

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

ART. VII.—THE DOCTRINE OF THE FATHERS ON
THE LORD'S SUPPER.

FOUR canons of interpretation have been suggested, whereby to identify the doctrine of the Real Presence in the language of the Fathers. A writer, it is asserted, may confidently be understood to teach that the true Body and Blood of Christ are in the consecrated elements at the Lord's Supper:—

I. If he holds the objective view. Those who hold this view "lay the essence of the Sacrament, not in the action, but in the Sacrament itself: they believe that in or behind the outward visible element there is a heavenly gift given to us of God."

II. If stress is laid upon the act of consecration.

III. If effects are attributed to the consecrated Sacrament (that is, to the consecrated bread and wine), which can only belong to the Body and Blood of Christ.

IV. If there is maintained an attitude of extreme reverence in presence of the Sacrament.

The four tests are intimately dependent one upon another, and the strength of all four lies in the first. The word "Sacrament" or "Eucharist," it will be observed, is attached absolutely to the consecrated elements, the "outward visible element." The use of the word in this sense is the prevalent fallacy that extends throughout the whole of the Sacerdotal argument, and lies like a destructive rottenness at the very base of the superstructure. In the Article in *The Church Quarterly Review*, of October, 1879, which has given occasion to these Papers,¹ the word "Eucharist," or the word Sacrament, employed as interchangeable terms, occur no less than ninety-two times, and each time in the sense of the outward visible element, while on every occasion the argument depends wholly on this sense of the words. Accustomed, as most persons are, to use the word Sacrament, or Eucharist, in its wider sense of the whole ordinance, and not of one special part, it requires considerable care on the part of a reader to understand the word consistently in the sense of the author, rather than in that with which he is himself familiar.

I. Since the first of the four canons embodies the prevalent fallacy of the whole, it will need to be examined with the greater care. It is needless to repeat the words, since they will be under the reader's eye, while these lines are being perused. The test turns on a serious misconception of the Evangelical or Calvin-

¹ See *THE CHURCHMAN*, vol. i. p. 453.

istic doctrine, that is, of the doctrine of the Church of England. It is not correct to say, that the essence of the Sacrament is held to lie in the action, that is, in the act of administering, or of receiving, the consecrated bread and wine. When the word Sacrament is appropriated simply to the outward visible element, it is evident that a part is substituted for the whole. A Sacrament, as defined by the Church of England, consists of two parts, an outward visible sign, and an inward spiritual grace. The two together, not either one of the two, constitute the Sacrament. Not any outward visible sign, but that particular outward visible sign which was ordained by Christ Himself, and that inward grace of which it is the means, constitute in their combination the Sacrament. That this is the positive teaching of the Church of England may be seen by comparing the twenty-fifth Article with the Homily on Common Prayer and Sacraments. The Article explains that the "five commonly called Sacraments, that is to say, Confirmation, Penance, Orders, Matrimony, and Extreme Unction, are not to be counted for Sacraments of the Gospel;" and the Homily explains the reason, because some of them want one, and some want another, of the two parts, the outward ordained sign or the inward grace which constitute in their union the Sacrament of the Gospel. If either part is absent from an ordinance, that ordinance is not a Sacrament. Nor is it possible to assert one part to be more essential to a Sacrament than another. The Church of England, therefore, does not place the essence of the Sacrament in the action, for to do so would be to contradict her own definition: the Evangelical view of the Lord's Supper does not place the essence of the Sacrament either in the act of administering or in the act of receiving, for to do so would be to repeat in another form the precise mistake which its theological opponents are charged with making. The outward visible sign is a part, and a necessary part, of the Sacrament; but it is not itself the Sacrament. So the action is a part, and a necessary part, of the Sacrament; but it is not itself the Sacrament. Where, then, is the essence of the Sacrament? Simply in the Sacrament itself, with all its parts complete, that is, in the perfect ordinance, and in the authority which instituted it.

As it is desirable that every step of this argument should be supported by authority, in order that it may not appear to express the view of any particular writer, the following passage is subjoined from Archbishop Cranmer:—

First, this word Sacrament, I do sometimes use (as it is many times taken among writers and holy doctors) for the Sacramental bread, water, or wine; as when they say that *sacramentum est sacræ rei Signum*, "a sacrament is the sign of a holy thing." But when I used to speak sometimes (as the old Authors do) that Christ is in the

Sacraments, I mean the same as they did understand the matter; that is to say, not of Christ's carnal presence in the outward Sacrament, but sometimes of His Sacramental presence. And sometimes by this word Sacrament I mean the whole ministration and receiving of the Sacraments, either of baptism or of the Lord's Supper; and so the old writers many times do say, that Christ and the Holy Ghost be present in the Sacraments; not meaning by that manner of speech that Christ and the Holy Ghost be present in the water, bread, or wine (which be only the outward visible Sacraments), but that in the due ministration of the Sacraments according to Christ's ordinance and institution, Christ and His Holy Spirit be truly and indeed present by their mighty and sanctifying power, virtue, and grace to all them that worthily receive the same."—"Cranmer's Answer to Gardiner." Preface.

