinal de Guise. Their assumption of the identity of Charles is based on his proximity to a device, a pyramid or obelisk, encircled from top to bottom by a flourishing ivy branch and a scroll. The scroll bears an inverted inscription which reads: TESTA/ANTE/VIREBO (TE STANTE VIREBO), “While You Stand I shall Flourish.” This device, (Fig. 7), Ritchie informs us, can be identified as the device of Charles de Guise. It can be found in a work by Claude Paradin, Devises héroiques, Lyon, 1557, pages 72-

\(^{114}\) The exact year of the commission is uncertain. See below Chapter 4.

The “pyramid” refers to Henry II, and the “holy ivy”, Paradin explains, represents the Cardinal of Lorraine. The inscription is to be interpreted: “While you Henry II reign, I, Charles, Cardinal of Lorraine, shall flourish.” The crescent normally at the tip of the pyramid is notably absent, indicating the enamel dates from after Henry II’s death in 1559. Charles de Guise had a long-standing association with Henry II. Evennett records that Charles had been placed in charge of the household of the Dauphin Henry and “he soon won the lasting affection of that prince.” Evennett, drawing on a biography of Charles de Guise by Nicolas Boucher, records that Henry II loaded Charles with honours and marks of favours and more than once solicited the Red Hat for him from Paul III. In fact, Charles received the Red Hat on July 28, 1547, the day after Henry was crowned, at which ceremony Charles had officiated as the Cardinal Bishop of Reims. And during the reign of Henry, Charles and his brother Francis, the second Duke de Guise, held key positions in the King’s Council and effectively controlled the government during the short reign of Francis II in 1559-60.

Their identification of the Cardinal in the centre, beside the late Duke, as being Louis, Cardinal de Guise, is here contested. There is no dispute as to the ivy encircled pyramid being the device of the Cardinal of Lorraine but it is possible the more commanding figure in the centre is in fact Charles, the Cardinal of Lorraine. Thierry Crépin-Leblond confirms this suggestion, explaining that the confusion in identification has come about by simply identifying the person next to the device as being the Cardinal of Lorraine. He contends that the figure on the far right is Louis, Cardinal de Guise, whereas the man more slightly built standing next to Claude, with an expression of complacent authority has certainly the features of Charles, cardinal of Lorraine which one finds on the copy of the statutes of the Order of St. Michael and on his enamel portrait in the Victoria and Albert Museum. It would seem reasonable to assume that the device of the Cardinal is positioned at the extreme right, not to
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116 In the Paradin illustration of the device there is a crescent at the tip of the pyramid. Paradin states that the pyramid and crescent refer to King Henry II whose royal insignia was made up of two crescents intertwined, Paradin continues, the holy ivy is the prince prelate, the Cardinal of Lorraine.


118 “La confusion dans l'identification des cardinaux, sur la plaque de la Frick collection, vient de l'emplacement de l'emblème du cardinal Charles de Lorraine, qui a été compris comme identifiant celui qui est représenté contre lui...” Thierry Crepin-Leblond, email to kathmccarthy@netspace.net.au, 24 January, 2009.
indicate the identity of that person but is rather a matter of the enamel’s artistic composition. The height of the device necessitated its positioning at the far right, to balance the height of the figure in the chariot on the left. If it had been placed adjacent to the Cardinal in the centre, it would then have displaced the whole arrangement of the figures and obscured the background setting. Apart from the resulting artistic imbalance in the composition, that background may itself be significant and will be considered once other features have been examined. Furthermore the rather obsequious stance of the far right figure is not consistent with the character of the Cardinal of Lorraine.

Ritchie identified the central figure as Charles’s brother Louis, on the basis of the likeness of that face with that in the Limosin enamel in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London. At the time of his writing, that enamel was thought to be a portrait of Louis, Cardinal de Guise. Since then, the person in that V & A enamel has been definitely re-identified as Charles, the Cardinal of Lorraine (see fig. 8). A further reason for Ritchie’s identification of the figure on the extreme right as Charles was the fact he was holding, in a gesture of presentation, a book. While there is no inscription on the book, Ritchie suggests it is a printed copy of the speech Charles delivered at the Colloquy of Poissy defending the Catholic teaching on the Real Presence in the Eucharist. Ritchie tells us that speech received instant acclaim in France by the Catholic party and was published in the same year, 1561, at Paris, Reims, Lyon, and Rouen. In addition to the four French editions, an English translation was published in London and a German one in Heidelberg, both in 1561, giving indications of the immediate and widespread interest in the Cardinal’s defence of the Eucharist.\(^\text{119}\) The very gesture of presentation, by the person on the extreme right, might seem to support the identification of that person as Charles’s brother offering the printed work to the Cardinal, the central figure in the enamel, with his hand, along with his father’s, on the hilt of the sword. Just as the late Duke had fought against the Calvinists with the sword so Charles defended the Catholic faith by his

---

\(^{119}\) Ritchie gives no source for these publications. It seems particularly interesting if, as he claims, that the book was published in England. By 1561 Elizabeth had been on the throne for three years and the Protestant Reformation was again being imposed there. It would then have been difficult for an edition to be published in England.
words. Jeanne Harrie, applies that concept when identifying Charles as the figure holding the book. With the current Duke Francis also taking up arms against the Huguenots and ushering in the chariot with his hand on its wheel, she writes: *Francois, holding the wheel, and the cardinal, proferring the book, frame the composition, conveying the message that both force and eloquence are essential to the defence of the faith.*
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120 Jeanne Harrie, “The Guises, the Body of Christ, and the Body Politic”, 51
fig. 7 L. Limosin, *The Triumph of the Eucharist*

fig. 9 Devise of Charles de Guise

The device

Fig. 8. Limosin enamel, *Charles de Guise, Cardinal of Lorraine*, V & A London
A further problem of identification of the persons in the enamel has arisen with the claim by Camille Grand-Dewyse in her recent publication, *Emaux de Limoges au temps des guerres de Religion*. Grand-Dewyse subscribes to the idea that the figure holding the book is Charles, the Cardinal of Lorraine, but offers an entirely new suggestion as to the Cardinal in the centre. This figure she argues is Jean, Cardinal of Guise, brother of the late Duke Claude. There is no place for Louis de Guise in her reading of the enamel. She argues that Louis was not so well known in his day, living as he did, in the shadow of his more famous brother Charles, whereas, Jean, Cardinal of Lorraine, brother of Claude, the first Duke de Guise, was known as a generous patron of the arts renowned for his wisdom and erudition and on whose death, Charles succeeded as Cardinal of Lorraine. Grand-Dewyse maintains the enamel deliberately features two successive generations of the Guise family. The late Duke famous for his military success against the heretics, and Jean, a renowned patron of the arts and mentor to his nephew, Charles, are here flanked at each end by the current defenders of Catholic Faith, military defender and literary and intellectual defender. It must be conceded that such an interpretation carries considerable weight.

Quite apart from justifying Cardinal Jean de Lorraine's central place in the enamel because of his patronage of the arts as Camille Grand-Dewyse argues, greater weight might be given to his role in establishing the most distinguished episcopal dynasty in France in the sixteenth century. Bishop of Metz at the age of four, cardinal at eighteen, he established a pattern that was not to be seriously challenged for nearly a century. Cardinal Jean de Guise held no less than eleven dioceses during his lifetime, three of which were of archiepiscopal rank. He also collected monastic benefices in large numbers. All of this was in an age when bishops and abbots in *commendam* were primarily regarded as administrators of their temporalities and such appointments were an integral part of royal policy. Benefices might be held only briefly and were transferred to personal or family clients. And as Joseph Bergin
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122 Camille Grand-Dewyse, 178-179.
observed “His successors, Cardinal Charles de Lorraine and Louis I de Guise consolidated and extended their inheritance.”\(^\text{124}\) (It should be noted Cardinal Charles de Lorraine was influenced by the Tridentine attack upon episcopal pluralism and at the time of his death he held only one diocese.) Thus the case for identifying the centre figure with the late Duke as Cardinal Jean de Lorraine has a certain clout.

Camille Grand-Dewyse also has an interesting explanation for the rather deferential pose adopted by Charles in the enamel, along with his apparent dressing in black rather than in cardinal red. She quotes from a letter written by Charles on 9\(^{th}\) April, 1561. Following the sudden death in December, 1560, of Francis II, who had been married to a Guise niece Mary, Queen of Scots, daughter of Margaret Guise, widow of James V of Scotland, Charles and his brother Francis lost favour at the royal court. Charles writes of his retirement from the political life of the court to attend to pastoral affairs in his bishopric of Reims concluding, *I can assure you that I take as much pleasure in this as I did formerly in my duties and travails at court; in this, too, I experience so much sweet pleasure and restfulness that any desire to return to court is now far removed from my thoughts.* \(^\text{125}\) However, it would not be long before Charles was to be summoned back to court as Regent Catherine grappled with the rising tide of Calvinism and religious troubles in the realm.

The hilly landscape background in the enamel has generally been acknowledged as in the Fontainbleau landscape tradition commonly adopted by ceramicists of the period and no particular note has been taken of it. It is possible it may relate to the actual location of Poissy. Thus, apart from the presence of the host and chalice, and the book representing the Cardinal of Lorraine’s defence of the Real Presence, the enamel’s landscape may further confirm the occasion for the commissioning of the piece. Evennett, describing the landscape round Poissy, wrote of “the twists and leisurely loops of the Seine... In the neck of one of these loops, commanding an extensive view towards the capital, stands the royal chateau of St. Germain-en-Laye, and three or four miles to the north screened off by a belt of woodland, lies Poissy” with the late Romanesque church dating from the twelfth century which had

\(^{124}\) J. Bergin, 783.  
\(^{125}\) Camille Grand-Drewyse, 196.
witnessed the baptism of St. Louis. The castle had been given by Philip the Fair to the Dominican nuns who transformed it into one of the most fashionable convents in France. That convent was the site of the colloquy. One can discern the outline of a large building in the distant landscape on our enamel, possibly the castle of St. Germain-en-Laye, and following “the twists of the river” in the foreground a Romanesque church. Diarmaid MacCulloch made the following observation regarding the choice of Poissy for holding this colloquy, an attempt to reach religious concord in the nation: “a little town north of Paris on the Seine, whose chateau as the birthplace of the royal saint King Louis strongly symbolised the French monarchy’s sacred trust for its people.” So even the background on the plaque may provide further confirmation of the enamel as commemorating the triumph of Charles de Guise over the Calvinists at Poissy.

Again, Camille Grand-Drewyse has an interesting alternative reading of this background. She suggests the building in the far background may represent an analogy with Solomon’s temple in Jerusalem linking the Guise lineage to their involvement in the medieval Crusades. This, then, had a contemporary relevance given the threat of the infidel Turks along with the closer to hand “heretics”, the Huguenots. The late Duke Claude had waged war against the Anabaptists in 1525 at Saverne, and now, the threat came from the Huguenots. The identification of the particular members of the Guise family may seem to have been a somewhat esoteric exercise. However, given the possible political innuendoes, apart from the religious meaning of the enamel, it has been considered necessary to try to identify them in light of the then contemporary situation in France and the role the Guise family played in that context.

128 Thierry Crépin-Leblond does not agree with this suggestion. He writes, “Je ne crois pas que le paysage abstrait et simplifié de l’émail puisse être identifié avec la priorale royale de Poissy, de construction gothique, où a eu lieu le colloque de 1561, même si la genèse di la plaque est lié à cet évènement.” Email to K. McCarthy 25 January, 2009.
129 “Tendus dans un mouvement ascensionnel vers le temple de Jerusalem symbolique de leur engagement ancestral, les Guises sont prêts à vbraver les forces obscures pour atteindre la lumiere divine. La presence sur l’émail de Claude associee à celle de ses fils renvoie donc à ses haits faits accomplis lors de la guerre de 1525, qui elle-meme fait reference à la croisade des ancêtres et a bataille de Nancy”, C. Grand-Drewyse, 167
The Triumph Motif

To interpret a five hundred year old painting it needs to be ‘read’ as it would originally have been viewed. By the sixteenth century the triumph motif was already well established in Renaissance art and literature. The Church, to represent the triumph of Christian Faith over pagan antiquity, had long ago adopted the classical triumph. The once elaborate victory processions intended to exalt the Roman Emperor to the status of the gods were redirected to exalt the one true God. The Church, personified in the Pope, sometimes became worthy of a triumphal victory parade. Margaret Zaho has given us a colourful description of the entry of Pope Innocent III into Rome for his consecration in 1198, preceded by cardinals, bishops, Priests, and followed by representatives of civil authority. Such elaborate papal processions redirected the focus of the event from the pagan emperors to the Christian ruler of the church on earth. Dante, in the Divine Comedy, detailed a vision of a heavenly pageant with the Church riding on a triumphal chariot on two wheels. The gospel writers, as the winged creatures of Ezekiel’s vision, surround the chariot drawn by a griffon, (a lion with an eagle’s head), representing Christ in his divine and human natures. The height of the griffon’s wings indicates his divine origin; “The pinions rose so high they were lost to sight’... ‘Africanus, or even Augustus, never delighted Rome with so beautiful a chariot.” In succeeding centuries the vivid descriptions in Dante, were taken up by writers and artists.

The “Triumph” theme was adopted in turn by Petrarch and his Trionfi, describing the triumphs of Love, Chastity, Fame, Time, Death, and Divinity inspired the production of a long line of illustrations in a variety of media during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. Such illustrations were not unknown in sixteenth-century France. Ritchie noted the similarity of certain features in the Limosin enamel with details in an early sixteenth-century Flemish tapestry of Petrarch’s Triumph of Love now in the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna. The classical, historical triumph had become a popular subject with Renaissance painters as, for example, Mantegna’s cycle The
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131 Dante, Purgatorio (Canto xxix), trans. Allen Mandelbaum, (Berkeley, 1982), 270
Triumph of Caesar (Hampton Court, London). The allegorical triumph was also taken up in Renaissance painting as in Piero della Francesca’s portraits of Federico di Montefeltro and his wife Battista Sforza (Uffizi, Florence), riding in a ceremonial chariot complete with the Seven Virtues and a Victory crowning of Federico. Late in the fifteenth century Savonarola appropriated the imagery of the classical triumph recasting it in a thoroughly Christian mould: the Triumphus Crucis. Charles Scribner has observed that in this influential work, Savonarola was the first writer to represent the history of the Faith allegorically as a triumphal procession. In 1510 Venetian artist, Titian, produced his extraordinary woodcut of “The Triumph of Faith”, very likely inspired by Savonarola’s Triumphus Crucis. Titian displays Christ in a chariot the wheels of which are turned by the four Doctors of the Church, preceded and followed by the patriarchs and sibyls, martyrs and confessors, all to glorify the Church triumphant, implying at the same time the triumphs of Christianity had superseded those of antiquity. Many copies of this woodcut were published and spread quickly north into France, and later into the Netherlands where, no doubt contributed to Rubens’s adoption of the “Triumph” allegory in his tapestries on the Eucharist.

Ritchie claimed it was a well-known fact that the Limoges school of craftsmen of the painted enamel were without exception dependent for their designs upon prints or drawings of other artists. This was a fact supported in Benezet’s Dictionnaire des Peintres; “…On croit qui la plupart de ses émaux furent executés sur des dessins qui lui étaient par des peintres.” Thus the idea of presenting the Church in a triumphal chariot would no doubt have been familiar to an artist such as Leonard Limosin, and certainly to members of the Guise family and their contemporaries. Evennett tells us in his detailed account of Charles de Guise that the Cardinal shared the quaint passion of his time for mythological representations and masques. The enamel plaque in the Victoria and Albert Museum of Charles would seem to bear that out with the small enamel roundels of classical profile busts and the two narrow almost rectangular
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136 Evennett, Charles de Guise, the Cardinal of Lorraine, 13-14
plaques with their allegorical figures bearing laurel wreaths. Quite apart from such literary and artistic allusions to Triumphs, there was the contemporary reality of the entry of rulers into the cities of their realm, such as Henry II’s entry into Paris in 1549. The royal entry focused public attention on the ruler as “the incarnation of the State, the anointed of God, and pater patriae, the defender of Holy Church and of Religion.”

Was the Guise family, with this Triumph commission, making a political as well as a religious statement identifying themselves as defenders of the Church? Jeanne Harrie has argued that the enamel expresses the Guise family’s frustration with Catherine de’ Medici’s accommodation of the Calvinists on the eve of the religious wars and exalts the family’s defence of the body politic through its defence of the faith and the Eucharist. “By presenting Antoinette de Bourbon, the mother of the Guises, in triumph, it opposes her to Catherine and her family and offers an early statement of the Guise family’s claims to religious and political leadership.”

Harrie also tells us that Antoinette was known for her piety and her zealous defence of the Catholic faith; her residence at Joinville served as the family seat, the centre of family conferences, well into the 1580’s, and a location for the Catholic League’s discussion of strategy in 1584 and 1588. By way of contrast, the female figure in the Rubens’ modello (fig. 6), personifying the Church and holding aloft the monstrance, is no known particular person. Reading the plaque, as the Guise family’s response to the Crown’s accommodation of the Calvinists, will be considered in some detail after other aspects of the enamel are here examined.

What might be considered somewhat intriguing is the existence of four doves drawing the triumphal chariot over a cloud mass. Dante’s chariot was drawn by the winged symbols of the Evangelists, Titian’s was drawn by the Doctors of the Church. Given the personification of the Church (ecclesia) with the Duchess de Guise holding aloft the Eucharist in procession, one might have anticipated a single dove symbolising the Holy Spirit but here we have four doves. James Hall in his Dictionary of Subjects and Symbols in Art records, that Venus, when travelling on her triumphal
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139 The role of the Guise family in the Holy League is commemorated in an engraving which appeared in Paris in 1585. See below fig. 13.
chariot is usually accompanied by two or four doves or swans.\textsuperscript{140} Figs 10 & 11 show Venus in such guise and the same motif can be found on other art pieces of the period.\textsuperscript{141} Ritchie cites a further instance of this design for Venus borne aloft on clouds. It can be seen in a Louvre enamel by the master I.C. (i.e. Jean de Court or Jehan de Courteys).\textsuperscript{142} Can one assume, in this Limosin enamel, that there is an allusion to Venus symbolising Divine Love as represented here in the Eucharist? While to the modern viewer such an analogy, Venus with Christ, might seem profane, one must read it in its sixteenth-century context. Neo-Platonic humanists such as Marsilio Ficino, Poliziano and Giovanni Pico della Mirandola represented Venus as that perfect beauty that inspires love. Renaissance humanists had come to establish in their writings, a symbiosis between the gods and goddesses of the antique world and the beliefs of Christianity. According to Plato, all communion between mortals and gods was established through the mediation of Love. Although Venus remained one deity among others, for these Italian Humanists Venus defined, as it were, the universal system of exchange by which divine gifts are graciously circulated. Italian humanist scholars were often employed to program an artistic work for a painter as was the case with Ficino for his patron, Pierfrancesco de’Medici, for Botticelli’s \textit{Primavera}.\textsuperscript{143} Venus was certainly a popular subject in art in the Renaissance era: witness Titian’s \textit{Worship of Venus}, or his \textit{Sacred and Profane Love}. There the figure with jewels at her waist and flowers in her lap representing the love of worldly things, is contrasted with Venus, \textit{amor celestis}, untrammelled by earthly possessions, holds the burning lamp of Divine Love. Such neo-Platonic ideas of Italian humanists regarding the role of Venus were gaining currency in France by the early sixteenth century.

\textsuperscript{140} James Hall, \textit{Dictionary of Subjects and Symbols in Art}, rev.ed. (London: John Murray, 1979) 319
\textsuperscript{141} A salière ronde by Pierre Reymond and dated ca. 1545, is similarly embossed. Sophie Baratte, Musée du Louvre, \textit{Les Emaux Peints de Limoges} (Paris: Louvre, 2000) 273
\textsuperscript{142} Ritchie,” Léonard Limosin’s Triumph of the Faith,” 249.
Fig. 10 Venus sending Cupid to Dido, Jean II Penicaud, ca. 1540. Norwich Museum

Fig. 11 - Venus sending Cupid to Dido Workshop of Pierre Reymond ca.1550 C.2412 Victoria & Albert Museum.

Fig. 12 - Detail of 4 doves (Shaft of chariot shaft protruding between doves)
Direct contact between Italy and France saw regular exchange of writers and artists particularly following Charles VIII’s invasion of Italy in 1494. Even earlier, Frenchmen like Guillaume Budé and Lazare de Baïf studied in Italy while Lefèvre d’Étaples stayed at Ficino’s villa at Careggi in Tuscany. Italian literature was revealed to France by translations: of the *Decamerone* in 1485, of the *Trifoni* of Petrarch in 1514, of the *Paradiso* between 1515 and 1524. At the same time printed editions of ancient authors, translations and commentaries were circulating in France. Thus it is not surprising that an artist such as Leonard Limosin, whom Benezit describes as “one of the most important enamellers in Limoges and perhaps in Renaissance France as a whole”, and painter to the King of France from 1530, would have been acquainted with classical myths such as Venus. In fact, he is reputed to have copied the style of Raphael depicting the story of Psyche after Raphael. In 1573 he made an enamel depicting Catherine de Medici as Juno where her chariot is pulled by peacocks walking on clouds very similar to those painted in the Frick enamel here, and her son, Charles IX is presented as Mars borne aloft and pulled by wolves. Camille Grand-Drewyse also refers to another plaque painted by Leonard Lmosin featuring Louise de Lorraine as Venus and whose chariot is drawn by four doves. With regard to the existence of the doves in our Frick enamel she interprets their presence as symbolising Venus “la force d’Amour qui assure l’harmonie du monde, selon les theories néoplatoniciennes en cours à la renaissance.” She goes on to argue that it is logical that doves, the birds associated with Venus, be attached to the chariot of the Faith, since it is the love of God which guides believers and which secures cohesion and harmony in the world. Grand-Drewyse ascribes une importance primordiale to the doves being harnessed to the chariot and again this accords with her identification of the figure holding the book as being the Cardinal Charles de Guise. She points out that the Cardinal is not standing upon a massacre of heretics, as are the present and the late Duke, but rather the doves are presented level with his

---

145 Benezit, *Dictionary of Artists* vol 8, 1054
147 C. Grand-Dewyse (2011), 149.
face and they should be read as embodying the Holy Spirit even more so than the clouds, which seem to support the yoking of the chariot as signs of the divine. The religious symbolism of the doves, she contends, attests to the more conciliatory overtures adopted by the Cardinal at Poissy rather than resorting to force.\textsuperscript{148} The Cardinal is shown as putting his faith in the healing power of words to calm the violent divisions that separate his contemporaries. Jeanne Harrie makes little comment on their presence in the enamel beyond observing that doves connote peace achieved through victory.\textsuperscript{149} From that perspective, the enamel with its illusion to Venus, might be read as representing the victory of Charles, the Cardinal of Lorraine over his Calvinist adversaries at Poissy.

