

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

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

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

with the third. The connection between them is striking. "Thou shalt not lift up *the Name* to a falsehood, whether concentered in an idol as a lying likeness of Deity, or uttered by the lips in attestation of a lie." Compare with this, "Thou shalt not answer against thy neighbour as a witness of a lie." In both cases a libel is forbidden; in both cases the "honour due" is implicitly insisted on and enforced.

In the Tenth Commandment, "Thou shalt not covet" is repeated before both "house" and "wife." In Ex. xx. 17 the verb is the same, but in the copy of the law as given in Deut. v. 18, "wife" stands first and "house" second. The verb before "wife" is the same as in Exodus, but the verb before "house" is אָוַה. The LXX. has ἐπιθυμήσεις in all places. The Syriac also has the same verb throughout, and the Vulgate in Exodus has "non concupisces"—"nec desiderabis," and in Deuteronomy it has "concupisces," and does not repeat the verb. Neither the repetition of the verb in the original in Exodus, nor the variation of the verb in Deuteronomy, denotes a separation of the commandment; but there is an interesting difference between the meanings of the verbs in Deuteronomy which we may notice. רָמַה signifies *desire*, as excited by some object outside one's self, and אָוַה, a *desire* that arises from within; the former is the result of incentive, and the latter of impulse.

These sporadic notes may stimulate the student to seek and find other latent thoughts in this portion of Holy Scripture—the law in which the Psalmist delighted to have his meditations all the day long.

F. TILNEY BASSETT.

Correspondence.

THE THEOLOGY OF BISHOP ANDREWES.

To the Editor of THE CHURCHMAN.

SIR,—The excellent articles on Bishop Andrewes in *THE CHURCHMAN* for July, 1889, p. 21, and for August, 1889, p. 587, by Rev. N. Dimock, are most seasonable; but attention should also be directed just now to Dean Goode's masterly examination of his views in his remarkable work, "The Nature of Christ's Presence in the Eucharist" (Hatchards), vol. ii.

Yours sincerely,

C. H. DAVIES.

Littleton Drew, Sept. 27th.

SIR,—Will you allow me to say a few words on Mr. Dimock's notice of Hooker, in his article on Bishop Andrewes?

At page 528 he says: "An attempt has been made to isolate the teach-

ing of Hooker. This attempt," he says, "will be found to break down completely under examination."

Now, in every other respect I readily own that Mr. Dimock's defence of Hooker is perfect. But where Hooker is isolated is as to bread being the means of conveying the grace. I know that the part of the Catechism which teaches of Sacraments was not written till after his death. He cannot, then, be accused of controverting an existing formulary. But his teaching does.

First, let us hear Hooker: "The question is . . . whether, when the Sacrament is administered, Christ be whole within man only, or else His body and blood be also externally seated in the very elements themselves; which opinion they that defend are driven," etc. So he goes on to speak of transubstantiation and consubstantiation, as if there was no possible theory of grace accompanying the bread—that grace being what St. Paul calls His body and blood. We have Hooker again (vol. ii., p. 352, Keble's edit.): "The real presence of Christ's most blessed body and blood is not, therefore, to be sought for in the Sacrament, but in the worthy receiver of the Sacrament." Again: "I see not which way it should be gathered by the words of Christ, and where the bread is His body or the cup His blood, but only in the very heart and soul of him which receiveth them."

So much for Hooker. Now for the Catechism. We have a Sacrament defined: "An outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us . . . as a means whereby we receive the same." So much for both Sacraments. Then specially for the Eucharist: "The bread and wine are the outward and visible signs" by which the inward part, the spiritual grace, is received. This grace St. Paul calls the body and blood of Christ. *Bread* is the outward and visible sign of the inward and spiritual grace which St. Paul calls the body of Christ. This outward and visible sign is ordained by Christ Himself, as a means whereby we receive the inward *spiritual* grace. The presence, then, is to be sought elsewhere than in our hearts, even in the bread when it is given to us. It may be said that if the grace comes on us in the eating of the bread, that meets the requirement; that there must be two parts in the Sacrament. But unless the grace comes to us *with the bread* the Catechism errs, and the bread is not the means whereby we receive the grace.