In this ordinance, therefore, our Church teaches that the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper. She believes, therefore, and all her faithful members must believe, that there is, in a true sense of the words, a real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ; but it is a presence in the ordinance not in the elements, to the faithful only, to those "who rightly and worthily receive," not to all without distinction of character. In the language of the twenty-eighth Article, "The body of Christ is given, taken, and eaten, in the Supper, only after a heavenly and spiritual manner. And the mean whereby the Body of Christ is received and eaten in the Supper is Faith." In the precise, trenchant language of the lamented Dr. Stephens, it is "given by God, not by the priest; taken by faith, not by the hand; eaten by the soul, not by the mouth."—"Argument in Sheppard *v.* Bennett," p. 78.)

Will any one say, that the fact of this presence being heavenly and spiritual detracts in the slightest degree from its actual reality? Are heavenly things less true than the ephemeral phenomena of the earthly state? Is the spirit of man less actual than his body, and the consciousness of the spirit less trustworthy than the delusive impressions upon the senses? If there is one point more than another, on which modern philosophy speaks with decision, it is on the reality of the human spirit and of all that enters into its experiences. The materialistic tendency, which believes in nothing but what can be touched and handled, is to be deprecated everywhere; but above all in that theology, which deals with unseen things and with that great Spirit, who is throned in the midst of them, the source and centre of all life. A spiritual presence is more real and actual, and is attested by more trustworthy evidence than any bodily presence can be. That word "Spiritual" seems, indeed, to carry two senses, and to whichever one of the two we

look, the real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the ordinance of the Lord's Supper is so asserted, that not to recognise it is an act of the grossest unbelief. On one side a spiritual presence means a presence to the spirit or soul of a man; but on the other side it also means a presence of which the Spirit of God is the Agent. We are made partakers of Christ by the operation of the Holy Ghost. This the Homily on the Sacraments strongly asserts. "The Communion of the Body and Blood of the Lord, which by the operation of the Holy Ghost—the very bond of our conjunction with Christ—is, through faith, wrought in the souls of the faithful." The scheme of belief asserted in these words is easily filled up. We are made partakers of Christ, not by bodily contact, but by spiritual union through the agency of the Holy Ghost. If, therefore, we could ascend into heaven and actually touch with the fingers of our body the glorified flesh of the Lord Jesus Christ, we should not be partakers of Him or of His life, save by the operation of the Holy Spirit, "the bond of our conjunction." What, then, can it conceivably matter to the efficient action of the Omnipresent Spirit whether the Body of Christ be actually present "on the altar in our churches," or whether it be seated as the Church of England teaches in Heaven, and in Heaven only? The work done by the Holy Ghost, and therefore the presence of the Body and Blood of Christ which He conveys to us, cannot be more real in the one case than in the other, unless the sovereignty of the Holy Ghost be blasphemed by calling into question either His Omnipresence or His Omnipotence. So far as concerns the reality of the Presence of Christ, nothing in the world is gained by asserting the Lord's bodily presence on the altar; nothing is lost by denying it. The presence in the ordinance is real and actual; how real and actual words are wanting to express. And if so, all the mingled blessedness and solemnity of partaking of the Body and Blood of Christ are there also; all the awe, and reverence, and tender emotions called into play by the conscious participation of the Body that was broken for us, and of the Blood which was shed for us on the Cross. Nay, such a Presence, and such a Communion as the Church of England teaches, is a far nobler and grander thing, and carries with it conceptions infinitely more exalted than the bare cold material communion of the Church of Rome and of her sympathisers.