This adapting of figures from classical mythology to enhance a current reality is typical of the period. Witness the Duke de Guise commissioning a medal of Hercules slaying the Hydra following the slaughter of St. Bartholomew’s Day. Consider the case of Catherine de Medici following the sudden death of her husband, Henry II in 1559, and then the death of her son, Francis II in 1560. As Queen Regent she needed her own iconography of power to articulate the active role she intended to play in public life. Given the restriction of the Salic Law prohibiting female succession, and a possible challenge for the regency from Anthony of Bourbon, the first prince of the blood, she adopted the persona, when portrayed in art, of Artemisia, Queen and widow of Mausolus who ruled in her own right after his death, in Asia Minor in the fourth century. As Stephen Orgel has argued, “The age believed in the power of art to persuade, transform and preserve.”\textsuperscript{150}

The final aspect of this intriguing enamel is the mound of figures over which the chariot rides triumphantly. The twenty heretics crushed by the chariot of “The Faith”, were originally identified by gilt inscriptions over or near their heads. The gold applied after the firing of the enamel, is now almost completely obliterated, but faint...
traces are still visible under a raking light. These were deciphered by Ritchie in his article of 1939 as follows: IEHAN HVS (Jan Hus the Bohemian reformer); DONATUVS (either of two fourth century heretics); BEZE (Théodore de Bèze); ADAMITE (a personification of the primitivizing sect of that name whose beliefs included a return to an Adam-like state of nudity); FRATRICELLI (the name of a heretical branch of the Franciscan order); PRAGE (Jerome of Prague, a follower of Jan Hus); ARIUS (another fourth century heretic); CALVIN; ANABAPTISTE (a Protestant sect persecuted by Catholic and Reformers alike); VABAPT (apparently a second reference to the Anabaptists;) and a fragment ending in the letters VS (possibly, since it accompanies a Turkish turbaned head, it might represent Aenobarbus, the Latinized name of the sixteenth century Turkish admiral better known as Barbarossa.

Two references to Anabaptists may not be surprising given that active opposition to Protestantism by the Guise family could be said to have begun with Claude de Lorraine’s role in the massacre of thousands of German Anabaptists at the battle of Saverne (Zabern) in 1525. Inscriptions for the remaining heads either have left no trace or never existed. Conspicuously absent among the heretics seems to be Martin Luther. This might be explained by the fact that at Poissy, Charles de Guise had attempted to get Beza (Beze) to accept the Lutheran formula of the Eucharist as a point of compromise in order to continue discussion. The historian has always to be on his or her guard from applying hindsight. In this situation, one has to remember that many points of doctrine had not, as then, been clearly defined nor understood by all parties. Certainly, it is a known fact that following the failure at Poissy, the Cardinal, with his brother the Duke, went to Germany in February 1562, to meet with the Lutheran Duke of Wurtemberg and his theologian. Evennett covers this meeting in some detail but no agreement between the parties on matters of doctrine was attained. Luther’s teaching on the Eucharist, along with that of the other Protestant reformers was not officially condemned until the final sessions of the Council of Trent.

One final observation of this Limosin enamel, is the absence of any Papal insignia which, by contrast, are prominent in the Rubens painting, and in turn, the tapestry
The Triumph of the Church. Given the traditional protection of Gallican rights by both the Crown and higher clergy in France, this is not entirely surprising. King Francis I had been reluctant to respond to the Papal summons to participate in the first gathering at Trent. It is generally agreed that it was only under pressure of the victorious Charles V in 1545, that Francis I finally agreed to send bishops to the Council; even then only four Bishops were sent. Furthermore, they were instructed that there had to be at the Council one French position. They were to be spokespersons of their King and of their nation. According to Hubert Jedin, they formed the only strictly national group, and they still expressed support for the Conciliar theory.\footnote{Marc Venard, “Ultramontane or Gallican? The French Episcopate at the End of the Sixteenth Century”, The Jurist 52, (1992) 143.}

Such independence had a long history going back more than a century to the Pragmatic Sanction of Bourges of 1438, and with some amendments, confirmed more recently in the Concordat of 1516. It might even be argued that French defiance of the Papacy could be dated back to Philip the Fair’s dispute with Pope Boniface VIII in 1302. The reconvening of the Council in 1551 came at the time of the Gallican crisis with Pope Julius III, and Henry II refused to participate at all. For a while it had even seemed as though Henry intended to establish a separate Patriarch. It is worth recalling that period of France’s extreme Gallicanism to appreciate the shift towards Rome which came later in the sixteenth century with which the Cardinal of Lorraine and the Holy League were associated. The Cardinal took immediate steps to implement the decrees of the Council in his diocese of Rheims on his return from Trent despite the refusal of the Crown to “receive” the decrees.

What then was the function of this plaque? Jeanne Harrie observes that the Guises chose the fashionable and expensive medium of painted enamel, instead of the less costly and more easily circulated medium of print.\footnote{Jeanne Harrie, “The Guises, the Body of Christ, and the Body Politic” 53.} Given its size it can only have been designed for a fairly private family setting, certainly not destined for major exhibition.\footnote{Limosin enamel measures 7.75 x 10 inches, or 19 x 25.1 cm.} Small pieces of decorative art were typically displayed in cabinets, like
that in which the Frick Museum houses *The Triumph of the Eucharist*. The likely location for this enamel might have been the Guise family seat at Joinville: there it presented to the family and their intimates, a graphic visual record of the family’s defence of the Catholic faith during the troubled times of the French religious wars. The first of those wars broke out in April 1562, a possible date for the commissioning of the enamel. By May the Huguenots had already taken Tours, Blois and Rouen. In Lyon, Natalie Zemon Davis has recorded that the Calvinist crowds purged the Catholic holy places; with thoroughness they had inventoried and melted down reliquaries, whitened church walls and put in simple windows where before there had been stained-glass pictures and crosses were smashed at crossroads.\(^{154}\) Therefore it is feasible to think that the Guise family could have reacted, in a gesture of defiance to such iconoclasm, with the commissioning of an art work identifying the family with defence of the Eucharist.

Apart from any specific occasion such as that violent iconoclasm, Harrie has mounted a convincing argument that the enamel expresses the Guise family’s frustration with Catherine de’ Medici’s accommodation of the Calvinists arguing that “its patron sought to represent the family as the rightful defender of the Catholic faith, the body of Christ and the body politic in opposition to the Valois family’s claims to such hereditary and divine responsibilities.”\(^{155}\) She has made an interesting comparison between Regent Catherine and the Dowager Duchess Antoinette de Bourbon: both mothers, widows, heads, in a way, of their households. We know that Antoinette was a devout Catholic; one might say fanatic, in her having a “heretic” discovered on her estates, burnt at the stake.\(^ {156}\) A striking feature of the plaque is that it is a known female actually holding aloft the chalice and host. It is one thing to personify the Church (ecclesia) by an anonymous female as in the Rubens painting (fig.6), but four hundred years ago, to personify the Church as the Duchess of Guise, and have her holding the chalice, could be construed as making a significant statement about family identity in upholding Catholic dogma of belief in the Real Presence. Then there are the

---


Guise Dukes, father and son, who took up arms to defend the Catholic Church against the “heretics”, Claude at Saverne against the Anabaptists, and Francis at Vassy. There is no doubt about the role of Charles, the Cardinal of Lorraine, defending the doctrine at Poissy while his sermons on the feast of Corpus Christi revealed his deep Eucharistic piety declaring that it was better to die than to allow another religion to be established in the Kingdom.\textsuperscript{157} There may also have been more personal reasons on the part of the Cardinal of Lorraine to identify himself with the Real Presence as in this plaque. While Lorraine had been the unanimous choice at Poissy to reply to Beza’s theology on the Eucharist, he had been careful to avoid charged terms such as “transubstantiation” and \textit{ex opere operato}. As has been noted above, he had even introduced the Confession of Augsburg as a way of negotiating with Beza, and in February, 1562, he had gone with his brother Francis, to Saverne to meet with the Duke of Wurtemberg. There the Cardinal had a conference with Johann Brenz, a noted Lutheran theologian.\textsuperscript{158} All of this had roused the suspicions of both the Calvinists as well as the ultra Catholic prelates who had attended Poissy and the more conservative Catholic theologians of the Sorbonne. There was no single united Catholic party in France at this point. On the extreme right there was the intransigent Cardinal Francis de Tournon, Archbishop of Lyon and Primate of Gaul: at the other extreme there was Odet Châtillon, Bishop of Beauvais, soon to go over to the Reformers. There was a middle party, generally referred to by historians as the “Moyenneurs”, which included among others, Jean de Monluc, Bishop of Valence, and the Chancellor Michel de l’Hôpital. The Cardinal of Lorraine, before he attended the Council of Trent, was considered to be closer to this middle party. Thus it is conceivable that Lorraine was anxious to attest to his absolute orthodoxy as regards the Eucharist. While he was prepared to discuss aspects of Protestant theology in the hope of preserving the unity of the Church, he was absolutely opposed to religious pluralism and any toleration of Calvinism in the realm as shown below in his correspondence with the Regent at this time.

\textsuperscript{157} B. Diefendorf, \textit{Under the Shadow of the Cross}, 161.
On 17 January 1562, Regent Catherine de Medici, had issued, in the name of the King, the Edict of Saint-Germain granting limited toleration to the Calvinists since...

It is well known what troubles and seditions are now in hand and are daily instigated and increased in our kingdom by the malice of the times and the diversity of opinions which reign in religion.\textsuperscript{159}

The toleration was to be provisional "awaiting determination by a General Council or until we decide otherwise...". In the meantime

when those of the new Religion go to and return from and gather outside the towns for their religion', (it was forbidden,) to impede, disquiet, molest or overrun them in whatever way it might be.\textsuperscript{160}

In a letter from the Cardinal of Lorraine to the Regent, dated 21\textsuperscript{st} February, 1562, he acknowledges receipt of a copy of that edict sent to him by the Regent to which he replies ; “... as to your wishing to have my opinion of it, it would be very foolish on my part, now that the decision has been taken, to presume to discuss it." And if he had been involved in any such plan to set up ministers of Antichrist, “I would certainly have been against it, for these people are opposed to God and to the king”.\textsuperscript{161} The Cardinal went on to thank God that the Calvinist preaching that had been taking place in the King’s palace had now ceased, but that

it was still more strange that you should not have the means to clean these heresies out of your own chambers and the apartments of your ladies and gentlemen who are of your estate.\textsuperscript{162}

The January edict had permitted Calvinist services in homes of the nobility. Is it too fanciful to think that the installation of a plaque proclaiming \textit{The Triumph of the Faith} in a Guise palace was a direct retaliation to such a provision? Given the private nature of this small, yet expensive piece, the absence of papal insignia may not be so significant. It represented the affirmation of a family’s belief in the Real Presence in


\textsuperscript{160} David Potter, \textit{The French Wars of Religion}, 31.


\textsuperscript{162} \textit{...est il plus estrange que vous n’ayez le moyen de netoyer de ces heresies vostre chamber et vostre garde robe, je n’ose dire les logis des dames et signeurs qui sont en vostre estat}. Cit Daniel Cuisiat, \textit{Lettres du Cardinal Charles de Lorraine}, 447.
opposition to Huguenot denial of that doctrine, rather than a public declaration vis a vis the Roman Catholic Church. Thus the question as to who precisely commissioned the plaque and when, still remains a mystery but a reasonable case can be mounted as to the likelihood of it being the Cardinal of Lorraine, certainly, a member of the Guise family and, very likely, early in 1562.

Twenty three years later, there appeared in Paris an engraving in January 1585, dedicated to Henry of Lorraine, Duke de Guise, son of Duke Francis who featured in the Limosin enamel. Jeanne Harrie’s interpretation of the Limosin enamel as seeking to represent the Guise family as “the rightful defender of the Catholic faith...in opposition to the Valois family’s claims to such hereditary and divine responsibilities”, (see above page 46), might very well be applied to this engraving (fig.13)

Fig. 13 Richard Verstigan, *L’Eglise catolique et l’eglise hérétiques*, engraving, H. 24cm x L. 23cm. Dedicated to Henry of Lorraine, Duke de Guise, 1585.\(^\text{163}\)

\(^{163}\) See Appendix 5 for B&W image of fig. 13
This engraving, by Richard Verstigan, dated 3 January, 1585, appeared as a renewed Holy League was making serious moves to prevent the possible ascension to the throne of Huguenot Henry of Navarre. Henry of Guise, right at this time, was concluding a treaty with Spain to this end. Drawing on the theological idea of typology, Verstigan is here juxtaposing the Typus of the Catholic Church with the Typus of the Church of the Heretics but uses here a biased term of calling it a Synagoge to further disparage the “Heretics”. The special characteristics of each church are framed below the central figure on each side. On the Catholic side Ecclesia sits on a throne crowned by the papal tiara, holding the keys and a book, possibly signifying the Scriptures. On the heretics’ side it is a rough, frenzied figure sitting at the entrance to a cave in the wilderness and holding in either hand, a mask and a flame, symbols of Envy. (The idea of the darkness of the cave is replicated in picture 3.) The characteristics for the Catholic Church translate as Antiquity, Succession (Apostolic Succession as illustrated in picture 2), Universal and Harmony. By contrast, the Synagoge of the heretics is characterised by Novelty, Disruption, Particularity and Disharmony. Each characteristic is then illustrated in the series of small pictures with corresponding text boxes.

In picture 1 on the Catholic side Communion is being distributed under the one species of bread to the faithful in a traditional church. Everything is orderly with the communicants kneeling reverently. On the heretics’ side the setting looks more like a tavern, rather disorderly with the dog jumping up to the table, and the gathering all downing their glasses of wine. Since the caption for this image is Novitas, is this referring to and denigrating the Reformers’ practice of taking Communion under both species, giving wine to the laity along with the bread, which practice was denied at Trent?

Picture 2 has a long line of seated Popes disappearing into the distance above which are the initials S P (Saint Peter) either side of a large mitred head above which is the word CHRIST surrounded by an aureole suggestive of the light of the Holy Spirit. This

---

164 Richard Verstigan, Oxford educated but unable to graduate being a Roman Catholic, was seeking refuge in France. He was being pursued in England for having secretly published an account of the martyrdom of Edmond Campion.
image in turn is contrasted with the wolves released by the Reformers disbursing part of the flock of the faithful. Pictures 3 are even more contrasting with people entering a church with its consecrated ground of the graveyard, and listening attentively to the sermon while on the heretics’ side there is an owl standing in the dark of a dead tree stump. The owl in medieval times was used as a symbol to stigmatise Jews. A medieval illustrated *Bestiary* in the Bodleian Library, Oxford, says of the owl, “It is a bird which flees from light and cannot bear the sight of the sun. This bird signifies the Jews, who, when our Lord came to save them, rejected Him, saying: ‘We have no king except Caesar’. And preferred the darkness to the light.”

In the era of the Reformation each side of the controversy designated the other by the symbol of the owl inferring a refusal to face the light of Truth. The branches of the tree in the middle ground of this picture seem tossed in an unnatural shape as if in a whirlwind suggesting chaos among the Reformed churches and instead of a traditional church in the background, it appears as a rough hut with a couple sitting outside. The hut may in fact be playing on the idea of a synagogue. Verstigan’s title for the church of the heretics is a *Synagoge* (synagogue), and a synagogue would normally be built beside a stream or river for ritual washing, and there does seem to be a stream running through the background in the picture with the building placed beside it. Consistent with the idea then of a synagogue as the heretics’ place of assembly, maybe the turbulent tree in the middle ground might stand for some tree in the Old Testament now in disarray, possibly the oak of Mamre?

Particularly stark contrasts are made in pictures 4. The idea of Authority and Order in the circle of Cardinals, mitred Bishops, monks and clerics presided over by the enthroned Pope above whom flies the dove of the Holy Spirit is contrasted by the almost violent disorder as the Reformers, holding their Bibles, argue over doctrine. Some of the Reformers can be identified, Martin Luther with his wife Katharine von Bora, and Zwingli with sword upraised argues with Luther, possibly recalls the heated exchange that had taken between them at the Colloquy of Marburg over the Eucharist, and bearded Calvin in discussion with maybe Bullinger.

---

166 I am grateful to Dr. Rosemary Canavan at Catholic Theological College for this suggestion.
Such a print, with its emphasis on the Mass, Holy Communion, harmony and Authority of Apostolic Succession as the distinguishing characteristics of Catholicism, in contrast to the portrayed disorder and the denial of the Real Presence in the Church of the heretics, would have played its part in the bitter print warfare between Catholics and Protestants in France in the latter part of the sixteenth century. This propaganda warfare became particularly vitriolic with the re-emergence of the Holy League following the death of the Duke of Anjou in 1584 and the likelihood of the succession to the French throne of Henry of Navarre, a Huguenot. The dedication of the Verstigan engraving, to the most Illustrious Henry, Duke de Guise, identified him as a leading figure in the Holy League whose aim was to prevent the succession to the throne of Henry of Navarre and the preservation of the Catholic religion in France.

Leaving aside the Richard Verstigan engraving, the question needs to be asked if the Limosin enamel *The Triumph of the Eucharist*, was in any way representative of similar pieces in French art at this time? Stories from the Old and the New Testaments, along with incidents from the lives of the saints were themes of religious paintings in seventeenth-century French art, but there appears no major painting resembling the triumphal Eucharistic motif of Limosin’s enamel nor anything approximating to paintings by Rubens and other Netherlands painters. The Eucharistic theme in French art of this time could be said to be there in *The Supper at Emmaus* (1656) by Laurent de La Hyre, and more directly in *The Eucharist*, one of the paintings in the two series on the Sacraments by Nicolas Poussin. These two series devoted to the seven sacraments have been judged “the most important paintings with Christian subjects from Poussin’s middle years.”167 The first series was painted between 1636 and 1642 for Cassiano Dal Pozzo168 and the second between 1644 and 1648 for his most important French patron, Paul Fréart de Chantelou. While it is of some significance that the seven sacraments were the theme of these commissions at a time when the Protestant Reformers had reduced the sacraments to

168 Cassiano Dal Pozzo was secretary to Cardinal Francesco Barberini, nephew of Pope Urban VIII. Poussin was working in Rome at this time.
two, Baptism and the Lord’s Supper, the treatment by Poussin reflected the dominant passion of his patron, Dal Pozzo, rather than any Reformation polemic. Dal Pozzo’s passion was the study of antiquity. He had brought together a collection of classical artefacts and relics of Imperial Rome, sculptural fragments, pieces of ancient architecture dug from Roman excavations creating the Museo Cartaceo. The research of Cardinal Caesar Baronius (1538-1607) in early church history and published in the twelve volume *Annales Ecclesiastici*, may have stimulated Dal Pozzo’s interest in wanting to give an historically accurate visual setting for the origin of the sacraments. Art critics have focused on the painting’s composition with the apostles dressed in Roman togas lying on couches round the table, and Poussin’s remarkable handling of light emphasising the drama of the moment of the institution of the Eucharist and the betrayal by Judas. Emile Mâle has made an interesting observation on these aspects in Poussin’s painting. He found it extraordinary that in the Middle Ages which created the feast of *Corpus Christi* and hymns celebrating the mystery of the Eucharist, painters rarely, if ever, in their Last Suppers painted the moment of the institution of the Eucharist, but focused instead on the moment of Christ announcing that one of his disciples would betray him. Mâle contended it was only following the Reformation controversy on the Eucharist that painters began to focus rather on the moment when Christ took the bread and said the words “This is my body”. Mâle included this work of Poussin in that latter category. However, in no way does Poussin’s *Eucharist* correspond with the triumphal motif of Limosin’s enamel.