I do not want to discredit "the judicious." I am only defending the language of the Catechism, and showing that, in comparison with that, Hooker must be said to be "isolated."

Your obedient servant,

CHARLES CROSTHWAITÉ

(Canon and V. G. of Kildare).

We have sent Canon Crosthwaite's letter to Mr. Dimock, and he replies as follows:

I feel sure that upon further examination Canon Crosthwaite will find that there is no real difference between the teaching of Hooker and the teaching of the Church Catechism.

The subsequent addition to the Catechism on the subject of the Lord's Supper is but a breaking into *two* of what had been *one* answer in Nowell's Smallest Catechism: "The body and blood of Christ, which in the Lord's Supper are *given* to the *faithful*, and are by them taken, eaten, drunken, only in a heavenly and spiritual manner, but yet in truth . . . our souls are refreshed and renewed by the blood of Christ through faith; in which way the body and blood of Christ are received in the Supper. For Christ as surely makes those who trust in Him partakers of His body and

blood, as they certainly know that they have received the bread and wine with their mouth and stomach."

And this teaching is nothing more than was constantly defended and maintained—and rightly so—by the Reformed.

I must only ask space for one or two examples :

1. Bishop Hooper (who led "the extremer school of Reformers," see Mr. Medd, *Intr. to first book of Ed.*, p. xii.) says : "I believe and confess . . . that always and as often as we use this bread and wine, according to the ordinance and institution of Christ, we do verily and indeed receive His body and blood." (*Later Writings*, P.S. edit., p. 49.)

2. Bishop Jewel (stigmatized as "an irreverent Dissenter," but whom Hooker pronounced to be "the worthiest divine that Christendom hath bred for the space of some hundreds of years"—*Ec. Pol.*, B. II., ch. vi., § 4) says : "We teach the people, not that a naked sign or token, but that Christ's body and blood indeed and verily is given unto us ; that we verily eat it ; that we verily drink it ; that we verily be relieved and live by it." (*Sermon and Harding*, P.S. edit., p. 448.)

It may be worth while to add a selection of a few extracts from Reformed Confessions of Faith.

1. The later Swiss Confession, 1566, says : "By this holy Supper . . . the faithful . . . receive the flesh and blood of the Lord." (*Hall's Harmony*, p. 317.) "By spiritual meat we mean not any imaginary thing, but the very body of our Lord Jesus, given to us : which is received of the faithful . . . by faith." (*Ibid.*, p. 318.)

2. The Belgian Confession, 1566, confirmed 1579, declares : "As truly as we do receive and hold in our hands this sign . . . so truly we do by faith . . . receive the very body and true blood of Christ." (*Ibid.*, pp. 336, 337.)

3. The Irish Articles of 1615 say : "But in the inward and spiritual part, the same body and blood is really and substantially presented unto all those who have grace to receive the Son of God, even to all those that believe in His Name." (# (*Neal's "History of Puritans,"* vol. iii., p. 517.)

A comparison of Hooker, *Ec. Pol.*, B. V., ch. lxvii., § 7, 8, 11, and 12, will show that his teaching did not fall short of this teaching of the Reformed.

I have been as brief as possible, but I venture to add that I have endeavoured to enter fully and at some length into the subject in "Papers on the Eucharistic Presence," No. VI., where much additional evidence will be found.—Yours faithfully,

N. DIMOCK.

Eastbourne, October 9th, 1889.

Review.

The Epistles of St. John. Twenty-one Discourses, with Greek Text, Comparative Versions and Notes, chiefly exegetical, by WILLIAM ALEXANDER, D.D., D.C.L., Brasenose College, Oxford, Lord Bishop of Derry and Raphoe. Hodder and Stoughton, 1889.

AS an expositor of the writings of St. John, the Bishop of Derry—the Chrysostom of the Irish Bench, has very special qualifications. In the volume before us the critical powers of the theologian are not more apparent than the spiritual insight displayed, combined as it is with an earnest and tender appreciation of all that is best in modern culture. The plan pursued is eminently popular, inasmuch as while no real difficulty is evaded, much of the extra-critical matter is deferred to