It is not meant that this Presence is attached exclusively to the ordinance of the Lord's Supper, or that it differs in kind from the communion with Christ enjoyed by the soul in other portions of the Christian life. The Body and Blood of Christ, that is, the virtue and efficacy of His atoning sacrifice and death, underlie the Sacrament of Baptism as much as they underlie

the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Nay, further, it is this and this alone to which all access unto God is due. We "enter into the holiest by the blood of Jesus, by a new and living way, which He hath consecrated for us, through the veil, that is to say, His flesh," Heb. x. 19, 20. "Therefore," the writer concludes, "let us draw near with a true heart in full assurance of faith," and he prolongs the exhortation, but without a syllable that can be thought to refer to the Lord's Supper. With a reference equally general St. John asserts that "Our fellowship is with the Father and with His Son Jesus Christ," 1 John i. 3. There appears to be no difference *in kind* in the communion of the Body and Blood of Christ enjoyed in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and that enjoyed in all other intercourse between the soul and God; but there may be a superiority *in degree* in proportion to the greater solemnity of the ordinance, the time and purpose of its institution, and the touching and pathetic character of the emblems which bring almost visibly before the soul's eye the sacrifice and death of the Son of God. In asserting the reality of the Presence of Christ in the highest and most special act of Christian communion, it is not necessary to depreciate, as many do when they apparently assert that there is no worship without the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the dignity and solemn greatness of the soul's habitual intercourse with God. We do not maintain the Presence in the Lord's Supper the less strenuously because it is the same Presence which vivifies every means of grace, and extends its meritorious efficacy through the whole scheme of saving love.

Anglo-Catholic writers have been far too apt to forget, that Evangelical Christians believe in the Real Presence of Christ in the ordinance of the Lord's Supper, as devoutly as Anglo-Catholics believe in the presence of the material body under the forms of bread and wine. The mistake is a prolific one: not a few of the erroneous quotations that occur in *catenas* are caused by it. For instance, the following words of Rückert are quoted as if they contained a decisive admission that the doctrine of the Real Presence in the elements was the doctrine of the Early Church:—

That the Body and Blood of Christ were given and received in the Lord's Supper, that became the general belief from the beginning, even in a time when written records had not yet arisen, or were not yet sufficiently spread to have an influence. And the same belief remained throughout the following time; the Christian community never had any other, and no one in the Ancient Church ever opposed it, even the Arch-heretics never did so.—*Church Quarterly Review*, October, 1879, p. 205.

Well, what then? We accept the statement as cordially as the highest Anglo-Catholic can do. But it has no bearing what-

ever on the contest between us, for it only states what we assert to be our own belief. The difference only arises when we read between the lines, and then we read differently. We read, "that the Body and Blood of Christ were given and received in the ordinance of the Lord's Supper." Sacerdotalists read, "in and under the consecrated bread and wine of the Lord's Supper." The words of Rückert only assert the former, and say nothing whatever upon the latter proposition. So when it is said that the consecrated bread and wine are the Body and Blood of Christ, the Evangelical Churchman entirely endorses the sentiment. "Our Lord hesitated not to say, 'This is my Body,' when He gave the sign of His body" (Augustine "Contra Adamantum," tom. viii. p. 124). The Church of England devoutly repeats the words in her office, "The Body of Christ, which was given for thee. . . . The Blood of Christ, which was shed for thee." But if this be so, of what possible use can it be, in a controversy of this kind, to quote passages which only express what both parties to the controversy equally believe? Here, again, it may be well to pause, and to give authorities:—

The doctrine of a real spiritual presence is the doctrine of the English Church, and was the doctrine of Calvin and of many foreign reformers. It teaches that Christ is really received by faithful Communicants in the Lord's Supper, but that there is no gross or carnal, but only a spiritual and heavenly presence there; not the *less real* however for being spiritual. It teaches, therefore, that the bread and wine are received naturally; but the Body and Blood of Christ are received spiritually. The result of which doctrine is this: it is bread, and it is Christ's body. It is bread in substance, Christ in the Sacrament; and Christ is as really given to all that are truly disposed, as the symbols are: each as they can: Christ as Christ can be given; the bread and wine as they can; and to the same real purposes to which they were designed; and Christ does as really nourish and sanctify the soul, as the elements the body.—Quoted from Jeremy Taylor on the "Real Presence," sec. i. 4, by Bishop Harold Browne. Exp. p. 678.

Again:—

It is admitted on all hands that the reception of the consecrated elements in the Lord's Supper is in the nature of means to an end. And as to the end itself, however variously it may be described, there is no dispute among those who profess to hold the doctrine of our Church. All fully assent to the statements made in her Communion Office, as to the nature of the benefits enjoyed by those who, "with a true penitent heart and lively faith, receive that holy Sacrament" as consisting in that spiritual union with Christ, which is expressed in the words, mainly borrowed from the language of Scripture, "Then we spiritually eat the flesh of Christ and drink His blood; then we

dwell in Christ, and Christ with us."—"Remains of Bishop Thirlwall," vol. i. p. 262.

The same assertion is made by Hooker, B. v. s. 67, though considerations of space compel the omission of the passage.

We behold with the eyes of faith Him present after grace, and spiritually set upon the table; and we worship Him which sitteth above and is worshipped of the angels.—Bp. Ridley, "Disputation at Oxford," *Church Historian*, vol. vi. pt. ii. p. 500.