More relevant to the artistic treatment of the Real Presence but some forty years later than the Limosin enamel, an illustrated Jesuit publication appeared for the first time in 1601, with subsequent editions in 1602, 1604, 1609, 1611 and 1613, *Tableaux sacrés des figures mystiques du tres-auguste sacrifice et sacrament de l’Eucharistie* by Louis Richeome, printed by Laurent Sonnus with engravings by Léonard Gaultier. With Jesuit emphasis on what Ignatius called “composition of place” involving virtually pictorial meditation, Richeome, believing in the affective potential of art, urged the excitant to:

---

Cast his or her mind’s eye on one or more of these venerable images. This contemplation will make the soul’s eye more diligent and keen, and the heart more eager for heavenly sustenance...171

The author dedicated this work to “the most Christian Queene of France” (Marie de Medici). There was also an English edition of this devotional work on the Eucharist, dated 1610, but that edition did not contain any images. The author explained in his introduction “To the Reader” that these engravings were so “over–worne” from the printing of a second edition, he decided against purchasing them from the French press. However, he went on to say that the descriptions themselves “are so glorious, so lifely, and so compleate” that there was no need of the images.” That English edition, on its cover page, announced that it was “Translated into English for the benefit of those of that Nation, as well Protestants as Catholics.” And in similar manner, to that adopted in due course by Peter Paul Rubens in executing his commission for the tapestry series on the Eucharist, Richeome’s images began with portraying the Old Testament pre-figurations of the Eucharist, the Sacrifice of Melchisedech, The Paschal Lamb, and the Fall of the Manna. Such approach enhanced the biblical authentication for the sacrament. Emile Mâle has noted that most Old Testament pre-figurations in seventeenth religious art were centred upon either the sacraments or the Virgin and thus were selected for an explicitly Counter-Reformation purpose. The Old Testament prototypes were used as Biblical precedents which, if interpreted correctly, clearly bolstered those Catholic doctrines which had come under the most severe attack by the Protestants.172 In a somewhat similar vein the Limosin enamel, and Richard Verstigan’s engraving (fig.13) might be regarded not so much as devotional Eucharistic images but rather as polemical pieces.

However, there were other representations in France of images with Eucharistic allusions and of a more reverential character. Images of Christ in the winepress, with their direct connection to the doctrine of transubstantiation, emphasized the

sacrificial and Eucharistic dimension of Christ’s suffering and were designed to rouse
the heart and mind of the viewer. The image, *Le Pressoir Mystique*, can be found in
stained glass windows of the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries in northern
France and in Paris, also in a most interesting woodcut dated ca. 1570 and an
engraving in a work published in Paris in 1609. Images of Christ in the Winepress
were also widely disseminated in engravings in the neighbouring Netherlands where,
as in France, the doctrine of the Real Presence and the concept of the Mass as a
sacrifice had been challenged by Calvinist Reformers.
The theme of Christ in the winepress was certainly not a new image in the sixteenth century. Maurice Vloberg contends that the oldest representation of such an image dates from a miniature in the *Hortis Deliciarum*, a medieval manuscript compiled at the Hohenburg Abbey in Alsace begun in 1167. Gertrud Schiller dates a wall painting in a monastery church of Kleincomburg to ca 1108. The image in the *Hortis Deliciarum* is a circular representation; the outer circle is studded with roundels of angels and Christ appears to be stepping from the inner circle to move towards and bless a believer standing outside the outer circle, while, what might be two apostles, are blessing a group of the faithful. The inner circle contains the winepress with an angel turning the winch while Christ treads the grapes and the wine flows into a vat. A large group, bishops, a Queen, a figure with a triple tiered cone shaped hat possibly represents a pope, nuns and monks, all reverently look on. There is no really overt allusion to the Eucharist as later appears in winepress images dating from the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

Many elements combined down the centuries to the emergence of representations of the Mystic Winepress. There are the scriptural sayings from Isaiah: *I have trodden the wine press alone, and from the people no one was with me...*(63:2-3); and the Suffering Servant, *But he was wounded for our transgressions, crushed in our iniquities...*(53: 5.): the Fountain of Life images, and the crucified Christ from whose side flows the

---

precious blood into a chalice. While Giovanni Bellini’s painting, *The Blood of the Redeemer* (The National Gallery, London), may be the most well known, Gertrud Schiller has unearthed such images dating back to drawings in a Utrecht Psalter dating from early in the ninth century.\(^{175}\) Then there are the images of the Mass of St. Gregory which began to appear in the fifteenth century. Miri Rubin writes of the “miraculous mood” which prevailed in medieval culture and how viewing a Eucharistic miracle could influence understanding of sacramental claims more than many sermons.\(^{176}\) The Mass of St. Gregory was one such miracle where the legend tells us that while saying Mass one day, Pope Gregory became aware of a disbeliever and began to pray for a sign that would leave no doubt of the Real Presence of Christ in the consecrated species. Showing His stigmata and surrounded by the instruments of the Passion, Christ materialised on the altar after the consecration. Gregory saw the vision first, gazing intently above as he spreads his hands in prayer. The most famous image of this “miracle” is the engraving by Israhel van Meckenem ca 1490 (British Museum, London).\(^{177}\) This image became immensely popular because of the indulgence attached to this devotion and to the cheap woodcuts sold at fairs. And the legend continued to be reproduced in paintings, engravings in stained glass windows and tapestries well into the sixteenth century.

However, many art historians see the origins of the Wine-press image as emerging from the devotion to the Precious Blood, a devotion founded on many scriptural texts. Christ Himself spoke of the Blood of the new covenant shed for many for the forgiveness of sins (Mt. 26.28). By it we are justified (Rom. 5.9) cleansed (Heb. 9.14; Jn 1.7) and redeemed for God (Ap. 5.9).\(^{178}\) At the last supper, Jesus taking the wine called it “my blood” (Mk 14.24) and invited his followers to drink it that they may have everlasting life (Mt. 26.28; Jn 6. 54-57). Evidence that “relics” of the Precious Blood were venerated at Mantua as early as 553, and at Bruges since 1158 attest to

---


\(^{176}\) Miri Rubin, *Corpus Christi: The Eucharist in Late Medieval Culture* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991),112-113

\(^{177}\) See also *The Mass of St. Gregory, Book of Hours of Bruges c. 1520-30*, attributed to Simon Bening, Getty Museum, Malibu; *Mass of St. Gregory*, stained glass window, Amsterdam, c. 1520, now Victoria & Albert, London, no. 1015-1905. These are only two of the many works, paintings, tapestries, engravings to be found in museums throughout the world.

the long history of this particular devotion but it became more widespread in the thirteenth century when many supposed “relics” of the Precious Blood were brought back by Crusaders returning from the Holy Land. This fostered a spirituality focused on the humanity of Christ and particularly on His sufferings and the shedding of His blood. This devotion became integrated with the image of Christ in the Winepress. The concept of Christ as the mystic Wine-treader became linked with the allegorical image of the ‘vineyard of God’ (Mat.21: 35-45) and this pictorial concept expanded into an allegory of the Church. Even before the polemics of the Reformation the image had taken on a more Eucharistic association. In many woodcuts or manuscript drawings, a chalice held by an angel at the opening of the press collects the wine. There is an image of Christ in the Winepress ca. 1511 in the Knights’ chapel in the church of St. Gumbert in Ansbach, where St. Peter, wearing papal tiara, kneels before the winepress and catches in his chalice, not wine but hosts (fig. 14).
Bernard Violle, in a paper delivered at a colloquy in France in 1989 on the occasion of the restoration of a stone retable featuring a depiction of the Mystic Winepress, maintained that the idea of Christ in the Winepress was well established in France by the sixteenth century.\textsuperscript{179} He refers to the work of Aloïs Thomas who has shown that the faithful were well acquainted with the theme of the Wine-press, thanks to sermons, hymns and spiritual writings.\textsuperscript{180} Violle’s essay deals with many surviving stained glass windows to be found in Normandy, the Champagne region, Brie, Beauce, the Île-de-France and in Paris, where such windows had a catechetical and a spiritual function. He points out that subjects treated there had to have been deeply rooted in the religious culture of the time for them to have been easily read and understood by everybody. Apart from church windows another important visual medium for the dissemination of this spirituality and its theology were printed images (estampes). There was a ready exchange of designs between painters of stained glass and the printers of images. One particular window from early in the seventeenth century, in the Church of St Etienne-du-Mont in Paris appears to be based closely on a most complex and theologically sophisticated woodcut printed ca. 1570, \textit{Le Pressoir de Nostre Savveur Jesus Christ} printed by Jacques Lalouette, (fig.15). We do not know who commissioned this woodcut. Lalouette’s print shop was located in Rue Montorgueil where many publishers of prints were settled from the mid sixteenth to early seventeenth century. In response to my query as to the possible circulation of such a print, Séverine Lepape, curator of prints from this period in the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris, replied that their archives record very large figures for the production of Rue Montorgueil, publishers were able to sell a thousand a month.\textsuperscript{181} Marianne Grivel, in an essay on “Print Makers in Sixteenth Century France” supports the idea that the extant holding of such engravings in the Bibliothèque Nationale is only a fraction of what once might have been disseminated. She suggests “What remains is only an infinitesimal part of real production of print holdings”.\textsuperscript{182}


\textsuperscript{180} Aloïs Thomas, \textit{Die Darstellung Christi in der Kelter}, Dusseldorf, 1936, cit. B. Viole, 130.

\textsuperscript{181} Séverine Lepape, email to kathmccarthy@netspace.net.au 11th January, 2012.

\textsuperscript{182} Marianne Grivel, "Print Makers in Sixteenth Century France", in \textit{The French Renaissance in Print from the Bibliothèque Nationale de France} (Grunwald Center for the Graphic Arts, Los Angeles: University of California , 1994), 53-58.
Therefore one cannot be certain as to the circulation of this particular print (fig. 15) and whether there may have been similar images in circulation. Given the BNF.’s suggested dating vers 1570, this woodcut appeared at a crucial period of the Counter Reformation in France, and apart from its spiritual messages it also provides insight into the politico-religious context of the time.

Fig. 15 Le Pressoir de Nostre Savveur Jesus Christ, Paris, par Jacques Lalouette. Bois, vers. 1570. B.N., Paris, Dpt des Estampes, Ed 5. 183

Reading the woodcut from the top right, a wagon, carrying a wine barrel, is driven and drawn by four winged creatures symbolising the four evangelists. The first of the scrolls, containing rhymed couplets, reads, Evangelists l’ont crié partout le monde et charié. This couplet freely translated, The evangelists on their chariot have proclaimed (the news) throughout the world, resonates with a line from psalm 147, “He sends out his word to the earth,” recited in the Mass of the feast of Corpus Christi.

183 It would appear that this woodcut was originally part of book. Right hand edge seems to be the spine leading onto next page.
To the left we see God the Father among the clouds and the accompanying scroll *Le père a fait houer Sa vigne & laboure*, (God the Father has made man to hoe and labour in his vineyard). Continuing down, there is a figure treading the grapes in a vat and we are told this is St. Peter the first pope who has gathered the grape harvest; *Saint Pierre premier pape a vendengé la grappe*. The apostles are bringing in the baskets laden with grapes, *Apostres ont foulee, La vendenge & coulee, Et les disciples mesmement Y ont travaillé grandement*: (The Apostles have trodden and crushed the harvest, and the disciples in like manner. They have laboured hard.) Christ being crushed under the board of the press is the centrepiece. A careful study reveals Christ’s own hand coming from below and pressing down the lid of the press suggesting his submission to the Father’s will (Jhn. 16:14; 31). The caption records the saying from Isaiah 63: 3, in Latin, I have trodden the wine press alone. The scroll below reads, *Dieu seul a presse en grad peine, Le pressoir de nature humaine, Et les pasteurs de droit divin En ont entonné le bon vin.* (God alone has trodden in great pain the wine press of human nature and the pastors with divine consent have put the wine into barrels.) The “pasteurs” who are decanting the wine into barrels are shown as a Pope, distinguished by his triple tiara, and a Cardinal, and to the right are mitred bishops doing likewise. The right end corner has a papal figure and a Cardinal lowering a wine barrel into the cellar and assisted by two crowned figures, one wearing the *fleur de lis* French crown the other the Imperial crown of the Holy Roman Emperor. The inscription here reads *Et avec les Roys familliers L’ot deualé dás celiers:* (And with the kings of the family they have stored the wine in the cellars.)

Reading upwards on the right side of the woodcut a priest is about to distribute Communion while further to the right a figure is kneeling before a priest who appears to be in the act of giving absolution to the penitent, while the scroll here warns that whoever drinks of the wine unworthily, takes and drinks his own judgment: *Qui cóque en boit indignement Il pren & boit son jugement*, (1 Cor.27).

---

184 The original French on the woodcut is being reproduced here, such as the spelling of the verb *faict*, though the old form of the letter s which appeared then closer to a *f*, has been transcribed here as an *s*. 
The inclusion in the woodcut of these scrolled captions, i.e. the addition of words on the image, is a mode David Freedberg describes as “literalizing visual language”. This supplementing the communicational aspect of the visual form, might stem from the assumption of the primacy of verbal language over visual language, to a feeling that pictorial images alone are not sufficient to convey specific messages. There are many messages to be read in this woodcut. One obvious message of the woodcut, linking Christ’s blood with the wine of the Eucharist being given in Communion, proclaims the dogma of transubstantiation, thus challenging the denial by the Huguenots in France of the substantial Presence of Christ in the consecrated species. It also affirms the importance of the sacrament of Penance. There is so much more to read here. It affirms the doctrine of Apostolic Succession by presenting to the viewer St. Peter, the first Pope, and then continuing with representations of two more Popes in line. Together with the depiction of a church in the upper level, and with figures of Popes, Cardinals and mitred Bishops the image propagates the belief that the Church through its ministry gives us the body and blood of Christ, our Saviour; and it is a hierarchical, sacramental Church. On the question of Apostolic Succession, Theodore Beza was pressed at Poissy to declare where he stood. Beza made a distinction between succession of persons and a succession of doctrine; going on to avow that the apostolic succession of Rome had been shattered by the frequency of schisms and anti-popes. Donald Nugent reports Beza as finishing the point with force: “..those who do not preach at all, or who in place of the apostolic doctrine teach their own, although they allege themselves to have a thousand consecutive predecessors, ought not to be heard as pastors, but to be put to flight as wolves, by the express commandment of Jesus Christ and his apostles.” An attitude, one might comment, shared by most Protestant Reformers who referred to the Pope of their day, as “anti-Christ” and with their emphasis on “the priesthood of all believers”, had no place for an ordained hierarchy. It should be noted that one of the tapestries in Rubens Eucharist Series is of The Apostolic Succession. This will be considered in chapter 5.

---

185 David Freedberg, “Prints and the Status of Images” http://www.columbia.edu/cu/arthistory/faculty/Freedberg, 47.
The inclusion of the two crowned figures is most intriguing, and the fact they are referred to “les Roys familiers”. This might simply mean that both the King of France and the Holy Roman Emperor belong to the family of the Catholic Church, and their role as Catholic rulers is to preserve the faith in their lands. It might also have a more immediate meaning given the suggested date for the woodcut, ca 1570. In that year the contract was signed for the marriage of Charles IX, King of France, with Elizabeth, daughter of Maximilian II, Holy Roman Emperor and early in 1571 the couple made an elaborate royal entry into Paris. Roy Strong has made an interesting observation on the political use of such a festival entry, and other fêtes orchestrated by the Regent, Catherine de ‘Medici. They were a product of a quite specific set of political circumstances designed to demonstrate to foreigners that the country was not entirely ruined financially as a result of the recent religious wars, and also a way of uniting catholics and protestants in a then deeply divided country.187

Did this woodcut also carry a warning? Was it a means of promoting the religious responsibility of both these rulers? After all the French King, His Most Christian Majesty, in his coronation oath undertook to preserve the unity of religion in his realm and to extirpate heresy. The late historian, Joseph Strayer, has argued that it was the union of the two ideas of sacred king and holy country that had created the emergence of the French state. He points to the development of the beliefs which made the king a sacred ruler: the coronation oil brought down from heaven, the possession of the relics of Charlemagne and the Crusade tradition.188 Whoever in Paris commissioned this print, which had a very wide circulation, may have thought that their King needed this reminder of his religious role. Rather ironically just at this time, the Peace of San-Germain-en-Laye, which concluded the second of France’s religious wars, conceded wider toleration to the Huguenots. Charles IX had even welcomed Gaspard de Coligny, leader of the French protestants, to court and invited him to meetings of the royal council. Furthermore Charles was reputed to be looking with favour on Coligny’s project of assembling a royal army that would invade the

Low Countries in support of the revolt being organized there against the King of Spain, hereditary ruler of the area. The queen mother quashed such a policy. Furthermore, as late as 1615, the French Monarchy had still not “received” the decrees of the Council of Trent.

There is also a certain irony with the inclusion of the Holy Roman Emperor of that time in the image. Maximilian II could hardly be described as a dedicated Catholic who gave priority to the preservation of Catholicism in his realm. His biographer, Paula Sutter Fichtner, records that modern historians regard Maximilian as “ethically bankrupt, Crypto-Catholic, Crypto-Lutheran, Catholic.” Another writer informs us that Maximilian would not be swayed from his refusal to accept the strict demands of post-Tridentine conformity and on his death-bed refused the Catholic sacrament, on the grounds that to take the host alone would offend his conscience, while to take the bread and the wine would offend his family. Still, as far as contemporaries in France were concerned, much of the details of Maximilian’s life might not have been known. The title and the Imperial tradition might have been sufficient to present him as a collaborator with the hierarchical church in the preservation of the faith. Thus the woodcut might be read as presenting the ideal rather than any current reality.

It should be pointed out that a French writer, Andre Blum, described on the cover page of his book published in 1916 (u.d.) as Docteur des Lettres, no other identification is given, maintains that this woodcut, Le Pressoir de Nostre Savveur de Jesus Christ, is a satire or caricature contre les papes et les moines. This is hardly an acceptable interpretation when a contemporary historian of the calibre of Philip Benedict describes this work as “a most complex and theologically sophisticated print defending the Catholic cause.” Benedict goes on to argue that:

193 Philip Benedict, is Professeur ordinaire at the Institutd’histoire de le Reformation, Université de Genève, Switzerland.
The extended analogy between Christ’s blood and the process of making wine asserts the Catholic view that the consecrated communion wine was literally Christ’s blood, while the assignment of the task of storing the wine to kings as well as prelates underscores the role of the secular rulers as defenders of Christ’s holy church.\textsuperscript{194}

Philip Benedict in a response to an email re. Andre Blum’s suggestion that this woodcut was a caricature replied:

How can the image be seen as anything other than a depiction of the link between Christ’s \textit{precious bloode shedyng} and the Catholic Church as a storehouse of merit?\textsuperscript{195}

The idea of that image being a caricature becomes even more improbable when Giselle Lambert, then Curator of Prints at the Bibliothèque Nationale, in her paper presented at a colloquy in France, refers to that woodcut as an example of a wood engraving of a popular nature through which biblical imagery was spread to the faithful.\textsuperscript{196} The founding in 1578 of the first confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament in Paris just a few years after the appearance of that woodcut may not have been just coincidental. Some decades later an engraving by Léonard Gaultier (1609) of Christ in the winepress with its Eucharistic allusion of collecting the blood in a chalice, was printed as the frontispiece of a book by Jean d’Intras.\textsuperscript{197} That, along with the publication of Louis Richeome’s work with its many images relating to the Eucharist, suggest increasing interest in some quarters in France to affirm the Real Presence in the Eucharist. The fact that d’Intras’s work carries the inscription \textit{Avec Privilege Du Roy} is surely indicative of greater royal support for the Catholic Church’s teachings.

\textsuperscript{194} Philip Benedict, “Of Marmites and Martyrs: Images and Polemics in the Wars of Religion”, \textit{The French Renaissance in Prints from the Bibliothèque Nationale de France}, 121

\textsuperscript{195} P. Benedict, email to kathmccarthy@netspace.net.au 20 December, 2012.

\textsuperscript{196} Giselle Lambert, “Étude Iconographique du Theme du Pressoir Mystique a Travers la gravure du XVe au XXe siècle”, Danièle Alexandre-Bidon, sous la direction de, \textit{Le Pressoir Mystique Actes Du Colloque de Recloses}, (Paris: Les Éditions Du Cerf, 1990), 122,

\textsuperscript{197} \textit{Le Pressoir Mystique} (Paris: Les Éditions Du Cerf) 270-272.
In the same publication, Bernard Violle informs us Émile Mâle and other authors have discerned that the origins of a window in the church of St. Etienne-du-Mont (fig. 16) are derived from that 1570 woodcut. A more recent source states that the window was originally one of a number of windows dedicated to the cult of the Eucharist which hung in the burial place of the canons of the church of Saint-Gervaise in Paris before being re-mounted in the church of Saint-Étienne-du-Mont.  

Étienne was the parish church of the University of Paris and a window of dubious interpretation would hardly have been hung there. Could the remounting of these windows in the early seventeenth century in this particular church, be of some significance? The window is part of an ensemble on the Eucharist, and the polemic with protestantism is not absent here. While many features of this window seem to be a direct copy of the woodcut, such as the allusion to Papal succession, the hierarchical Church, the sacraments of Eucharist and Penance, one differing aspect is the portrayal of God the Father above in the clouds. He is shown, in the window, wearing a papal tiara and a stole, thus identifying God Himself with the Papacy and the Catholic Church. The patronage of this window may provide a clue to the commissioning of the 1570 woodcut. Violle tells us that the windows in St. Etienne-du-Mont were, in part, an offering made by families of the Parlement and known supporters of the Holy League. The League was an association of Catholics first organized in 1576 under the leadership of Henry de Lorraine, 3rd Duke de Guise to oppose concessions granted to the Huguenots by King Henry III. Henry III ordered its dissolution, but it revived in 1584 and tried to prevent Henry of Navarre, originally a Huguenot, from becoming King of France. Historian Barbara Diefendorf, in her study of Paris in the years leading up to the massacre of 1572, also details the conservative orthodoxy of Parisians and their persecution of Huguenots. The Parlement of Paris certainly delayed for some months in registering the Edict of January 1562 granting a degree of toleration, albeit very limited, to Huguenots. Thus there may be a link between families of the Parlement of Paris and the remounting of this window on the Eucharist to a church associated with the University of the Sorbonne, thereby giving public theological approval to the doctrine of the Real Presence.