To the right celebration of the Lord's Supper there is no other presence of Christ required than a spiritual presence, and this presence is sufficient for a Christian man, as a presence by which we abide in Christ, and Christ abideth in us; to the obtaining of eternal life if we persevere. And this same presence may be called most fitly a real presence—that is, a presence not feigned, but a true and faithful presence.—Bp. Latimer, "Disputation at Oxford," *ibid.*, p. 501.

Thus it appears that the Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the ordinance of the Lord's Supper has been the doctrine of the Church of England since the Reformation. But this doctrine is different almost *toto caelo* from the doctrine of the Real Presence in the visible outward elements after consecration. Consequently, passages which prove the first—and they are to be found abundantly all down the line of Christian literature—are as far removed as the poles from teaching the second.

The primary conception on which the first of the four canons under discussion is based, "is thus found" to be "false." The division of the two opposing schemes of belief into objective and subjective must, therefore, be utterly rejected. The words themselves are novel and ambiguous in the highest degree. Scarcely any two writers use them in the same sense. Subjective presence may be employed to express a presence created by the action of the soul itself and having no reality distinct from it, and such a meaning is rejected by the Evangelical as firmly as it is rejected by the Sacerdotalist. The presence of Christ, if it be real, must be equally objective, whether it is objective in the soul, or objective in the outward elements. If it be not objective, it is not real. Accordingly, Bishop Thirlwall, whose acuteness as a thinker none will call into question, applies the word "objective" to that spiritual presence in the rite which has been stated to be the doctrine of the Church of England:—"Many have lost sight of what I venture to call the objective reality in the Sacrament" (*Remains*, vol. ii. p. 277). But when this distinction fails, it is not true to say that in the Evangelical view the grace of the Sacrament has "no necessary connection with the outward elements; for the act of receiving the bread and wine is part of the ordinance of

Christ, and, if it were omitted, it would no longer be the Sacrament that He has ordained. "The reception of the Sacrament, says Bishop Thirlwall, "is an integral part of the divinely appointed memorial" (*Ibid.*, p. 280).

Neither is it any longer possible to interpret the word "Sacrament" or "Eucharist" as necessarily meaning in the language of the Early Fathers the elements, and not the ordinance. It is admitted that the words have sometimes been used of the rite, sometimes of the elements. Cranmer, in a passage quoted (p. 46), states himself to have used them both ways. Hooker does so in the passage quoted on p. 51. The Church of England does so in the Twenty-ninth Article:—"The sign or Sacrament of so great a thing." But because the words are used in two senses, one proper, the other derivative, it is monstrous to assume that the Fathers always use it in its derivative, and not its proper meaning. Yet this is what is asserted in the first of the four Sacerdotal Canons. It may, indeed, be disputed whether the Early Fathers ever used "Sacrament" or "Eucharist" for the elements alone. The passage commonly quoted is from Justin Martyr:—"This food is called by us the Eucharist" (*Ap. I. c. 66*); but the word translated "food" is τροφή, which properly denotes, not what is eaten, but the benefit derived from eating. Thus it is used by Sophocles for children: ὦ τέκνα Κἀδμου τοῦ πάλαι νέα τροφή (*Ed.*, T. i.). It is translated by Scapula, "Alitura, nutritio, educatio; item nutrimentum, alimonia, victus;" by Stephens, "Alitura, nutritio;" by Damm, "Alitio;" by Dunbar, "Nourishment, food, aliment;" by Donovan, "Nourishment, aliment, food." The word is as nearly as possible equivalent to the "strengthening and refreshing" of the English Catechism, where it is indisputable that the Catechism is speaking, not of the elements, but of the rite or ordinance. In this case Justin may have used it for the whole Sacrament, as he has clearly done in another passage. He says that the offering of fine flour made under the law was "a type of the bread of the Eucharist." Again:—"Who in every place offer sacrifices to him—*i.e.*, the bread of the Eucharist and also the cup of the Eucharist" (*Dial. with Trypho*, pp. 139, 140).

What was meant by the word "sacrifice" by the Early Fathers, in such passages as the one just quoted, may be seen from passages like the following:—

The Lord, brethren, stands in need of nothing; and He desires nothing of any one, except that confession he made to him. . . . He saith, "Offer unto God the sacrifice of praise, and pay thy vows unto the Most High, and call upon me in the day of trouble; I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorify me." For "the sacrifice of God is a broken spirit" (*Clement, 1st Ep. s. 52*).

Sacrifices, therefore, do not sanctify a man, for God stands in no need of sacrifice, but it is the conscience of the offerer that sanctifies the sacrifice when it is pure, and this makes God to accept (the offering) as from a friend (Irenæ. c. Hær. b. iv. c. 18).

From all these it is evident that God did not seek sacrifices and holocausts from them, but faith and obedience and righteousness, because of their salvation (Irenæus v. Hær. b. iv. p. 429. Ante Nicene Fathers).

It appears, therefore (to sum up what has been said), that the essence of the Sacrament is to be found in no one part of the rite, but in the whole complete ordinance, and in the authority of Christ, by which it was instituted. By virtue of this institution the Body and Blood of Christ are "verily and indeed taken and received of the faithful in the Lord's Supper." This presence, being real, is objective to the soul of the faithful recipient. Hence the first of the four Canons altogether fails. It does not follow in the least that the Fathers who hold an objective view, who "place the essence of the Sacrament in the Sacrament itself," and who believe that "there is a heavenly gift given us of God," therefore believe that this gift is attached to the bread or wine, either in, or under, or behind, the outward visible elements. Consequently, they cannot justly be quoted in support of the Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the consecrated bread and wine of the Lord's Supper.

But when this first of the four Canons fails, all the other three will be found to have lost the very foundation on which they rest.

II. The second canon is this, "any Father may confidently be understood to teach that the true Body and Blood of Christ are in the consecrated elements of the Lord's Supper, if stress is laid in his writings on the act of consecration." Consecration, according to the Church of England, is the act of solemnly setting anything apart for a sacred use. A curious proof of this is afforded by the fact that the Church has provided no authoritative service for the consecration of her fabrics. The services actually used among us, and most wisely and rightly used, are used simply on the authority of the individual Bishop. It has often been stated, and so far as the writer knows without contradiction, that the late Archbishop Whately never used a service on such occasions. He attended formally to accept the building, and to complete the legal documents by which it was set apart for the service of Almighty God, but that was all. The consecration of such churches was as complete and valid, as if he had used the beautiful and becoming service generally employed among ourselves. So appropriate is some service of the kind, that it is difficult to understand why the compilers of the Liturgy did not provide a suitable office, unless it was that they desired to dis-

courage the Popish notion, that a moral quality of holiness could be attached, by virtue of consecration, to outward material things. Consecration is the act of setting apart, not all bread and wine in general, but a special portion of bread, and wine to represent the broken bread and the outpoured blood (*ἐκχυνόμενον*) of the crucified Son of God. By that act it ceases to be common bread and wine, and represents *unto us*, the "Body of the Lord Jesus Christ that was given for us, and the Blood of the Lord Jesus Christ that was shed for us." To treat it with irreverence is the sin, with which St. Paul charges the Corinthian Christians. They did not "discern the Lord's Body." To them the bread and wine in the Sacrament were just the same as all other bread and wine, and no more; means for satisfying bodily appetite, but having in them no sacred meaning, set apart for no divine purpose. Nor is it correct to say that in the Evangelical view the consecrated bread and wine are "mere symbols;" for they are integral parts of an ordinance in which by the special appointment of Christ, the Body and Blood of the Lord are "verily and indeed taken and eaten by the faithful in the Lord's Supper."

No doubt the world is full of symbols. To many minds every outward thing is a representative of some inward and heavenly truth. There may be symbols in almost every object that we see, and in almost every act that we do; for the wondrous unity of the Mind of God pervades everything, and produces corresponding unities everywhere. But such things are symbols of man's making, and not of God's appointing. In the service of His worship he has commanded three symbols to be used, and only three; and these three things not always and everywhere, but as organic parts of divinely instituted ordinances—water in the Sacrament of Baptism, and bread and wine in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. A representative meaning which our own minds may attach to things is evidently widely different to a representative meaning which the Lord Himself has, by special enactment, authoritatively attached to them. If a Church should appoint a hundred Sacraments, they would not be Sacraments of the Lord's appointing; and they would be distinguished from the two, which are of the Lord's appointing, by a line as broad and deep as that which separates the human and the divine, man and God.

Nor does it follow that every symbol of which it may have pleased God to make use in the course of His dealings with mankind, should therefore be on the same footing as water in Baptism and bread and wine in the Lord's Supper. It has pleased God to use seed as a symbol or illustration of the Word of God, just as in the Old Testament the seven ill-favoured kine in Pharaoh's dream were used to symbolise the seven years

of famine, and the bonds and yokes of Jeremiah to represent the calamities impending over Judah. In such cases God, condescending to employ human language, has made use of symbols, spoken or acted, to express His will; but He has nowhere made it a part of our religious duty that we should make use of them also. He has employed them as vehicles of revelation, but not ordained them as acts of worship. He has used them once in words, which will indeed abide to all time, but He has not made them parts of an ordinance of perpetual obligation, for "as often as we eat this bread and drink this cup, we do show forth the Lord's death till He come." Great importance attaches to the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper, for they are an essential part of this ordinance, and in their absence it would no longer be the Sacrament that Christ has ordained.