Another factor adding to the spiritual context for the commissioning of the woodcut of 1570 might well have been the impact of the popular preachers in Paris at that time. Again, Diefendorf is a valuable source of information here. She has pointed out that one of the most striking characteristics of the sermons and treatises that issued

199 B. Violle, “Le Pressoir Mystique sur Les Vitraux”, 132-133. Violle makes no mention of these windows as being remounted in the church of St. Étienne-du-Mont in the seventeenth century, that is, that they originally hung in the church of St. Gervais in Paris.

200 B. Diefendorf, Under the Shadow of the Cross, 140.
from the Parisian clergy in the late 1560’s was the new emphasis on explaining Catholic ritual and dogma. Among the popular preachers of the 1560’s was Francois Le Picart, dean of St. Germain-l’Auxerrois. Diefendorf records that Picart in his sermons on the Mass even introduced the term “transubstantiation” to his listeners, explaining that although the word itself is not in the Bible, the doctrine to which it refers most certainly is. Moreover, he placed his explanation of Catholic teachings into the explicit context of Calvinist “errors”. More influential was Simon Vigor who in 1566, along with Claude de Sainctes, engaged in an important theological dispute against the Protestant ministers Jean de L’Espine and Hugues Sureau Du Rosier. Vigor also preached to the King and court as well as to the Parisian populace and bourgeoisie. In 1568 he was one of the four clerics named as prédictateur du roi. This seemed a surprising appointment given that Vigor had criticised the king and his council early in 1568 for seeking a compromise peace to end the second religious war. Catholic writers, so Diefendorf informs us, also attribute to Vigor an influential role in political events, but they indicate that his relationship with the monarchy was an ambivalent one. While in the service of the king, Vigor praised the monarch and built up his role as defender of the faith. So it is quite possible that Simon Vigor could have been an inspirational source for our woodcut here. Print makers were employed on both sides of the religious divide at this time in France as shown by Philip Benedict in his essay “Of Marmites and Martyrs, Images and Polemics in the Wars of Religion”. Barbara Diefendorf has re-produced some of the images from a Catholic polemic of 1562 featuring the “Horrible Cruelties of the Huguenots in France”. Thus, the woodcut, Le Pressoir Mystique may have been part of that religious print propaganda warfare of the late sixteenth century in Paris as was Richard Verstigan’s engraving considered above in Chapter 3. In 1587, Verstigan, who by then was receiving a pension from the King of Spain, left Paris and moved to Antwerp where he acted as an important link between the Jesuit priests in England and their leaders on the continent. Antwerp might well

---

201 B. Diefendorf, Under the Shadow of the Cross, 147-158.
202 Prédicateur was the preacher appointed to the royal court.
204 B. Diefendorf, Under the Shadow of the Cross, 147-148.
be regarded as the power-house of the Counter Reformation and illustrated literature, much of it commissioned by the Society of Jesus, issued from its printing presses. A popular subject in the commissioned engravings in the Spanish Netherlands was Christ in the winepress and other images giving graphic testament to belief in the Real Presence in the Eucharist.

**Christ in the Winepress: images in the Netherlands**

In the neighbouring Netherlands, as in France, the struggle with the Calvinists had led to violent civil war and the artists in turn, played their part in countering “heresy”. Notable engravers of the winepress subject were the Wierex Brothers, Jan, Hieronymous and Anton. Their workshop produced over two thousand engravings of portraits, copies of paintings, engravings for illustrated books and many small devotional images of their own designs. Three quarters of their work was of religious subjects. They were employed by the most successful publishing house in Antwerp, the Plantin Press, by the Jesuits, as well as producing independent prints on their own behalf. Christopher Plantin had established himself as a printer in Antwerp in the early 1550’s though he fled the city during the violence of the iconoclasm and uprisings against Spain that began in 1566. He returned to Antwerp once the city was back in Catholic hands in 1585. Plantin’s son-in-law Jan Moretus, and subsequently Moretus’s descendants, ran the business after Plantin’s death. Illustrated books and independent prints from the Plantin-Moretus presses were not confined to the Flemish market but were sold throughout the Netherlands, in Spain, France, and Germany. We are told Plantin could get a thousand impressions as the number of usable images from a single copper plate. Apart from the circulation that the Plantin press ensured for Wierix prints, engravings by these brothers were commissioned by the Jesuits and found their way to China, Japan and the Spanish colonies in the New World.

---

205 The Moretus family sustained their international reputation among the leading publishers of Europe well into the eighteenth century.

There was close cooperation between the Wierix family and the Society of Jesus. Out of a total of 2,333 prints made by the Wierixes, at least ten percent have a close Jesuit connection. Intriguing evidence of this connection was provided in 2010 when an elderly member of the Jesuit community in Amsterdam produced a simple cardboard box that he had kept in his room for more than thirty years. Nestled inside were seventy-five copperplates from the early seventeenth century, the work of three members of the Wierix family. The plates, in excellent condition, are now one of the largest collections of Wierix copperplates in the world.207 These copperplates were engravings for devotional prints or prayer cards.

In the late sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries, Antwerp was the printing capital of the Counter-Reformation and devotional prints constituted a considerable portion of the output of Antwerp printers. Such prints, combining image and text, were intended to instruct and revitalize Catholic doctrine. A major form of devotional prints were the *suffragia* produced for Jesuit sodalities and confraternities, one such confraternity was that dedicated to the devotion to the Blessed Sacrament.208 Members of a sodality or confraternity might receive a separate monthly print. As R. Po-Chia Hsia commented, “Sometimes sold and sometimes given away free, devotional prints shaped popular piety during the seventeenth and most of the eighteenth centuries.”209 The Wierix engravings illustrated here, often with minor alterations, were in turn, copied by many other Flemish artists at the time. Thus these prints provide not only an insight into the spirituality of this period but were themselves important transmitters of those beliefs and devotion. And a not insignificant number of these prints transmitted dramatic representations of the doctrine of transubstantiation through images of *Christ in the Winepress*.

---

208 *Suffragia* were small prints or holy pictures that accompanied religious texts.
Some indication of the dissemination of this image (fig.17) can be deduced from the fact that the Marie Mauquoy-Hendrickx catalogue, *Les estampes des Wierix*, Vol 1, lists 9 major galleries worldwide who hold copies of it. Furthermore it was copied and
published with minor alterations by one other Antwerp publisher, and two other publishers in Brussels, Michael Snijders and Johannes Boel.210

This small engraving which circulated so widely in early seventeenth-century Catholic Europe was described in the catalogue for an exhibition, Seeing Salvation, at the National Gallery, London in 2000, as containing “a visual exposition of the entire theology of Redemption and the Eucharist.” It employs narrative techniques to make the Eucharistic allusions ever clearer. In the background on the left are the Patriarchs and Judges of the Old Testament planting the vines. After centuries of waiting for the harvest (i.e. the coming of Christ), the Apostles pick the grapes and place them in the vat. Instead of the grapes being crushed, it is Christ. The press is represented by the cross thus emphasising the sacrificial aspect of the image with God the Father turning the winch and the Holy Spirit hovers over the cross. Christ is doing the will of the Father and atoning for the sins of mankind. The walled town in the background suggesting Jerusalem makes the allusion to the Crucifixion. The Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation is represented by Christ’s blood, issuing from the five wounds, being collected in the chalice by the angels. The young people praying on the bottom left may be preparing to receive the Eucharist.

The theme of Christ in the winepress was repeated many times by different Wierix brothers with slight modifications. In fig. 18 by Hieronymous Wierix, Christ is carrying the cross in the winepress amidst the instruments of the Passion, and the inscription from Isaiah, as in fig. 16, is engraved below. This particular engraving was copied, with slight variations, by seven other Flemish engravers.211 That image does not make a direct allusion to the blood of the Eucharist as is made in fig. 19. The engraving, fig. 19, by Anton Wierix with its Latin inscription, Nolo domine sine vulnere viuere qui ate video vulnertum, (Because I see you wounded I wish you were not wounded), is copied from a painting by Maarten de Vos sometime before 1624.

That same concept of having the Blood of the Redeemer flow directly into the chalice can also be seen in fig. 20 where Hieronymous Wierix has the Eucharist being venerated by two angels. (There is a related print of this image with a different background and two Jesuits instead of two angels, M. H. 1287). There is also a much larger engraving by the same Wierix brother, dated 1584, copied from a painting by Titian, where Christ is hanging on the cross and the blood, issuing from His hands and feet is being collected in chalices by three angels. The inclusion of angels in images of the Eucharist, as seen here also in figs 20, 23, 24, 25 and 26, and in many of the tapestries in the Rubens Eucharist series (Chapter 6), has been commented on by Nora De Poorter in her study of those tapestries. She comments, “As enacters of the heavenly liturgy they (angels) worship God in all his glory and pay special devotion to their heavenly food, the ‘bread of angels’ (*panis angelorum*).”

---

212 Hollstein’s *Dutch and Flemish Etchings Engravings and Woodcuts*, V. 61, No. 734. 93.
This term for the Eucharist comes from Psalm 77:78, where manna is referred to as the bread of heaven or of angels (*Panem caeli dedit eis*), and was used by Thomas Aquinas in his Corpus Christi hymn (*...ecce panis angelorum*). According to Johnannes Molanus, one of the first ecclesiastical writers to expand on the Tridentine decree on the use of images, the justification for representing angels venerating the monstrance derives from the first epistle of St. Peter 3:22, (*Jesus Christ, who has gone into heaven and is at the right hand of God, with angels, authorities, and powers made subject to him.*), or, from the description of the cherubs guarding the Ark of the Covenant.\(^{214}\) The Counter-Reformation attributed apologetic significance to the adoration of the Eucharist by angels, serving to justify to the Protestants, the honour paid by the faithful on earth to the monstrance containing the consecrated Host.

The small sizes of the original images here in figures 18, 19, 20, 21 and 22, an average size of 8.6 x 5.3 cm, suggest they may originally have been designed for those monthly prints disseminated to members of sodalities as discussed above, page 84. We do know they were copied by other Flemish artists, often in larger format and with minor variations.\(^{215}\) The multiplicity of such images alluding to the doctrine of transubstantiation appearing in the decades immediately after the reconquest of the Southern Provinces of the Netherlands from the Calvinists in 1584, suggests the determination of the Catholic authorities to propagandise Tridentine dogmas. The Society of Jesus was one Religious Order commissioning such images.

\(^{214}\) Johnannes Molanus, *De Historia Imaginum et Picturarium*, (Louvain: 1570, 1594; Douai, 1617; Antwerp, 1617).

Jeffrey Chipps Smith in his impressive work on Jesuit patronage in Germany, *Sensuous Worship and the Art of the Early Catholic Reformation*, has argued that the Jesuits in commissioning art had an informal, unwritten artistic policy in place, one informed by Jesuit spirituality. The Jesuit appreciation of the omnipresence of God, that God is in all things, certainly not a new understanding by any means, but one especially emphasised in Jesuit spirituality, entailed an appreciation that it is through the senses that one can comprehend the presence of God, an approach not shared by Huldrych Zwingli. The articulation at Trent of the Church’s official endorsement of the role of religious art to instruct, “to confirm ...and continually revolving in mind the articles of faith ....(the faithful) may order their own lives and manners in imitation of the saints; and may be excited to adore and love God, and to cultivate piety,” was certainly adopted by the Society of Jesus. Jeffrey Smith comments; “Their art is insistent; it has a dogged intentionality that transcends the importance of any particular church, painting, sculpture, or print.” Ever conscious of their mission to teach, Chipps Smith goes on to conclude that for the Society; “A painting might be artfully made and full of rhetorical artifice to attract the viewer’s attention, but the picture’s aesthetic merits serve merely as a means to a religious end.”

Apart from images of Christ in the Winepress, another graphic version of representing the theology of transubstantiation in Wierix engravings, and in turn copied by other Flemish artists, was to present the bloodied Christ actually standing in the chalice. Such an image draws on the earlier representations of the miracle of the Mass of St. Gregory dating from the 15th century and also in a stained glass window dating from ca. 1520 in a church in Amsterdam or Leiden and now in the Victoria and Albert Museum, London. Now that traditional image has been abstracted to become a singular representation establishing a complete identification between the blood shed by Christ during his Passion and death and that of the blood

---


((wine) of the Eucharist. While participating in the medieval traditional genre of the Man of Sorrows, Christ in these Wierix engravings stems rather more from the Counter Reformation polemics on the Eucharist.

In the small devotional engravings (figs 21 and 22) Christ is surrounded by the instruments of His Passion: the cross, the crown of thorns, the mocking inscription I.N.R.I., the scourge, the sop of vinegar, the lance that pierced His side, the dice with which the soldiers gambled for His clothes, and on the left, strung together, the thirty pieces of silver for which Judas betrayed Him. The inscription below in fig. 21 derives from Saint Bernard of Clairvaux’s sermon on the Song of Songs: “Above all things, (which move, excite and fire Bernard) it is the cup which thou didst drink, O Jesu, merciful and kind, in the great task of our redemption undertaken by Thee.” 220 Here, Hieronymus and Johannes Wierix have replaced the tomb in which the Man of Sorrows was often shown with a chalice, thus emphasizing the idea that in the bread

---

(the Christ figure here), and in the wine, Christ is really and truly present as was decreed at the Council of Trent:

...that by the consecration of the bread and wine a change is brought about of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of wine into the substance of His blood. This change the holy Catholic Church properly and appropriately calls transubstantiation.221

And the Fathers at Trent went on to recall the custom of reserving the Eucharist in a sacred place as being “so ancient that even the age of the council of Nicea recognized it”, and declared:

That if anyone says that it is unlawful to reserve the holy Eucharist in a sacred place, but that it must of necessity be distributed to those present immediately after the consecration...let him be anathema.222

The liturgical ceremony of adoring the consecrated host, often exposed in an elaborate monstrance, became a particularly popular Catholic Reformation practice and is commemorated in many engravings where image and print combine to confront the viewer with a complex and elaborate theology of the Eucharist.

222 Decrees of the Ecumenical Councils, Vol.11, ed. Tanner, 698.
CHAPTER 5

The Adoration of the Eucharist

In the Limosin enamel (fig. 3) celebrating *The Triumph of the Eucharist*, there was no text other than the motto of Charles de Guise encircling the pyramid. Given that the enamel was intended for exhibiting in a private family setting that is not surprising. The frequency of combining image and text appeared as a relatively new dimension in religious art in this era. The point was made above, how this combination was intended to instruct and revitalize Catholic doctrine, particularly those doctrines challenged by protestant Reformers. Catholic belief in transubstantiation is given dramatic representation in the engraving commemorating the consecration of Levino Torrento as Bishop of Antwerp in September 1587. An event so soon after the reconquest of Antwerp from the 'heretics' was made memorable through the commissioning of this engraving by Hieronymus Wierix, Fig. 23, *L'Adoration du Verbe incarné*. As there is evidence that other copies were made of this engraving, it is clear that is was intended for public circulation.

In the foreground members of the faithful are attending Mass at the moment of consecration as the priest lifts aloft the consecrated host. Above, the shepherds and the three kings are kneeling paying homage to the Christ child, and above them God the Father, wearing a triple Papal like tiara and holding in his left hand a globe topped with the cross, God the Son with hand raised in a blessing gesture and the Holy Spirit, in the form of the dove, complete the Trinity. A blessing rains down from the Trinity through the scene of the Nativity onto the raised host held by the priest below. If the epiclesis, the role of the Spirit, was not as emphasised at that time in the liturgy of the West as it was in churches of the Eastern rite, the artist here certainly attests the

---

223 See Chapter 4, p. 76
fig. 23 H. Wierix, *L’Adoration du Verbe incarné*, 32.6 x 22.1cm
role of the Holy Spirit as the transmitter of the redeeming grace of the Incarnation in the sacrament of the Eucharist.

In line with the engraving’s title, the focus here is on the Incarnation. In turn this connection between the Incarnation and the Real Presence in the Eucharist is made in the writings, on either side, by the Holy Fathers portrayed above the various texts. It is particularly significant that not only are the four Latin Doctors of the Church represented, Gregory, Ambrose, Augustine and Jerome, but two Eastern Fathers are included, Saints John Chrysostom and Cyril Bishop of Jerusalem. The Counter Reformation church had to be seen to be in harmony with the church of the first centuries of Christianity and thus recourse to the writings of the early Fathers was frequently made to authenticate the church’s teachings. The texts selected here for this Wierix engraving were clearly chosen to bolster the Catholic interpretation of the Real Presence in the Eucharist. On the right_

St. Ambrose wrote in 390 in his treatise On the Mysteries:

Did the birth of the Lord Jesus from Mary come about in the course of nature? If we look at nature we regularly find that conception results from the union of man and woman. It is clear then that the conception by the Virgin was above and beyond the course of nature. And this body that we make present is the body born of the Virgin.

St. Jerome wrote in 410 in Letter 21 to Pope Damasus, in a commentary on Luke 15:11-32, the parable of the prodigal son;

...The fatted calf, which is sacrificed for the safety of penitents, is the Saviour Himself, on whose flesh we feed, whose blood we drink daily.

And in a letter to Hedybia responding to one of the many questions she had put to him, Jerome wrote:

224 Some of these same texts appear also in an engraving by C. Bloemaert (fig. 37) see below in chp. 5
225 P.P.Rubens in one of the ceiling paintings for the Jesuit Church in Antwerp (1620) also defers to an Eastern Father when he has St. Gregory Nazianus striking down a figure symbolizing Heresy with his bishop’s crosier. St. Gregory had been installed as Patriarch of Constantinople replacing Demophilus who had adhered to the Arian heresy.
226 http://www.crossroadsinitiative.com/library_article/185/This is My Body_ St. Ambrose on Eucharistic Consecration (accessed 24 October, 2012)
Moses did not give us the true bread, but the Lord Jesus did, himself both the feaster and the feast, himself the eater and the one who is eaten.\textsuperscript{228}

We drink his blood and cannot drink without him, and daily in his sacrifices, from the fruit of the true vine and of the vine of the Sorek, which means “chosen”, we press the red grapes and we drink new wine from them in the kingdom of the father, not at all in the oldness of the letter, but in the newness of the spirit...\textsuperscript{229}

And St. Cyril, Bishop of Jerusalem, wrote in 381 in \textit{Catecheses 4}:

Contemplate therefore the bread and wine not as bare elements, for they are, according to the Lord's declaration, the Body and Blood of Christ; for though sense suggests this to thee, let faith establish thee. Judge not the matter from taste, but from faith be fully assured without misgiving, that thou hast been vouchsafed the Body and Blood of Christ.\textsuperscript{230}

On the left side, Pope St. Gregory wrote ca. 586 in Book 4 of the \textit{Dialogues} Cap. 58:

We should offer unto God the daily sacrifice of his body and blood... for there his body is received, there his flesh is distributed for the salvation of the people; there his blood is not now shed at the hands of infidels, but poured into the mouths of the faithful. Wherefore let us meditate what manner of sacrifice this is ordained for us, what for our absolution doth always represent the passion of the only Son of God: for what right believing Christian can doubt, that in the very hour of sacrifice, at the words of the Priest, the heavens be opened and the choirs of angels are present in that mystery of Jesus Christ; that high things are accompanied with low, and earthly joined to heavenly, and that one thing is made of visible and invisible.

St. Augustine wrote ca. 425 on \textit{Psalm} 98:

I turn to Christ, because it is He whom I seek here; and I discover how the earth is adored without impiety, how without impiety the footstool of His feet is adored. For He received earth from earth; because flesh is from the earth, and He took flesh from the flesh of Mary. He walked here in the same flesh. And He gave us the same flesh to be eaten unto salvation. But no one eats that flesh unless first he adores it...And, not only do we not sin by adoring, we do sin by not adoring.\textsuperscript{231}

\textsuperscript{228} http://www.tertullian.org/fathers/gregory_04_dialogues_book_4.chapter58 (accessed 17/12/12).
\textsuperscript{230} http://www.crossroadssinitiative.com/library_article/383/Real Presence of Christ in the Eucharist_St. Cyril of Jerusalem (accessed 24/10/12).
\textsuperscript{231} http://www.therealpresence.org/eucharist/father/fathers.htm (accessed 26/11/12.)
St John Chrysostom ca. 414, wrote in Homily 24 on 1Corinthians 10: 23-24, par.8

This body, even lying in a manger, Magi reverenced. Yea, men profane and barbarous, leaving their country and their home, both set out on a long journey, and when they came, with fear and great trembling worshipped Him. Let us imitate those Barbarians, we who are citizens of heaven. For they indeed when they saw Him in a manger, and in a hut, and no such thing was in sight as you behold now, drew near with great awe; but you behold Him not in the manger but on the altar, not a woman holding Him in her arms, but the priest standing by, and the spirit with exceeding bounty hovering over the gifts set before us. You do not see merely this Body itself as they did, but you know also its power, and the whole economy, and art ignorant of none of the holy things which are brought to pass by It, having been exactly initiated into all.\textsuperscript{232}

Another engraving of this image is recorded in the Marie Mauquoy-Hendrickx catalogue but with the dedication suppressed.\textsuperscript{233} This would suggest that the image had a wider circulation than its original commissioning to commemorate the installation of the new Archbishop of Antwerp in 1587. The exquisitely detailed engravings of lengthy extracts from the Fathers, and in Latin, suggest a learned market for such an image but the graphic representation of the offering of the host at Mass, the Nativity scene and the Trinity above from which flows the grace of the Incarnation to the altar would have been comprehensible to a far wider circulation.