Now, let it be remembered that the tenderness and awe, the soul-saddening pathos and adoring affection which centre round the Sacrament, depend wholly on the reality of the presence of Christ, and not at all upon the mode of it. It has already been shown that the Evangelical believer holds to the reality of this presence as strongly as the highest Anglo-Catholic can do. They only differ as to the mode; and if one mode of this presence can be more rich in grand and adoring thoughts than another, it is that of the Evangelical; for the presence of the whole Christ to the soul is a more lofty and exalting communion than the presence of the natural flesh of Christ to the outward and material lips. Consecration, therefore, does not necessarily involve more to the one than to the other; and no line of distinction between two schools can possibly be found in an estimate that may be common to them both.

III. The third proposed canon is as follows:—"A writer may be understood to teach that the true Body and Blood of Christ are in the consecrated elements in the Lord's Supper, if effects are attributed to the consecrated Sacrament (that is, the consecrated elements) which can only belong to the Body and Blood of Christ."

The words imply that spiritual effects are to be attributed to the Body and Blood of Christ—that is, to the Body and Blood of Christ as distinguished from the other portions of the indivisible person and two-fold nature of the Lord Jesus Christ. But Scripture teaches no such thing: the Church of England, following Scripture, teaches no such thing. No doubt in many passages of the Word the body, and especially the blood of Christ, are specified as essential conditions of the atoning work of Christ. Thus, "He made peace with the blood of His Cross;" but it is not the blood, but HE who voluntarily shed the blood who is said to have made peace—that is, the entire Christ, God and man in one. So in the words of institution, "This is My

body which is given for you;" "My blood which is shed for you." Again, the efficacy is in the Person of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the emphasis on the word "My." Still more strongly St. John speaks, "The blood of Jesus Christ, His Son, cleanseth us from all sin;" where, if the word "blood" be pressed, as being the cause of salvation apart from the Deity of the person (see Acts xxi. 28), it would follow that the Body of Christ occupied no part in the work. But, according to the usage of Scripture, the blood stands for the whole atoning sacrifice and death of Christ. There is only one passage in Scripture in which saving virtue is attributed to the material flesh and blood of the Lord; and then it was wrongly attributed, and the mistake called forth the instant and almost indignant rebuke of the great Master, "It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing." Had it been otherwise, how could St. Paul have written "Henceforth we know no man after the flesh; yea, though we have known Christ after the flesh, yet now henceforth know we him no more" (2 Cor. v. 16). See Waterland "Review of the Doctrine of the Eucharist. Works," vol. vii. c 3.

But we are told "the Gospel conception of the Flesh of Jesus is that it is instinct with Divine and eternal life, which flowed forth from Him into the souls and bodies of all, who worthily came near Him. Whence St. Paul, speaking of His glorified Flesh, calls it *πνεῦμα ζωοποιόν*, quickening or life-giving spirit." The mistake is so extraordinary, that it is equally difficult to believe that it can have been made intentionally, or have been made unintentionally. The reference is to 1 Cor. xv. 45, where alone the phrase, "a quickening spirit" occurs. But it is not used of the flesh of Christ, but of the entire Christ, as the federal head of His people in accordance with the argument of St. Paul in the fifth of the Romans. The first man Adam (*ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος Ἀδὰμ*) was made a living soul; the last Adam (*ὁ ἔσχατος Ἀδὰμ*) was made a quickening spirit. The omission of *ἄνθρωπος* in the second half of the contrast is, to say the least, remarkable. The word *ζωοποιέω* only occurs in the New Testament twelve times. Twice it is used of the human body without any specification of the agent; once of the law; once of Christ; three times of God absolutely, and five times of the Spirit; but not in one single passage of the flesh of Christ. This canon consequently falls to the ground, and is only invested with the slightest shadow of plausibility by that equivocal use of the word Sacrament, to which repeated attention has already been called.