The inclusion of the four Latin Doctors on the Church henceforth became a regular feature in paintings and engravings of the Eucharist by artists in the Netherlands in the early seventeenth century. Examples of these engravings are examined in chapter 6. John Knipping maintains that it was rare to find in early Netherland masters all four Doctors of the Latin Church portrayed together. “Only since the fifties of the Reformation century did all four appear in series or together in one composition.”\textsuperscript{234}

The presentation of them, and in this instance with two of the Eastern Doctors of the Church, suggest they are there to give witness as defenders of Church doctrine, giving historical legitimacy to the doctrine of the Real Presence and at the same time the

\textsuperscript{232} Church Fathers: Homily 24 on First Corinthians Chrysostom \url{http://www.newadvent.org/fathers/220124.htm} (accessed 5/12/12).
\textsuperscript{233} M-H. 1347 II
importance given to Tradition in the Church as attested to in Trent’s decree “On Scripture and Tradition” in response to the Protestant sola scriptura.\textsuperscript{235}

Furthermore, visual affirmation of the Tridentine decree of “The Excellence of the Most Holy Eucharist Over the Other Sacraments” can be seen in another Wierix engraving.\textsuperscript{236}

Anton Wierix’s \textit{L”Euchariste} (fig. 24) is, by far, one of the largest engravings produced by the Wierix brothers. The central subject of the engraving is an elaborately designed monstrance, topped by a cross held aloft by two angels. Within the lacuna of the monstrance is a host held aloft by another two smaller angels and against a canopy proclaiming \textit{S. Eucharistia}. An image of the crucified Christ is inscribed on the host. The Eucharist is then flanked on either side by the other six sacraments,

\textsuperscript{235} On Scripture and Tradition, session IV, 8 April, 1546, Schroder, Canons and Decrees, 24.
\textsuperscript{236} Thirteenth Session Council of Trent, Schroeder, H.J., Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent, 74
Baptism, Confirmation, Penance, Matrimony, Holy Orders, and Extreme Unction. Not only is this professing belief in the seven sacraments as proclaimed by the Fathers at Trent in the face of Protestant reduction of the sacraments in most instances to two, Baptism and the Lord’s Supper, but it is clearly here linking Christ’s grace in the sacraments with His sacrifice on the cross. The Catholic Church, in contrast with the evangelical emphasis of Reformed churches, is a sacramental church, while the representation of the host in such an elaborate monstrance attested to the instruction of the Fathers at Trent that the host was not just to be received but was to be preserved and adored.

Calvin had condemned as superstitious and unscriptural the preservation and adoration of the consecrated bread as “absurd things which appear to be unworthy of Christ’s heavenly majesty, or incompatible with the reality of his human nature,” whereas in Catholicism the Forty Hours Devotion, a continuous period of prayer before the Blessed Sacrament had become a popular devotion in Europe before the end of the sixteenth century. The origins of this devotion are diverse and obscure. This forty hours exposition may have been first held in Milan in 1527 in order to invoke divine aid during a time of war and plague. It was introduced into the Southern Netherlands by Capuchin monks and especially promoted by the Jesuits who also encouraged more frequent reception of Holy Communion. John Knipping contends that the habit of more frequent Communion was better established in the Netherlands than elsewhere pointing to the evidence of reports sent to Rome and cited by Father Vaan Miert sj in his “Studien” 51, (1919), 395.

---

237 The portrayal of the Eucharist flanked on either side by the other six sacraments was not new in the Netherlands. Roger van der Weyden’s painting Seven Sacraments (now in the Konink Lijk Museum) was painted sometime between 1440-50.
238 Schroeder, Canons and Decrees, 1978, 76, 80.
239 John Calvin, The Institutes, IV, 17, 32.
240 John Knipping, Iconography of the Counter Reformation in the Netherlands, 300.
Another near contemporary engraving, also published in Antwerp, and featuring the same idea of representing the Eucharist as the pre-eminent sacrament is one by Adriaan Collaert (c.1560-1618). This engraving was the title page for the publication in Antwerp in 1616 of Jesuit Father Coster’s, *Sermon on the Epistle of Sunday on the Octave of the Feast of the Sacrament of the Altar*. In fig. 25 the central panel is divided into an earthly and heavenly level: the Pope and Emperor, with their respective retinues, are looking up at the object of their devotion, the host enclosed in the monstrance upheld and surrounded by angels.

Fig. 25 Adriaan Collaert, *The Adoration of the Eucharist*
Again, the Doctors of the Church are included only St. Gregory here is replaced by St. Paul, whose description in I Corinthians 11:24-26, of the Last Supper and the institution of the Eucharist is possibly the oldest in the New Testament. An image of the last Supper is placed to the right of St. Paul, and in turn paralleled by the Old Testament pre-figuration of *The Gathering of the Manna*. On the lower level between the images of Saints Ambrose and Augustine are the Paschal Lamb and a Distribution of Communion to the faithful. Across the bottom of the engraving in Latin is the text of Canon 1 from the seventh session of the council of Trent:

> If anyone says that the sacraments of the New Law were not all instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ, or that there are more or less than seven, namely, baptism, confirmation, Eucharist, penance, extreme unction, order and matrimony, let him be anathema.\(^\text{241}\)

On either side are images depicting the dispensing of each sacrament while beneath each is a quotation from the Scriptures giving biblical support for that sacrament. Under the central image there are two Latin texts. The first is from St. John’s Gospel, 6: 53-56: *Unless you eat the flesh of the Son of Man and drink his blood you have no life in you.*

The second in Latin reads:

> Participa immaculato corpori Domini tui fide plentissima, certus quod agnum ipsum integrum comedis. (Participate in the immaculate body of your Lord with fullest faith; it is certain that you are eating the complete Lamb itself)

This is a line taken from a text written by St. Ephrem, a fourth century Syrian hymnographer and theologian.\(^\text{242}\) Living at the time of the Arian heresy he wrote *Hymns Against Heresies*. Ephrem used these to warn his flock of the heresies which threatened to divide the church. His writings were known to St. Jerome who acknowledged that Ephrem’s works were publicly read along with the Sacred Scriptures in the churches of his day. With the recovery of Greek by Humanist scholars in the fifteenth century Ephrem’s writings again became popular and were translated into Latin by Italian humanist Ambrose Traversari (1386-1439) who also

---

\(^{241}\) Canon 1, seventh session Council of Trent, Schroeder, *Canons and Decrees*, 51.

\(^{242}\) St. Ephrem was declared a Doctor of the Church by Pope Benedict XV on October 5, 1920.
wrote a treatise on the Holy Eucharist. It is of some significance that of all the writings of St. Ephrem, his text on the Eucharist was incorporated into this image for a Jesuit commission for a Latin preparatory catechism composed by Peter Canisius.

Another near contemporary engraving published in 1622, is *The Holy Sacrament* by Jean Leclerc, fig. 26. Leclerc was born into a family in the service of Duke Charles III of Lorraine, a prominent leader of the Holy League along with members of the French Guise family. R. Po-Chia Hsia has pointed out the Duchy of Lorraine, in contrast to the French realm, declared its allegiance to Rome and to Tridentine reform. In the Leclerc engraving virtually the whole Christian story of The Fall and Redemption is portrayed, and along with the numerous texts, it provides a visual presentation of the theology of the Eucharist. The engraving has a dedication with a crest of the Dominican Order, to the Illustrious Guidon DD, Bishop and Count of Tréguier.

---

243 Ambrose Traversari is honoured as a saint by the Camaldolese Order of which he became the Prior General in 1431. He also translated many other works of the Fathers and writers of the Greek Church.


245 Tréguier was an important town in Brittany having a beautiful gothic cathedral dating from early in the fifteenth century.
Across the bottom of the engraving are pre-figurations of the Eucharist beginning on the right with the Sacrifice of Melchizedek, the Passover, the Showbread and the Gathering of the Manna.\textsuperscript{246} In the centre of the middle ground Holy Communion is

\textsuperscript{246} Showbread are the specially prepared bread or cakes which Israelite priests set before Yahweh in the Temple. The legislation in Leviticus 24.5-9, provides that each Sabbath day 12 freshly baked cakes
being distributed to three kneeling figures, a monk and two rather aristocratic looking men and a woman. Further to their right kneel three other figures in adoration and further right, a group of kneeling monks. On the left, three angels identified as Purity, Faith and Charity kneel on the altar steps. There are two intriguing groups in the foreground, one on either side. In the group on the left under a scroll which translates as “The infidels and radicals may not take the eucharist”, there is a figure at the right hand end with a devil issuing from his mouth. The effect is to demonise the group as a whole. Then there is a turbaned figure representing the Turks, a jester traditionally symbolising fools, an aristocratic looking gentleman with ruffled collar and a helmeted soldier possibly representing Huguenots, a blindfolded figure with a large volume strapped to his back representing a Reformer who refuses to see the light of truth, and at the back, a bearded man clutching a book and wearing a horned beret and with serpents issuing from his mouth and Bible, may be a particularly vicious satire on Calvin. The injunction in the scroll above this group reflects a church confident in its doctrine, determined to preserve its integrity and make no compromise with the reformers. Indeed the inclusion of the latter with the infidel Turk gives an added emphasis to the injunction. On the right, under a scroll proclaiming “Communion is to be denied to public sinners”, are figures with animals or other objects on their backs. Their number of seven suggests they may represent the seven deadly sins; pride can be identified by the peacock, avarice by the pile of material goods, lust by the couple swathed together in a blanket, gluttony by the figure eating some object. The portrayal and adamant exclusion of both these groups from the reception of Communion adds to the overall message of the sacredness of the consecrated host.

The central focus of the engraving is the host displayed in the monstrance with the text proclaiming Hoc est corpus meum, while across the chalice are the words Hic est calyx sanguinis mei. The scroll behind the priest giving communion declares that the priest alone is the rightful minister, a response to the abolition of the sacrament of Holy Orders in the Reformed churches. The figure to the left of the altar steps is St. Paul with the words “Whoever eats the bread or drinks the cup of the Lord
unworthily will be guilty of sinning against the body and blood of the Lord” (1 Cor. 11:27). St. Thomas Aquinas, on the right, has a verse in Latin from *Lauda Sion*, from the Mass of Corpus Christi, beginning *Dogma datur Christianis*, translating as:

```
Hear, what holy church maintaineth,
That the bread its substance changeth
Into Flesh, the wine to Blood.
```

In the upper level the Holy Trinity is displayed with the dove of the Holy Spirit radiating over the Father and the Son. That the Father and the Son are co-equal is proclaimed in the text, an aureole around God the Father, *Pater non est prim(us) origine, beatus quam filium generet*. Descending from the Trinity to the Monstrance on the altar, the scroll text proclaims the Real Presence, *Pater et Spiritus Sanctus per concomitantiam sunt in Sacramento Alteris*, (The Father and the Holy Spirit through their “concomittance” are in the sacrament of the altar). The other line of that scroll reads upwards, *Sacramentum hoc, est adeptio gloriae*, which might translate as “This sacrament is the attainment of glory”.

On the left side Mary is shown as Queen of Heaven and on the other side there are saintly figures with hands in prayerful gestures of intercession. The scroll reads “Sancti audiunt preces nostras, eorumque meritis iuuumur” (the saints hear our prayers, and we are assisted by their merit,) thus professing belief in the power of Mary and the saints as intercessors as was affirmed at Trent refuting the Reformers’ doctrine of predestination. Illustrated then on either side is the story of the Fall, the Incarnation and Redemption. On the left side is the Annunciation; juxtaposed on the right side, the angel drives Adam and Eve out of the garden of Eden. The text here translates, “If Adam had not sinned the eucharist would not have been instituted”. Below the Annunciation is the meeting of Christ with the disciples at Emmaus, and opposite Elijah receives food from the angel, a pre-figuration of the Eucharist. Below the Emmaus scene is the multiplication of the five loaves and two fishes. Further down are the souls in Purgatory praying for their release, while on the opposite side the souls in hell are marked with the words “The dead who descend into Hell will not praise you.” Out of the fires of hell serpents are hissing terms of abuse which
regularly were hurled by Protestants at the Catholic Church, “The Church is Babylon”, “The Pope is anti-Christ” and “The Mass is an abuse.”

This engraving, dedicated to the Illustrious Bishop Guidon and Count of Tréquier, was obviously destined for educated viewers, given its numerous and erudite Latin texts, but the many images would have been comprehensible to the unlettered. Unfortunately, it has not been possible to gather any information regarding its likely print run nor circulation. It presents to the viewer, in one engraving, an extraordinary array of theological teachings, an insight into counter-reformation polemics, and the role of the Trinity, the central mystery of the Catholic faith, is made paramount in the moment of consecration at Mass.

The visual identification of the Catholic Church with the Eucharist originally seen in this thesis in the Limosin enamel is no longer confined to a private family collection, but has become increasingly the subject of prints, large and small, where the ecclesiastical and secular hierarchies and the laity kneel in adoration of this “most excellent of sacraments.” Furthermore, these many engravings occasioned a wide dissemination of Catholic belief in the Real Presence in the Eucharist far beyond the borders of the Netherlands. They provide dramatic insight into Catholic Reformation spirituality and powerful testimony of a Church confident in the truth of its teachings. Perhaps the paintings and tapestry designs of that prince of Flemish painters, Peter Paul Rubens, represent the most impressive and triumphal visual presentation of the Counter-Reformation polemic on the Eucharist.
CHAPTER 6

Rubens and the Eucharist

In the early 1620’s Peter Paul Rubens was to receive a commission from the Infanta Isabella Clara, Archduchess of the Netherlands, for designs for possibly twenty tapestries on the subject of the Eucharist. 247 This tapestry series has been described as “Rubens most ambitious, thoroughly Baroque testament to his Catholic faith.” 248 However, this was not the first time Rubens had been commissioned to paint a work on the Eucharist. In 1609, following his return from Rome, Rubens received a commission for a painting to be hung above the altar of the Holy Sacrament in St. Paul’s Church, Antwerp, where it still remains. 249 The painting is identified in the inventory drawn up on July 24, 1614, of the possessions of the Fraternity of the “Holy Sweet Name of Jesus and of the Holy Eucharist” as The Real Presence of the Holy Sacrament. 250 It is not exactly surprising, to find a painting reaffirming the doctrine of transubstantiation, in a Dominican church in the town that came to be regarded as a power house of the Counter-Reformation and where as one historian put it, “the religious ideals of the Counter-Reformation were to be manifest in their purest, most rigorous form.” 251

Rubens’s return to Antwerp coincided with the successful negotiation of the Twelve Year Truce which suspended the violence and war between Spain and the Northern Netherlands which had begun with the outbreak of iconoclasm in the southern provinces back in July, 1566. Philip II through his Regents had tried to pursue a

247 The exact date for this commission is unknown. Some art historians have suggested 1625, when it is known the Infanta called on Rubens in Antwerp following the surrender of the Dutch at Breda. See Nora de Porter, The Eucharist Series 2 vols., (Corpus Rubenianum Ludwig Burchard, II). (London : Harvey Miller-Heyden & Son, 1978), 33. It is known that the tapestries were delivered to Madrid in 1628.
249 This church was visited by the author to view this painting in July, 2008.
severe religious policy in the Netherlands with the result that political revolt against Spain was intertwined with religious revolt. By the second half of the sixteenth century the Netherlands had become as Hugh Trevor-Roper put it, “a kind of European Vietnam.” Now, with the restoration of peace and under the shared vision of the Archduke Albert and the Infanta Isabella, the decrees of the Council of Trent were being faithfully implemented. In the decades ahead there was ample scope for the restoration and rebuilding of churches, and the patronage of the many religious orders established in Antwerp, provided commissions to architects, artists, engravers and printers. Rubens was to be the recipient of much of this patronage.

Rubens, while in Rome, would have studied Raphael’s famous Disputa in the Stanza Della Segnatura which Professor Frederick Hartt has described as “the most complete exposition of the doctrine of the Eucharist in Christian art”. The title, Disputa, now generally regarded as erroneous, is the title Cornelis Cort gave to an engraving he made in 1575 of Raphael’s painting with which Rubens may also have been familiar. The arrangement of the figures around the altar in Rubens’s painting is clearly based on Raphael’s painting. A number of saints, monks and church dignitaries are grouped symmetrically about an altar, on which is a monstrance containing the Host. In the upper part of the picture, God the Father and

---

the Holy Spirit appear among the clouds, and similar to Raphael’s presentation, cherubs float above holding books of the Gospels with texts relating to the miracle of transubstantiation. On the left can be read: CARO (ENIM) MEA VERE EST CIBVS ET SANGVIS MEVS (EST POTVS) Jn 6: 56), and on the right HOC EST CORPUS MEUM QVOD PRV VOBIS DA (Lk 22:19) and ACCIPITE ET COMEDITE: HOC EST CORPVS MEVM (MT. 26: 26).

Drawing on Hans Vlieghe’s identification of the figures, the imposing personages in the foreground are certainly the four Latin Doctors of the Church. The mitred bishops on the left, he identifies, as St. Augustine and St. Ambrose. In the right foreground is St. Gregory the Great, shown according to custom with shaven head, and St. Jerome in cardinal’s robes. On the left, beside St. Augustine and St. Ambrose, is a bearded figure with long black hair. Vlieghe suggests this may be St. Paul, who was patron of this Dominican church at Antwerp and to whom we owe the oldest account of the last Supper, other than the Synoptic Gospels (1 Cor. 11:23 et seqq.) John Knipping maintains that the two figures in the foreground “unconcealedly reflect the features of Luther and Calvin who both seem to place passages from the Scriptures before the attention of their adversaries.” Vlieghe does not concur preferring to leave them unidentified, and the old, half-naked man in the middle distance he recognizes as the Seneca motif Rubens uses about the same time in his painting of the Death of Seneca. There seems no obvious reason to include Seneca here unless it was intended to present him as a motif for wisdom. The young monk with the broach of the sun on his breast is St. Thomas Aquinas seated behind the altar on the left, in conversation with a Pope. Vlieghe identifies as Pope Urban IV, who instituted the Eucharist feast of Corpus Christi by a bull of 1264. It is generally believed the text for the Office and hymns for that feast were composed by St. Thomas. In the extreme background, on the left five monks are seen in discussion; one, wearing the Dominican habit, is pointing to the monstrance on the altar. In the right background are a number of young men in togas. They, along with the Seneca like figure, may have a reference to Raphael’s painting with its many classically draped figures adding to the sense overall.

256 Hans Vlieghe has pointed out that the altar piece has not been preserved in its original state; the figure of St. Augustine, or of St. Ambrose, is cut off at the right side. Vlieghe, Saints, Corpus Rubenianum Ludwig Burchard Part VIII, 2 vols, London: Phaidon, 1972, 74. 11.H. Vlieghe, Saints, 74.
of the development of the church’s teaching on transubstantiation over time, and, more recently, affirmed as a doctrine at the Council of Trent. The Four Doctors of the Church play a dominant role in this painting. They will feature again in one of Rubens’s design for a tapestry in the Eucharist series and will be the subject of many later engravings from Rubens’s designs. It was noted above, fig. 23, that Hans Knipping observed that it was only since the fifties of the Reformation that all four Fathers begin to be portrayed together in art in the Netherlands. The frequency of their portrayal, often in conjunction with the Eucharist, sometimes independently, suggests their promotion as expounders and defenders of Church doctrine, in particular, the doctrine of the Real Presence.

Within two years of Rubens’s painting in the Church of St. Paul in Antwerp, the defence of the Real Presence in the Netherlands was given further affirmation both in word and in art with the publication of the polemic by the Jesuit, Johannes van Gouda, entitled *Victorieuse Transsubstantiatie* (fig. 28) with its frontispiece engraving by Willem D. Hack, featuring in the upper level a monstrance encircled by worshipping angels, and in the lower level Johannes van Gouda disputing with one of the Brothers Lansberghen.259 Samuel Lansberghen and his brother were Calvinist ministers and preachers in Rotterdam. Faith and Hope stand beside the title-tablet in which Love is symbolized by the Sacrament itself. But of all the affirmation of the Real Presence possibly none can equal Rubens’s designs for the tapestry series on the Eucharist.

Fig. 28. W.D Hack, *Victorieuse Transsubstantiatie*, engraving, 1611.

259 J.B. Knipping, *Iconography of the Counter-Reformation*, plate 285, 301
Rubens and the Tapestries on the Eucharist

Sometime in 1625 the Infanta Isabella Clara Eugenie, Archduchess of the Netherlands, visited Rubens’s studio in Antwerp to sit for her portrait dressed in the Franciscan habit of the Poor Clares, which she had donned at the death of her husband (1621) as a sign of perpetual mourning.

It is probably at this time she commissioned Rubens to do designs for a series of tapestries on the Triumph of the Eucharist. They were woven in Brussels at the workshops of Jan Raes, Jacques Fobert, Jean Vervoert and Jacques Geubels. These tapestries were intended as a gift to the royal convent of the Descalzas Reales in Madrid. The convent had been founded in 1559 by Isabella’s aunt, Juana of Austria, youngest daughter of Charles V. The Infanta Juana had established at the convent a tradition of special devotion to the Blessed Sacrament. In the charter of the convent’s foundation she had enjoined that three Eucharistic feasts should be celebrated with especial splendour: the Santo Entierro (The Entombment), the Resurrection, and the whole octave of Corpus Christi. Devotion to the Eucharist had become a typical virtue of the House of Habsburg going back to the legend of Count Rudolph of Habsburg giving up his horse to a priest carrying the sacrament and refusing hereafter to ride it for any worldly purpose. Rubens was to immortalise this story with his painting now in the Prado.

Fig. 29. P.P. Rubens, *The Infanta Isabella in Habit of the Poor Clares*, 1625.

The devotion to the Eucharist of the Infanta Isabella herself, was later attested to by the terms of her will. She stipulated that her body was to be interred at the entrance to the chapel of the Holy Sacrament of the Miracle in the church of St. Guldula at Brussels, and further, that an amount was to be set aside for candlewax “so that the most holy Sacrament be displayed more becomingly and His Holiness be asked to give permission for the establishment of the confraternity of the most holy Sacrament that exists in Spain.”

Further, Philippe Chifflet, the Infanta’s court Chaplin, and later biographer, recorded that “Her devotion to the Most Holy sacrament was beyond description, and this could be seen very clearly, for she attended all its feasts with such devotion and such a pious spirit that it was a marvel to see”. He went on to record that she regularly attended processions, especially on the feast of Corpus Christi. That feast was a major religious festival in both Brussels and Madrid. The mention above, of Isabella’s wish to be interred in the chapel of the Holy Sacrament of the Miracle, alludes to a particular devotion in Brussels stemming from the legend of three miraculous Hosts that bled when stabbed by a Jew. These were preserved in

---

a chapel especially built by Charles V in the Church of St. Guldula. This kind of legend involving desecration of hosts was all too often a feature of anti-semitism particularly in the later Middle Ages; nor was it abating in the militant Catholicism of Counter-Reformation Spain and the Netherlands.

The question of the location and the order of hanging the tapestries has long engaged the interest of art historians. Charles Scribner’s contribution to that debate was to argue that processional pairs of tapestries were meant to be hung one above the other on the basis of the architectural framing within the tapestry, a Solomonic one above the Doric, as can be seen in the Chicago sketch of the altar group (fig. 31).  

Fig. 31 P.P.Rubens, The Adoration of the Eucharist, bozzetto, Chicago, at Institute

There have been several masterly in depth studies of Rubens’s Eucharist tapestry series.\textsuperscript{264} The works of Nora de Poorter and Charles Scribner have been the major sources for this study. One recognizes that the tapestries constitute an integral whole, and “not merely a sequence of individual scenes,’ as de Poorter argues, ‘but a single monumental composition built up around the spectator.”\textsuperscript{265} However, the intention here, is to abstract but a few of the tapestries which appear to have a more direct relationship to the Counter Reformation polemic on the Eucharist. These tapestries had a functional purpose, namely to be publicly displayed on the walls of the convent of the Descalzas Reales during the major feasts of the Blessed Sacrament, and, it will be argued, their designs were affected particularly by the timing of their commissioning.

While the exact number in the original commission is not known there are currently twenty tapestries in the Convent in Madrid.\textsuperscript{266} Nora de Poorter has divided them into the following four groups.

- Group 1 known collectively as the Adoration of the Eucharist consisting of five tapestries (as seen above in the Chicago sketch, fig. 21).
- Group 2 a single tapestry, King David Playing the Harp.
- Group 4 the small tapestries consisting of three allegorical personifications: The Succession of the Popes, Historiography, and Charity enlightening the World.


\textsuperscript{265} Poorter, \textit{The Eucharist Series}, Vol. 1, 63.

\textsuperscript{266} That convent was visited by the author in 2008 to view the tapestries.
The traditional Old Testament prefigurations of the Eucharist: Melchizedek offers bread and wine to Abraham, Moses and the gathering of the manna, Elijah receiving bread and water from the Angel, are there in the tapestries. Likewise, French Jesuit, Louis Richéome, in his illustrated devotional work, *Tableaux sacrés des figures mystiques du tres-auguste sacrifice et sacrement de l’Eucharistie* published in 1601, and reprinted several times, had begun by referring back to the Old Testament prefigurations. In the 1609 edition a long text accompanies each of fourteen engravings by L. Gaultier and C. de Mallery of such prototypes as “Melchisedec and Abraham”, “L’Agneau Paschal” and “La Manne”. In like manner, an engraving of 1622 (fig.26 above) by L. Leclerc combines a monstrance on the altar with four Old Testament prefigurations of the Eucharist, one being of the Showbread. Emile Mâle noted that the familiar Old Testament prototypes were used as Biblical precedents in Counter Reformation art and literature, which, if correctly interpreted, clearly bolstered those Catholic doctrines which had come under most severe attack by Protestants.267

There are two Old Testament scenes in the tapestries, not ones of standard typologies of the Eucharist but which could be deemed to have a contemporary Counter Reformation relevance. The first of these, *The Sacrifice of the Old Covenant* is not based on a specific biblical event, though some aspects might reflect the procession of the Ark into the newly constructed Temple of Solomon (I Kings, VIII, i-vi) and (II Chron, V, i-vii.). Charles Scribner comments that “while the correct biblical source remains open to question, the significance of this tapestry is clear: it prefigures both the sacrifice of the Mass and the several independent devotions to the sacrament.”268 Nora De Poorter suggests that Rubens may have chosen this subject because the feast of Corpus Christi, in which the ark of the New Covenant, the monstrance containing the Host, was carried in a joyful procession, paralleled the joyful entry of the Ark into the Temple.269 Corpus Christi had been proclaimed a feast, throughout the Latin rite, back in the thirteenth century by Pope Urban IV in the bull *Transitus de hoc mundo*. Originally it was a relatively humble liturgical celebration, more one of expiation than

celebration. The processions were small scale associated more often with carrying Holy Communion as *viaticum* to the sick or transporting the sacrament from one church to another. By the late Middle Ages the processions had become more festive and crystal reliquaries, and then more and more elaborate monstrances, were used to carry the consecrated Host. By the late sixteenth century, greater emphasis was placed on spectacle and the procession had become a triumphal assertion of Catholic identity, and of belief in the Real Presence to counter Protestant denial. Given the Archduchess’s promotion of the Corpus Christi procession in Antwerp and Brussels, De Poorter’s rationale for *The Sacrifice of the Old Covenant* tapestry as having a contemporary relevance would seem most likely. While the Corpus Christi procession was actually proscribed by Calvinist preachers in the towns of the Northern Provinces, as it was by all reformed Ministers, the Fathers at Trent had argued that processions “must show forth the triumph of the truth (of the Eucharist) in such a way that, in the face of such magnificence and such joy on the part of the whole Church, the enemies of the truth will either fade away or, stricken with shame, attain to insight.” Certainly the Corpus Christi procession in Brussels was one of “such magnificence and such joy.” After all, these tapestries were to be the backdrop for Eucharistic processions in the Convent of the Descalzas Reales in Madrid.

The second tapestry that was not one of the standard typologies of the Eucharist and is probably not based on a story from the Old Testament is *The Victory of the Sacrament over Pagan Sacrifices* (Fig. 32).

---

270 Marc Forster, *Catholic Revival in the Age of the Baroque, Religious Identity in Southwest Germany, 1550-1750*, (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001), 118, has shown how devotion to the Eucharist, as shown in the splendour of their Corpus Christi procession, was an important element in their Catholic identity for villagers in many parts of southwest Germany. While the holding of communal processions marked many feast days, the procession on Corpus Christi seems to have been the most elaborate of the year.

In Charles Scribner’s suggested reconstruction of the original hanging of the tapestries, *The Sacrifice of the Old Covenant* is placed directly below *The Victory of the Sacrament over Pagan Sacrifices*. In this tapestry (fig. 32), we have the first appearance of the image of the Eucharist, the chalice with host held aloft. Charles Scribner gives this tapestry, too, a particular Counter-Reformation relevance. He interprets the action here as portraying not the victory of Christianity in the Constantinian era but in the reign of Theodosius the Great (379-95) who succeeded Julian the Apostate. Under Julian, paganism had experienced a revival and an apparent triumph over Christianity. He had opened new temples and actively took part in ritual sacrifices. However, Theodosius, on securing the Imperial throne, mercilessly combated both heretics and pagans. His last decree, issued in 392, referred to the old Roman religion as a “pagan superstition”, and prohibited completely the offering of sacrifices, burning of incense, hanging of garlands, libations and divinations. 272 Everything, in fact, that Rubens illustrates in this tapestry. Scribner records that the historian Alexander Vasiliev, noted that Theodosius’s

victory over paganism was coupled with a victory for orthodox Christianity. He designated the Nicene Creed “as the only legal creed,” thus laying an absolute veto upon all other tendencies in the Christian fold, as well as upon paganism.” In similar vein to Theodosius in ancient Rome, likewise in the Netherlands, the Archduchess, and in his lifetime, the Archduke, had dedicated themselves to rigorously implementing “orthodoxy” in the decrees of the Council of Trent. To identify the Christian victory over paganism with the image of the Eucharist was typical Counter-Reformation triumphalism. This tapestry should be read, not only as the victory of Christianity over pagan sacrifices, but allegorically, as the supremacy of the traditional doctrine of the Real Presence over Protestant “heresy”.

The assertion of the dogma of the Real Presence was given more forceful and more dramatic representation in the tapestry, *The Victory of Truth over Heresy* (fig. 33). Nora De Poorter describes the scene thus:

> Time, a winged old man with a scythe, leads Truth towards the light. Truth, in a shining white garment, faces the spectator and points to a scroll with the text “HOC EST CORPUS MEUM”. Both figures hover in a patch of radiance above a slain monster and prostrate heretics. Two half-naked men, and two winged monsters breathing fire, flee in terror, two other figures with books and scrolls follow Truth, stepping over a man on the ground.

The general sense of the picture is clear; it signifies the triumph of truth over Heresy, and in particular the victory of the Eucharistic dogma, expressed by the words “Hoc Est Corpus Meum”, over the heretics who opposed it. The female figure carries the word “Veritas” as an aureole above her head. De Poorter identifies Calvin with his narrow face and pointed beard, and the full faced Luther in a monk’s habit. It is interesting to observe that Luther appears here among the heretics, when he appeared to be absent sixty years earlier in the Limosin enamel (see above, chp. 3.) It was noted there, that at Poissy Charles de Guise had attempted to use Luther’s Eucharist teaching as a possible point of compromise to enable discussion to continue with Beza. But now, sixty plus years later, Luther’s teaching too has been declared heretical. Not only are recent “heretics” portrayed in this tapestry, but the figure

---

falling backwards with a monstrance slipping out of his grasp, is probably Tanchelm, a twelfth-century heretic who had had many followers in the Netherlands. Tanchelm was reputed to have described the Mass as an “abomination”, such a charge would have identified him with contemporary Protestants. He was particularly well known at Antwerp because his heresy continued to flourish there after his death until stamped out by St. Norbert, who appears in another tapestry in this series, *The Defenders of the Eucharist.*

De Poorter suggests the fleeing figures on the right are likely to represent heretics or enemies of the Faith. The man with a turban is perhaps a Muslim. The dark faced man with the dagger has collected Hosts in a flap of his garment, from where some hosts are falling out. This is probably a reference to the incident referred to above, of the desecration of the hosts in Brussels. The figures on the other side have been given varying designations. They may be allegorical personifications of the Old and New Testaments: the rear and older of the two men being the Old and the nearer younger
man the New Testament. Nora de Poorter maintains that we cannot explain them. They carry books and scrolls, suggesting they are writers or theologians: probably they are champions of Eucharistic dogma, since they are stepping on a prostrate figure, representing heresy, and pursuing Truth. Undoubtedly, the overall message of this tapestry where Truth, the daughter of Time, points upwards to the inscription “Hoc Est Corpus Meum”, is the affirmation of the “Truth” of the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation.

![Image: J. Raes after designs by P.P. Rubens, The Triumph of Faith, tapestry, Madrid, convent of the Descalzas Reales]

We come next to the tapestry *The Triumph of Faith* (Fig. 34). A flat cart is drawn in procession by two angels and pushed by putti. On the cart stands the allegory of Faith. She is a young woman with a halo around her head, dressed in an antique flowing white gown, and holding aloft a chalice with host. Next to her kneels an angel holding an enormous cross. Between the two figures is a globe. Above the two angels drawing the cart two putti hover with the instruments of the passion: one holds the crown of thorns, the other holds the nails, the symbols of salvation. Behind the cart

---

hovers an angel with torch in hand. In all probability, the torch symbolizes the light of Faith that must lead the way out of darkness for the “prisoners” following the cart, imprisoned by their blindness or refusal to recognize the Truth. The original sketch for this tapestry, now in the Fitzwilliam Museum, Cambridge, shows them being led in fetters by Faith. The Eucharistic hymn, *Pange lingua*, attributed to St. Thomas Aquinas, speaks of the Faith needed to take us beyond the evidence of the senses (*Praestet fides supplementum/ Sensum defectui*), may have suggested this theme to Rubens. 276

This now brings us to the largest tapestry in the series, *The Triumph of the Church* (fig 35.) the *modello* of which (fig 6), was compared to the Limosin enamel in (Chapter 3). (The tapestry becomes the reversal of the *modello* and thus the reverse image is closer to the direction of the progress of the procession in the enamel.) In his design Rubens may have been drawing on a painting by Otto van Veen, *The Triumph of the Catholic Church*, sometime after 1610.277 Van Veen had received commissions from the court in Brussels, from Archduke Ernest and then his successors, Archduke Albert and the Infanta Isabella. Rubens had worked in van Veen’s studio before he left for Italy but Rubens has put far more life into his design, as he has in all the designs for the other tapestries. Indeed, this image with its high colour, dramatic action and movement evokes greater emotional involvement in the viewer than does the rather static van Veen version.

---

276 The sequence of the Mass for Corpus Christi, continues this theme of the limitation of the senses:

*This faith to Christian men is given,*

*Bread is made flesh by words from heaven;*

*Into his blood the wine is turned;*

*What though it baffles nature’s powers*

*Of sense and sight? This faith of ours*

*Proves more than nature e’er discerned*

As was observed in the Limosin enamel, several features of this tapestry are borrowed from Roman triumphs; the figure with the labarum leading the procession, the captives or prisoners herded behind the chariot. Here the place of honour in the triumphal chariot is occupied by a stately female figure, the Church (ecclesia), in liturgical vestments: alb, stole and cope and an angel holds the papal tiara above her head. More papal insignia are represented in the papal processional umbrella and the crossed keys held by the female figure astride the leading horse in the procession. The Church figure holds with both hands, a monstrance radiating light making it the focus of the tapestry. A naked cherub sitting in front of the chariot and with a whip driving the horses forward has the dove of the holy spirit hovering above his head implying that it is the Spirit that guides the Church. De Poorter suggest that the shell–like shape of the chariot with a kind of prow in front is meant to recall the image of the Church as a ship. Such an image occurs repeatedly in literature and the plastic arts, see for example in fig. 40, the engraving by Cornelis Galle, The Ship of the Church. No doubt such an analogy recalls the biblical story of Christ with his Apostles in the ship on the Sea of Galilee when Christ stills the storm. In like manner Christ will steer

278 De Poorter, The Eucharist Series, 321
his ship, the Church, through the dangers of the sea and heresy will not overcome it. Indeed, heresy as represented here in the prostrate figures, will be trampled beneath the wheels of the triumphant Church. The cartouche above the tapestry is inscribed \textit{ECCLESÆ TRIUMPHVS}. Of the two men led captive behind the chariot, the one with ass’s ears is generally identified as Ignorance. The blindfolded and groping man beside him represents Blindness.\footnote{De Poorter, 324} In the centre, emerging from under the bottom of the tapestry there appears a globe encircled by a snake with a palm branch on the left and a rudder on the right. These symbols may be read as signifying the victorious Church’s conquest (palm and oak-crown) and eternal (snake) domination (rudder) over the world (globe).\footnote{De Poorter, \textit{The Eucharist Series}, 325.} This, according to Nora de Poorter sums up the meaning of the whole scene:

The Church is depicted in a war-chariot, advancing to her final triumph, crushing her enemies and leading Ignorance and Blindness towards the light, so as to rule the world forever. Rubens expressed in this way the central idea of the Counter-Reformation, that of the ultimate and final victory of the Catholic church over the world.\footnote{De Poorter, 325.}

While there are definite similarities between this design of Rubens and the Limosin enamel, \textit{The Triumph of the Eucharist} (fig.5), there are significant differences which may be explained by the occasion of their commissioning and by their very different functions. The Limosin enamel, a small but expensive object, approx.20x25cm, identifies a particular family, the Guise, with the triumph of Faith in contrast with the universal setting implied in Rubens’s design. The mother of the Guise is in sharp contrast to the anonymous classically draped figure of Ecclesia. There are no papal insignia in the French enamel, a fact already observed (chp. 3, above). While in Spain under Phillip II, and indeed in the Netherlands under the administration of Duke Albert and the Infanta Isabella, the decrees of the Council of Trent were actively implemented, they were never taken up by the monarchs of France. However, the French piece exhibits a very definite Counter Reformation character with its mound of heretics especially the inclusion of Calvin and Beza, being crushed under the wheels of the chariot. So while the French monarch might have been slow to identify with Trent, the Guise family then under the direction of the Cardinal of Lorraine,
certainly indicated where they stood in the Reformation polemic on the Eucharist. The Limosin enamel, given its nature and size was obviously not for public exhibition, while the Rubens tapestry, 480 x 750 cm, was to be publicly displayed and to adorn the convent walls during processions of the Blessed Sacrament. In time, this composition of Rubens became extremely well-known and was reproduced in tapestries, paintings and engravings attesting to the stress on the doctrine of the Real Presence in the aftermath of Trent. However, the Limosin enamel retains its importance to historians as being, very likely, the first image to represent the triumph of the Church with the Eucharist. The Limosin enamel dating from late 1561 or early 1562, was commissioned by a private family before the conclusion of the Council of Trent, that is before all the decrees of the Council were formally adopted, and at a time when the Regent of France was still seeking a compromise with the Huguenots in the interest of national unity if not religious unity. Rubens was commissioned more than sixty years later by the ruling Archduchess, renown for her devotion to the Blessed Sacrament at a time when Catholicism had triumphed over Calvinism in the Southern Netherlands.

There are two other tapestries to consider in this series as having compelling Counter-Reformation significance relevant to the doctrine of the Real Presence, and which exhibit certain features connecting them with other images of the Eucharist examined in this thesis. There is one (fig. 36), known today, as The Succession of the Popes. One art historian M. Rooses actually entitled it The Dogma of the Eucharist Confirmed by the Popes. Authority and Tradition were crucial issues in the Reformation debates. It was noted above that the doctrine of Apostolic Succession was debated at Poissy back in 1561, while Richard Vertisgan’s engraving of 1585 featured the doctrine as one of the characteristics of the Catholic Church in contrast

---

282 See the long list of other versions given by De Poorter, 320
283 In an exhibition of the tapestries in New York in 1942, it was given the title of Allegory of Eternity.
to the disorder of the church of the “Heretics”. Thus, the inclusion of a work propagating the idea of the authority of the Papacy and of succession stemming from St. Peter would seem to have its place in defending the doctrine of the Real Presence.

In this tapestry, an old woman, representing History, sits upon a large rock, (an allusion possibly to the Petrine foundation of the Papacy (Matt. 16: 13-19). Through her hands she passes a cord on which are strung medallions of Popes as she looks up at an angel who with one hand grasps her hand and with the other holds a snake biting its tail, a symbol of Eternity, and a symbol already appearing in the tapestry, *The Triumph of the Church*.

There are three putti each holding a section of the cord in the lower part of the composition. Erwin Panofsky, viewing the modello for this tapestry, now in the Fine Arts Gallery San Diego, interprets these three putti as Past, Present, and Future. In that modello Rubens had painted not medallions but roses and the snake biting its tail was first conceived as a ring and Panofsky interpreted the work as an elaborate allegory of Eternity. So the precise meaning of this tapestry is still somewhat obscure but Rooses’s reading of it as representing Apostolic Succession would seem to be more than feasible and Nora de Poorter entitled it *The Succession of the Popes*.

While it is undoubtedly difficult to visualise the concept of Papal authority and the dogma of Apostolic Succession there is another source of authority which Catholics,

---

as well as Protestant Reformers, enrolled in their controversies to support their doctrines, and one somewhat easier to represent visually, and that is the authority of the Fathers of the Western Church. This source was portrayed with amazing consistency by artists in the era of the Counter Reformation in images representing the Eucharist in order to validate the doctrine of the Real Presence.


In this tapestry (fig. 37), *The Defenders of the Eucharist*, seven saints including the four Latin doctors of the Church, are seen proceeding across a landscape. In the front on the right are St Gregory wearing a papal tiara and holding a crozier, St. Ambrose and St. Augustine wearing richly embroidered copes similar to their portrayal in the
Rubens painting fig. 27, St Jerome in his traditional red robes and Cardinal’s hat is on the left. Behind St. Jerome is a monk, in a white habit, who may be St. Norbert. In the centre next to St. Gregory is St. Clare holding a monstrance with both hands and standing partly in front of her is St. Thomas Aquinas with a large book under his arm and on his chest a blazing sun, again similar to his representation in the painting in the Dominican church in Antwerp (fig.27). In the centre the dove of the Holy Spirit hovers in the clouds radiating light over the Saints’ heads.