IV. One more canon alone remains to be considered. "A writer may be understood to assert the Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the consecrated elements in the Lord's Supper, if he maintains an attitude of extreme reverence

in the presence of the Sacrament." This has been already answered by anticipation, and it is only necessary to bear in mind that the word Sacrament is again used equivocally. It is not to be assumed that the Fathers used the word for the elements and not for the ordinance. It has already been pointed out that Evangelical Churchmen believe Christ to be actually present in the ordinance, and that the Body and Blood of Christ are "verily and indeed taken and received of the faithful in the Lord's Supper." The only matter in controversy is, where Christ is present and how? Is He present in the elements or in the heart; by material contact or by living faith? Let not one word in these Papers be supposed to depreciate the vast and incalculable importance of this difference. The one mode differs from the other, as widely as piety differs from superstition. But, so far as the actual presence of Christ is concerned, it is not a whit more true and actual, more solemn and life-giving, on the one system of belief than on the other. Extreme reverence is becoming in both cases equally. In point of fact there has existed, in all times of the Church, considerable diversity in the amount of importance attributed to the Sacraments in the scheme of salvation, and consequently in the language in which men of different schools, and even of the same school, have spoken of them, and especially in regard to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. Mental constitution and devotional habits have widely modified them. The mistake of supposing that Evangelical Churchmen do not regard the Lord's Supper with profound emotion is only a corollary of supposing, that they do not believe Christ to be truly present in the ordinance to every faithful heart. The mistake lies at the very bottom of the Anglo-Catholic treatment of this subject. To assume that every one who maintains an attitude of extreme reverence towards the ordinance therefore believes in the Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the elements, is as opposed to logic as it demonstrably is to fact.

How it is opposed to the logic of the question has already been pointed out. That it is opposed to fact admits of easy demonstration. But it may be well to establish the fact by actual quotations. Their number might be indefinitely multiplied; but the following will suffice. The authoritative language of the Church of England claims precedence. It is taken from the Homily, which contains the emphatic warning to take heed lest of a Sacrament the Lord's Supper be made into a Sacrifice:—

The true understanding of this junction and union, which is betwixt the body and the head, betwixt the true believer and Christ, the ancient Catholic Fathers, both perceiving themselves, and commending to their people, were not afraid to call this Supper, some of them, the salve of immortality, and sovereign preservative against death; other, a classical communion; other, the sweet dainties of our Saviour,

the pledge of eternal health, the defence of faith, the hope of the resurrection; other, the food of immortality, the healthful grace, and the conservatory to everlasting life. All which sayings, both of the Holy Scripture and of godly men, *truly attributed to this celestial banquet and feast*, if we would often call in mind, O, how would they influence our hearts to desire the participation of these mysteries, and oftentimes to covet after this bread, continually to thirst for this food.—“Homily,” xxvii. Pt. i.

In the same devout spirit writes Bishop Jewell:—

We make no doubt to say that there be certain visible words, seals of righteousness, tokens of grace; and do expressly pronounce that in the Lord's Supper there is truly given unto the believing the Body and Blood of the Lord, the flesh of the Son of God which quickeneth our souls the meat that cometh from above, the food of immortality, grace, truth, and life; and the Supper to be the communion of the Body and Blood of Christ, by the partaking whereof we be revived, we be strengthened, we be fed unto immortality, and whereby we be joined, united, and incorporated into Christ, that we may abide in him and He in us.—“Bp. Sewell's Apol.,” Pt. ii.

No doubt can possibly be entertained of Hooker's sentiments in the face of his express declaration, “I see not which way it should be gathered by the words of Christ, when and where the bread is His body, or the cup His blood: but only in the very heart and soul of him which received them.” Yet the lofty language in which he enlarges on the dignity of the Sacrament is very remarkable:—

The very letter of the word of Christ giveth plain security that these mysteries do, as nails, fasten us to his very Cross, that by them we draw out, as touching efficacy, force, and virtue, even the blood of his gored side; in the wounds of our Redeemer we there dip our tongues, we are dyed red both within and without; our hunger is satisfied, and our thirst for ever quenched; they are things wonderful which he feeleth, great which he seeth, and not heard of which he uttereth, whose soul is possessed of this paschal lamb, and made joyful in the strength of this new wine; this cup hath in it more than the substance which our eyes behold, and this cup, hallowed with solemn benediction, availeth to the endless life and welfare both of soul and body, in that it serveth as well for a medicine to heal our infirmities and purge our sins, as for a sacrifice of thanksgiving; with touching it sanctifieth, it enlighteneth with belief; it truly conformeth us unto the image of Jesus Christ.—Hooker, “Ecc. Pol.,” b. ii. s. 67.