At the top and bottom are emblematic figures. Above, the head of an angel blowing two trumpets with a scroll around them, which Nora de Poorter interprets as indicating that the Fathers’ writings have reached to the ends of the earth.²⁸⁶ Below are inkpots and quill pens, an oil lamp and open books, again a reference to the Fathers’ writings. A famous engraving by Schelte a Bolswert of this Rubens tapestry design and also titled The Defenders of the Eucharist, inscribes in that upper scroll, Hic est panis qui de caelo descendit, and below, the translation of the inscription there reads:

What the divine learning of the doctors has brought into heavenly light- as many as there are books, so many triumphs have sounded. What is proved so early by reason and by the Spirit, our Supreme teacher, do thou also believe with ready faith.²⁸⁷

All the saints shown here have in common the fact that they are specially venerated as defenders of the Eucharist. The four Doctors of the Church are there to represent the traditional teachings of the Church, and the Fathers at Trent had laid equal emphasis on Tradition along with Scripture as the sources of Revelation. We have already seen the four Fathers above in engravings on the Eucharist (figs 23 and 25). St Thomas Aquinas with upraised hand in the gesture of an orator making a point, is accorded a special place in the centre. St Thomas in his Summa Theologica had assembled all that had been taught on the Eucharist and using Aristotelian philosophical terminology defined the concept of transubstantiation to explain the Real Presence. Indeed De Poorter suggests the large volume under Thomas’s arm represents the Summa. As noted above, page 104, St. Thomas reputedly composed

²⁸⁶ N. De Poorter, The Eucharist Series, 362.
²⁸⁷ N. De Poorter, the Eucharisti Series, 221
the Office of Corpus Christi including the hymns *Pange lingua* and *Lauda Sion*. Certainly St. Thomas is frequently featured in Eucharistic art. He is there in Rubens's altar piece in St. Paul's Church in Antwerp, see above fig. 27; he is the subject of numerous altar pieces and of Zurbaran's magnificent painting *The Apotheosis of St. Thomas* of 1631 and of engravings to be examined below. St. Thomas is regarded as being virtually “a presence” at the Council of Trent. The Fathers at Trent made it part of the order of the conclave to lay upon the altar, together with the code of sacred Scripture and the decrees of the supreme Pontiffs, the *Summa* of St. Thomas Aquinas whence to seek counsel, reason and inspiration. And, when the Council Fathers decreed that “by the consecration of the bread and wine a change is brought about of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of His blood,” they relied on St. Thomas Aquinas’s formulation of the theory of transubstantiation.288

St Clare, the disciple of St. Francis, is there because of her veneration of the Eucharist. There is a story that when abbess of the convent of San Damiano at Assisi, she put to flight a band of Saracen marauders by advancing towards them with a monstrance in her hand. And after all these tapestries are to be hung in the convent of the Poor Clares in Madrid. Rubens here represents St Clare with the features of his patron, the Infanta Isabella Clara who was herself a Franciscan tertiary and known for her devotion to the Blessed Sacrament. De Poorter suggests the figure in the white habit between St. Thomas and St. Jerome is St. Norbert who championed the Holy Sacrament against the followers of heretic Tanchelm in Antwerp. He is also featured in the tapestry *The Victory of Truth Over Heresy* (fig. 33). The Four Fathers of the Church and St. Thomas are to be found in so many engravings featuring the Eucharist mostly variants of paintings by Rubens, attesting to the apparent need to keep proclaiming the Church’s teaching against the Reformers’ denial of the Real Presence.

One final tapestry in the series that should be mentioned is *The Adoration of the Eucharist*, the bozetto sketch of which is shown above in Fig. 31. The central feature is the monstrance with the consecrated Host held aloft by two cherubs. The Church
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288 H.J. Schroeder, *Canons and Decrees of the council of Trent*, 75.
Triumphant is represented by angels in the clouds while below the Church Militant is occupied by church dignitaries on one side and on the other by the secular dignitaries. While the church dignitaries, the Pope and other ecclesiastical orders are portrayed as types, the secular figures are clearly identifiable, and justifiably so, as members of the House of Habsburg, the reigning Emperor Ferdinand II, beside him, Philip IV, the King of Spain and patron of the Descalzas together with his consort Isabella, a family renowned for their devotion to the Eucharist.

The significant feature of this Eucharist series of tapestries is the very wide diffusion of these designs in all kinds of media—engravings, paintings and other tapestries, most notably in The Triumph of Faith, a tapestry in the Cologne Cathedral and a painting in St. Paul’s Church in Ghent, and an engraving by S Bolswert of The Triumph of the Church. One other subject also widely disseminated and also deriving from Rubens’s painting in the church of St. Paul, Antwerp (fig 27), is the four Fathers of the Church and their identification with the Eucharist.

**The Fathers of the Church**

One of the more interesting works in this genre is the engraving in 1629 by Cornelis Bloemaert (fig. 38) executed from a sketch by his father Abraham Bloemaert. Adding to the importance of this engraving is its dedication to and likely commission by a princely convert to Roman Catholicism, Duke Gundaker von Liechtenstein. He had converted to Catholicism in 1602 and subsequently wrote several religious treatises, in particular on theological controversies. Such a learned interest on the part of the likely patron, may explain the prominence of biblical texts which feature in the engraving. The Duke’s fervour for the Catholic cause, according to Marcel Roethlisberger, was demonstrated by the zeal with which he strove to implant his new faith on his estates. In 1623 he was created an imperial prince by Ferdinand II. The dedication addresses him as the Duke of Silesia and Chamberlain in Chief of the Emperor Ferdinand II.
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289 Marcel Roethlisberger and Marten Jan Bok, *Abraham Bloemaert and his sons: paintings and prints: biographers and documents* (Ghent: Davaco, 1993), 303
The texts appearing in this engraving are also sections of the texts engraved by Hieronymous Wierix in *L’Adoration du Verbe Incarné* (fig. 23). Marcel Roethlisberger transcribes and translates the texts inscribed in the book held by the angels are the following:

*Figural legis naturae/ Melchisedech Sa/credos Dei altissimi/ obtulit-et vinum./Gen.14./ Figura Vet.Test./ Panem coeli dedit eis/ panem Angelorum/ manducavit hom./ Psal. 77./ Promissio./ Panis quem ego/ dabo carom ea est/ Ioann.6./ Solutio./ Accepit Jesus panem et*
Roethlisberger gives the following translation of the Latin texts.


Roethlisberger translates the subscriptions as follow:

St. Augustine on Psalm 98: Christ accepted the flesh from the flesh of Mary and gave us his own flesh to eat for our salvation. St. Jerome, Epistle to Hedybia, 2: Moses did not give us the true bread, but the Lord Jesus, both guest and host, both eating and being eaten. St. Gregory in the life of the deacon Paul: With the same power with which he created all from nothing, our creator transformed bread and wine into his flesh and blood. St. Ambrose in the Mysteries, ch.9: The Virgin procreated beyond the order of nature, and this, which we eat, is the body coming from the Virgin.

This engraving by Cornelis Bloemaert, of the Four Church Fathers of the Church was, in turn, produced with only minor adjustments, as an oil painting on canvas by his father Abraham, as an altarpiece for St. Paul’s Church in Cologne in 1632. Whether the acknowledgment is to that painting or to yet another by Abraham Bloemaert, there is an engraving (fig. 39), undated and described as “After A. Bloemaert”, St. Thomas and the Church Fathers. As the title suggests St. Thomas Aquinas is represented, and, as often referred to as Doctor Angelicus, is shown with angel’s wings. That might also be an allusion to the hymn, Panis Angelicus, the bread of Holy Communion and attributed to St. Thomas. In a Latin inscription the print is dedicated by Brother Ambrosius Druwe of the Dominican convent in Brussels to Father Johannes Coene, prior of the Cistercian monastery of Cambrai and Belgian vice-general of the order, his coat of arms is in the center. Marcel Roethlisberger comments on the “Rubensian flavour and the fluid graphic style akin to Bolswert shows this to be a contemporary Flemish product soon after 1629”. (J. Coene published a pamphlet in 1634 and A.
Druwe a book on the Eucharist in 1638.)\(^{291}\) The engraving therefore, may have been intended for use in those publications. St. Thomas holds the book open at the lines *Tantum ergo*...from the hymn *Pange Lingua* in the *Office of Corpus Christi*.

![Fig. 39. After Bloemaert, St. Thomas and the Church Fathers, engraving.](image)

The popularity of images of the Four Fathers is attested by the fact that as late as the 1650’s an engraving acknowledged as “After Rubens” by Flemish artist Cornelis van

\(^{291}\) M. Roethlisberger and Marten Jan Bok, *Abraham Bloemaert*, 304
Dalen in the British Museum depicts the Four Fathers: St. Jerome in cardinal robes and holding a book which the others read with him, St Augustine and St. Ambrose wearing mitres and St. Gregory a papal tiara. The inscription below the image identifies and refers to the Four Fathers as “Fathers of the Church, greatest in merit. Posterity, look upon these the ancient Church of the Father praised for their merits, and borne above the stars.”

An engraving by Cornelis Galle, *The Ship of the Church* c. 1640, (fig.40) combines the four Fathers with the Eucharist in a somewhat different guise.

In this engraving the allegory of the Church as a ship is represented where a boat with invisible oarsmen is steered by Christ who holds the banner of the Cross, the fluttering pennant with an inscription, *Absit gloriari nisi in Cruce Domini* (*May I never boast of anything except the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ*) (Gal. 6: 14). Opposite Christ, in the stern, the Church is represented as a female (ecclesia) holding in her right hand the chalice and host, and in her left, the symbols of the Papacy, the Papal tiara and the keys. The church identifies Herself with the Eucharist and attached to the sides of the boat are four shields with the representations of the four Latin
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292 British Museum print 1859,05114.261.
Fathers as if in affirmation of that dogma. In all these engravings the Church is identified with the consecrated host in the Monstrance or with the chalice and host proclaiming the dogma of the Real Presence as in the Leonard Limosin enamel, *The Triumph of the Eucharist and of the Catholic Faith*.

![Fig. 41 Museo of the Desalzas Reales, Madrid, showing current hanging of Tapestry *Triumph of the Church* and indicating its size of nearly 5 metres high.](image-url)
CHAPTER 7

Conclusion

This thesis has confined its study of Eucharistic images to works commissioned in France and the Netherlands in the immediate aftermath of the Council of Trent. These two countries had experienced bouts of violent iconoclasm and prolonged religious and civil wars. In both countries, the Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation was challenged by the Calvinist Reformed Confession of Faith. While John Calvin adamantly affirmed, “We must truly receive in the Lord’s supper the body and blood of Christ”, he vehemently denied the Catholic doctrine of the Real Presence and condemned as superstitious and unscriptural the preservation and adoration of the consecrated bread. For Calvin, “participation in the body of Christ...does not require a local presence. The Lord bestows this benefit on us through his Spirit”. In contrast, paintings, engravings, stained glass windows, and richly orchestrated Corpus Christi processions all gave public witness to Catholic belief in the doctrine of transubstantiation, a concept, as the hymn proclaims *Where the feeble senses fail, Faith for all defects supplies.*

While the Limosin enamel *The Triumph of the Eucharist* may have been the first art work of the Catholic Reformation to proclaim belief in the Real Presence identifying the Catholic church with that dogma, it does not seem to have been the forerunner to similar “triumphal” Eucharistic pieces in France. The prodigious output of Eucharistic images, of paintings, engravings and tapestries, in the Spanish Netherlands, was not matched in France. A variety of factors, no doubt, contributed
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293 John Calvin, *The Institutes*, IV, 17, 32.
295 See appendix 3 on “transubstantiation”.

to this significant difference; high on the list might have been the decades of political instability that prevailed in that country until the end of the sixteenth century and well into the seventeenth century. Petty jealousies, family intrigues, self-interest, along with incompetent monarchs who pursued a more than ambiguous religious policy, meant there was a lack of unity or cohesion among Catholics in that country in the face of a rising tide of Calvinism. Religious wars there were indeed civil wars with ever changing alliances and the involvement of foreign powers.

Henry II’s religious policy in his lifetime had progressed from a policy of prohibition and suppression of heresy to outright persecution but his untimely sudden death in 1559 plunged the country into a crisis of authority and more than a half century of continuous conflict. The brief ascendency of the Guise family at court during the short reign of Francis II, (married to a Guise niece, Mary Queen of Scots), stirred up vehement opposition not only from Protestants but also from rival Catholic families. Opposition to the Guise continued well into the reign of Henry III and when a new, revitalised Holy League emerged in 1585, swearing “to use force and take up arms to the end that the holy church of God may be restored to its dignity and the true and holy Catholic religion,” it failed to unite the Catholic factions. Rather, the alliance of the League with France’s traditional enemy, Spain, and the support of the Papacy, roused the ultra Gallican sentiments of many conservative noble families more prepared to support the ascendancy of Henry of Navarre and the principles of hereditary monarchy than the cause of an ultramontane Catholicism. When “The most Christian King of France “, Henry III, despite having submitted to the League three years previously, ordered the assassination of its leader, Henry Duke de Guise and his brother, Cardinal de Guise, we have some insight into the machinations of French religious/ political policy. The early seventeenth century, despite the Edict of Nantes, saw little real improvement. The regency of Marie de Medici, following the assassination of her husband, King Henry IV, was a time of continuing political crises as rival factions struggled for domination of Louis XIII’s government.

__296__ Déclaration des causes qui ont meu M. le cardinal de Bourbon et les princes, pairs, prelates et seigneurs, villes et communautés, catholiques de ce royaume, de s’opposer à ceux qui veulent subvenir la religion et l’État, cit. J.H.M.Salmon, Society in Crisis (London: Methuen, 1975) 238.
The political situation in the Spanish Netherlands presents a stark contrast where the thirty-seven year reign of the Archduke Albert and Archduchess Isabella provided a period of both political and religious stability during which the country enjoyed a twelve year truce with the United Provinces. This period saw a major rebuilding programme of churches, of increase in Religious Orders, many Congregations emigrating from France and England and particularly an increase in the Society of Jesus which became a major patron of the arts there. Far from any ambiguous or vacillating religious policy, the Hapsburg rulers continued the policy of King Philip II in adopting the decrees of the council of Trent and implementing reform. By contrast, apart from individual French Bishops, the French Monarchy failed to “receive” the decrees of Trent.

The Archduchess of the Netherlands, as we observed in chapter 6, demonstrated throughout her life the traditional Hapsburg devotion to the Eucharist and a firm belief in the doctrine of transubstantiation. Quite apart from the enormous expense involved in commissioning the twenty or more tapestries of the *Eucharistic Series*, her biographer records that;

> Her devotion to the Most Holy Sacrament was beyond description, and this could be seen very clearly, for she attended all its feasts with such devotion and such a pious spirit that it was a marvel to see...She never tired of attending its processions; and thus on Corpus Christi day, when she was in Brussels, and on the day of the holy sacrament of the Miracle, she came expressly to do it honour each year, and presented some precious gift.

This, one might observe, was a far cry from the Queen Mother, Marie de Medici, in France in 1620’s, who was commissioning Rubens to paint those flamboyant allegorical paintings of her life to decorate the Luxembourg Palace just when Archduchess Isabella was planning her Eucharist tapestries. Hapsburg devotion to the Eucharist was attested in the tapestry *Adoration of the Eucharist* where Rubens represented the Church militant by the earthly hierarchies. On the left of the

---

297 The Archduchess following the death of Albert in 1621, was appointed Governor of the Netherlands on behalf of the King of Spain until her death in 1633.
299 This tapestry is not shown here, only the bozetto for it. See fig. 31.
painting i.e. on the right of the Monstrance, the ecclesiastical hierarchy is represented by a Pope and other clerical figures. These appear as types rather than as particular individuals, but the figures representing the secular hierarchy can be identified as the then reigning Emperor Ferdinand II, and beside him, Philip IV, the King of Spain and patron of the Descalzas Reales together with his consort Isabella. Furthermore, in the Kunsthistorisches Museum in Vienna there is a painting by Jan Davidsz de Heem *Christ and Host Encircled by Garlands of Fruit, 1648*. Below the chalice there is an inscription in Latin indicating the work is dedicated to the Hapsburg Archduke Leopold Wilhelm, Governor of the Netherlands. The painting seems to be one intended for personal contemplation and prayer. In a dark niche, one sees a precious Communion chalice over which hovers a Communion wafer. The mysterious glow of the Host is meant to symbolise its transubstantiation into the body of Christ. An image of a crucified Christ can be detected in the Host. The surrounding richly painted garlands of fruit and flowers symbolise the fruitfulness of this sacrament.

Devotion to the Eucharist in the Netherlands also was fostered by several religious Congregations, notably by the Capuchins with their practice of the 40 Hours Devotion, but pre-eminently by the Society of Jesus, in not only commissioning the many engravings such as have been considered here, but in establishing lay congregations and Confraternities, that cut across social groups from nobles to artisans, building up a network of sodalities forging a truly devout Catholic Eucharistic spirituality. The first foundation of a Congregation of the Holy Sacrament was founded in the church of the Jesuit College in Naples in 1554, and such foundations became a feature of their apostolate wherever they went. For all its emphasis on intellectual understanding, Jesuit spirituality demonstrated a profound appreciation of the value of sacred images to engulf the senses to the extent that art historian, Gavin Bailey, has described Antwerp as being the second capital of Jesuit art after Rome. Apart from commissioning great churches such as that of St. Carlo Borromeo, the Jesuits were able to utilise in Antwerp, the resources of the Plantin publishing house to print and

---

circulate their illustrated literature such as Hieronymus Nadal’s *Evangelicae Historiae Imagines*.

It would be hard to overestimate the significance of the role of the Plantin Press in disseminating illustrated religious prints in the period under study here. Founded in 1555, the *Officina Plantiniana* is regarded as the most important printing-publishing house Belgium ever had. Its founder, Christopher Plantin played a pioneering role in the production and distribution of books with engraved and etched illustrations in sixteenth century Europe. The fact that that house published the Polygot Bible of Alcala with the text in four languages, Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek and Latin, in six volumes gives some indication of the importance of Plantin in the history of the art of printing. Plantin had obtained in 1569-70 the monopoly of the sale in Spain and in the Spanish colonies of breviaries and missals according to the instructions of the Council of Trent, while the account book of the publishing house in 1609 shows deliveries of their published works to the Southern Netherlands, the United Provinces, France, Germany, Italy, Spain and Portugal. Jesuit publications went even further afield, carried as they were to their missions in India, the New World and China. The Society of Jesus itself, had become by the early seventeenth century, a major player in the world of publishing and commissioning of art in the Netherlands. Historian Hugh Trevor-Roper records that under the rule of the Archdukes between 1598-1621, the Jesuits multiplied fourfold in numbers. The story of the Society of Jesus in France was somewhat different.

It was not entirely unusual in their earliest years for the Jesuits to be met with a certain amount of suspicion, if not outright hostility. As John O’Malley has put it, it was not because of a particular theological position they defended or opposed, but

---


“because their very Institute was considered suspect or subversive.”303 While their lack of clerical dress and failure to recite the Divine Office in Community might have been unusual, opposition came from more fundamental issues. The Papal bull *Regimini* which gave the Society of Jesus official status within the Catholic Church, meant they were exempt from the jurisdiction of bishops and that “within certain limits they could function independently of episcopal hierarchy even in their ministries and that their privileges came directly from the Pope.”304 Nowhere was this more resented than in France with that country’s sensitivity to its Gallican rights. Thus from the start of their ministry in Paris in the 1550’s the Society encountered active opposition from Bishop du Bellay, from the French Parlement, and from the Faculty of Theology of the University of Paris. They also encountered resentment from mendicant orders and from some pastors and towns. This is not the place to engage in a history of the Jesuits in France, enough to contrast their position with that of the Society in the Spanish Netherlands. Involvement of some Jesuits in the Holy League with its known alliance with France’s traditional enemy Spain, the role of the Jesuits as champions of ultramontanism and allegations that the Society was somehow involved in assisting in Jean Chastel’s attempted assassination of Henry IV, combined to bring about their expulsion from a great part of France in 1594. By 1600 the Jesuit mission maintained only a precarious legal existence in the south and west of the kingdom. It was Henry IV who in 1603 was responsible for inviting the Society back, motivated, as Eric Nelson has argued in his recent detailed study, by his interest to use them as pawns to placate the Pope and have his excommunication lifted.305 The Edict of Rouen of September, 1603, under which terms the Society returned to France and defined its legal standing in the country, seemed drafted for the purpose of placating the objections of the Gallican lawyers in the Parlement of Paris. It stipulated that Jesuits working in France be French citizens and every Jesuit swear an oath of loyalty to the monarch upon entry into a French foundation. While the Society came in time to flourish in that country and Jesuits become Confessors to the French monarch, their impact in the wider field of art and publishing in the early seventeenth

century, was undoubtedly less than that of their confreres in the Netherlands. The case of Louis Richeome’s publication of his *Tableaux sacre des figures mystiques du tres-auguste sacrifice et sacrement de l'Eucharistie* seems somewhat of an exception. Researching more broadly beyond Jesuit commissions, a search of Andre Linzeler and Jean Adhemar *Inventaire de fonds francais: graveurs du siezieme siecle* while it revealed scores of religious prints, images of the Mother of God, of saints and prints of the Passion of Christ, there was none specifically dealing with the Eucharist. There does not appear to be a similar inventory of seventeenth century prints. While Nicolas Poussin painted two large canvases titled “The Eucharist”, they were paintings of the Last Supper reflecting the antiquarian interest of his patron rather than presenting any Reformation polemic though the possible significance of representing the moment of the consecration of the bread and wine has been observed.\footnote{306 Chapter 3, page 25.}

Of course there is also the happy accident of the incident of genius in explaining any difference in the artistic output between France and the Spanish Netherlands in our period of study. Peter Paul Rubens virtually stands alone and as Gavin Bailey has commented, “Artists were not outsiders bemusedly or fearfully looking on in the Catholic reform movement. They were active and zealous participants in the renewed church, and their art and lives were often very personal expressions of faith.”\footnote{307 G. Bailey, *Saints and Sinners*, 152.} Rubens was such a case. He is reputed to have “done” the *Spiritual Exercises* and to have been a regular Communicant. Then, there were the very gifted Wierix brothers. Despite their Jesuit patrons’ complaints that they spent more time in the tavern than in their studio, one marvels at the exquisite skill of their detailed engraving and that of the many others, such as Cornelis Bloemaert, van Dalen and Cornelis Galle who drew inspiration from Rubens.

One other aim in studying Eucharistic iconography in this period, the first Tridentine century in the history of the Catholic Church, was to observe if there were any significant recurring themes in that iconography. Apart from the obvious Triumphal motif to be seen in the Limosin enamel and particularly in more than one of Rubens’s
Eucharist tapestries, there are two other recurring themes having a particular Counter-Reformation import. The first of these is the portrayal or reference to the doctrine of Apostolic Succession. It is implied in that 1570 woodcut, *Le Pressoir Mystique* with its reference to “Sainct Pierre premier pape” and the inclusion of two more Popes engaged in decanting the blood/wine. It is spelt out in Richard Verstigian’s print of 1585, with its carefully constructed line of mitred Popes receding to the far distance to the initialled “S P” with an aureole above inscribed “CHRVS”. Again, one of Rubens’s tapestries is titled *The Succession of the Popes*. The issue of Papal authority was never debated at Trent but all the delegates replied “Yes” to the final decree that confirmation of all matters decreed in the course of all sessions of the Council “be sought from the pope”. Thus, it was ultimately a Papal bull, *BenedICTUS DEUs* that confirmed the work of the council of Trent. Apart from the obvious representation of Apostolic Succession in these several images the vesting of God the Father with a papal-like triple tiara as can be seen in figs 16, 25, and 26 may be of more than passing interest. At a time when the Papacy itself had been rejected by Protestant Reformers, was this a case of artistic licence suggesting the association of Papal authority with that of God the Father?

More frequent than references to Apostolic Succession was the representation of the Fathers of the Church in Eucharistic images, and as John Knipping observed, to present all four together was new in sixteenth century Netherlands art. On occasion, the group was extended to include Eastern Fathers, and on one occasion referred as far back as to St. Ephrem of the mid fourth century. The theologians of the early Tridentine church shared the same understanding as nineteenth century E.B. Pusey who argued “(the Fathers) are witnesses....as to the sense in which God willed His Scripture to be understood”. And again, that of John Henry Newman when he wrote “...God speaks to inquirers after truth by the mouth of those who possess it, the writings of the Fathers must always have an authority”. Likewise, by including the Fathers, Catholic Reformation art validated the Council of Trent’s affirmation of transubstantiation. This focus on the Eucharist, with images and texts from the

---

Fathers, was something new in the modes of expression in Christian art. Emile Mâle has commented that the art of the Counter-Reformation could no longer, like medieval art, express repose in faith. Art of this era was committed; was obliged to struggle, to affirm and to refute, defending what the Protestants attacked.\textsuperscript{310}

Perhaps it is not entirely out of place to draw attention to a feature to be found in many of the images reproduced in this study, that is, to the monstrance. Holding the sacred host, the monstrance itself became a work of art: crafted in a semi-precious metal, sometimes radiating shafts of light like the sun and often, jewel-encrusted. Thus this object, so often represented in the images, itself gave witness to the idea of the Real Presence, and when carried in processions of the Blessed Sacrament, may have borne out the hope expressed by the Fathers at Trent:

\begin{quote}
That in the sight of so much splendour and in the midst of so great joy of the universal church, her enemies may either vanish weakened and broken, or, overcome with shame and confounded, may at length repent.\textsuperscript{311}
\end{quote}

It would be remiss in any study of Eucharistic images of the Catholic Reformation to pass over entirely paintings of The Last Communion of Saints. There is Agostino Carraci’s \textit{Last Communion of St. Jerome} painted in the 1590’s for the Carthusians at Bologna, and now in the Museum there; Domenichino’s version of the same subject painted in 1614 for San Girolamo della Carità in Rome, Zubarán’s moving \textit{Last Communion of St. Bonaventure} and St. Stanislaus Kostka receiving communion from the hands of angels. This is to mention just a few, but such paintings are beyond the orbit of this thesis focussed as it is on Catholic Eucharistic iconography in France and the Spanish Netherlands. However, there is one that is relevant, namely Rubens’s \textit{The Last Communion of St. Francis} painted in 1619 for an altar in the Church of the Recollects at Antwerp. It is a dramatic and highly moving representation of this saintly figure receiving Viaticum. The links of faith and devotion between saint and surrounding monks, powerfully rendered in Rubens’s handling of figures and dramatic lighting, makes palpable belief in the grace of this sacrament and the.


\textsuperscript{311} Chapter V, Thirteenth Session. H.J. Shroeder, \textit{Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent}, 76.
presence of Christ within. It is no simple coincidence, in an era when the salvific value of the sacraments was challenged by Protestant affirmation of “faith alone”, that artists were commissioned to represent what Emile Mâle has described as “one of the greatest themes of religious art”.

Surely the idea of transubstantiation must be the most intractable of doctrines to portray though the dramatic presentation of a bloodied Christ standing in a chalice must go some way to transmitting that concept. Other aspects of Tridentine Eucharistic theology might be considered somewhat more capable of visual presentation. Exhibiting the host within an elaborate monstrance radiating emanating light, and held triumphantly aloft or enthroned on an altar suggest a sacredness in what otherwise would appear as a mere wafer of bread. The Tridentine decree affirming the rightness of the preservation and adoration of that consecrated wafer is attested to by such visualisation. The decree of “the Excellence of the Most Holy Eucharist Over the Other Sacraments” is clearly affirmed when a monstrance is held aloft by adoring angels and placed centre stage surrounded by roundels or boxes exhibiting the other six sacraments. When the blood of Christ, nailed on a cross or crushed beneath a winepress, is collected in a chalice such an image then must surely attest to the consecrated communion wine as Christ’s saving blood. In all these various ways Tridentine Eucharistic theology was transmitted to the faithful in the first century of the Counter-Reformation.

This thesis began by reviewing the history of the debate on the place of images in Christianity. To some, though to a far lesser, extent that debate continues. In the closing messages at Vatican II, Leo Cardinal Suenens addressed artists saying:

"The Church has long since joined in alliance with you. You have built and adorned her temples, celebrated her dogmas, enriched her liturgy. You have aided her in translating her divine message in the language of forms and figures, making the invisible world palpable. Today, as yesterday, the Church needs you and turns to you."

---


However, in tones reminiscent of St. Bernard of Clairvaux who denounced the ornamentation of churches as a distraction to the worshipper (see above Chapter 1), the General Instruction of the Roman Missal, *To Give Thanks and Praise*, advises that “works of art should nourish faith and piety”, but, … ‘They should, however, be placed so as not to distract the faithful from the actual celebration. They should not be too numerous, there should not be more than one image of the same saint, and the correct order of saints should be observed.’

Pope Benedict XVI, was more encouraging of the role that art can play in mediating the sacred mysteries. When launching, in June 2005, the new “Compendium” of Catholic doctrine, which features prominently in full colour fourteen sacred images, Benedict explained the images were not there purely for the sake of illustration. They were an integral part of the new catechism. “Images,’ he said, ‘are also a preaching of the gospel...Image and word illuminate one another in turn.” How much more important might images have been in the sixteenth and early seventeenth centuries when Latin was the language of the liturgy, and the majority of the faithful were illiterate; the visual was then a more than significant mode of communication. Certainly, the invention of printing had enabled mass circulation of prints, such as has been illustrated here, and while many prints incorporated Latin texts, the essential message was comprehensible to the vast majority through the accompanying image. There has always been an argument mounted for the importance of the sense of sight over the sense of hearing. In the thirteenth century, St. Bonaventure argued for the effective and affective role of images in instructing the faithful: …“our emotion is aroused more by what is seen than by what is heard.”

Perhaps the most appropriate recommendation for the role of art in communicating the mysteries of our Faith, and particularly for that most intractable of mysteries to communicate, namely transubstantiation, are the words spoken by Pope Paul VI when speaking of the friendship between the Church and the arts, he said:

---

We need you. We need your collaboration in order to carry out our ministry, which consists as you know, in preaching and rendering accessible and comprehensible to the minds and hearts of our people the things of the spirit, the invisible, the ineffable, the things of God himself. And in this activity...you are masters. It is your task, your mission, and your art consists in grasping treasures from the heavenly realm of the spirit and clothing them in words, colours, forms - making them accessible.317
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Appendix 1

On the invocation, veneration and relics of saints and on sacred images
Decree of the Council of Trent, 25th session, December, 1563

The holy Synod enjoins on all bishops, and others who sustain the office and charge of teaching, that, agreeably to the usage of the Catholic and Apostolic Church, received from the primitive times of the Christian religion, and agreeably to the consent of the holy Fathers, and to the decrees of sacred Councils, they especially instruct the faithful diligently concerning the intercession and invocation of saints; the honour (paid) to relics; and the legitimate use of images: teaching them, that the saints, who reign together with Christ, offer up their own prayers to God for men; that it is good and useful suppliantly to invoke them, and to have recourse to their prayers, aid, (and) help for obtaining benefits from God, through His Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, who is our alone Redeemer and Saviour; but that they think impiously, who deny that the saints, who enjoy eternal happiness in heaven, are to be invoked; or who assert either that they do not pray for men; or, that the invocation of them to pray for each of us even in particular, is idolatry; or, that it is repugnant to the word of God; and is opposed to the honour of the one mediator of God and men, Christ Jesus; or, that it is foolish to supplicate, vocally, or mentally, those who reign in heaven. Also, that the holy bodies of holy martyrs, and of others now living with Christ,-which bodies were the living members of Christ, and the temple of the Holy Ghost, and which are by Him to be raised unto eternal life, and to be glorified,-are to be venerated by the faithful; through which (bodies) many benefits are bestowed by God on men; so that they who affirm that veneration and honour are not due to the relics of saints; or, that these, and other sacred monuments, are uselessly honoured by the faithful; and that the places dedicated to the memories of the saints are in vain visited with the view of obtaining their aid; are wholly to be condemned, as the Church has already long since condemned, and now also condemns them.

Moreover, that the images of Christ, of the Virgin Mother of God, and of the other saints, are to be had and retained particularly in churches, and that due honour and veneration are to be given them; not that any divinity, or virtue, is believed to be
in them, on account of which they are to be worshipped; or that anything is to be asked of them; or, that trust is to be reposed in images, as was of old done by the Gentiles who placed their hope in idols; but because the honour which is shown them is referred to the prototypes which those images represent; in such wise that by the images which we kiss, and before which we uncover the head, and prostrate ourselves, we adore Christ; and we venerate the saints, whose similitude they bear: as, by the decrees of Councils, and especially of the second Council of Nicaea, has been defined against the opponents of images.

And the bishops shall carefully teach this,-that, by means of the histories of the mysteries of our Redemption, portrayed by paintings or other representations, the people is instructed, and confirmed in (the habit of) remembering, and continually revolving in mind the articles of faith; as also that great profit is derived from all sacred images, not only because the people are thereby admonished of the benefits and gifts bestowed upon them by Christ, but also because the miracles which God has performed by means of the saints, and their salutary examples, are set before the eyes of the faithful; that so they may give God thanks for those things; may order their own lives and manners in imitation of the saints; and may be excited to adore and love God, and to cultivate piety. But if any one shall teach, or entertain sentiments, contrary to these decrees; let him be anathema.

And if any abuses have crept in amongst these holy and salutary observances, the holy Synod ardently desires that they be utterly abolished; in such wise that no images, (suggestive) of false doctrine, and furnishing occasion of dangerous error to the uneducated, be set up. And if at times, when expedient for the unlettered people; it happen that the facts and narratives of sacred Scripture are portrayed and represented; the people shall be taught, that not thereby is the Divinity represented, as though it could be seen by the eyes of the body, or be portrayed by colours or figures.

Moreover, in the invocation of saints, the veneration of relics, and the sacred use of images, every superstition shall be removed, all filthy lucre be abolished; finally, all lasciviousness be avoided; in such wise that figures shall not be painted or adorned with a beauty exciting to lust; nor the celebration of the saints, and the
visitation of relics be by any perverted into revellings and drunkenness; as if festivals are celebrated to the honour of the saints by luxury and wantonness.

In fine, let so great care and diligence be used herein by bishops, as that there be nothing seen that is disorderly, or that is unbecomingly or confusedly arranged, nothing that is profane, nothing indecorous, seeing that holiness becometh the house of God.

And that these things may be the more faithfully observed, the holy Synod ordains, that no one be allowed to place, or cause to be placed, any unusual image, in any place, or church, howsoever exempted, except that image have been approved of by the bishop: also, that no new miracles are to be acknowledged, or new relics recognised, unless the said bishop has taken cognisance and approved thereof; who, as soon as he has obtained some certain information in regard to these matters, shall, after having taken the advice of theologians, and of other pious men, act therein as he shall judge to be consonant with truth and piety. But if any doubtful, or difficult abuse has to be extirpated; or, in fine, if any more grave question shall arise touching these matters, the bishop, before deciding the controversy, shall await the sentence of the metropolitan and of the bishops of the province, in a provincial Council; yet so, that nothing new, or that previously has not been usual in the Church, shall be resolved on, without having first consulted the most holy Roman Pontiff.
Appendix 2.
Ubiquity


Ubiquitarianism, theory peculiar to Lutheranism, according to which the body of Christ is, in some sense omnipresent. This Lutheran position came as a reaction against the denial of the Real Presence of Christ’s body and blood in the Eucharist by certain Reformers (Sacramentarians), a denial based ostensibly on the article of faith concerning Christ’s sitting in majesty at the Father’s right hand. Luther himself countered with arguments which led to the ubiquitarian position. He assumed as its basis the hypostatic union of the two natures in one Person. According to Luther, such a union gives a supernatural mode of being to Christ’s human nature, such that omnipresence is not precluded as one of its properties.

Lutherans themselves were divided over the question in the 16th century. Philipp Melanchthon held a position more moderate than that of Luther; and the former’s authority prevailed in northern Germany, given the assistance of Martin Chemnitz. In the south Johann Brenz gained support for the doctrine of Luther.

The *Formula of Concord* (1577) presents the theory as follows: “(Christ’s body) is able to be somewhere or other according to a divine and heavenly mode, since he is one person with God... According to this... wonderful and sublime mode, he (is) in all creatures, so that they do not include, circumscribe, or contain him; rather, he has them present to himself, and even circumscribes and contains them” (*Von heiligenAbendmahl*, BSLK 1007)
Appendix 3

Transubstantiation

Transubstantiation is a means of expressing the Catholic doctrine of the Real Presence. It is a mode of expression based on the Aristolelian philosophy as taught by the schoolmen in the middle ages according to which a physical object consists of ‘accidents’, the properties perceptible by the senses, and an underlying ‘substance’ in which the accidents inhere, and which gives to the object its essential nature.

According to the expression of transubstantiation the accidents of bread and wine remain after consecration, but their substance is changed into that of the body and blood of Christ.

St. Thomas Aquinas, *Summa theologica, iii*. Q. lxxv

Article IV. *Whether bread can be converted into the body of Christ.*

... I reply that this conversion is not like natural conversion but is wholly supernatural, effected solely by the power of God.... All conversion which takes place according to the laws of nature is formal.... But God... can produce not only a formal conversion, that is, the supersession of one form by another in the same subject, but the conversion of the whole being, that is, the conversion of the whole substance of $A$ into the whole substance of $B$. And this is done in this sacrament by the power of God, for the whole substance of the bread is converted into the whole substance of Christ’s body...Hence this conversion is properly called transubstantiation.

Decree of 13th Session of the Council of Trent, October, 1551, Chapter 1V.  

But since Christ our Redeemer declared that to be truly His own body which He offered under the form of bread, it has, therefore, always been a firm belief in the Church of God, and this holy council now declares it anew, that by the consecration of the bread and wine a change is brought about of the whole substance of the bread into the substance of the body of Christ our Lord, and of the whole substance of the wine into the substance of His blood. This change the holy Catholic Church properly and appropriately calls transubstantiation.

---

Appendix 4

Eucharistic Formulae employed at the Colloquy of Poissy, September-October, 1561.

(Appendix IX, H. Outram Evennett, The Cardinal of Lorraine and the Council of Trent.
(Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1930) 492-502)

1. Evenett gives the Definitions of the Council of Trent, Session XIII, October 11th, 1551. Those canons were not used at Poissy, he gave them solely for the purpose of comparison. They have been given here in Chapter II, page 37, and in Appendix 3).

2. Three extracts from Calvin’s In Heshusium used by d'Espene on September 24th, 1561.
   (a) Ubiqueadmittosubstantialiternospasci Christi carne et sanguine, modofacessatcrassum de localicommixitionecommentum.
   (b) Substantiaiter Christi carnemetsanguinemnobisofferi et exhiberi in coena...hincconficiturneque de praesentia, neque de esusubstantiali, sedtantum de utriusquemodoessecertarmen, quialocalempreasentiam non admittimus.
   (c) Omninoisthaecpiistenendaestregula, utquiotissymbolavident a Domino instituta, illicreisignataeveritatemadessecertocogitent ac sibipersuadeant.

3. Lutheran articles put forward for Beza’s signature by the Cardinal of Lorraine on September 24th.
   (a) The 10th article of the Confession of Augsburg. 2
   De coena Domini docetur, quod corpus etsanguis Christi vereadsint et distribuanturvescentibus in coena Domini, et improbantursecus docents.
   (ii) From the Apology of the Augsburg Confession.
   Decimusartiusapproxobatusest, in quo confitemurnossentire quod in coena Domini vere et substantialiteradsint corpus et sanguis Christi, et vereexhbeantur cum illis rebus quae videntur pane et vino, his qui saramentumaccipiunt.
   (iii) The 10th article of the 1540 version.
   De coena Domini docteur, quod cum pane et vino vereexhbeantur corpus et sanguis Christi, vescentibus in coena Domini.

2 It is impossible to discover which version the Cardinal used. Probably the original.
(b) Article on the Eucharist from the Wurttemberg Confession.

De substantia Eucharistiae esentiam docemus quod verum corpus Christi et verusanguei jus in eucharistidistribuantur, et refutamuseos qui dicunt panem et vinum.

Eucharistiae distribuantur, et refutamuseos qui dicunt panem et vinum

Eucharistiae essetantum absentior corporis et sanguinis Christi signa.

Credimusetiamonipotentiam Dei tantamesse, ut posit in eucharistiasubstantiam panis et viniformer humiliarevel in corpus et sanguinem Christi mutare.

(From Heppe, Dei Bekenntnisschriftender altpotestantischenKircheDeutschlands, pp 24, 189, 346 and 514.)

4. Formula composed by the Cardinal of Lorraine on September 24th at the Queen-Mother’s request, and given to Beza.

Firma fide confitemur in augutissimosacramento Eucharistiae verum Christi corpus et verum Christi sanguinem vere, realiter et substantialiteresse et existere, exhiberi et sumi a communicantibus.

5. Modification of No. 4 made at San Germain on September 25th by Beza, des Gallars, d’Espence and the Bishop of Valence.

Credimus in usu coenae Dominicae verum Christi corpus et verum sanguinem Christi spirituali et ineffabilimodoesse, exhiberi, sumi a fidelibus communicantibus.

(Dis cours de d’Espence, p. 63; d’Espence, Apologie, p. 467; H.E.1, 672)

6. Modification of No. 4 made at Poissy on September 25th.

Credimus et confitemur in augustissimo Eucharistiae sacramentossaesse et existereverum Christi corpus natum ex Maria Virgine, et de manibus sacerdotum, eorum ore consecratum, exhiberi et sumi a communicantibus.

7. Declaration of Faith read out by Beza on September 26th.

Nous disons que nostre seigneur Jesu-Christ est en l’usage de la Sainte Cène, en laquelleil nous presente, donne et exhibevéritablement son corps et son sang par l’opération du Sainct Esprit, et que nous recevons mangeons et beuvons spirituellement et par foyses proper corps qui est mort pur nous, et ce proper sang qui a estérespandupur nous, pur ester os de sesos, et chair de sa chair, à fin d’en ester vivifies, et percevoir tout ce qui estrequis pour nostresalut.

8. Peter Martyr them made a personal declaration of Faith on septembere 29th.

9. A Formula was then proposed by the Calvinists, Beza, Peter Marty, Malorat, des Gallars and de L’Espine- on September 30th and condemned at Poissy on October 2nd.
Appendix 6

Will of Infanta Isabella Clara Eugenia, Archduchess of the Netherlands


TRANSLATION - Doc. 4

[f° 851] I give order that my body be interred at the entrance to the chapel of the Holy Sacrament of the Miracle at Brussels, where everyone passes in and out, with only a single flagstone recording that I lie there, and this shall suffice until Our Lord takes the Archduke to Himself; then it is my will that we be buried together, for as in life I desired not to be separated from him, so in death I wish that our bodies be together, and if I should die in a place such that my body cannot be taken to Brussels, let me be interred in the manner that I here direct, wherever the Archduke shall decide.

I give order that I be buried in the habit of St. Francis, on account of my particular devotion to it.

[f° 871] desire that palls be given to all the parishes of the place where I shall die, and such others as my executors shall think proper, and that an amount be supplied for candlewax so that the most holy Sacrament be displayed more becomingly and that His Holiness be asked to give permission for the establishment of the Confraternity of the most holy Sacrament that exists in Spain, if all this shall not have been done before Our Lord takes me to Himself.

[f° 88v] To the Infanta Dona Margarita my sister I command that there be sent the reliquary of ebony and silver [f° 891 with St. Stephen and St. Laurence in ivory, that she may remember to pray to Our Lord for me.

[Added in 1633 in the margin, f° 88v] This shall be given to her niece Sister Ana Dorotea (see n. 3).