The same manner of language in speaking of the Lord's Supper is to be found in writers of a very different class to Hooker, and who would be considered in our own day to stand among the lowest of Low Churchmen. The theologicall lectures of Archbishop Leighton contain an exhortation before the Communion. “This is it,” he writes, “which render a vast number

unworthy of such an honour : they approach this heavenly feast without forming a right judgment of themselves or of it." He proceeds :—

Consider with yourselves, I pray, think seriously, what madness, what unaccountable folly it is to trifle with the Majesty of the Most High God, and to offer to Infinite Wisdom the sacrifices of distraction and folly. Shall we, who are but insignificant worms, thus *provoke the Almighty King to jealousy*, as if we were *stronger than He*, and of purpose run our heads, as it were, against that Power, the slightest touch whereof would crush us to dust. Do we not know that the same God, who is an embracing and saving light to all that worship with humble piety, is, nevertheless, a *consuming fire* to all the impious and profane, who pollute the sacrifice with impure hearts and unclean hands. . . . If there be any, let their guilt and pollution be ever so great, who find arising within them a hearty aversion to their own impurity, and an earnest desire for holiness; behold, there is opened for you a living and pure fountain, most efficient for cleansing and washing away all sorts of stains, as well as for refreshing languishing and thirsty souls. And He who is the living and never-failing fountain of purity and grace, encourages, calls, and exhorts you to come to Him. *Come unto me all ye that are a-thirst, &c.* ; and again, *"All that the Father giveth me shall come to me ; and him that cometh to me I will by no means expel or cast out (Joh. vi. 3)."*—"Leighton's Works," Lond. 1835, vol. ii. pp. 512-513.

The next extract is taken from the "Memorials of Dr. John Love," a Scotch minister, who flourished about a hundred years ago :—

"This cup is the New Testament in my blood," 1 Cor. xi. 25. A New Testament indeed—a new and surprising thing. Think of God making a Testament in favour of guilty rebels. Wonder, O, heavens, and ye that dwell therein : look down and wonder. God, instead of pouring out wrath on sinners executes a Testament in their favour ; making over good things to them. And what are those things? Are they heaven and earth? Are they all creatures? No, He makes over *Himself* to them, in His infinite attributes, riches, and fulness, with all that He can do for them. Is not this a *New Testament* indeed? and is it not made in as new a manner? It is made "in My blood," saith the Lord of Hosts; "Nails, and spears, and agonies did let out My blood, that it might fill this cup, to be put into thine hand, O, heir of hell." "Memorials of Dr. Love," vol. ii. p. 226

One closing quotation shall be given from a Nonconformist Divine of eminence in our own day :—

Anglican theologians derive an immense, but illegitimate advantage from the way in which their theory is commonly discussed. It is implied that all other Protestant theories deny "the Real Presence" of Christ in the supreme rite of the Christian Faith. This implication we passionately resent. Christ is present at His table, though not in the bread and wine which are placed upon it. He is there, as a

Host with His guests. We do not meet to think of an absent Lord, or to commemorate a dead Saviour; we receive the bread from His own hands, and with it all that the bread symbolises; we drink the cup in His presence, and affirm that we are His friends—that through His blood we have received “remission of sins,” and that we have “peace with God” through Him. He is nearer to us now than He was to those who heard from His lips the words of instruction. It was “expedient” for us that He should go away; for He has come again, and by the power of His Spirit we abide in Him and He in us. In being made partakers of Christ, we are “made partakers of the Divine Nature,” and become for ever one with God.—Ecclesia, “The Doctrine of the Lord’s Supper,” by the Rev. R. W. Dale, p. 300.

According to Anglo-Catholic canons, every one of these writers must be supposed to maintain the Real Presence of the Body and Blood of Christ in the consecrated Bread and Wine in the Lord’s Supper. Such a conclusion is a *reductio ad absurdum*. Not one of the suggested canons holds good. They really contain in themselves the assumption of the whole matter which has to be proved, and from themselves they extend the fallacy into the language they are professedly employed to interpret, and put into it a meaning which the language itself does not contain. Are there, then, no true canons which can be adopted? In truth they are unnecessary, if men will only read the language of the Fathers in the light of their times, and not view it through the colouring of later controversy. But if any such rules are desired, they can be readily gathered out of what has been already said. But the brief statement of them, and their application to the language by those Fathers, on whose testimony the matter in dispute is made to hang by Anglo-Catholic consent, must be reserved for another and a closing Paper.

EDWARD GARBETT.

ART. VIII.—LYRICS, SYLVAN AND SACRED.

Lyrics, Sylvan and Sacred. By RICHARD WILTON. George Bell and Sons.

THOSE who have read Kingsley’s description, in his “Alton Locke,” of the toilworn tailor’s escape from the city and first enjoyment of the country, will never forget it. You seem to breathe the fetterless air, and bask in the smokeless sunshine, and to echo back the songs of the birds, and almost to be drawn up into the blue crystal deeps of the sky. And many will be conscious of the same mastery of quiet rural joys over the spirit